LMU LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

DISSERTATIONEN DER LMU

UB

54

KATRIN BAUER

"For the World is broad and wide"

Intercultural Encounters as Dramatic Negotiations of Early Modern Globalisation in Selected Plays by William Shakespeare

OLMS

Katrin Bauer

"For the World is Broad and Wide"
Intercultural Encounters as Dramatic Negotiations of Early Modern Globalisation in Selected Plays by William Shakespeare

Dissertationen der LMU München

Band 54

“For the World is Broad and Wide”

Intercultural Encounters as Dramatic Negotiations of Early Modern Globalisation in Selected Plays by William Shakespeare

Inauguraldissertation
zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie
an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

vorgelegt von
Katrin Bauer
aus München
2022

Erstgutachter: Prof. Dr. Tobias Döring
Zweitgutachter: Prof. Dr. Enno Ruge
Datum der mündlichen Prüfung: 15.02.2021

“For the World is Broad and Wide”

Intercultural Encounters as Dramatic Negotiations of Early Modern Globalisation in Selected Plays by William Shakespeare

von
Katrin Bauer

OLMS

UB | Universitätsbibliothek
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Eine Publikation in Zusammenarbeit zwischen dem **Georg Olms Verlag** und der **Universitätsbibliothek der LMU München**

Mit **Open Publishing LMU** unterstützt die Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München alle Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler der LMU dabei, ihre Forschungsergebnisse parallel gedruckt und digital zu veröffentlichen.

Georg Olms Verlag AG
Hagentorwall 7
31134 Hildesheim
https://www.olms.de

Erstveröffentlichung 2022
Zugleich Dissertation der LMU München 2021

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet abrufbar über http://dnb.d-nb.de

Open-Access-Version dieser Publikation verfügbar unter:
http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bvb:19-295160
https://doi.org/10.5282/edoc.29516

ISBN 978-3-487-16183-9

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Abbreviations

Shakespeare's plays and poems

1H4	Henry IV, Part 1
1H6	Henry VI, Part 1
2Gents	Two Gentlemen of Verona
2H4	Henry IV, Part 2
2H6	Henry VI, Part 2
3H6	Henry VI, Part 3
Ado	Much Ado about Nothing
Ant	Antony and Cleopatra
AWW	All's Well that Ends Well
AYL	As You Like It
Cor	Coriolanus
Cym	Cymbeline
Err	The Comedy of Errors
H5	Henry V
H8	Henry VIII
Ham	Hamlet
JC	Julius Caesar
John	King John
Lear	King Lear
LLL	Love's Labour's Lost
Luc	The Rape of Lucrece
Mac	Macbeth
MM	Measure for Measure
MND	A Midsummer Night's Dream
MoV	The Merchant of Venice
Oth	Othello
Per	Pericles
R2	Richard II
R3	Richard III
Rom	Romeo and Juliet
Shrew	The Taming of the Shrew
Temp	The Tempest
Tim	Timon of Athens
Tit	Titus Andronicus
TN	Twelfth Night
TNK	The Two Noble Kinsmen
Tro	Troilus and Cressida
Wiv	The Merry Wives of Windsor
WT	The Winter's Tale

Other abbreviations

Ap. Rhod. Argon.	Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica
Apollod. Bibl.	Apollodorus, The Library
BF	Jonson, Bartholomew Fair
Caes. B.G.	Caesar, De Bello Gallico
DFA	Marlowe, Doctor Faustus, A-Text
Eur. Hipp.	Euripides, Hippolytus
Eur. Med.	Euripides, Medea
FQ	Spenser, The Faerie Queene

Hdt.	Herodutus, Historia
Hol. Chron.	Holinshed, Chronicles (2nd edition 1587)
Hom. Il.	Homer, Iliad
JM	Marlowe, The Jew of Malta
Jord. Get.	Jordanes, Getica
KnT	Chaucer, The Knight's Tale
Liv.	Livy, Ab urbe condita
Mon. Hist.	Monmouth, Historia Regum Britanniae
OCD	Oxford Classical Dictionary
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
Ov. Met.	Ovid, Metamorphoses
Plut. Vit. Thes.	Plutarch, The Life of Theseus
Res. Ges.	Augustus, Res Gestae Divi Augusti
Sp. Trag.	Kyd, The Spanish Tragedy
SV	Fletcher and Massinger, The Sea Voyage
Tac. Agr.	Tacitus, Agricula
Verg. Aen.	Vergil, Aeneid

Quotes of Shakespeare's plays are taken from The RSC Shakespeare. Complete Works. eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. Houndsmill: Macmillan, 2007, with the exception of the six plays with which this thesis is mainly concerned: Tit, MND, MoV, Oth, Cym, and Temp.

The original orthography of the sources has been preserved except for the long ſ, which has been consistently changed to s for ease of reading. The Latin sources are cited in their English translation with the original passage in Latin given in a corresponding footnote. Quotations from Greek sources are only given in their English translation.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help of so many incredible people. First and foremost, I want to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Tobias Döring, who has supported and encouraged me throughout this project. He has been a huge inspiration to me ever since my first seminar with him during my undergraduate studies back in 2011 and I feel honoured to have been able to work with him on this project. I am immensely grateful for his continued belief in and enthusiasm for this thesis. I also want to thank my second supervisor Prof. Dr. Enno Ruge for his generous assistance and feedback and my amazing colleagues Bettina Vitzthum, Kathrin Härtl and Irmtraud Huber, who have always been there to help and support me.

Furthermore, I want to express my deep and sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. John Jowett, Prof. Dr. Ewan Fernie, and Dr. Martin Wiggins as well as the entire staff and students of the Shakespeare Institute in Stratford-upon-Avon, where I was able to work on and refine my thesis during my research visit. I felt truly welcomed and the thought-provoking conversations both on and off campus have inspired me so much. Thank you to Aiofe O'Rourke as well as Elizabeth Jeffrey and the rest of our Team SI Skype group, who have kept me focused and motivated through the lockdown and beyond.

Special thanks go to my wonderful proofreaders Judith Bauer, Christiane Lehner, Mary Davies, Beth Sharrock, and Sara Marie West, whose insightful comments and feedback have helped me tremendously with focusing and strengthening my arguments in this thesis. Above all, I am eternally grateful to my family, to whom this thesis is dedicated. Without their love and support, none of this would have been possible and I would not be who I am today.

1 Introduction

(1) Helena: For you, in my respect, are all the *world* (*MND* 2.1.224)
(2) Falstaff: [B]anish plump Jack, and banish all the *world* (*1H4* 2.4.350)
(3) Jaques: All the *world's* a stage (*AYL* 2.7.142)
(4) Cloten: Britain's / A *world* by itself (*Cym* 3.1.12–13)
(5) Coriolanus: There is a *world* elsewhere (*Cor* 3.3.159)
(6) Miranda: O brave new *world* (*Temp* 5.1.183)
(7) Friar Lawrence: Be patient, for the *world* is broad and wide (*Rom* 3.3.17)

The term *world* is used a total of 679 times in the complete works of William Shakespeare; that is an average of 18 times per play.[1] It appears as a figure of speech to describe how much somebody is in love with another character as in Helena's quote from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1) or as Falstaff uses it to claim how important he is to Prince Hal (2). It is also used as a metaphor for the *Theatrum mundi* that was hugely popular on the early modern stage. This concept is, as Tobias Döring has pointed out, a figure of reflection which can be read in two directions: "Das Theater ist die Welt, und die Welt ist ein Theater" (Döring 2020: n/a). Jacques's comment (3) is one of the most cited and most famous expression of this idea. While the slightly altered form of this, *totus mundus agit histrionem* has become the legendary motto of the new theatre that Shakespeare and his company built in 1599, it was never actually inscribed above the entrance of the theatre (cf. Döring 2020: n/a). Yet, the idea behind it is still reflected in the name they gave it: *The Globe*.

The last four quotes with which I opened this introduction illustrate how the term *world* is used in a more literal context. They showcase notions about the actual geography of the plays in which they are uttered. Cloten, one of the antagonists of *Cymbeline*, proudly proclaims the idea of what would today be referred to as 'British Exceptionalism'

1 Based on the concordance search of the Open Source Shakespeare for each of the plays, see Appendix I.

(4), whereas Coriolanus, by contrast, rejects this idea for the Rome he lives in (5). Both quotes reflect the position of a nation in the wider context of the world around them. Miranda's famous exclamation (6) and Friar Lawrence's statement (7), which also provides the title for this thesis, both allude to the fundamental changes in how people in the early modern period were thinking about the world.

Friar Lawrence's evaluation of the world as "broad and wide", in particular, would have corresponded very closely with the lived experience during a period that has often been termed the 'age of discovery' and which saw a significant increase in knowledge about the rest of the world as people started to look

> outwards from home, undertook long voyages, and sought out people of distant lands […] thereby form[ing] ideas which have become foundational to modern mentalities, including race, ethnicity, nation, and the nature of humanity itself (Bailey, Diggelmann, and Phillips 2009: 9).

With the introduction of the printing press with moveable types, these ideas could be spread more easily and reach more people more quickly. Even though many of the terms used in this context are highly controversial in modern historical and political discourses,[2] the fact remains that the world Shakespeare and his contemporaries lived in was radically different from that of their grandparents. In 1571, when Shakespeare turned seven, Spain established Manila as a trading post, connecting for the first time Asia and the Americas. In 1578, Francis Drake embarked from Plymouth on his expedition which would take him around the world in two years. During Shakespeare's lifetime, cultural encounters increased significantly not only among European nations, but between Europe and the Atlantic and, more slowly, Pacific worlds.

2 It rightfully seems difficult to 'discover' whole continents where people have already lived for centuries. As the protests across the world in 2020 have shown again, the results of this Eurocentric view have been the discrimination of minority voices as well as systemic oppression and racism. I am still using these terms because I am interested in the notions Shakespeare's early modern audience in London would have had of the world around them, which necessarily requires taking a Eurocentric view of the issue of globalisation, another controversial term that I am going to discuss later in this introduction.

Writing for an early modern audience that became increasingly aware of the wider world around them, beyond the confines of the country or even town in which they lived, Shakespeare capitalises on this interest in the new 'discoveries' and ideas by negotiating these processes of early modern globalisation in his plays. The worlds he puts on the stage are more than just a "decorative scheme intended to foster an emblematic conception of the theatre as a microcosm, a theatre of the world" (Wilson 2016: 32). Neither are the settings just more or less "thinly disguised cover[s] for Shakespeare's England" and about "matters of local and domestic concern dressed in exotic costume" (both Holderness 2010: 2). Instead, the plays' settings evoke a variety of different geographies and meanings and become the locus of various encounters between different cultures. As I am going to explore in this thesis, these encounters are central to the understanding of the plays since they are examples of the various ways in which the playwright and his audience are influenced by and, in turn, participate and help shape the discourses of globalisation in the early modern era.

1.1 Terminology

This thesis sets out to map the influence of processes of globalisation on six plays by William Shakespeare by examining the intercultural encounters between representatives of the Self and the Other at the heart of these plays. Most of the terms used in the previous sentence merit closer discussion as they do not necessarily have commonly accepted definitions despite their ubiquity. Before I outline the procedure and methodology of this thesis, therefore, I want to begin by defining those key terms and establish the definitions underlying my exploration of Shakespeare's plays.

The central dichotomy of *Self* and *Other* fulfils an important role in the plays I analyse in this thesis. Both terms are central categories of postcolonial theory which "deals with the effects of colonization on cultures and societies" (Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin [3]2013: 204). This theory was originally used with a "clearly chronological meaning" (both Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin [3]2013: 204) that was later extended to include "historical, political, sociological and economic analyses" (Ashcroft,

Griffith and Tiffin [3]2013: 205). Postcolonial theory reads the creation of the Other as "a means of establishing the binary separation of the colonizer and colonized and asserting the naturalness and primacy of the colonizing culture and world view" (Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin [3]2013: 186). The Other in this context becomes "crucial in defining what is 'normal' and in locating one's own place in the world" (Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin 32013: 186). The various ways in which Shakespeare's plays portray the several cultural, religious, and racial Others that take part in the intercultural encounters at their core, therefore, also reveal a lot about the Self that encounters them. As a consequence, the seemingly straightforward dichotomy of *Self* and *Other* become increasingly complicated.

The concept of a representative of the Self encountering the Other is by no means a new idea. It is present in various forms in Ancient Greek and Roman mythology, medieval romances as well as religious texts. There have been cultural encounters and literature about them for centuries before Shakespeare was even born. Yet, the quality of these encounters appears to be somewhat different when we look at how they are represented in the Renaissance period. By locating the encounters not in some distant realm beyond the boundaries of the known world but at the very centres of power, the plays I am going to focus on in this thesis negotiate important processes of globalisation and pose important questions about early modern England and its role in the wider world around it.

Accordingly, the key concept of my thesis is the *encounter*, which comes in many different forms as their portrayal changes throughout Shakespeare's career as a playwright. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *encounter* as "a meeting with (a person or thing), esp. undesignedly or casually" and "a meeting (of adversaries or opposing forces) in conflict" (*OED*, s.v. *encounter*). This second meaning, as well as the word's etymology from Latin via Old French, constitute the word's original meaning in English as "hostile meetings or violent clashes, particularly on fields of battle" (Bailey, Diggelmann, and Phillips 2009:1). But it was also used from the early modern period onwards in the more neutral connotation of 'meeting'. Shakespeare uses it in both senses throughout his plays (cf. *Open Source Shakespeare*, s.v. *encounter*). Following Lisa Bailey, Lindsay Diggelmann, and Kim M. Phillips, I am going to use the term in its

broader meaning in this thesis to describe the various ways in which Shakespeare's plays depict responses to encounters with a cultural Other:

> 'Encounter' best expresses this diversity. Encounters may be voluntary, or forced. The parties may be on an equal footing, or representative of profound inequities. Handled badly, or with ill intent, encounter can result in diplomatic incidents, shows of aggression, or violence on a grand scale. Handled well, or with an attitude of enquiry rather than condescension, it can be transformative. While encounters often serve primarily to form a sense of unity or selfhood in opposition to 'Others', at other times they offer opportunities to gain knowledge or to take pleasure in difference (Bailey, Diggelmann, and Phillips 2009: 2).

This broad category also aligns with what Mary Louise Pratt has defined as "contact zones" (1991: 34). Her term describes "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (Pratt 1991: 34). Taking the long view on how the plays construct both their encounters and their contact zones, therefore, allows for meaningful comparisons between the different interactions between the Self and the Other in the plays and how they would have been perceived by Shakespeare's audiences.

The plays' portrayals of these encounters, so one of the main arguments of this thesis, are shaped by early modern processes of globalisation. While the term 'globalisation' has become, in the words of Manfred Steger, "*the* buzzword of the 1990s" and "has remained a hot topic" (both [4]2017: 1) since then, it still merits closer attention as well. As "a reality and not just a concept", it is something that "every person has to deal with in one way or another, in their everyday life as well as in their comprehension of the world and the way that they choose to act in it" (both Gills and Thompson 2006: 5). Since its emergence in the 1930s, however, globalisation has been used indiscriminately and often times confusingly as a label for "a process, a condition, a system, a force, and an age" (Steger [4]2017: 11) respectively. In short, globalisation has become an umbrella term in modern discourses

> to describe a variety of economic, cultural, social, and political changes that have shaped the world over the past 50-odd years, from the much celebrated revolution in information technology to the diminishing of national and geo-political boundaries in an ever-expanding, transnational movement of goods, services, and capital (Guttal 2007: 523).

This definition confirms that we tend to think of globalisation as a modern phenomenon because its effects have been more pronounced and happening at an accelerated pace in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. But globalisation also "names a condition as ancient as the experience of empire and diaspora, of nations and the states they create" (Bosman 2010: 285). The early modern period, in particular, can be seen as the first era where we can speak of globalisation in the modern sense of the word:

> globalization occurred when all heavily populated land masses began sustained interaction in a manner that deeply linked them all through global trade. Global trade emerged when (1) all heavily populated land masses began to exchange products continuously – both directly with each other and indirectly via other land masses – and (2) they did so in values sufficient to generate lasting impacts on all trading partners (Flynn and Giráldez 2006: 235).

As Dennis O. Flynn and Antonio Giráldez argue, this 'global trade' in a sustained manner began when the Spanish founded their trading outpost in Manila in 1571 (cf. 2006: 235). The profound impact of this early modern globalisation, they argue, can be seen in the "ecological and demographic consequences [which] reverberated in multiple directions throughout planet earth once the Americas were brought into the mix" (2006: 236).

The early modern period, therefore, is the first stage of Europe's widespread and systemic engagement with the wider world around them. For early modern England, however, these do not yet reflect coordinated colonial policies:

> For if the English were already dreaming of empire by the late sixteenth century, those dreams had neither a definitive shape nor a discernible purchase on reality, which was being improvised overseas, venture by venture (Bartels 2008: 46).

So while the "debates about religious, cultural, and bodily difference" that were generated during sixteenth and early seventeenth century have profoundly shaped "the development of racial thinking over the next 400 years" (both Loomba 2002: 4), many of the devastating developments that accompanied England's colonial expansion particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such as chattel slavery and the systemic exploitation of the colonised countries, were not yet manifested or at least not to their full destructive extent in Shakespeare's time. When discussing the various intercultural encounters in the plays selected for this thesis, then, it is important to avoid reading them with these later developments already in mind.

Additionally, I am less interested in the political and economic sides of globalisation even though these have been the driving force in most of the endeavours of the early modern period. What I want to focus on instead is the aspect of globalisation that is at its core "about shifting forms of human contact" (Steger [4]2017: 12). When European explorers returned from their journeys to the 'New World', they brought with them not merely "new staple crops, such as potatoes, sweet potatoes, maize, and cassava" as well as "[l]ess calorie-intensive foods, such as tomatoes, chili peppers, cacao, peanuts, and pineapples […] [that] are now culinary centerpieces in many Old World countries" (both Nunn and Quian 2010: 163). More importantly for the purpose of this thesis, they also came back with new knowledge about the world and its inhabitants. In this context, Roland Robertson's highly influential definition of globalisation as a process of simultaneous "compression of the world and […] intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole" (Robertson 1992: 8) seems particularly useful. By expanding the scope of the term beyond its purely economic interest, Robertson opens up the possibility to examine the different ways in which processes of globalisation have influenced Shakespeare's plays and their reception as they were performed on the stage in early modern London.

This influence does not translate directly into representation in the plays. Objectively, none of his plays are set outside of the 'Old World'. In this, Shakespeare is not alone. Looking at early modern plays in general, Laurence Publicover observes a "surprising dearth of early modern English plays set in the New World" (2017: 2). As Gavin Hollis shows, there is also "no extant English play of the early modern period [that] is set in the Americas until 1658" and only a "few plays make transatlantic trade and colonization central to their plots or even subplots" (both 2015: 2). But despite the lack of direct representations of early modern 'discoveries' in the plays' settings, the plays nonetheless express considerable interest in them as negotiations of early modern processes of globalisation and the effect they have on the daily lives of people at home.

Accordingly, Shakespeare's settings evoke a rich tableau of associations and connections that would have influenced how an early modern audience would have perceived the intercultural encounters at the heart of the plays. Lawrence Publicover has suggested the term *dramatic geography* as a possibility to interpret the geographic spaces presented on the early modern stage as "both multiple and mutable" places that "could accrue highly symbolic and intertextual meanings" (2017: 3). The plays' settings, he argues, are simultaneously "haunted by other locations, and more specifically by those of previous dramas" (Publicover 2017: 3) as well as affected by "the location within which it was performed or the kinds of playgoers before whom and with whom it was created" (Publicover 2017: 4). So while the plays discussed in this thesis except for *Cymbeline* are set in the Mediterranean, their dramatic geography also always evokes early modern England and the context of English engagements with the wider world around them. Through their dramatic geography, the plays negotiate issues that were important for Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Stephen Greenblatt has coined the term *oblique angle* for this technique of "speaking in code, addressing at one or more removes what most mattered to them" (2019: 3). By staging intercultural encounters between the Self and Other and setting them elsewhere, Shakespeare's plays, therefore, also raise questions about English national identity and early modern England's place in an increasingly globalised world.

1.2 Methodology and Selection of Plays

This thesis explores six plays by William Shakespeare: *Titus Andronicus*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice, Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Tempest*. The selected plays were written between the early 1590s and the early 1610s, thus covering not only most of Shakespeare's career as a playwright but also two monarchs with different attitudes towards foreign policy and both successes and failures of English explorations of the world. They also include comedies, tragedies, and romances[3] to show how their genre has – or rather does not have – an effect on how the intercultural encounters are presented.

The selected plays have at their core intercultural encounters between representatives of the European Self and the Other from different cultures and religions. In earlier examples from classical antiquity and the Middle Ages, these take place at the margins of the known world where the hero of the story travels to in order to fight an existential threat to the status quo before returning home mostly unchanged by the encounter. In Shakespeare's plays, by contrast, the Other is no longer geographically and ideologically distant. Due to this sudden proximity, the Other can unfold its subversive power in the encounter with the Self to its full effect. Since these encounters play a central role in understanding the plays and the cultural work they perform, they have already been discussed in research on various occasions such as Peter Hulme's *Colonial Encounters* (1986) and Geraldo De Sousa's *Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters* (1999) to name but two of the most influential examples.

What distinguishes my approach from these and similar investigations is that I trace a historically determined development in my reading of these encounters. By analysing the plays in chronological order based on the most likely year in which they were written and first performed given in Martin Wiggins's *Catalogue of British Drama*, I want to trace how they reflect the processes of globalisation to which they react and of which they are also an integral part. In the course of Shake-

3 Romance is not a traditional genre of Shakespearean drama. The Folio files *Temp* under the comedies, while *Cym* is listed as a tragedy. Both plays, however, are nowadays usually categorised as a *romance* and I am going to treat them as belonging to this separate genre in this thesis.

speare's career as a playwright, I argue, we can identify three distinct phases in the way these encounters are staged in the plays. These phases are defined by the directionality of the central movement that the parties involved in these encounters produce: *transgression*, *presence*, and *reversal*. The development of the portrayal of these encounters reflects, so the central argument of this thesis, the socio-cultural discourses of the time when the plays were written and thus allows insight into specific negotiations with the processes of globalisation.

The chapter TRANSGRESSION: FROM THE OUTSIDE IN analyses two early Shakespearean plays. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Titus Andronicus* portray the transgressions into the centre of power by representatives of the ultimate Other for the Roman Empire and ancient Athens respectively. But, as I am going to argue in this chapter, the supposed opposition between the Self and the Other is not as clear as the parties involved make it out to be. The plays' portrayal of the encounters showcases the subversive potential of the Other that is no longer geographically remote. In doing so, the plays already indicate the blurring of the boundaries between the seemingly clear distinction between the Self and the Other that will become more pronounced in later chapters.

