

**MEN ON THE ROAD:
BEGGARS AND VAGRANTS IN EARLY MODERN DRAMA
(WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, JOHN FLETCHER, AND RICHARD BROME)**

A Dissertation

by

MI-SU KIM

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2004

Major Subject: English

MEN ON THE ROAD:
BEGGARS AND VAGRANTS IN EARLY MODERN DRAMA
(WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, JOHN FLETCHER, AND RICHARD BROME)

A Dissertation

by

MI-SU KIM

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

James L. Harner
(Co-Chair of Committee)

Douglas A. Brooks
(Co-Chair of Committee)

Howard J. Marchitello
(Member)

James M. Rosenheim
(Member)

Paul A. Parrish
(Head of Department)

May 2004

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Men on the Road:

Beggars and Vagrants in Early Modern Drama

(William Shakespeare, John Fletcher, and Richard Brome). (May 2004)

Mi-Su Kim, B.A.; M.A., Seoul National University

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. James L. Harner

Dr. Douglas A. Brooks

This dissertation examines beggars, gypsies, rogues, and vagrants presented in early modern English drama, with the discussion of how these peripatetic characters represent the discourses of vagrancy of the period. The first chapter introduces Tudor and early Stuart governments' legislation and proclamations on vagabondage and discusses these governmental policies in their social and economic contexts. The chapter also deals with the literature of roguery to point out that the literature (especially in the Elizabethan era) disseminated such a negative image of beggars as impostors and established the antagonistic atmosphere against the wandering poor. The second chapter explores the anti-theatrical aspect of the discourses of vagrancy. Along with the discussion of early playing companies' traveling convention, this chapter investigates how the long-held association of players with beggars is addressed in the plays that are dated from the early 1570s to the closing of the playhouses in 1642. In the third chapter I read Shakespeare's King Lear with the focus on its critical allusions to the discourses of vagrancy and interpret King Lear's symbolic experience of vagrancy in that context. The chapter demonstrates that King Lear represents the spatial politics embedded in the

discourses of vagrancy and evokes a sympathetic understanding of the wandering poor. Chapter IV focuses on Beggars' Bush and analyzes the beggars' utopian community in the play. By juxtaposing the play with a variety of documents relating to the vagrancy issue in the early seventeenth century, I contend that Beggars' Bush reflects the cultural aspirations for colonial enterprises in the early Stuart age. Chapter V examines John Taylor's conceptualization of vagrancy as a trope of travel and free mobility, and discusses the "wanderlust" represented in A Jovial Crew: Merry Beggars as an exemplary anecdote showing the mid seventeenth century's perceptions on vagrancy and spatial mobility. Thus, by exploring diverse associations and investments regarding vagrants, this study demonstrates that the early modern discourses of vagrancy have been informed and inflected by shifting economic, socio-historical, and national interests and demands.

In memory of my father, Chul-Sik Kim (1938-2000)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation could not have been completed or imagined without the support of my committee. I would like to thank Dr. James L. Harner for his consistent encouragement and guidance. From my first year as a Ph.D. student until now, he has watched me go through all the different stages and helped me step forward with wisdom and humor. The scholarly diligence I learned from him enabled me to develop my primary idea into this dissertation. I am grateful to Dr. Douglas A. Brooks for his willingness to discuss the subject of vagrancy and for his steady interest in my work. I feel gratitude to Dr. Howard J. Marchitello for giving me inspiration on spatial issues and to Dr. James M. Rosenheim for his insightful and knowledgeable comments.

I do thank the Department of English and the Center for Humanities Studies at Texas A&M University for offering me travel grants, which I used to present my papers on King Lear and A Jovial Crew. I wish to express my gratitude to the late Dr. Helen Barthelme and Dr. Lynne Vallone, whose friendship and motherly care I feel privileged to enjoy in this foreign country.

I reserve my special thanks to my parents-in-law and my mother for their sacrificial love and vigorous support. I want to thank my lovely nine-year-old daughter Yesul, who accompanied me on my trips to the library and showed her curiosity and excitement about writing a dissertation. I owe many things to my eighteen-month-old daughter Yejean, who had to stay apart from me while I finished up writing. My warmest thanks go to my husband Taehoon Kim for his emotional and intellectual

support. Without his encouragement, I would not have even tried to challenge myself and could not have completed this work. As a critical reader, wise adviser, and sympathetic companion, he accompanied me on this long journey and shared many burdens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		iii
DEDICATION		v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS		viii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	1. Prologue	1
	2. Poor Law and Vagrancy Legislation	4
	3. The Image of Beggars in the Literature of Roguery	9
	4. A Brief Review of Recent Scholarship and My Approach	18
II	BEGGARS, ROGUES, AND PLAYERS	27
	1. Traveling Players and Vagabonds	28
	2. Roguery and Theatricality	37
	3. Reconfiguration of Theatricality, Beggary, and Roguery for Promoting the Acting Business	51
III	KING LEAR'S SYMBOLIC EXPERIENCE OF VAGRANCY	80
	1. A Dialogue with the Literature of Roguery	80
	2. Vagrancy and Homelessness	95
	3. Lear's Spatial Experience	104
	4. James I and Foresters	112
IV	<u>BEGGARS' BUSH</u> AND COLONIAL ENTERPRISES	122
	1. A Carnival of Beggars	123
	2. The Glory of Merchants	139
	3. The Beggars' Forest Community and Colonial Green World....	154
	4. England in 1622: the Instability of Colonial Enterprises	163

CHAPTER	Page
V A BEGGAR AS A TRAVELER IN <u>A JOVIAL CREW</u> : <u>MERRY BEGGARS</u>	172
1. Traveling in Early Seventeenth-Century England	174
2. John Taylor's Self-Representation as a Beggar	183
3. Diverse Modes of Travel in <u>A Jovial Crew</u>	190
VI CONCLUSION	204
WORKS CITED	210
VITA	222

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. Prologue

FOOL.

Thou [Lear] wast a pretty fellow then thou hadst no need to
Care for her frowning; now thou art an O without a figure. I
Am better than thou art now; I am a fool, thou art nothing.

(King Lear 1.4.167-69)

When the Fool looks at Lear, whose power and authority has become so minimal that he has to beg his daughter for his dinner, the Fool sees in his master the beggared poor who have to depend on charity-givers for their food and shelter. The Fool tells Lear the rule of the world: if you possess nothing, you become nothing. When Lear gives up his throne, the Fool implies, Lear loses his identity, and the right to claim himself as a king. Lear's "nothingness" bears a close resemblance to the vagrant poor in early modern England, who underwent a turbulent experience of identities when they could not hold onto their occupation, belongings, and their home. Vagrants' and beggars'

This dissertation follows the style of the MLA Handbook.

turbulent experiences of “becoming nothing” will be explored in this dissertation, together with the diverse discourses of vagrancy in early modern England.

A variety of polemicists in that period approached the issue of vagrancy from different angles. Some, in discussing the problems of public health and hygiene, attributed the dissemination of the plague to vagrants. On the other hand, nationalists noted vagrants’ potential economic power if they had participated in productive work. Also, some members of the propertied class, fearing the plethora of uprooted poor lingering around their properties, argued that vagrants should be monitored and controlled more thoroughly. In this light, diverse writers voiced their values, interests, and anxiety by discussing the vagrancy issue. In such discursive practices, vagrants were culturally an empty figure (“O without a figure”) whose significance was defined and manufactured by legislators, rogue pamphleteers, nationalists, historiographers and all other kinds of writers. In fact, beggars were discursively monstrous figures whose significance was oversupplied and incongruent. Largely illiterate, beggars were isolated from discursive practices and could not control the cultural manipulation of their images. Some of their images of being idle, roguish, and incorrigible were mainly produced and consumed by relatively upper-class writers and, thus, the discourses of vagrancy often tell us more about higher class’ value systems and perceptions of vagrants than the realities of vagrants themselves.¹ Noting such features, I will discuss the discourses of vagrancy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and examine the impulses and the interests that shaped them.

How were vagrants and beggars represented and what do these representations tell us about early modern society? Each chapter in this dissertation approaches these questions with a slightly different focus. Discursive practices of vagrancy, I will show, were not monolithic historically and horizontally, and their media were diverse. I will examine a variety of contemporary texts such as Privy Council proclamations, regulations on vagabonds, rogue pamphlets, poems, plays, broadsides, lottery advertisements, sermons, homilies, and political, religious, and economic treatises. Their examination opens to us contesting interests and values that informed and inflected the discourses of vagrancy. Accordingly, different historical interests in each period generated a distinctive image of beggars: for example, the holy image of beggars in the Middle Ages, the beggar as a crafty villain in the sixteenth century, and the beggar as a potential labor force employable in the seventeenth-century imperial enterprise. These historically different perceptions of beggars never changed linearly but coexisted and contested at the same historical moments. Yet despite some moments of coexistence, beggars' images historically underwent a gradual shift, representing cultural anxieties and aspirations prominent in each period. This study will focus on the transitional period of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, in which the beggar's image as a crafty villain contested with its positive image as a vivacious, jovial, adventurous figure enjoying freedom. Again, just as the demonic image of beggars could be far from a true reflection of beggars' realities, the romantic image of beggars cannot be taken literally as reflecting beggars' real lives. Yet, the employment of the vagrant poor in the colonial

enterprises in the seventeenth century contributed to changing cultural images of the vagrant poor, and facilitated altered perceptions of vagrancy and mobility.

2. Poor Law and Vagrancy Legislation

The medieval holy image of a beggar changed in Tudor England, in conjunction with the historical change the society had undergone. A. L. Beier explains that the Franciscan ideal that beggars were holy and that the holy should live as beggars was discredited. Instead “a new set of values, that of Renaissance humanists, which celebrated the value of worldly activity and success,” emerged and generated the conceptual change in Tudor England (Beier 4). With a slightly different focus, Mark Koch discusses the same phenomenon of “de-sanctification of the beggar” during the Reformation. Koch demonstrates that Protestants’ emphasis on work and disapproval of charity, which had been regarded as a way of earning God’s grace, established an anti-mendicant cultural attitude. The historical shift in the attitude toward the vagrant poor was also interrelated with several causes. The dissolution of the monasteries, the enclosure movement, the confluence of various strains on the economy, a sharp demographic increase, and the disbanding of professional soldiers led to the increase of the unemployed poor and contributed to augmenting the level of fear of the vagrant poor (Kinney 19).

Cultural anxiety and fear about the wandering poor was so strong that it drove the Tudor regime to legislate harsh regulations and punishments on vagabonds. Unemployment was regarded as “a dangerous crime” and vagrants were considered “no

ordinary criminals” but “menaces to society” (Beier 5-6). The 1531 vagabond act defines that any person who has a whole and mighty body able to work, who has no land or master or any lawful craft or mystery, will be arrested by king’s officers and be beaten and whipped. The government’s will to regulate and criminalize the unemployed poor as vagabonds was maintained through the Poor Law in the Tudor regime with only slight variations. The 1547 statute commanded that “all able-bodied persons not working be declared vagabonds, that they be seized by former masters and branded with a V on their breast, and then enslaved for two years” (Kinney 45). If the branded vagabonds ran away during the two years, they were subject to the harsher punishment: they were to be branded with an S and made slaves for life. The Elizabethan act in 1572 extends the category of vagabond to include several wandering trades (fortune tellers, jugglers, peddlers, tinkers, petty chapmen) and the performing troupes (fencers, bearwards, common players in interludes, minstrels) when they do not belong to a baron or a patron of equal or higher degree. In 1598, the Elizabethan government revised the Poor Law, and the regulations made that year served “as the fundamental English poor law for the next two hundred years” (Kinney 48). With the systemization of poor relief per parish, the legislation commands rogues to be put in a house of correction or a jail until they were placed in service, with the specification that dangerous rogues should be banished. James I reenacted this regulation in the first year of his reign, and maintained it as the policy on troublesome groups throughout his regime. In 1603, James ordered that rogues should be branded in the left shoulder with a great Roman R and, if this failed, that they should be banished to Virginia (Kinney 51). In 1610, the Jacobean government ordered

houses of correction, similar to London's Bridewell, to be erected in every county for "rogues, bastard-bearers and other 'idle and disorderly persons'" (Slack, English Poor Law 53). In this way, the legislation on and punishment for vagabonds and beggars in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was changing from corporal punishment to enforcement of labor.

Overall the vagabond acts were authorities' medium of establishing and consolidating their power with the strategy of demarcation and categorization. By distinguishing the deserving poor from the undeserving poor, the government made its harsh treatment of the undeserving poor look justifiable. Vagrants' bodies in particular were employed as the sites for Tudor and Stuart authorities to inscribe their power. The 1547 and 1604 statutes authorized the branding of letters (V, S, and R) on vagrants' breasts and shoulders.² Ear-boring, that was included in the 1572 act, was another example of "semiotic mutilation of the vagrant's body" (Carroll 44). As William Harrison notes, ear-boring was a "more easily visible permanent 'token' on the body" (qtd. in Carroll 44). Along with such various corporal punishments that were tried and revoked, whipping was practiced for a long time as the standard punishment for vagabondage.

In addition to "corporal puniton," A. L. Beier observes that "the loss of freedom" was another way to deal with vagrancy, and "impressment and transportation" were its examples (160-61). "Impressment began in the reign of Edward I," Beier says, but it "escalated in the second half of the sixteenth century" (161). The Elizabethan and the first two Stuart governments drafted vagabonds for several campaigns, and

especially the Stuart government practiced and utilized the policy of transportation. The policy was first conceived and authorized with the Vagrancy Act of 1597, but it was elaborated with more detail and employed mostly by James I. The 1603 proclamation states:

We therefore of his Majesties privie Council, whose names are hereunto subscribed, finding it of necessitie to reforme great abuses, and to have the due execution of so good and necessarie a Law, doe according to the power limitted unto us by the same Statute, hereby Assigne and thinke it fit and expedient, that the places and partes beyond the Seas to which any such *incorrigible or dangerous Rogues shall bee banished and conveyed* according to the said Statute, shall bee these Countries and places following, viz. The New-found Land, the East and West Indies, France, Germanie, Spaine, and the Low-counties, or any of them. (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 1. 52-53 my italics)

By re-enacting the ruling of banishment on incorrigible and dangerous rogues, James I and his Privy Council declared their resolution for the social issue of vagrancy; instead of imprisonment and punishment, they decided to solve the problems of poverty and vagabondage by transferring troubling groups abroad. On this policy of transplantation, Beier remarks that although several places were named for exile, “in practice most were sent to the American colonies” (162). Stuart authorities were determined to reform and capitalize on the flowing vagrants by providing them work in domestic industry or by authorizing them to be employed in maritime enterprise and colonial plantations.

The late Elizabethan and early Stuart policy of employing vagrants for work, impressment, and transplantation was influenced by the belief that such methods of punishment could be beneficial to England financially and socially. Even preachers in their Sunday sermons delivered the message supporting the employment of vagrants in the national project of transplantation. John Donne, for example, in his sermon for the Virginia company in 1622, agrees that colonization will be beneficial to “many a wretch” who will be redeemed “from the hands of the Executioner,” but also to the country, since colonization “shall sweepe your streets, and wash your doores, from idle persons, and the children of idle persons, and imploy them” (21-22). “Plantations in the new World,” as Howard Mumford Jones notes, were regarded as a “sovereign remedy” for over-population and poverty (146). But such a policy of transportation would not have been conceivable and practicable without the enhanced interest in overseas expansion and overseas companies in the Stuart era. It was the epoch during which dozens of new overseas companies were organized and their success and persistence reflected “a growing determination to open new areas of the world to English enterprise” (Rabb 2). Theodore K. Rabb notes that England, which had been “an underdeveloped country” in the middle of the sixteenth century, had a striking economic transformation “between the last years of Edward VI’s reign and the first years of Charles I’s reign” and by 1630 founded all the groundwork for its imperial expansion and its role as the leader of European commerce (1-2). With the help of promotional literature such as broadsides, treatises, and lottery advertisements, colonial enterprise was a familiar part of Londoners’ everyday life in the seventeenth-century England. Such historical, socio-

political, and economic conditions informed and inflected the revived romantic image of beggars and vagrants in the early seventeenth-century plays. Seventeenth-century playwrights revised Thomas Harman's demonic characterization of vagrants and represented them as comic characters full of vitality. Such a change in beggars' and vagrants' image was enabled by the growing economic attention to their potential as a labor. Their employment in domestic and colonial enterprises generated and helped to disseminate the perception of the unemployed poor as a part of national wealth rather than the symptom of a national disease.

3. The Image of Beggars in the Literature of Roguery

In addition to the legislation and official policy on vagrancy, the literature of roguery was another important factor in the cultural process of constructing the images of vagrants. When Koch surveys Protestantism's contribution in eliminating the aura of holiness about mendicancy during the Reformation, he argues that the literature of roguery "may have played a more direct role in desanctifying mendicancy than did the theological writings of the Protestant Reformers" (96). Koch notes that Martin Luther presented his virulent indictment on undeserving beggars in his popular rogue book, Liber Vagatorum (1528), as well as in his formal writing, Ordinance for a Common Chest. Liber Vagatorum divulges the crafty wiles of undeserving beggars and contains a lexicon of the beggars' canting language. A similar type of rogue pamphlets were circulated and popularized in England. After a few precursors-- Ship of Fools (1508), Robert Copland's Highway to the Spital-House (1535), and John Awdeley's Fraternity

of Vagabonds (1561)--, Thomas Harman's Caveat or Warening for Commen Cursetors, Vulgarly Called Vagabones appeared in 1567, and had a seminal impact on the Elizabethan perception on vagabonds.³ Harman lists twenty-four types of beggars with detailed descriptions of the deceptive techniques of each. Harman, for instance, depicts a Rogue as a liar or con-man with a false excuse for wandering:

A Rogue is neither so stout or hardy as the upright man. Many of them will go faintly and look piteously when they see, either meet any person [. . .] But you may easily perceive by their color that they carry both health and hypocrisy about them, whereby they get gain when other want that cannot feign and dissemble. Others there be that walk sturdily about the country, and feigneth to seek a brother or kinsman of his, dwelling within some part of the shire. Either that he hath a letter to deliver to some honest householder dwelling out of another Shire, and will shew you the same fair sealed, with the superscription to the party he speaketh of, because you shall not think him to run idly about the country. either have they this shift: they will carry a certificate or passport about them from some Justicer of the peace, with his hand and seal unto the same, how he hath been whipped and punished for a vagabond according to the laws of this realm, and that he must return to T. where he was born or last dwelt, [. . .] And all this feigned, because without fear they would wickedly wander, and will renew the same, where or when it pleaseth them, for they have of their affinity that can well write and read. (120-21)

Harman describes every different type of beggar in terms of each beggar's methods of cheating and stealing. In addition, Harman explains that the beggars use their canting language and have their own social rules. When a beggar is admitted as a member of the underworld, he gains the right to be called a "rogue" and is informed of the underworld rules. Harman's Caveat, with four printings in seven years, played a major role in establishing the image of vagrants during the Elizabethan period.

Harman's Caveat has been considered one of the crucial historical documents reflecting the realities of the poor in the mid-Elizabethan period. Early modern scholars who examined the social condition of the Elizabethan poor often approach Harman's text as non-fictional evidence.⁴ Frank Aydelotte presents Harman's Caveat as the most relevant historical document. "For a description of their [Elizabethan beggars and vagabonds] methods and tricks," Aydelotte asserts, "there is no authority as good as Thomas Harman's pamphlet, the *Caveat for Commen Cursetors*" (26). Aydelotte envisions and constructs the social condition of the wandering poor based on Harman's accounts. Just as it was addressed by Harman, Aydelotte explains that Elizabethan beggars and vagrants lived in the underworld that had its own social hierarchical system, code of rules, and canting language. Aydelotte accepts Harman's description of vagabonds as a true account, and, further, repeats the value-ridden judgement embedded in Harman's demonization of vagabonds. Aydelotte explains Elizabethan vagrants in this way:

Elizabethan wanderers who could not find work or did not wish to,
invented and practised a large variety of devices for extorting money

from all mankind—vagabond vocations which were in reality only skillful methods of begging or stealing. (22)

Aydelotte's assumption that the Elizabethan beggars voluntarily chose to be vagrants undeniably reflects Harman's judgement on the wandering poor. In the dedication to the lady Elizabeth, Countess of Shrewbury, Harman declares his purpose of writing:

I thought it good, necessary, and my bounden duty to acquaint your goodness with the abominable, wicked, and detestable behavior of all these rowsey, ragged rabblement of rakehells that under the pretense of great misery, diseases, and other innumerable calamities which they feign through great hypocrisy do win and gain great alms in all places where they wilily wander to the utter deluding of the good givers, deceiving and impoverishing of all such poor householders, both sick and sore, as neither can or may walk abroad for relief and comfort (where indeed most mercy is to be shewed). (109)

Harman states that his aim is to expose the undeserving beggars' wicked tricks and thereby to help his countrymen not to be deceived by the dissembling beggars.

The value of Harman's text as a repository of historical facts, however, has been challenged and discredited by several early modern scholars who have examined the issue of the Elizabethan poor and vagrant. For instance, A. L. Beier argues that although Elizabethan vagabonds were often understood as highly organized and traveling "in gangs of 40 to 50 members, with recognized leaders," "these interpretations are misleading" (124). Beier goes on to state that "based largely upon literary sources, they

[historians] exaggerate the underworld element among vagrants” (124). In particular, Beier disagrees with the belief that vagrants moved in gangs and lived with their own rules. Vagrants could have preferred moving alone to moving in groups, since in that way they could reduce their visibility and avoid provincial officials’ attention. Paul Slack also discusses the fictional element of professional beggars characterized in rogue literature such as Harman’s Caveat. Slack says that although some vagrants’ names in Harman’s list can be found in official records, “Harman leaves little doubt that he selected, shaped, and gilded his material, to give it a clear structure and provide amusement for his readers” (104). Slack points out that Harman and other rogue pamphleteers distorted and exaggerated vagrants’ images, and claims that “The picturesque or professional rogue appears to have been the exception not the rule. As one might expect, the majority of vagrants were less willing and less comfortable occupants of the shifting no man’s land between criminality and respectability” (97). The popularity of rogue literature, Slack argues, demonstrates not so much “the existence of a rogue society or counter-culture” as “people’s determination to believe in one” (105). J. A. Sharpe, in agreement with Beier and Slack, marks the gap between the vagrants portrayed in Elizabethan rogue literature and the vagrants treated in court archives:

The first impression to strike anyone turning from the statutes and the rogue literature to court archives [. . .] is that the vagrant emerges as a much tamer phenomenon from the second than from the first. The large bands of vagrants [. . .] are absent; there is little evidence of a “fraternity of vagabond”; and the justices examining vagabonds seem not to have

been in any way concerned about such matters. Most of those apprehended do not seem to have been the professional rogues legislated against in Parliament, but were usually unremarkable representatives of the lower, and hence more vulnerable, strata of society. (143-44)⁵

Sharpe points out the unsuitably overrated threat of vagrants in rogue pamphlets, based on the impression he formed from his research on legal materials on vagrants. Although Beier, Slack, and Sharpe have different focuses, all of them suggest that Harman's account of vagrants should not be taken as factual. Drawing on Beier, Slack, and Sharpe's historical research, Linda Woodbridge clarifies and unmasks the misconceptions of vagrants built on the image of beggars and rogues created by Harman and other pamphleteers. To show how much distorted the representations of vagrants are in rogue literature and to prove the "lack of fit between reality and representation" of the early modern vagrant, Woodbridge dissects common beliefs about vagrants (17). She devotes several pages to disputing the myths about vagrants: vagrants were organized in hierarchical societies, vagrants had an "intricate system of criminal specializations," vagrants could foment sedition and riots, vagrants could be radical communists, vagrants were jobless "by choice," vagrants had "sexual orgies" and used women for that purpose, and vagrants spoke thieves' cant (6-12). Woodbridge argues that all those myths involving vagrants were far from reality, since historical evidence hardly supports such images of vagrants.

Yet despite its misrepresentation of vagrants, Harman's Caveat is still significant for exploring the cultural attitude to the unemployed and wandering poor in the

Elizabethan age. Beier, Slack, and Woodbridge approach Harman's Caveat not so much as a transparent reference to vagrants' real condition as a cultural reference for understanding what was associated with and attributed to vagrants. They explore the social milieu that produced and consumed Harman's rogue stereotypes. Beier notes that Harman was "popular and believed" and that "a large section" of his work re-appeared in William Harrison's Description of England and Holinshed's Chronicles (8). Slack also remarks that although "by 1600 the gap between literary convention and social reality was probably becoming very wide," it "did not prevent the literature [of roguery] being popular" (105). Woodbridge points out that Harman's text even influenced and justified the legal punishment of vagrants, particularly the 1572 Vagabond Act (4). These scholars note in common that Harman's characterization of vagrants was influential in Elizabethans' constructing perspectives on them, although Harman did not represent the actual condition of the poor.

Harman's demonization of vagrants, along with vagrancy legislation expressed and justified Elizabethans' anxiety and hatred toward the wandering poor. Vagrants, most of whom were nothing other than the unemployed poor, were denounced as the root of all social problems. To some extent, the hatred of vagrants was derived from the sense of frustration Elizabethans had concerning the worsening economic condition. The plethora of the uprooted poor emerging in the sixteenth century was a condition neither the poor nor the government could control. As Beier indicates, the increase of the wandering poor was partly caused by natural reasons such as famine, harvest failures, and population increase, and also related to changes in land management and the

economic system. The relationship between landlords and servants/ tenants became less abiding and more mediated by monetary payment. But such change was not incorporated into the political system, and vagabond legislation suggests that the legislation was still based on the interests of a feudal economy. The wandering poor were often called “masterless men”—those who lost or abandoned their link to a master and a workplace. The idea that people should be bound to a master or a certain place, however, is a value-ridden assumption particularly based on a manorial or feudal economy. Every member of the society in that system should be affiliated with lord/ tenant or master/ servant relations. Belonging nowhere was a legitimate reason for punishment, as is exemplified in the legal definition of a rogue as a “healthy person who has neither land, nor master, nor a legitimate trade or source of income” (Mowat 65). After all, the Tudor government’s incapacity to solve the problem of the poor for such a long period of time illustrates that the feudal economy could not accommodate the increased masterless men any more.⁶ It was a telling sign that the Elizabethan government needed a new way of dealing with the peripatetic people. Until Jacobean England found the solution through the overseas colonial enterprise, vagabonds were registered as the agents of social disorder and menace, as Harman describes in his Caveat.

The shift of the economic condition in the seventeenth century, however, generated a change in the representation of vagrants in Jacobean and Caroline drama and the post-Harman rogue pamphlets, wherein their Vagrants’ peripatetic life is romanticized, and their vitality and mobility are celebrated.⁷ For instance, Wye Saltonstall, in his Picture Loquentes or Pictures Drawne forth in Characters (1631),

presents a rogue as one of the notable characters occupying the theater of the world. With the goal of drawing a big picture of the world, not “in colours, but in Characters” (v), Saltonstall enters a long inventory of characters, and provides one space for “a wandring Rogue.” “A wandring Rogue,” Saltonstall describes, “is an *Individuum Vagum*, a wandring Plannet. He alone contemns fortune, for what shee never gave, shee can never take away from him. [. . .] Hee thinkes himselfe as auncient a gentleman as the best, and can deduce his pettigree from *Adam*. [. . .] He stiles himselfe a traveler, and indeed it is thought if he had learning, he might make a good description of *England*, for hee knows all the highways, though not as at his fingers, yet his toes-end” (38-39). Although the characteristics of Harman’s rogue are still resident in Saltonstall’s description of a wandering rogue, Saltonstall elevates the figure into the hero who condemns and resists the comfort of fortune, and entrusts himself to the vicissitudes of life on the road. The romantic atmosphere of vagrants’ wandering life that Saltonstall insinuated in his description of a rogue had been recaptured in several early seventeenth-century plays on beggars and vagrants. Harman’s vagrant types reappear in these seventeenth-century plays, but their role is changed. This transformation in the images and associations of vagrants will be explored in this dissertation. By contextualizing the transformation and adaptation of vagrants’ images in the contemporary socio-cultural milieu, I will analyze how the discourses of vagrancy and roguery functioned as the venue of channeling diverse historical demands and cultural aspirations.

4. A Brief Review of Recent Scholarship and My Approach

The issue of vagrancy and beggary in Renaissance England has drawn early modern scholars' attention consistently and in diverse directions. One notable approach is to discuss the wandering poor in relation to the economic turbulence England had undergone. A. L. Beier in Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England 1560-1640 (1985) argues that the difficulty of finding steady employment in an oversupplied labor market, along with the "de-sanctification of the poor" in the sixteenth century, made many men (and women) seek a livelihood by taking to the road. He observes that their poverty was a structural characteristic in a market society undergoing large-scale demographic expansion that did not have any available solution. Beier elaborates on vagrants' and migrants' life styles, occupations, and routes of movement. Beier also addresses the Tudor and the Stuart governments' several policies on vagabondage, and points out that vagrancy was a "crime of status" which was regarded as threatening "not because of their [vagrants'] actions, but because of their position in society" (xxii).

While Beier's argument is based on archival materials, Richard Halpern in The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital (1991) bases his analysis on theoretical grounds. Borrowing from Marx his notion of primitive accumulation, Halpern explains the explosion of masterless men in the sixteenth century as a part of the structural process of primitive accumulation. In the transitional stage from feudalism to capitalism, the dispossessed class who could not be accommodated by the old economy was reabsorbed through the system of wage labor. Comparing it with the process of capital's primitive accumulation in the same period,

Halpern remarks that “the vagrant poor” had a more thorough and “absolute deterritorialization that sent them sprawling over the countryside and prompted an urgent-and brutal-reterritorializing effort on the part of the state” (74).

Patricia Fumerton in “London’s Vagrant Economy: Making Space for ‘Low’ Subjectivity,” argues that vagrants in early modern England were a large group of people in which “most of the lower orders” were included (208). The vagrant, Fumerton asserts, was comprehended as those who were liable to unsettling change at any time, such as itinerant laborers, servants, apprentices, and poor households. These groups, she notes, shared a sense of alienation and instability and participated in “a new fluid economy that produced, and was reliant upon, mobile and intermittent labor” (212). Fumerton goes on to discuss how such volatile economic and social conditions produced “vagrant subjectivity” that can be characterized as “provisional, manifold, mobile, and dispersed,” and she conjectures that a modern notion of subjectivity as “mutable and manifold” might have emerged in this period (222).

On the other hand, there is a branch of scholarship that attends to the cultural and social aspects of the issue of vagrancy. Bryan Reynolds’ Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England (2002) approaches beggars and vagrants in relation to the early modern criminal culture.⁸ With more focus on rogues and cony-catchers, and their representations in the literature of roguery, Reynolds examines how the early modern criminal culture enabled and reflected a conceptual territory of dissidence. He observes that “there was a substantially unified criminal culture of rogues, vagabonds, beggars, cony-catchers, cutpurses,

prostitutes, and gypsies that emerged in the 1520s and continued to develop [. . .] in the early 1640s” (22). To analyze that culture, Reynolds adopts Félix Guattari’s concept of “transversality” in his explanation of the criminal culture.⁹ Thus Reynolds argues that “early modern England’s criminal culture was both informed by and a medium for transversal power: the social and conceptual forces that stimulate movement outside the parameters imposed on people socially or physically by any organizational social structure” (17, 22).

Noting the difference between social reality and discursive representation, William Carroll and Linda Woodbridge examine the representation of beggars and vagrants in the discourses of poverty (Carroll), homelessness, and vagabondage (Woodbridge). Carroll and Woodbridge focus not so much on how beggars and vagrants *were* as on how they *were understood and represented*. Carroll asserts in Fat King, Lean Beggar (1996) that what privileged members of early modern society saw most often in the poor were threats to themselves, the social hierarchy, and the economy that served them. Moreover, Carroll notes that vagrants’ mobility caused them to be considered transgressive much more easily, and that the vagrant poor were “systematically marginalized and demonized through official discourse” (15). After a broad survey of “official” representations of the poor including the functions of the two chief hospitals, Bridewell and Bedlam, Carroll discusses various representations of the beggar, primarily in Elizabethan plays.

Woodbridge, in Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature (2001), defines the subject of her study as the “homeless” (27). But she deliberates over

the word choice, since each term entails its own special associations. She thinks the word “homeless” is not proper as her main term, since “homeless” was not a sixteenth-century concept and its contemporary association may hinder readers from grasping the proper image of the early modern poor. Further, she rejects the term “rogue,” since naming the uprooted poor as rogues, she notes, is to accept the moral judgement of those who labeled and punished them as rogues. Thus, she decides to use the word “vagrant,” although she worries that the negative quality associated with that word misguides readers. Revealed in Woodbridge’s endeavor to find a correct term for the destitute rural migrants is her assumption that the dislocated rural migrants who once preoccupied social, political, and economic discourses so largely were, in fact, the poor who had no permanent employment and could not afford to have “a basic necessity, namely, a home” (28). She asserts that such a condition of the vagrant had been misrepresented in the discourse of vagrancy. She argues the discourse of vagrancy represented and constructed the vagrant poor as “bogeymen” and an “Other” onto whom the society projected the features they “disowned in themselves—social mobility, linguistic innovation, sexual misconduct, sedition, idleness” (Woodbridge 13, 16).

Thanks to these recent studies, beggars and vagrants, who were once understood as idle and deceitful canters as described in rogue literature, were illuminated in a multifaceted way and their economically, socio-politically, and discursively turbulent lives began to be examined. Even with the variety of approaches, however, I found a common assumption in these scholars’ arguments. Although they discuss the horizontally different discourses of vagrancy, they do not consider a historical change in

the discourse of vagrancy in the late sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries. They assume this period is one historically homogeneous period. These scholars do not draw their attention to the comic and romantic atmosphere that the early seventeenth-century pamphleteers and playwrights added and wove into vagrant images.¹⁰ Although the Tudor regime's dealing with beggars was quite notorious and the vagrant poor were undergoing a huge reconfiguration process in that period-- the "Othering" process in Woodbridge's term or the process of "primitive accumulation" in Halpern's explanation-- the discourses of vagrancy in the early Stuart period deserves attention for its own unique features and different functions. Noting Theodore Rabb's remark that the groundwork of imperial expansion was founded in that period, and attending to the intensified interest in an outside "Other" with the imperial enterprise, I will address how vagrants' mobility and economic potentiality were re-appraised and infused into the discourses of vagrancy.

Although I refer to texts from various genres, I organize each chapter with one central dramatic text or several dramatic texts, since plays, I believe, were more closely related to the social issue of vagrancy than any other literary genre in the period. The social milieu of early modern theaters and players rendered players and playwrights actively engaged with the vagrancy issue and led them to foreground it on their stage more often. In Chapter II, I will discuss the discourse of vagrancy in relation to the history of theaters from the early 1570s to the closing of the playhouses in 1642. I will examine the long-held association between vagrants and playing companies, with the focus on early playing companies' convention of traveling. I will also demonstrate the

complicated relations between the literature of roguery and the theatrical culture.

Drawing on the treatment of ‘acting beggars’ in seven plays (The Three Ladies of London, 2 Henry VI, The Blind Beggar of Alexandria, The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green, The Winter’s Tale, The Spanish Gipsy, and A Jovial Crew: Merry Beggars), I will discuss the complex ways the players’ association with vagrants were sometimes sublimated and negated, but at other times, recuperated and validated.