The second chapter deals with the aftermath of the initial transgression of the Other. IN PRESENCE: CO-EXISTENCE AT THE CENTRE, I examine examples of intercultural encounters, where the Other has already been present in the society of the Self for a long time. Accordingly, both *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* initially present their audiences with a co-existence of the Self and the Other that seems profitable for all parties involved. Yet, as the plays progress, they also show that this shared community is only possible as long as everybody involved abide by the rules that guarantee this mutually beneficial relationship. What the intercultural encounters in these two plays ultimately reveal is the fundamental hypocrisy that is initially hidden beneath the professed tolerance of the Other. This eventually leads to a failure of the shared community to the detriment of everybody involved.

The final chapter INVERSION: FROM THE CENTRE TO THE MARGIN is devoted to the late romances *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*. The relationship between the Self and the Other becomes more complicated as the directionality of the traditional transgressive movement

is reversed and the transgression takes place from the centre of power to its periphery. The locus of the central encounters is the realm of the Other: the Roman colony of Britain in *Cymbeline* and on Ariel and Caliban's island in *The Tempest* respectively. Furthermore, the characters transgressing are no longer representatives of the Other but members of what Shakespeare's audiences would have perceived as the society of the Self. By staging intercultural encounters that invert and complicate the patterns established in the previous chapters, both plays also subversively undermine the distinction between Self and Other.

In my readings of these plays, I am taking a *New Historicist* approach, which analyses the plays in their historical context and with reference to the various sources that may have shaped how the plays portray the intercultural encounter between the Self and the Other. My aim in this is not to argue for particular sources that Shakespeare would have used or to trace specific verbal influences on his plays. Rather I want to apply this contextual knowledge to the plays themselves in order to work out what Shakespeare's early modern London audiences could have reasonably known about the various topological and thematic allusions made in the plays. This knowledge in turn would then have influenced how they would have reacted to the intercultural encounters at the heart of these plays. I am interested in exploring how their attitudes towards other cultures would have influenced their understanding of individual characters, their relationships, and the plays in general. How are the various representatives of the Other presented in the encounters in the selected plays by William Shakespeare on the early modern stage? What do these encounters reveal about early modern English ideas of their own identity? How do they evolve over the course of Shakespeare's career as a playwright? In answering these questions, this thesis aims to offer close readings of the intercultural encounters portrayed in the six plays. In doing so, I want to illustrate how the plays are affected by early modern discourses of globalisation and how they in turn also contribute to them as well as to show how Shakespeare's portrayal of these encounters and the various parties involved in them reflects attitudes that were prevalent during his time.

2 Transgression: From the Outside In

Let me begin my exploration of the development of the intercultural encounters in Shakespeare's plays by looking at two of his early plays that are seldomly discussed in the context of early modern globalisation: *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. At first glance, these plays seem markedly different. On the one hand, we have *Titus Andronicus*, which is one of Shakespeare's most gory tragedies. While immensely popular during Shakespeare's lifetime,[4] it has since been the subject of "several centuries of *Titus*-bashing" (Friedman and Dessen 2013: 5), to the extent of some critics even denying Shakespeare's authorship of the play:

> I have been told by some anciently conversant with the Stage, that it was not Originally his, but brought by a private Author to be Acted, and he only gave some Master-touches to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters; this I am apt to believe, because 'tis the most incorrect and indigested piece in all his Works; It seems rather a heap of Rubbish then a Structure (Ravenscroft 1687: n/a).

On the other hand, we have *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, arguably "the Shakespeare play most widely circulated across the globe: not only in direct translations [...] but in cultural translation into many social contexts and theatrical idioms" (Chaudhuri 2017: 1–2). Despite some unfavourable criticism such as Samuel Pepys's famous verdict calling it "the most insipid ridiculous play" (Pepys [1662] 2005: n/a), Shakespeare's magical comedy has remained hugely popular with scholars, theatre-makers, and audiences alike.[5] Overall, *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* "*dream world of flying fairies, contagious fogs and moonlight revels*" *(Bridge Theatre 2019: n/a) does indeed* seem a far cry from *Titus*

4 Ben Jonson references *Tit* alongside Thomas Kyd's highly influential *Sp. Trag.* in the Induction of *BF* as "the best plays", at least for in the eyes of those "whose judgment shews it is constant, and hath stood still these five and twenty or thirty years" (*BF* 182).

5 In a *YouGov* poll from April 2016, *MND* ranked third most popular, cf. Dahlgreen 2016: n/a, while Shakespeareances 2020 lists *MND* as most performed Shakespeare play with 175 productions since 2012, cf. Minton 2020: n/a.

Andronicus, which is traditionally regarded as "Shakespeare's most immature work in its overly sensational emphasis on violence and bloodshed" (Karim-Cooper 2019: 1).

Yet, the plays share several significant similarities: both are set in the capital cities of a major empire of classical antiquity;[6] both take place after an important military operation that eventually results in a political marriage; both feature a daughter's refusal to marry her father's suggested candidate; and both have at their heart an intercultural encounter where representatives of an Other (are forced to) transgress from the outside into the heart of power. In doing so, they challenge the status quo and reveal fundamental flaws in the society they encounter. The Other in these plays ceases to be geographically and ideologically remote as the encounters occur within what Kathryn Schwartz has called "conventional structures", i.e. "places that, politically, socially, and erotically, matter" (Schwartz 2000: 18). This transgression from the outside in has a profound impact both on the Other and the society where these encounters take place.

Both Athens and Rome would have been well known to Shakespeare and his audiences as the two main centres of power of classical antiquity. Similarly, the Amazons and the Goths would have been firmly established as the ultimate Other by the ancient Greek and Roman societies respectively. Additionally, all parties involved in these intercultural encounters become highly topical in the early modern period.

In the following, I am going to look at the early modern associations with the Goths and the Amazons as well as the ancient Romans and Greeks. Where do they come from? How do they influence and evolve in Early Modern discourses of globalisation? Shakespeare's "bouncing Amazon" (*MND* 2.1.70) and "warlike Goths" (*Tit* 1.1.560) embody many

6 The terms 'Athenian Empire' or 'Delian League' are traditionally used to describe Athens during the fifth century BCE (Low 2008: 3) although neither term would have been used historically. For a full discussion of the applicability of the term 'empire' for Athens, see Low 2008: 9–12. The term 'Roman Empire' typically refers to both "the government of Rome under Augustus, the first Roman emperor, and his successors" and "the lands governed by the Romans at any time from about the third century bc, when her power began to expand beyond the Italian peninsula" (both Howatson 2011, s.v. Roman Empire).

elements of their classical predecessors and combine these with important issues in the context of England's increasingly global ambitions.

2.1 Titus Andronicus

Titus Andronicus, to quote Barbara Antonucci, is "[c]ertainly one of the most tantalizing and least digestible of Shakespeare's plays" (2009: 119). But the play offers a great wealth of intercultural encounters and lays the groundwork for several themes that are explored in more detail in Shakespeare's later plays (and this thesis) because it puts on stage more than one representative of the Other: not only the queen of the Goths and her three sons but also an entire army of Goths transgress from the outside into the Roman Empire. The intercultural encounters produced by these transgressions have a profound effect on the characters involved in them and on the society where they take place despite the fact that most of the characters engaged in these encounters do not survive the play.

Given the central role of the Goths for the play and its intercultural encounters, the comparative lack of interest in these characters as a cultural Other seems somewhat puzzling. If the topic of Otherness in *Titus Andronicus* is addressed at all, the focus is usually on Aaron, who as a Moor stands out as the more visible example.[7] Tamora's role is mostly read in terms of her female Otherness in the context of gender studies and the discussion of "the widespread cultural unease about female unruliness that marked the sixteenth century" (Carney 2014: 415).[8] Accordingly, she has been variously associated with "the many classical tyrants or vengeful women the play invokes, including Semiramis and Hecuba" as well as "with Shakespeare's current monarch, Elizabeth I […]" or "Catherine de Médici […] whose legendary status as archetypal wicked queen had already gathered currency in her own life time" (Carney 2014: 415). But Tamora plays an important part as a cultural Other as well. She is both the queen of the Goths and eventually

7 See e.g. Karim-Cooper 2019, which contains three articles about Aaron but none about Tamora or the Goths: Kunat 2019: 89–110, Brown 2019: 111–133, and LaPerle 2019: 135–156.
8 See also Kehler 1995: 317–332 who reads Tamora as the archetype of the lusty widow.

also the Roman empress. As such, she is at the heart of the intercultural encounters of the play. Yet, this aspect of her role in the play has so far received very little attention. In this, Tamora is treated similarly to Hippolyta in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, whose role as Amazonian queen and personified Other for ancient Greek society too has been long neglected. While Hippolyta only has a relatively small part, Tamora has substantially more lines with 257 lines which make hers the fourth largest part in the play after Titus (711), Aaron (357), and Marcus Andronicus (329) (cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a).

The Goths who accompany Lucius Andronicus when he returns to Rome during the final act have been widely overlooked as well.[9] In contrast to them, the Romans and the "amorphous view of Rome and the seemingly haphazard arrangement of classical allusion" (Harries 2018: 194) in the play have received a lot of attention. The main reason appears to be that, as Naomie Conn Liebler argues, *Titus Andronicus* "challenge[s] [its] readers to trace its sources" (1994: 264). Accordingly, critics "who have rightly resisted consigning [the play's Rome] to an entirely fictional status [have] produced a bricolage Roman context patched together out of various bits of literary and historical lore" (Liebler 1994: 264).

In the following, I want to look at what associations Shakespeare and his audiences would have had with the Goths and the Romans at the heart of the play. As mentioned, both become highly topical in the early modern period. By framing its intercultural encounters between seemingly 'civilised' Romans and 'barbarous' Goths both in recourse to classical sources and early modern discourses of globalisation, I want to argue, the play negotiates issues of national identity and the nation's role in the wider context of the increasingly globalised world of the early modern period.

9 The notable exceptions are Kliger 1952 and Broude 1970. Bate also briefly addresses the role of the Goths as cultural Other in the introduction to the Arden edition but points out that his passages are very much indebted to those earlier texts, cf. ²2018: 18.

2.1.1 Rome

As becomes clear almost from the outset, the Rome of *Titus Andronicus* is not a haven of civilisation and order. As a "composite of the many things Elizabethans thought about Rome and their relationship to it" (Harries 2018: 210), the dramatic geography of Rome is presented here as highly ambivalent. It introduces a Roman Empire "in terminal decline, torn apart by contradictions within its governing ideology" (Chernaik 2011: 62). Unlike Shakespeare's other Roman plays, it does not reflect a historically specific moment but rather "a kind of canon-defining survey of Latin literary history" (Teramura 2018: 891) and ideas associated with ancient Rome.

The tragedy opens with the Roman Empire in a state of crisis. Not only are the Romans engaged in a war with the Goths that has already lasted for ten years and has claimed the lives of many of its citizens, including 21 of the 25 sons of the titular character (cf. *Tit* 1.1.82–87). The death of the emperor has also left Rome with a dangerous power vacuum. His two sons, Saturninus and Bassianus, are trying to take advantage of this precarious situation and are gathering their supporters to "[p]lead [their] successive title with [their] swords" (*Tit* 1.1.4). In short, the Rome of *Titus Andronicus* is "already contaminated and fragmented before the encounter with otherness, represented metaphorically by the Goths" (Golinelli 2009: 137).

The four parties involved in the election of the new emperor – Saturninus and Bassianus, as well as Marcus Andronicus and Titus Andronicus – represent different traditions and stages in the history of Rome: Saturninus, who addresses only Rome's "Noble patricians" (*Tit* 1.1.1), bases his claim on being "his first-born son that was the last / That wore the imperial diadem of Rome" (*Tit* 1.1.5–6). This appeal to patriarchal primogeniture aligns him with the last Roman king, Lucius Tarquinius Superbus. This connection is made even more explicit later in the play: Lucius openly compares Saturnius and Tamora to "Tarquin and his queen" (*Tit* 3.1.299) when he promises to revenge the wrongs done to his family by them (cf. *Tit* 3.1.297–300). In doing so, they explicitly align him with Tarquinius's "reign of terror" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*,

s.v. Tarquinius Superbus), which eventually led to his deposition in 509 BC as well as the end of the monarchical system in Rome.

According to Livy, one of the main sources for the transition into the early Republic, Tarquinius "did not have the right to rule beyond the power that he could do so without the decree of the people or the authority of the senators" and "had to defend his rule through fear because he had no hope for the love of his people" (both *Liv*. 1.49, my translation).[10] Writing several centuries after the events he describes, Livy paints Tarquinius as a ruthless tyrant whose actions force the virtuous Romans to oppose his rule and eventually depose him (cf. *Liv*. 1.59–60). When Livy then turns to describe the "now free Roman people" and their "deeds in peace and war, the annual magistrates, and the sovereignty of their laws which is more powerful than men", he again reminds his readers that "the previous king's pride had made this liberty more pleasant" (all *Liv*. 2.1, my translation).[11] That Saturninus puts himself in the tradition of Tarquinius as well as that of "the wicked emperors described in Suetonius and Tacitus" (Bate ²2018: 20) characterises him as a threat to Roman values from the beginning. At several instances throughout the play, this becomes even more obvious when Saturninus is directly referred to as "king" by various characters. Tamora (cf. *Tit* 2.3.259, 2.3.304 and 4.4.80) and Aaron's uses (cf. *Tit* 2.2.47, 2.2.206 and 3.1.155) of this historically loaded term could at least to some extent be explained by them being outsiders and unfamiliar with Roman history.[12] But when Bassianius and Lavinia threaten to expose Tamora's relationship with Aaron to Saturninus, they use the term as well even though they should be aware of its problematic connotations and its historical significance (cf. *Tit* 2.2.82–87).

10 "neque enim ad ius regni quicquam praeter vim habebat, ut qui neque populi iussu neque auctoribus patribus regnaret. Eo accedebat ut in caritate civium nihil spei reponenti metu regnum tutandum esset".

11 "Liberi iam hinc populi Romani res pace belloque gestas, annuos magistratus, imperiaque legum potentiora quam hominum peragam. Quae libertas ut laetior esset proxumi regis superbia fecerat".

12 Earlier in the play, Tamora tells Saturninus that "Rome reputes [ingratitude] to be a heinous sin" (*Tit* 1.1.453), which suggests at least some familiarity with Roman customs, see also chapter 2.1.3.

Additionally, Lavinia's claim in this scene that Saturninus is a "Good king" (*Tit* 2.2.87) – if indeed she is serious here[13] – is not supported by the play at all. The first scene of the play already hints at Saturninus's lacking moral suitability for the empery:

> Tribunes, I thank you, and this suit I make
> That you create our emperor's eldest son,
> Lord Saturnine, whose virtues will, *I hope*,
> Reflect on Rome as Titan's rays on earth
> And ripen justice in this commonweal.
> Then, if you will elect by my advice,
> Crown him and say "Long live our emperor."
> (*Tit* 1.1.227–233, my emphasis).

Having been away for ten years, Titus is hardly in a position to properly judge Saturninus's character: "for all his valiant actions on behalf of the state, [Titus] lacks the wisdom to recognize the nature of the political system or possibly of the character of the actors within it" (Harries 2018: 198). He insists on following the primogeniture even when faced with evidence that suggests that Saturninus might not be the best choice for the position (cf. *Tit* 1.1.207–211). This puts him at odds with the Roman ideals he claims to be defending (cf. *Tit* 1.1.196–200). By choosing Saturninus mainly because he is "our emperor's eldest son" (*Tit* 1.1.228) and only being able to "hope" (*Tit* 1.1.229) that he will be a good emperor, "Titus maintains the Roman soldier's patriotic belief that right, virtue, and action exist conterminously at the base of the state's greatness" (Harries 2018: 198). Yet, as the rest of the play will show, this is no longer the case for the Rome to which Titus has returned.

Unlike Saturninus, Bassianus at least includes all Romans in his appeal calling on "Romans, friends, followers, favourers of my right" (*Tit* 1.1.9) and cites various elements of the *virtus Romana* as his qualifications for the empery:

13 Given Saturninus's behaviour prior to this scene, Lavinia's attribute does not really make sense as a sincere evaluation of his rule but could instead be an attempt to re-establish the dichotomy between the "good" Romans and the "[l]ascivious" (*Tit* 2.2.110) Goths.

> Keep then this passage to the Capitol,
> And suffer not dishonour to approach
> The imperial seat, to virtue consecrate,
> To justice, continence and nobility;
> But let desert in pure election shine,
> And, Romans, fight for freedom in your choice (*Tit* 1.1.12–17).

The concept of *virtus* is, as Catalina Balmaceda writes, "one of the most important ideas that made up the Roman set of values" (2017: 14). The term is derived, as Cicero claims in his *Tusculan Disputations*, from the word *vir* 'man' (cf. *Cic. Tusc. Disp.* 2.43). It originally referred to manly virtues like courage and fortitude which Cicero calls "man's peculiar virtue" with "two main functions, namely scorn of death and scorn of pain" (both *Cic. Tusc. Disp.* 2.43).[14] Eventually, it "came to mean good qualities in general – courage being only one of them" (Balmaceda 2017: 19) as well as "moral excellence" (Balmaceda 2017: 24). By appealing to his countrymen's sense of honour and courage, Bassianus seems to fit more easily into the traditional association of Rome with "goodness, civilization and order" (Broude 1970: 27).

Yet, even though Bassianus advocates a "pure election" (*Tit* 1.1.16), implying an election that is "free from consideration of primogeniture" (*Tit* 1.1.9–17 FN), the first thing he, too, highlights is his lineage from the deceased emperor: "Bassianus, Caesar's son" (*Tit* 1.1.10). This is the only instance in the entire play where the title "Caesar" is used and as such, inevitably evokes the Roman dictator[15] Julius Caesar. As Shakespeare later dramatises in his play of the same name, he was killed because several senators feared that he wanted to become a king like Tarquinius. Shakespeare draws attention to this parallel when Cassius reminds Brutus of his namesake's role in the deposition of Tarquinius:

14 "viri autem propria maxime est fortitudo, cuius munera duo sunt maxima mortis dolorisque contemptio".

15 Dictator here is used as the official term for the position that Julius Caesar held in the Roman Republic. The dictator was a magistrate who was given special powers by the consuls and the senate in order to deal with a military crisis. The position was usually limited to the duration of six months, see *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. *Dictator (Roman official)*.

> There was a Brutus once that would have brooked
> Th'eternal devil to keep his state in Rome
> As easily as a king (*JC* 1.2.165–167).

The Brutus referenced in this quote is Lucius Junius Brutus. In Livy's story, he vows to avenge Lucrece after she has killed herself because she had been raped by Tarquinius's son:

> 'By this blood, which was most chaste before it was royally violated', he said, 'I swear and make you, gods, my witnesses, that I will pursue L. Tarquinius Superbus with his accursed wife and all his progeny of children with the sword, with fire, and lastly with whatever strength I possibly can and that *I will suffer neither him nor anyone else to rule as king in Rome*' (*Liv*. 1.59, my translation and emphasis).[16]

Despite the aversion to kingship apparent in Roman writing of the Republic and also later during the Principate, Bassianus deliberately aligns himself with this tradition by evoking the images of Caesar and Tarquinius. His reference to Rome with the attribute "royal" (*Tit* 1.1.11), which derives from the Latin word *rex* 'king' (cf. *OED*, s.v. 'royal' and 'regal'), further underlines this fundamental similarity between the two brothers.

The central role Marcus Andronicus plays in the election of the next emperor further complicates the political situation in this Roman Empire. As a "tribune of the people" (*Tit* 0.6), he is able to assert and defend the will of the people against the pretensions of the emperor's sons (cf. *Tit* 1.1.20–24 and 1.1.49–66) – at least for a brief moment.[17] Historically, this is the function he would have played in the Roman Republic where the plebeian tribunes were created as an institution to better represent the common people. According to the ancient Greek historian

16 "'Per hunc,' inquit, 'castissimum ante regiam iniuriam sanguinem iuro, vosque, di, testes facio me L. Tarquinium Superbum cum scelerata coniuge et omni liberorum stirpe ferro, igni, quacumque denique vi possim, exsecuturum nec illos nec alium quemquam regnare Romae passurum'".

17 Saturninus's immediate recourse to threats of violence when he thinks that Marcus Andronicus could simply create Titus as the new emperor as well as his interruption of Titus reveal that he probably would not have accepted any choice but himself as the next emperor (cf. *Tit* 1.1.205–237).

Polybios, these tribunes enjoyed a special position in the constitution because they were the only magistrates not under direct control by the consuls and therefore the only ones not "bound to obey them" (*Polyb*. 6.12). Their position gave them a great deal of power, even to the extent that "if a single one of the tribunes interposes, the senate is unable to decide finally about any matter, and cannot even meet and hold sittings" (*Polyb*. 6.16). By convincing the two rivals to accept the candidate of the people, Marcus Andronicus fulfils the main obligation of the tribune, namely "to act as the people decree and to pay every attention to their wishes" (*Polyb*. 6.16).

But as the name suggests, the plebeian tribune would historically have been from a free plebeian family. The Andronici are clearly patricians. Marcus Andronicus, therefore, would not have been a possible candidate for the position. The case of the patrician Publius Clodius Pulcher, who was adopted by a plebeian family and then managed to become a plebeian tribune, which Jonathan Bate cites (cf. *Tit* 1.1.21 FN), seems to have been the exception rather than the rule. This is evident in Cicero's oration "de domo sua":

> What more striking example of evasion than that a beardless stripling, married and in excellent health, should come before you and say that he wishes to adopt as his son a senator of the Roman people, and that all should be perfectly aware of and awake to the fact that the motive of the adoption was not that the adopted party might become the son of the adopter, but that he might leave the patrician body and so be in a position to become tribune of the plebs? (*Cic. Dom.* 14.37).[18]

Cicero uses Clodius's adoption as an example of the latter's general disregard for Roman laws and customs. This context makes it implausible that the adoption of patricians by plebeian families so that the former could become tribunes reflected common practice.

18 "Quae maior calumnia est quam venire imberbum adolescentulum, bene valentem ac maritum: dicere se filium senatorem populi Romani sibi velle adoptare: id autem scire et videre omnes, non ut ille filius instituatur, sed ut e patriciis exeat et tribunus plebis fieri possit, idcirco adoptari?"