Chapter III examines the engagement of and interaction with the discourses of vagrancy in King Lear. By addressing how the play develops and expands the issue of vagrancy and homelessness, this chapter will demonstrate how Shakespeare’s play illuminates the power relations embedded in the discourse of vagrancy. I will elaborate Lear’s, Poor Tom’s, and Gloucester’s wandering as homeless beggars in relation to the vagrancy of the powerless poor. Lear’s wandering in particular will be discussed with more attention, since his spatial experience in the “outside” as a displaced beggar opens for him a new horizon of perceptions of the land and also the vagrant poor.

In Chapter IV, I will elaborate how the early Stuart colonial enterprise affected and modified the discourses of vagrancy. Beggars’ Bush is saturated with several allusions to the contemporary development of colonial companies. By noting the allusions, I will address how beggars’ characterizations are modified from Harman, and discuss how the ideally collaborative relationship between a magnanimous merchant and the beggars in the play is related to the cultural investment onto national expansion. The utopian green world of the beggars’ community in the play, I will demonstrate, embodies

and reflects the cultural aspirations for colonial plantations to find the solutions for their society.

Chapter V explores the seventeenth-century literary milieu in which the beggar's wandering life was romanticized and compared to a merry traveler living in nature. John Taylor in his poem "Praise, Antiquity, and Commodity of Beggerie, Beggars, and Begging by Taylor" celebrated the beggar's volatile life and revived the medieval image of a humble and honest man. He also used the beggar as the persona in his traveling writing as a traveling and narrating "I." Contextualizing the emerging interest in travel and the trope of vagrancy employed for that purpose, I will discuss the beggars' peripatetic life romanticized in A Jovial Crew.¹¹

Overall, this study will challenge the scholarship that limits the early modern discourses of vagrancy mainly to the observations on what is called the "Elizabethan underworld." By exploring diverse associations and investments regarding vagrants and beggars, this study will demonstrate that the early modern discourse of vagrancy had been informed, inflected, and transformed by shifting economic, socio-historical, and national interests and demands.

Notes

¹ William Carroll and Linda Woodbridge develop their discussions of vagrants with the presupposition that the images of vagrants represented in the discourse of vagrancy might differ from their realities.

² William Carroll labels the tension on beggars' bodies between beggars and authorities as "a war of signs" when he discusses penal semiotics on beggars and vagrants (42).

³ Harman's text is abbreviated as Caveat from now on.

⁴ See Frank Aydelotte's Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds (1913), A. V. Judges Salgādo's The Elizabethan Underworld (1977), Cony-Catchers and Bawdy Baskets (1972) edited by Gāmini Salgādo, and J. F. Pound's Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England (1971).

⁵ This is originally quoted by Linda Woodbridge. For her discussion of the same quote, see page 4 of her Vagrancy, Homelessness, and the English Renaissance Literature.

⁶ Richard Halpern explains this period as the one when England was undergoing the primary form of primitive accumulation, the necessary condition for capitalistic economy.

⁷ Woodbridge indicates that the post-Harman rogue pamphlets, even with similarities, have remarkable differences, and suggests that it is hard to discuss Harman's Caveat and the second-generation rogue books in one category.

⁸ See John L. McMullan's The Canting Crew: London's Criminal Underworld, 1550-1700, and J. A. Sharpe's Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750.

⁹ With the term "transversality" Guattari tries to indicate "the whole aspect of social creativity".

¹⁰ Mark Koch points out a slight change of attitude in later rogue literature such as Dekker's The Belman of London and Samuel Rid's The Art of Juggling.

¹¹ It seems that the term "vagrants" in early modern England comprehended various groups that we now distinguish as homeless people, nomads, and the unemployed. A Jovial Crew captures well the extended notion of vagrancy and represents vagrancy as a kind of life style or a part of upper class' life through Springlove' wanderlust.

CHAPTER II

BEGGARS, ROGUES, AND PLAYERS

Engagement in the theater business in the early modern period was never an honorable matter, particularly before the acting profession obtained social recognition and authorization as a legitimate occupation. Acting did not fit well with the early modern notion of occupation, and it took a few decades before players gained cultural acceptance for their work. “Playing” as a profession was a riddle and abnormality.¹ Even though officially affiliated as noblemen’s livery servants, players still had to earn their living through performance. They were engaged in commercial transactions, working in the market, but the value of their labor was questioned and its product denounced. Playing companies were an exception to the restrictions and the privileges of the guild system. As such, early modern players had a tumultuous life where their status was consistently negotiated in terms of legality, morality, and legitimacy.

This chapter will explore the cultural association of players with vagrants and rogues, with attention to the anti-theatrical aspect of the Elizabethan discourse of vagrancy. I will first examine the traveling convention of the Elizabethan and Jacobean players, and their vulnerability to the vagabond acts. Then I will address the cultural association of theatricality and roguery, and discuss the reciprocal influence of two genres, rogue literature and plays, which flourished in the early seventeenth century. In the final section of this chapter, I will investigate how players and playwrights advance their sense of profession in their work, with the assimilation to, and the differentiation

from, beggary and roguery. By contextualizing the seven plays that depict rogues (The Three Ladies of London, 2 Henry VI, The Blind Beggar of Alexandria, The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green, The Winter's Tale, The Spanish Gipsy, and A Jovial Crew: Merry Beggars) in the history of early modern theaters, I will address how the plays conceal, recuperate, and transform the long-held relation of theatricality and roguery/beggary.

1. Traveling Players and Vagabonds

Early modern players, especially before they settled their business in London, had frequently been associated with and identified as vagrants.² They were called popish vagabonds, roguish actors, immoral gypsies, or obscene vagrants. The contemporary association between players and vagrants was mainly related to the standard practice of traveling by the early players. The Elizabethan players shared the peripatetic life with a plethora of uprooted vagrants, and frequently encountered requests to prove that they were not vagabonds. Although the significance of traveling was gradually lessening in the seventeenth century, the Tudor century, in the history of playing, was “the heyday for travelling players,” and “travelling was the Tudor norm,” as Andrew Gurr remarks (36). The practice of traveling was not limited to players patronized by nobles or royalty. Several town companies, as well as the players patronized by gentlemen, also toured regionally. According to J. T. Murray, “at least thirty-seven Greater Men’s companies, seventy-nine Lesser Men’s companies, five Players’ companies and twenty-seven Town companies were active outside London between 1559 and 1645” (qtd. in Keenan 9).

“The tradition of professional actors periodically touring the country,” Siobhan Keenan states, “can be traced back at least as early as the fifteenth century and was well established by the sixteenth century” (2). The proclamation of 16 May 1559 regulating touring players tells of the frequency of performances by traveling players in regional towns even in that early day:

Al manner interludes to be played either openly or privately, except the same be notified beforehand, and licensed within any city or towne corporate by the mayor or other chief officers of the same, and within any shire by such as shall be lietenants for the Queen’s majesty in the same shire, or by two of the justices of peace inhabiting within that part of the shire where any shall be played. (Larkin and Hughes, Tudor Royal Proclamations 2: 115-116)

This regulation, calling for city mayors or officials to judge plays before allowing them to be performed, was established as the authorial procedure for a traveling troupe’s performances, and the custom lasted a long time as the basic principle governing regional performances.

Even after the establishment of the two London playhouses in 1594 and their ensuing prosperity in the Jacobean age, the traveling tradition persisted. Companies that could not find a permanent place or success in London continued to travel to visit regional towns to give performances. Even the promising London companies preserved the touring tradition. Andrew Gurr addresses the duration of the traveling custom with the example of King’s Men, which, in the early Stuart era, still toured even when they

were prosperous and did not have to travel to support themselves (40). When the playhouses were closed because of the plague in London, King James paid the King's Men in order to support the company, a benefit that was never given to other companies. Nevertheless, the King's Men traveled during closures, and in later years traveling was mainly given over to younger players in the company (Gurr 40).

Some London companies ran a double system, dividing the company forces into a traveling group and a London group. When several playing companies settled in London, they let a second group of players travel under the same name of the company with a copy of the royal patent--the original of which stayed with the London company. Queen Anne's Men was one such case (Gurr 48-49). Lady Elizabeth's Men in the Jacobean age had a notable traveling group. Elias Guest, William Perry, and Nicholas Long were regularly mentioned in provincial records in affiliation with Lady's Elizabeth's Men (Gurr 51). Some players even preferred traveling to the London playhouses. In addition to the three players, provincial records name several other players such as Martin Slater, Thomas Swinnerton, Gilbert Reason, Robert Kempston, Nicholas Hanson, and William Daniell. Gurr states that those players "seemed to have led permanent touring groups" using the copies of the London company's licenses (Gurr 41). As such, the tradition of traveling endured, even if the need for traveling gradually diminished.

Yet, in the sixteenth century traveling was such an essential part of players' lives that "the early companies thought of themselves as travelling players" (Gurr 47). Traveling players, however, were not likely to make a prosperous living. The hardships

of traveling players are well represented in several texts. Thomas Dekker in News from Hell (1606) mentions “a companie of country players [. . .] that with strowling were brought to deaths door” (qtd. in Chambers’ Elizabethan Stage 1: 332). Histrion-mastix conveys the poverty of traveling companies from the perspective of London residents such as John Marston (Gurr 47). Queen Henrietta’s Men, “a company that hardly ever travelled,” boasts, in Thomas Nabbes’s Covent Garden (1638), that its players do not have to make a country tour—since such a tour forces the players to sell their texts, wardrobes, and stage props to buy food in the country (Gurr 47).³ Traveling players, thus, shared the poverty of the vagrant poor as well as their peripatetic lifestyle.

Although a traveling troupe fared a bit better than vagrants, the difference between traveling troupes and vagrants were often tenuous and easily ignored. That the 1572 Vagabond Act strove for stricter regulation of lower-class itinerant social groups evinces the growing tendency to control playing groups in the countryside, but it also tells of the social image of traveling players, who were often associated and identified with vagrants. The Act commanded traveling groups of players or performers to keep their lord’s license and to show it to the mayor of the towns they were visiting in order to avoid the sanctions against vagabonds. Muriel C. Bradbrook states that the Act eventually served to develop the profession of acting (37), and Keenan notes the beneficial aspect of the Act for the players who could obtain authorization to perform (7). The access to licenses was one benefit for traveling players, and the licensed players could gain relatively favorable treatment. The license, however, did not fully guarantee the players’ right of provincial performances, and the Act did not improve many players’

social and financial status. Noblemen's patronage did not mean financial support and did not resolve the traveling companies' need to travel for the purpose of making money. If they performed for the noblemen's occasional events, they were rewarded with some payment, but such income was not regular and consistent, so they had to earn their living by touring and staging plays in the countryside. As such, traveling players were always under the risk of being unwelcome and were vulnerable to mistreatment, similar to nomadic vagrants.

Thomas Potter's boycotting Sir Walter Waller's Men in Kentish Town in 1583 demonstrates the tension concerning traveling players, even if they were patronized. The players, presenting themselves as under the protection of Sir Walter Waller, encountered a firm opposition from the Kentish justice of the peace, Thomas Potter, when they "proclaimed an interlude at Brasted in Kent" (Keenan 5). After hearing the proclamation, Potter sent for the players via the constable "to knowe what warrant they had" (qtd. in Keenan 5). The constable reported that the players had the license of Sir Walter Waller, but no one else. Potter placed the players "within ye daunger of ye statute of roges," and recommended the players to stop the "wandringe trade of lyffe" and to find "some more comendable exercyse" for their living. This angered the players. They answered that "they muche dysdayned to be called roges" and said that "they had longe tyme vsed that wandringe trade" and "neyther coulde nor woulde leave yt, for yt they had none other meanes to lyve by" (qtd. in Keenan 5). These players were put in the constable's custody, "threatened with the stocks," and had to "pawn their playing apparel while they made contact with their patron" (Keenan 5). When hearing of his

players, Waller expressed his anger at Potter's maltreatment of his players by saying that "they were hys men all of them, & no roges" and that Potter "was a knave & a villayne" (qtd. in Keenan 6). Waller was an enthusiastic patron who stood behind his players. Yet "the players faced prosecution as rogues and vagabonds," says Keenan, since "they had not obtained a licence to perform at Brasted from two local justices of the peace, as they were legally obliged to do post-1572" (6). This incident reveals how a touring troupe--a "wandering trade of life" as Potter terms it-- was not considered a recommendable or respectable profession, even if the players enjoyed patronage. Their status was always precariously unstable, and they could easily be prosecuted as rogues and vagrants in the sixteenth century.

Even in the Jacobean age, when a player's status was upgraded and held in relatively high esteem, *traveling* players were often designated as vagrants. Theater companies of the seventeenth century had branch groups of players who were mainly responsible for provincial performances. These traveling groups toured with a copy of the original patent, while the original was kept secure with the London group. The use of the copy, which was referred to as a duplicate or exemplification in provincial records, was notably and peculiarly given the government's attention twice (Gurr 49). The Lord Chamberlain, William Herbert, in 1616 let the player Joseph Moore deliver to city mayors an official letter that was meant to control players who were using "duplicates of patents." The letter penalized traveling players of several London companies and indicated their names:

wheras Thomas Swynaerton and Martin Slaughter beinge two of the Queens Majestes Company of playors havinge separated themselves from their said Company, have each of hem taken forth a severall exemplification or duplicate of his Majestes Letters patentes graunted to the whole Company and by vertue therof they severally in two Companies with vagabondes and such like idle persons, have and does use and exercise the quallitie of playinge in diverse places of this Realme to the great abuse and wronge of his Majestes Subjectes in generall and contrary to the true intent and meaninge of his Majestie to the said Company [sic] And whereas William Perrie havinge likewise gotten a warrant whereby he and a Certaine Company of idle persons with him doe traviall and play under the name and title of the Children of hir Majestes Revels [. . .] And wheras also Gilberte Reason one of the prince his highnes Playors having likewise separated himself from his Company hath also taken forth another exemplication or duplicate of the patent granted [. . .] These are therefore to pray, and neverthelesse in his Majestes name to will and require you upon notice given of anie of the said persons by the bearer herof Joseph More whome I have specialllye directed for that purpose that you Call the said parties offenders before you and thereupon take ther said severall exemplications or duplicates or other ther warrantes by which they use the saide quallitie from them, And forthwith to send the same to me. (qtd. in Gurr 49-50)

Although the Lord Chamberlain stated that his purpose is to collect traveling groups' duplicates to prevent abuse, we can infer that his target was the anonymous "vagabondes and such like idle persons" who gathered around the traveling players and hid themselves under legal boundary. The Lord Chamberlain's repetition of banning duplicates in 1624 gives such a reading more credibility. The Lord Chamberlain employed Gilbert Reason, one of the "vagabondes" players he listed in 1616, as a carrier of the official letter in 1624. His shift in treatment of Gilbert Reason as a vagabond player to an official player tells us that eliminating the playing troupe's use of duplicates was not the government's sole intention. Rather, the government intended to control idle vagabonds hanging around traveling troupes as well as the traveling players themselves.

The Lord Chamberlain's action is more easily understandable when we consider the contextual question of why the government *suddenly* paid special attention to the duplicates carried by traveling groups and why it endeavored to stop such usage. Between 1616 and 1624, England's trade declined and the country experienced economic hardship. Theodore K. Rabb explains that England had enjoyed an economic boom during the years of 1604-1615 (81), but the depression starting in late 1610s worsened in the 1620s (86-87). During those years, the Jacobean government reactivated the regulations on vagrancy, and Parliament turned again to a complete reconsideration of the Poor Law in the 1620s (Slack, Poverty and Policy 129). The proclamation of 1618 concerning peddlers' licenses exemplifies the Jacobean government's policy on vagabonds during the period of depression. This proclamation required licenses for peddlers and petty chapmen, whose trade had been relatively tolerated by the early

Jacobean government because of their contribution to the development of internal and external trade. Yet, when vagrancy became an issue due to the economic crisis, peddlers' traveling was restrained because of their association with vagrants. The Privy Council in 1618 proclaimed, "Many rogues and idle wandering persons, carying about trifles in the habite of Pedlers or Pettie-Chapmen, so misbehave themselves, as they are indeed no other but Sturdy Beggars, theeves and absolute dissolutes" (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 1: 393). To purge these dissolute and dissembling wanderers, and to approve and encourage the honest peddler or petty chapmen, the government pronounced the activation of a licensing system. Such regulation of peddlers had the same cause as the Lord Chamberlain's action on traveling players. Both regulations were enacted to control an itinerant lower class. Touring troupes were easily accused of being a shelter for idling persons and vagabonds. As such, traveling players were compelled to undergo certain restraints whenever vagabondage became a concern. In the letter of 1624, the Lord Chamberlain states that some players procured licenses "by secret means" and did "abusively Clayme unto themselves a kinde of licentious fredome to travell aswell to shew play & exercise in eminent Cities & Corporacion within this kingdome" (qtd. in Gurr 50). Traveling players, even after the relative promotion of their social status, were still subject to the government's restraints on vagabonds.

In sum, traveling provided early modern players a significant venue for performance, and the tradition lasted well into the middle of the seventeenth century. The practice of traveling allowed players to become easily associated with, and suspected as, vagabonds. As was the case with Sir Walter's players, the livery players

patronized by noblemen were often prosecuted and treated as vagabonds. When such players' social status was elevated by the privilege of royal patronage, they could enjoy a relatively prosperous condition; yet, as we saw in the Lord Chamberlain's regulation of traveling players' duplicates, traveling players were not completely free from an association with vagabonds and vagrants.

2. Roguery and Theatricality

Although players encountered unfavorable treatments as vagabonds, they had even more challenges posed by Puritans and anti-theatrical polemicists.⁴ They criticized the acting business as immoral, for the reason that theaters endorsed and encouraged attempts to act like someone else by creating entertainment based on identity switching. In their opinion, the acting business was nothing better than roguery based on crafts and props. Gurr explains that such enmity against role-playing was the basic root of the hostility to theaters:

To judge by the municipal records across the country, the strength of the hostility in most local authorities, including London, to professional playing was notably greater than it was to other crowd-pulling enterprises such as bear- or bull-baiting, or even to the smaller groups of entertainers like tumblers and acrobats. It was not just a matter of local religious hostility to the kind of public leisure pursuits thought to do the devil's work. Nor was it just a matter of the riots and affrays which the authorities expected to take place whenever large crowds gathered.

Something more basic, a prejudice that was in complex ways rooted in the idea that people who paid money to witness the *counterfeits* and *con-tricks* which happened when men and boys *pretended to be what they were not* were at risk, sits somewhere under this broadly felt animus. (7 my italics)

Such hostility to theatricality was declared by such well-known polemicists as Stephen Gosson, Philip Stubbes, and William Prynne. For instance, Stephen Gosson, a harsh critic of the theater and author of The Schoole of Abuse (1579) and Plays Confuted in Five Actions (1582), “characterized players as professional deceivers” (Keenan 7). If we consider that assuming other identities is the crucial element of the acting business, then nothing could be so fatal and critical an opposition than such a denunciation that actors are professional deceivers.

Prior to these anti-theatrical polemicists of the 1570s, however, Thomas Harman contributed to establishing an anti-theatrical atmosphere by criticizing the theatricality that he found in beggars and rogues. Harman lists beggars by their types and discloses the dissembling nature of their beggary. For Harman, every beggar is a professional actor who gains charity through his performance. Harman’s denunciation of beggars as dissemblers in his Caveat eventually entailed the grand change in the 1572 Vagabond Act. The Act extended to those who could be subjected to the Vagabond Act, and it included rogues as one type of criminal that could be punished by the regulation. Because of legislation and the development of rogue literature, dissembling rogues were established as Elizabethan cultural icons of villains and evildoers.⁵

My discussion in this section is about the relation of rogue literature to theatrical culture. Intriguingly, the period when rogue literature enjoyed its popularity, approximately from Harman's Caveat in 1567 to Thomas Dekker's Lantern and Candlelight (1608), was the one in which the theater business emerged, developed, and eventually flourished. By mapping the cultural geography of roguery and theatricality, I want to discuss the cultural context in which players were associated with counterfeiting rogues.

Harman's Caveat does not make any direct comment about playing companies and theatrical culture, but it does suggest disapproval with both in a very subtle and complicated way. In the dedication, Harman warns his dedicatee against loitering vagabonds, because of their dissembling means of begging. For Harman, wandering vagrants do not deserve any sympathy and charity, since "all these rowsey, ragged rabblement of rakeells" did "win and gain great alms in all places" "under the pretense of great misery, diseases, and other innumerable calamities which they feign through great hypocrisy" (109). As a country gentleman in Kent and possibly a local "Commissioner of the Peace" (Kinney 105), Harman must have felt uneasy about the wandering beggars appearing at his door to ask for alms, and had convinced himself that "something lurk and lad hid" (109) behind the beggars. Harman explains why he decided to write about beggars and how he came to know about their lives:

And for that I, most honorable lady [the Countess of Shrewsbury, Harman's patron], being placed as a poor gentleman, have kept a house these twenty years whereupon poverty daily hath and doth repair, not

without some relief, as my poor calling and ability may and doth extend, I have of late years gathered a great suspicion that all should not be well, and, as the proverb saith, “Something lurk and lay hid that did not plainly appear.” For I, having more occasion through sickness to tarry and remain at home than I have been accustomed, do, by my there abiding, talk and confer daily with many of these wily wanderers of both sorts, as well men and women as boys and girls, by whom I have gathered and understand their deep dissimulation and detestable dealing, being marvelous subtle and crafty in their kind, for not one amongst twenty will discover, either declare, their scelerous secrets. (109-110)

Disclosing the wanderers’ “deep dissimulation and detestable dealing,” as he states here, is the purpose of his writing. As one type of vagabond, Harman lists a rogue. Rogues “will go faintly and look piteously,” Harman says, but “you may easily perceive by their color that they [rogues] carry both health and *hypocrisy* about them, whereby they get gain when others want that cannot feign and dissemble” (120 my italics). Abraham men are the beggars who “*feign* themselves to have been mad, and have been kept either in Bedlam or in some other prison a good time, and not one amongst twenty that ever came in prison for any such cause” (127 my italic). Exemplified by these two cases, Harman repeatedly employs such words as dissembling, feigning, dissimulation, counterfeit, tricky, crafty, and hypocrisy to argue that beggars are professional deceivers, and, therefore, deserve punishment rather than sympathetic charity. As the most cunning dissembler, Harman describes “a counterfeit crank”:

These that do counterfeit the Crank be young knaves and young harlots that deeply dissemble the falling sickness. For the Crank in their language is the “falling evil.” [. . .] This Crank there, lamentably lamenting and pitifully crying to be relieved, declared to diverse there his painful and miserable disease. I, being risen and not half ready, heard his doleful words and rueful mourning; hearing him name the falling sickness, thought assuredly to myself that he was a deep dissembler; so, coming out at a sudden and beholding his ugly and irksome attire, his loathsome and horrible countenance, it made me in a marvelous perplexity what to think of him—whether it were feigned or truth—for after this manner went he: he was naked from the waist upward, saving he had an old jerkin of leather patched and that was loose about him, that all his body lay out bare. A filthy, foul cloth he wore on his head, being cut for the purpose, having a narrow place to put out his face, with a beaver made to truss up his beard and a string that tied the same down close about his neck; with an old felt hat which he still carried in his hand to receive the charity and devotion of the people, for that would be hold out from him, having his face from the eyes downward all smeared with fresh blood, as though he had new fallen and been tormented with his painful pangs; his jerkin being all berayed with dirt and mire and his hat and hosen also as though he had wallowed in the mire. (128-29)

Looking at a “monstrous and terrible” sight, Harman’s main interest here is to figure out whether the beggar is feigning or not. Harman suspects that the vagrant may be acting like a sick beggar with prepared props. When hearing the beggar’s claim that he had been in Bedlam, Harman decides to verify his story by sending a person to Bedlam. When he proves that the beggar’s story is a lie, Harman gloats over his discovery and employs two servants to stealthily track the “counterfeit” beggar. Harman presents this case as the convincing evidence proving his theory that every loitering beggar is a con-man and dissembler. Thus, Harman, throughout the Caveat, is devoted to denouncing the details and tricks of dissembling beggars, who are nothing other than walking theatrical spectacles to him.

Although Harman’s text might not purport to denounce playing companies, it did serve to underpin anti-theatrical discourse and reinforce the conceptual environment in which theatricality and roguery were easily correlated. Harman’s text on dissembling rogues contributed to the discrediting of the acting business in general by advocating the immorality of acting and feigning. Although Harman might not have realized it, his description of the sub-society of rogues is based on and nourished by his knowledge of the playing troupe. The playing troupe’s way of living--players move around as a group to find a place to perform, each player might have some expertise for certain roles, and they earn their living based on acting--provided the *form* and *structure* of Harman’s imagination of rogue society. Harman’s rogue society shares the feature of a playing group: rogues moved around together and each rogue had a special method of dissimulation. Harman’s assumption of rogues and vagrants as walking theatrical entities

had an impact on the grand revision of Vagabond Act in 1572, six years after the publication of Caveat. The Act, driven by the government's will to control the itinerant group, classified players in the group of rogues and vagrants.

Harman's text was not the only one that assimilated players into rogues and acting into roguery. John Northbrooke, in his Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine Playes, or Enterludes (1577), includes plays as one of the malignant and immoral devices rogues use for tempting the young and the innocent (Keenan 6). Thomas Middleton's early seventeenth-century play, The Mayor of Queenborough (1616), also reflects the mixed image of players and rogues. While watching a play performed by a playing troupe, the mayor is robbed of his purse by a roguish actor, who later turns out to "take the name of country comedians" only "to abuse simple people / with a printed play or two, which they bought at Canterbury for six pence" (5.1.264, 266 qtd. in Keenan 14).

The link between roguery and acting business, which is implied in Harman's Caveat, is further maintained by the second-generation rogue pamphleteers, but they appreciate the rogue's theatricality rather than demonizing it like Harman. Thomas Dekker and Robert Greene clandestinely celebrate the rogue's theatricality, and enjoy the fictionality of their texts where their rogues engage in role-playing. The preface to Dekker's The Belman of London appears to follow Harman's ideology of uncovering beggars' tricks and deceits. Dekker says in the preface that his "labours" of writing the pamphlet are for "the safetie of my country in defending her from these Serpents [rogues]" (66). Dekker declares that he will divulge beggars' and rogues' vices and villainies, but his detailed description of beggars in the body of the essay departs from

what he promises in the preface. Dekker presents a beggar who makes an eloquent oration about vagrants' unflagging will and perseverance to endure various hardships and legal punishments. The orator mentions the punishment beggars are subjected to and points out its unjustness:

What though there be Statutes to Burne us I'th eares for Rogues? To
 Syndge us I'th hand for pilferers? To whippe us at posts for being
 Beggars; and to shackle our heeles I'th stockes for being idle
 vagabondes? [. . .] What though a prating Cōstable, or a red nosd beadles
 say to one of us, Sirra Goodmā Rogue, if I served you well, I should see
 you whipped through the towne? Alas! Alas! Silly Animals! If all men
 should have that which they deserve, we should doe nothing but play the
 Executioners and tormenters one of another. [. . .] The life of a Begger is
 the life of a souldier: he suffers hunger, & cold in winter, and heate and
 thirst in Sommer: he goes lowsie, hee goes lame, hees not regarded, hees
 not rewarded: here onely shines his glorie; The whole Kingdome is but
 his Walke, a whole Cittie is but his parish. (89-90)

Dekker allows the orator to glorify the vagrant as a hero. He does not ridicule or satirize the orator who portrays the beggar class as an innocent victim of an unjust legal system and celebrates the beggar life as that of a solitary hero. Here Dekker makes his readers feel sympathetic to beggars when the orator says, "The life of a beggar is the life of a soldier: he suffers hunger and cold in the winder, and heat and thirst in summer. . . he's not regarded, he's not rewarded: here only shines his glory: the whole kingdom is but his

walk, a whole city is but his parish.” Dekker, at this moment, abandons his original purpose of denouncing the beggar class. Instead, he seems mesmerized by the words of the orator, the character he himself created, and relishes his fictional world in which a beggar is presented as a tragic hero. Dekker’s departure from Harman’s anti-beggary tenet is pointed out by Mark Koch, who remarks, “Dekker enhances what he borrows from Harman with fictional elements that ultimately check the purely antimendicant polemic of earlier beggar books and create a more fantastic image of the vagrants” (100).

Likewise, Greene makes full use of, and creates great humor through, the rogue characters’ theatricality. Greene juxtaposes his texts with double views. For instance, he organizes The Black Book’s Messenger as a moral allegory. He says that a malign cony-catcher, Ned Browne, is executed because of his devilish acts, and that his buried body is devoured by dogs “as a man not worthy to be admitted to the honor of any burial” (205). But such an instructive preface and epilogue, narrated by the author, are too short and weak to counterbalance the mysterious appeal of the story that is narrated by the cony-catcher, Ned Browne. Greene in the preface introduces the following story as a “discourse of the repentance of a Cony-Catcher lately executed out of Newgate” (193), which makes his readers expect a story of penitence. But the next narrator and persona, Ned Brown, disrupts such an expectation by saying:

If you think, Gentlemen, to hear a repentant man speak, or to tell a large tale of his penitent sorrows, ye are deceived, for as I have ever lived lewdly, so I mean to end my life as resolutely, and not by a cowardly confession to attempt the hope of a pardon. Yet, in that I was famous in

my life for my villainies, I will at my death profess myself as notable, by discoursing to you all merrily, the manner and method of my knaveries, which, if you hear without laughing, then, after my death, call be base knave and never have me in remembrance. (194)

Going against the convention of repentance, the cony-catcher does not renounce his crooked life; instead, he bets that he will have the audience remember him by making them laugh with his cony-catching stories. Ned Browne then presents several “pleasant” tales about conies. To some extent, Greene’s use of double views and a knavish persona are intentional for the purpose of puzzling readers who try to find a lesson in his stories. As Arthur Kinney observes, Greene’s text can be understandable only when “we refuse to impose *any* structure—either that of poetic justice or of conventional morality, that of the value of ingenuity or the value of rhetoric itself” (159). In fact, Greene himself is a cony-catcher who toys with his readers:

His [Greene’s] book is designed not to reveal cony-catchers but to play games with the language as cony-catchers do; the author is transformed by the pamphlet into a cony-catcher himself; and we are in turn teased into becoming conies by buying this book, tricked into thinking it was the exposé it proposed to be. (158)

Like a cony-catcher, Greene performs different roles by using different personas. It is Greene who embodies Ned Browne and tells the cony-catching stories. Whenever he wants, Greene freely changes roles. One moment he is the voice of a moral commentator, but in another moment he is a cony-catcher who is sarcastic and

pessimistic about the norm of the society. By playing several roles, Greene performs as a rogue and relishes his theatricality. Greene's theatrical imagination and the agility that he integrated into rogue books were what he had acquired throughout his lifelong engagement in the theatrical business.

As is reflected in Dekker's and Greene's careers (as a dramatist and rogue book writer), rogue pamphlets and plays depended on each other and shared many things. We already saw Greene and Dekker's incorporation of theatricality in their rogue pamphlets. Alternatively, theaters, and city comedies in particular, frequently adopted rogue book materials and exploited rogue characters. For example, Thomas Middleton's Michaelmas Term (c. 1605) depicts how city rogues capture the gentleman and lead him to bankruptcy. When we take a closer look at the play, we can see that the play borrows this cony-catching episode from rogue books.

A London draper Quomode employs a rogue called Shortyard to catch Master Easy, heir of a great estate in Essex. Quomode plans to snatch the estate from Easy by making him become infatuated with the diverse entertainments London provides. The way that Shortyard, a rogue and coney-catcher, approaches Easy closely resembles the way Greene introduces the art of cony-catching. Shortyard goes to Easy, who is dicing in the tavern:

SHORTYARD. [to Easy] An Essex gentleman, sir?

EASY. An unfortunate one, sir.

SHORTYARD. I'm bold to salute you, sir.

[He doffs his hat]

You know not Master Alsup there?

EASY. Oh, entirely well.

SHORTYARD. Indeed, sir.

EASY. He's second to my bosom.

SHORTYARD. I'll give you that comfort then, sir, you must not want money as long as you are in town, sir.

EASY. No, sir?

SHORTYARD. I am bound in my love to him to see you furnished, and in that comfort I recover my salute again, sir.

[He puts on his hat again]

EASY. Then I desire to be more dear unto you. (2.1.6-18)

Assuming friendship or kinship with the cony's neighbor is the first trick a cony-catcher uses. By letting the cony, who needs some companionship in a strange town, believe the cony-catcher to be a friend, the cony-catcher ensnares and begins to control the cony. This same method is explained by Greene in his A Notable Discovery of Cozenage. Concerning the "art of cony-catching," Greene explains that three rogues ("the Setter, the Verser, and the Barnacle") work as a group. The "Setter" finds out a cony's name and place of residence, then gives the information to the "Verser." The Verser, in turn, approaches the cony, claiming that he is a friend or relative of the cony's neighbor:

With that [information] away he [the Verser] goes, and crossing the man [cony] at some turning, meets him full in the face, and greets him thus:
 "What, goodman Barton! How fares all our friends about you? You are

well met. I have a pint of wine for you; you are welcome to Town.” The plain countryman, hearing himself named by a man he knows not, marvels and answers him that he knows him not, and craves pardon. “Not me, goodman Barton? Have you forgot me? Why, I am such a man’s kinsman, your neighbor not far off. How doth this or that good Gentleman, my friend? Good Lord, that I should be out of your remembrance; I have been at your house diverse times.” “Indeed, sir,” saith the farmer, “are you such a man’s kinsman? Surely, sir, if you had not challenge[d] acquaintance of me, I should never have known you. I have clean forgot you, but I know the good Gentleman your Cousin well. He is my very good neighbor.” “And for his sake,” saith the Verser, “we’ll drink afore we part.” Haply the man thanks him and to the wine or ale they go. Then, ere they part, they make him a Cony and so ferret-claw him at cards that they leave him as bare of money as an ape of a tail.

(167-168)

When a cony meets a gentleman-looking rogue who claims to know his neighbor, Greene explains, the cony begins to feel comfortable with the rogue and easily accepts the rogue’s invitation to games. As such, diverse kinds of cony-catching episodes in rogue books are appropriated and employed in seventeenth-century dramatic texts.

Playwrights’ free use of rogue pamphlets signals that the literature of roguery can be conveniently formatted for plays. Several cony-catching episodes in rogue books are told with dramatic imagination, and thus can be easily dramatized. Dekker in his The

Bel-man of London explains Barnard's law, which is a cony-catching trick in card games. Dekker says that the trick needs five rogues, and he elaborates on the five rogues' different roles. His description of the roles, however, evokes and resembles the introduction of characters in the play. Dekker says, "To *Act* which knauish *Comedy* of Wily-Beguily, 5 Persons are required": they are "taker, cozen, verser, barnard, and the rutter" (125 my italics). Each rogue's role is as follows:

These are the players: and shall you heare their parts. The Taker, is he that by some fine inuention fetcheth in the Man, whome they desire to draw into Gaming. The Cozen, is the partie that is Taken. The Verser, is a fellow more Graue in speech and habit, and seemes to be a Landed man; his part is to second what the Taker begins, and to giue countenance to the Act. The Bernard is the chiefe Player, for hee counterfets many parts in one, and is now a drunken man, anon in another humour, and shifts himselfe into so many shapes, onely to blind the Cozen, and to feede him with more delight, the more easily to beguile him. The Rutter is as arrant a knave as the rest; his parts I discharged, when he hath begin a fray with his owne shadow, whilst the rest that haue made a younger brother of the poore Cozen, steale out of sight. Now to *the Comedy* it selfe. The prologue of which if it goe off well, there is good hope all shall end well: All the cunning thereof is how to Begin, and to does that, the Taker studies his part at his fingers ends. *The Stage on which he playes the Prologue*, is either in Fleetestreete, the Strond, or in Poules, and most

commonly in the afternoone, when Country Clyents are at most leysure to walke in those places, or for dispatching of their businesse, trauell from Lawyer to Lawyer, through Chancery lane, Holbourne, and such like places. (125-126 my italics)

As the italicized words (“comedy,” “stage,” and “playes the Prologue”) indicate, Dekker uses theatrical diction to describe cony-catching episodes. Sharing theatrical diction is an indication of how a rogue pamphlet is organized with theatrical imagination. Episodes are narrated in such a way that readers can easily imagine the development of dramatic scenes. Overall, second-generation rogue writers vigorously celebrated theatricality and contributed to the promoting of theatrical business in the off-stage venue. In other words, rogue books and theaters in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries influenced each other by exchanging episodes, characters, diction, imagination, and the values of roguery and theatricality.

3. Reconfiguration of Theatricality, Beggary, and Roguery for Promoting the Acting Business

Theater historians have examined the institutionalization of the early modern theaters, by focusing on such issues as the patent of permanent playhouses and the royal patronage of playing companies. But we can envision a more accurate picture regarding the legitimization of the early modern theater when we include in our discussion internal evidence that reflect the early modern players’ and theaters’ sense of their occupation and business. As we will see in this section, many plays represent their profession-

consciousness by reconfiguring the cultural association and identification of players with vagabonds and rogues. Generally speaking, earlier plays are less likely to advance or clarify the issue of institutionalization, since the theater business (before 1590s) was too unstable to develop its sense of profession. Some plays try not to evoke players' similarity to vagabonds, whose legality was always suspected. Other plays question the conventional negative view of vagabonds. There was, however, a gradual emergence and development of players' profession-consciousness, which began to be manifested in late sixteenth-century plays. George Chapman's The Blind Beggar of Alexandria (c. 1595-96) and Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale (1609-11), for instance, present respectively the blind beggar Irus and a rogue character Autolycus, both of whom relish acting out several identities. On the other hand, Thomas Middleton's The Spanish Gypsy (1623) demonstrates players' sense of profession by denying their association with idling vagabonds and by claiming their labor as a legitimate one. Eventually theaters' efflorescence and authorization in the seventeenth century provided an environment in which players, without any hesitation, recuperated their association with beggars and rogues, and appropriated beggars' images in such plays as Beggars' Bush (1622) and A Jovial Crew (1641). I will examine seven plays in more detail, with a focus on how these plays reveal theater companies' sense of profession in their portrayal of beggars and rogues.

* * *

Robert Wilson's The Three Ladies of London (1581) reflects the Elizabethan concern about dissemblers and wily beggars. As a morality play, it presents allegorical

characters who personate and represent abstractions such as Conscience, Honesty, Diligence, and Hospitality. In addition to the virtuous characters, the play presents several vice figures. Intriguingly, Dissimulation is staged as one of the vice characters, together with Usury, Fraud, and Simony. The play's inclusion of Dissimulation instead of the often-mentioned seven deadly sins is telling evidence that shows the historical anxiety about dissemblers in the late sixteenth century--the anxiety well represented in Harman's and Awdley's texts of roguery. In addition to Dissimulation, the play includes Harman's type of dissembling beggars who dissimulate lameness and blindness, "catch sheets from hedges" (347), and engage in robbery on the road. Three beggars (Tom beggar, Wily Will, and Simplicity) hang around the house of a wedding, waiting for a chance to get food and to rob.

To the wedding, to the wedding, to the wedding go we:

To the wedding a-begging, a-begging all three.

Tom Beggar shall brave it, and Wily Will too,

Simplicity shall knave it, wherever we go:

With lustly bravado, take care that care will,

To catch it and snatch it we have the brave skill.

Our fingers are lime-twigs, and barbers we be,

To catch sheets from hedges most pleasant to see:

Then to the alewife roundly we set them to sale,

And spend the money merrily upon her good ale. (347)

Presenting beggars as idling liars who work for Usury and Fraud, this play shares with Harman the apprehension about the idling poor who take away others' labor by unlawful begging and theft. This play does not present any distinctive view on the poor, nor does it show the players' profession-consciousness that later plays demonstrate. Rather, by taking a notably similar position with Harman's text and by following the authoritative view of beggars in the middle of the sixteenth century, this play delivers an indirect message about players' status at that time. The players in these early years, who were often associated with beggars and dissembling rogues in real life, could protect and legalize themselves only by presenting a play that adopts the hegemonic view of beggars and rogues.

* * *

Shakespeare's 2 Henry VI presents a rogue character who acts as a blind and lame beggar. But the beggar, who tries to deceive those who gather around him, is less devilish than foolish, since he reveals his feigned blindness by naming the color of the objects that he says he cannot see. When he acts as if he were lame, the Lord Protector Gloucester suspects his dissembling and sends for a beadle. When Gloucester has the beadle hit the beggar, the beggar stops pretending to be lame and runs away. The Lord Protector commands the mayor to whip the beggar and his wife "through every market-town / Till they come to Berwick, from whence they came" (2.1.158-59). The beggar Simpcox's dissembling alludes to the beggars' dissembling disability in Harman's Caveat. Harman remembers as one of his most successful moments the day when he

found a beggar who folded his tongue on purpose in order to pretend that he could not speak. Harman, together with a surgeon, examined the tongue of the “dummerer”:

The Surgeon made him [a beggar] gape, and we could see but half a tongue. I required the Surgeon to put his finger in his [the beggar's] mouth, and to pull out his tongue, and so he did, notwithstanding he held strongly a pretty while. At the length he plucked out the same, to the great admiration of many that stood by. Yet when we saw his tongue, he would neither speak nor yet could hear. Quoth I to the Surgeion, “Knit two of his fingers together, and thrust a stick between them, and rub the same up and down a little while, and for my life he speaketh by and by.” “Sir,” quoth this Surgeon, “I pray you let me practice another way.” I was well contented to see the same. He had him [the beggar] unto a house, and tied a halter about the wrists of his hands, and hoisted him up over a beam, and there did let him hang a good while. At length for very pain, he required for God's sake to let him down. So he that was both deaf and dumb could in short time both hear and speak. (133)

Harman is delighted to observe the whole procedure in which the surgeon causes pain to the beggar to see whether he can stand it. Harman gleefully observes the beggar as he begins to speak when he cannot stand the pain any more. Although Shakespeare's beggar is similar to Harman's, Shakespeare handles his beggar's episode a little differently. When the Lord Protector commands a harsh punishment for Simpcox and his wife for their dissembling, Simpcox's wife pleads that their trickery is not driven by any

malicious desire but by “pure need” (2.1.157). By adding a sympathetic context to beggars, and emphasizing their harmless motive, Shakespeare re-presents and alters Harman’s episode of the dissembling beggar.

In addition, Shakespeare helps to diminish the weight of culpability imposed on roguish vagrants by juxtaposing the needy beggar with more devilish rogues whose deceits are much harder to discover. Just after the Simpcox episode, it is reported that the duchess, the Lord Protector’s wife, has been arrested for her involvement in a meeting of conjurors. But the fact is that the duchess was caught in a trap set by vicious men, Suffolk and the Cardinal, who, knowing the duchess’ inclination, ensnare her through Hume. As a hireling working for Suffolk and the Cardinal, Hume comments:

They say ‘A crafty knave does need no broker,’

Yet am I Suffolk and the Cardinal’s broker.

Hume, if you take not heed you shall go near

To call them [Suffolk and Cardinal] both a pair of crafty knaves.

(1.3.100-103)

Shakespeare juxtaposes the malicious and “crafty knaves” with the foolish Simpcox, thereby allowing for a comparison of the two types of rogues. It is ironic that Gloucester, who easily discovers and chastises a foolish and poor beggar’s relatively harmless crafts, does not perceive the more wicked knavery that occurs in the court. Such a contrast of two types of roguish characters in the play could reflect the playwright’s and theater company’s implicit sympathy for beggars, who were often the object of punishment and

ridicule, and suggests that vagrants' acting for charity was unfairly exaggerated in comparison with seemingly austere persons' more malicious dissembling.

* * *

George Chapman's The Blind Beggar of Alexandria (c. 1595-1596) is a unique and radical play that focuses on a central character's use of multiple identities as disguises. The play presents several personalities such as Count Hermes, Duke Cleanthes, Usurer Leon, and the blind beggar Irus, but all of these characters are actually different roles one person performs by changing his appearance. In the first scene the blind beggar Irus introduces himself to the audience and invites them to partake of the joy of role-playing:

I am Cleanthes and blind Irus too,
 And more than these, as you shall soon perceive,
 Yet but a shepherd's son at Memphis born;
 And I will tell you how I got that name:
 My father was a fortune-teller and from him I learnt his art,
 And, knowing to grow great was to grow rich,
 Such money as I got by palmestry
 I put to use, and by that means became
 To take the shape of Leon, by which name
 I am well known a wealthy usurer;
 And more than this I am two noblemen:
 Count Hermes is another of my names,

And Duke Cleanthes whom the Queen so loves;
 For, till the time that I may claim the crown,
 I mean to spend my time in sports of love,
 Which in the sequel you shall plainly see,
 And joy, I hope, in this my policy. (1.109-25)

In most of the scenes, the audience observes just one player who changes garments and behaves in different ways to act as different people. Whenever Irus needs to change his appearance, he goes to the wardrobe: “Now to my wardrobe for my velvet gown; / Now doth the sport begin” (324-25). All of the sport and pleasure Irus enjoys and provides to the audience centers around the wardrobe. Irus’ metamorphosis based on his wardrobe invokes the practices of players’ performance and playing companies’ dependence on a wardrobe. The roles a playing company could include in their plays were determined by the availability of costumes in the company’s wardrobe. To increase the number of roles that could be performed, the company had to purchase costumes and corresponding apparel into their stock. Purchasing costumes along with playtexts was a main part of playing companies’ expenditure, as we see from Henslowe’s diary. Although the rate of expense for playtexts and apparel varied, Henslowe for the Admiral’s Men in the summer of 1598 paid £37 for eight plays and £45 for different kinds of special costumes (Gurr 103).⁶

Irus, who symbolizes actors by playing several roles by changing into different costumes, eventually becomes Egypt’s king and wins battles against surrounding countries. The play ends with Irus’ joy of victory and carousal in the court. Through the

character Irus, this play openly celebrates the “sport” and fun of acting out several identities, thereby promoting the acting business and endorsing the pleasure of taking multiple identities.

* * *

The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green (1600) also engages and reflects the discourse of roguery. This play shows the various crafts used by two wily rogues, Hadland and Canbee, who, like Robert Greene’s cony-catchers, steal money from Tom Strowd, son of a Norfolk Yeoman, who is visiting London. The two rogues also fabricate counterfeit documents such as their passports and the Lord Protector’s reprieve of Old Strowd’s execution. When they are searched, the two cony-catchers decide to “turn gypsies” to “go about a fortune-telling” (3.1265-66) and perform puppet-shows. These two rogues are finally sentenced and “sent / out of the land to dateless banishment” (5.2624-25). This punishment reflects and perpetuates the Vagrancy Act of 1597, which banishes dangerous and incorrigible rogues overseas. In this regard, the characterization of the two coney-catchers replicates both the popular coney-catching materials of the 1590s and the legal treatment of rogues. Yet, this play complicates the issue of roguery with another dimension of dissembling.

Lord Momford, the main character of the play, appears on stage in several different attires and personas. On the battlefield in the opening scene, Momford is unfairly accused of being a French informer and banished as a traitor. Because of his exile, Momford arrives in London as a poor beggar. Momford, in his ragged garments, visits his brother’s house to see his own daughter, Bess, who stays with her uncle after

her father's infamous banishment. When Momford arrives at his brother's house, no one recognizes him because of his ragged and impoverished outlook. But when Bess looks at the impoverished soldier, she gives her sympathy and charity to him, recalling her own father:

Thou seem'st a maymed Souldier, wo is me!

I have a little Gold, good Father take it,

And here's a Diamond do not forsake it;

My Father was a Souldier maym'd like thee,

Thou in thy limbs, he by vil'd infamny. (2.641-44)

Although Bess feels empathy for the maimed soldier, Momford's brother, Sir Robert Westford tries to oust the beggar and treats him as a dissembler. Being a greedy man, Westford, who "coveted" Momford's land and snatched the land and possessions from Momford and his heiress, becomes infuriated and considers the maimed beggar an intruder on his property, calling him "a rogue" (2.652). Such treatment of the maimed soldier parallels Harman's description of a "Ruffler." Harman begins his list of rogues and sturdy beggars with the ruffler, a wandering soldier, "because he [ruffler] is first in degree of this odious order" (115). Since the ruffler asks charity "with stout Audacity" and also "ruefully and lamentably," Harman says, "it would make a flinty heart to relent and pity his miserable estate, how he hath been maimed and bruised in the wars" (115). But Harman warns that if "some will shew you some outward wound," it is only what "he got at some drunken fray." Harman argues that "the hardiest soldiers" are "so much ashamed and disdain to beg or ask charity, that rather they will as desperately fight for to

live and maintain themselves as manfully, and valiantly” instead of wandering around to rob and steal (115). By presenting a story of a maimed soldier in a different view than Harman’s, this play serves to revise and diversify the discourse of roguery and dissimulation.

After being unjustly dispossessed, Momford decides to live as a blind beggar in Bednal Green.⁷ But his decision is not driven by any malicious motive. Momford decides to act as a blind beggar when he perceives his daughter Bess’ suicide impulse. In order to ameliorate her despair, he approaches her as a blind beggar and asks for her help. Momford’s saving of his daughter by acting as someone else recalls Edgar and Gloucester in King Lear. Acting as an insane beggar, Edgar approaches his blind father who wants to end his life, and stops him from attempting suicide. Alternatively, an outcast father in this play feigns blindness to stop his daughter’s suicide by turning her attention away from herself. Edgar’s and Momford’s dissembling as beggars, which are motivated for a redemptive purpose, suggest a wider spectrum of dissembling.

Momford changes his identity, when such a change is needed. Momford takes one more identity (a serving-man) when he has to fight against Young Playnsey, who attempts to rape Bess. Indeed, Momford is an expert in “altering shapes,” as Bess finds that he acts as a serving-man and a blind beggar. Yet this play does not lead the audience to view Momford’s taking of several identities with a critical eye. By using Hadland and Canbee, two malicious rogues, as a foil to Momford, the play marks the difference in the intentions of acting and dissembling. The two cony-catching rogues in the end are banished out of the country. Such punishment reflects the 1598 Poor Law, which

commands the banishment of incorrigible rogues to countries overseas. While replicating and approving the authorities' view on rogues, this play tries to tackle the issue of theatricality within legal boundaries. By presenting Momford's "altering shapes" as distinctive from rogues' malicious acting, this play tries to evoke the wide range of theatricality. This play, then, reflects the theater companies' desire and strategy to legitimate their business by illegalizing other forms of acting, which are quite similar to the theatrical acting, and by differentiating their business from the infamy of roguery.

* * *

Shakespeare reinstates a rogue character in The Winter's Tale (1609-11), where his implicit toleration of the roguish vagrant of 2 Henry VI is more fully expressed. Autolycus loiters from town to town and "haunts wakes, fairs, and bear-baitings" (4.3.92), looking for anything by which he can make money. He has various experiences and professions:

He hath been since an ape-bearer, then a process-server--a bailiff--then he compassed a motion of the Prodigal Son, and married a tinker's wife within a mile where my land and living lies, and having flown over many knavish professions, he settled only in rogue. (4.3.86-91)

As one of the wandering poor who cannot hold down a permanent job or residence, Autolycus lives a volatile and tumultuous life, a type of life which is defined as a rogue's. What is notable with Autolycus' "knavish professions" is that he was involved in the entertainment business of a performing troupe, which requires a capacity to attract

an audience with skills to perceive the customer's desire. Autolycus' mastery of gullible people's minds is demonstrated by his acting of several roles in the play.

Autolycus is on stage in only three scenes (scene 3 and 4 in Act 4, and scene 2 in Act 5), but each time he appears, we see a different Autolycus, since he acts a different role in every scene with different garments and manners. In scene 3 of Act 4, Autolycus grovels on the ground and acts like a gentleman who has been beaten and robbed. When he sees a passer-by, Autolycus performs the role of an innocent traveler who was injured by a street rogue. With that scheme, Autolycus traps a Clown and secretly takes his purse when the Clown stoops to help Autolycus get up. In the next scene, we see Autolycus as a peddler who wears a false beard and carries a pack of wares. Autolycus captivates the rural customers' curiosity and money with cunning lies:

CLOWN. Have I not told thee how I was cozened by the way, and lost all my money?

AUTOLYCUS. And indeed, sir, there are cozeners abroad, therefore it behoves men to be wary.

CLOWN. Fear not thou, man, thou shalt lose nothing here.

AUTOLYCUS. I hope so, sir, for I have about me many parcels of charge.

CLOWN. What hast here? Ballads?

MOPSA. Pray now, buy some. I love a ballad in print, alife, for then we are sure they are true.

AUTOLYCUS. Here's one to a very doleful tune, how a usurer's wife

was brought to bed of twenty money-bags at a burden, and how she longed to eat adders' heads and toads carbonadoed.

MOPSA. Is it true, think you?

AUTOLYCUS. Very true, and but a month old.

DORCAS. Bless me from marrying a usurer!

AUTOLYCUS. Here's the midwife's name to't, one Mistress Tail-Porter, and five or six honest wives' that were present. Why should I carry lies abroad? (4.4.243-61)

Autolycus, who has stolen the clown's money, brazenly says that he himself is worried about cozeners on the road, and then sells his ballads by simulating the interest of the country lad and lass with monstrous and sensational stories. In the same scene, we see Autolycus' transformation one more time. Autolycus exchanges his clothing with the prince Florizel's royal garment by Camillo's request. Wearing the royal costume, Autolycus performs as a courtier and makes fun of the Old Shepherd and his son. In all of these instances, Autolycus deceives the people in the countryside with his wily acting.

Autolycus, who changes his roles depending on the situation, shares a certain image of players. Autolycus is always ready to play any role extempore with full imagination. When asked by two shepherdesses to play one part of the ballad, which is about two maids wooing a man, Autolycus answers readily and willingly, "I can bear my part, you must know, 'tis my occupation" (4.4.283-84). Here Autolycus implies his sense of identity as a player and his talent for acting different roles. Shakespeare utilizes Autolycus, who is a volatile, imaginative, and protean character, for plot development.

By exchanging his clothes with Florizel, Autolycus enables him to move easily in disguise from Bohemia to Sicilia. Also, Autolycus menaces and sends away the Old Shepherd and his son to Leontes's palace, where the Old Shepherd discloses Perdita's origin of birth. Autolycus is, then, a sort of catalyst that facilitates plot development.

Shakespeare embraces Autolycus' roguery in terms of its dramatic function, and, for that theatrical reason, Shakespeare obscures any morality issue regarding Autolycus. Autolycus is never criticized or punished for his dissembling and money-taking, although he is eligible for banishment just like Hadland and Canbee, the rogues in The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green. Unlike John Day, though, Shakespeare boldly endorses a rogue character and emphasizes his theatricality.⁸ By presenting a rogue character as the symbol of a player and artist, the play indicates that players believed their status to be relatively secure since they thought that they would not be discredited because of their comparison to rogues. In essence, this play's endorsement of a rogue's theatricality can be regarded as a testament to the theater companies' developed sense of their occupation and business.

* * *

Thomas Middleton's The Spanish Gypsy (1623) represents, through a traveling gypsy group, the Jacobean players' sense of profession and desire to legitimize their work. The gypsies are a playing troupe, and their performances reflect the early modern custom of provincial performances. When the players arrive at a provincial town, they request the city official's warrant, which permits the troupe's performances in the town and surrounding region. In order to gain the license, the leader of the gypsies, Alvarez,

pleads, “O please your high authority to sign us / Some warrant to confirm us” (3.2.226). When they receive the warrant, the troupe is allowed to stage their play in a local inn or a nobleman’s house. The gypsies perform in the court of an inn and then in a nobleman Fernando’s house, where they stage an extempore play by Fernando’s request.

This play also comments on Jacobean theaters through several allusions.

Roderigo wanders as a way of repentance for his careless behavior to a woman. When he meets the gypsies, he joins them. Two gypsies, Santo and Soto, invite Roderigo to join their play when they hear that Roderigo was an actor: They exclaim, “a player! A brother of the tiring house!” (3.1.62). Because of their invitation, Roderigo decides to become their playwright. When Santo expresses his concern about stealing dramatic plots, Roderigo responds that he is not a playwright that steals other playwrights’ plots. But Santo’s comment that “now-a-days ’tis all the fashion” (3.1.77) refers to and satirizes theatrical convention of the early seventeenth century.

Among the allusions to theaters, the gypsy players’ strong claim for recognition of their work as a legitimate one is most worthy of attention. Alvarez, chief of gypsies, defines their group as “noble gypsies” (2.1.11), and distinguishes his group from thieves, peddlers, or petty chapmen. He says that gypsies defy and degrade “filching, foisting, niming, jilting” (2.1.4-5). The gypsies share their nomadic lifestyle with peddlers or other troupes, since “If one city cannot maintain us, away to another!” city they have to go to find customers. But Alvarez explains how they differ from other entertainment troupes:

We entertain no mountebanking stroll,

No piper, fiddler, tumbler trough small hoops,

No ape-carrier, baboon-bearer;

We must have nothing stale, trivial or base: (2.1.18-21)

Here Alvarez expresses his pride of their acting business and strongly asserts it as a noble trade. Alvarez's belief in the decency of their profession is shared and expressed by the other players. Santo insists that playing is not something "stale" or "base"

(2.1.21):

We scorn cutting purses;

Though we live by making noise,

For cheating none can curse us. (3.1.116-18)

Santo strongly argues that players should not be blamed for cheating. His speech, on the one hand, exemplifies the accusation that players are identical to vagabonds and rogues, and, on the other hand, reveals players' desire to change their image. Soto says that a gypsy player is a laborer who "earn[s] money" and "gets his living by his tongue and legs" (2.2.66, 70) than a beggar who depends on alms for his living without work. The gypsy players' emphasis on their work as professional and legitimate is worthy of attention since players, along with vagabonds and rogues, were frequently criticized for non-participation in productive labor and, for that reason, were compared to drones or caterpillars. Nicholas Breton, in The Good and the Bad; or, Descriptions of the Worthies and Unworthies of this Age (1616), remarks that the idle beggar is "a drone that feeds upon the labours of the bee," and "a kind of caterpillar that spoils much good fruit" (26). Harman's Caveat shares the idea that rogues and sturdy beggars take money from honest

working people in the country, and Harman argues that such harmful people that endanger the well-being of the commonwealth are proper for harsh chastisement. Greene also mentions coney-catchers as “base-minded caterpillars,” “vipers,” and “worms of the commonwealth” (172). Anti-theatrical documents include players in that category and assume theaters to be the breeding ground of idle and lazy people. Viewed in this rhetorical context, Alvarez’ revision of the players’ symbol is impressive. Alvarez says

None be sluttish, none thievish, none lazy; all bees, no

Drones, and our hives shall yield us honey. (2.1.66-67)

Alvarez employs the metaphor of the bee and drones to reconfigure the players’ conventional image and associations. He states that players are not lazy idlers but laboring workers and that plays are legitimate product of work. As such, this play represents players’ belief in, and claim for, recognition of their profession as legitimate work in the Jacobean period. Such conviction in their profession possibly comes from the popularity and social esteem that the theater achieved in the Jacobean period, and royal patronage was an element that contributed to such an effect.

* * *

If Thomas Middleton’s Spanish Gypsy shows us the players’ endeavor to underscore their distinction from idling vagrants and rogues, Richard Brome’s A Jovial Crew (1641) consistently employs the association of players with beggars. The series of beggary metaphors in A Jovial Crew begins in the dedicatory letter. When he dedicates the play to Thomas Stanley, Brome uses the trope of beggary by defining himself as a poor beggar asking for charity:

Yet we all know beggars use to flock to great men's gates. And, though my fortune has cast me in that mold, I am poor and proud, and preserve the humor of him who could not beg for anything but great boons, such as are your kind acceptance and protection. (3)

To plead for patronage, Brome compares himself to the wandering poor who hang around country gentlemen's houses for alms. In the latter part of the dedication, Brome describes himself as a beggar who "limps hither with a wooden leg to beg an alms at your hands" and states that he will "Duly and truly pray" for the patron just as a beggar prays heavenly blessings on an alms-giver (4). Brome ends his dedication with the wish that Thomas Stanley enjoy his play: "Be pleased, therefore, sir, to lodge these harmless beggars in the outhouses of your thought" (4). By referring to the main characters as "harmless beggars," Brome effectively and smoothly closes his dedication and turns his patron's attention to the play itself.

The beggars in this play maintain their symbolic relation to the players. The beggars participate in play performances, even though the performances are not public and commercial ones. They plan to present "a masque or a comedy" (4.2.172) in order to celebrate an elderly couple's wedding. As the themes of the play, they decide on "commonwealth" and "Utopia" (4.2.179), and they divide up the roles among themselves:

RACHEL. I'll be Utopia; who must be my branches?

POET. The country, the city, the court, and the camp, epitomiz'd

And personated by a gentleman, a merchant, a courtier, and

A soldier.

SOLDIER. I'll be your soldier. Am not I one? Ha!

COURTIER. And am not I a fashionable courtier? (4.2.181-86)

Here poet, soldier, and courtier are nicknames of the beggars who have special talents and experiences in each area. The poet-beggar is the playwright who improvises a general plot of the masque about utopia. To present an abstract version of the world, the poet-beggar lists representative characters as dramatic personae, such as a gentleman in the country, a merchant in the city, a courtier in the court, and a soldier in the camp. In addition, the poet-beggar presents "Divinity" and "Law," since these two are often considered the organizing principles of an utopia. But Divinity's or Law's intervention does not enable the construction of utopian society. The soldier controls the society with his "cudgel" (4.2.210), restraining all others with his power. The poet-beggar adds one more character as a concluding vision for utopia.

POET. Stay, yet I want

Another person.

HILLIARD. What must he be?

POET. A beggar.

VINCENT. Here's enough for us, I think. What must the beggar do?

POET. He must at last overcome the soldier, and bring them all

To Beggars' Hall. And this, well acted, will be for the

honor of our calling. (4.2.211-218)

The beggars plan a masque on utopia that has the climax with beggar's ruling. But the masque is not staged, since, all of a sudden, a justice of the peace raids the beggars' barn and arrests them.

But the justice of the peace and the judge provide the beggars a chance to perform another play. The officials, who think that the beggars are players, request a play. If their play pleases him, the judge promises, the beggars will be exonerated. Thus the beggars create a new play, and this time it is more formal. It begins with a prologue, which states the general idea behind play they are going to stage:

Enter Poet for Prologue.

POET. To knight, to squire, and to the gentles here,

We wish our play may with content appear.

We promise you no dainty wit of court,

Nor city pageantry, nor country sport:

But a plain piece of action, short and sweet;

In story true. You'll know it when you see't.

OLDRENTS. True stories and true jests do seldom thrive on stages.

(5.1.302-308)

After hearing the prologue, Oldrents says that true stories are not popular in theaters, thereby referring to the trends of Caroline theaters. Through these beggar-players, Brome comments on contemporary theaters, which commonly opted to stage romances.⁹ Under the influence of Henrietta Maria, who brought "the fashion for platonic love and for Arcadian pastoralism" from France, Caroline courts preferred romantic plays (Gurr

134). Such tendencies contributed to the displacement of the resident playwrights of King's Men such as Philip Massinger, James Shirley, and Brome, and the appointment of Cavalier playwrights such as Sir William Davenant and Sir John Suckling in their place.¹⁰ As "the spokesman of the anti-Cavalier faction," Brome opposed the amateur court playwrights' snatching the audience from the professional playwrights "by the expensive novelty of elaborate scenery and costume" (Kaufmann 151). The beggars in this play, then, reflect the tension in Caroline theaters, and demonstrate his theatrical preferences.

Against Oldrents' expectation, the beggars' play about a true story moves him to repent his past. In exchange for the beggars' successful play, the judge offers them a reprieve. The beggars' playing is applauded and rewarded. As he ends the play, Brome once again assimilates the trope of beggary. Brome lets Springlove beg for the audience's applause by making the "begging Epilogue":

Tho' we are, now, no beggars of the crew,
 We count it not a shame to beg of you.
 The justice, here, has given his pass free
 To all the rest [beggars] unpunish'd; only we
 Are under censure, till we do obtain
 Your suffrages, that we may beg again;
 And often, in the course we took today,
 Which was intended for your mirth, a play;
 Not without action, and a little wit.

There we *beg your pass* for us and it. (5.503-12 my italics)

The association of players with beggars that Brome develops throughout the play reaches a climax in this epilogue. Here Springlove compares the players waiting for audience's reward to the arrested vagrants waiting for the justice's decision. Just as the beggars in the play are given the pass to go free and beg, Springlove asks the audience to give the players a "pass" (the official license that allows the deserving poor to beg). For players, the pass is more likely to signify an audience's applause and favorable recommendation to other people so that the company can enjoy popularity and affluence. In this light, Brome appropriates the rhetoric of beggary to represent players' reliance on the audience's fee and judgement.

The players' begging epilogue was also employed in Beggars' Bush (1622), which presents an epilogue in the format of beadsman's prayer for an alms-giver's wellbeing:

As you are kinde unto us and our Bush,
 We are the Beggars and your dayly Beadsmen,
 And have your money, but the Almes we aske
 And live by, is your Grace, give that and then
 Wee'l boldly say our word is, Come Agen. (5.2.250-54)

For the professional players, audience' or patron's response can be undeniably significant, and the trope of beggary is well infused in such circumstances that the players wish the success of their business in monetary terms. The players' assimilation

of their status into beggars, however, illuminates an interesting aspect of early modern theater.

In the plays before the 1590s, it is hard to find any play that directly addresses and develops the similarity between players and beggars/ vagrants. There may have been some historical reason for playwrights to erase players' image in the characterization of beggars or rogues. During the period, players were always associated with vagrants and beggars in their *real lives*. Players had to depend on traveling without permanent playhouses, and their traveling made their lives as hard as those of vagrants. Furthermore, the strong anti-theatrical atmosphere—the social circumstances galvanized by anti-theatrical treatises, early rogue pamphlets, and regulations such as 1572 Vagabond Act—perpetuated players' cultural image as rogues. During such a precarious period, the players tried to disassociate their image from idling and dissembling rogues. The sixteenth-century players preferred, instead, being compared to a merchant or shopkeeper selling his ware, as the prologue of The Three Ladies of London (1581) shows:

You marvel, then what stuff we have to furnish out our show.
 Your patience yet we crave awhile, till we have trimm'd our stall;
 Then, young and old, come and behold our wares, and buy them all.
 Then, if our wares shall seem to you well-woven, good and fine,
 We hope we shall your custom have again another time.

Like a shopkeeper who wishes customers to return, the prologue of this play manifests the players' wish that audience would make a habit of visiting them.¹¹ The metaphor of

commercial transaction was materialized and lasted long, when the Lord Chamberlain permitted permanent playhouses as a legitimate place for selling their plays in the suburb of London. And the establishment and authorization of theater business helped players develop the professional sense on their occupation.

The establishment of permanent playhouses and the eventual royal patronage for players were the historical and material conditions that enabled players to recuperate the metaphor of beggars to represent themselves. It was the theaters' relative affluence and social recognition that led the players to use the rhetoric of beggary. In fact, dedicating literary works to patrons and begging for patronage had been long-held conventions of high literary culture, but sixteenth-century plays were never a part of that culture. But two seventeenth-century plays on beggars, Beggars' Bush and A Jovial Crew, appropriate the convention of dedication to patrons and adopt the trope of beggary in a dramatic format. Beggar-players' asking for the audience's and patron's sponsorship in those plays is a variation of literary dedication, and paradoxically indicates players' developed sense as professionals. In other words, only after players gained a certain social recognition and they could claim playgoing as an essential part of Londoners' everyday life, then they were able to employ the trope of beggary and adopt their associative image with beggars—the association was, in fact, quite consistent in society from the sixteenth century.

Notes

¹ During that period, theater business still had its traditional association with “play” as a part of holiday festivities. Actors and theaters were called “players” and “playhouses.” The terms “actors” and “theaters” were more frequently used after the Restoration.

² Philip V. Thomas discusses itinerant entertainers’ precarious status in the Elizabethan and early Stuart period with the focus on performance practices in Norwich.

³ Allan Somerset has a different opinion on this issue. He points out the problem of the reading to take representations of traveling companies in plays at face value in his article “‘How Chances It They Travel?’: Provincial Playing, Playing Places and the King’s Men”

⁴ Playing companies had a variety of challenges even after their settlement in London. Theaters’ marginal and unstable condition of the period has been discussed by many scholars. Steven Mullaney in The Place of the Stage discusses theaters’ cultural condition of liminality with the topological approach to the location of theaters. Bryan Reynolds’s Becoming Criminal examines the co-development of criminal culture and theaters. Joseph Lenz in “Base Trade: Theater as Prostitution” explores theaters’ several connections to prostitution.

⁵ Although “rogues” and “vagabonds” can be used interchangeably as the terms denoting itinerant poor people (with the implication of denouncement), the two terms had a slightly different focus in the Elizabethan age. While the terms--“vagabonds” and “beggars”--denoted the poor in general who wandered around without stable income, the

term “rogues” was used to indicate those who made their living by cozening and dissembling. In other words, rogues had more negative connotation and relation to trickery. Such rogues began to be included in the Vagabond Act from 1572: Earlier Vagabond Acts referred to “Beggars, Vagabonds, and Idle persons,” but the 1572 Act renamed them by “Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars” (Mowat 65). The Act defined a rogue as “a healthy person who has neither land, nor master, nor a legitimate trade or source of income” (Mowat 65). For more discussion of cultural investment in the word “rogue” and its semantic variations, see Chapter IV (pages 116-20).

⁶ Peter Stallybrass discusses the trade of costumes in his article “Worn Worlds: Clothes and Identity on the Renaissance Stage.”

⁷ Bednal Green is the name of a place in the suburbs of London.

⁸ Barbara A. Mowat in her article “Rogues, Shepherds, and the Counterfeit Distressed: Text and Infracontext of The Winter’s Tale 4.3” discusses Autolycus’s symbolic aspect as an artist by tracing the mythological allusions in Autolycus’s characterization.

⁹ The contemporary theaters’ preference for romances is referred to and so regretted by Brome even in the prologue of A Jovial Crew:

The title of our play, *A Jovial Crew*,
 May seem to promise mirth, which were a new
 And forc’d thing in these sad and tragic days
 For you to find, or we express in plays.
 We wish you then would change that expectation,

Since jovial mirth is now grown out of fashion.
 Or much not to expect, for now it chances
 Our comic writer, finding that romances
 Of lovers through much travel and distress,
 Till it be thought no power can redress
 Th'afflicted wanderers, though stout chivalry
 Lend all his aid for their delivery,
 Till, lastly, some impossibility
 Concludes all strife and makes a comedy—
 Finding, he says, such stories bear the sway,
 Near as he could, he has compos'd a play
 Of fortune-tellers, damsels, and their squires,
 Expos'd to strange adventures through the briers
 Of love and fate.