Furthermore, the plebeian tribune was a magistrate of the Roman Republic and as such incompatible with a Roman state headed by an emperor. With the establishment of the Principate under Augustus, the tribunes' powers, the *tribunica potestas*, were transferred to the *princeps*. As Augustus states himself in his *Res Gestae*, these powers formed the basis of his rule:

> when the Senate and the Roman people unanimously agreed that I should be elected overseer of laws and morals, without a colleague and with the fullest power, I refused to accept any power offered me which was contrary to the traditions of our ancestors. Those things which at that time the senate wished me to administer I carried out by virtue of my *tribunician power* (*Res. Gest.* 1.6, my emphasis).

In a system where it would be in the interest of the emperor to keep such an important power to himself, Marcus Andronicus would have no authority to stand for "the people of Rome [...] [as a] special party" (*Tit* 1.1.20–21). Accordingly, even the pretence of the election of the emperor is dropped pretty quickly. As Marcus Andronicus proclaims, the people of Rome only chose Titus to be their "candidatus" (*Tit* 1.1.188) "in the election for the empire / With these our late-deceased emperor's sons" (*Tit* 1.1.186–187), implying that the actual election will take place after this nomination. But after Titus's initial rejection (cf. *Tit* 1.1.190–202), Marcus Andronicus declares that Titus just needs to ask to "obtain [...] the empery" (*Tit* 1.1.204). Saturninus's reaction calling the tribune "proud and ambitious" (*Tit* 1.1.205) and questioning his authority to personally make Titus the next emperor not only implies that this is not the usual procedure. It also shows that the princes' earlier acquiescence to "[d]ismiss [their] followers and [...] / Plead [their] deserts in peace and humbleness" (*Tit* 1.1.47–48) offered only a tenuous truce and as such does not survive the tribune's overstepping his competences.

All in all, the first scene already shows a deeply fractured Roman society:

> With Rome's identity thus firmly destabilized, the rest of the play presents us with characters who must deal with a Rome that is no longer (or no longer recognizably) Rome. As such, they no longer have access to a collective identity, or the assumed collective memory, that previously guided their actions (Harries 2018: 200).

In order to cope with their precarious sense of identity, which is further threatened by the transgression of the Goths into the heart of the Roman Empire, the Romans turn to their own mythological and historical past: "The characters in Shakespeare's play not only are conscious of their classical precedents, but cite them to make sense of their own predicament" (Chernaik 2011: 62). In this context, it is important to acknowledge the role the Roman Empire, in particular, played "in the culture of a nascent [English] Empire which proudly boasted a Roman lineage" and where classical sources "were often used to substantiate the country's growing imperial ambitions" (both Antonucci 2009: 121). This idea of a *translatio imperii* was initially made popular by the Roman poet Publius Vergilius Maro. Tracing Rome's imperial origins back to Troy, this idea was employed in the wake of "Rome's painful transitions from republican to triumviral and finally imperial government under Augustus Caesar" (James 1997: 13). It then gained a new topicality in the context of early modern globalisation:

> It was, above all, Rome which provided the ideologues of the colonial systems of Spain, Britain and France with the language and political models they required, for the *Imperium romanum* has always had a unique place in the political imagination of western Europe (Pagden 1995: 11).

Titus Andronicus with its depiction of "imperial Rome on the eve of its collapse" therefore also looks at the same time "proleptically at Elizabethan England as an emergent nation" (both James 1997: 42) as it styles itself as Rome's successors and profiteer of this collapse.

With the looming threat of the Goths in the background during the ten years of war abroad and the danger of a civil war for the succession of the emperor at home, the Rome of *Titus Andronicus* "had lost its distinctive features even before the meeting of the Goths and the

announcement of a foreign queen as empress" (Golinelli 2009: 138). Once the Goths transgress into the heart of power, the Romans' already precarious sense of identity becomes highly unstable. This ultimately leads to a breakdown of social order and a descent into chaos.

2.1.2 The Goths

The Goths in *Titus Andronicus* first arrive in Rome as prisoners of a long war. Topological connections tie the Goths in the play to various Others the Romans have fought. The ten years duration of the war between Romans and Goths is reminiscent of both Caesar's Gallic Wars and the siege of Troy, which as mentioned, played an important role in the formation of the Romans' sense of identity (cf. Bate ²2018: 18). This puts the focus mainly on their functionality for the Roman Empire, as Jonathan Bate has argued in his introduction to the Arden edition of the play:

> the Goths in the play are not historically specific. They are all the enemies of Rome, including the Carthaginians whose wars were a main preoccupation of Livy and the Gauls whose wars were a main preoccupation of Julius Caesar" (Bate ²2018: 18).

These echoes of peoples that were defeated by the Romans initially present the Goths in *Titus Andronicus* as the embodiment of Otherness. This reading is supported by their main function as a challenge to be overcome by the Romans to show their superiority. Accordingly, Titus Andronicus is portrayed as the epitome of Roman *virtus* because he has been able to defeat the Goths:

> A nobler man, a braver warrior,
> Lives not this day within the city walls.
> He by the Senate is accited home
> From weary wars against the barbarous Goths,
> That with his sons, a terror to our foes,
> Hath yoked a nation strong, trained up in arms.

> Ten years are spent since first he undertook
> This cause of Rome, and chastisèd with arms
> Our enemies' pride (*Tit* 1.1.25–33).

Titus's victory over the Goths is the ultimate proof of his worthiness. It is also, as Marcus Andronicus tells the princes, the main reason why "the people of Rome [...] have by common voice, / In election for the Roman empery, / Chosen Andronicus, surnamèd Pius" (*Tit* 1.1.20–23).

In stark contrast to Titus's characterisation as valiant and honourable, the Goths are introduced with the epithet "barbarous" (*Tit* 1.1.28). This establishes the central dichotomy of the play by seemingly identifying Rome with "goodness, civilization and order" and the Goths with "evil, barbarism and chaos" and as "a savage people who toppled the Roman Empire, smothering its brilliant culture and spurning its venerable institutions" (Broude 1970: 27). The term 'barbarous' derives from the ancient Greek 'barbaroi', a term used in ancient Greece and Rome for various peoples who were not Greek or Roman (*OED*, s.v. *barbarous* 1 and 2). From the fourteenth century onwards, the term was also used for the native inhabitants of the Barbary coast (cf. OED, s.v. *barbarian* 5a), a usage which becomes topical in the early modern period as the place "where Shakespeare's English contemporaries purchased the blacks and set them up in new lands" (Golinelli 2009: 137). The *Oxford English Dictionary* also cites *Titus Andronicus* as one of the first instances for the use of 'barbarous' in the sense of "[s]avage in infliction of cruelty, cruelly harsh" (*OED*, s.v. *barbarous* 4).

Following this initial description, the focus shifts onto a different attribute which further links the Goths to various other Germanic tribes: At several points throughout the play, they are referred to as "warlike" (cf. *Tit* 1.1.560, 4.4.109, 5.2.113, and 5.3.27).[19] The use of this adjective echoes, for example, Caesar's depiction of the Suevi in his *Bello Gallico*. The narrator describes them as "by far the largest and the

19 This adjective is not used for anybody else, except when both Saturninus and Tamora use it for Lucius after he has become the leader of the Goths marching against Rome (*Tit* 4.4.68 and 4.4.101 respectively) and when Marcus Andronicus applies it to Titus's hand after he has cut it off to save his sons (*Tit* 3.1.256).

most *warlike* nation of all the Germans" (*Caes. B.G.* 4.1, my emphasis).[20] The conflation of Germans and Goths is further reflective of how Elizabethans were thinking about their past, as this example from William Lambarde's *A Perambulation of Kent* demonstrates:

> The Saxons, Iutes, & Angles, weare the Germains that came ouer, (as we haue saide) in aide of the Britons, of which the first sorte inhabited Saxonie: the seconde were of Gotland, and therfore called Gutes, or Gottes: The thirde weare of Angria, or Anglia, a country adioyning to Saxonie [...], and of these last we all be called Angli, English men (1576: 2).

The Goths, or "Gottes" as Lambarde spells them, are mentioned here together with other Germanic tribes whom the Britons recruited because they were "being greiuously vexed with the Pictes and Scottes their neighbours on the North" (Lambarde 1576: 1). The Britons, he writes, turned to those tribes because they could not expect any help from the Romans "who also at the same time weare sore afflicted with the inuasion of the Hunnes, and Vandales, like barbarous nations" (Lambarde 1576: 1). But instead of helping the Britons, these Germanic tribes, "entised by the pleasure of this countrey, and the fraude of the enemies", change sides and "set vpon the Britons that brought them in: and so, driuing them into Fraunce, Wales, and Cornwall, possessed their dwelling places, and diuided the countrye amongst themselues" (both Lambarde 1576: 2) forming the basis of the people of England.

This varied Germanic descent creates an interesting situation for Shakespeare's audience watching *Titus Andronicus*. They could have identified with both the Romans, whom the nascent English empire was trying to emulate, and the Goths, whom the Elizabethans regarded as their ancestors but who were at the same time portrayed as barbarians in the newly rediscovered sources of classical antiquity. In this context, it is interesting that there seems to be "residual sympathy for the Goths" while many of the Rome-focused readings of the play make "cartoon villains of the Goths, mere foils to the more significant matter of Rome" (both Grogan 2013: 31). The Elizabethans, as Richard Helgerson states,

20 "Sueborum gens est longe maxima et bellicosissima Germanorum omnium".

were acutely aware of their double heritage from both to the Roman Empire and the cultures the Romans portrayed as barbarians:

> Prompted by the cultural breaks of Renaissance and Reformation, sixteenth-century national self-articulation began with a sense of national barbarism, with a recognition of the self as the despised other, and then moved to repair that damaged self-image with the aid of forms taken from a past that was now understood as both different from the present and internally divided (Helgerson 1992: 22).

Texts like Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* try to mitigate this identity crisis by taking up the idea of the *translatio imperii* from Vergil and applying it to their own country. Similar to Vergil's *Aeneid*, they trace a British descent from Troy through Brutus (cf. *Hol. Chron*. 2.4), whom they establish as the great-grandson of Aeneas, who fled Troy after the Trojans were defeated by the Greeks and eventually founded Rome (cf. *Verg. Aen*. 1.1–7). In doing so, they help create a British past separate from Rome which becomes highly important following the religious and political upheavals of the Reformation.

Against this background, the Goths' traditional association with the fall of the Roman Empire receives a positive connotation: "The *translatio* suggested forcefully an analogy between the breakup of the Roman empire by the Goths and the demands of the humanist reformers of northern Europe for religious freedom" (Kliger 1952: 33). The Second Goth straying from the troops "[t]o gaze upon a ruinous monastery" (*Tit* 5.1.21) evokes precisely this context. The "wasted building" (*Tit* 5.1.23) recalls the dissolution of the monasteries as part of Henry VIII's break with Rome and the establishment of the Church of England. The Goths who come to Rome with Lucius at the end of *Titus Andronicus* then point past the Roman Empire, which cannot be salvaged from the damage inflicted upon it by the Romans as well as Tamora and her family, and towards the Goths' descendants in England. On the one hand, therefore, the Goths in *Titus Andronicus* are, as Eugene Giddens puts it, "the other who is not other" (2010–2011: 19). The Romans portray them as barbarians in a way that echoes strongly how they had described the

inhabitants of Britain as well, whom the early modern English audiences of Shakespeare's play would have considered their ancestors.

On the other hand, they also embody elements of the historical Goths as described in Jordanes's *Getica*, whose "story of Gothic migration underpins nearly every modern treatment of the Goths, consciously or not" (Kulikowski 2006: 43). While its historical accuracy has been subject to extensive debate among classical historians (cf. Kulikowski 2006: 43), it has played an important part in constructing "a Germanic past that was older than, and therefore could not depend upon, a Roman past" (Kulikowski 2006: 45). As such, the *Getica* has informed a great deal of understanding of the Goths since the early modern period (cf. Kulikowski 2006: 49) and also offers several parallels to Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*.

According to Jordanes, the Goths originally come from "a great island named Scandia" and "burst forth like a swarm of bees from the midst of this island and came into the land of Europe" (both *Jord. Get*. 1.9).[21] Eventually, they settle "in the Goths' first stage [...] on Scythian soil next to the Sea of Azov, in the second in Mœsia, Thrace and Dacia, in the third again in Scythia above the Black Sea" (*Jord. Get*. 5.38).[22] The settlement in Scythia is particularly interesting because, as William Lambarde writes in his *Perambulation of Kent*, it is the land of origin for the "*Scottes*" or "Sctos (as them selues do write) [who] weare a people of *Scythia*, that came first into *Spaine*, then into *Ireland*, and from thence to the North part of *Britaine* our Iland, where they yet inhabit" (1576: 2).

Scythia is also the land where, according to Herodotus, the Amazons settled eventually (cf. *Hdt*. 4.110). In the *Getica*, the Amazons are even described as the wives of the Goths:

> a neighboring tribe attempted to carry off women of the Goths as booty. But they made a brave resistance, as they had been taught to do by their husbands, and routed in disgrace the enemy who had come upon them.

21 "amplam insulam nomine Scandiam […] ab hujus insulæ gremio velut examen apium erumpens in terram Europæ advenit".

22 "Gothorum mansione prima in Scythiæ solo juxta paludem Mæotidem, secunda in Mœsia Thraciaque et Dacia, tertia supra mare Ponticum rursus in Scythis legimus habitasse".

> When they had won this victory, they were inspired with greater daring. Mutually encouraging each other, they took up arms and chose two of the bolder, Lampeto and Marpesia, to act as their leaders (*Jord. Get.* 7.49).[23]

Later on, Jordanes explicitly refers to these "women of the Goths" as "Amazons" (*Jord. Get.* 7.51). This heritage links the Goths in *Titus Andronicus* to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and its queen of the Amazons, Hippolyta. Tamora, in particular, shares several similarities with Hippolyta: both are ruling queens of their people; both are representatives of a cultural Other who is defeated and taken as prisoners of war; both eventually marry the ruler of the society they encounter; and both use their subversive power as an Other to confront the society's order. Accordingly, Tamora's first speech act is to oppose what she calls the Romans' "irreligious piety" (*Tit* 1.1.133).[24] Pleading for her eldest son's life, she calls out her "Roman brethren" (*Tit* 1.1.104) for their double standard and excessive demand for retribution:

> Sufficeth not that we are brought to Rome
> To beautify thy triumphs and return
> Captive to thee and to thy Roman yoke,
> But must my sons be slaughtered in the streets
> For valiant doings in their country's cause?
> O, if to fight for king and commonweal
> Were piety in thine, it is in these! (*Tit* 1.1.109–115)

Calling them her "brethren" and directly comparing her sons' actions to those of the Romans, Tamora is claiming equality for herself and the Goths. In doing so, she is denouncing Roman hypocrisy because, despite their insistence on virtue and piety, they punish Alarbus for what just a few lines earlier Marcus Andronicus had identified as "good and

23 "feminæ Gothorum a quadam vicina gente temptantur in prædam. Quæ, doctæ a viris, fortiter restiterunt hostesque super se venientes cum magna verecundia abegerunt. Qua patrata victoria fretæque majore audacia, invicem se cohortantes arma arripiunt, eligentesque duas audentiores, Lampetonem et Marpesiam, principatui surrogarunt".

24 Hippolyta, too, continually contradicts Theseus, the representation of authority in Athens, see chapter 2.2.3.

great deserts to Rome" (*Tit* 1.1.24) and frame it as a religious sacrifice. In this first scene, the Romans seem closer to depictions of barbarians in the classical sources like Plutarch and Tacitus. These authors focus on the "overall savage nature of the barbarians, their ferocity, bestiality, and cruelty in its various forms (including human sacrifice)" (Schmidt 2002: 57) and use them "to bring out the virtues of the Romans and the superiority of the Roman civilization" (Schmidt 2002: 63). The Romans in *Titus Andronicus* not only do not meet these standards of Roman civilisation but also seem to surpass the supposed barbarity of the barbarians as Chiron indeed accuses them: "Was never Scythia half so barbarous" (*Tit* 1.1.134).

Tamora is at first less successful than Hippolyta in exerting her influence on the Roman society as we can see in this instance when she fails to persuade the Romans spare her son's life. This is because her transgression and subsequent integration into Roman society is not complete at this point in the play. Unlike Hippolyta, who is introduced as Theseus's future wife at the beginning of the play (cf. *MND* 1.1.1–11), Tamora's marriage to Saturninus and her ascension to Roman Empress comes only after this initial failure to productively expose and challenge Roman injustice and hypocrisy. Once she becomes fully "incorporate in Rome / A Roman now adopted" (*Tit* 1.1.467–468), however, she proves immensely successful at influencing Saturninus and the Roman society in turn. Yet, because her previous pleas were ignored by Titus, she uses this new position of power to "find a day to massacre them all, / And raze their faction and their family" (*Tit* 1.1.455–456). In doing so, she irrevocably destroys the fabric of Roman society and cements the play's tragic trajectory. By contrast, Hippolyta, as I am going to argue in the second half of this chapter, uses hers to bring about the happy conclusion of her play.

2.1.3 Romans and Goths

As representatives of "all the enemies of Rome" (Bate ²2018: 18) and associated with the fall of the Roman Empire in the fourth century (cf. Heather 1996: 1–2), the Goths for the Romans, like the Amazons for the Athenians, "work more logically as signs for what is 'out there,' at the

edge of the world or beyond that edge" (Schwartz 2000: 13). As such, they mostly feature in classical accounts as enemies the Romans defeat on far-off battlefields beyond their borders. The effects of the encounters are usually presented as one-directional:

> In foreign affairs change was brought about by the conquest of one people by another. Romans saw themselves and their conquests as agents of positive change – bringing other peoples the rule of law, for example. While changing others for the better, they believed that they themselves were unchanged by the process (Burns 2003: 10).

As mentioned above, the encounters between Romans and Goths in *Titus Andronicus*, however, take place in the capital of the Roman empire. The Goths, who transgress from the outside into the heart of power, reveal not only that the changes brought by the Romans are not always for the better. They also show that it becomes increasingly difficult for the Romans to uphold the dichotomy between the 'civilised' Romans and the 'barbarous' Goths once the locus of the encounter shifts from the margins of the empire to its centre.

Marcus Andronicus's strict distinction between "Roman" and "barbarous" (both *Tit* 1.1.383) becomes blurred already during the initial encounter with the Goths in Rome. Lucius Andronicus insists on the sacrifice of Alarbus to appease "the groaning shadows that are gone" (*Tit* 1.1.129). This links the Romans closely to the Goths, who, as Jordanes writes in his *Getica*, are known for their practice of sacrificing humans to the god of war:

> Mars has always been worshipped by the Goths with cruel rites, and captives were slain as his victims. They thought that he who is the lord of war needed to be appeased by the shedding of human blood. To him they devoted the first share of the spoil, and in his honor arms stripped from

> the foe were suspended from trees. And they had more than all other races a deep spirit of religion, since the worship of this god seemed to be really bestowed upon their ancestor (*Jord. Get*. 5.41).[25]

What is more, Lucius's behaviour is explicitly 'unroman'. By refusing to show mercy to their defeated enemy, he is acting in a way that Livy calls "very alien to Roman religious observance" (*Liv*. 22.57).[26] It is even in direct violation of Roman law according to Pliny's *Natural History*: "in the consulship of Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus and Publius Licinius Crassus there was passed a resolution of the Senate forbidding human sacrifice" (*Plin. Nat*. 30.3).[27]

Titus, too, is adamant that the sacrifice is necessary and ignores Tamora's pleas for her son. In doing so, he directly contradicts the epithet "Pius" (*Tit* 1.1.23) that he was given as a reward for his "many good and great deserts to Rome" (*Tit* 1.1.24). According to Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae*, *pius* is used in Vergil in the sense of "[r]eligious; devout; godly; *mercifull*; benign" (1587 s.v. *pius*, my emphasis). As the noblest and bravest Roman (cf. *Tit* 1.1. 25–26), Titus should also be the embodiment of these Vergilian virtues. But by ignoring Tamora's explicit appeal to his mercy, which she describes as divine (cf. *Tit* 1.1.117–118) and "nobility's true badge" (*Tit* 1.1.119), and by allowing the sacrifice of Alarbus to go forward, Titus shows a disregard for values associated with *romanitas*:

> Truly noble Roman leaders kept the currents of change moving in the right direction, that is, from barbarism towards the higher values of Roman civilization. [...] They did so by manifesting traditional aristocratic virtues; foremost among these were manliness (*virtus*), respect for tradition and the gods (*pietas*), and clemency (*clementia*) (Burns 2003: 10–11).

25 "Quem Martem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura (nam victimæ ejus mortes fuere captorum), opinantes bellorum præsulem apte humani sanguinis effusione placandum. Huic prædæ primordia vovebant, huic truncis suspendebantur exuviæ, eratque illis religionis præter ceteros insinuatus affectus, quum parenti devotio numinis videretur impendi".
26 "minime Romano sacro".
27 "Cn. Cornelio Lentulo P. Licinio Crasso cos. senatusconsultum factum est ne homo immolaretur".

Titus's behaviour in this scene is explicitly in contrast to these virtues. It, therefore, foreshadows the escalating cycle of violence and revenge which will eventually lead to the destruction of Rome from both within and without.

Despite the violence in the opening being framed as professedly unroman, however, it is coded throughout the entire play as Roman rather than Gothic regardless of who commits it. As Brian Harries argues, the Goths as "newcomers to Rome, [...] use Roman mythic history via Ovid to form their new identity and shape their actions" and "act out a distinctly Roman heinous villainy" (Harries 2018: 201). This is the most explicit in the way in which the Goths cite examples from Roman literature as they are planning and referring to the rape of Lavinia both in the build-up to and during the act itself. Aaron introduces the idea of raping Lavinia to Chiron and Demetrius by referring to Lucrece:

> Take this of me: Lucrece was not more chaste
> Than this Lavinia, Bassianus' love.
> A speedier course than lingering languishment
> Must we pursue, and I have found the path (*Tit* 1.1.608–611).

Aaron is here referring to the already mentioned story of the rape of Lucrece[28] by Tarquinius's son which Livy depicts as the decisive moment that turns the Romans against Tarquinius and convinces them to fight against and depose him (cf. *Liv*. 1.59–60). As argued above, this deposition of the last king has greatly influenced the Romans' sense of identity and their dislike of kings, which Shakespeare addresses more explicitly in *Julius Caesar*. Demetrius's Latin phrases immediately following Aaron's proposition also quote from classical literature (cf. *Tit* 1.1.633 FN and *Tit* 1.1.635 FN) and in doing so, establish examples from Horace, Seneca, and Ovid as contexts for the rape of Lavina.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in particular, provides the Goths with a model to emulate. When Aaron reveals their plan to Tamora, he explicitly frames it in terms referring to the story of Philomel from book six of the *Metamorphoses*:

28 Shakespeare's narrative poem *Luc* also depicts this story but only briefly addresses the political dimension in the final four stanzas.