¹⁰ R. J. Kaufmann states that Brome in The Court Beggar satirizes William Davenant and the custom of coterie culture in which an amateur playwright composes a play. Kaufmann also points out the tension between professional playwrights and the amateur playwrights in terms of the “second war of the theaters” (151).

¹¹ The trade metaphor—players as shopkeepers, and plays as commodities—was continually used in plays, and one of them could be Ben Jonson’s The Magnetic Lady, where Jonson presents theater as a shop selling wares for sale. For the early modern

theater's commercial aspect and their relation to market economy, see Douglas Bruster's Drama and the Market in the Age of Shakespeare.

CHAPTER III

KING LEAR'S SYMBOLIC EXPERIENCE OF VAGRANCY

If the earlier chapter discusses early modern theater's interactions and negotiations with the discourses of vagrancy, this chapter will focus on the political ramifications of the discourses of vagrancy reflected in Shakespeare's King Lear. The first section will examine Shakespeare's representation of the discourse of vagrancy by paralleling the play with Thomas Harman's Caveat--a seminal work that was influential in disseminating the Elizabethan discourse of vagrancy and proliferating rogue stereotypes. In the second section, I will explore the motif of geographical mobility permeating the play, with a discussion about the diverse group of wanderers that engage in such mobility. In the third section will focus on Lear's mobility in particular to argue that the expansion of his spatial awareness is directly related to his changed perspective on the poor. Finally, I will discuss the similarities of spatial perception between Lear and King James I regarding the kingdom by discussing James' revival and refortification of forest law. This chapter, therefore, will discuss the spatial politics of the discourse of vagrancy represented in King Lear.

1. A Dialogue with the Literature of Roguery

When compared with the earlier anonymous True Chronicle History of King Leir, Shakespeare's King Lear employs the motifs of poverty and vagrancy in resonant and multi-faceted ways. King Leir deals with the motifs of hunger and poverty, and the

notion of charity, only briefly and tenuously. Poverty and charity are presented through the relationship between Leir and Cordella, in order to reveal their personal characters. Leir, an arrogant father who does not listen to Cordella's honest concern, is eventually expelled by his ungrateful daughters. Leir wanders as a beggar, and faces starvation, fainting "for want of sustenance" (scene 24. 22). Through poverty and hunger, Leir realizes his mistake and discovers Cordella's sincerity. Poverty is thus presented as an individual experience for Leir to get through in order to reach to his moralistic lesson for his mistake. Leir's hunger is eventually relieved by the banquet and charity Cordella provides. Cordella's charity is portrayed as her personal virtue, and through this King Leir seems to hint that such individual charity can resolve problems of poverty. The issue of poverty is recycled in Shakespeare's play as well, but he approaches the issue from a different angle. By reflecting on the contemporary discourse of beggary and roguery, Shakespeare raises the issue in its social and political contexts. King Lear, as we shall see, exposes the unfair representation of vagrants in the hegemonic discourse of vagrancy and examines the political ramifications of the discourse of vagrancy.¹

Shakespeare's use of the Tom of Bedlam figure, which is not in King Leir, triggers an approach that attends to the play's reflection of the discourses of vagrancy.² Tom of Bedlam, which Shakespeare dramatizes through Edgar's disguise, is a certain type of beggar that was a matter of concern in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. His relation to Bedlam implies his madness, since Bedlam was the name of hospital that was noted for caring for lunatics since the late fourteenth century (Allderidge 141-43).³ Because of its long history associated with insanity, the word

“bedlam” was often used in the sixteenth century to indicate an unreasonable or irrational person or action. John Skelton in 1522, for instance, describes Cardinal Wolsey as “Suche a madde bedleme/ For to rewle this rea[l]me” (qtd. in Carroll 100). Such a figurative use of the word illustrates that the Bedlam and its associative image were a familiar part of early modern lives.

In fact, bedlam beggars or beggars who claimed to have been in Bedlam roamed the street, as several texts show. In the late seventeenth century, John Aubrey reports that some mad beggars from Bedlam hospital were allowed to go on the street to beg, when their symptoms improved. Aubrey calls such a beggar a “Tom o’ Bedlam”:

Till the breaking out of the Civil Wars, Tom o’ Bedlam did travel about the country; they had been poor distracted men, but had been put into Bedlam, where, recovering some soberness, they were licentiated to go a-begging, i.e. they had on their left arm an armilla of tinn, about four inches long; they could not get it off; they wore about their necks a great horn of an ox in a string or bawdry, which when they came to an house for alms, they did wind, and they did put the drink given them into this horn, whereto they did put a stopple. (qtd. in Wheatley London Past and Present 176)

Aubrey indicates that Tom o’ Bedlam was a quite familiar cultural figure on the streets of London. Tom o’ Bedlam had specific appearances, and carried “tin” on his arm, (which was regarded as the license of begging,) and a “horn,” which was used for drinking when he was entertained by kind beneficiaries. H. B. Wheatley says that

because of the lack of funding, certain beggars of Bedlam hospital were allowed to wander on the street and beg for charity (176). But there is some disagreement on the authorization of licenses for bedlam beggars' begging on the streets. A. L. Beier states that there is no official document to prove that Tom o' Bedlam was allowed to beg in the parish (Masterless 115). Several documents describe incidents of prosecuting beggars' use of false licenses from Bedlam hospital. One archival record of 1576 describes a man confessing that "he had for five months gone with a false license 'feigning himself to have been in Bedlam this two years and a quarter for lunacy, and to beg for his fees'" (Carroll 103). In addition, the London governor in 1675 denied licenses for Bedlam beggars and warned the public against such beggars who took advantage of Bedlam licenses. Whether authorized or not, Bedlam beggars could have appealed to the populace, since they could be properly categorized as the deserving poor due to their insanity. But sympathy for Bedlam beggars was adversely affected by rogue pamphlets' descriptions of Tom o' Bedlam.

Rogue pamphlets promoted the idea that a wandering beggar could be an imposture and crafty con-man. Tom o' Bedlam is explained as one kind of scenario that vagrants choose to act for the sake of eliciting charity. John Awdeley's Fraternity of Vagabonds (1561) is the first English text that introduced an insane vagrant as a fraudulent one. Awdeley calls him "Abraham Man":

An Abraham Man is he that walketh bare-armed and bare-legged, and feigneth himself mad, and carryeth a pack of wool, or a stick with bacon on it, or suchlike toy, and nameth himself Poor Tom. (91)

Awdeley introduces two names, Abraham Man and Poor Tom, along with their two different uses. While beggars use the category “Abraham Man” as a cant for their own communication, they identify themselves as Poor Tom when they go begging in the country. Here the name “Tom” first appeared and became attached to insane beggars in such titles as Poor Tom or Tom o’ Bedlam. Such an image of Poor Tom, who acts an insane beggar with a strange look, is more fully developed by Harman. Harman characterizes the Abraham Man more vividly with the dramatization of demanded charity:

These Abraham men be those that feign themselves to have been mad, and have been kept either in Bedlam or in some other prison a good time, and not one amongst twenty that ever came in prison for any such cause; yet will they say how piteously and most extremely they have been beaten and dealt withal. Some of these be merry and very pleasant; they will dance and sing; some others be as cold and reasonable to talk withal. These beg money; either when they come at Farmers’ houses they will demand Bacon, either cheese or wool, or anything that is worth money. And if they espy small company within, they will with fierce countenance demand somewhat. Where for fear the maids will give them largely to be rid of them. If they may conveniently come by any cheat, they will pick and steal, as the upright man or Rogue, poultry or line. (127)

Harman asserts that these beggars claim they were given harsh treatment when they were in Bedlam, but that they only make up a story as a way to receive charity and money.

This discursive milieu of the Abraham Man that Awdeley and Harman construct is reflected in Edgar's move toward the disguise as a Poor Tom. But Shakespeare's appropriation of the discourse of roguery, I wish to argue, does not endorse Awdeley's and Harman's denunciation of dissembling beggars. By placing a representative rogue character in a sympathetic context, Shakespeare revises the images of beggars and thereby questions the stereotypical perspective of vagrants in rogue books. In other words, Shakespeare does not validate the ideology of Harman, but demystifies it to draw empathy for vagrants. This is the context in which Shakespeare places Edgar.

Shakespeare presents Edgar as *compelled* to disguise himself as Poor Tom in order to survive. Due to Edmund's wiles, Gloucester is deceived into proclaiming Edgar a traitor and banishing him. Edgar is at the risk of execution, and he thinks only of survival. In a desperate moment, Edgar finds a way to escape: he must deface himself with filth and beg around the village as a Bedlam beggar:

EDGAR. My face I'll grime with filth,
 Blanket my loins, elf all my hair in knots,
 And with presented nakedness out-face
 The winds and persecutions of the sky.
 The country gives me proof and precedent
 Of Bedlam beggars, who, with roaring voices,
 Strike in their numbed and mortified bare arms
 Pins, wooden pricks, nails, sprigs of rosemary;
 And with this horrible object, from low farms,

Poor pelting villages, sheep-cotes, and mills,
 Sometime with lunatic bans, sometime with prayers,
 Enforce their charity. Poor Turlygod! Poor Tom! (2.3.9-20)⁴

Edgar has seen many examples of Bedlam beggars, and he knows quite well how they look and how they act. Bedlam beggars roam with their bare bodies and an unkempt look, and have sharp things (pins and nails) stuck in the skin of their bare bodies. Edgar knows that pins and nails function as the sign of insanity, and that the beggars' grotesque look is meant to overwhelm and horrify observers and evoke charity. Following the beggars' examples, Edgar decides to beg as a wandering lunatic.

Going against the grain of contemporary associations of the vagrants with idling and dissembling, Shakespeare elicits compassion for them. Through Poor Tom, King Lear depicts the life of the destitute and the uprooted more sympathetically, with an emphasis on their hunger and coldness. Edgar in the play repeats: "Poor Tom's a-cold" (3.4.135).⁵ Poor Tom's coldness contains several layers of implications. On the one hand, the coldness could mean the literal feeling in Poor Tom's bare body, or the sickness he gets from being cold. On the other hand, the coldness could refer to the cold charity and hospitality Poor Tom receives.⁶ When he begs, what Poor Tom receives is cold punishment: Poor Tom is "whipped from tithing to tith- / ing, and stock-punished, and imprisoned" (3.4.123-124). Poor Tom's coldness, thus, symbolizes his unwelcome life.

Given the significance of Poor Tom's coldness, Lear's note of Poor Tom's bareness deserves our attention. When he first meets Poor Tom, Lear notes his

nakedness and nothingness: Lear says, “Hast thou given all to thy two daughters? And art thou / come to this?” (3.4.49-50). Lear projects himself onto the naked beggar and finds his fate in Poor Tom. After giving all of his possessions to his daughters, Lear himself has begun to feel literally like a beggar. He has even knelt and asked Goneril for the basic necessities of life: “On my knees I beg / That you’ll vouchsafe me raiment, bed, and good” (2.4.148-49). Because of his own experience, Lear begins to perceive the life of the poor.⁷ Aroused by Poor Tom’s miserable bareness, Lear tears off his garment to show empathy and respect to Poor Tom. When Lear is asked to go into Gloucester’s outbuilding to escape from the storm, he insists on the company of Poor Tom, whom he calls a “philosopher” (3.4.141.164) and “learned Theban” (3.4.145).

At this point it is evident that Shakespeare departs completely from the rogue writers’ assessment of Abraham Man or Poor Tom. Awdeley and Harman aim to divulge the Abraham Man’s dissembling and to denounce him for attempting to earn a living without labor. Alternatively, Shakespeare uses Lear to show empathy for Poor Tom’s condition -- Lear even empowers Tom, first by calling him a philosopher, and then by appointing him as a Justice. In the mock trial for reprimanding his two daughters, Lear reverses the normal power relation. Poor Tom, who is vulnerable to authority’s surveillance and punishment, becomes a Justice who prosecutes the two daughters for their ungrateful coldness toward their beggarly father.

Intriguingly, Lear’s empowerment of Poor Tom foreshadows what Shakespeare does in the final act. The play ends with Edgar (or Edgar and Albany) as the future ruler of the kingdom. Edgar has been a companion in Lear’s journey of suffering when Lear

wanders the country as a bare beggar. When they meet and then wander together as beggars, Edgar and Lear teach each other the social reality of poverty. Although Lear dies without the chance to reform the society with his knowledge of social injustice, the play ends leaving the opportunity to Edgar. Like Lear, Edgar has experienced the life of the indigent who have nothing but their bodies, and the lessons he gained as a beggar make him eligible to be the future king of the country. In this regard, it is not accidental that Lear names Edgar his “godson” (2.1.91-92), and that the relationship between Lear and Edgar is more intimate than the natural blood kinship between Lear and his daughters.

Shakespeare’s alteration of the Poor Tom figure from Harman affects Thomas Dekker’s description of Abraham Men in The Belman of London. Although Dekker says that the beggars do falsely swear that they were in Bedlam, he also presents that the beggars’ acting results from their hard realities. Dekker narrates that Abraham Man has “pinnes stuck in sundry places of his naked flesh, especially in his arms, which paine hee gladly puts himselfe to [. . .] onely to make you beleeeve he is out of his wits” (101). Yet Dekker adds that the pain from pins is “indeede no torment at all, [since] his skin is either so dead, with some fowle disease, or so hardned with weather” (101). Dekker suggests that the beggar’s reality is much more horrible than what they look by the pins stuck in their naked flesh. Dekker, at some moment, implies that the Abraham Man is an insane man:

He calls himselfe by the name of *Poore Tom*, and comming neere any body, cryes out, *Poore Tom* is a cold. Of these Abraham-men, some be

exceeding mery, and doe nothing but sing songs, fashioned out of their owne braines, some will dance, others will doe nothing but either laugh or wéepe, others are dogged and so sullen both in looke and spéech, that spying but small company in a house, they boldly and bluntly enter, compelling the servants through feare to give them what they demand, which is commonly bacon, or some thing that will yéelde ready mony.

(101-102)

Perhaps unintentionally, Dekker suggests the beggar's madness by describing the beggar's unstable mind with his extreme or fluctuating feelings. Dekker's characterization is a salient departure from Harman's description of the Abraham Man, although Dekker's The Belman of London and Harman's Caveat are in the same genre of rogue pamphlet. Harman, as we discussed, continually emphasizes the beggar's intentional acting. Harman says that the Abraham Man is "as cold and reasonable to talk withal" (127). Harman's use of "coldness" is prominently different from Poor Tom's coldness in Shakespeare and Dekker. Harman uses the word "coldness" to emphasize the beggar's capacity to be reasonable and to control his actions. Harman describes one Abraham Man he met: "He is able with his tongue and usage to deceive and abuse the wisest man that is" (128). But Dekker's description of the Abraham Man is modified, with Shakespeare's influence. By adopting Shakespeare's phrase, "Poor Tom is a cold," instead of Harman's words "cold and reasonable," Dekker supports Shakespeare's view that beggars suffer from hard reality and their acting, if ever, is only for survival.

Shakespeare's critique of Harman's representation of vagrants becomes pronounced when he uses Goneril and Regan to represent the pamphleteers' voice and beliefs. When Lear begs for "raiment, bed, and food," Regan denies it promptly: "Good sir, no more! These are unsightly tricks" (2.4. 150). Regan's use of the word "tricks" is noteworthy, since Harman uses similar rhetoric. Harman advises the Countess of Shrewsbury, to whom he dedicates his book, to reconsider her charitable actions, since most of the beggars at the door are tricksters. In the dedication, Harman says:

And I well by good experience, understanding and considering your [Countess of Shrewsbury] most tender, pitiful, gentle, and noble nature, not only having a vigilant and merciful eye to your poor, indigent, and feeble parishioners; yea, not only in the parish where your honor most happily doth dwell, but also in others environing or nigh adjoining to the same; as also abundantly pouring out daily your ardent and bountiful charity upon all such as cometh for relief unto your lucky gates; I thought it good, necessary, and my bounden duty to acquaint your goodness with the abominable, wicked, and detestable behavior of all these rowsey, ragged rabblement of rakehells that under the *pretense* of great misery, diseases, and other innumerable calamities which they *feign* through great *hypocrisy* do win and gain great alms in all places where they wilily wander to the utter deluding of the good givers, *deceiving* and impoverishing of all such poor householders, both sick and sore, as

neither can or may walk abroad for relief and comfort (where indeed most mercy is to be shewed). (109 my italics)

Harman expresses his enmity against the vagrants as he describes begging as “abominable, wicked, and detestable behavior of all these rowsey, ragged rabblement of rakehells.” Harman endeavors to construct vagrants as dissembling figures by using such words as “pretense,” “feign,” “hypocrisy,” and “deceiving” in one sentence. As we saw from his description of Abraham Man earlier in this chapter, Harman depicts each beggar as a trickster who uses slightly different tactics and tools for eliciting charity. Given the discursive milieu of roguery represented in Harman, Regan’s dismissal of Lear’s begging as a trick precisely echoes Harman’s argument that charity is an unwise, and rather foolish, act, prompted by “wicked” “rakehells.” King Lear underscores the cruelty of Regan and Goneril, both of whom calculate precisely the effect of their actions. Goneril deliberately delays the dinner for Lear, and thereby succeeds in ousting Lear and his retinue. Regan and Cornwall leave their house on purpose when they receive Goneril’s letter about Lear. They preclude the opportunity to entertain Lear in their house by intentionally traveling to Gloucester’s house. Regan excuses her uncharitable acts by saying that she is “now from home and out of that provision which shall be needful for your entertainment” (2.4.200-1). Goneril, Regan, and Cornwall justify their ousting of Lear because they believe he should learn from his irrational actions. Regan and Cornwall even punish Gloucester for helping the frail, old Lear. By alluding to Harman’s principle of discretion with Goneril and Regan’s cruel rationality,

Shakespeare implicitly criticizes Harman and the rogue pamphleteers for deeming vagrants as wicked and for preaching discretion in acts of charity.

Goneril and Regan's attention to Lear's retinue closely reflects Harman's attitude to vagrants. The two daughters ask Lear to reduce the number of his followers who, they claim, are disorderly. Goneril asserts that the retinue is "so disordered, so deboshed and bold" that her "court, infected with their manners," becomes "a riotous inn" and "more like a tavern or a brothel / Than a graced palace" (1.4.117-221). Goneril describes the retinue staying in her house as idle, lascivious, and unmannerly. Indeed, the words Goneril uses to describe Lear's retinue are the ones which were often unfairly associated with vagrants. Further, Goneril's claim for the need to find a "redress" of the "disordered rabble" evokes Harman's treatment of "all these rowsey, ragged rabblement of rakehells" (109). After identifying vagrant people as "peevish, perverse, and pestilent people," Harman proposes "as short and as speedy a redress" like the one that had been tried for wandering gypsies (112). Gypsies were harshly punished when they were discovered, Harman says, and "through wholesome laws and the due execution thereof" gypsies were dispersed and vanished.⁸ Harman suggests that any vagrant in the country should be given the same penalty. According to Harman, vagrants are a nuisance and are detrimental to the welfare of the nation. Harman argues that if "the justices and shrieves may in their circuits be more vigilant to punish these malefactors," "then shall this famous empire be in more wealth and better flourish, to the inestimable joy and comfort of the Queen's most excellent Majesty" (110-11). By using comparable rhetoric, Goneril asserts the need to regulate Lear's followers.

GONERIL. Not only, sir, this your all-licensed fool,
 But other of your insolent retinue
 Do hourly carp and quarrel, breaking forth
 In rank and not-to-be-endured riots. Sir,
 I had thought, by making this well known unto you,
 To have found a safe redress; but now grow fearful,
 By what yourself too late have spoke and done,
 That you protect this course, and put it on
 By your allowance; which if you should, the fault
 Would not 'scape censure, nor the redresses sleep,
 Which, in the tender of a wholesome weal,
 Might in their working do you that offense,
 Which else were shame, that then necessity
 Will call discreet proceeding. (1.4.175-88)

Goneril's justification for the regulation of the "insolent retinue" for the well-being of the nation resembles Harman's strategy and echoes the ideology of Vagabond Acts as well. Goneril's referring to "a wholesome weal" (185) as the purpose of the redress recalls the proclamation, aimed at controlling vagrants for the order of the nation. When James I was enthroned in 1603, he made a proclamation for the speedy execution of the statute against rogues, vagabonds, idlers, and dissolute persons:

a profitable and necessary Law was made for the repressing of Rogues,
 Vagabonds, idle and dissolute persons, wherewith this Realme was then

much infested, by the due execution of which lawe, great good ensued to the whole Common weale of this Realme, but now of late by the remissenesse, negligence, and connivencie of some Justices of the Peace, and other Officers in divers parts of the Realme, they have swarmed and abounded every where more frequently then in times past, which will grow to the great and imminent danger of the whole Realme, if by the goodnesse of God Almighty, and the due and timely execution of the said Law the same be not prevented. (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 52-53)

James and his Privy Council regard the group of vagabonds as a disease in the nation, which spreads speedily when justices of the peace and officers neglect their monitoring duties. James and his privy council manifest their will to chastise idle rogues and vagabonds by reenacting the statutes. The rhetorical tone in this proclamation is very similar to the one in Goneril's speech that we discussed above. As such, Goneril's treatment of Lear's retinue as an insolent and riotous rabble reflects both Harman's narrative and the government's legislation on vagabonds. What, then, does the play imply by representing Harman's and the government's views on vagrants through Goneril and Regan?

The play shows that Goneril and Regan mention the reformation of Lear's retinue not because the retinue is really disorderly but because Goneril and Regan want to consolidate their power with regulations. Shakespeare discredits the literary and legal discourse of vagrancy in that period, with the analysis on the power relation mediating

the representation of vagrants. Furthermore, Shakespeare demystifies the ideology of “nation’s well-being,” which was often presented as the cause of regulations on vagabonds.

Overall, King Lear is the rhetorical arena in which differing perspectives on beggars are entertained and contested. While borrowing the typical features of beggars from the rogue pamphlets, Shakespeare relocates the beggars under sympathetic circumstances, thereby breaching the stereotypical perspective on beggars. Furthermore, by reflecting Harman’s and the government’s views on beggars through Goneril and Regan’s cruel rationality, this play offers a critical view against the tenor of Harman’s Caveat and the ideology of the discourse of roguery.

2. Vagrancy and Homelessness

King Lear addresses the issue of mobility and vagrancy in multiple ways. “Home” in this play fails to function as the center of order, and most of characters stay outside the home, as Woodbridge notes (207-8). Kent and Cordelia are the first characters to depart their home and country as outcasts. Lear, who recognizes Goneril and Regan’s unkindness, decides to go on the road with his retinue, wandering around until he dies, never to return home. Gloucester’s house is also in chaos. Deceived by Edmund, Gloucester proclaims Edgar a traitor, leading Edgar to disguise himself as a Poor Tom. By Edmund’s betrayal, Gloucester is also banished from his own house.

In addition to the movement of these banished characters, the play employs a travel motif with other characters, particularly Goneril, Regan, Cornwall, and Edmund

(Woodbridge 225). These characters' several travels are worthy of attention. Regan and Cornwall, who do not wish to accommodate Lear in their home, leave their houses and go to Gloucester's. After the dispute with Lear, Goneril also visits Gloucester's, and goes back to her house after discussing Lear's temper with Regan. Edmund leaves his house during Gloucester's punishment to make it easier for Cornwall and Regan.⁹ Eventually most of the characters travel to Dover, and the play ends in the camp there. Shakespeare's use of a travel motif is geared toward criticizing the government's policy toward mobility. Authorities categorized the wandering poor's movement as dangerous vagrancy, while they authorized travels that had certain other purposes. Goneril, Regan, and Edmund's travel, which falls under the category of authorized movement, actually serves their greedy desire for power and possession, while Lear, Edgar, and Gloucester's wandering, which evokes beggars' rambling, enables them to get out of their perceptive boundary and feel empathy for indigents.

Through Lear, Edgar, and Gloucester's wandering, the play materializes the vagrant poor's hardships and entertains the idea of social justice. Gloucester embodies the gruesome image of an injured blind beggar. When stripped of social prestige, he is no better than a helpless vagrant. Under the doom of "smell[ing] his way to Dover" (3.7.97), Gloucester accepts his misery as compensation for the privileges he has enjoyed due to his status. Gloucester understands his suffering as the intervention of providence:

That I am wretched

Makes thee the happier. Heavens, deal so still!

Let the superfluous and lust-dieted man,
 That slaves your ordinance, that will not see
 Because he doth not feel, feel your power quickly;
 So distribution should undo excess
 And each man has enough. (4.1.65-71)

Through the voice of Gloucester, who is degraded from top to bottom, the play conveys a radical message: Beware of excess or “superflux” (3.4.36), since it will be distributed. Leveling and equalizing again take place with Lear, who falls from the height of a king to the depths of a houseless beggar. Without a place to stay, he moves his body, wandering around as a naked beggar. His mind is also derailed from its place, as he experiences the extreme misery of a pitiable and insane beggar.

In regard to vagrancy, a number of wandering nameless beggars, who did not have their deserving attention, are worthy of discussion. Lear’s retinue is one such group. They become wandering vagrants when their master can no longer provide for them. This retinue has referentiality to vagrant soldiers common during Harman’s period. The soldiers returned from war, and, being unemployed, relied on charity. The other group of beggars worth highlighting is the nameless poor Lear meets in a hovel. Led by Kent’s plea to go inside against the inclement storm, Lear enters the hovel. At that moment, Lear discovers them:

Poor naked wretches, whereso’er you are,
 That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
 How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,

Your looped and windowed raggedness, defend you
 From seasons such as these? O, I have ta'en
 Too little care of this! Take physic, pomp;
 Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
 That thou mayst shake the superflux to them,
 And show the heavens more just. (3.4.29-37)

The plural form of “wretches,” “your heads,” and “them” indicates that the hovel is occupied not just by Poor Tom. It is hard to believe that Lear refers to Kent and the Fool as “poor naked wretches,” since Lear, in the same scene, describes Kent, Fool, and himself as “sophisticated” (3.4.98) in comparison with Poor Tom’s “uncovered” and “unaccommodated” body (3.4.95. 99). Therefore, the “wretches” that lead Lear to realize the miserable situation of “houseless” people, are the group of beggars inside the hovel with Poor Tom.

The implication of the poor people in this scene, however, does not get well-deserved attention. Some critics state that Lear’s social concern in this scene is “conspicuously irrelevant,” since the play does not prepare readers for such orientation (Berger 38). It is only recently that scholars have begun to discuss the poverty issue in this play; William Carroll (1988) and Linda Woodbridge (2001) examine several aspects and images of beggary and poverty that saturate the play. But even they do not address the importance in this scene of staging several nameless beggars. The only interpreter and critic I can find that noted multiple beggars in the hovel is a Russian filmmaker named Grigorii Kozintsev. Kozintsev adapted Shakespeare’s King Lear into a movie in

1971 with a special attention to the vagrancy and poverty issues in the play. He explores the imagery of beggary throughout the play and insightfully represents it in the medium of film.

Kozintsev unfolds the first scene by filming poor and ragged people moving in the bare and dreary landscape. These people gathering outside of Lear's castle are not two or five beggars, but hundreds of poor people. As these beggars watch over the castle, the camera moves inside and zooms in on the main characters. By focusing on hundreds of ragged people first, Kozintsev accentuates the problems of poverty as the main issue of the play. He continues to employ this group of ragged people throughout the film. When Lear and Edgar wander around the country, Kozintsev has these poor people wander along with them. One particularly impressive scene is when Edgar disguises himself as Poor Tom. Kozintsev presents an outlawed Edgar hiding behind a rock. At that moment, a group of beggars pass by the rock, and Edgar decides to join them. Kozintsev provides the social context of Edgar's decision and renders it more understandable when Edgar says, "The country gives me proof and precedent / Of Bedlam beggars" (2.1.170-71). Kozintsev successfully dramatizes Edgar's decision as culturally-bound by letting the visible beggars motivate him to join the group.

Furthermore, Kozintsev has beggars accompany Lear when he wanders in the country. Kozintsev crowds the hovel with beggars who make Lear sigh for their miserable condition: "Poor naked wretches [. . .] How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides [. . .] defend you / From seasons such as these?" (3.4.29-33). Kozintsev shows us that the numerous poor lead Lear to realize their unfair social condition. Even

as Lear makes a tirade against the “great image of authority,” Kozintsev occupies the screen with beggars and shows that Lear has become one of them. In this way, Kozintsev’s subtle use of multiple beggars illuminates his reading of the play as a presentation of the issue of poverty. Kozintsev emphasizes poverty as a social issue, not just the unfortunate individual circumstances that Edgar and Lear experience.

Kozintsev, a modern filmmaker, could easily represent “Poor naked wretches” by creating extra roles of several wandering beggars. In contrast, it might not have been easy to stage as many speechless actors in Jacobean theaters. Literary trends regarded the use of beggars on the tragic stage as unharmonious and incompatible. As Philip Sidney’s An Apology of Poesy illustrates, literary theory of the period observed the rule of decorum. According to the theory, characters in dramatic poesy should fit with dramatic genres; for example, kings and emperors are proper characters of tragedy, while lower class people are appropriate in comedy. This is probably why Shakespeare had to choose characters of the higher class, such as Lear and Edgar, to present the unequal social condition of the poor lower class. In a sense, Lear and Edgar undergo the overturn of destiny in order to experience “Necessity’s sharp pinch” (2.4.212) and, accordingly, to stand on the side of the beggar. When Poor Tom comes out of the hovel occupied by “poor naked wretches,” he comes not as an individual, but as one representing the group of “poor naked wretches.” Poor Tom’s “unaccommodated” and “poor, bare, forked” (3.4.99) body functions as a signifier of poverty which symbolizes the hunger and misery that vagrant people endure. Similarly, when Lear is banished and

wanders in the country, his meandering envisions “houseless” (3.4.31) beggars’ roaming figuratively.

The trial is another important scene where we note a change in Lear’s perspective. Lear’s empowering of Poor Tom as a justice is an act of ritual celebrating an order that is not possible in reality. Oddly enough, this scene is usually omitted by critics or referred to as evidence of Lear’s insanity. Ken Jackson, for instance, discusses the scene in association with the Bethlem hospital and states that here “the dramatist’s struggle with mad places again becomes apparent” (237). And, Roger Warren explains why this scene was omitted in the Folio by pointing out that the hint at group madness might have been considered to deteriorate the play’s artistic value (45-47). Both Warren and Jackson observe that group madness is implied in this scene. Indeed, Poor Tom, Fool, and Lear’s conversations do not create any significant semantic context, since, when they talk, they are not really responding to one another.

EDGAR. Frateretto calls me; and tells me Nero is an angler in the
Lake of darkness. Pray, innocent, and beware the foul fiend.

FOOL. Prithee, nuncle, tell me whether a madman be a gentleman or a
yeoman?

LEAR. A king, a king!

FOOL. No, he’s a yeoman that has a gentleman to his son; for
He’s a mad yeoman that sees his son a gentleman before him.

LEAR. To have a thousand with red burning spits
Come hissing in upon ‘em—

EDGAR. The foul fiend bites my back.

FOOL. He's mad that trusts in the tameness of a wolf, a horse's

Health, a boy's love, or a whore's oath.

LEAR. It shall be done; I will arraign them straight.

(To Edgar) Come, sit thou here, most learned justicer;

(to the Fool) Thou, sapient sir, sit here. Now, you she foxes! (3.6.6-20)

In the apparent disorder of their conversation, however, we can find a semiotic rule (logic) working in Lear's mind. Their conversation seems to be in a meaningless world in terms of what Kristeva defines as "symbolic."¹⁰ In other words, their conversation is beyond the boundary of rationality. Yet by letting Poor Tom, who symbolizes the poor, judge the two daughters, who are at the center of power, Lear attempts to create an overturned and carnivalesque social order. The object of the trial is not only Goneril and Regan's ingratitude to their father but also their "cold hospitality" (Marcus 155). This mock trial functions as a symbolic ritual to celebrate poor people's desire to castigate rich people's hard hearts.

The play's reference to the issue of charity becomes clearer when we take into account the circumstances of the first day it was performed on stage. It was in 1606 on St. Stephen's day, "the holiday most associated with the granting of traditional hospitality" (Marcus 154). On this holiday, the poor were allowed to move around and request charity, which was usually granted for fear of being cursed. Cohering the spirit of the holiday, the mock trial serves to liberate the poor's grievances.

Although Lear can emit his anger through the mock-trial and curse, he cannot return to his home and ends his life as a wanderer. In fact, Lear's consistent concern is to search for home, a place to stay and take rest. After giving away his kingdom and revenue, Lear visits several places and houses. As the Fool points out, however, Lear was too foolish to save a house for himself. Lear realizes that nobody provides "bed and food" (2. 4. 149) for him. When he returns from hunting, Lear finds that Goneril deliberately neglected the task of getting dinner ready for him. Lear discovers Goneril's cold heart, and he, then, runs toward Regan's house. But Regan and Cornwall, who are informed of Lear's coming, depart their house in order to turn Lear away. Gloucester's house could still have been a shelter for Lear, but Regan and Cornwall proceed to take control of his household and thereby stop him from offering assistance to Lear. When he realizes he is deserted by his daughters, Lear begins to wander just like the houseless beggars. Only when he enters the hovel does he find momentary relief from his troubles. Lear's concern about housing is revealed when he encounters Cordelia. After slowly waking up from his confusion, Lear wonders whether he is in this earthly world or in the heavenly world. He tries to estimate his sense of reality by place recognition.

LEAR. Pray, do not mock at me.

I am a very foolish fond old man,

Fourscore and upward, not an hour more nor less;

And, to deal plainly,

I fear I am not in my perfect mind.

Methinks I should know you, and know this man;

Yet I am doubtful; for I am mainly ignorant
 What place this is; and all the skill I have
 Remembers not these garments; nor I know not
 Where I did lodge last night. (4.7.60-69)

Lear feels confused, since he cannot identify his current location and the places through which he has wandered. The difficulty Lear faces here is that he cannot *locate* his turbulent experience. The new horizon Lear reaches in his spatial experience is too elusive to capture and to define. Cordelia summarizes Lear's experience and tells him that he "hovel[ed] thee with swine and rogues forlorn / In short and musty straw" (4. 7. 39). Basically, after he departs his royal court, Lear cannot achieve his aim to find a charitable house where he can enjoy the remainder of his life. After staying in the hovel with "houseless heads" (3. 4. 31), Lear eventually ends his long journey in the camp of Dover.¹¹

3. Lear's Spatial Experiences

As is discussed in the previous section, Lear's "hovel[ing]" and wandering enable him to perceive the reality of the vagrant poor. By experiencing a beggar's nomadic life, and thereby having a different kind of spatial experience, Lear perceives the social issue of beggary to which he was previously blind. When he witnesses the miserable condition of the "houseless" in the hovel, he realizes his negligence in considering the problems of poverty and vagrancy from the perspective of the poor: "O, I have ta'en / Too little care of this!" The play highlights Lear's progression of social

consciousness by dramatizing Lear's initiation into a new spatial experience. After being stripped of a king's privilege and prestige, Lear begins to perceive and envision his kingdom in a new manner, which is quite different from his perception of his kingdom in the first scene.

In the first scene, Lear reifies and promotes the land as royal property. He considers the kingdom as the space he can control by his own will, and initiates an unnatural procedure of dividing his land based on his daughters' love vows. In response to Goneril's manifestation of her inexpressible love for him, Lear endows her with the northern third of his land and dedicates it as the due inheritance of her descendents.

LEAR. Of all these bounds, even from this line to this,
 With shadowy forests and with champains riched,
 With plenteous rivers and wide-skirted meads,
 We make thee lady: to thine and Albany's issue
 Be this perpetual. (1.1.61-65)

Similarly, Lear gives Regan another third portion, which is "No less in space, validity, and pleasure, / Than that conferred on Goneril" (1.1.80-81). Here Lear assesses and measures the land based on certain values. The "Shadowy forests" and "wide-skirted meads" Lear describes as the features of Goneril's portion hint at Lear's spatial perception and show the system of his spatial values. As John Gillies states, Lear's reference to forests and meadows can be related to early modern maps' iconographic features, the convention of representing "forests, fields, and rivers . . . by mimetic codes" (117). But Lear seems to have something else in mind when he mentions forests and

meadows. Lear's spatial interest is revealed when he compares Goneril's portion with Regan's portion in terms of "space, validity and pleasure" (1. 1. 80). That is, Lear measures the place's spatial value in terms of its use-value for his leisure and pleasure: How useful and relevant is the land as a place of hunting, hawking, or other royal entertainment? Lear's validation of the place as one of pleasure corresponds to Lear's aspirations in his ritual of division. Lear intends to "shake all cares and business from our [Lear's] age" (1. 1. 37), and visit his daughters' houses "by monthly course" with "an hundred knights" (1. 1. 132-35). Lear plans to enjoy his remaining life by hunting and hawking, and to move around his kingdom as a permanent traveler and guest enjoying hospitality. And that is exactly what Lear tried to do when he visits Goneril's house. He goes hunting with his knights and returns excited, expecting a feast. Contrary to his expectation, however, Lear finds that a feasting table is not ready for him.

Lear's validation of the land as the place of his pleasure and his envisioning the land as royal property are only possible at the expense of alienating different kinds of spatial experiences, notably the ones of poor inhabitants. The uneven representation of the land, and the alienation of people from the land, are naturalized and accelerated by Lear's use of a map. Although the map appears as a transparent and objective representation of territory, it only mystifies the selective process he uses concerning representation of the land. As Garrett Sullivan Jr. points out, "a sense of the land as social site" is missing in Lear's judgment, just as maps largely dismiss such kind of sense (105). Thus the first scene addresses Lear's incapacity to comprehend the social geography of the land when he uses the map.

Lear's limited, class-bound conceptualization of space is challenged when he undergoes an unusual spatial experience for a king. Lear enters into a new spatial world by wandering around as a homeless beggar. Through a new and different relationship with the land, Lear comes to realize that the land he had considered as either the land of sovereignty or vacant space is actually a social site and a living zone of the poor and socially dislocated people. The setting of "outside" in this play implies something more than the opposite of the interiority of a house. It retains a symbolic dimension in terms of social geography. This play's outside setting in the "heath" has been questioned by Frederic T. Flahiff and John Gillies, both of whom address the spatial and geographical elements of this play. According to Flahiff, neither the Quarto nor the Folio defines the place clearly, and the word 'heath' cannot be found in either text (20-21). Based on Flahiff's discovery, Gillies develops the point by stating that "heath" is "first introduced as an actual scenic effect in Tate's adaptation, and thereafter as a stage direction from Rowe's edition until the recent Oxford edition of the Quarto and Folio texts" (124-25). Gillies argues that it should be noted that "the action shifts abruptly from a generic 'inside' to a generic 'outside'" and "Lear's ordeal" is placed "outside the household setting" (124-25).

The "outside" in this play, then, signifies not only "outside the household setting" but also outside of the social community. It is a liminal area surrounding the regulated communal space. Infuriated by Goneril and Regan's harsh request to shrink the number of his retinue, Lear leaves Gloucester's house. Against Lear, who is out under storm and tempest, Regan tells Gloucester to "Shut up your doors" (2. 4. 299). In the

manorial economy of the old Britain, which is the temporal setting of the play, the local landlord's castle establishes the boundary of the local community. Gloucester's castle is not only the space for Gloucester's comprehensive household including his family and servants, but also the space where authority is located and enacted. His house is the social site where brutal punishments are executed. Kent is stocked and mocked, Edgar is proclaimed a traitor, and Gloucester is tortured so severely that he loses his eyes. When Regan commands Gloucester to shut the door against Lear, her action signifies not only an ungrateful daughter's unkind act toward an old father, but also a public legal action announcing Lear as an outlaw and traitor of society. Because he helps the traitor in spite of Regan's command not to, Gloucester receives brutal chastisement as payment of "treasons to us [Regan and Cornwall]" (3. 7. 92). In this light, the "outside" Lear is in implies more than the outside of the household. It is the symbolic and semiotic social site of outlawry, treason, and is something a society endeavors to expel and detach itself from.

In this "outside," Lear encounters "poor wretches" and "houseless poverty." There must be a reason why Tate clarified the "outside" into "heath" as the background and setting of the play. Michael Ignatieff describes the associated social group with the heath: "The heath was the . . . home of escapees from village order, paupers denied a parish settlement, vagrants escaping the oppression of wage labour, masterless men without land or trade of their own, madmen like Tom O'Bedlam, fugitives from justice and old people abandoned or thrown out of their families" (40). In the midst of the storm, Lear finds that "poor naked wretches" and "houseless poverty" have gathered in

the hovel to put their “houseless heads and unfed sides” to avoid “the pelting of the pitiless storm” (3. 4. 26-30). This place is also where Gloucester, who is dispossessed and outcast as a traitor, moves his anguished body. When Gloucester is banished and, therefore, deprived of his name, his name and his land are given to Edmund, who is *in* Gloucester’s house. This “inside” is not for Edgar, either. Edgar knows that “Edgar I nothing am” (2. 3. 21) in that place, and that he should act as an insane beggar. Edgar’s explanation about Poor Tom’s life reflects what is assumed by an impoverished and outcast life in the early modern society.

GLOUCESTER. What are you there? Your names?

EDGAR. Poor Tom, that eats the swimming frog, the toad, the
Tadpole, the wall-newt and the water; that in the fury of his
Heart, when the foul fiend rages, eats cow-dung for sallets;
Swallows the old rat and the ditch-dong; drinks the green man-
tle of the standing-pool; who is whipped from tithing to tith-
ing, and stock-punished, and imprisoned; who hath had three
Suits to his back, six shirts to his body, horse to ride, and weapon
To wear; (3.4.118-26)

Edgar magnifies how unusual and grotesque Poor Tom’s life can be in order to disguise his identity. This way of life and survival, however, can be literal as well as symbolical. The play shows it will not be limited to an insane beggar like Poor Tom. The vagrant poor and the banished people such as Gloucester depend on such unusual sources of food and living. Anyone wandering in the “outside” without provisions will face this

situation. This could be the reason why Lear allows Kent to stay “five days” (1. 1. 176) when he commands Kent’s exile. Even though he is angry with Kent’s direct criticism against his command, Lear gives Kent the time to prepare “for provisions” (1. 1. 176). Thus “outside,” in the play, is often regarded as “open country,” or “heath,” and represents the social site of vagrant, outcast, and displaced people. This liminal zone is regarded as either empty space or the breeding zone of danger by the “insiders,” whose experiences never transgress the territorial boundary of societal norms.

No other character in this play undergoes the transgression of boundaries as bitterly as Lear. Through perambulation in the “outside,” Lear enters in to a new perceptual territory. Lear comes to perceive the culturally invested significance of the liminal space, which he had regarded as socially vacant space. Lear’s map, which advocates pastoral landscape, had promoted and naturalized Lear’s narrow scope of spatial paradigms, as we see in the first scene. Now, however, Lear’s pastoral view has been challenged and disrupted. The countryside (the “outside”) does not provide Lear with a carefree life and regenerative power, both of which are available to Duke Senior exiled in the forest of Arden. Rather, the countryside in King Lear is the place of Lear’s ordeal and anguish, and is the revelatory place where Lear recognizes rigid and unfair social reality. Lear’s drifting with “hoveling” beggars in the countryside enables the transformation of Lear’s perspective of space and, accordingly, of social issues. By sharing the beggars’ nomadic life in the heath, Lear grasps the lower class’s helplessness about the unfair treatment and grievances they bear. In the countryside around Dover,

Lear expresses his disdain for and animosity toward those who uphold and manipulate power of authority.

LEAR. See how yond justice rails upon
 Yond simple thief. Hark, in thine ear. Change places and,
 Handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief? Thou
 hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar?

GLOUCESTER. Aye, sir.

LEAR. And the creature (wretch) run from the cur? There thou mightst
 Behold the great image of authority: a dog's obeyed in office.
 Thou rascal beadle, hold thy bloody hand!
 Why dost thou lash that whore? Strip thine own back;
 Thou hotly lusts to use her in that kind
 For which thou shipp'st her. The usurer hands the cozener.
 Through tattered clothes small vices do appear;
 Robes and furred gowns hide all. Plate sin with gold,
 And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;
 Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw does pierce it. (4.6.147-61)

Here Lear states that the power of authority comes from “places” (4.6.148), which are quite meaningless and unstable, and that poor people are just helpless victims before the tyranny of hypocritical authority. Lear's progress in the recognition of social matters began when Lear shared the beggars' temporary abode and Lear's spatial experience entered in to a new dimension.

In conclusion, the expansion of Lear's spatial experience is symbolically outlined through the modes that Lear represents his kingdom. The cartographic representation of Britain is a synecdoche of Lear's class-bound perception of the land and his people. In contrast, Lear draws a symbolic and imaginary map of Britain through his movement. Lear wanders around the country, from Albany's residence in Scotland, to Cornwall and Gloucester's castles in the middle of the island, to the south, Dover, where Lear's long journey ends. As a counter version to the royal map of Britain, which evacuates and disregards inhabitants' living experience, the land represented by Lear's trajectory is redolent with the anger and bitterness he felt as a vagrant. Divested of his royal prerogatives, Lear's symbolic and semiotic experience of vagrancy ultimately opens up a new horizon for him so he can better understand the issue of vagrancy and beggary.

4. James I and Foresters

Lear's map is one of the things that invite readers to make a correlation between the play and King James. Shakespeare's addition of the map, which is not in the earlier play King Leir, reflects the cartographical development of and growing interest in national maps during that period. The interpolated map portrays the whole British isle, including Scotland. Shakespeare replaced the King of Cambria in King Leir with the Duke of Albany (Albany being the old name of Scotland) as Lear's first son-in-law. Shakespeare's addition of Scotland refers to James's project of uniting Great Britain. After James's ascension to the throne of England succeeding Elizabeth, he tried to unite the two ruling powers of the British isle under the name of Great Britain. James liked to

present himself as the second Brutus, who would rebuild the nation just like Brutus who founded the nation of Britain. Although it was not a complete unification, the union of the two crowns was sanctioned by an act of Parliament in 1608. Terence Hawkes remarks on the effect of Lear's act of dividing the nation on James' political maneuvers. Hawkes says, "Lear's division of the kingdom emerges as far more than the whimsical folly of an old man" (124). Indeed, the disaster and chaos Lear brings about by dividing the kingdom could support James's national project of British union more than any effort.

Furthermore, Lear's association with hunting and his validation of forestry suggest a parallel with James. One of James's first acts after his accession was to reclaim the royal right of forests to establish the favorable condition of hunting. In May of 1603, James issued a proclamation against unlawful hunting. It prohibited any "good and natural subject" from "unlawfully hunt[ing] or enter[ing] into any Forest, Parke, Chase, or Warren, to kill or destroy any Deere or Game with any Dogs, Nettes, Gunnes, Crossebowes, Stonebowes or other Instruments, Engines, or means whatsoever, or by any such unlawfull meanes or devises to spoile or destroy the Game of Pheasants, partridges, Hearne, Mallard, & such like" (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 14-15). There was an urgent necessity in James' reviving the effectiveness of the forest laws, which had not been enforced for a long period before James was enthroned.¹² Since Queen Elizabeth did not enjoy hunting, and, therefore, neglected regulating the royal forest, the royal forests were vulnerable to intruders' misappropriation. In September of 1609, James made another proclamation against

hunting, stealing, or killing deer within any of the King's forests, chases, or parks. By declaring his fondness for hunting, James declares the sovereign's will to chastise lawbreakers in his forests. Since this proclamation emphasizes James' commitment to this action, I quote it at length:

We had hoped [. . .] how greatly we delight in the exercise of Hunting, aswell for our recreation, as for the necessary preservation of our health, that no man in whom was either reverence to our person, or feare of our Lawes, would have offered us offence in those our sports, considering especially, that the nature of all people is not onely in things of this qualitie, but in matters of greater moment so farre to conforme themselves to the affections and disposition of their Sovereaigne, as to affect that which they know to be liking to them and to respect it, and to avoyd the contrary: And we must acknowledge that we have found, that Gentlemen and persons of the better sort (who know best what becometh their duetie) have restrained their owne humors and framed themselves therein to give us contentment: yet falleth it out notwithstanding, that neither the example of them, nor respect of the Lawes, nor duetie to us, hath had power to reforme the corrupt natures and insolent dispositions of some of the baser sort, and some other of a disordered life [. . .]

Neverthelesse, howsoever in her[Queen Elizabeth's] later dayes (being a Lady whose sexe and yeeres were not so apt to that kinds of recreation, having no posteritie, and therefore lesse carefull of conservation of that

kinde of Royaltie, which her Progenitors Kings of this Realme had mainteined) people might perhaps for those respects presume of more libertie then became them, or the Lawes of the Realme do permit; Yet in our time, being a Prince that have manifested our affection & delight in that exercise, & having posteritie like to continue in the same disposition, when either their recreation or their exercise shal require it; It seemeth strange that men will now attempt to offend with more licentiousnesse, then at any time heretofore, and offer to us in our Grounds, that which they will not endure each at others hands in their owne. (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 227-28)

James stresses his intent to pursue his sports, to restore the forest laws, and to keep them in effect through his posterity. James' desire to control and preserve the royal forests and parks was also expressed in the frequent proclamations to that purpose. The proclamations concerning leases in February and May of 1605 were made to reclaim royal possessions such as castles, manors, forests, parks, lands, and tenements. In February of 1609, another proclamation for the preservation of woods was aimed at stopping "spoils and devastations" within the forest and parks. But it was not so successful, and James could not avert intruders' felonies in the royal territory. For more effective management, James asked his 1610 Parliament to legislate more potent regulations against stealing deer and pheasants in the royal forest.

What is interesting here is the characteristic James attaches to the intruders of his forests. James and the Privy Council attributed the violations to "the corrupt natures and

insolent dispositions of some of the baser sort or some other of disordered life,” and claimed that the transgressions come from “a barbarous and uncivil disposition” (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 228). A similar judgement is shared by John Norden, a surveyor of Jacobean England. Since he was the records investigator of missing leases, Norden’s perspective of the land was oriented toward organizing and territorializing the land in terms of property rights. Norden describes the people in the forest in a fashion similar to the proclamation: the people in the woodland were “given to little or no kind of labour, living very hardly with oaten bread, sour whey, and goats’ milk, dwelling far from any church or chapel, and are as ignorant of God or of any civil course of life as the very savages amongst the infidels. [. . .] Their greens and inns became the resorts of cattle-drovers and wayfaring badgers; their woods and dingles the haunts of vagabonds, gipsies, and bandits; their cottages the meeting places of millenarian sects” (qtd. in Thirsk 411-12). Such authorial views often tended to define the people living in the forest as barbarous, uncivilized, disorderly, insolent, and very dangerous.

Early modern historians, however, address the conflict around the woodland areas from a slightly different perspective. They note conflicts and tensions between subsistence migrants and legislators. A. L. Beier explains, “Squatters and small cottagers across the country troubled landlords and legislators, concerned partly by their transient and alienated relation to social space” (Problem of the Poor 10). He goes on further to say that forests and woodland areas attracted more paupers than open-field areas, and the poor in woodland areas “set up lean-to’s and shacks, stole fuel almost at will, and carved

out fields and grazing land from the forest” (Problem of the Poor 10). James’ revival of the forest laws, Beier determines, was an attempt to “rid woodland areas of squatters” (Problem of the Poor 11).

Joan Thirsk illustrates the increase of subsistence migrants and squatters in the context of “encroachment,” a new wave of settlement taking place in the sixteenth century (409). Many laborers were drifting away and resettling themselves “wherever land remained unappropriated, in royal forests, on sandy heaths, and beside wooded spaces” (409). Thirsk explains that those beggars contributed to the expansion of forest communities:

They [forest communities] usually consisted, on the one hand, of a small core of substantial peasant labourers, with sizeable holdings of their own, decidedly better off than common-field labourers, and probably identifiable with the indigenous settlers of the original community. On the other hand, they [forest communities] often included a much larger body of new squatters and “beggary people,” who had little legal right to the land they appropriated, but “adventured upon” the erection of their cottages—as two Kentish squatters remarked—“for that they were built by other poor men.” Not infrequently these hovels existed for two or three generations before they were tracked down by manorial surveyors, and their owners forced them to pay rent. (411)

Most of the poor people who settled in the forest without property rights were subject to the royal commissioners’ investigation and taxation, and they protested against the

“policy of disafforestation” and the government’s attempt to “suppress new cottages” (412).

When examined in historical context, King Lear subtly and covertly addresses the tensions between legislators and paupers over forest areas in Jacobean England through Lear’s series of spatial experiences. Instead of presenting the direct tension and migrants’ revolt against James’s policy of disafforestation, the play depicts Lear who, as a king, undergoes the symbolic experience of vagrancy, to evoke a sympathetic understanding of wandering beggars.

Notes

¹ William Carroll (184) and Linda Woodbridge (206) agree that King Lear deals with the issue of vagrancy in that period. They suggest that beggars and vagrants are always comic figures in other contemporary texts so that vagrancy and beggary do not draw serious attention.

² Carroll and Woodbridge examine King Lear's engagement with rogue literature with a discussion of Tom o' Bedlam, "a signature figure of rogue literature" (Woodbridge 221).

³ The hospital was founded in 1247 as the priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem, and the name Bedlam was attached to it from about 1330. It was the place for caring for and curing insane poor people. But Patricia Allderidge demonstrates that the hospital's history in this period was one of neglect and mismanagement. It was regarded as a grim place, as Donald Lupton shows us from his impression of the place when he visited it in 1632: "It seemes strange that any one shold recover here, the cryings, screechings, roarings, brawlings, shaking of chaines, swearings, frettings, chaffings, are so many, so hideous, so great, that they are more able to drive a man that hath his witts, rather out of them, then to helpe one that never had them, or hath lost them, to finde them again. [. . .] You shall scarce finde a place that hath so many men & woemen so strangely altered either from what they once were, or should have beene" (qtd. in Carroll 99). But visiting Bedlam became a fashionable activity in the later sixteenth century, and the hospital itself encouraged visitors as a way to get money for the hospital. Ken Jackson discusses Bedlam's functioning as a "theater of charity" in relation to the change of national policy

in his article “‘I know not / Where I did lodge last night?’: *King Lear* and the Search for Bethlem (Bedlam) Hospital.”

⁴ All the quotations regarding King Lear are cited from the conflated text of King Lear in Norton Shakespeare.

⁵ Or Edgar says, “Tom’s a cold” (3.4.78; 3.4.161).

⁶ The relation of “coldness” to “cold charity” will be discussed more in detail later.

⁷ Lear’s empathy with the bareness and helplessness of the poor is expressed more vigorously when he talks about the farmer’s dog barking at a beggar and its resemblance to “the great image of authority.” Here Lear compares an innocent beggar’s rags with gilded robes.

⁸ Arthur Kinney notes that under the Tudor statutes arrested gypsies were executed, and this penalty was extended to those who impersonated or accompanied gypsies by Harman’s time (Harman 297).

⁹ Edmund is also reported to have traveled for nine years and to go abroad soon (1.1.32-33).

¹⁰ Kristeva, in her Revolution in Poetic Language, develops her notion of language as a dialectical struggle between two forces. One is the “Semiotic,” which is a pre-linguistic modality of psychic inscriptions, and the other is the “Symbolic,” which is representations through language, a system of signs. She diagnoses that modern Western society has consistently neglected and refused the semiotic, and, as a result, isolated the subject from language.

¹¹ It can be said that Lear eventually finds a real and permanent home in death, and this play can be interpreted in spiritual terms. In a sense, Lear foreshadows his death in the first act by implying that his grave will be his final home and destination. Lear says: “Know that we have divided / In three our kingdom; and ’tis our fast intent / Shake all cares and business from our age, / Conferring them on younger strengths, while we / Unburthened crawl toward death” (1.1.35-39). Although this play presents the symbolic aspect of home for mankind, the play also deals with the social issue of homeless people, and this aspect does not receive the attention it deserves.

¹² Larkin and Hughes explain that the code of the forest laws was very harsh. It imposed “imprisonment, outlawry, exile, amputation of hand or foot” for one or two offenses. And, if they killed a royal hart, they could become a bondservant, or, if they were violent to the king’s forester twice, they could be even killed (15).

CHAPTER IV

BEGGARS' BUSH AND COLONIAL ENTERPRISES

In discussing Beggars' Bush, Rosemary Gaby observes, "The play is full of the lore of the rogue pamphlets--vagabond cant, songs, and rituals (including a colorful "stalling to the rogue" ceremony)--but its rogue material is placed within a pastoral context" (404). Gaby concisely points out the prominent features of the play. John Fletcher borrows beggar-characters from Harman's rogue pamphlet and modifies them to fit the pastoralism which saturates the play.¹ The romanticized beggars' community will be discussed in this chapter in relation to the historical and economic conditions of early seventeenth-century England. The first section will focus on the appropriation of Harman's rogue characters into Fletcher's play. By noting the difference between Harman's and Fletcher's rogues, I will explore the Jacobean cultural milieu, specifically the Jacobean policy of transplantation and the development of overseas companies, that caused such a shift in rogue characterization. In the second section, I will show how the play incorporates the growing interest in overseas ventures through the character Floriz, a merchant adventurer, and argue that this play endorses the hegemony of the merchant class and its values. The third section will focus on the concepts of pastoralism and idealism that the beggars' community represents. By comparing this play with the idealism in Anthony Munday's Robin Hood play, I will show how the pastoral green world in Beggars' Bush alludes to overseas plantations.² In this light, I will demonstrate that Beggars' Bush reflects the Jacobean cultural fantasy to idealize colonial expansion

and find a solution overseas for such social problems as vagabondage and overpopulation.

1. A Carnival of Beggars

Beggars' Bush is a comedy that stages Harman's rogues and beggars in the format of a festive comedy. By replicating such festive plays as Munday's Robin Hood play and its variation As You Like It, Beggars' Bush stages two antithetical worlds, and develops their dramatic plot with characters who move in the two worlds. In Munday's play, Robert, who is the Earl of Huntington and later called Robin Hood, is banished by the illegitimate tyrant Prince John. After being banished, Robert goes to Sherwood Forest and creates an egalitarian community with his followers. In As You Like It, Duke Senior's power is unjustly usurped by his brother, and he escapes to the Forest of Arden, where he lives "like the old Robin Hood" (1.1.100-101). As in those plays, the city of Flanders in Beggars' Bush is ruled by a usurper and tyrant named Woolfort. To escape the tyrant, the legitimate heir, Floriz, is displaced at a young age for his protection, and, Gerrard, who is eventually revealed as Floriz's father, escapes to the beggars' bush and lives with them.

If Fletcher borrows the structure from the Robin Hood play, he recruits the characters from Harman's Caveat. Like Harman's beggars, the beggars in the play constitute a community with its own hierarchical system, codes of behavior, and canting language for secret communication. Scene 2 of Act 1 is the beggars' congregation scene, where rogues have their regular meeting. Higgen, the orator of the "ragged regiment" (2.

1. 1), calls each member of the group to the gathering: “Upright Lord,” “Jarkman,” “Patrico,” “Cranke,” “Clapperdudgeon,” “Frater,” and “Abram-man.” Such canting terms in the beggars’ underworld were introduced by Harman and proliferated in rogue books. Harman presents twenty-three types of vagabonds and beggars. For each beggar, Harman describes his appearance, his way of making a living, and his manufactured excuse for vagrancy. Harman says that a “Jarkman” is a beggar who makes fake licenses and passports for vagabonds, and that a “Patrico” is a beggar-priest who sanctions marriages among beggars. A “Whipjack or Fresh-Water Mariner” is a beggar who runs about the country with a duplicated license, “feigning either shipwreck, or spoiled by pirates,” counterfeiting “great losses on the sea” (128). An “Upright Man,” Harman says, is a king of beggars who has the ultimate power to accept a beggar as a member of the group: “Here you see that the upright man is of great authority, for all sorts of beggars are obedient to his hests, and surmounteth all others in pilfering and stealing” (119).

At their gathering, the beggars have a ritual for a new member’s initiation. When a new member is accepted, he is titled as “a rogue.” Becoming a rogue means getting some privileges in the beggars’ society. Higgen, the orator-beggar, welcomes Hubert as a new member of their fellowship with canting language: “I crowne thy nab, with a gage of benbouse, / And stall thee by the salmon into the clowes, / To mill from the Ruffmans, commission and slates, / Twang dell’s I’the stromell, and let the Quite Cuffin: / And Herman Becks trine, and trine tot he Ruffin” (3.4.130-35). This cant is translated for the new member:

I powre on thy pate a pot of good ale,

And by the Rogues oth a Rogue thee install:
 To beg on the way, to rob all thou meetes;
 To steale from the hedge, both the shirt and the sheetes:
 And lye with thy wench in the straw till she twang,
 Let the Constable, Justice, and Divell go hang.
 Y'are welcome Brother. (3.4.137-43)

The new member is allowed to steal and cheat and is eligible for the brotherhood of the underworld. This initiation scene follows Harman's and Dekker's descriptions. For instance, the Upright Man in Harman's Caveat announces, "I, G.P., do stall thee, W.T., to the Rogue, and that from henceforth it shall be lawful for thee to cant; that is, to ask or beg for thy living in all places" (119). As such, the word "rogue" means the fellowship of the underworld, and, because of that, the name "rogue" become attached to the literature that deals with such clandestine underworld.

Although the beggars in the play share Harman's characterization, Beggars' Bush does not endorse Harman's ideology and criminalization of beggars. In fact, this play presents carnivalesque fun created by beggars, and demystifies the seriousness implied by the word "rogue." The beggars' playful use of the word "rogue" culminates in the trial scene, where the beggars make a mock-court in the bush. In the beggars' court, the prosecuted are the foolish boors who have worked for the tyrant for monetary reward. The tyrant was searching for the legitimate heir of the earldom, Floriz, in order to remove him and to consolidate his power. This conspiracy is overheard by Gerrard, king of the beggars and the beneficiary of Floriz' charity. The beggars stop the tyrant's

court, place themselves as the prosecutor and the justice, and control the court by their whim. A captain, Hemskirk, who has jurisdictional power in Flanders, is one of the prosecuted in the beggars' court. This inverted court satirizes contemporary courts by reflecting and replicating place politics of a court. The beggars utilizes the power that accompanies the justice's and the prosecutor's *place*. Prig and Higgen as the prosecutors label the prosecuted as "rogues" and impel them to admit the accusation: "ye are rogues," and "You shall be poore rogues still." These beggars dominate the court and control the prosecuted. By mirroring the arbitrary power relations of the court system, the beggars' court demystifies the jurisdictional power, just as Lear questions, "Change *places* and, / handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief?" (4.6.148-9 my emphasis).

Particularly the beggars' court alludes to the arbitrariness of the legal terminology regarding a "rogue" in the Vagabond Acts. The word "rogue," which was first used in print in John Awdeley's Fraternity of Vagabonds (1561), began to be used to denote a certain type of criminal included in the 1572 Vagabond Act.³ Under law, a rogue is defined as "a healthy person who has neither land, nor master, nor a legitimate trade or source of income" (Mowat 65). According to the 1572 law, if a person was apprehended as a rogue, he was "stripped to the waist, whipped until bloody, and had a hole burned through the gristle of the right ear" (Mowat 65). Once introduced as a type of criminal in the Vagabond Act, a rogue was established as a cultural icon of villainy and criminality, when the following Vagabond Acts sentenced harsher punishment on a rogue. The 1598 Vagabond Act proclaimed that "incorrigible and dangerous rogues"

should be banished and transplanted to overseas countries, and the 1604 Act commanded that rogues should be branded with an R on their bodies. Thus, a healthy person who did not hold a permanent source of income was subjected to the punishment as a “rogue.” The arbitrariness of the vagrancy legislation is evinced from one particular case in which a householder who had a family and even an apprentice was punished as a vagrant:

Thomas Coxe, his wife and two children, had an apprentice with them when they were shipped as vagrants and sent from Salisbury to Gaddesden, Hertfordshire. They were unlucky not to be expelled without punishment, or asked for sureties, as many people like them were. Eleven months later the family was taken in Salisbury and whipped again, but the apprentice and one of the children had by then disappeared. The household was gradually being fragmented and degraded. (Slack, Poverty & Policy 99)

As Thomas Coxe’s case shows, vagrancy legislation was enforced irregularly by the local officials’ judgement. Furthermore, the legal process of naming and categorizing vagrants helped to make them real vagrants. Citing Thomas Cox’s case, Paul Slack remarks that “vagrancy legislation helped to create the conditions it was directed against” (100). As such, Vagabond Acts were not only arbitrary but also far from satisfactory as a solution. The legislation worked only as authorities’ means for restraining the lower and impoverished class.

The arbitrariness of the term “rogue” is indicated and parodied in the beggars’ court. The beggars create fun with their play of the word “rogue,” and ridicule the

authorial judgement attached to the word. In the quoted scene of the beggars' court, the beggars use the word "rogues" seven times, "knaves" once, and "rascals" three times in thirty-five lines. Going against the negative implication of those words, beggars' court creates a carnivalesque moment in which an authorial view and order are mocked and parodied.

The beggars' exposure of the arbitrariness of the legal system in Beggars' Bush echoes Lear's divulgence of the tyranny of "the great image of authority" (4.6.153). Lear expresses his recognition that social injustice is mediated and perpetuated by the arbitrary justice system with these words: "A man may see how this world goes with / no eyes. Look with thine ears. See how yond justice rails upon / yond simple thief. Hark, in thine ear. Change places and, / handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief?" (4.6.146-49). Lear regards a ragged beggar as a weak victim of the hypocritical authorities' power. If King Lear addresses the unfairness of the legal system regarding vagrants in a tragic mode, then Beggars' Bush gives a similar message in a comic mode. The beggars are hilarious when they sentence the boors as rogues. When the beggars, who could be apprehended as rogues by the Vagabond Acts themselves, sentence the boors as rogues, they ridicule and disrupt the authority of the legislation. But the court of beggars is not intended as a harsh critique, but as a gentle, humorous ridicule:

PRIG. You most abhominable stincking Rascalls,

You turnip-eating Rogues.

BOORES. We are truly sorry.

PRIG. Knock at your hard harts Rogues; and presently

Give us a signe you feele compunction,
 Every man up with's cudgell, and on his neighbour
 Bestow such almes, 'till we shall say sufficient,
 For there your sentence lyes: without partiality
 Either of head, or hide, Rogues, without sparing,
 Or we shall take the paines to beat ye dead else:
 Ye know your doom. (3.4.27-36)

The punishment for the boors is to beat each other as a sign of contrition. The beggars' court enacts a carnival characterized by mocking, parodying, cheerfulness, and catharsis.

Fletcher transforms Harman's malignant rogues into likable comic characters. The beggars reveal, without any hesitation, their tools of begging and cheating. They share tips for successful begging. Gerrard, for instance, advises the beggars to "keep the humble and the common phrase of begging." In the same vein, Higgen adds his own advice:

Yes; and cry sometimes,
 To move compassion: Sir, there is a table,
 That doth command all these things, and enjoyns 'em
 Be perfect in their crutches, their fain'd plaisters,
 And their torne pas-ports, with the ways to stammer,
 And to be dumb, and deafe, and blind, and lame,
 There, all the halting paces are set downe,
 I'th learned language. (2.1.130-37)

The beggars admit that they use tricks and props for effective begging, as Harman argues. Yet, these beggars' schemes and crafts are rather harmless when compared with the tyrant's scheme to kill the legitimate heir by his tools of manipulation. The tyrant Woolfort's cruel reign is parodied by a beggar named Prig, who nominates himself as a candidate for the king of the beggars. When asked about his vision of kingship, Prig boasts that he will reign as a tyrant. He says that he will domineer all the "privileges, revenues" and all props for begging, which is the beggars' means of living. But his shameless bragging is intended to mock the tyrant, Woolfort, who controls his people by exerting his power. Compared with him, the beggars are presented as harmless, even if they dissemble their bodies for gaining money.

Thus, Fletcher employs Harman's characterization of beggars only in order to show his different attitude to the issue of vagrancy. Fletcher intentionally disrupts readers' expectation by departing from Harman's ideology. Fletcher is able to show his different attitude effectively because of the genre he is writing in. For example, the narrator (Harman) in Caveat focuses on rogues' evil aspects. The narrator is the one that easily determines readers' perception on rogues. Alternatively, a play can provide multiple views on beggars, without a narrator's intervention. While the beggar-characters in Beggars' Bush are sometimes mischievous, and even obnoxious, they are also humorous and cheerful. The beggar-characters are allowed to present their own show and to sway audience through their humor and vitality.

The beggar-characters' departure from Harman's beggars, however, is related to the different socio-historical contexts of Caveat and Beggars' Bush. As R. H. Tawney

remarks, “the sixteenth century lived in terror of the tramp” (268). Harman shares the cultural anxiety about vagabondage in the Elizabethan era—an era that could not find viable solutions to poverty and economic depression. But England in the early seventeenth century began to find a way out of chronic social problems. The Stuart government preferred a different strategy for the unemployed poor. The Privy Council had the policy to banish idle vagabonds overseas instead of imposing harsh punishments, which were ineffective in eliminating the problem. As Howard Mumford Jones notes, “plantations in the New World” were regarded as a “sovereign remedy” for over-population and poverty (Jones 146). Although it was proposed in the Tudor age that employing beggars in productive work could be the solution for vagrancy, it was in the Jacobean era that the idea was approved and realized, through the development of colonial enterprise.⁴

Sir Humphrey Gilbert addressed the benefit of transporting the poor to colonies in 1583. He asserted that those who “live idly at home, are burdenous, chargeable, and unprofitable to this realm, shall be set on work” by sending them to overseas plantations (qtd. in Beier 149-52). With the publication of Principal Navigations by Richard Hakluyt, Gilbert’s notion of using the unemployed poor in the colonial enterprise attracted even more attention and approval. Gilbert mentions the taking away of potential criminals as one of the benefits of establishing the Northwest Passage: “Also we might inhabite some part of those countryes, and settle there such needy people of our cuntry, which now trouble the common wealth, and through want here at home are inforced to commit outrageous offences, whereby they are dayly consumed with the

gallowes” (Hakluyt 7. 186).⁵ A variety of seventeenth-century treatises endorsed the transfer of the vagrants for overseas and colonial ventures. John Donne, for instance, agrees that colonization will be beneficial to “many a wretch” who will be redeemed “from the hands of the Executioner,” but it will be also beneficial to the country, since the colonization “shall sweepe your streets, and wash your doores, from idle persons, and the children of idle persons, and imploy them” (21-22).