> This is the day of doom for Bassanius,
> His *Philomel* must lose her tongue today,
> Thy sons make pillage of her chastity
> And wash their hands in Bassianus' blood (*Tit* 2.2.42–45, my emphasis).

Ovid's story not only provides them with inspiration for the rape itself but also for the location. Aaron raises the point that the "forest walks are wide and spacious" (*Tit* 1.1.614) and that they contain "many unfrequented plots […] Fitted by kind for rape and villainy" (*Tit* 1.1.615–616). This is evocative of Ovid's Tereus, who also chooses a secluded space "hidden in the ancient woods" (*Ov. Met.* 6.521).[29]

The Goth's knowledge of the classics, however, precedes any encounter with the Romans. Instead, it seems to already have played an important part in the Goths' education. During the first scene, Demetrius compares Tamora to Hecuba, the queen of Troy, and her "sharp revenge / Upon the Thracian tyrant" (*Tit* 1.1.140–141) and hopes that Tamora, too, will be able to "quit the bloody wrongs upon her foes" (*Tit* 1.1.144). At this point, he is still a prisoner of war and not yet integrated into the Roman Empire. Despite that, however, his choice of the Trojan myth with its central role in the formation of a Roman sense of identity reveals his familiarity with both Roman literature and the importance of classical exempla. When Chiron and Demetrius read Titus's letter in act four, Chiron rightly identifies its Latin phrases as a quote from Horace's *Odes* (cf. *Tit* 4.2.20–21) and states that "I know it well: / I read it in the grammar *long ago*" (*Tit* 4.2.22–23, my emphasis). In this, the Goths again resemble Shakespeare and his contemporaries, for whom William Lily's *Short Introduction of Grammar*, from which Titus's quote is taken (cf. Lily [1542] 2013: 196), was "the most common Latin grammar used in English schools and the standard by which all others were measured" (Mace 2006: 178). This again connects the Goths to Shakespeare's early modern audience.

Additionally, the Goths exceed the acts of violence presented in the classical sources, perhaps in response to the Romans' surpassing the supposed barbarous nature of the Goths in the first act, as argued above. The mutilation of Lavinia after she is raped is already part of the Goths'

29 "in stabula alta trahit, silvis obscura vetustis".

plan from the beginning while Ovid's Tereus only cuts out Philomel's tongue when she threatens to tell what he has done:

> The savage tyrant's wrath was aroused by these words, and his fear no less. Pricked on by both these spurs, he drew his sword which was hanging by his side in its sheath, caught her by the hair, and twisting her arms behind her back, he bound them fast. […] he seized her tongue with pincers, as it protested against the outrage, calling ever on the name of her father and struggling to speak, and cut it off with his merciless blade (*Ov. Met.* 6.549–557).[30]

By planning to cut out her tongue from the start and then cutting off her hands after raping her, Chiron and Demetrius exceed the violence portrayed in the source they are emulating. In doing so, they, in turn, provoke Titus to retaliate with further escalation when he promises that "worse than Progne I will be revenged" (*Tit* 5.2.195):

> While the term 'worse' carries a moral connotation, [Titus's revenge] is by no means a plan that lacks all semblance of 'Roman virtue'; in fact, it is hard to imagine an act that is more (if problematically) Roman. The stories of Lucretia and Philomela from Livy and Ovid give Titus all the cultural precedent he needs. Rape requires revenge; terrible rape requires terrible revenge (Harries 2018: 202).

Both Lavinia's rape and Titus's revenge, thus, are framed as Roman through their recourse to classical literature. Both Romans and Goths are equally versed in those texts and both use their knowledge as the basis for their actions throughout the play. Marcus Andronicus's dichotomy of "Roman" and "barbarous" (both *Tit* 1.1.383), therefore, does not hold up. In fact, it has not been true from the beginning as the first on-stage encounter between Romans and Goths already reveals. By erasing the distinctions between them, the play also evokes the context

30 "Talibus ira feri postquam commota tyranni / nec minor hac metus est, causa stimulatus utraque, / quo fuit accinctus, vagina liberat ensem / arreptamque coma fixis post terga lacertis / vincla pati cogit; [...] / ille indignantem et nomen patris usque vocantem / luctantemque loqui conprensam forcipe linguam / abstulit ense fero".

of early modern globalisation and turns the common practice of establishing a Self and an Other on its head:

> the criteria used to describe and accentuate the differences of peoples encountered in the new lands broadened and distorted the accepted meanings of epithets like 'savage, black or barbarous' which were generally used to define the other. Most frequently, the description of the customs of these peoples and the moral judgement expressed about them, and accordingly their more or less barbarous nature, depended on political, ideological, and above all economic considerations (Golinelli 2009: 140).

In *Titus Andronicus*, these epithets can be fittingly applied to both Romans and Goths. Once the Goths transgress into the heart of the Roman Empire, the Romans struggle and ultimately fail to uphold the pretence of a clear distinction between themselves and the Gothic Other.

We can see a similar lack of differentiation albeit with a more positive connotation in Elizabethan travel writing like Walter Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana. The author*, as Gilberta Golinelli argues, deliberately portrays the indigenous peoples he encounters by "rendering them as similar as possible to the English so as to favour court investment in a very expensive colonial undertaking" (2009: 140). Throughout his narrative, Raleigh describes the indigenous peoples such as the "Tivitivas" as "a very goodly people and very valiant", who "have the most manly speech and most deliberate that ever I heard of what nation soever" (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a). When he writes of the "Capuri, and Macureo", he admits that "in all my life, either in the Indies or in Europe, did I never behold a more goodly or better-favoured people or a more manly" (all Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a). Throughout, he focuses on the exceptionality of the peoples he encounters because, as Sabine Schülting points out, he is "under pressure to emphasize the success of his voyage" and by comparing them favourably to the English, he "offers Elizabeth not only a rich country and the weakening of Spanish colonial power but also colonial subjects who do not have to be subjected" (both Schülting 1996: n/a). This is most explicit in his encounter with the native inhabitants of Puerto de los Espanoles:

> by my Indian interpreter [...], I made them understand that I was the servant of a queen who was the great cacique of the north, and a virgin [...]; that she was an enemy to the Castellani in respect of their tyranny and oppression, and that she delivered all such nations about her, as were by them oppressed; and having freed all the coast of the northern world from their servitude, had sent me to free them also, and withal to defend the country of Guiana from their invasion and conquest. I shewed them her Majesty's picture, which they so admired and honoured, as it had been easy to have brought them idolatrous thereof. The like and a more large discourse I made to the rest of the nations, [...] so as in that part of the world her Majesty is very famous and admirable; whom they now call EZRABETA CASSIPUNA AQUEREWANA, which is as much as 'Elizabeth, the Great Princess, or Greatest Commander' (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a).

Raleigh here simultaneously highlights the readiness of the indigenous people to accept Elizabeth as their ruler and constructs Elizabeth as a "cacique" herself. In doing so, he is blurring the distinction between the English Self and the indigenous Other he encounters in a similar yet more positive way than *Titus Andronicus* does with the dichotomy between Romans and Goths.

The play's ending completes this process further when Lucius returns to Rome at the head of a Goth army. The election of Lucius by the "common voice" (*Tit* 5.3.138) and his subsequent vow to "heal Rome's harms and wipe away her woe" (*Tit* 5.3.147) seems to promise at least some restoration of order after the excessive violence and bloodshed. Yet, the play does not end there but instead with the threat of even more violence in the form of the punishment of Aaron (cf. *Tit* 5.3.178–182) and the refusal of a proper burial for Tamora. Lucius not only dehumanises her by calling her "that ravenous tiger" (*Tit* 5.3.194) but also orders her corpse to be thrown "forth to beasts and birds of prey" (*Tit* 5.3.197) allowing "No funeral rite, nor man in mouring weed / No mournful bell" for "her burial" (both *Tit* 5.3.195–196). Furthermore, his insistence on sacrificing Alarbus and thereby betraying Roman virtues earlier in the play can be seen as the catalyst of the cycle of vengeance that leads to the destruction of order in the first place. Lucius, therefore, seems to be the least suitable candidate to restore order to Rome.

Additionally, Shakespeare's audience would also have known that this was at best a temporary restoration, given the association of the Goths with the fall of Rome. The danger of a Goth invasion of Rome is briefly averted in *Titus Andronicus* through the election of Lucius, who comes to Rome at the head of a Goth army and therefore has some control over them. But this second transgression into the heart of power foreshadows not only the historical end of the Roman Empire where "the Goths were encouraged to become so powerful because it was useful to the political schemes of successive Roman emperors for them to do so" (Kulikowski 2006: 76). The association of the Goths with English Protestants also evokes the context of the Reformation and England's break with Rome:

> While this impending doom signals the end of Rome as the unifying power in the Mediterranean, it also heralds the next stage of history in which Rome will function primarily as the center of the Christian church in Europe. Over the next centuries, it would become a new kind of superpower, with primarily religious rather than political weight, spreading its influence north rather than south. Given enough time, those Goths that originate from various Germanic territories would also become the Protestants who opposed Rome in a new way, as well (Harries 2018: 28).

By introducing the Reformation context to the play, the Goths also suggest the idea of the "*translatio imperii ad Teutonicos*" (Bate ²2018: 19) which according to Samuel Kliger "crystallized the idea that humanity was twice ransomed from Roman tyranny and depravity – in antiquity by the Goths, in modern times by their descendants" (1952: 33).

All in all, *Titus Andronicus* already features many of the elements that I am interested in for this thesis. As Gilberta Golinelli highlights, the encounters "between various ethnic groups acquir[e] numerous epistemological values thereby bringing the play close to later works like *Othello*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, *The Merchant of Venice*, or *The Tempest* in which the encounter with otherness discloses the identity crisis of Renaissance man" (2009: 144). *Titus Andronicus* touches on issues of national identity and a nation's changing relationship to other cultures as part of early modern processes of globalisation. Many of

these issues will become a lot more prevalent and explicit in the plays discussed later in this thesis.

2.2 A Midsummer Night's Dream

Unlike in *Titus Andronicus*, we only have one representative of the Other who transgresses from the outside into the heart of power in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: Hippolyta, Queen of the Amazons. Like Tamora, she arrives as a prisoner of war in the city where the play is set; she is a representative of a people regarded as the epitome of Otherness by the society that encounters her; she eventually marries the ruler of this society; and before her marriage, her main function is as a challenge for the Greeks to overcome to showcase their superiority. Hippolyta's Amazonian heritage, like the Goths in *Titus Andronicus*, links the play with the context of early modern exploration and with questions of national identity and England's role in the world as an incipient empire.

Traditionally, the focus of engagements with *A Midsummer Night's Dream* has been on the events of the night in the forest near Athens and the metadramatic aspects of the play rather than the intercultural encounters at its centre. This is very clearly illustrated by the play's synopsis on the homepage of the Royal Shakespeare Company. Focusing on the "four young lovers", the "feuding Fairy King and Queen", the mechanicals, and Puck as "[c]hief mischief-maker", the RSC highlights the "games of fantasy, love and dreams" of "Shakespeare's most beguiling comedy" (all RSC *MND* 2020: n/a) but makes no mention of Hippolyta or the Amazons. By concentrating on the comedic aspects of the play and largely ignoring the framing intercultural encounter between the Athenians and the queen of the Amazons,[31] this synopsis

31 Some recent productions have re-contextualised the framing intercultural encounter between the Duke of Athens and the Queen of the Amazons by drawing attention to its violent nature. Dominic Dromgoole's production for the Globe Theatre from 2013, for example, stages the battle that precedes the play's original opening and shows Hippolyta surrendering to Theseus as she witnesses her Amazons getting killed by the Athenians (cf. *Globe on Screen MND* 2013: 00:01:44–00.03:10). Nicholas Hytner's production for the Bridge Theatre from 2019 opens with Hippolyta securely locked away in a glass prison cell, which also highlights the threat she is posing to Theseus's rule (cf. *NTLive MND* 2020: 00:01:43).

is indicative of a broader tendency where "the dream-work of the play seems to have worked to deflect critical attention from its ideological investments in, and reshaping of, the discourses of travel, trade, and colonialism" (Loomba 2016: 181). *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Ania Loomba argues, has "generated wide-ranging commentaries on the relation between its depiction of erotic and familial tensions and contemporary discourses of gender and sexuality" (2016: 181). But it does not feature prominently "in analyses of early modern intercontinental and cross-cultural relations" (Loomba 2016: 181)[32] even though the Amazons traditionally represent the ultimate "female otherness inhabiting the space just beyond the margins of the known landscape" (Stock 2006: 16). As such, they are indeed highly relevant to these discussions.

Both Theseus and Hippolyta, in particular, would have been very familiar to an early modern English audience. They appear in a variety of sources such as Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* or Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*. Chaucer's narrative, in particular, inspires the framing narrative of the wedding of Theseus and Hippolyta in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and more explicitly most of the plot of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, written in collaboration with John Fletcher. As the play's main representative of the Other and as queen of the Amazons, Hippolyta would have additionally evoked an interesting mixture of domestic and exotic contexts for Shakespeare and his audience. This allows her to make a substantial impact on the society she encounters once she transgresses from beyond the boundaries of the known world into the centre of power despite her quantitatively small part of merely 35 lines (cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a).

In the following, I am going to explore the notions that could have influenced the portrayal of the various parties engaged in the intercul-

32 Another character that has received little attention is the Indian boy who links the fairies and the Athenian forest to English encounters with the indigenous peoples of the Americas. He can be read as a potential reference to Cayowaroco, the "only son [of Topiawari, lord of Aromaia]" (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a). He accompanied Walter Raleigh back to England in 1595, the year in which *MND* was most probably written (cf. Wiggins 2013: 302) and is portrayed "in subsequent English accounts of Guiana […] as a keen supporter of the English against Spanish and a devotee of Sir Walter Ralegh" and "seems to have benefited English assistance against his own enemies" (both Vaughan 2002: 364). For a discussion of the Indian boy in *MND*, see Loomba 2016: 181–205 and Fetters 2016: 2–9.

tural encounters of the play. What ideas did Shakespeare and his contemporaries have about ancient Athens and Theseus as its main representative? What kind of associations did the Amazons hold for them? And finally, how is the play's portrayal of the intercultural encounters between the Athenians and the queen of the Amazons influenced by and contributing to discourses of early modern globalisation?

2.2.1 Athens and Theseus

Similar to *Titus Andronicus*'s Rome, Athens as the setting of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* would have evoked well-established and equally ambivalent connotations for early modern audiences. According to Alison Findley and Vassiliki Markidou, "classical Greece constituted the paragon of and a model for European power, civility and scripture" and was regarded as "the origin and idealized pinnacle of Western philosophy, tragedy, democracy, heroic human endeavour" (both 2017: 1). Early modern Greece, on the other hand, functioned at the same time as an "example of decadence: a fallen state, currently under Ottoman control, and therefore an exotic, dangerous 'other'" (Findley and Markidou 2017: 1). Yet, whereas *Titus Andronicus*'s Rome and its numerous sources have been widely discussed, as stated above, the significance of Athens for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* has received comparatively little attention. Considering the importance of classical Greek models for the incipient English empire "struggling to establish its cultural, linguistic and imperial authority" (Findley and Markidou 2017: 1–2), it is worthwhile to take a closer look at how Athens is presented in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and how the encounter between the Athenians and the Amazon affects the society where it takes place.

In contrast to the Rome of *Titus Andronicus*, the Athens of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* does not appear to be in a state of crisis. Theseus has just returned victorious from the war with the Amazons and is now preparing to marry the defeated Hippolyta:

> Hippolyta, I wooed thee with my sword,
> And won thy love doing thee injuries;
> But I will wed thee in another key,
> With pomp, with triumph, and with revelling (*MND* 1.1.16–19).

Instead of a threat of civil unrest, the play begins with Theseus ordering his master of the revels to "[s]tir up the Athenian youth to merriments" (*MND* 1.1.12) and to "[a]wake the pert and nimble spirit of mirth" (*MND* 1.1.13). The only threat to Theseus's happiness is "how slow / This old moon wanes" (*MND* 1.1.3–4) and in doing so, "linger[ing] [his] desires / Like to a stepdame or a dowager / Long withering out a young man's revenue" (*MND* 1.1.4–6). As Hippolyta reminds him, this problem will eventually solve itself as "Four days will quickly steep themselves in night; / Four nights will quickly dream away the time" (*MND* 1.1.7–8). Accordingly, the play's main conflict does not arise due to political challenges as we have seen in *Titus Andronicus*. Instead, Egeus interrupts the aforementioned merriments with a personal suit. He arrives before Theseus and Hippolyta "[f]ull of vexation" (*MND* 1.1.22) and wants to force his daughter Hermia to marry the man of his choice (cf. *MND* 1.1.42–44). Egeus is insisting on "the ancient privilege of Athens" (*MND* 1.1.41) which allows him to "dispose of [his daughter] […] either to this gentleman [Demetrius] / Or to her death" (*MND* 1.1.42–44). His demand reflects the traditional gender roles within the Athenian household, the *oikos*.[33]

Signifying various meanings including "1) the physical structure, as building; 2) a family or lineage […]; 3) an estate or property; or 4) all of the above at once, a household" (Foxhall 2013: 24), the Athenian oikos is structured along clearly gendered hierarchical relationships (cf. Foxhall 2013: 29–30). The head of the oikos is the husband or father who acts as "the spokesman and mediator between the realm of private life within the household and the public world of politics, law and the marketplace" (Foxhall 2013: 25–26). Marriage is, as a consequence, more a social than a private relationship as it is seen as "one of the fundamental partners-

33 The source material we have on gender roles within the oikos comes, like most of the sources about Ancient Greece in general, from Athens during the fifth and fourth century BCE (cf. Foxhall 2013: 32), see also Nevett 1995: 363–381.

hips that bind the fabric of the household" (Foxhall 2013: 30). As such, it forms the basis of Athens's social structure as well. It is also a strictly hierarchical relationship where "convention sanctioned autonomy for married men, but not for women" (Foxhall 2013: 33).

Yet, in Theseus's Athens, this "ancient privilege" (*MND* 1.1.41), which gives the head of the oikos the power to decide over their children's life or death, is not as absolute as Egeus makes it out to be. His authority is no longer enough to exert control over his daughter. Instead, he "must now come to Theseus to petition […] for it" and "cannot punish [his daughter's] disobedience without Theseus's consent" (both Blits 2003: 24–25). Theseus decides to delay Egeus's demand of an immediate judgement of Hermia according to the ancient laws of Athens (cf. *MND* 1.1.44–45) and to give Hermia respite until "the next new moon / The sealing-day betwixt my love and me" (*MND* 1.1.83–84). This enables the lovers to use that time to flee Athens.

As mentioned above, Theseus would have been a familiar character for Shakespeare and his audiences. As Peter Holland argues, "Theseus […] constitutes a major source for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, a source of allusion, opposition and difference, a source of threat and terror […] that the play, for all its wonderful assuredness in its happy ending, cannot really eliminate" (2007: 151). In the play, he is not only the figure with the second most lines despite only appearing on stage during the first and the last two scenes of the play (cf. Cystal and Crystal 2020: n/a). More importantly, he is also the focal point for the play's representation of Athens because he "encapsulated, as no other single figure did, the ideals of Athens and its conception of the past" (Hawes 2014: 153).

Theseus's depiction in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is probably influenced by two main sources: Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*, on which Shakespeare and Fletcher draw more extensively and explicitly in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*, which was immensely popular in Thomas North's translation during the early modern period. Plutarch, in particular, champions the idea of Theseus as a personification of the ideals that became associated with ancient Athens in the early modern period. His description focuses largely on the heroic deeds that Theseus accomplished in emulation of Hercules, whose "valour [he admired], until by night his dreams were of the hero's

achievements, and by day his ardour led him along and spurred him on in his purpose to achieve the like" (*Plut. Thes*. 6.7). The most famous of these is Theseus slaying the Minotaur and freeing Athens from their tribute to Crete (cf. *Plut. Thes*. 15.1- 19.3). Yet, what truly earned Theseus his place in Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* as Romulus's equal is that he "made a metropolis of" one of "the world's two most illustrious cities" (both *Plut. Thes*. 2.1):

> Theseus conceived a wonderful design, and settled all the residents of Attica in one city, thus making one people of one city out of those who up to that time had been scattered about and were not easily called together for the common interests of all […] to the powerful he promised government without a king and a democracy, in which he should only be commander in war and guardian of the laws, while in all else everyone should be on an equal footing (*Plut. Thes*. 24.1–3).

In addition to this positive depiction of Theseus's role in the unification of Attica and the foundation of Athens, Plutarch also acknowledges his problematic private life, which Theseus again has in common with Romulus: "both resorted to the rape of women" and "neither escaped domestic misfortunes and the resentful anger of kindred, but even in their last days both are said to have come into collision with their own fellow-citizens" (both *Plut. Thes*. 2.1–2).

Shakespeare alludes to Theseus's long history of problematic relationships when Oberon rebukes Titania after she "glance[s] at [his] credit with Hippolyta" (*MND* 2.1.74):

> Didst not thou lead him through the glimmering night
> From *Perigenia*, whom he ravishèd,
> And make him with fair *Aegels break his faith*,
> With *Ariadne*, and *Antiopa*? (*MND* 2.1.76–80, my emphasis).[34]

34 The last woman in Oberon's list is also interesting in the context of Theseus's Amazonian encounters since Antiopa is one of the four main Amazons from Greek mythology along with Hippolyta, Penthesilea, and Menalippe.

Even though Titania dismisses Oberon's accusations as "the forgeries of jealousy" (*MND* 2.1.84), they are well documented in the play's sources:

> There are, however, other stories also about marriages of Theseus which were neither honourable in their beginnings nor fortunate in their endings […]. For instance, he is said to have carried off Anaxo, a maiden of Troezen, and after slaying Sinis and Cercyon to have ravished their daughters; also to have married Periboea, the mother of Aias, and Phereboea afterwards, and Iope, the daughter of Iphicles; and because of his passion for Aegle, the daughter of Panopeus, […] he is accused of the desertion of Ariadne, which was not honourable nor even decent; and finally, his rape of Helen is said to have filled Attica with war, and to have brought about at last his banishment and death (*Plut. Thes.* 29.1).