Such an argument validating the shipping off of vagrants influenced the Jacobean government’s policy on vagrants. In 1603, when James I became enthroned, the Privy Council announced its policy on rogues and vagrants through “a proclamation for the due and speedy execution of the Statute against Rogues, Vagabonds, Idle, and dissolute persons.” James re-enacted the 1597 law, which authorized the banishment of “incorrigible or dangerous rogues.” The Privy Council of 1603 declares its will to convey and remove troublesome vagabonds by presenting a more specific plan. The Privy Council assigned places such as “The New-found Land, the East and West Indies, France, Germanie, Spaine, and the Low-countries, or any of them” as proper holding places for “incorrigible or dangerous rogues” (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 1. 51-53). The Jacobean government hoped “incorrigible or dangerous rogues” would be reformed into new men by being in a new place, and several times they employed colonies for such purposes. James I once specified Virginia as a reformatory (Neill in Virginia Vetusta, 101-103). The transplantation of rogues to Ireland in 1619 was a similar notorious event. The government declared that it would deport “idle or disordered beggars” as well as “poor married couples who fill every place

full of children,” relieving “civilized England” of “its worst people.” As such, the Jacobean government relieved social anxiety concerning vagrants, rogues, and idling beggars by sending them away to overseas colonies.

Vagrants were not the only group eyed for the Jacobean policy of transplantation. Several times the Jacobean government reinstated the policy of removing troublesome groups by sending them abroad. One example is the government’s treatment of the Graham clan. King James had a special antipathy toward the clan, since it had traditionally been loyal to England in previous struggles between England and Scotland (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 65). In “a proclamation for transplantation of the Greames” in 1603, the government singled out the Graham clan for border crimes and declared the decision to transplant them to the low countries. This policy was re-enacted in 1614, when the government claimed that the Grahams often returned and become “the most violent disturbers of the peace” (Larkin and Hughes, Stuart Royal Proclamations 311).⁶ The Council considered transplantation as a more efficient and merciful way of dealing with problematic people. It stated that it is “the temper of our Government” to cleanse the “malefactors” from the nation by “draw[ing] as little blood as” possible (Larkin and Hughes Stuart 310-11).⁷ The Jacobean government preferred an easy way of removing troublesome groups, and the vagrants and rogues were the prominent group among those shipped away.⁸

The policy of transplantation reflected not only the disposition of King James and his Privy Council but also the economic condition of the seventeenth century. Newly-discovered places and the increase of foreign trade provided the conditions

needed for implementing such a policy. Maritime enterprises and colonial plantations demanded people who could work. Several overseas companies advertised their enterprises and tried to attract a mobile labor force. It was the companies' need, rather than the government's policy, which triggered the transference of vagrant poor to colonies. Historical records of the Virginia Company present a very interesting case. Through broadsides, the company promoted their project of building plantations and invited many willing English subjects. The broadsides appealed to the lower class who had meager resources. One of the earliest broadsides, circulated in 1609, tried to lure poor people to the colonial venture with monetary and property reward for their labor:

And if they wish to do so [join the Virginia plantation], will come to 'Fitpot len' [Filpot Lane] street, to the house of Sir Thomas Smith, who is Treasurer of this Colony, and there they will be enlisted by their names and there will be pointed out to such persons what they will receive for this voyage, viz. five hundred 'reales' for each one, and they will be entered as Adventurers in this aforesaid voyage to Virginia, where they will have houses to live in, vegetable-gardens and orchards, and also food and clothing at the expense of the Company of that Island, and besides this, they will have a share of all the products and the profits that may result from their labor, each in proportion, and they will also secure a share in the division of the land for themselves and their heirs forever more. (Brown 248-49)

The company promises every thing needed for living—including some extra bonuses. The company welcomes anyone who is willing to go: “all workmen of whatever craft they may be, blacksmiths, carpenters, coopers, shipwrights, turners and such as know how to plant vineyards, hunters, fishermen, and all who work in any kind of metal, men who make bricks, architects, bakers, weavers, shoemakers, sawyers, and those who spin wool and all others, men as well as women, who have any occupation, who wish to go out in this voyage for colonizing the country with people” (Brown 248). The list is not intended to be comprehensive: any man or woman with a healthy body is qualified. But the company, in that same year, slightly revised the policy to exclude a specific group. They resolved to reject “such unnecessary person”; the idle crew such as “lascrivious sonnes” and “bad servants” “clog[ged] the businesse [of Virginia Company],” for they “will rather starve for hunger, than lay their lands to labor” (Brown 355). The company expressed their determination to reject “such vagrant and unnecessarie persons,” even in the broadsides of 1610 and 1611 (Brown 439, 445).

Through those broadsides, the company manifested publicly their will to reject “idling people.” But they, in secret, endeavored to collect laborers, even offenders in jail. In his writing from Jamestown to Salisbury on August 17 of 1611, Sir Thomas Dale justifies the company’s employment of criminals for colonization by saying that the Spaniards are doing the same thing in the Indies: “on account of the difficulty of procuring men in so short a time, all offenders out of the common gaols condemned to die should be sent for three years to the colony; so do the Spaniards people the Indies” (qtd. in Jones 147). Furthermore, the company contacted the City of London and asked

for their assistance in sending the vagrant poor to supply the colonial work force. The company asked the city's support in transplanting London's vagrant children to Virginia, and they transferred children to Virginia three times during 1619-1622. Each time, about one hundred children loitering in the streets were collected and sent, with the understanding that they would be apprenticed and would get a certain amount of land at the end of the apprenticeship. In the second gathering, some children resisted going to Virginia. Sir Edwin Sandys, the representative person of the Virginia company, sent a letter to the King's secretary, and on January 31 in 1620, the Privy Council "granted the necessary authority, decreeing that if any of the children were 'obstinate' and still resisted transportation they should be imprisoned and punished" (qtd. in Robert C. Johnson 150). In this way, the company received the government's support to facilitate their use of the surplus labor force for their enterprise. To mobilize the approval of Parliament for the company's use of "idle rogues," Sandys in 1621 made a speech to the House of Commons, suggesting "the poor that cannot be set on work may be sent to Virginia. Never was there a fairer gate opened to a nation to disburden itself nor better means by reason of the abundance of people to advance such a plantation" (qtd. in Robert C. Johnson 150). The Virginia Company, which desperately lacked workers, even had to seek criminals in Bridewell whom they had condemned and disapproved of in earlier times.

The vagrants were employed in various ways in colonial ventures. Virginia was not the only place where the inmates in Bridewell were moved. Bridewell exiled hundreds to the plantations in Bermuda and Barbados. Shipments of the poor were also

arranged in provinces. According to a letter written to the Virginia Company in 1627, “there are many ships now going to Virginia, and with them some 1400 or 1500 children, which they have gathered up in diverse places” (qtd. in Beier 162-63). In the 1630s, Kentish officials summarily deported the poor to the colonies, and in 1653 two ships sailed to Ireland to collect four hundred Irish children (Beier 162-63). Yet, the government did not consistently approve transplantations, particularly in 1630s. In 1637, the Caroline government attempted to prevent emigration to America. Too many laborers had been drained out of England, and the Caroline government had to stop the emigration of people to America in order to sustain the manpower at home. The 1637 proclamation says that “many idle and refractory” people are transported to America, and their “onely or principall end is to live as much as they can without the reach of authority.” After considering the situation, Charles I was determined to “restraine [. . .] such promiscuous and disorderly departing out of the Realme” (Larkin and Hughes Stuart Royal Proclamations 2. 555-56). This proclamation indicates that emigration and transplantation occurred in such huge numbers in the early seventeenth century that the government felt the need to control the exodus.

In conclusion, the seventeenth-century overseas enterprise depended on “idling rogues” for their working hands, and provided a solution to vagabondage and poverty, which were regarded as chronic social problems. As a potential labor force, the idling poor were involved in the colonial and imperial expansion during the Stuart era. These economic and historical conditions helped curb the anxiety about beggars and rogues and ameliorate their image. This positive atmosphere is the environment in which

Fletcher wrote Beggars' Bush as a parody of Harman's characterization of rogues. The vitality and humor the rogue characters embody in Beggars' Bush reflects Stuart England's optimistic vision of the social issue of vagabondage.

2. The Glory of Merchants

Floriz, the legitimate heir of Flanders, is on stage as a merchant throughout the play, except in the final moment when his real identity is discovered. Floriz has grown up without knowing his origin of birth, since he was displaced at an early age to escape harm. Under a merchant father's care, Floriz becomes a well-known merchant who deals in overseas commodities. As for his prosperity as a merchant, people say that Floriz is favored by the wind of the sea:

He [Floriz] beares himselfe with such a confidence
 As if he were the Master of the Sea,
 And not a winde upon the Sailers compasse,
 But from one part or other, was his factor,
 To bring him in the best commodities,
 Merchant e're venturd for. (1.3.5-10)

Floriz's association with the sea is related to his way of accumulating wealth.⁹

Transporting commodities and making the surplus from the difference in the prices is the way Floriz makes his money. Floriz's traffic is reputed so credible that it "makes many Venturers with him, in their wishes, for his prosperity" (1. 3. 39-40). Act 1, scene 3 shows how imported commodities such as the "wine of Cyprus" and "Candy sugars" are

traded and bargained between Floriz and merchants. But, Floriz's compassionate treatment of "a Pirat" and "water-Theeves," who endanger merchants' wealth, confuses other merchants. This seemingly conflicting element in Floriz and his involvement in mercantile activities are the issues I want to address in this section.

Through the character Floriz, this play represents the increasing tendency of the merchant class' hegemony and dominance in early seventeenth century England. Discussion of the marriage of Floriz and Bertha focuses on the matter of Floriz's social status. Floriz encounters strong disapproval from his would-be bride's uncle, Hemskirk, who rejects Floriz only because he is a merchant:

HEMSKIRK. You [his niece] must not only know me for your Uncle,

Now, but obey me; you, goe cast your selfe

Away, upon a dunghill here? A Merchant?

A petty fellow? One that makes his trade

With oathes and perjuries?

FLORIZ. What is that you say Sir?

If it be me you speake of; as your eye

Seems to direct: I wish you would speake to me, Sir.

HEMSKIRK. Sir, I do say, she is no Merchandize,

Will that suffice you? (2.3.73-81)

Hemskirk does not accept a merchant as a suitor for his niece, since a merchant, to him, is "a petty fellow" who "makes his trade with oathes and perjuries" (2.3.76-77).

Hemskirk's denunciation of merchants as "the trade with perjuries" infuriates Floriz, not

only because of Hemskirk's arrogance but also because of Hemskirk's use of the word "perjuries." Hemskirk downgrades merchants by grouping them in the same category with rogues, who had been sharply criticized for using tricks and perjuries to make a living. The association between rogues and chap-men was not unusual. Vagabond Acts often included peddlers in the group of vagrants, and these acts required them to possess licenses in order to avoid accusations of being vagabonds. But peddling was often employed by beggars as another mean for earning money. Patricia Fumerton presents an interesting example of the nomadic life of an early modern beggar: Thomas Spickernell is described as "somtyme apprentice to a bookebynder; after, a vagrant pedler; then, a ballet singer and seller; and now, a minister and alehouse-keeper in Maldon" (qtd. in Fumerton 206). If that were the case, then, a "beggar" could mean one that would do any type of work that was available, peddling being just one of the possibilities. Rogues in literary texts as well are often shown peddling goods which they get by suspicious means. Autolycus in The Winter's Tale sells pins, combs, ballads, and broadsides at a country fair, with a set of attractive perjuries. In Beggars' Bush, the beggars in Act 3 gain money by singing, playing the pipe, juggling, and peddling goodies. These examples tell us that peddlers and rogues were often considered to be interchangeable.

Hemskirk's scorn directed at merchants and the mercantile economy triggers Floriz's enraged response:

FLORIZ. No, now 'tis pittie
 Of your poor argument. Do not you, the Lords
 Of land (if you be any) sell the grasse,

The corne, the straw, the milke, the cheese?

[.....]

Do not your Lawyers

Sell all their practise, as your Priests their prayers?

What is not bought, and sold? (2.3.100-3, 112-4)

Floriz points out that Hemskirk is hypocritical and ignorant when he condemns the merchant class for engaging in its commercial transactions. Even a landlord, Floriz says, who seems distanced from the mercantile economy of exchange, is involved in bargaining. What is intriguing about Floriz' mercantile argument is that he includes lawyers' and priests' services in the category of buying and selling. Floriz generalizes various forms of social production in terms of commercial transaction, and with that generalization he tries to assert the superiority of the mercantile economy. According to his reasoning, social actions such as a priest's sermon or a lawyer's practice have monetary value and can be purchased in the same way as visible objects such as a carpenter's chair or a weaver's lace-work. Such a mercantile theory of human labor is exemplified in the advertisements of contemporary colonial enterprises.

In the broadsides encouraging participation in colonial plantations, human labor was assigned monetary value. As is mentioned earlier, one broadside of 1609 for the Virginia Company declares the company's demand for laborers, and promises them corresponding material benefits such as "five hundred 'reales' for each one," "houses to live in, vegetable-gardens and orchards, and also food and clothing" (248-49).

Furthermore, the broadside disseminated the notion of a labor market where laborers'

special skills and capacity for production are the determining factors for employment. One broadside in 1610 invites the working class to the Virginia plantation and includes the list of occupations needed for colonialization: “Smiths, Shipwrights, Sturgeon-dressers, Joyners, Carpenters, Gardeners, Turners, Coopers, Salt-makers, Ironmen for Furnasse & hammer, Brickmakers, Brick-layers, Minerall-men, Bakers, Gun-founders, Fishmen, Plough-wrights, Brewers, Sawyers, Fowlers, Vine-dressers, Surgeons and Physitions for the body, and learned Divines to instruct the Colonie, and to teach the Infidels to Worship the true God” (Brown 355-56). Here, surgeons and preachers are listed as laborers equal to others. Although these two occupations are rather distinctive from other labors (particularly preachers’ work because of their dealing with human souls), all of these varied professions are presented to hold equal value. Such advertisements seeking employable laborers, in accordance with the rise of colonial enterprise, naturalized and disseminated the idea that both labor and laborer were things that could be exchanged or purchased with money. This sort of thinking, when it gained widespread acceptance, initiated the trade of black slaves in 1650s.¹⁰

Floriz’s question, “what is not bought and sold?,” signals a shift in attitude toward the merchant class, since every social action, even though it may not appear to be, is mediated by the economy of buying and selling. Floriz’ representing of the merchant class is not just limited to his theoretical arguments. His behavior and his explanation of his actions reveal his characteristic as a merchant more thoroughly. He explains his actions in terms of exchange and equalization. When Floriz becomes angry with Hemskirk for scorning the merchant class, he responds, “he that will provoke me

first, doth make himselfe my equall” (2.3.118-9). Akin to the bargaining process in which two things are traded and bartered, in return for Hemskirk’s scorn, Floriz insults him and then disregards his expectations. It makes Hemskirk angry again and he strikes Floriz; in turn Floriz inflicts a wound on his head. Floriz finalizes his action against Hemskirk by saying, “there’s exchange” (2.3.136). Floriz’ use of mercantile terms in his actions, which does not initially seem momentous, actually serves to mark him more thoroughly as a merchant.

Although Floriz represents the rising merchant class of the seventeenth century, his character contains a disparate element. Floriz is not presented as a character of diligence, thrift, or financial talent, the features usually associated with the merchant class. On the contrary, he is, according to other merchants, an idling person who spends prodigally without any thought of the future. The other merchants consider Floriz’s spending and debt as proof of profligacy and think him to be lacking in wisdom. When Floriz implores them to help, they turn him down:

SECOND MERCHANT. ‘Tis foolish to depend on others mercy:

Keepe our selfe right, and even, cut your cloth Sir,
 According to your calling: you have liv’d here
 In Lordlike prodigality; high, and open,
 And now ye finde what ‘tis: the liberall spending
 The summer of your youth, which you should gleane in,
 And like the labouring Ant, make use and gaine of,
 Has brought this bitter stormy winter on ye,

And now ye cry. (4.1.12-19)

The merchant chastises Floriz for careless “prodigality” and his days of waste. But the words “Lordlike,” “high,” and “open” -- words modifying “prodigality” -- produce the opposite effect of the merchant’s intention. Floriz is a generous person who gives charity to beggars and servants, so instead of inflicting blame on Floriz, his “Lordlike prodigality” actually characterizes him as a charitable and good-natured person. In other words, Fletcher merges the images of aristocracy and mercantilism in the character of merchant Floriz. As a new type of merchant, Floriz represents both the bright side of the developing mercantile economy, and the spirit of the old aristocratic virtue of largess.

What made Fletcher create such a complex character in which two seemingly disjoint features are combined? Laura Stevenson’s study of “gentle” merchants in Elizabethan popular literature is instructive for dissecting Floriz’s characterization as a “Lordlike” merchant. According to her, merchants in the Elizabethan age could not find proper words validating their own activities, and therefore could not create distinctive merchant images. As a result, we often meet unusual merchants in Elizabethan popular literature (the aristocratic merchants) who are often praised as “magnanimous, courtly, and chivalric vassals of the king” (Stevenson 6). As an aristocratic merchant, Floriz is one such “gentle” merchant. Concerning the demand for a new type of merchant, Richard Helgerson notes such characterization was driven by the contingent socio-historical need “to show the leading members of the urban commercial class in a more positive way” (169). If “the proliferating array of joint-stock companies” provided the capital for overseas enterprise, Helgerson argues, “the merchant heroes in popular

literature” functioned as a new form of ideological expression supporting overseas trade (169). When colonial enterprises and overseas trade developed in the early seventeenth century, literary texts justified and glorified the work of the merchant who mediates trade.

Thomas Mun’s England’s Treasure by Forraign Trade is just one example that demonstrates the contemporary interest in trade and the merchant class’ endeavor to enhance its image. Although written by Thomas Mun in the 1620s, it was published by his son, John Mun, in 1664. Although the text is an economic treatise that elaborates point by point how England can gather wealth from foreign trade, it was also written to be an instructive handbook for young people. What should be noted, however, is the pride Thomas Mun, a merchant, has in his profession and his wish that his son would follow in his path of glory. In one passage, Mun deplores his contemporaries’ disregard and disrespect of merchants’ achievements:

It is true indeed that many Merchants here in England finding less encouragement given to their profession than in other Countreys, and seeing themselves not so well esteemed as their *Noble Vocation* requireth, and according to the great consequence of the same, doe not therefore labour to attain unto the excellencie of their profession, neither is it practised by the *Nobility* of this Kingdom as it is in other States from the Father to the Son throughtout their generations, to the great encrease of their wealth, and maintenance of their names and families. (3)

Evoking the change of attitude, Mun defines a merchant as a “noble vocation” and says that it should be practiced more by the “nobility of this kingdom.” Here Mun italicized the word “nobility” and “noble vocation” for emphasis, and seeks to merge and associate the merchant profession with nobility, the two of which had been long considered as incompatible. As a confident merchant, Mun proudly expresses his desire to see his son take up his “noble” profession.

It is questionable as to how Mun overcame the class-consciousness and notion of inferiority perpetuated through the traditional hierarchical structure. What could be the source of Mun’s pride in and self-respect for his profession? How could he glorify a merchant’s pursuit of money and profit without any qualms? The answer can be found in his unique definition of a merchant’s work. Mun posits a merchant as a patriotic subject who works for the wealth of the nation:

and therefore (my Son) it is now fit that I say something of the Merchant, which I hope in due time shall be thy Vocation: Yet herein are my thoughts free from all Ambition, although I rank thee in a place of so high estimation; for the Merchant is worthily called *The Steward of the Kingdoms Stock*, by way of Commerce with other Nations; a work of no less *Reputation* than *Trust*, which ought to be performed with great skill and conscience, that so the private gain may ever accompany the publique good. And because the nobleness of this Profession may the better stir up thy desires and endeavours to obtain those abilities which may effect it

worthily, I will briefly set down the excellent qualities which are required in a perfect Merchant. (1)

Mun's pride of his profession comes from his sense that a merchant determines the wealth of a nation by managing the nation's stocks and by controlling imports and exports. As "the Steward of the Kingdoms Stock," Mun says, a merchant can work for the nation and for the good of the public as well as seek personal profit. Mun's text can be compared to today's economic text, because it presents a detailed strategy and information about trade with European nations and other countries and colonies. He even includes the analysis of rival countries' trade policy such as the Netherlands and Spain. In the early seventeenth century, a merchant's role could be, agreeably, as significant as Mun emphasizes, and in this light Mun's pride of his profession is understandable. By providing the proper terms for ennobling merchants' work, Mun's treatise functioned to justify the mercantile profession and galvanized the English ventures to overseas colonies.

Floriz shares and embodies Mun's positive vision for overseas trade. In fact, Floriz' "Lordlike prodigality" and "liberal spending" are related to the investment in overseas ventures. Floriz gives a bountiful charity to beggars and helps pirates and thieves. Floriz offers, and appears to offer, charity for an unselfish purpose, but the play shows that these beneficiaries eventually contribute to his mercantile success. Floriz' bounty has comparable elements with the bounty Timon provides to all of his guests in Shakespeare's Timon of Athens. Both Floriz and Timon experience the situation that

efforts to attract diverse people to the lottery. The ballad begins with a celebration of London, which nourishes the great project of building a kingdom and extending its territory to Virginia:

London, liue thou famous long,
 Thou bearst a gallant minde:
 Plenty, peace, and pleasures store,
 In thee we dayly finde.
 The Merchants of Virginia now,
 Hath nobly tooke in hand,
 The brauest golden Lottery,
 That ere was in this Land.
 [.]
 Well may this famous Lottery,
 Haue good successe and speede,
 When as the States of England thus,
 Doe such good liking breed.
 Come Gallants, come; come noble mindes
 Come venture now for Gold,
 For smiling hope, heere bids you all,
 Take currage, and be bold.

 Come knights, and gallant Gentlemen,

Put in your ventures all:

Let nothing daunt your willing mindes,

Good fortune may befall:

Mee thinkes I see great numbers flocke,

And bring in fast their Coyne:

And Tradesmen how in louing sort,

Their monyes all doe ioyne:

Heere Pryzes are of great account,

Not simple, plaine, and poore;

But vnto Thousands doe surmount,

Whereof there be some store:

And happely some men there be,

In gayning of the same,

May spend their dayes like Gentlemen,

In credite and good name.

The anonymous author identifies the joining of the lottery as a courageous and “bold” act. By promising a fortune great enough to change their social status, this broadside exhorts people of all classes to take a chance in the lottery. The ballad singer even covets a small allowance in maid’s and widow’s pouches, enticing women with the chance for a great fortune:

You Maydes that haue but portions small

To gaine your mariage friend,
 Cast in your Lottes with willing hand,
 God may good fortune send.
 You Widowes, and you wedded Wiues,
 One litle substaunce try:
 You may aduance both you and yours,
 With wealth that comes thereby.

Catering to the company's demand to attract more investors and more money, the ballad celebrates the buyer's desire for fortune as something natural and harmless. For further justification of the investment, the ballad underscores the nationalistic aspect of the project by elaborating on how their project is authorized and approved by King and how the venture could increase the wealth of the nation.¹³ If Thomas Mun illuminated a merchant's devotion to trade as the heroic service for the nation, then this ballad proclaims any English subject's investment in overseas ventures as a patriotic act.

In regard to Floriz's overseas venture, it should be noted that Beggars' Bush emphasizes the collaborative relation between Floriz and the beggars. Like Antonio in The Merchant of Venice, Floriz experiences a precarious situation when his returning ship is delayed. Floriz is at risk of imprisonment for insolvency. After everyone else turns down Floriz' plea for help, the beggars are the ones who support him by collecting money. What makes those beggars inclined to help Floriz? We can find the answer in the scene where the beggars reproach the boors who conspired with the tyrant to slay Floriz. The beggars remind the boors of the good things Floriz has done for them:

mercantile capital through the battle with the Turks. A sailor vividly relates the battle at sea to Floriz:

SAYLOR. Thus Sir, sh [Floriz' ship]'ad fight
 Seven howers together, with six Turkish Gallyes,
 And she fought bravely: but at length was borded:
 And over lai'd with strength: when presently
 Comes boring up the winde Captaine *Van-noke*,
 That valiant Gentleman, you [Floriz] redeem'd from prison;
 He knew the Boate, set in: and fought it bravely:
 Beate all the Gallies off; sunk three, redeem'd her,
 And as a service to ye [Floriz], sent her home Sir. (4.3.22-30)

Due to Van-noke's exploits, Floriz' ship and his merchandise from the colonies arrives safely. In this light, the growing interest in overseas enterprises and the merchants' hegemony in the early seventeenth century is represented in Floriz' characterization as a noble merchant and by his cooperative relationship with beggars. Although there might have been discord between the two classes in real life, this play presents a peaceful version of cooperation between the merchant class, which provides capital, and the beggars, who devote their labor to commercial enterprises.

3. The Beggars' Forest Community and Colonial Green World

As I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, Gaby notes the pastoral atmosphere imbued in Beggars' Bush (404). She argues that early Stuart era's beggar

plays (Beggars' Bush, A Jovial Crew, The Sisters) with “nonurban settings” create remarkably different perspectives on beggars and vagabonds from their urban counterparts of city rogues and cony-catchers, by shifting the location to the countryside in the plays (401). The beggars' forest community in Beggars' Bush contains the utopian characteristics of the “green world” of the pastoral comedy, with many of comparable elements with Munday's Robin Hood play.

Along with the similar concerns and plot, Beggars' Bush and Munday's Robin Hood play betray remarkable differences. The two plays present different notions of utopian communities, as they are informed and determined by political, socio-economic, and cultural interests. With Munday's Robin Hood fellows, egalitarianism is the first principle of their society. Aiming to be an alternative version of the normal hierarchical society, this community attempts to construct a society without any social distinction by rank. Every member is called “yeoman,” even Robert, the dispossessed Earl of Huntington: “no man must presume to call our master, / by name of Earle, Lord, Baron, Knight, or Squire” (1330). This group identifies themselves as the defender of the poor, the weak, and the distressed, and declares their hostility toward certain elitist classes. The group's sympathy is revealed in their behavior codes:

5. Fifthly, you neuer shall the poore man wrong,
Nor spare a Priest, a vsurer, or a clarke.
6. Lastly, you shall defend with all your power,
Maids, widowes, Orphants, and distressed men.

It is interesting to note that they have enmity for clerks, who were in charge of collecting rent from tenants. Warman, the earl's clerk and steward, is denounced as the person who increased his wealth by even racketeering his master's tenants and who actually caused the earl's downfall. Warman, who betrays his master, is repeatedly referred to as "Iudas," who had betrayed Christ. Robert expresses his anger when he discovers Warman was conspiring against himself:

You from a paltry pen and inkhorne clarke,
 Bearing a buckram satchell at your belt,
 Vnto a Iustice place I did preferre,
 Where you vniustly haue my tenants rackt,
 Wasted my treature, and increast your store. (348-52)

By positing Robert as a victim of the clerk, along with the tenants who suffered from the clerk's racking rents, Munday tries to attract sympathy for Robert from the lower-class members of the audience. Thus, the forest community of Robin Hood is designed to appeal to the lower-class' emotions in the manorial economy, and provides the medium through which the lower class can discharge their grievances and remorse.

If egalitarianism is what is most desired by Munday's Robin Hood fellows, then Fletcher's beggars prefer "freedom" as their privilege more than anything else. These beggars are associated with festivity, songs, and mirth. They sing a song to celebrate Gerrard's accession as a king and the beggars' holiday:

At the Crowning of our King,
 Thus we ever dance and sing.

In the world looke out and see:
 Where so happy a Prince as he [Gerrard]?
 Where the Nation live so free,
 And so merry as do we?
 Be it peace, or be it war,
 Here at liberty we are,
 And enjoy our ease and rest;
 To the field we are not prest;
 Nor are called into the Towne,
 To be troubled with the Gowne.
 Hang all Officers we cry,
 And the magistrate too, by;
 When the Subsidie's encreast,
 We are not a penny ceast. (2.1.147-60)

Celebrating their liberty and freedom from the authority of society at large, these beggars toast their independent and "merry" lives. These beggars' festivities are quite different from the subversive activities of Robin Hood's fellows. Whereas the Robin Hood fellows celebrate their community as one that overturns regular order and satisfies their remorse, Fletcher's beggars do not show much anger or antipathy. Such differences in emotional range of these two plays are related to each period's different visions of their contemporary social concerns.

The Robin Hood play does not deal extensively with practical concerns such as how to survive and how to earn money; instead, it focuses more on the spiritual lives of the fellows.¹⁴ Unlike the Robin Hood play, which sublimates economic concern, however, Beggars' Bush renders a uniquely materialistic vision of utopia. This play shows how these beggars earn their living and what they desire from a new king concerning their earnings. With the accession of Gerrard as the new king, Higgen celebrates the way of life in the bush:

No impositions, taxes, grievances,
 Knots in a state, and whips unto the subject,
 Lye lurking in this Beard, but all kem'd out:
 [.]
 He will not force away your hens, your bacon,
 When you have ventur'd hard for't, nor take from you
 The fattest of your puddings: under him
 Each man shall eate his own stolne eggs, and butter,
 In his owne shade, or sun-shine, and enjoy
 His owne deare Dell, Doxy, or Mort, at night
 In his own straw, with his owne shirt, or sheet,
 That he hath filch'd that day, I, and possesse
 What he can purchase, backe, or belly-cheats
 To his own prop: he will have no purveyers
 For pigs, and poultry. (2.1.105-121)

The absence of impositions, taxes, and grievances should probably be one of the recurrent features when envisioning an ideal world. But the previous passage suggests that these items have a special implication for the beggars. Higgen elaborates on why their life will be merry: it is because Gerrard, the new king of the beggars, will not plunder their earnings gained by begging, cheating, or even stealing. The right to “possess” what each beggar gains is the main issue in this beggars’ society. Such right of property will be ensured and guaranteed by Gerrard, who states that “every man” can “keep / In his own path and circuite” his earnings, and promises that “what they get there is their owne” (2.1.123-24. 126).

Interestingly, these beggars present a unique type of economic community not found in typical utopian writings. Thomas More in Utopia proposes an economic solution, which is to remove *property*. One reformer in Utopia exclaims: “Unless private property is entirely done away with, there can be no fair or just distribution of goods, nor can mankind be happily governed” (More 31). Jack Cade in Shakespeare’s 2 Henry VI and many anti-enclosure polemicists criticize property as the main cause of all social inequality. Cade’s decision that “all things shall be in common” echoes More’s idea.¹⁵ But the beggars in the bush community do not suggest that property should be eliminated because it is the source of social inequality. In addition, most utopian writings tend to emphasize the justice and equality of *distribution* instead of equal chance of income. But these beggars do not give any thought to the issue of distribution. Rather, their crucial concerns are a guaranteed work space and a right to all of their earnings. In this context, Higgen’s announcement has special meaning when he says that nobody will

take away property, “when you have ventur’d hard for’t.” As such, this beggars’ society validates the individual right for economic gain rather than equality based on commonwealth.¹⁶ Although it is somewhat ironic to claim the right of property for the items they have stolen, the beggars’ economic and materialistic concerns symbolically reflect seventeenth-century England’s colonial enterprises.

Although several colonial companies advertised their projects as patriotic and religious missions, their main concern was economic gain. The companies vigorously promoted newly-discovered lands as ideal places with plenty of food, lumber, land, and even gold, and promised that those who work hard in the new world will surely gain all of these things.¹⁷ Richard Whitbourne, who was devoted to the New-Found-Land enterprise, describes the nature of the island:

The Iland of New-found-land is large, temperate and fruitfull, the fruitfulness of it consisting not only in things of sustenance for those that shall inhabite it, but in many sorts of commodities likewise, of good use and valem to be transported. The Natives in it are ingenuous, and apt by discreete and moderate governments to be brought to obedience. (B2 verso)

By elaborating on the gentle and fruitful nature of the island, Whitbourne invites English subjects to join the venture. Among the reasons he lists for joining the enterprise, Whitbourne emphasizes that the land “will in all likelihood yeeld them a plentiful reward of their labours,” if they “put to their helping hands to” the plantation to New-Found-Land (B3).

Whitbourne was not the only one employing the strategy to lure settlers by promising economic rewards. The Virginia Company was more desperate to attract possible laborers and advertised the company in several broadsides targeting the lower class. I mentioned earlier one of the broadsides suggesting a promising contract for participating laborers: freedom after indentures, possession of land under a proper title, house, garden, and so on. One ballad titled “Newes from Virginia” also appeals to the common man by promising similar benefits:

To such as to Virginia

Do purpose to repaire;

And when that they shall hither come,

Each man shall have his share,

Day wages for the laborer,

And for his more content,

A house and garden plot shall have,

Besides 'tis further ment

That every man shall have a part,

And not thereof denied

Of generall profit, as if that he

Twelve pounds, ten shillings paid. (Neill 29-35)

Likewise, Captain Smith reports on his experiences in America in order to seek more hands for the plantations. His report is one of the strongest promotional writings that appealed to the ordinary man:

For Labourers, if those that sowe hemp, rape, turnups, parsnips, carrats, cabidge, and such like; give 20, 39, 40, 50 shillings yearely for an acre of ground and meat drinke and wages to use it, and yet grow rich; when better, or at least as good ground, may be had, and cost nothing but labour [in the new world]; it seems strange to me, any such should there grow poore. (1. 214)

Smith presents a rosy picture of the settlement in America by focusing on “easy riches” (Jones 149). As such, overseas companies tried hard to mobilize people by promising that “what they get there is their owne” (2.1.126) “when you have ventur’d hard for’t” (2.1.112), the same thing Gerrard promises his subjects in Beggars’ Bush.

Overall, the romantic “green world” of the Beggars’ Bush alludes to the overseas “pastures”, which were eulogized in diverse promotional literature. Michael Drayton, in his “Ode to the Virginian Voyage,” celebrates Virginia as “Earth’s onely Paradise,” “Where Nature hath in store / Fowle, Venison, and Fish, / And the fruitfull’st Soyle, / Without your Toyle” (24-28).¹⁸ This is the primitive land where “still Natures lawes doth give” the golden age, and “the ambitious Vine / Crownes with his purple Masse, / The Cedar reach[es] hie / To kisse the sky” (31-38). Such portrayal of the colonies as utopian places where nature provides abundant resources induced English people to invest their money and labor in the overseas enterprises, thereby contributing to its enhancement.

With an emphasis on individual property rights and attention to labor, the beggars' utopian vision in Beggars' Bush, which is quite different from Robin Hood's utopian vision, reflects the growing interest in plantation settlements and overseas trade of the early seventeenth-century England.

4. England in 1622: the Instability of Colonial Enterprises

Beggars Bush was performed in December 1622 at Whitehall, a newly-constructed royal building. James' extension of his palace and Whitehall's luxurious ornaments symbolize the prosperity Britain enjoyed with the development of colonial enterprises and the nation's affluence. Beggars Bush was one of the first plays performed in the luxurious Whitehall, and the site of performance fit well with the romantic green world alluded to in the play.