Theseus's marriage with the queen of the Amazons, whose name, as Plutarch insists, was Antiopa, or Antiope as she is spelt in *The Live of Theseus*, rather than Hippolyta (cf. *Plut. Thes.* 27.4), is equally ill-fated: "when Theseus married Phaedra, Antiope and the Amazons who fought to avenge her attacked him, and were slain by Heracles" (*Plut. Thes.* 28.1).[35] Theseus's marriage to Phaedra also ends fatally for her when she falls in love with Theseus's son from his marriage to Antiope, Hippolytus, and commits suicide after he refuses her. Before killing herself, however, she frames Hippolytus, who is killed as he tries to escape his father's wrath and then saved and hidden away by the goddess Diana (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 7.764–777).

Shakespeare would have found Hippolyta as the name of Theseus's Amazonian queen in his other main source, Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*. What is more, however, in choosing to not name Theseus's wife Antiopa, he makes the connection to Hippolytus more obvious, whose name is "shadowily close to Chaucer's and Shakespeare's use of Hippolyta as the name for Theseus' Amazon-bride" (Holland 2007: 144). Hippolytus evokes "an unavoidable future for the marriage so richly, lengthily and apparently gloriously celebrated at the end of the play" (Holland

35 Plutarch himself discounts this version as having "every appearance of fable and invention" (*Plut. Thes.* 28.1).

2007: 144). In this context, Oberon's blessing of "the best-bride bed [...] / And the issue there create" (*MND* 5.1.420–422) seems "radically different from what the audience could reasonably be assumed to know would happen to Theseus and Hippolyta" (Holland 2007: 143).

In Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*, the narrator conveniently glosses over Theseus's problematic relationships and focuses mainly on the love triangle between Hippolyta's sister Emilia[36] and the two Theban princes Arcite and Palamon. The narrator does, however, highlight Theseus's heroic achievements and his role as fair and just ruler:

> Ther was a duc that highte Theseus;
> Of Atthenes he was lord and governour,
> And in his tyme swich a conquerour,
> That gretter was ther noon under the sonne.
> Ful many a riche contree hadde he wonne,
> What with his wysdom and his chivalrie (*KnT* 860–865).

Later in the narrative, Theseus is referred to as "the noble conquerour" (*KnT* 998), "this worthy duc" (*KnT* 1001, 1025, and 1742), and "myghty Theseus" (*KnT* 1673). As such, he does not hesitate when four "wrecched women" (*KnT* 921) approach him asking for his help against Creon, the ruler of Thebes, who "wol nat suffren hem [i.e. their dead husbands], by noon assent, / Neither to been yburyed nor ybrent" (*KnT* 945–946). Theseus's response shows his "gentil" (*KnT* 952) nature and his "herte pitous" (*KnT* 953) as he immediately

> swoor his ooth, as he was trewe knyght,
> He wolde doon so ferforthly his might
> Upon the tiraunt Creon hem to wreke
> That al the peple of Grece sholde speke
> How Creon was of Theseus yserved
> As he that hadde his deeth ful wel deserved (*KnT* 959–964).

36 I am using the spellings of the names as Shakespeare and Fletcher use them in *TNK* which, as mentioned above, is very much inspired by Chaucer's narrative.

In the ensuing battle with Creon and the Thebans, Theseus's knightly qualities secure his victory: "He faught, and slough hym manly as a knight / In pleyn bataille, and putte the folk to flight / And by assaut he wan the citee after" (*KnT* 987–989).

After Theseus discovers Palamon and Arcite during a hunt, he at first condemns them to death (cf. *KnT* 1742–1747) until Hippolyta and Emilia plead for them (cf. *KnT* 1748–1760). In his description, the narrator presents Theseus as a merciful and compassionate ruler:

> […] Fy
> Upon a lord that wol have no mercy,
> But been a leon, bothe in word and dede,
> To hem that been in repentaunce and drede,
> As wel as to a proud despitous man
> That wol mayntene that he first bigan.
> That lord hath litel of discrecioun,
> That in swich cas kan no division
> But weyeth pride and humblesse after oon (*KnT* 1773–1781).

His solution to the princes' quarrel over Emilia also adheres to knightly ideals: "Everich of you shal brynge an hundred knyghtes / Armed for lystes up at alle rightes, / Al redy to darreyne hire by bataille" (*KnT* 1851–1853). In this quarrel, Theseus styles himself "evene juge […] and trewe" (*KnT* 1864). The narrator attests that in allowing this trial by combat, "Theseus hath doon so fair a grace" (*KnT* 1874).

Shakespeare's Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and even more so in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, echoes many of these positive attributes ascribed to him by Chaucer's narrator. Theseus's aforementioned victory over the Amazons highlights his competence as a warrior and leader. Like in Chaucer's narrative, he is asked to be the judge in a dispute about who should be allowed to marry a woman over whom two men are fighting.[37] Theseus is presented as a fair judge even though he

37 Like Palamon and Arcite, Demetrius and Lysander are introduced as each other's equal: "I am, my lord, as well-derived as he / As well-possessed […] / My fortunes very way as fairly ranked" (*MND* 1.1.99–101). The love triangle in *KnT* also haunts Shakespeare's play: Lysander and Demetrius fighting over first Hermia and later over Helena recalls Palamon and Arcite's fight over Emilia, yet the comedy manages to avert the tragic ending.

sides with Egeus and upholds the patriarchal order in this first scene: "To you your father be as a god […] To whom you are but as a form in wax / By him imprinted" (*MND* 1.1.47–50). He suggests that Hermia should "fit [her] fancies to [her] father's will" (*MND* 1.1.118) and protesting that "else the law of Athens yield you up […] To death or to a vow of single life" (*MND* 1.1.119–121). Theseus does not share Egeus's extreme views on filial obedience. Egeus only gave Hermia the choice between marrying Demetrius or death (cf. *MND* 1.1.43–45). To that, Theseus adds a third option that Egeus either did not know about or deliberately withheld to force his daughter into submission: "on Diana's altar to protest / For aye austerity and single life" (*MND* 1.1.89–90).

What is more, he later chooses to break these same rules which he claims here he is unable to do: "the law of Athens […] Which *by no means* we may extenuate" (*MND* 1.1.119–120, my emphasis). When he and his hunting party encounter the lovers again in act 4, Theseus suddenly is able to simply tell Egeus that "I will overbear your will" (*MND* 4.1.176) and that "in the temples, by and by, with us / These couples shall eternally be knit" (*MND* 4.1.177–178). As I am going to demonstrate in the following, this seemingly sudden change of heart is at least in part the result of the intercultural encounter at the centre of power.

2.2.2 The Amazons

In contrast to Tamora, who, as mentioned above, has the fourth-largest part in *Titus Andronicus*, Hippolyta only has 35 lines in the three scenes she appears on stage (cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a). Despite that, her impact on the Athenian society is no less profound, albeit less destructive than Tamora's influence on Roman society. Hippolyta's double nature as the queen of the Amazons and the betrothed of Theseus allows her to affect fundamental change within the society that encounters her and to eventually bring about the play's happy conclusion, just as much as the fairies' interventions with the magical flowers as I am going to argue later in this chapter. But before focusing on her role in the intercultural encounter with the Athenian society, I want to first take a look at what kind of associations an Amazon would have evoked for Shakespeare and his audiences.

The term *Amazon* has undergone significant semantic change since its origins in Ancient Greek mythology. Modern associations with the term incorporate several of the ideas connected to it throughout the ages:

> Its connotations may vary from a slightly comic praise of sporting excellence in women to underlying insinuations that Amazons are not quite feminine. […] the epithet Amazon carried the implication that these women rejected men and had developed a society apart (therefore *(sic)* they must be subversives, lesbians, communists, hippies – etc. etc.) (Hardwick 1990: 14).

In more recent years, there has been a shift towards a predominantly positive perspective.[38] Yet, the Amazons remain, "for whatever reason, outside the 'normal' parameters of life-style and achievements" (Hardwick 1990: 14).

While their geographical origin and the etymology of their name remain largely unclear, stories about the Amazons, a "war-like society of women, living on the borders of the known world, renowned for archery and riding skills" (Hardwick 1990: 14), can be found in sources ranging from texts like Homer's *Iliad* and Plutarch's *Life of Theseus* to portrayals on vase paintings and sculptures. As Lorna Hardwick outlines, there seems to be a "symmetrical relationship [of the portrayal of the Amazons] with the way the Greeks perceived their own identity" (1990: 15). The ancient Greek myths consistently portray the Amazons as representatives of the "Amazonian myth of disorder and inversion" (Hattaway 1996: 182) and "in direct contrast to the qualities expected from women in the Greek *oikos*" (Hardwick 1990: 18). By definition, the Amazons live in an all-female society "based on independence and […] merit proved in battle" (Hardwick 1990: 17) and exist "just beyond the margins of the known landscape" (Stock 2006: 16).

38 The 2017 film *Wonder Woman*, for example, features an Amazonian heroine who grows up in the Amazonian society on Themyscira. This is a fictional island but its name references the classical name for the capital city of the Amazons (cf. *Apollod. Bibl.* 2.5.9). Among others are again the four main Amazons in the Amazon tradition as mentioned above. As one reviewer pointed out, "[f]or many viewers, […] Wonder Woman could have – and should have – been set entirely on the women-only Amazon warrior paradise of Themyscira. […] It felt profoundly satisfying to watch women of all colors, sizes, shapes and ages wield so much physical power on a humongous screen" (Hatch 2017: n/a).

At the same time, their "geographical remoteness, 'otherness', and implicit or explicit rejection of Greek norms" (Hardwick 1990: 18) is utilised to reinforce a sense of identity within the Greek *oikos*. The Ancient Greek *Amazonomachy* is therefore mainly interested in the Amazons as a challenge for the Greek hero to overcome. Precisely because the Amazons present a threat not only to the individual hero but to Greek civilisation as a whole, the hero's inevitable victory over them not only distinguishes him from other less powerful heroes and highlights his strength and valour. By proxy, it also functions as "a sign of historical supremacy of the Greeks (and most notably the Athenians) over outsiders" (Hardwick 1990: 23). The various tales show admiration for the military prowess of the Amazon warriors as well as their potential as a threat both ideological and territorial. Eventually, however, the Amazonian threat of disorder will be inevitably vanquished by the valiant Greek hero: "Outsiders can remain different if they stay away but if they move place, willingly or unwillingly, they must conform or be defeated" (Hardwick 1990: 23). Attempts at 'domesticating' the Amazon are usually depicted as unsuccessful and end in the Amazon's death. This can be seen in the portrayals of Theseus's ill-fated marriage to the queen of the Amazons in Shakespeare's sources, which, as argued above, still haunt the play even though it seemingly ends in a happy marriage.

This pattern of exotic fascination and eventual assimilation or death is maintained in the stories about the Amazons throughout the Middle Ages. Like their counterparts from antiquity, the medieval Amazons are both revered and feared for their "military prowess", their "exotic otherness" and their "unnatural rejection of domesticity" (all Carney 2003: 118). In *The Knight's Tale*, the narrator describes Hippolyta as the "faire, hardy queene of Scithia" (*KnT* 882) and speaks of "the grete bataille […] Betwixen Atthenes and Amazones" (*KnT* 879–880). These few lines reveal admiration for the Amazons, who are able to present a worthy challenge to the greatest of Greek heroes (cf. *KnT* 863). Later in the story, however, when Hippolyta is Theseus's wife and uses her influence to persuade him not to kill the Thebans Arcite and Palamon (cf. *KnT* 1819), the attributes with which the narrator endows her are different. A long way from the brave warrior queen, the narrator tells us that Hippolyta begins to weep "for verray wommanhede"

(*KnT* 1748–1749) when Theseus wants to execute Palamon and Arcite, who defied his orders (cf. *KnT* 1742–1747). Hippolyta and her sister Emily fall "on hir bare knees adoun […] And wolde have kist his feet ther as he stood" (*KnT* 1758–1759) to beg for his mercy. This not only shows their submission to Theseus. It also reveals that the Amazon queen has accepted the conventional gender roles of the oikos through her marriage to Theseus. Hippolyta has been fully incorporated into Athenian society and given up her Amazonian attributes that had previously been a source of admiration.

As the examples from Antiquity and the Middle Ages have shown, "Amazons work more logically as signs for what is 'out there,' at the edge of the world or beyond that edge" (Schwartz 2000: 13). Yet, this "gesture outward is increasingly complicated by an impulse inward" (Schwartz 2000: 15) in the early modern period. With the succession of Mary I and Elizabeth I to the English throne in 1553 and 1558 respectively, female rulers had become a political reality in England and indeed throughout Europe. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, "a whole range of 'dynastic accidents' […] had resulted in a surprising number of women ruling as queens or functioning as regents" (Jansen 2002: 2). Reactions such as John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* from 1558 reveal deeply rooted "male anxieties about female sovereignty" (Cruz and Suzuki 2009: 3) and evoke the myths of the Amazons as a cautionary tale:

> I am assuredlie persuaded that if any of those men, which […] did see and pronounce the causes sufficient, why women oght not to beare rule nor authoritie, shuld this day liue ād see a woman sitting in iudgment, […], hauing the royall crowne vpon her head, the sworde and sceptre borne before her, in signe that the administration of iustice was in her power […] that suche a sight shulde so astonishe them, that they shuld iudge the hole worlde to be transfformed in to the *Amazones* (Knox 1558: 10–11, my emphasis).

If female rulers become like Amazons, Knox argues, their male subjects are transformed as well: "albeit the owtwarde forme of men remained, […] their hartes were changed frome the wisdom, vnderstanding,

and courage of men, to the foolishe fondness and cowardice of women" (Knox 1558: 11). Beneath this fear of the "monstruous empire of a cruell woman" (Knox 1558: 2), there is also the more fundamental fear that the "owtward forme" and the "hartes" no longer correspond. The presence of an Amazon at the head of the state, therefore, seems to dissolve traditional values and norms, which in turn again threatens the patriarchal order.

Such rather overt criticisms of female rulers linking them directly to the Amazons "who notoriously invert the structures of government" (Schwartz 2000: 12) are understandably rare. Knox's open disparagement, for example, published the same year Elizabeth ascended to the English throne, resulted in his banishment from England (cf. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. John Knox). But as Kathryn Schwartz highlights, "metonymic association" means that allusions to Amazons need not be explicit to comment on female sovereignty and that the "tactful separation of queens and Amazons is less absolute than occasionally contrived" (both 2000: 18).

One of the more prominent examples of this is Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queen*, which features the Amazonian queen Radigund. She is introduced by Sir Terpin, who has just been rescued by Artegall from execution by "a troupe of women warlike dight, / With weapons in their hands, as ready for to fight" (*FQ* 5.4.21). Reluctantly, he reveals to Artegall that he had refused to obey the commands of Radigund. Having been previously rejected by Sir Bellodant, she has decreed to punish any knight who comes into her realm (cf. *FQ* 5.4.28–30). The form of her punishment fulfils Knox's worst nightmare about the subversive Amazonian influence on the male subjects:

> First she doth them of warlike armes despoile,
> And cloth in womens weedes: And then with threat
> Doth them compell to worke, to earne their meat,
> To spin, to card, to sew, to wash, to wring (*FQ* 5.4.31).

By forcing them to dress like women and to do domestic work, this Amazon tries "to disable [them] from reuenge aduenturing" (*FQ* 5.4.31).

Whoever refuses to follow her orders, "[s]he causeth them be hang'd vp out of hand" (*FQ* 5.4.32).

Despite Terpin's abhorrence of "that shamefull life, vnworthy of a Knight" (*FQ* 5.4.32), he cannot help but also admire her:

> A Princesse of great powre, and greater pride,
> And Queene of Amazons, in armes well tride,
> And sundry battels, which she hath atchieued
> With great successe, that her hath glorifide,
> And made her famous, more then is belieued (*FQ* 5.4.33).

Artegall manages to beat her in single combat even after she has wounded him (cf. *FQ* 5.5.6–10), thus proving his extraordinary martial prowess. But even he succumbs to the Amazon's temptation as he cannot bring himself to kill her. He throws away his weapon and surrenders after seeing her beautiful face (cf. *FQ* 5.5.12–16). The poem makes it very clear that Artegall did not lose due to any superiority on Radigund's part: "So was he ouercome, *not ouercome*, / But to her yeelded of his owne accord" (*FQ* 5.5.17, my emphasis). His subsequent submission to her is also portrayed as his choice rather than punishment at her hands:

> Yet was he iustly damned by *the doome*
> *Of his owne mouth*, that spake so warelesse word,
> To be her thrall, and seruice her afford.
> For though that he first victorie obtayned,
> Yet after by abandoning his sword,
> He wilfull lost, that he before attayned (*FQ* 5.5.17, my emphasis).

In the *Faerie Queene*, Radigund is a representative of the "Amazonian myth of disorder and inversion" (Hattaway 1996: 182). As such, she presents a threat to society that needs to be defeated. In forcing brave knights to wear women's clothing and do domestic work, she surpasses even Knox's prediction of what would be a consequence of female rule in England as not even the men's outward form remains (cf. Knox 1558: 11) in the *Faerie Queene*.

Yet, unlike Knox, Spenser does not seem to see a female ruler as inherently Amazonian and not all Amazonian qualities as inherently threatening. Accordingly, we find at least three non-Amazonian queens and a huntress who are associated with Queen Elizabeth herself and embody different facets of her role as ruling monarch: the eponymous Faerie Queen Gloriana; Britomart, daughter of the King of Britain and mother of a long line of "famous Progenie […] out of the auncient *Troian* blood" (*FQ* 3.2.22); Mercilla, "a mayden Queene of high renowne" (*FQ* 5.8.17); and the huntress Belphoebe, whose symbolic connection to Elizabeth I is made explicit in Spencer's prefatory letter to Walter Raleigh:

> In that Faery Queene I meane glory in my generall intention, but in my particular I conceiue the most excellent and glorious person of our soueraine the Queene, and her kingdome in Faery land. And yet in some places els I do otherwise shadow her. For considering she beareth two persons, the one of a most royall Queene or Empresse, the other of a most vertuous and beautifull Lady, this latter part in some places I doe ezpresse in Belphoebe, fashioning her name according to your owne excellent conceipt of Cynthia (Phoebe and Cynthia being both names of Diana) (*FQ* Letter to Raleigh).

Belphoebe is introduced in book 2, canto 3 as a "goodly Ladie clad in hunters weed, […] a woman of great worth / And by her stately portance, borne of heauenly birth" (*FQ* 2.3.21). And while she is not an Amazon herself, she nevertheless cannot escape the Amazonian influence entirely. A highly interesting simile in the ensuing extended blazon praising her beauty compares her first to the virgin goddess Diana (cf. *FQ* 2.2.31), underlining her connection to the Virgin Queen Elizabeth. Immediately following this, however, Belphoebe is compared to the Amazon Penthiselea:

> Or as that famous Queene
> Of Amazons, whom Pyrrhus did destroy,
> The day that first of Priame she was seene,
> Did shew her selfe in great triumphant ioy,
> To succour the weake state of sad afflicted Troy[39] (*FQ* 2.3.31).

So, while the actual Amazonian queen Radigund is killed (cf. *FQ* 5.7.30–34) and the 'proper' order is re-established (cf *FQ* 5.7.42), aspects of the Amazonian myths still persist as a metonymic way of describing female skill and prowess.

This strategy is more frequently employed in the context of the threat of the Spanish Armada (cf. Schleiner 1978: 164). In James Aske's *Elizabetha triumphans*, which was published in 1588, for example, we again find a comparison to Penthiselea:

> […] our princely Soueraigne,
> […] Most brauely mounted on a stately Steede
> […] In nought unlike the Amazonian Queene,
> Who beating downe amaine the bloodie Greekes,
> Thereby to grapple with Achillis stout,
> Euen at the time when Troy was sore besieg'd (Aske 1588: 23).

Later in the poem, Aske even goes so far as to forgo the stylistic device of the simile when he explicitly calls Elizabeth "an *Amazonian* Queene" (1588: 24).

This martial prowess of the Amazonian queen is carried over into the second area where comparisons of Elizabeth I to Amazons occur more often: in the context of the 'New World'. "[W]hen explorers of the Americas and Africa recounted stories of alleged Amazonian tribes in the New World" (Carney 2003: 117), the Amazons stopped being purely mythical beings and finding them becomes an actual possibility. As Michael Hattaway argues, "the projection of this Amazonian myth of disorder and inversion was […] central to the inventing of the New

39 The reference to the Trojan tradition of the Amazonomachy also links Belphobe to England, see chapter 4.2.2.

World" (Hattaway 1996: 182). When European explorers like Columbus, Cortéz, Orellana, or Raleigh travelled to the Americas, they were also looking for "Amazons and other amazing inhabitants, such as dragons, hydras and griffins in far-off lands, the lore of medieval legends" (Hart 2003: 84). The Amazons in these endeavours become metonyms for "more obviously material goals" (Schwartz 2000: 52) such as finding gold and other precious metals and possession of land. At the same time, they also represent "a mythological dimension to European ideology in coming to terms with the New World" (Hart 2003: 85).

In this context, the Amazon analogy does not usually carry a negative connotation. The female monarch as an Amazonian queen here highlights the promise of martial prowess and victory over the perceived threat of disorder and subversion:

> Her Maiesty heereby shall confirme and strengthen the opinions of al nations, as touching her great and princely actions. And where the south border of Guiana reacheth to the Dominion and Empire of the Amazones, those women shall heereby heare the name of a virgin, which is not onely able to defend her owne territories and her neighbors, but also to inuade and conquere so great Empyres and so farre remoued (Raleigh [1596] 1848: 120).

By conquering the Amazons, Raleigh argues, Elizabeth would become the "virginal queen of the Amazons" (Hart 2001: 175), which would strengthen her position among the other European monarchs. He puts Elizabeth in line with the heroes of Ancient Greek mythology, who also proved their worth by conquering the Amazons. But Raleigh takes this motif one step further. He envisions Elizabeth as the Virgin queen of the Amazons, who would then go on to conquer other empires as well. In doing so, he portrays Elizabeth as more powerful than any of those heroes or the Spanish King because she is able to incorporate the mighty Amazons into her order rather than just conquer them.