The national enterprise of colonial expansion, however, was not so successful by 1622. The conflict with native residents in the American colonies foregrounded ethical issues that had previously been ignored. The Virginia Company, for instance, experienced difficulties in the early 1620s. The company suffered from serious labor shortage and financial deficit, and the situation worsened after the colony "was nearly wiped out by an Indian attack" in March of 1622 (Coward 27). That incident revealed the instability of the overseas enterprise and posed serious questions regarding the relationship of the native residents with the colonies.

English priests provided an answer to the problematic relationship between colonialists and the native Indians. Through sermons, ministers proliferated the distorted

image of the natives as savage and irreligious people who should be inculcated and enlightened in the English way. Colonialization was justified as a religious mission, to deliver God's message to the native people and to convert them to Christianity. John Donne, as a parson, delivered a sermon with this message to the Virginia Company in November of 1622, eight months after the company experienced the Indian attack.¹⁹

In the sermon, Donne relates Acts 1: 8 to the Virginia Company's enterprise.²⁰ The company, Donne explains, should play the role of an apostle delivering God's message to savage people. Donne supports the Virginian Company as God's enterprise and provides the company the rhetorical and ideological means for justifying the company's work in the colony.²¹ Donne's sermon was not exceptional in any sense.²² Many overseas companies advertised their work as the expansion of the Christian faith, and London priests encouraged companies' enterprises for that reason.

What should be noted in Donne's sermon, however, is Donne's justification of the enterprise in terms of "the law of nations" as well as in biblical terms (274-75). Donne defines the land in America as unclaimed land. Just as a few fishermen cannot claim the right of the sea, Donne explains that the native inhabitants cannot claim the land of America. Through that analogy, Donne denies Amerindians the right to the American land. Donne goes on to say, "In the Law of *Nature* and *Nations*, A Land never inhabited, by any, or utterly derelicted and immemorially abandoned by the former Inhabitants, becomes theirs that wil possesse it" (274). As well as the right to *possess* the land, Donne justifies the transference of the commodities from America to England. He legitimates the act of transference on the ground of "patents, charters, and seals from

him [the English king]" (275). Donne's justification, to the contrary, reveals the lack of legitimacy of the overseas enterprise. The patents and charters made by the English king were, for instance, designed to give one particular English company privileges in trade against other English companies. The English patents in no way reflected the Amerindians' agreement to the English act of transference. In other words, the English documents had no real authority over the commodities in America. Donne in his sermon, thus, attempts to authorize the Virginia Company's enterprise as a Godly and legitimate act, even though in reality the enterprise yielded violent, exploitative, and illegitimate acts. Donne's, and many priests,' endeavors themselves to justify the overseas enterprise suggests the lack of legitimacy of such enterprise. In this way, Jacobean England's ethical and practical burdens regarding colonial enterprise were exposed and widely discussed in the 1620s.

The unveiled negative side of the colonial enterprise was embedded in the description of the beggars' community in Beggars' Bush. The beggars' society in the play reflects the ethical dilemma of colonialization that Donne suggests in his efforts of justification. The beggars' society in the play suggests that economic gain is the primary motivation of the colonial expansion. The profit and economic gain of colonies is similar to the beggars' gain which they earn by cheating or stealing. The king of beggars' society pronounces that he will guarantee each beggar's right to "possess" (2.1.118) for whatever gain each beggar earns, either "stolen eggs" or "shirt or sheet that he hath filch'd" (2.1.114. 117). The irony that the beggar-king guarantees a rogue's right of possession for the item he steals closely resembles the irony we see in Donne's

explanation that English king's charters and patents will secure the overseas company's right of possession on the commodities the company exploits from the colony.

Yet such a negative aspect of colonial expansion did not seem to deter the development of overseas enterprise in the Stuart era. Colonial enterprises continued to develop until they facilitated and fortified the construction of the British Empire, despite continued complications such as practical, ethical, and financial troubles. The changing economic situation in England and the specific situation of each colony altered a particular period's policy concerning a particular overseas company. What was certain among such variables, however, was the economic view of beggars and rogues as a potential labor force. When England encountered a new "Other" in the colonies, the idling beggars and rogues, once harshly labeled as the "Other" in English society, were re-conceived and given a new role as a collaborative partner for the construction of the British Empire.

Notes

¹ Although records indicate that the play was performed with popularity in the court in 1622 and the following years, the date of its composition is obscure. Based on linguistic evidence, editors speculate that Beaumont, John Fletcher, and Philip Massinger were involved in writing or revising the play for performance. By considering that Fletcher worked as a collaborator with Beaumont in his earlier years, and with Massinger in his later years, I will designate Fletcher as the playwright representing all those collaborative authorship.

² Anthony Munday adapted the Robin Hood legend for the stage in two plays Downfall of Robert, Earle of Huntington, afterward called Robin Hood of Merrie Sherwodde and Death of Robert, Earle of Huntington. Munday describes Robin Hood as an aristocratic person who becomes dispossessed and exiled. Besides Robin Hood's elevation of social rank, Munday has changed several characteristic features of traditional Robin Hood legend.

³ Carroll and Woodbridge observe that the word rogue migrated from the popular literature to the legal terminology, and that Harman's demonization of rogues could be a significant factor in including rogues as criminals.

⁴ Thomas More's Utopia (1516) presented unemployment as the main cause of crimes, recommending that government should provide work instead of punishing thieves. Thomas Cromwell and his circle in 1530s suggested that vagabonds should be employed in building highways, harbours and fortifications. (Beier, Masterless Men 149-52) In 1580, Robert Hitchcock presented the idea that to root out the loathsome monster

idleness vagrants should be set for fishing on herring boats, which would benefit the realm to the tune of £ 200,000 a year from the sale of herrings.

⁵ Look at the similar idea expressed in Peckham's report in Principal Navigations 8. 112.

⁶ In 1614, the government again asked the Graham clan to return to low countries or Ireland by a new proclamation. The government expected them to be reformed a new man in a new place, overcoming their wicked way of living in "blood and rapine" (Larkin and Hughes Stuart Royal Proclamations 1. 311).

⁷ The proclamation shows how the Jacobean government preferred the policy of transplantation to dealing with them in the nation: "It alwayes hath beene and is Our naturall disposition, and the temper of Our Government, to purge Our Dominions of Malefactors, and nevertheles draw as little blood as maybe, and rather to prevent offenses, than to suffer them to goe on, to the hurt of the innocent Subject, and finall destruction of the Malefactors themselves. [. . .] We were pleased to extend Mercie unto them, and upon their owne suite, and humble prostrating of themselves by submission, to remove them, and transplante them into Our Realme of Ireland, there to become new men, and to put off their wicked and desperate course of life, formerly continued in blood and rapine" (Larkin and Hughes Stuart Royal Proclamations 1. 310-11).

⁸ The policy of transplantation was enforced in 1617 for the "notorious and wicked offenders" in the shires of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westermorland. These shires were on the border between England and Scotland, so some people after committing certain crimes used to run away to the opposite jurisdictional area by taking

advantage of different rules and policies. So the Jacobean government felt the need to announce unified rules in these areas. Among the several policies delineated in the proclamation, the government authorized local officials to file a list of “notorious and wicked offenders” and to send them away to colonies or remote places: “We hereby signifie our pleasure to be upon Certificate of the said Commissioners, to send the most notorious ill livers, and misbehaved persons of them that shall so be certified, into Virginia, or to some other remote parts to serve in the Warres, or in Colonies, that they may no more infect the places where they abide within this our Realme” (Larkin and Hughes Stuart Royal Proclamations 1. 378). The policy was to sanction local commissioners’ filing wicked persons and sending them out overseas.

⁹ Also see 1. 3. 83-90, where the relation between the merchant class and pirates is referred with the implication that the sea is a significant means of gaining money to the merchant.

¹⁰ The idea of buying laborers with money enabled and resulted in the trade of black slaves in 1650s.

¹¹ Timon’s largess and bounty is presented as the reason of his decline in Timon of Athens.

¹² The surviving record tells that lottery was drawn in 1612 and 1615.

¹³ The Virginia company in many ways tried to make the plantation in America figured as a national project. To disseminate such image, the company instigated the print of Robert Johnson’s Nova Britannia, dedicated to Sir Thomas Smith of the Council

for Virginia (Jones 132). Nova Britannia is reprinted in Peter Force's Tracts Vol. 1. No. 6.

¹⁴ Labor is mentioned only as the means to check a lustful body, suggesting that hard labor can remove sexual desire by exhausting a body: "Thirdly no yeoman, following Robin Hoode / In Sherewod, shall vse widowe, wife, or maid, / But by true labour, lustfull thoughts expell." This play is more concerned with the spiritual lives of the fellows and especially chastity is one of the emphasized issues. That is quite different from the earlier forms of Robin Hood legends that exalt and approve sexual indulgence.

¹⁵ Carroll 137.

¹⁶ John Smith's description of New England in 1616 shares the ethos of beggars' celebration speech: "There are no hard Landlords to racke us with high rents, or extorted fines to consume us; no tedious pleas in law to consume us with their many years disputations for justice; no multitudes to occasion such impediments to good orders, as in popular States [. . .]" (1: 195-96).

¹⁷ A broadside of 1616-1617, which was written to attract additional colonists for the Virginia Company, advertises that the abundant raw materials in the blessed land only wait for the cultivating hands: "[We] have been thoroughly informed and assured of the good estate of the Colony, and how by the blessing of God and good government, there is great plenty [. . .]; and that there wants nothing for the settling of that Christian Plantation, but more hands to gather and return those commodities which may bring profit to the Adventures, and encouragement to others. [. . .] Whereby in short time that

good work may be brought to good perfection, [. . .] to the contentment and satisfaction of all well affected subjects” (Brown 2: 797-798).

¹⁸ That ode was printed in 1606 and 1619.

¹⁹ Donne was the Dean of St. Paul’s in London and gave the sermon on November 13 of 1622. He also published the sermon by itself in the same year.

²⁰ “But yee shall receive power, after that the holy ghost is come upon you, and yee shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the Uttermost part of the earth” (Donne 265).

²¹ Donne uses the ship analogy. Donne elaborates that God gave men “the modell of a Ship” with the example of Noah’s ark, and whereby God showed men the “means to passe from Nation to Nation” (265). Donne stresses that God taught us how to make ships “not to transport our selves, but to transport him,” so when the company has received power and the Holy Ghost come upon them, they should go as witnesses of him to the people in America (266). The emigration to America for religious freedom and political difficulty was conspicuous in 1630s and especially with Plymouth Plantation, according to Rabb (86-87).

²² Patrick Copland delivered the sermon of similar message in “Virginia’s God be Thanked, or A sermon of Thanksgiving for the Happie successe of the affayres in Virginia this last yeare” in 1622 (Jones). The preacher Robert Gray also said in 1609 that those who “have employed their best endeouours in such vertuous and honourable enterprises” would have “aduanced the glorie of God” (qtd. in Jones 137-38). For more examples, see Parker’s Books to Build an Empire.

CHAPTER V

A BEGGAR AS A TRAVELER IN A JOVIAL CREW: MERRY BEGGARS

The main concern of my argument in this chapter is geographical mobility, which encompasses travel, traffic, adventure, and vagrancy. I will address the shifting attitudes to geographical mobility in the early seventeenth century and its effect on the issue of vagrancy. My discussion will be focused on domestic mobility, the issue that has been given less attention by early modern scholars, compared with their voluminous study of overseas travels and explorations in the same period.

My discussion is based on the assumption that the Tudor regime had different policies for overseas travel and domestic mobility. The Tudor government encouraged and supported outbound mobility for diverse reasons: to expand national territory, to seek economic gain, to find an itinerary or trade route, or to check rival countries' colonial expansion. Comparatively, internal mobility or travel had been undeveloped and, in fact, discouraged through the government's different policy. Vagabond Acts are, as C. G. A. Clay observes, a far-reaching form of social control to place restrictions upon "the freedom of the poor to move about as they liked" (1: 234). As the poor law of 1531 illustrates, the legislation of Vagabond Acts aimed to reduce vagrants' mobility by sending them home and forcing them to reside in a certain place. Under that condition, domestic travel was only possible with an official license. The search for employment was not a legitimate reason for traveling, and sometimes even those with license were punished as vagabonds. Thus, Vagabond Acts were intended for controlling not only the

unemployed poor but also all kinds of wandering trade and itinerant groups. As a result, domestic mobility was regarded as endangering home and nation, while overseas travel was credited as strengthening and enriching the nation.

But the early seventeenth century witnessed a changing attitude toward domestic mobility and the growing interest in exploring the homeland. Andrew McRae remarks, “While Tudor moralists insistently proclaim the virtues of place, by the early seventeenth century texts increasingly consider the importance of mobility, depicting men and women of middling and lower degree on the move” (“Peripatetic” 41-42). In fact, this change of attitude was inevitable, since the development of overseas enterprise necessarily required and accelerated circulation of materials and people in the homeland. John Norden’s publication of a domestic traveler’s guide book in 1625 betokens the emerging interest in domestic mobility and the consequent need for geographical information. This chapter will discuss such an emerging interest in domestic mobility in the early seventeenth century in terms of its re-adjustment of the trope of vagrancy. John Taylor, the Water Poet, notably identifies himself as a beggar and narrates his travel as a beggar’s perambulation. In that way, Taylor appropriates the trope of vagrancy for his travel accounts. Juxtaposing Taylor’s travel accounts and his poem on beggary with Richard Brome’s A Jovial Crew, I will trace the symbolic process of appropriation and neutralization of the trope of vagrancy in the early seventeenth century.

1. Traveling in Early Seventeenth-Century England

It would be a mistake to envision traveling in the seventeenth-century England in terms of our sense of traveling in the twenty-first century. Traveling in that period was admittedly rare and for special reasons. But it will be another mistake to think that no remarkable attempts had been made to explore the domestic land until the trend of domestic tourism in the eighteenth century. Although travelers were few in the seventeenth century, the period witnessed the emerging interest in domestic travel along with overseas travel.

Generally speaking, travel in the period had a unique implication. The simultaneous use of “travail” and “travel” to mean a journey suggests to us the contemporary sense of travel. The Oxford English Dictionary shows “travail” and “trauail” were interchangeably used to indicate the act of traveling. The Dictionary provides several examples, one of which is from Day’s Festivals III (1610): “He made foure *travailes*.” John Taylor, whom I will examine more closely in this section, uses “travail” or “trauail” several times as the act of traveling: “Reader, these *travailes* of mine into Scotland, were not undertaken, neither in imitation, or emulation of any man, but onely devised by my selfe” (Chandler 5). Such linguistic usage suggests that traveling in this period was regarded as something that accompanied hardship, and required endurance, labor, and suffering. It could be related to the material conditions of roads, lodging, and, inclement weather. Because of the hardship associated with travel, it was, on the other hand, considered good for character building and education. A well-known traveler of the world, W. Cunningham describes travel as a way to acquire

several virtues. In the preface to Cosmography Glasse (1559), Cunningham says, “His eloquence, prudence [. . .] and other life vertues [. . .] insued of hys peregrinations, and *travails*” (Oxford English Dictionary). Here again he uses the word “travails” and declares that travel is the source of diverse virtues. Henry Peacham in his “The Worth of a Penny” (1647) also recommends travel as a wise and good way of using money (qtd. in McRae, “Peripatetic” 51). Although Cunningham and Peacham emphasized travel’s educational effect, however, travel in this period was largely motivated by a practical incentive: to investigate a navigating route by river, to check military camps in England, or to survey the land for the reinforcement of property rights. Such practical orientation was dominant in domestic travel and reflected in early travel guides. For example, each page of John Norden’s An Intended Guide for English Travelers (1625) is composed of a table that records the distance and time to travel from towns. It does not have any description of towns or their attractions worthy of visiting. It presents only technical information that can facilitate travelers charting an itinerary. In the same format as the Guide, A Direction for the English traviller was published four times from 1635 through 1677.

Joan Parkes, the author of Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century, introduces several domestic travelers who left records of their travels: John Taylor, Sir William Brereton, three gentlemen of the Military Company of Norwich, and Mrs. Celia Fiennes. Sir William Brereton, who “later became a well-known Parliamentary commander,” traveled the Northern and Western shires, passing through Scotland and Ireland (297). The military men of Norwich surveyed 26 famous shires in 1630s, and

made a tour of England, North, West, South, and East, “missing only the extreme west and southern seaboard counties” (297). They traveled on their horses, on an average thirty to forty miles a day. They often recorded in their travel narrative their conviviality with innkeepers and townsfolk. Another traveler, Mrs. Celia Fiennes, was a brave gentlewoman who traveled some three thousand miles almost entirely on horseback in the last decade of the seventeenth century. Her “wide and comprehensive survey,” Parkes observes, “entitles us to regard her as the forerunner of the modern woman explorer, as the discoverer of an England” (301). With a colloquial and intimate style, she notes aspects of towns and countryside, the forms of transport in use and the various manners and customs in different localities (302).

While those three traveled for a short period time, John Taylor traveled continually, so much so that he can be properly called a traveler by occupation. Among the fourteen journeys he took, two were foreign journeys (to Hamburg and Prague), and the remainder were to different regions of Britain. His first domestic travel was to Edinburgh in 1618, and his last one was to Sussex and Kent in 1653, when he was seventy-five years old. Just three months after the completion of the last journey, Taylor died. The passion he had for travel is easily understandable from the diversity of the places he visited: Edinburgh, York, Salisbury, Isle of Wight, West country, East Anglia, Wales, and so on. He contemplates his life as a traveler’s when he writes about his journey to East Anglia in 1650:

And all my life time it hath been my fate

To be a traveller legitimate:

From head to heele, by either land or sea

I am a traveller, right *Cape a Pea* [from top to toe]. (Chandler 247-48)

Taylor spent a significant part of his life traveling and writing about his travels. He, quite unusually in his time, liked to travel in Britain more than foreign countries. He often expresses the pride and joy he felt on discovering his country. For instance, Taylor in his Penniless Pilgrimage to Scotland, glorifies his efforts to explore his native land. Taylor compares himself with the historically famous travelers and literary travelers in romance as well:

I that have wasted, months, weekes, dayes, and howers

In viewing kingdomes, countreys, townes, and towers,

Without all measure, measuring many paces,

And with my pen describing sundrie places,

With few additions of my owne devizing,

(Because I have a smacke of Coriatizing.)

Our Mandevill, Primaleon, Don Quixot,

Great Amadis, or Huon, traveld not

As I have done, or beene where I have beene,

Or heard and seene, what I have heard and seene;

Nor Britaines Odcomb (zanye brave Ulissis)

In all his ambling saw the like as this is. (Chandler 35)

Taylor lists several travelers' names. Sir John Mandeville is a well-known traveler of the fourteenth century. Don Quixote, Amadis of Gaul, and Huon of Bordeaux are all

adventurous romance heroes. Coryate, who was called Britain's Ulysses, was a well-known contemporary traveler to foreign countries.¹ By listing those famous travelers and comparing them with himself, Taylor empowers him as equal to the adventurer-heroes, and, on the other hand, underscores the originality of his travel. Taylor highlights that the domestic land had not been explored by any famous traveler before him, and, thus, represents himself as the first English traveler.

There was, however, a notable group of geographers who surveyed, explored, and traveled the domestic land before Taylor. In fact, Taylor's discovery of Britain was dependent upon the achievements of precedent or contemporary cartographers and chorographers.² Elizabethan cartographer, Christopher Saxton published the first comprehensive map, An Atlas of England and Wales (1579), a full visualization of the country. Saxton's map contributed to triggering the interest in the domestic land, and chorographers enkindled and magnified it. Such chorographers as William Camden, Michael Drayton, and John Speed surveyed and described the land with the legends and stories on relics and antiquities. Taylor was conscious of this academic society and used their information for his travel. But Taylor's travel and travel accounts were the first trial to represent the country as the land of people. Taylor's travel writing was geared toward a different audience, who was excluded from the readership of the chorographical writing. William Camden published Britannia, a chorographical description of the whole kingdom, first in Latin in 1586, which definitely was not for uneducated multiple populace. Other chorographical writings were also largely intended for a landowning audience.³ Alternatively, Taylor's travel writing registers the populace-oriented notion of

the nation that validates ordinary people's living experience. Taylor declares that his writing is different from Camden and Speed's "treatise of geography" that deals with "exact relations of cities, townes, or countries scituations" (Chandler 224-5). In the preface of his Penniless Pilgrimage to Scotland, Taylor emphasizes the originality of his travel accounts:

Now readers, if you expect
 That I should write of cities situations,
 Or that of countries I should make relations:
 Of brooks, crooks, nooks; of rivers, boorns and rills,
 Of mountains, fountaines, castles, tower and hills,
 Of shieres, and peires, and memorable things,
 Of lives and deaths of great commanding kings:
 I touch not those, they not belong to mee,
 But if such things as these you long to see,
 Lay down my booke, and but vouchsafe to reede
 The learned Camden, or laboriou Speede. (Chandler 5-6)

Taylor says that his writing is not about great kings' history, relics, antiquities, or pure landscape without people; those were the historiographers' and chorographers' interests. Taylor abandons such an elitist view of the nation, and, instead, replaces it with ordinary people's living experience. For instance, Taylor fills his narrative with the description of a barber and a smith:

This gentleman not onely gave me harbor,

But in the morning sent me to his barber,
 Who lav'd, and shav'd me, still I spard my purse,
 Yet sure he left me many a haire the worse.
 But in conclusion, when his worke was ended,
 His glasse informd, my face was much amended.
 And for the kindnesse he to me did show,
 God grant his customers beards faster grow,
 That though the time of yeare be deeire or cheape,
 From fruitfull faces hee may mowe and reape.
 Then came a smith, with shoes, and tooth and nayle,
 He searched my horse hooves, mending what did faile,
 Yet this I note, my nagge, through stones and dirt,
 Did shift shoes twice, ere I did shift one shift: (Chandler 19)

Taylor focuses on the working ordinary people whom he met on his journey to Scotland.

Taylor's unique achievement in his travel accounts is insightfully pointed out by John Chandler:

Most important of all, perhaps, he [Taylor] was the first to publish
 topography for and about everyman. His Britain is populated not only by
 noblemen, courtiers and bishops, as Leland's seems to be; on every page
 of Taylor we are introduced to fishermen, innkeepers or labourers as well.
 He seems to have had the knack of engaging everybody, and in his pages
 everybody is brought to life. (ix)

Taylor was a natural writer who did not have any institutional education. Despite his lack of education, he was good at capturing the vivid life of common working people. As such, Taylor's travel was significant in that he elaborated the land as the living place of people for the first time.

Taylor's commitment to the living experience of ordinary working people renders his travel oriented for more practical purposes. Taylor's attention is often drawn to the issue of trade and development of trade routes. In his Penniless Pilgrimage to Scotland, Taylor's description is most vivid and noteworthy when he depicted the coal-mine managed by the Scotland nobleman, Sir George Bruce. Taylor entertains readers by his intriguing use of mock-epic. Taylor describes his visit of the underground mine as if an epic hero visits hell. The entrance of the mine, Taylor describes, is charged by three workers instead of "Cerberus," a dog that guarded the entrance to the underworld in epic (Chandler 36). In the dark mine, old and young people dig, delve, and labor, among whom there are some old women who resemble "furies or infernall hags" (36). But the mine-hell, Taylor says, is not like a tormenting hell, and it is a "pleasant, profitable hell" (36). Taylor's comparison of the mine with a hell is for humor and getting attention, not for any negative purpose:

Yet all I saw was pleasure mixt with profit,
Which prov'd it [the mine] to be no tormenting Tophet;
For in this honest, worthy, harmelesse hell,
There ne'r did any damned Divell dwell:
And th'owner of it gaines by't more true glory,

Then Rome doth by fantastick Purgatory. (Chandler 36)

Taylor glorifies the mine and applauds the nobleman's "worthy endeavours," which is to make tons of salt by pumping out sea water and exporting it to Germany after providing for domestic demand. The focus in Taylor's observation on the mine is "profit" and "working people." Taylor celebrates the mine that produces a great profit and provides employment for many poor people who otherwise would perish. In this manner, Taylor's travelogue illuminates the land as the place of production and profit, and encourages such way of development of the nation.

Taylor's several travels by river demonstrate his interest in developing internal trade and traffic. Taylor's Voyage to Salisbury (1623) was to investigate the possibility of revitalizing the navigation on the Christchurch Avon River for transporting goods and people. The voyage was to approve and enkindle the seventeenth-century's "enthusiasm for the improvement of rivers as an aid to commerce and a preservative of the highway" (LaMar 28). "Patents" were approved to "improve the navigability of the Avon between Bristol and Bath, to make the Soar navigable between Leicester and the Trent, and to make the Tone navigable from Bridgewater to Taunton" (LaMar 28). Taylor, in his account on his voyage on the Thames in 1632, advocates water travel over land travel for the reason of efficiency. He estimates that the work of one hundred horses and eight men can be replaced by only eight men's labor in a boat. Indeed, the Thames in that period was extensively used as the easiest way to reach various parts of London and other points beyond the city. Taylor's consideration of water travel shows us the increase of internal mobility and the development of a nationwide market system. For the

convenience of traders and travelers on the road, Taylor even published utilitarian handbooks. Taylor's Travels and Circular Perambulations (1636) presents a catalogue of taverns in London and ten counties in the south-east. The Carriers Cosmographie (1637) contains the information about “regular carrier service between London and all parts of the kingdom” (LaMar 19). These practical handbooks for travelers suggest that many efforts were made to expedite and accommodate goods and people on the move. Taylor was the person who greatly contributed to promoting the domestic mobility by his series of travel writing. Thus Taylor was the first vigorous domestic traveler who facilitated the imaginary process of envisioning the nation as an extended community.

2. John Taylor's Self-Representation as a Beggar

Taylor in his travel accounts employs the rhetoric of beggary and vagrancy to represent his life as a traveler. He dramatizes his beggar image by advertising and performing his travel as a simulation of beggar's journey. Taylor's first and longest domestic travel, later named his “*Penniless Pilgrimage*” was to walk to Edinburgh without money. He advertised his travel to the Scotland in the form of wager, by making people bet on whether he could succeed in his journey without spending money. Taylor, for that reason, literally experienced the beggar's life. To keep the promise of travelling as a beggar, Taylor had to rely on local people's hospitality and charity. Taylor was relatively lucky in finding generous people who provided lodging. The word about Taylor's journey was disseminated and the peculiarity of his travel made him a famous figure. In some localities, Taylor received all the attention of a town. People gathered in

a local inn and looked at Taylor with curiosity, as if he were “some monster sent from the Mogull,” “some elephant from Affricke,” or “some strange beast from th’ Amazonian queene.” But Taylor was not always lucky to find accommodation. In that case, he stayed on the road just like a beggar:

On Dunsmore Heath, a hedge doth there enclose
 Grounds, on the right hand, there I did repose.
 Wits whetstone, want, there made us quickly learne,
 With knives to cut down rushes, and greene fearne,
 Of which we made a field-bed in the field,
 Which sleepe, and rest, and much content did yeeld.
 There with my mother earth, I thought it fit
 To lodge, and yet no incest did commit:
 My bed was curtain’d with good wholesome ayres,
 And being weary, I went up no stayres:
 The skie my canopy, bright Phaebe shinde,
 Sweet bawling Zephirus breath’d gentle winde,
 In heav’ns starre chamber I did lodge that night (Chandler 14)

Taylor describes the night on the road as a delightful night enjoying mother nature.

Interestingly, Taylor’s description of his night reappears in his poem about a beggar.

Taylor wrote a poem on beggar’s life in “Praise, Antiquity, and Commodity of Beggerie, Beggars, and Begging by Taylor” in 1621, three years after he did his travel to Edinburgh. In that poem, Taylor discusses several aspects of the beggar’s life: their

hardship, happiness, origin, mobility, way of living, and their symbolic images. But in general, the poem romanticizes the beggar's life as the life close to nature. Taylor describes a beggar as nature's special protégé, just as he portrays himself in his journey to Scotland:

Heau'n is the rooffe that Canopies his [beggar's] head,
 The cloudes his curtaines, and the earth his bed.
 The Sunne his fire, the Starre's his candle light,
 The Moone his Lampe that guides him in the night.
 When scorching Sol makes other mortals sweat,
 Each tree doth shade a begger from his heat:
 When nipping Winter makes the Cow to quake,
 A begger will a Barne for harbour take,
 When Trees & Steeples are o're-turn'd with winde,
 A begger will a hedge for shelter finde: (Taylor, Works of John Taylor
 105)

Here it is easy to see that Taylor describes a beggar's life with the identical words with which he describes his night on the road. The similarity tells us that Taylor identified himself (or his traveling self) as a beggar who moves around the country. Taylor's note of beggar's mobility is worthy of special attention in the poem. He uniquely defines a beggar's vagrancy. Just as he presents a beggar's night on the road as a natural and happy life, Taylor asserts a beggar's wandering as a natural way of life:

A begger liues here in this vale of sorrow,

And trauels here to day, and there to morrow.

The next day being neither here, nor there:

But almost no where, and yet euery where.

He neuer labours, yet he doth express

Himself an enemie to Idlennesse.

In Court, Campe, City, Country, in the Ocean,

A beggar is a right perpetuall motion, [. . .] (Taylor, Work of John Taylor
109)

Taylor celebrates beggars' perpetual mobility by reasoning that their consistent movement makes them not idle. The beggar's idleness and their non-participation in productive acts were among the main reasons that they were harshly criticized and prosecuted. The beggar's persistent wandering was regarded, for a long period, as a serious social problem and apprehended as the sign of social and political mobility. Taylor revises such a long-held negative association with beggar's vagrancy in this poem. Taylor here denies the link between beggars and idleness, by saying that beggar's consistent mobility leads them not to be idle. Nothing can stop beggar's motion. He can be here today and there tomorrow, and he can be everywhere. Taylor thus defines a beggar as a "spatial" figure. By concluding that "a beggar is a right perpetuall motion," Taylor finally legitimates the beggar's perpetual spatial movement.

Taylor's poem on a beggar foreshadows Taylor's development of the trope of beggary in his travel writing. He adopts a beggar as his persona who narrates his travels. Every time when he made his travels, Taylor vigorously advertised his travels and

invited subscribers to his travelogues. For him, traveling was not only the means of pure enjoyment, but also a way of making his living. Taylor declares that his travel from London to the West in 1649 is for making money:

This long walke (first and last) I undertooke
 On purpose to get money by my booke:
 My friends (I know) will pay me for my paine,
 And I will never trouble them againe. (Chandler 224)

By selling his travel accounts Taylor earned a better standard of living than a regular waterman. Taylor's biographer, Bernard Capp, says that travel writing, among Taylor's diverse literary attempts, was the most successful one (86). Taylor "organized the distribution and sale of his work himself" (Chandler vii). As a waterman on the Thames who carried theater audiences, Taylor knew how to draw attention to the performance of his travel. Taylor distributed bills to make his travels known before he embarked on his travel. For instance, Taylor wrote a bill in 1649 in which he announces his travel to West country and appeals to subscribers for support. Taylor desperately seeks financial support, as we see in the following:

Old, lame and poor, by mad contentious beggerd,
 And round about with miseries beleaguerd:
 Too many masters made me masterlesse,
 Too many wrongs have made me monylesse,
 Helples, and hopeles, and remedillesse,
 And every way encompast with distresse.

To ease my griefes I have one trick of wit,
 (If you that read will set your hands to it:)
 Which is, when I do give you good account
 From London unto Cornewals Michaels Mount,
 Of all my journey, and what news I found
 In ayre, or sea, above, or under ground;
 When I do give you truths of this in print,
 How I did travell, gravell, dust, durt, flint,
 My entertainment, where twas good, where ill,
 Then (in good mony) give me what you will,
 Your, nams and dwellings, write that I may find you,
 And I shal (with my book) seek, find, and minde you,
 With humble thankes. (Chandler 222)

To promote the sale of his travelogue, Taylor dramatizes himself as a masterless, lame beggar who desperately needs charity givers. Taylor in this period might be compelled to depend on his meager resources, partly due to his allegiance to the royal party, so his use of beggary image reflected his living condition. Yet, Taylor adopts the image on purpose in order to induce subscribers' attention and to imitate the literary convention of asking patronage. Taylor seeks as many subscribers as possible who can buy his books. Taylor does not conceal his relationship with his customers; rather he publicizes it by making use of his text as the site in which he advances his reactions to and comments on his

customers. Taylor expresses his gratefulness to the subscribers who paid money for him, but harshly criticizes those who pledged money but did not keep their word:

For those that have payd, or can and will pay, I thanke them; for such as would if they could, or will when they can, I wish them ability to performe their wills for their owne sakes, and mine both: But for those that are able to reward me and will not, I will not curse them, though I feare they are almost past praying for. (Chandler 262)

Additionally, Taylor even published a pamphlet (A Kicksey Winsey: or A Lerry Come-Twang) in which he attempted to shame his debtors who refused to honor their pledge to pay for a copy of his travels. Taylor did not have any regret on his image as a vigorous seller of his writing.

In fact, Taylor's hilarious performance of traveling was another tool for attracting readers' attention as his travel to Edinburgh illustrates. Taylor advertised that he would walk to Scotland without money, and invited people to make a bet whether he could succeed or not. His travel on a paper boat in 1619 was another famous event that made his travel memorable. He made a voyage on the Thames in the boat made by brown paper and with the oars made of dried fish. Taylor departed London on Saturday July 24, and spend two nights afloat and landed at Queenborough, 40 miles down stream from London. It was "the briefest of Taylor's journeys and the silliest" (Chandler 54), but the journey attracted a vast audience. As such, his travel was a theatrical performance of beggary, by which he instigated readership and tried to promote subscription to his travel writing. Like William Kempe who made a "nine day's wonder"

with his walk from London to Norwich by dancing, Taylor enacted his beggary travel in the theatrical form on the stage of the countryside road, with the audience of countryside people.⁴ After all, Taylor's life-long commitment to traveling Britain embodied and enacted a beggar's "right perpetuall motion" that he glorifies in the poem on a beggar. Taylor assimilates a beggar's perpetual mobility into his destiny, by comparing himself to Sisiphus' stone which is doomed to roll forever.⁵

3. Diverse Modes of Travel in A Jovial Crew

Taylor's appropriation of the beggary theme, as we have seen in the earlier section, is one example that redefines beggar's vagrancy and transforms it into a safe metaphor of travel. Beggars' mobility is adopted to deal with travel in several other seventeenth-century texts. Wye Saltonskill describes a wandering rogue as a traveler: "He [a wandering rogue] stiles himselfe a traveler, and indeed it is thought if he had learning, he might make a good description of *England*, for hee knows all the highways, though not as at his fingers, yet his toes-end" (38-39). Thomas Middleton and William Rowley, base the plot of The Spanish Gypsy on the travel of gypsies. Ben Jonson in The New Inn focuses on a gentleman character who is curious about gypsies' nomadic life. The strong desire for the life on the road drives the gentleman to join gypsies and abandon all the duties he has. Richard Brome develops the same issue of travel to its full extent in A Jovial Crew: Merry Beggars. Brome highlights beggars' merry and happy life, and insinuates that their happiness comes from their way of nomadic life.

Brome in the prologue explains the circumstances of staging beggars' journey. The theaters, he says, had a trend of staging romances where "damsels and their squires" are "expos'd to strange adventures" (lines 17-18). Brome in his play replaces the unrealistic romance quest with the pilgrimage of beggars. It implies that beggar-characters are employed mainly because of their wandering and nomadic features. Indeed, the beggars' journey and traveling function as a central structure of the plot. The play begins with Oldrents' country manor house. With the arrival of a wandering beggars' group, his household encounters confusion and the dramatic tension is developed. Attracted by the beggars' traveling group, Oldrents' daughters, their gentlemen friends, and Oldrents' steward Springlove depart the manor house to join the beggars' journey. Brome presents several episodes on the life on the road in the middle part of the play. Eventually provincial officials apprehend the traveling group. The play closes with the play-within-the-play that the beggar group performs. The play the beggars act is about Oldrents and previous generation's history regarding wandering beggars. In this manner, Brome stages beggars as a prominent group in his play to employ beggars' vagrancy for the travel motif of the play.

Those who first discuss traveling in the play are Oldrents' two daughters and their gentlemen friends. Oldrents' daughters, Meriel and Rachel, are bored with their father's melancholic concern about their future. Oldrents' concern is intensified because he has heard a beggar-prophet's fortune-telling that his daughters will be beggars. Oldrents' daughters, who brood over the way to get out of their father's obsessive worry,

come to think about traveling. Oldrents' daughters and their gentlemen friends discuss possible traveling places:

VINCENT. We are for any adventure with you, ladies. Shall we project
A journey for you?

[.....]

Shall we make a fling to
London, and see how the spring appears there in the
Spring Garden; and in Hyde Park, to see the races, horse
And foot; to hear the jockeys crack and see the Adamites
Run naked afore the ladies?

RACHEL. We have seen all already there, as well as they, last year.

HILLIARD. But there ha'been new plays since.

RACHEL. No, no, we are not for London.

HILLARD. What think you of a journey to the Bath then?

RACEL. Worse than t'other way. I love not to carry my health
Where others drop their diseases. Theres no sport I'that.

VINCENT. Will you up to the hill top of sports, then, and merriments,
Dover's Olympics or the Cotswold Games.

MERIEL. No, that will be too public for our recreation. We would
Have it more within ourselves.

[.....]

HILLARD. What think you of a pilgrimage to St. Winifred's Well?

VINCENT. Or a journey to the wise woman at Nantwich, to ask if we
 Be fit husbands for 'em? (2.1.69-95)

These young people list several places worthy of visiting in the middle of seventeenth-century England. Some places are where they have already been. The young group's discussion about travel shows that traveling for pleasure and leisure was already relatively familiar in 1641. But Oldrents' daughters turn down those well-known places. Instead, they are drawn to the idea of free travel when they happen to observe the beggars' group. They envy the beggars who have "absolute freedom [. . .] to feast and revel here today, and yonder tomorrow, next day where they please, and so on still, the whole country or kingdom over" (2.1.18-21). They think that the beggars are happier than themselves, since they are "pent up and tied by the nose" in their father's house, when the beggars have "the air at pleasure in all variety" (2.1.9-12). Aspiring for freedom and pleasure, they join the beggars. But unlike their expectation, these young fellows find that the beggars' real life is not such an idealistic world as they have imagined. They often fail in securing food, and come to realize the "difference between a hard floor with a little straw, and a down bed with a quilt upon't" (3.1.77-79). Springlove, who accompanies the young group, recommends the beggary experience as an ordeal through which they can grow and mature. Springlove says that the travel is "worth your time in painful, woeful steps" (2.2.333) and that, then, it will be "meritous warfare" (2.2.329). Through the young people's journey, Brome presents travel as a rewarding experience, and validates it for young people to get maturity and expand their range of experience.

While Brome illustrates, on the one hand, the educational effect of traveling, he shows, on the other hand, how traveling can be an exotic and pleasant activity. For Springlove, another character who joins the beggars' journey, traveling, even in the beggar way, is an excitement and a temptation that he cannot turn down. He joins the beggars' wandering every spring when nature calls. As his name implies, Springlove has unflagging impulse to go out to wander and enjoy "shifting place and air" (1.1.213). Unlike the young group, Springlove knows the hardship of begging, but still he chooses to travel with beggars, since he feels certain pleasure from the life on the road. He compares himself to a bird ("a swallow in a cage" (2.1.180)) that always wishes to fly freely in the air, whose flying, unluckily, is delayed. As a steward to landlord Oldrents, Springlove has to get Oldrents' permission for his leave:

I cannot, sir, endure another summer
 In that restraint, with life; 'twas then my torment,
 But now, my death. (2.1.181-83)

Springlove asks an understanding from his master by telling how deeply the desire for travel controls himself. He has a uniquely strong wanderlust. Because of that instinct, Springlove says that he "must abroad," otherwise he feels he will "perish" (1.1.223).

The tension between Oldrents and Springlove around Springlove's travel foregrounds the idea of "home." What is interesting in Springlove's story is his account of Oldrents' manor house as the place of "death." He says that the house is, at best, a cage that restrains his freedom. It is not only Springlove, but also Oldrents' daughters who describe Oldrents' country house as a gloomy, melancholic, and listless place. Even

Oldrents himself admits that he is too melancholic in his house. Oldrents says, “Well, sir, I will be merry. I am resolv’d / To *force* my spirit only into mirth” (2.2.82-83 my italics). Given the fact that mirth is something that comes without any efforts or force, Oldrents’ efforts to become merry looks ludicrous and even pitiable. Oldrents sighs on his situation where his free spirit is confined:

What is an estate

Of wealth and power, balanc’d with their [beggars’] freedom,

But a mere load of outward compliment,

When they [beggars] enjoy the fruits of rich content?

Our dross but weighs us down into despair,

While their sublimed spirits dance I’th’ air. (2.2.185-90)

Oldrents attributes his despair to his “estate of wealth” and envies unpropertied beggars’ free spirits. Brome subtly uses the mechanism of feelings between Oldrents and beggars to highlight the vitality of the nomadic group. Beggars are presented as full of vitality, laughter, and life force. Several events occurring in beggars’ group give them full occasions for holiday. A beggar-woman gives a birth to a baby in the barn. A blind old female beggar weds an old male beggar. These beggars do not care about their condition. If they can find food and a barn, they are happy anywhere. They sing a song about their happiness:

Our bellies are full; our flesh is warm;

And, against pride, our rags are a charm.

Enough is our feast, and for tomorrow

Let rich men care; we feel no sorrow.

No sorrow, no sorrow, no sorrow, no sorrow.

Let rich men care; we feel no sorrow.

[.....]

Each city, each town, and every village,

Affords us either an alms or pillage.

And if the weather be cold and raw

Then, in a barn we tumble in straw.

If warm and fair, by yea-cock and nay-cock

The fields will afford us a hedge or a haycock. (1.1.341-53)

When hearing the beggars' song, Springlove can turn down "all doubts and fears" relating the journey and becomes inflated with its excitement. Brome, thus, presents Springlove's desire for travel as natural and acceptable. But for the endorsement of travel, Brome takes a risk of deprecating the values symbolized by "home." To approve Springlove's wanderlust, Brome abandons the ideology of home, the symbol of order and stability. When Springlove asks Oldrents' permission, he says that his wish is to be no longer a "home-man" (2.1.315). Onto that word, Springlove loads his value-judgement that it is worthless as well as joyless to stay within one's limited experience without opening one's eyes beyond the horizon. Brome, thus, illuminates two contrasting versions of spatial experiences ("home-man" and "bird") and endorses travel and its volatility.

In fact, Springlove's wanderlust is in his inborn nature, so it is hard for him to live as a "home-man." Springlove, who compares himself to a bird kept in a cage, was a beggar wandering on the road, before he was picked up by Oldrents. Oldrents took him to his house, and educated and employed him as his steward. But Springlove, who was born and lived on the road, feels that nomadic life as a beggar is his destiny operated by an "absolute power of nature" (1.1.168). He is continually governed by the irresistible impulse for traveling, and he feels he belongs to the flowing community of beggars. Whenever beggars visit the Oldrents' house, Springlove provides them a hearty charity and a great feast. As well as giving, Springlove is eager to join their feast and share their conviviality. Springlove puts an interesting analogy to tell how he is attached to beggars. He compares his fixation on beggars to usurers' fixation on gold. Springlove says in front of the barn where beggars sing about their festivity:

Most ravishing delight! But in all this
 Only one sense is pleas'd: mine ear is feasted.
 Mine eye, too, must be satisfied with my joys.
 The hoarding usurer cannot have more
 Thirsty desire to see his golden store
 When he unlocks his treasury than I
 The equipage in which my beggars lie. (1.1.356-62)

With such thrilling joy, Springlove opens the door of the barn. It is not only Springlove but also the beggars in the barn who are excited. The beggars heartily welcome and hail

Springlove as his master and king. And, as such, Springlove joins the beggary travel, after all.

But Brome in the end equivocates Springlove's identity as a beggar by elevating his status as Oldrents' son. The play within the play in the final scene represents Oldrents' family history. One beggar, Patrico, who knows the secret history of Oldrents' family, directs the play. Patrico exposes the seamy side of Oldrents' personal and family history. Oldrents' grandfather by wiles and crafts dispossessed the original landlord, who was Patrico's grandfather, of his estate. By its impact, Patrico's family was exposed to beggary. Patrico's sister, who also became a beggar, was loved by Oldrents and had his baby. The baby, born on the road without his father, was Springlove. With the discovery of his birth, Springlove becomes Oldrents' heir. In this way, Brome in the final act makes his play a variation of prodigal son play, in which a prodigal son is reformed and given his inheritance in the end. This ending seems to overturn what the play shows until the end. Oldrents' gloomy life resulting from his obsession with his property turns into a merry one. Oldrents regains his illegitimate lost son and, therefore, he no longer has to worry about his estate. Also, the ending blurs Springlove's attachment to beggars and his celebration of the pleasure of wandering. Why, then, did Brome conclude his play by revealing Springlove's birth origin and change his social status? Or is such an ending foreshadowed?

Here is the moment that class politics regarding travel is unmasked. Brome deals with the travel of the propertied class, although he represents it in the venue of beggars' life. Beggars in the play are idealized, and their life is romanticized. Their poverty is

evaporated, and only their mobility is highlighted in terms of free travel. Beggars celebrate their traveling life and invite Springlove and even the audience:

Come, come; away: the spring
 (By every bird that can but sing,
 Or chirp a note) doth now invite
 Us forth, to taste of his delight.
 In field, in grove, on hill, in dale;
 But above all the nightingale,
 Who in her swettness [sic] strives t'out-do
 The loudness of the hoarse cuckoo.
 "Cuckoo," cries he, "Jug, jug, jug," sings she,
 From bush to bush, from tree to tree,
 Why in one place then tarry we? (1.1.473-83)

When the beggars' life is defined in terms of *spatial* quality, their perambulation becomes something that can be simulated by the propertied. Brome appropriates beggars' wandering and vagrancy as the rhetorical means for celebrating the voluntary and temporary excursion. With the propertied class, Brome validates travel as a better option than the life of "home-man." Springlove tells Oldrents that his vagrancy is not for necessity but for pleasure: "Oh, sir, y'have heard of pilgrimages, and / The voluntary travels of good men" (1.1.207-8). Such kind of voluntary travel was only tolerated in the propertied class.

Overall, traveling in the early seventeenth century was motivated by diverse impulses, to explore unknown places and to expand political, economic, social boundaries. These diverse travelers' attempts were, in common, attracted by the idea that traveling, for pleasure or for practical purposes, was a symbolic act of expansion and a contribution to the nation's good. In that context, traveling was endorsed, and the traveler's wanderlust was romanticized. The seventeenth-century theaters staged a few more characters who have the same impulse of wanderlust. Ben Jonson presents a character who is preoccupied with curiosity in nomadism. Lord Frampful in The New Inn is a wealthy landlord, but deserts his settled life. He explains about his motivation in choosing vagrancy that he was "addicted to these savages [gypsies, beggars]" and wanted to "search their natures, and make odd discoveries" (5.5.99-100). Peregrine in Brome's The Antipodes has an obsessive desire for traveling to another world. When his desire is not satisfied, he lives in his imaginary world. The curiosity in other worlds and the spirit of adventure, reflected in those plays, were closely related to the seventeenth-century England's cultural exertions on expansion and exploration.

In such milieux, beggars' vagrancy was transformed into a neutral metaphor of geographical mobility, and many writers appropriated the beggary rhetoric to celebrate the cultural fantasy about spatial expansion. The beggars in the play sing:

Come away; why do we stay?

We have no debt or rent to pay.

No bargains or accounts or make;

Nor land or lease to let or take:

Or if we hand, should that remove us,
When all the world's our own before us,
And where we pass, and make resort,
It is our kingdom and our court. (1.1.484-91)

Brome transforms a perpetually wandering beggar into an image of conqueror. Beggars can go anywhere, and they can claim any land that they can reach as their kingdom. All the world is beggars' land, when they pass and claim theirs. Here Brome, on these beggar-emperors, projects the seventeenth-century Englishmen's aspirations for spatial expansion and possession. In this light, beggars' vagrancy in the Jacobean and Caroline period is given different significance from that of the Elizabethan age. If Elizabethans distorted beggars' images by demonizing their vagrancy, Jacobeans and Carolines appropriated and exploited beggars' mobility for their rhetorical purpose to celebrate geographical mobility.

Notes

¹ Taylor referred to Coryate several times in his travel accounts, like “Coriatizing” here. “Coriatizing” means Thomas Coryate’s style of describing the exotic. Taylor was conscious of Coryate’s traveling and his popularity, and might have wished to compete with him. Coryate’s walk to Italy was a well-known contemporary event, and Taylor’s walk to Edinburgh could be partly influenced by his example.

² Helgerson discusses the Elizabethan cartographic development in relation to the notion of nationalism that, Helgerson argues, emerged during the period. See “The Land Speaks” in his seminal work Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England.

³ McRae discusses the generic feature of chorography in relation to gentry and their property concern in the chapter titled “Chorography: the view from the gentlemen’s seat” of his book God Speed the Plough: the Representation of Agrarian England, 1500-1660.

⁴ William Kempe was one of the Elizabethan comic actors of high reputation. He was greatly “applauded for his buffoonery, his extemporal wit, and his performance of the Jig” (Dyce v).

⁵ Taylor writes:

Like to the stone of Sisiphus. I roule
 From place to place, through weather faire and foule,
 And yet I every day must wander still
 To vent my bookes, and gather friends good will. (Chandler 238)

In Greek mythology, Sisiphus was given the afterworld punishment of continually rolling a stone to the top of a hill, whence it always rolled down again.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this study, I have examined the representation of beggars and vagrants in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. By challenging the assumption that envisions the early modern discourse of vagrancy in terms of the “Elizabethan underworld,” this study has demonstrated that the Elizabethan discourse of roguery and vagrancy was adopted, revised, and appropriated by Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline playwrights. Harman’s discourse of vagrancy establishes the critical view of the vagrant poor by catering to the cultural enmity against theatricality and imposture. By illustrating and overlapping the image of the vagrant poor with an actor who performs a different identity for gain, Harman argues that the wandering vagrant is nothing other than a walking theatrical spectacle that targets innocent people’s money. This discourse of vagrancy and roguery was the cultural environment in which early modern theaters developed. In the discussion of the acting beggars represented in the seven plays that date from the early 1570s to the closing of playhouses in 1642, I have demonstrated that the early modern players developed their profession-consciousness by grappling with, negotiating, and, finally, appropriating the discourse of vagrancy and roguery.

Besides the theatrical ramifications of the discourse of vagrancy, I have analyzed how three seventeenth-century plays foreground the issue of vagrancy and beggary with a different focus in successive historical periods. In King Lear Shakespeare challenges the unfair representation of vagrants in the literary and legal discourses of vagrancy.

Through Lear, Edgar, and Gloucester, who go through symbolic experiences of vagrancy, the play evokes the hard reality of the wandering poor, and opens up a new horizon to understand the issue of vagrancy and beggary. Lear's realization of the vagrancy issue concurs with the expansion of his spatial experience and his disillusionment with his monarch-centered landscape. Thus, the play explores the spatial politics of the discourse of vagrancy. Harman's discourse of vagrancy is again adopted in Beggars' Bush, but the beggars' community is imbued with the Jacobean cultural fantasy of colonial expansion and plantation. The play reflects the early seventeenth-century historical context that the development of overseas enterprise provided the solution for vagabondage and poverty, and helped to lower anxiety about vagrants. A Jovial Crew moves further in transforming Harman's discourse of vagrancy. Vagrants' nomadic and volatile life, which was denounced in the Elizabethan discourse of vagrancy as the synecdoche of social disorder, is re-appreciated and employed as a rhetoric to represent the cultural aspirations to spatial expansion. Brome represents a new version of the discourse of vagrancy, in which vagrancy is re-defined and neutralized into a safe metaphor of travel. With the discussion of these three seventeenth-century plays, I have demonstrated how the Elizabethan discourse of vagrancy transformed in the early Stuart period.

Despite the diverse images and representations of the vagrant poor, however, the vagrants and rogues were, in real life, largely the poor who could not find stable work due to the aggravated economic condition. Beier finds the Elizabethan vagabond's modern counterpart in the unemployed of the great Depression:

The Elizabethan vagabond bears little resemblance to the down-and-outs, often middle-aged alcoholics, of the early 1960s in Britain; nor was he at all like the drop-outs involved in counter-cultures later in that decade. If masterless men have modern counterparts, they are the unemployed of the great Depression of the 1930s, or the jobless millions of today's inner cities. (3)

Beier here asserts that Elizabethan vagabondage was an economic and social phenomenon in elaborating several factors that caused the extensive unemployment: population increase, a series of harvest failures and famine, enclosure, and changes in land management. In such circumstances of economic depression, as Fumerton notes, the vagrants were, rather, a larger group of lower subjects that encompassed itinerant laborers, servants, apprentices, and poor householders whose occupations and lives were subject to change at any moment. The wandering vagrants were, thus, simply the flowing surplus wage-laborers who migrated to look for a job. Some vagrants had diverse jobs, which were temporary ones that did not require special skills. As Thomas Spickernell's life illustrates, shifting several careers was the characteristic of the nomadic poor. When he was questioned by a town magistrate in 1594, Spickernell said that he was "somtyme apprentice to a bookebynder; after, a vagrant pedler; then, a ballet singer and seller; and now, a minister and alehouse-keeper in Maldon" (qtd. in Fumerton 206). As such, most of the vagrants shifted their jobs and places, and wandered in search of work and home. Hence, the vagrants' volatile and turbulent life on the road was only the symptom and result of the social and economic problems that the Elizabethan society

had. As Slack remarks, “the majority of vagrants were less willing and less comfortable occupants of the no man’s land between criminality and respectability” (97).

Yet the discourse of vagrancy dominant and influential in the Elizabethan period, that was proliferated by Harman and consolidated by the Vagabond Acts, often distorted the realities and images of the vagrant poor. In fact, the Elizabethan discourse of vagrancy served to uncover the society’s incapacity to handle economic problems, and transferred the responsibilities of social economic problems to each individual vagrant. The “terror of the tramp,” Tawney summarizes as the cultural condition of the sixteenth century, reflects the material condition that could not accommodate the plethora of the wandering poor, who were the product of several economic factors (146). The legislation on vagabondage in particular functioned as the means to justify Elizabethans’ anxiety and enmity about the vagrant poor. Thus, the demonic image of vagrants represented in the Elizabethan discourse should be understood not as a transparent reference to reality but as a cultural signifier to indicate social semiotics and to reflect the cultural psychology conceived in economic depression.

With the shift of economic condition in the seventeenth century, therefore, the discourse of vagrancy transformed and diversified. The development of overseas companies in the Stuart age invited and employed the surplus wage-laborers in their ventures, and the Stuart government endorsed this use of vagrants with the “transplantation” policy. The Stuart government’s resolution on vagabondage and utilization of vagrants’ labor helped to change the demonic image of vagrants. While Harman’s image of vagrants resided, it was blended with and transformed by a romantic

image of vagrants.¹ Beggars' freedom to move was celebrated to promote adventures, explorations, and travels. With the emerging interest in colonial expansion and domestic trade, vagrants' mobility and volatility was validated as the trope of the Stuart age imbued with the expansive spirit.

After all, the multiple texts in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries evince the shifting and diverse cultural attitudes to the unemployed and vagrant poor during that period. Despite different images, however, beggars and vagrants throughout functioned as the medium in which the society projected the society's anxiety and aspirations, and constituted the "imaginary repertoires of the dominant culture" (Stallybrass 6). Thus the discourse of vagrancy and beggary, although it relates to the marginal and peripheral group, on the contrary, helps us to envision the hegemonic culture and the confluence of diverse interests and values contested in the early modern England.

Notes

¹ The romantic image of the vagrants in the seventeenth century, to some extent, was the revival of the medieval image of beggar, which was suppressed and abandoned with the emergence and dominance of the critical view on beggars as idling caterpillars.

WORKS CITED

- Allderidge, Patricia. "Management and Mismanagement at Bedlam, 1547-1633." Health, Medicine, and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century. Ed. Charles Webster. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979. 141-64.
- Andrews, Kenneth R. Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Avery, Bruce. "Gilded Continents and Plenteous Rivers: Cartography as Rhetoric in Shakespeare." Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama. Ed. John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1998. 46-62.
- Awdeley, John. The Fraternity of Vagabonds. 1561. Kinney 85-102.
- Aydelotte, Frank. Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds. Oxford Historical and Literary Studies Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1913.
- Beer, George Louis. The Origins of the British Colonial System 1578-1660. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Smith, 1959.
- Beier, A. L. Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560-1640. London: Methuen, 1985.
- . The Problem of the Poor in Tudor and Early Stuart England. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.

---. The Profession of Player in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.

Berger, Harry. Making Trifles of Terrors: Redistributing Complicities in Shakespeare. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997.

Bradbrook, Muriel C. The Rise of the Common Player: A Study of the Actor and Society in Shakespeare's England. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

Brayton, Dan. "Angling in the Lake of Darkness: Possession, Dispossession, and the Politics of Discovery in King Lear." English Literary History 70 (2003): 399-426.

Brenner, Robert. Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Breton, Nicholas. The Good and the Bad; or, Descriptions of the Worthies and Unworthies of This Age. London, 1616.

Brome, Richard. The Antipodes. Three Renaissance Travel Plays. Ed. Anthony Parr. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

---. The Court Beggar. Five New Plays. London: Humphrey Moseley, 1653.

---. A Jovial Crew. Ed. Ann Haaker. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1968.

Brown, Alexander. The Genesis of the United States. Boston: Houghton, 1890. 2 Vols.

Bruster, Douglas. Drama and the Market in the Age of Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Cain, Tom. "John Donne and the Ideology of Colonization." English Literary Renaissance 31 (2001): 440-76.

- Capp, Bernard. The World of John Taylor the Water Poet 1578-1653. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Carroll, William C. Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.
- Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1923. 4 vols.
- Chandler, John, ed. Travels through Stuart Britain: The Adventures of John Taylor, the Water Poet. Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1999.
- Chapman, George. The Blind Beggar of Alexandria. 1598. The Plays of George Chapman. Ed. Thomas Marc Parrott. Vol. 1. New York: Russell, 1961.
- Clay, C. G. A. Economic Expansion and Social Change: England 1500-1700. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Coward, Barry. The Stuart Age England, 1603-1714. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1980.
- Day, John, and Henry Chettle. The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green. 1659. Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama. Ed. W. Bang. Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1902.
- Dekker, Thomas. The Belman of London. 1608. The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. Vol. 3. New York: Russell, 1963. 5 vols.
- . Lantern and Candle-light. 1608. Kinney 207-60.
- Dionne, Craig and Steve Mentz, ed. Rogues and Early Modern English Culture. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2003.
- Donne, John. The Sermons of John Donne. Ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson. Vol. 4. Berkeley: U of California P, 1959. 10 vols.

- Drayton, Michael. "Ode to the Virginian Voyage." The Works of Michael Drayton. Ed. J. William Hebel. Vol. 2. Oxford: Shakespeare Head P, 1932. 363-64.
- Dyce, Alexander. Kemps Nine Daies Wonder: Performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich. London: Nichols, 1840.
- Flahiff, Frederic T. "Lear's Map." Cahiers Élisabéthains 30 (1986): 17-33.
- Fletcher, John. Beggars' Bush. The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976. 225-362.
- Fumerton, Patricia. "London's Vagrant Economy: Making Space for 'Low' Subjectivity." Material London, ca. 1600. Ed. Lena Cowen Orlin. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. 206-26.
- Gaby, Rosemary. "Of Vagabonds and Commonwealths: Beggars' Bush, A Jovial Crew, and The Sisters." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 34 (1994): 401-24.
- Gillies, John. "The Scene of Cartography in King Lear." Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain. Ed. Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 109-37.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, et al, eds. The Norton Shakespeare. New York: Norton, 1997.
- Greene, Robert. The Black Book's Messenger. 1592. Kinney 187-206.
- . A Notable Discovery of Cozenage. 1591. Kinney 155-86.
- Gurr, Andrew. The Shakespearian Playing Companies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Hakluyt, Richard. The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffics & Discoveries of the English Nation: Made by Sea or Over-Land to the Remote and Farthest Distant

Quarters of the Earth at Any Time Within the Compass of These 1600 Years.

Glasgow: J. MacLehose and sons, 1903-05. 12 vols.

Halpern, Richard. The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

Harman, Thomas. A Caveat for Common Cursitors Vulgarly Called Vagabonds. 1566.
Kinney 103-54.

Hawkes, Terence. Meaning by Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 1992.

Helgerson, Richard. Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England.
Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992.

Ignatieff, Michael. The Needs of Strangers. New York: Viking Penguin, 1984.

Ingram, W. The Business of Playing: The Beginnings of the Adult Professional Theater in Elizabethan London. Ithaca: 1993.

Jackson, Ken. "‘I know not / Where I did lodge last night?’: King Lear and the Search for Bethlem (Bedlam) Hospital." English Literary Renaissance 30 (2000): 213-40.

Johnson, Robert C. "The Transportation of Vagrant Children from London to Virginia, 1618-1622." Early Stuart Studies: Essays in Honor of David Harris. Ed. H. S. Reinmuth. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1970. 138-46.

Johnson, Robert. Nova Britannia. London, 1609. rpt. Tracts. Ed. Peter Force. Vol. 1. 27-28.

- Jones, Howard Mumford. "The Colonial Impulse: An Analysis of the 'Promotion' Literature of Colonization." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. 90 (1946): 131-61.
- Jonson, Ben. The New Inn. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984.
- Judges, A. V., ed. The Elizabethan Underworld. 2nd ed. New York: Octagon, 1964.
- Kaufmann, R.J. Richard Brome, Caroline Playwright. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.
- Keenan, Siobhan. Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Kinney, Arthur, ed. Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars: A New Gallery of Tudor and Early Stuart Rogue Literature. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1990.
- Koch, Mark. "The Desanctification of the Beggar in Rogue Pamphlets of the English Renaissance." The Work of Dissimilitude: Essays from the Sixth Citadel Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Literature. Ed. David G. Allen and Robert A. White. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1992. 91-104.
- Kozintsev, Grigorii, dir. King Lear [Korol' Lir] Lenfilm, 1971.
- Kristeva, Julia. Revolution in Poetic Language. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.
- LaMar, Virginia A. Travel and Roads in England. Washington D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1960.
- Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes, eds. Stuart Royal Proclamations. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973. 2 vols.
- . Tudor Royal Proclamations. New Haven: Yale UP, 1969. 3 vols.

- Lenz, Joseph. "Base Trade: Theater as Prostitution." English Literary History 60 (1993): 835-55.
- "London's Lottery." The Pepys Ballads. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1929. 24-31. 8 vols.
- Marcus, Leah S. Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- McMullan, John L. The Canting Crew: London's Criminal Underworld, 1550-1700. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1984.
- McRae, Andrew. God Speed the Plough: The Representation of Agrarian England 1500-1660. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- . "The Peripatetic Muse: Internal Travel and the Cultural Production of Space in Pre-Revolutionary England." The Country and the City Revisited: England and the Politics of Culture, 1550-1850. Ed. Gerald Maclean, Donna Landry, and Joseph P. Ward. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 41-57.
- Middleton, Thomas. The Mayor of Queenborough. 1616. Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queenborough. Ed. R. C. Bald. London: Scribner's, 1938.
- . Michaelmas Term. A Mad World, My Masters and Other Plays. Ed. Michael Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.
- . The Spanish Gypsy. The Works of Thomas Middleton. Ed. A..H. Bullen. Vol. 6. London: John C. Nimmo, 1885. 8 vols.
- More, Thomas. Utopia. Ed. Robert M. Adams. New York: Norton, 1975.

- Morgan, Victor. "The Cartographic Image of 'The Country' in Early Modern England"
Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. 29 (1979): 129-54.
- Mowat, Barbara A. "Rogues, Shepherds, and the Counterfeit Distressed: Texts and
Infracontexts of The Winter's Tale 4.3." Shakespeare Studies 22 (1994): 58-76.
- Muir, Kenneth. Ed. Introduction. King Lear. London: Methuen, 1972. xiii-lviii.
- Mullaney, Steven. The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance
England. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.
- Mun, Thomas. England's Treasure by Foreign Trade. 1664. Fairfield, New Jersey:
Kelley, 1986.
- Munday, Anthony. The Downfall of Robert, Earle of Huntington, Afterward Called
Robin Hood of Merry Sherwood: With His Love To Chaste Matilda, the Lord
Fitzwater's Daughter, Afterwards His Fair Maid Marian 1601. The Huntington
Plays: A Critical Edition of the Downfall and the Death of Robert, Earl of
Huntingdon. Ed. John Carney Meagher. New York: Garland, 1980.
- Neill, Edward D. Early Settlement of Virginia and Virginiola. Minneapolis, 1878.
- Norden, John. England; An Intended Guyde for English Travailers. London: Edward
All-de, 1625. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1979.
- Northbrooke, John. Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine Playes, or Enterludes. 1577.
- Parker, John. Books to Build an Empire: a Bibliographical History of English Overseas
Interests to 1620. Amsterdam: Israel, 1965.
- Parkes, Joan. Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century. 1925. Oxford: Clarendon,
1968.

- Peacham, Henry. The Worth of a Penny. 1647.
- Pound, John F. Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England. London: Longman, 1971.
- Rabb, Theodore K. Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.
- Reynolds, Bryan. Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2002.
- Rid, Samuel. The Art of Juggling. 1612. Kinney 261-92.
- Roberts, Peter. "Elizabethan Players and Minstrels and the Legislation of 1572 against Retainers and Vagabonds." Religion, Culture, and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson. Ed. Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 29-55.
- Salgãdo, Gãmini, ed. Cony-Catchers and Bawdy Baskets. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- . The Elizabethan Underworld. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.
- Saltonskill, Wye. Picture Loquentes. 1631. Oxford: Blackwell, 1946.
- Shakespeare, William. 2 Henry VI. Greenblatt 203-90.
- . King Lear. Greenblatt 2307-2554.
- . Timon of Athens. Greenblatt 2245-2306.
- . The Winter's Tale. Greenblatt 2873-2954.
- Sharpe, J. A. Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1999.

- Sidney, Philip. An Apology for Poetry; or, The Defence of Poesy. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. London: Nelson, 1965.
- Singman, Jeffrey L. Robin Hood: The Shaping of the Legend. Westport: Greenwood, 1998.
- Slack, Paul. The English Poor Law, 1531-1782. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- . Poverty & Policy in Tudor and Stuart England. London: Longman, 1988.
- Smith, John. Description of New England. 1616. The Complete Works of Captain John Smith Ed. Philip L. Barbour. Vol. 1. Williamsburg: U of North Carolina P, 1986.
- Somerset, Allan. "How Chances It They Travel?" Provincial Touring, Playing Places, and the King's Men." Shakespeare Survey 47 (1994): 45-60.
- Spurgeon, Caroline. F. E. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. 1935; reprint Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1968.
- Stallybrass, Peter. "Worn Worlds: Clothes and Identity on the Renaissance Stage." Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture. Ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 289-320.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. The Politics and Poetics of Transgression. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.
- Stevenson, Laura. Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Sullivan, Garrett. Jr. The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.

- Tawney, R. H. The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century. 1912. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Taylor, E. G. R. Late Tudor and Early Stuart Geography 1583-1650. London: Methuen, 1934.
- . Tudor Geography 1485-1583. London: Methuen, 1930.
- Taylor, John. John Taylor's Wandering-London to the West Country. Chandler 219-40.
- . A Late Weary, Merry Voyage. Chandler 241-58.
- . The Penniless Pilgrimage to Scotland. Chandler 1-52.
- . "The Praise, Antiquity, and Commodity, of Beggary, Beggars, and Begging." 1621.
The Works of John Taylor, the Water-Poet. 1630. New York: Franklin. 105-112.
- . The Praise of Hemp-Seed. Chandler 53-60.
- . Taylor on Thame Isis. Chandler 129-50.
- . Taylor's Travels. Chandler 205-18.
- . A Very Merry Wherry-Ferry-Voyage. Chandler 61-94.
- Thirsk, Joan. The Agrarian History of England and Wales Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- Thomas, Philip V. "Itinerant, Roguish Entertainers in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Norwich" Theater Notebook 52 (1998): 118-29.
- True Chronicle History of King Leir and His Three Daughters, Gonorill, Ragan, and Cordella. Ed. Donald M. Michie. New York: Garland, 1991.
- Walker, Gilbert. A Manifest Detection of Diceplay. 1552. Kinney 59-84.

Warren, Roger. "The Folio Omission of the Mock Trial: Motives and Consequences."

The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of *King Lear*. Ed.

Gary Taylor and Michael Warren. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983. 45-57.

Wheatley, Henry B. London Past and Present: A Dictionary of Its History, Associations, and Traditions. Vol. 1. London: John Murray, 1891. 3 vols.

Whitbourne, Richard. A Discourse and Discovery of New-Found-Land. 1620.

Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm, 1971.

White, Paul Whitefield, and Suzanne R. Westfall, eds. Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Wilson, Robert. The Three Ladies of London. A Selection Collection of Old English Plays. 4th ed. Ed. W. Carew Hazlitt. New York: Blom, 1964.

Woodbridge, Linda. Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature.

Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2001.

VITA

Mi-Su Kim
 Sanbon-dong Eulgi Apt. 623-1701
 Gunpo-si, Kyeonggi-do, 435-040
 Republic of Korea

Education

Ph.D. (2004): English, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
 M.A. (1992): English, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea
 B.A. (1990): English, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea.

Presentations

Paper titled “Beggary Romance, the Idea of Travel and Nation in A Jovial Crew” at the annual conference of the Renaissance Society of America (April 11-13, 2002)

Paper titled “Divided in Three, but a Third More Opulent: Lear’s Affective Mapping” at the Ohio Shakespeare Conference organized with the theme “The Nature of Shakespeare” (March 1-3, 2001)

Paper titled “Building Empire with a Roaming Hero in Cymbeline” at the conference “Shakespeare 2001,” the 34th Annual Texas Tech University Comparative Literature Symposium (February 15-17, 2001)

Professional Experience

Research Assistant, Texas A&M University, 2003 -- 2004

Assistant Lecturer, English 104, Composition and Rhetoric, Texas A&M University, 2002 -- 2003

Teaching Assistant, English 104, Composition and Rhetoric, Texas A&M University, 2001 -- 2002.

Non-Teaching Assistant, Grading, Shakespeare on Film, Texas A&M University, 2001

Non-Teaching Assistant, Grading, Shakespeare, Texas A&M University, 2000

Non-Teaching Assistant, Grading, American Literature from Civil War to Present, Texas A&M University, 1997 -- 2000