As Kathryn Schwartz suggests, the early modern understanding of the Amazon was characterised by a movement in two opposite directions. The Amazons as "mythical objects […] can never be found, identifying the edge of knowable space by remaining just beyond it"

(Schwartz 2000: 51). As the known world expands, they have to move further away. At the same time, however, the Amazons are moving closer to the European centre as they become "linked to all the objects that *can* be found, from gold to cannibals to women to land" (Schwartz 2000: 51). They are used both as metonyms for the Other in general and as analogies for discussing the position of female rulers and the domestic roles of women at home. In this respect, it is no longer possible to just regard them as distant Other. Early modern representations of Amazons, therefore, tend to "see Amazons not only at the edge of the world but at its center" (Schwartz 2000: 15). Accordingly, encounters with the Amazon, like the one between Theseus and Hippolyta in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, increasingly take place at the heart of power where the effects of the Amazon's subversive power can unfold their full potential.

2.2.3 Intercultural Encounters in Athens

The *List of Characters* introduces Hippolyta as "Queen of the Amazons, betrothed to Theseus" (*MND* 0.2). This double characterisation already introduces one of the central conflicts of Hippolyta's character. Hippolyta combines both the exotic eroticism and the domestic threat so typical of the portrayal of Amazon encounters in earlier sources. While it at least seems that "the domestication of Amazons subsumes a threat to social order", the act of domesticating them is also always incomplete because "amazonian wives do not lose the adjective when they acquire the noun" (both Schwartz 2000: 3).[40] Theseus's victory over Hippolyta, therefore, remains highly doubtful throughout the play.

The threat Hippolyta poses to the Athenian society represented by its ruling duke Theseus is evident from her first appearance on stage. While Theseus proudly states that he has defeated Hippolyta in battle, he also finds out that the Amazon cannot be subjugated as easily as he thought. Hippolyta's first speech act of the play is to contradict Theseus,

40 In John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *SV*, the supposed Amazons even turn out to be the lost wives of the Portugese colonists dispensing completely with the distinction between Amazons and wives.

who is complaining about the slow progression of time (cf. *MND* 1.14–6). She challenges his point of view by stating that the four days before their wedding "will quickly steep themselves in night; / Four nights will quickly dream away the time" (*MND* 1.1.7–8). Her simile, comparing the "[n]ew bent" (*MND* 1.1.10) moon to "a silver bow" (*MND* 1.1.9), is taken from the word field of hunting. It could thus also serve as a veiled threat or at least a reminder for Theseus of Hippolyta's heritage as Queen of the Amazons, who were famed among other things for their hunting prowess. Under these circumstances, it is unsurprising that Theseus immediately changes both the addressee and the topic of his speech: he turns to Philostrate and enquires after entertainment to "[a]wake the pert and nimble spirit of mirth" (*MND* 1.1.13).

Theseus eventually addresses Hippolyta again (cf. *MND* 1.1.16–19) but his choice of words is quite revealing. Before Hippolyta contradicted Theseus, they both spoke of their wedding as "*our* nuptial hour" (*MND* 1.1.1, my emphasis) and "*our* solemnity" (*MND* 1.1.11, my emphasis) respectively. Now, Theseus uses the subject-object construction of "I will wed thee" (*MND* 1.1.18) that dispenses with the community that was created by the plural determiner in the previous declarations and can be read as an attempt to assert his authority over Hippolyta. Yet, this assertion does not come from a position of strength. Instead, it reveals his insecurity: he may have "won [her] love" (*MND* 1.1.17) by defeating her in battle; he cannot, however, be sure of his victory. The Amazon is still present and continues to be a challenge for him. Therefore, he feels the need to impress her with "pomp, with triumph, and with revelling" (*MND* 1.1.19).

Their first exchange reveals the Amazon's double nature as both fascinating and threatening. This doubleness finds its mirror also in Theseus's choice of words. The highly suggestive imagery of the Athenian hero's "sword" "doing injuries" (*MND* 1.1.16–17) to the Amazonian queen links an act of military conquest with sexual eroticism, blurring the boundaries between them:

> The erotic is not only unruly, any more than it is only a consolidation of right relations; it does not map out categories, but reveals their interpenetration. Eroticism, like Amazons, implicates both bodies and fantasies, its presence both domesticating and estranging the intersection of social normativity and sex (Schwartz 2000: 7).

In the very first encounter between the Athenian hero and the Amazonian queen, categories already start to dissolve: enemy and lover; violence and love; man and woman; Self and Other; they all eventually become indistinguishable in the encounter with the Amazon. As the comedy progresses, this process of dissolution only accelerates.

Hippolyta remains on stage during Egeus's suit against his daughter although she does not speak (cf. *MND* 1.1.20–121). When Theseus finally turns to her and asks her "what cheer, my love" (*MND* 1.1.122), he reveals Hippolyta's disapproval of his decision. This does not seem surprising considering his choice of words when describing the life of a votaress of Diana:

> For aye to be in shady cloister mewed,
> To live a barren sister all your life,
> Chanting faint hymns to the cold fruitless moon.
> [...] earthlier happy is the roles distilled
> That that which, withering on the virgin thorn,
> Grows, lives, and dies in single blessedness (*MND* 1.1.71–78).

His negative descriptors for the all-female community of nuns also indicate how he probably regards Hippolyta's Amazonian society, who equally "abjure / For ever the society of men" (*MND* 1.1.65–66). He alludes to the moon, which is reminiscent of Hippolyta's earlier contradiction of Theseus with regards to the passing of time before their wedding (cf. *MND* 1.1.1–11), as well as to the goddess Diana, who is usually portrayed as a huntress, echoing the Amazons' famous hunting prowess. In doing so, he makes it clear that he also intends to depreciate Hippolyta's previous way of life. Accordingly, he does not give Hippolyta time to answer his question. He immediately turns to Egeus and Demetrius to "employ [them] in some business / Against our nuptial, and confer

with [them] / Of something nearly that concerns [themselves]" (*MND* 1.1.123–125). He is not interested in Hippolyta's opinion at all and "only asks her acquiescence" (Carney 2003: 119).

But it is not Hippolyta who acquiesces to Theseus's judgement but the other way around. It is the male head of the state who changes his opinion along the line of what presumably is Hippolyta's view. In the first scene, he is adamant that he has "no means [to] extenuate" (*MND* 1.1.120) the Athenian law which Egeus tries to use to subordinate his daughter and force her to marry Demetrius or die (cf. *MND* 1.1.38–45). When they meet the lovers again at the end of Act 4, he can suddenly simply "overbear [Egeus's] will" (*MND* 4.1.176) and decree that "in the temple, by and by, […] / These couples shall eternally be knit" (*MND* 4.1.176–177).[41] Both Theseus and Egeus, who upheld patriarchal authority as the only right system earlier in the play, have to yield to a different, female authority by the end of the play. The presence of the Amazon, even though she remains silent on the topic of Egeus's request and does not defend Hermia, is enough to dissolve the traditional order of society.

In Act 4, Theseus is still trying to impress Hippolyta with his skills as a hunter and the "the music of [his] hounds" (*MND* 4.1.104). Hippolyta's response constitutes her "longest speech, her only autobiographical moment, and one of the most impenetrable statements in the play" (Schwartz 2000: 213). She brings up her previous hunting experiences with "Hercules and Cadmus" (*MND* 4.1.109) and describes how impressed she was with their hounds (cf. *MND* 4.1.110–115). In doing so, she also reminds Theseus of her heritage as Amazonian queen, "rearmed and reengaged in violent pursuits, nostalgically recalling her masculine past" (Schwartz 2000: 213). Theseus's reaction is identical to his reaction to the reminder of her Amazonian past in Act 1 as he again quickly changes the subject.

Hippolyta's version of the events does not match with the timeline of Greek mythology as "Cadmus […] precedes Hippolyta and Hercules by several mythological generations, and Hippolyta and Hercules do not include hunting among their encounters" (Schwartz 2000: 213).

41 The fact that Demetrius does no longer want to marry Hermia should not carry much weight because the authority in the patriarchal society lies with Theseus and Egeus.

But this does nothing to change the effect her story has on Theseus. To avoid becoming just "another hero in a series of heroes, his status as her conqueror overshadowed by the company she has already kept" (Schwartz 2000: 213–214), Theseus has to point out that his hounds are superior to those of Hercules:

> My hounds are bred out of the Spartan kind,
> So flewed, so sanded; and their heads are hung
> With ears that sweep away the morning dew;
> Crook-kneed, and dewlapped like Thessalian bulls;
> Slow in pursuit, but matched in mouth like bells,
> Each under each. A cry more tuneable
> Was never hallooed to nor cheered with horn
> In Crete, in Sparta, nor in Thessaly.
> Judge when you hear (*MND* 4.1.116–124).

Again, he uses sexually charged language to respond to Hippolyta's threat, focusing on reproduction and metaphors for virility. The hunt is put off because of the encounter with the lovers, so we do not find out if he succeeds in convincing her. But the fact remains that he feels he has to do so, which again portrays Hippolyta as a worthy opponent. More than a show of Theseus's excellence, this is a demonstration of Hippolyta's power "to figure and refigure, to make things happen by making things up" (Schwartz 2000: 214). Her recollection of her Amazonian past, which may or may not have happened the way she describes it, forces Theseus to impress her with his hounds. It also immediately precedes his decision to overrule Egeus, which in this context could be read as an attempt to prove to Hippolyta that he possesses the same transformative power with his decree that the lovers can get married despite his previous instance that he was unable to do anything about it. Just like Hippolyta's story ignores the mythological chronology, he too can now just ignore the Athenian law. What is more, he seems to even feel compelled to do this to maintain at least some kind of balance of power between him and the Amazonian queen.

Hippolyta's female authority again clashes with the patriarchal order in the last act. During her last scene, Hippolyta's subversive potential as

an Amazon is brought out in her conversation with her newly-wedded husband about the lovers' "story of the night" (*MND* 5.1.24). Theseus claims the prerogative of interpretation for himself when he discards their tales as "antique fables" and "fairy toys" (both *MND* 5.1.3). For him, "cool reason" (*MND* 5.1.6) is to be preferred over "fantasies" (*MND* 5.1.5) and "imagination" (*MND* 5.1.8), implying thereby that giving the lovers' story any credibility would fall into the latter category. Even though he seems to be in love with Hippolyta (cf. *MND* 1.1.122 and 4.1.103), he does not include himself in the category of the "lover" who "[s]ees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt" (*MND* 5.1.10–11) in an attempt to show his superiority over both the lovers and Hippolyta.

Theseus does not succeed, however, in convincing his Amazonian wife of his interpretation. Instead, Hippolyta rejects his dichotomy of reason and imagination, thereby also calling into question Theseus's interpretative authority as a whole:

> But all the story of the night told over,
> And all their minds transfigured so together,
> More witnesseth than fancy's images,
> Ad grows to something of great constancy;
> But howsoever, strange and admirable (*MND* 5.1.23–27).

Interestingly, Hippolyta has the last word on the matter as the conversation turns to a different topic. Her opinion is also the one that the audience would probably agree with as they have seen the "story of the night" (*MND* 5.1.23) played out on stage and therefore know that "these fairy toys" (*MND* 5.1.3) have happened, at least within the theatrical contract of the play. Theseus's authority, therefore, is successfully challenged again by the Amazonian queen. As a consequence, he changes his position during the play within the play when he concedes a restorative power to the imagination (cf. *MND* 5.1.205–209).

Hippolyta's behaviour during the play within the play also deserves a closer examination. Helena and Hermia indeed remain silent throughout the last act, which Jo Elridge Carney reads as a sign for the destruction of female community and the complete surrender of female authority to Theseus (cf. 2003: 119–120). But Hippolyta is assertively

vocal during her final scene. As she has done throughout the entire play, Hippolyta again voices dissent with Theseus. When he proclaims that

> [he] will hear that play;
> For never anything can be amiss
> When simpleness and duty tender it (*MND* 5.1.81–83),

Hippolyta replies that she does not "love […] to see wretchedness o'ercharged, / And duty in his service perishing" (*MND* 5.1.85–86). Her assessment of the mechanicals' capabilities also turns out to be the more accurate one. Additionally, Hippolyta's use of the verb *to love* shows a certain level of emotional involvement prompting Theseus to call her "gentle sweet" (*MND* 5.1.87). So while Hippolyta seems to be concerned about the mechanicals and does not want them to make fools of themselves, Theseus condescendingly emphasises the superiority of himself and the Athenian nobles because they will be able "to take what [the mechanicals] mistake" (*MND* 5.1.90). His use of the term "sport" (*MND* 5.1.90) suggests that he deems watching people struggle to deliver "what poor duty cannot do" (*MND* 5.1.91) as entertainment.

It becomes obvious rather quickly that the mechanicals' performance "fails to seduce the audience in the play into suspending disbelief" (Macsiniuc 2008: 265). Although Theseus claims to be prepared to appreciate the performance for the actors' "might, not merit" (*MND* 5.1.92), he starts to mock them immediately after the prologue has finished. In doing so, he sets an example that Lysander, Demetrius, and also Hippolyta follow for the rest of the play within the play. As it continues, however, the meta-audience's comments begin to turn from actual commentary on the performance to demonstrations of their superior intellect.

What this meta-audience does not seem to pick up on for the most part, however, are the "metadramatic levels which constitute implicit comments on the limits and possibilities of theatrical art" which the play within the play produces despite being "turn[ed] into a burlesque" (both Macsiniuc 2008: 267). While the male meta-audience members, Theseus, Demetrius, and Lysander, seem rather impervious to these metadramatic implications, Hippolyta is more susceptible to them.

Even though she too continues to mock the performance, one of her comments stands out from the rest. After Pyramus has discovered Thisbe's bloodied mantle, Hippolyta's reaction is one of empathy: "Beshrew my heart, but I pity the man" (*MND* 5.1.274). Theseus does voice a similar opinion but unlike Hippolyta, he uses a pseudo-passive construction in the conditional mode and avoids using personal pronouns all together: "This passion, and the death of a dear friend, would go near to make a man look sad" (cf. *MND* 5.1.272–273). Despite his claim that he is willing to "amend" (*MND* 5.1.206) the mechanicals' performance with his "imagination" (*MND* 5.1.205), therefore, Theseus fails to do so, while Hippolyta succeeds. Her comment shows that she can empathise with Pyramus when he thinks that he has lost his lover. She seems to be the only character in the on-stage meta-audience who experiences "tragic *catharsis*, whose precondition would have been the emphatic identification ensured by successful mimesis" (Macsiniuc 2008: 271).

As an Other who transgresses from the outside into the heart of power, Hippolyta carries a very potent subversive potential.[42] Theseus's victory over Hippolyta – and by proxy, the victory of the patriarchal society over an alternative female-ruled society – is neither as absolute nor as secure as he wants to believe. As queen of the Amazons and Theseus's wife, Hippolyta retains "a syntagmatic doubleness, asserting that 'betrothed' intersects without displacing the effects of 'Amazon'" (Schwartz 2000: 40) throughout the play. The threat the Amazon poses to the Athenian society by questioning traditional norms and values and by giving a dissenting voice cannot be quelled by her domestication. Hippolyta reminds both the play's characters and its audience that

> patriarchally governed heterosociality rests on fragile and fluid distinctions […] [and] signals that these processes [of suppression or repression or oppression], at once necessary and dangerous to comic conclusions, are always ongoing and never complete (Schwartz 2000: 210).

42 For a different, less optimistic reading of Hippolyta's role in *MND*, see Carney 2003, who argues that Shakespeare introduces the queen of the Amazons "only to erase her, or, more specifically, to subsume her into the larger world of orthodox patriarchy" as "the queen is vanquished, and she and the female community she represents are forced to accept a supporting role in a world ruled by men" (both 2003: 118).

Unlike Tamora in *Titus Andronicus*, Hippolyta's role in the play reveals the restorative potential of challenging the existing order. She presents a threat to Theseus and his patriarchal authority and in doing so, compels him to react to her subversive power. He feels challenged by her female authority and therefore tries to impress her throughout the play. By the end of act 4, he has already relinquished essential positions of the patriarchal order that he had previously insisted were immutable. By allowing Hermia to marry the man she wanted against her father's will, he subverts the fundamental power structure of the Athenian oikos and society as a whole. In doing so, he becomes more like the Amazons, who, as highlighted above, function as the embodiment of this myth of subversion. Hippolyta's influence on Theseus is therefore as necessary as the supernatural interference of Oberon and Puck to bring about the comedy's conclusion. The encounter with the Amazon, previously regarded as a threat, now proves to be beneficial to the society that encounters her. In doing so, Hippolyta is closer to the early modern attitude towards the Amazons as expressed in Spenser's *Fairie Queene* and Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana*.

3 Presence: Co-existence at the Centre

The second set of plays that I want to explore in this thesis no longer fit the pattern of the Other transgressing from the outside into the heart of power established in *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Instead, *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* stage the aftermaths of those initial encounters. In this second phase, both Self and Other exist in a shared space, come into contact with each other frequently, and seem to live in a symbiotic relationship where both sides can prosper. Yet, similar to the intercultural encounters in the previous chapter, the encounter with the Other also reveals the systemic and fundamental injustices in the society where it takes place as I am going to argue in the following.

The Merchant of Venice and *Othello* have received plenty of attention, yet as Graham Holderness points out, "they have rarely been considered together" (2010: 4). Despite the difference in genre, the plays share some remarkable similarities. One of these similarities is that both plays are set in Venice during the fifteenth and sixteenth century (cf. Wiggins 2013: 343 and Wiggins 2015: 132). This puts the actions of these plays closer to Shakespeare's time than those of the two plays discussed earlier. As Stephen Orgel points out, it has long become

> a truism that the Venice of the Rialto and the dogana is really Shakespeare's London, but here surely the distinction are more important than the similarities. The Italian setting is everything Elizabethan middle-class mercantile London is not for Shakespeare: a world of romance, glamor, poetry, and danger (2003: 144).

Yet, Venice is also what early modern England was aspiring to become as Carole Levin and John Watkins highlight when they analyse the observations made by the Venetian ambassador Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli during a diplomatic visit to London. He "had come to England as an envoy of the Senate to negotiate a case of piracy involving a Venetian ship and, more generally, to get Elizabeth to do something about the increasing number of English pirates in the Mediterranean" (Levin and

Watkins 2009: 111). This already shows an inverse relationship between English and Venetian interests in the region. What is more, Levin and Watkins argue, early modern England was about to take over Venice's position as the leading mercantile power:

> While the English merchants, captains, courtiers, and the queen herself looked forward to a glorious future, one in which their Mediterranean triumphs would be schools for their further expansion into Atlantic and Indian oceans, Scaramelli looked back to a receding past. If England was a phoenix, it was rising on Venice's ashes (Levin and Watkins 2009: 113).

Overall, Venice functions as a "projection of English fears of political instability and political aspirations" (Tosi and Bassi 2011: 8) as well as an example of the "destabilising effects" felt in the process of "the early modern capitalist transformation of England" (both Coral 2015: 285). Similar to how the plays discussed earlier examine previous forms of empire for their relevance for early modern England, Shakespeare's Venetian plays also address issues that are important for the political, social, religious, and economic discourses of early modern England by playing them through in this foreign setting.

The Merchant of Venice and *Othello* moreover share the similarity that they are "not only distinguished by authentic 'local colour', but convey the playwright's awareness of a certain image of Venice, both as it was presented by Italian historians, and as English visitors recorded their experiences of the city" (Freed 2009: 47). The images of Venice presented in Shakespeare and his sources comprise the four main myths that were highly prevalent during the early modern period: "Venice the Rich, Venice the Wise, Venice the Just, and Venice, *città galante*" (Pfister 1999: 17). Both plays also transition to a different location, Belmont and Cyprus respectively. While these settings do not carry as vast of a set of associations as Venice, they nevertheless help to characterise both the society where the encounters take place as well as the parties involved.

Additionally, Shylock and Othello fulfil strikingly similar roles as the plays' main representative of the Other. Their significant impact on

Venetian society is also reflected in the size of their parts.[43] Yet, they are not the only Other in these plays. *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* also feature intercultural encounters with or at least allusions to further foreign cultures that affect Venetian society. Given this centrality and abundance of representatives of the various Others in these plays, the interactions between the Self and the Other in Venice offer insight into the dynamics involved after the initial encounter. These also become relevant in Shakespeare's early modern England as it expands its relations across the world. Both plays explore a shared community, which at first seems to work to the benefit of all parties involved. But, as I am going to show in the following, this co-existence is ultimately challenged and destroyed not just by certain individuals deliberately working against it but because the seemingly tolerant system is revealed by the encounter to be just a cover for deeply rooted distrust and prejudice.

3.1 The Merchant of Venice

In his introduction to the Arden edition, John Drakakis calls *The Merchant of Venice* "arguably Shakespeare's most controversial comedy" ([2]2013:1). While a lot of the literary criticism of the play has focused on its portrayal of Shylock, its "provocations", as Lindsay Kaplan puts it, "lie not only in its representation of Jews and Judaism, but also in its representations of gender, blackness, Islam and queerness" (Kaplan 2020: 1). The encounters between these various Others take different forms throughout the play. Some are still transgressions from the outside like the ones discussed in the previous chapter. This is the case for all of Portia's suitors who come from all over the world (cf. *MoV* 1.1.168–172) and, in particular, for both the Prince of Morocco and the Prince of Arragon, whose brief encounters end in their removal from Belmont.

The central intercultural encounters of *The Merchant of Venice*, however, do not conform to this transgressional model. The play offers two

43 Shylock and Othello each have the second largest part in their plays with 352 and 880 lines respectively. With 574 lines, Portia has the biggest role in *MoV*. In *Oth*, the largest part is Iago's with 1088 lines, cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a.

main representatives of Venice's famous Jewish community,[44] who interact with the Venetians in various ways throughout the play. In the following, I am going to focus on these various encounters between the Self and Other, which take the form of a shared community with benefits and challenges for both the parties involved and Venetian society as a whole. I am again going to look at early modern accounts that could have influenced the portrayal of the play's intercultural encounters. But this time, we have a more directly traceable source in a story in Giovanni Fiorentino's *Il Pecorone* which provides most of the plot for Shakespeare's play. Another huge influence on the play is Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* which, according to John Drakakis, is the "most popular dramatization of the figure of the Jew on the Elizabethan public stage" (22013: 17). Comparing where Shakespeare's depiction deviates from his sources thus sheds light on the various attitudes that an early modern audience would have brought to the play and how they would have perceived the encounters at its centre.

3.1.1 Venice and Belmont

I want to begin my exploration of *The Merchant of Venice* by looking at its two main settings, Venice and Belmont, to highlight the various ways in which the settings influence the encounters at its core. Venice, in particular, is "a culturally charged signifier" (Tosi and Bassi 2011: 6) that evokes a variety of associations combining "sophistication with corruption, sameness and alterity, often producing a powerful vision which blurs the boundaries between historical fact and imaginary fiction" (Tosi and Bassi 2011: 3–4). The aforementioned central myths of Venice inform not only Shakespeare's portrayal of the city but also the associations his audiences would have had with the play's setting.

Shakespeare would have found many of the elements that he expanded on in his play already in his main source, *Il Pecorone*. In the novella, the protagonist Giannetto, who will become Bassiano in

44 I am excluding Chus and Tubal from my exploration. Chus is only mentioned once by Jessica (cf. *MoV* 3.2.284) and Tubal, who does appear on stage, only speaks a few lines. Other than providing Shylock with the means to furnish Bassanio and Antonio with the three thousand ducats (cf. *MoV* 1.3.51–54), he does not really interact with the Venetians at all.

Shakespeare's play, is a Florentine merchant's son. He arrives in Venice at the house of his godfather, Ansaldo, who is described as "the richest of all the Christian merchants" (*Il Pecorone* 45). Belmonte, which is located several days out from Venice on the route to Alexandria (cf. *Il Pecorone* 46), is the port town where Giannetto tries to woo a beautiful lady, who "had brought many to ruin" (*Il Pecorone* 47). As the captain of Giannetto's ship explains, she

> has made it a law that, if any stranger lands there, he must needs share her bed, and, if he should have his will of her, that he should have her to wife and be the lord of the town and of all the country round. But if he should fail in his venture, he must lose all he has (*Il Pecorone 47)*.

After two failed attempts, during which Giannetto falls asleep after being drugged by the lady (cf. *Il Pecorone* 47–50), Ansaldo borrows "ten thousand ducats" from "a certain Jew of Mestri" (*Il Pecorone* 51). This loan has the provision that "if he should not repay the debt by Saint John's day in the June following, the Jew should have the right to take a pound of his flesh, and to cut the same from what place so ever he listed" (*Il Pecorone* 51) to provide his godson with the means to regain the losses of his previous journeys. Giannetto, however, uses the money instead to woo the lady a third time (*Il Pecorone* 52). During this third attempt, Giannetto is warned not to drink the wine by one of the lady's attendants and therefore, manages to stay awake when she comes to bed:

> as soon as the lady was under the sheets, he turned to her and embraced her, saying, 'Now I have that which I have so long desired,' and with these words he gave her the greeting of holy matrimony, and all that night she lay in his arms; wherefore she was well content (*Il Pecorone* 53).

Giannetto then becomes the lord of Belmonte and lives "his life in joy and gladness, and gave no thought to Messer Ansaldo, who, luckless wight as he was, remained a living pledge for the ten thousand ducats which he had borrowed from the Jew" (Il Pecorone 54). On the day on which the repayment is due, Giannetto is suddenly reminded of Ansaldo and pressured by his wife into riding to Venice to pay back the

loan and save him (cf. *Il Pecorone* 54). As in *The Merchant of Venice*, the Jew rejects the offers of increasing amounts of money and insists on his bond (cf. *Il Pecorone* 55). Likewise, he is eventually thwarted by "the lady of Belmonte, clad as a doctor of laws" (*Il Pecorone* 55), who solves the issue by insisting on the letter of the bond which "says naught as to the shedding of blood" (*Il Pecorone* 57). The Jew then tears up his bond and leaves (cf. *Il Pecorone* 57).[45]

The novella's portrayal of Venice focuses on one main aspect of the city's myth, namely that of the wealthy trade city. Yet, it also remains vague about the actual practices of trade and where the city's wealth comes from. Instead, it is taken for granted as Venice in the novella is not only the home of "the richest of all the Christian merchants" (*Il Pecorone* 45), who can afford to furnish his godson with a ship "filled with rich and fine merchandise" (*Il Pecorone* 48) twice and then possesses enough sureties to borrow ten thousand ducats from a moneylender (cf. *Il Pecorone* 51). It also offers opportunities for young merchant adventurers such as Giannetto's friends, who annually return to Venice from Alexandria "having won great profit from their venture" (*Il Pecorone* 48).

In addition to this, *Il Pecorone* also briefly addresses Venice's "special reputation for justice" with its "supposed impartiality, even toward the lower classes and outsiders" (both McPherson 1990: 36) through its portrayal of the bond between Ansaldo and the nameless Jewish moneylender:

> Over this matter there arose great debate, and everyone condemned the Jew; but, seeing that equitable law ruled in Venice, and that the Jew's contract was fully set forth and in customary legal form, no one could deny him his rights; all they could do was to entreat his mercy (*Il Pecorone* 55).

45 The rest of the story revolves around the ring plot (cf. *Il Pecorone* 58–60) that is also present in Shakespeare's play. Unlike Antonio in *MoV*, however, Ansaldo is not excluded from the happy ending of the story because Giannetto arranges for him to marry the waiting woman who had warned him of the drugged wine and "they all lived together in joy and feasting as long as their lives lasted" (*Il Pecorone* 60).

As mentioned above, the Jew is eventually outwitted by the disguised lady of Belmonte. But this does not detract from the fact that he has the right to bring his case "to the proper court for such affairs" (*Il Pecorone* 56).

Shakespeare takes up these two aspects of the myth of Venice and expands on them in his portrayal of the city in *The Merchant of Venice*. The first scene already establishes a "primary connection between Venice and trade" (Kaplan 2002: 2) as the play opens at the eponymous merchant's house where Antonio's friends Salarino and Salanio are discussing "why [Antonio is] so sad" (*MoV* 1.1.1). They suggest various possible reasons for his "want-wit sadness" (*MoV* 1.1.5) and the first reason they think likely is connected to Antonio's "merchandise" (*MoV* 1.1.44). During the negotiations over the loan for Bassanio, Shylock offers some details about what this merchandise entails:

> My meaning in saying he is a good man is to have you understand me that he is sufficient, yet his means are in supposition. He hath an argosy bound to Tripoli, another to the Indies; I understand, moreover, upon the Rialto, he hath a third at Mexico, a fourth for England, and other ventures he hath squandered abroad (*MoV* 1.3.14–20).

The various destinations evoke the context of early modern globalisation and the emergence of the truly global trade that Dennis O. Flynn and Arturo Giráldes, as discussed above, use as the basis for their definition of globalisation in the early modern context (cf. 2006: 235). The more or less exotic destinations of Antonio's trade ventures exemplify the boasts of Venice as "a common and general market to the whole world" (Contarini 1599: 1)[46] made by Gasparo Contarini, whose *Commonwealth and Government of Venice* is one of the most important

46 The quotes from Contarini's *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum*, which was originally published in 1543, are taken from Lewes Lewkenor's translation from 1599. Graham Holderness postulates that Shakespeare could possibly have previewed this translation since "writings circulated in manuscript form before publication" (2010: 19). Eugenie Freed, on the other hand, argues that Shakespeare seems to have read Contarini as well as the two novellas, on which *MoV* and *Oth* are based, in Italian as they had not been translated into English yet (cf. 2009: 48): "if Shakespeare wished to acquire a reading or speaking

sources of the early modern perception of the city. The goods Antonio trades in – spices and silks (cf. *MoV* 1.1.32–33) – also allude to Venice's "fabled wealth […] [which] originated from its trade with the East" (Freed 2009: 50). Antonio's claim that he expects "return / [o]f thrice three times the value of this bond" (*MoV* 1.3.154–155) within two months further illustrates Venice's status as "the most copious and rich city under the heavens" (quoted in McPherson 1990: 28).

Shakespeare elaborates on the vague topography of Giovanni Fiorentino's novella and also transplants integral parts of the story from Mestre on the Italian mainland (cf. *Il Pecorone* 51) to the city itself.[47] The Rialto, which Contarini describes as "the place where the marchantes meet" (1599: 153), is mentioned five times (*MoV* 1.3.18, 1.3.34, 1.3.103, 3.1.1, and 3.1.40) in Shakespeare's play. It is the city's central market place of goods and information and also a meeting place of different cultures and religions. This connects Venice's wealth to its diversity as Lindsay Kaplan points out: "Not only do people of different national origins, ethnicities, and religions flock to Venice, but its own inhabitants include outsiders, such as the Jewish moneylender Shylock" (Kaplan 2002: 2). Contemporary accounts by English travellers like William Thomas's *Historie of Italie* repeatedly highlight the city's famous tolerance of other cultures:

> For no man there marketh an others dooynges, or that meddleth with an other mans liuyng. If thou be a papist, there shalt thou want no kinde of supersticion to feede vpon. If thou be a gospeller, no man shall aske why thou comest not to churche. If thou be a Iewe, a Turke, or beleeuest in the diuell (so thou spreade not thyne opinions abroade) thou arte free from all controllement (Thomas 1549: 85).

Thomas Coryat, whose *Crudities* was published several years after Shakespeare wrote his Venetian plays but which has been highly influential for the English perception of Venice, comments on the city's

knowledge of Italian […], there would have been no shortage of opportunity, either by live instruction or from language manuals" (2009: 49), especially given that the "Italian language and its culture were all the rage at the Elizabethan court" (2009: 48).

47 As Eugenie Freed points out, Jews were only allowed to settle in Venice from the early sixteenth century onwards after the establishment of the "walled-in New Ghetto […] in 1516" (2009: 56).

diversity as well. Describing "the Piazza, that is, the Market place of St. Marke" (1611: 171), Coryat remarks that it is the city's central location where "the famous concourse and meeting of so many distinct and sundry nations" such as "Polonians, Slauonians, Persians, Grecians, Turks, Iewes, Christians of all the famousest regions of Christendome" take place "twise a day, betwixt sixe and eleuen of the clocke in the morning, and betwixt fiue in the afternoon and eight" (all 1611: 175).

The trial scene again highlights Venice's justice system which was accessible to both citizens and strangers. As is the case in Il Pecorone, Shylock is able to bring the Venetian citizen Antonio before a court of justice and "Venetian law / Cannot impugn [him] as [he] proceed[s]" (*MoV* 4.1.174–175). As Antonio, the Duke, Shylock, and the disguised Portia all make clear, it is precisely this "supposed impartiality" (McPherson 1990: 36) that forms the basis of Venice's mercantile wealth:

> The Duke cannot deny the course of law;
> For the commodity that strangers have
> With us in Venice, if it be denied,
> Will much impeach the justice of the state,
> Since that the trade and profit of the city
> Consisteth of all nations (*MoV* 3.3.26–31).

If the duke "[w]rest[s] once the law to [his] authority […] / [to] curb this cruel devil of his will" (*MoV* 4.1.211–213) as Bassanio beseeches him, it will, as Portia points out, "be recorded for a precedent" (*MoV* 4.1.216). Shylock too is aware that if he is denied, "danger light[s] / Upon your charter and your city's freedom" (*MoV* 4.1.37–38). Because of this, he is rightfully confident that the Venetian law will have to grant him his bond. As Eugenie Freed argues, this would have been "noteworthy to English audiences at a time when Jews had no legal rights at all in most of Europe" (2009: 52).

Yet, as Farah Karim-Cooper shows, this remarkable tolerance of other cultures does not mean "that racial tensions did not exist" and there are also accounts that "describe a city that ghettoised its ethnic minorities" (both 2016: n/a). Shylock, in the end, fails to get his bond and on top of that is forced to "presently become a Christian" (*MoV*

4.1.383). This condition is not part of Shakespeare's source where the Jew just leaves (cf. *Il Pecorone* 57). Stephen Orgel reads the inclusion of Shylock's conversion as an attempt of "incorporate[ing] him into the Christian world" motivated by the acknowledgement that Shylock "is an essential part of Venice, which is to say, of England" (both 2003: 154). Yet, Antonio and Gratiano's racist remarks and behaviour (cf. *MoV* 1.3102–126 and 4.1.127–137) throughout the play also reveal that Venice is only tolerant compared to the extreme intolerance the Jews experienced in other places at the time: "Christian and Jews are able to coexist, albeit acrimoniously, in Venice to exchange goods and services" (Trepanier 2014: 204), but prejudice and intolerance are still very much part of how society treats representatives of other cultures and religions.

This seemingly tolerant front combined with its inherent racial prejudice also surfaces in *The Merchant of Venice*'s other setting. Belmont has frequently been interpreted in contrast to Venice as the play's *green world*. As Catherine Belsey has remarked, it is "evidently the location of happy love" (1991: 41):

> Belmont is a fairytale castle, where three suitors come for the hand of the princess and undergo a test arranged by her father in order to distinguish between true love on the one hand and self-love and greed on the other (Belsey 1991: 41).

It is also the place where Jessica and Lorenzo seek refuge after having spent all the money Jessica had taken from her father (cf. *MoV* 3.1.76–111). As such, it represents "a haven of hospitality, music, poetry, old love stories retold in the night – and the infinite wealth (without origins) which makes all this possible" (Belsey 1991: 41). In the novella, each of Giannetto's attempts to win the lady is marked by feasts and celebrations as well (cf. *Il Pecorone* 47, 50, and 52). When he finally succeeds, "there was no lack of merry jesting, and jousting, and sword-play, and dancing, and singing, and music, and all the other sports appertaining to jollity and rejoicing" (*Il Pecorone* 53). In *The Merchant of Venice*, Lorenzo asks for "music" (*MoV* 5.1.53) to "wake Diana with a hymn, / With sweetest touches [to] pierce [their] mistress' ear, / And [to] draw her home with music" (*MoV* 5.1.66–68). As the setting of the play's ending, Belmont is

also the place where the action returns to after the emotional turmoils of the trial scene. This return is necessary to restore some sort of "harmony" (Belsey 1991: 41):

> Act 5 constitutes a coda to the main plot, a festival, set in Belmont, of love and concord and sexuality, combining elements of poetry and comedy […] conventionally held to complete its 'harmonies', to dissipate tension and reconcile differences (Belsey 1991: 41).

Yet, despite how "different – perhaps more romantic or exotic – Belmont may seem", it also "functions as an extension of Venice" (both Sousa 2014: 44). From the beginning, it is framed in mercantile terms by Bassanio who introduces the play's love sub-plot with this interesting description: "In Belmont is a lady *richly* left" (*MoV* 1.1.161, my emphasis). The expressed aim of his quest for Portia is not to find love and happiness but "to come fairly off from the great debts / Wherein my time, something too prodigal, / Hath left me gaged" (*MoV* 1.1.128–130). Bassanio also formulates his plan to marry Portia by comparing it to Jason's quest for the golden fleece:

> Nor is the wide world ignorant of her worth,
> For the four winds blow in from every coast
> Renowned suitors, and her sunny locks
> Hang on her temples like a *golden fleece*,
> Which makes her seat of Belmont *Colchis*' strand,
> And many *Jasons* come in quest of her (*MoV* 1.1.167–172, my emphasis).

Gratiano, too, makes this comparison when he boasts to the newly arrived Salerio that "We are the Jasons; we have won the fleece" (*MoV* 3.2.240). In one of the best-known versions of the myth, Jason is tasked by his uncle Pelias to travel "through the mouth of the Black Sea and between the Cyanean rocks to fetch the golden fleece" (*Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 1.3–4) from Aeetes, the king of Colchis. Pelias, who has usurped the throne from Jason's father, has "arranged for [Jason] the ordeal of a very arduous voyage, so that either on the sea or else among foreign people he would lose any chance of returning home" (*Ap. Rhod. Argon.*

1.15–17). Jason eventually manages to secure the golden fleece with the help of Aeeton's daughter Medea, who is made to fall in love with Jason by Hera and Aphrodite (cf. *Ap. Rhod. Argon*. 3.84–89). In exchange for Jason's promise to take her with him, Medea offers to magically put the snake guarding the fleece to sleep so that he can steal it (*Ap. Rhod. Argon*. 4.83–91). After this is accomplished, Jason tells his companions that he intends to "take her home to be [his] lawfully wedded wife" (*Ap. Rhod. Argon*. 4.190–205). Yet, as is told in Euripides's play *Medea*, which "more than any other text, influenced later traditions about and iconographic representations of Medea" (*OCD*, s.v. *Medea*), their relationship turns sour quickly:

> But now all is enmity, and closest ties are diseased. For Jason, abandoning his own children and my mistress, is bedding down in a royal match, having married the daughter of Creon, ruler of this land. Poor Medea, finding herself thus dishonored, calls loudly on his oaths, invokes the mighty assurance of his sworn right hand, and calls the gods to witness the unjust return she is getting from Jason (*Eur. Med*. 1.15–25).

By objectifying Portia as the golden fleece and focusing on the wealth they have gained through their marriages, Bassanio and Gratiano already undermine the fairytale-like atmosphere of Belmont and the happy resolution to the casket plot from the beginning.[48] Belmont as the "the location of happy love" (Belsey 1991: 41) is further called into question by the various pairs of unhappy lovers that Lorenzo and Jessica evoke:

> Lorenzo: The moon shines bright. In such a night as this,
> […] *Troilus*, methinks, mounted the Trojan walls
> And sighed his soul toward the Grecian tents
> Where *Cressid* lay that night.

48 Gary Harrington calls this happy ending into question when he argues that "Morocco may well the worthiest of Portia's suitors" (2017: 54). Portia rejects him out of bigotry and prejudice because of his "complexion" (*MoV* 1.3.125) which is more important to her than his "condition" (*MoV* 1.3.124). Her aversion towards Morocco is purely based on his appearance which is ironic in the context of the casket trial which can only be won by someone who "can recognize the difference between inner and outer selves, appearance and reality" (Loomba 2002: 136).

Jessica: In such a night
Did *Thisbe* fearfully o'ertrip the dew
And saw the lion's shadow ere himself
And ran dismayed away.
Lorenzo: In such a night
Stood *Dido* with a willow in her hand
Upon the wild sea-banks, and waft her love
To come again to Carthage.
Jessica: In such a night
Medea gathered the enchanted herbs
That did renew old Aeson (*MoV* 5.1.1–14, my emphasis).

None of the lovers they refer to end up living together happily ever after. The relationships of Troilus and Cressida and Dido and Aeneas are marked by the infidelity of one partner (cf. *MoV* 5.1.4–5 FN and 5.1.10 FN). Pyramus and Thisbe both die before they can be together (cf. *Ov. Met.* 4.96–166). Jessica also again refers to the Jason myths with the mention of both Medea and Jason's father but shifts the focus away from Medea betraying her family to help Jason steal the fleece (cf. *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 4.83–91). That the various lovers in Belmont use allusions to these mythical unfortunate couples does not bode well for their futures together.

All in all, both Venice and Belmont are topical settings in *The Merchant of Venice*. Their dramatic geography evokes complex associations that inform the various intercultural encounters that take place there. But, as John Drakakis points out, the play "both represent[s], and maintain[s] a critical distance from" (2007: 172) its settings. In doing so, their portrayal in the play raises important questions about the myths associated with them. Both settings ultimately reinforce homogeneity within the cast of characters that are engaged in these encounters despite their outwardly professed tolerance.

This is most explicit in the play's portrayal of the treatment of its two main Jewish characters Shylock and Jessica by the Venetian Christians. Shylock has an equivalent in Giovanni Fiorentino's novella in the nameless Jewish moneylender whose role Shakespeare expands greatly. He also adds the character of Jessica to show another dimension to the

intercultural encounters at the heart of the play. Shylock is ultimately barred from integrating or even co-existing with Christian society, whereas the process at least seems to be less difficult for his daughter. What is interesting about Shylock and Jessica, however, is that while they are members of the Venetian Jewish community, they are also identifiably English and Scottish respectively. As Stephen Orgel points out, "Shylock is not some form of a biblical name" but "clearly and unambiguously English" (2003: 151) whereas Jessica is "a common enough name in Scotland" (2003: 152).[49] This offers an interesting twist because the characters made out to be the Other by Venetian society are actually English and Scottish. This brings them closer to what Shakespeare's audience would have perceived as the Self. This foreshadows the role reversal of Self and Other that I am going to explore in the final chapter of this thesis.

3.1.2 Jessica and Female Conversion

Apart from Shylock, Jessica is the representative of the Other that has the most interactions with the Venetian Christians. Through her conversion to Christianity and her marriage to Lorenzo, she gains access to the Venetian society as well as Portia's court in Belmont. As Sara Coodin points out, her liminal position "between ethnological and theological worlds [...], neither willing to remain affiliated with the Jewish 'blood' of her father nor able to convincingly be defined by the Christian 'manners' that she seeks to adopt through conversion" allows her to remain "pivotal to the unfolding of *Merchant*'s action, including the bond plot and trial" (both 2017: 141–142) despite her minor role in the play.[50] As she does not have a counterpart in Giovanni Fiorentino's novella, her addition to the play is most likely inspired by Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, which, as mentioned above, was highly influential and also features a Jewish father and daughter.

49 As Stephen Orgel shows, there are several instances in other Shakespearean plays where we find identifiably English names among a majority of non-English names in non-English settings (cf. 2003: 152). Examples include the mechanicals in *MND*'s Athens, Nathaniel and Costard in *LLL*'s Navarre, Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek in *TN*'s Illyria; Sampson, Gregory, Peter and Abraham in *Rom*'s Verona, and Don John in *Ado*'s Messina.
50 Jessica only appears in five scenes and has 86 lines, cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a.

Jessica shares many similarities with Marlowe's Abigail. Both are the only child of rich Jewish fathers as well as the only Jewish woman in their plays. Both eventually give up their Jewish heritage and convert to Christianity seemingly successfully albeit out of different motivations and through different means. In contrast to Abigail, whose relationship to her father Barabas seems to be cordial and close, at least at the beginning of the play (cf. *JM* 1.1.136–138 and 1.2.226–245), Jessica is characterised in opposition to her father:

> Alack, what heinous sin is it in me
> To be ashamed to be my father's child!
> But, though I am a daughter to his blood,
> I am not to his manner (*MoV* 2.3.16–19).

As Carol Levin and John Watkins point out, there is no suggestion in the play that "Shylock is cruel to his daughter" but in her description of her feelings towards him and their home, she seems to have "begun to accept the dominant culture's perception of Shylock, the Jewish moneylender, as a monster" (both 2009: 96–97). In her exchange with the Clown, she reveals her feelings of loneliness as she is saying goodbye to the "merry devil" who did "rob [their house] of some taste of tediousness" (both *MoV* 2.3.2–3). Her metaphor of "Our house is hell" (*MoV* 2.3.1) also echoes the various descriptions of Shylock as "the very devil incarnation" (*MoV* 2.2.24).[51]

Whereas Shylock is focused on his "bargains and [his] well-won thrift" (*MoV* 1.3.46) and "breed[ing]" (*MoV* 1.3.92) his wealth, Jessica seems more liberal in her use of money. Her first action in the play is to give a ducat to the Clown as he is leaving Shylock's service (cf. *MoV* 2.3.4). Later on, after she has eloped with Lorenzo, she is reported to have "spent in Genoa, as [Tubal] heard, one night fourscore ducats" (*MoV* 3.1.98–99) and to have purchased a monkey with the turquoise

51 Antonio first compares Shylock to the devil when on Shylock's retelling of the story of "Jacob graz[ing] his uncle Laban's sheep" (*MoV* 1.3.67), he comments with the proverbial "The devil can cite Scritpure for his purpose" (*MoV* 1.3.94). During the trial scene, Bassanio refers to Shylock twice as "this cruel devil" (*MoV* 4.1.213) and "this devil" (*MoV* 4.1.283).

ring that Shylock had received from his wife Leah and seems to hold very dear (cf. *MoV* 3.1.109–111).[52]

The difference between Shylock and Jessica is not restricted to their "manners" (*MoV* 2.3.19) either. Throughout the play, several characters remark on Jessica's difference from her father "in terms of race, rather than belief or behaviour" (Kaplan 2007: 20). Salarino compares the difference between Shylock and Jessica to that "between jet and ivory" (*MoV* 3.1.35). While Lindsay Kaplan takes this as well as Lorenzo's remark about Jessica's "whiter than the paper it writ on […] fair hand" (*MoV* 2.4.14–15) to establish her "whiteness […] as a fact before her conversion" (Kaplan 2007: 21), Brett Hirsch reads the repeated references to Jessica's fairness as comments on her mercantile value:

> To the Venetians in the play, women are 'fair' as long as they offer financial benefit. Portia is 'faire, and, fairer than that word' (171, 1.1.162) because she is 'a Lady richly left' (170, 1.1.161), and Portia and Nerissa are 'Faire Ladies' (2723, 5.1.294) when they deliver the generous proceeds of the trial to Lorenzo and Jessica. Jessica is only 'fair' when she has something to offer (Hirsch 2009: 4.19).

It is for this reason that she steals a casket "worth the pains" (*MoV* 2.6.34) containing over two thousand ducats in precious jewels (*MoV* 3.1.76–80) before eloping with Lorenzo. Gratiano's comment on her exit before she joins the Christians characterises Jessica as "gentle [...] and no Jew" (*MoV* 2.6.52) even before she has officially become a Christian by marrying Lorenzo reinforces this idea. He is tying his evaluation of her gentleness to her ability to "gild [herself] / With some moe ducats" (*MoV* 2.6.50–51)[53] as well as to her imminent conversion through his use of the early modern homophones *gentile* and *gentle* (cf. *MoV* 2.6.52 FN).

52 The ring Shylock received from his wife and "would not have given […] for a wilderness of monkeys" (*MoV* 3.1.11) also foreshadows the rings that Bassanio and Gratiano receive from their respective wives and in contrast to Shylock, are easily persuaded to part with (cf. *MoV* 4.1.445–450).

53 When Shylock agrees to provide Bassanio and Antonio with the loan of three thousand ducats they requested, Antonio uses the same adjective to describe Shylock (cf. *MoV* 1.3.173), which further highlights that the Venetian Christians "are liberal with their praise as long as the subjects of that praise are equally liberal with their purse" (Hirsch 2009: 4.20).

The Christians' evaluation of Jessica's fairness and gentleness based on her monetary means, therefore, asserts that despite her willingness "to become a Christian" (*MoV* 2.3.21), Jessica's acceptance into Christian society is not up to her. Instead, it is reliant on Lorenzo's decision to marry her, a fact of which Jessica is highly aware as her use of the conditional clause "If thou keep promise" (*MoV* 2.3.20) shows. Lorenzo, too, makes Jessica's reliance on his evaluation explicit when he speaks after she has promised him access to her father's ducats:

> Beshrew me but I love her heartily,
> For she is wise, if I can judge of her,
> And faire she is, if that mine eyes be true,
> And true she is, as she hath proved herself:
> And therefore like herself, wise, faire, and true,
> Shall she be placed in my constant soul (*MoV* 2.6.53–58).

Not only are his comments on her true self ironic in this instance, considering that Jessica is currently dressed "in the lovely garnish of a boy" (*MoV* 2.6.46). But he also makes her worth contingent on his judgement, again expressed through his use of several conditional clauses. This undermines "any assertions of her 'fairness' being innate" (Hirsch 2009: 4.21). For the Christians to accept and appreciate her worth, she needs to "prove[...] herself" first which she accomplishes by stealing her father's property. She must, therefore, rely on the "willingness of others to find her integrable" (Metzger 1998: 56). While, as James Shapiro points out, "Jewish women are always depicted as young and desirable" and "the fantasy of Christian men marrying converting Jewesses was far more appealing than the idea of Jewish men, even converted ones, marrying Christian women" (both ²2016: 132), the success of Jessica's conversion and integration into Christian society is called into question as she remains "suspended between Jewish and Christian worlds for much of the play" (Coodin 2017: 142).

Jessica herself appears to be sceptical about her position as a converted Jew in the Christian society of Venice and Belmont. Although it seems that the play ends with "a happy ending for Jessica, who attains financial security and marriage to the man of her choice", it also "gives

several indications that that victory, devastating to her father, is not without cost to her" (both Hamilton 2003: 36). She is already acutely aware that she is committing a "heinous sin" (*MoV* 2.3.16) by betraying her father before she leaves him. But the full realisation of her decision to leave behind her Jewish heritage and to convert only comes after she arrives in Belmont. Her conversation with the Clown reveals that she still harbours doubts about the success of her conversion and integration. She reacts to his suggestion that she is "damned both by father and mother" (*MoV* 3.5.13–14) with the exclamation that she "shall be saved by [her] husband" (*MoV* 3.5.17). Jessica knows very well that her current position as a member of the Christian society is relying on Lorenzo. Speaking metaphorically about herself and Lorenzo, Jessica expresses her concerns that Bassanio should "live an upright life" (*MoV* 3.5.67) because he has already found "the joys of heaven here on earth, / And, if on earth he do not mean it, it / Is reason he should never come to heaven" (*MoV* 3.5.69–71). Lorenzo picks up on her implicit comparison when he boasts that he is "[e]ven such a husband […] as [Portia] is for a wife" (*MoV* 3.5.76–77). In doing so, however, he is also implicitly threatening Jessica by stating that her salvation also rests on how much she shows her appreciation for him. Jessica's exclamation of "Nay, but ask my opinion too of that!" (*MoV* 3.5.78) is postponed by Lorenzo's demand that they should "go to dinner" (*MoV* 3.5.79) but might indicate that she thinks differently of him.

The signs that Jessica's marriage to Lorenzo might not be what she had imagined resurface again during the final scene of the play. By recalling their elopement, both Jessica and Lorenzo focus on different aspects of the events of the night. Lorenzo's version stresses "Jessica's betrayal of her father and the loss of security their mutual commitments guaranteed her" (Metzger 1998: 60):

> Lorenzo: In such a night
> Did Jessica steal from a wealthy Jew,
> And with an unthrift love did run from Venice
> As far as Belmont (*MoV* 5.1.14–17).

Jessica takes up Lorenzo's self-characterisation as "an unthrift love" and accuses him of "[s]tealing her soul with many vows of faith, / And ne'er a true one' (*MoV* 5.1.19–20). Although Lorenzo professes that he forgives her for "[s]lander[ing] her love" (*MoV* 5.1.22), they also align themselves with the tragic lovers from mythology and literature mentioned above. As John Drakakis points out, their seemingly playful exchange can be seen as "a possible anticipation of future friction" (*MoV* 5.1.23 FN). This would be particularly dangerous for Jessica since the success of her conversion heavily relies on her marriage to Lorenzo.

Jessica's last line of the play further underlines her isolation and difference from the rest of the Christians: "I am never merry when I hear sweet music" (*MoV* 5.1.69). In contrast to this, Lorenzo commends the "sweet power of music" (*MoV* 5.1.79). Jessica's feelings about music are a call-back to Shylock's aversion to "the drum / And the vile squealing of the wry-necked fife" (*MoV* 2.5.28–29) and "the sounds of shallow foppery enter[ing] / [his] sober house" (*MoV* 2.5.34–35).

Despite Jessica's reservations, however, the other Christian characters seem to readily accept her into their society. Yet again, this seems contingent on her role as Lorenzo's wife. She is not mentioned when Bassanio and on his request also Portia extend their welcome to Lorenzo and Salerio (cf. *MoV* 3.2.219–224) but merely included as Lorenzo's "infidel" (*MoV* 3.2.217). While she does participate in the following discussion of Antonio's situation, she mostly uses this as an opportunity to further distance herself from her father (cf. MV 3.2.284–289). Nonetheless, Portia explicitly states that her people "will acknowledge [Lorenzo] and Jessica / In place of Lord Bassanio and myself" (*MoV* 3.4.38–39) and addresses her directly when she says goodbye (cf. *MoV* 3.4.44).

Above all, the Christians' acceptance of Jessica seems to be a means to an end, namely the destruction of her father Shylock as their main antagonist:

> [Jessica's] rebellion […] is sanctioned by the ruling Duke but for less benevolent reasons: he and the other Christians of Venice see Shylock as a usurer and an alien. They cheer Jessica's betrayal of all that her father stands for, and intensify Shylock's losses by forcing him to will his remaining fortune to the rebellious couple (Hamilton 2003: 36).

Antonio's condition for leaving Shylock half of his goods is that he "do record a gift / Here in the court of all he dies possessed / Unto his son Lorenzo and his daughter" (*MoV* 4.1.3874–386). Not only does this add to Shylock's humiliation who had previously disowned his daughter:

> The curse never fell upon our nation till now; I never felt it till now. […] I would my daughter were dead at my foot, and the jewels in her ear; would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in her coffin (*MoV* 3.1.76–83).

It also makes Shylock's money again available to Jessica and Lorenzo's use which, in turn, makes Jessica 'fair' again in the sense established earlier. Jessica's relationship with Lorenzo, then, is only one of the examples in the play that highlights the "corrosive effect on non-contractual, moral relationships like friendship, love, and marriage" as well as the "tendency to reduce all relationships to motives of self-interest, utility, and profit" (both Trepanier 2014: 204) that is exercised by the mercantile Christian communities of both Venice and Belmont.

3.1.3 Shylock and the Venetians

All in all, Jessica is at least cautiously accepted into the Christian society of Venice and Belmont. By contrast, Shylock is ultimately denied this acceptance even though he too converts, albeit not out of his own volition. He is the play's most prominent representative of the Other and has the second-largest part (cf. Crystal and Crystal 2020: n/a). But his aforementioned associations with early modern England complicate his straightforward characterisation as the play's villain.

Shylock undeniably exerts immense influence over the other characters and enables much of the play's plot. Through his various encounters with the Christian characters, he also reveals the fundamental and systemic hypocrisy of Venetian society. The play shows how Shylock attempts "to participate in, integrate into, or to be accepted by the citizenry of Venice" (Sousa 2014: 41). At first, he seems to be at least somewhat successful as the shared community enables both the Jewish moneylender and the Venetian merchants to prosper. Yet, throughout the play and, in particular, as the power dynamic in the encounter shifts,

Shylock's role in Venetian society is, as Geraldo de Sousa argues, met with "considerable resistance and become[s] the [centre] of intense religious, ethnic, or racial conflict", which in turn, exposes "a fundamental contradiction in the Venetians' pursuit of global trade and their geographical protection in the lagoon" (both 2014: 41).

Shylock is introduced through his interaction with Bassanio who seeks him out to arrange the loan of "three thousand ducats for three months" (*MoV* 1.3.9) for which "Antonio shall be bound" (*MoV* 1.3.4–5) and that Bassanio claims to require to "hold a rival place" (*MoV* 1.1.174) with Portia's suitors. This initial negotiation portrays Shylock as a wealthy moneylender who is well-connected both within the Venetian merchant and the Jewish communities. As mentioned above, he knows a lot about Antonio's ventures (cf. *MoV* 1.3.14–20) and remains informed about them throughout the play. He is even approached by Salanio for "news among the merchants" (*MoV* 3.1.21). He also has contacts to Genoa and Frankfurt (cf. *MoV* 3.1.72 and 77). Additionally, Bassanio picks Shylock after Antonio has encouraged him to try "what [his] credit can in Venice do" (*MoV* 1.1.180) after he cannot furnish Bassanio with the requested money since "all [his] fortunes are at sea" (*MoV* 1.1.177) and he does not have "money, nor commodity / To raise a present sum" (*MoV* 1.1.178–179). This seems to indicate that Shylock has a reputation in Venice not only that he is rich enough himself to be able to procure the large amount of money Bassanio is asking for but also that he lends money to Christian merchants.[54] Shylock confirms as much when he turns down Bassanio's dinner invitation but acknowledges that "I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you and so following" (*MoV* 1.3.31–33).

This scene also sets up a distinction between Shylock, who has the means to provide the money necessary to enable most of the play's plot on the one hand and Antonio and Bassanio on the other. Bassanio admits that he has "disabled [his] estate / By showing a more swelling port / Than [his] faint means would grant continuance" (*MoV* 1.1.123–

54 In contrast to my reading, Stephen Orgel speculates that Bassanio choosing Shylock is rather a sign of the former's desperation: "Bassanio has already gone to all the classy mainline banks and none of them will give him the time of day – Antonio is obviously a bad risk, and his emissary is an even worse one. So he ends up with Shylock" (2003: 153).

125) and Antonio is enabling it and hazarding his life in the process. As Ian MacInnes argues, this excessive taking of risks by both Antonio by accepting the bond and Bassanio in the casket trials aligns them with the aforementioned capitalist transition of early modern England:

> risk […] is actually at the center of key economic transformations in the period. As European ships went forth and returned in a rising tide of mercantilism, those whose fortunes depended on trade resorted to an increasingly sophisticated variety of means for raising and protecting invested capital by managing and describing risk (MacInnes 2008: 40).

Antonio and Bassanio are thus representatives of the new type of mercantile endeavours that came with the expansion of trade, which not only "increased opportunities for profit" but also "created social problems" (both Muldrew 1993: 174). Shylock too is an essential part of this economic system because his loan forms the basis for the risks taken by Antonio and Bassanio.

The Merchant of Venice's depiction of Shylock is also indebted to the increased interest in Jewish culture and religion in early modern England. While Jews had officially been banned since the thirteenth century,[55] "early modern England […] was nonetheless a society surprisingly preoccupied with Jewish questions" (Shapiro ²2016: 1). As Stephen Orgel argues, this interest was partly due to the special theological status of the Jews in early modern English religious discourse:

> they are neither heathens nor heretics, categorically different from pagans and Moslems because they were God's chosen people, and in them Renaissance Christianity saw its own past. The conversion of the Jews was a holy mission, because it would mark the historical completion of Christ's work. [...] for Christians who saw the church as corrupt,

55 As Lindsay Kaplan points out, "a small number of observant Jews, secretly observing converts from Judaism, and full converts did reside in England during the time Shakespeare wrote" (2019: 168). There were also a number of "so-called Marranos, descendants of Jews from Spain or Portugal who had been forced to convert to Christianity" (Mullan 2016: n/a).

> or as having fallen away from its proper function and its original purity, the Jews represented a tradition to be embraced and returned to, a way of starting afresh (Orgel 2003: 154).

Accordingly, almost "every sixteenth-century English traveller who published an account of Venice mentions its Jewish community" (Freed 2009: 50). Thomas Coryat, for example, writes extensively about his observations about Venice's Jewish population in his *Crudities*:

> I was at the place where the whole fraternity of the Jews dwelleth together, which is called the Ghetto, being an iland: for it is inclosed round about with water. It is thought there are of them in all betwixt five and sixe thousand. They are distinguished and discerned from the Christians by their habites on their heads (1611: 230).

Furthermore, Coryat observes that they have "divers Synagogues in their Ghetto, at least seven, where all of them, both men, women and children doe meete together upon their Sabboth […] to doe their devotion, and serve God in their kinde" (1611: 231). The view presented in this and various other accounts is that of Venice as "a quite integrated and racially diverse society" (Karim-Cooper 2016: n/a). Venice's Jewish community enjoyed "two significant rights denied to other Jewish communities in Europe: they were free to practice their religion openly [...] and they had the same legal rights and access to the courts of law as Christian citizens" (Freed 2009: 52). Both these rights are also depicted in Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*. Shylock references "our synagogue" twice (*MoV* 3.1.116–117). He is also allowed to "observe his dietary restrictions and follow his cultural and religious customs" even though "outside of his own home, he finds himself with those who despise him and do not respect his traditions" (both Sousa 2014: 49). Similarly, while the Christian characters, Antonio and Gratiano in particular, disrespect him throughout the play, he is able to pursue his rights in front of a Venetian court when Antonio fails to repay his loan. This is again, as mentioned above, a reference to the famous impartiality of Venetian justice.

Shylock's role in Shakespeare's play also illustrates that the motives of the Venetian Republic in its relatively tolerant treatment of its Jewish community were neither altruistic nor humanitarian since the Jews "provided the Venetian economy with an essential service: moneylending, which was forbidden to Christians" (Freed 2009: 52). As Lee Trepanier has pointed out,

> the great benefit to a city like Venice that is founded and governed by commerce and contract is that motives of self-interest, utility, and profit override the natural tendency to exclude, persecute, or kill strangers. […] Instead of excluding or killing Jews, Christians seek to make a profit with or out of them and vice versa (Trepanier 2014: 204).

Shylock and his ability to lend out money to the Christians are essential to the plot of *The Merchant of Venice* even though, as Elizabeth Valdez Acosta has argued, "there is no valid reason for Bassanio to borrow money other than to continue living a lifestyle of indulgence, to which he has admitted enjoying" since Belmont seems to be "not only widely known but also accessible to all, regardless of wealth and status" (both 2014: 187). Yet, the money is crucial to Bassanio's success nonetheless because it enables him to at least give "the expected appearance of the high social standing he has" (Acosta 2014: 191) and to impress Portia sufficiently enough that she helps him cheat the casket trial.[56]

Shylock's profession as a moneylender is also well-documented in the sources about early modern Venice. This again puts Shylock in the context of the "continuing Elizabethan debates on banking and interest" (Orgel 2003: 152). As Claire Jowitt explains, the practice of "usury raised key ethical and economic issues for Elizabethan Londoners, and contemporary literature reflected these concerns" (2012: 310):

56 While Portia provides all three suitors who attempt the casket trial during the play with the clue that they need to "hazard" (*MoV* 2.1.45, 2.9.18, and 3.2.2), Gary Harrington argues that "the timing and tenor of the single hint given to Morocco differ very significantly from the multiple tips provided to Aragon and Bassanio" (2017: 57–58). Additionally, the first three lines of the song she has her musicans perform before Bassanio's attempt all end in words rhyming with 'lead' (cf. *MoV* 3.2.63–65), therefore leading Bassanio to pick the right casket.

> In 1571 Parliament approved the Act Against Usury, which regulated against excessive interest charges through imposing heavy financial penalties. Those charging in excess of 10 per cent were fined harshly – triple forfeiture of the principal and nullification of the contract; for those charging less than 10 per cent the fine was much less severe, being only required to forfeit the interest on the loan (Jowitt 2012: 314).

These and similar regulatory measures "were used to attempt to slow the effects of economic change", but these "attempts at enforcement often encountered as much opposition as support" (both Muldrew 1993: 175). In his *Historie of Italie*, William Thomas, for example, paints a rather positive picture about the practice of money lending with interest as he highlights that both the Venetians and the Jews profited from it:

> It is almost incredible, what gaine the Uenetians receiue by the vsurie of the Iewes, bothe priuately and in common. For in euery citee the Iewes kepe open shops of vsurie, takyng gaiges of ordinarie for .xv. in the hundred by the yeere: and if at the yeres ende, the gaige be not redemed, it is forfeite, or at the least dooen awaie to a great disaduantage: by reason wherof the Iewes are out of measure wealthie in those parties (1549: 76–77).

Shylock's portrayal in the play certainly fits this last description. When he is talking to Antonio and Bassanio about the loan, he mentions that he "cannot instantly raise up the gross / Of full three thousand ducats" (*MoV* 1.3.51–52) but immediately dismisses any concerns since he can himself borrow the missing amount from "Tubal, a wealthy Hebrew of [his] tribe" (*MoV* 1.3.53). Accordingly, Shylock himself must be "sufficient" (*MoV* 1.3.16) enough to provide the necessary sureties. As he tells Antonio and Bassanio, he is able to "make [his gold and silver] breed as fast" (*MoV* 1.3.92) as "ewes and rams" (*MoV* 1.3.91). This not only shows how wealthy he is but also that his services are in great and constant demand from the Venetian economy. The "[t]wo thousand ducats in that [diamond], and other precious, precious jewels" (*MoV* 3.1.78–80) that Jessica steals from him are another indication of his wealth. This amount is presumably only a part of Shylock's means. Otherwise, Anto-

nio's condition that Shylock has to leave his possessions to his daughter and her husband (cf. *MoV* 4.1.384–386) would not make much sense since its main goal, as discussed above, is to make Shylock's money available for the Christians to use.

In this portrayal, Shylock mirrors both the portrayal of the Jewish moneylender in *Il Pecorone*, where the sum of the loan that he can easily provide is "ten thousand ducats" (*Il Pecorone* 51), and Marlowe's Barabas, who is introduced taking stock of his income "in his counting-house, with heaps of gold before him" (*JM* 1.1.0 SD). Yet, unlike Barabas, who is mostly motivated by reclaiming his wealth that was confiscated by the governor of Malta (cf. *JM* 1.2.227–273), Shylock astonishingly is not. In the trial scene, he explicitly refuses "twice the sum" (*MoV* 4.1.206) and Bassanio's offer to be "bound to pay it ten times o'er" (*MoV* 4.1.207). He even insists that

> If every ducat in six thousand ducats
> Were in six parts, and every part a ducat,
> I would not draw them; I would have my bond! (*MoV* 4.1.84–86)

Unlike the Jew in *Il Pecorone*, who is "minded rather to do this bloody deed, so that he might boast that he had slain the chief of the Christian merchants" (*Il Pecorone* 55), Shylock also has more nuanced and personal reasons for his insistence on the "pound of flesh" (*MoV* 4.1.98):

> if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge. He hath disgraced me and hindered me half a million, laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated mine enemies, and what's his reason? I am a Jew (*MoV* 3.1.48–53).

Antonio has repeatedly disrespected and humiliated Shylock and called him "misbeliever, cutthroat dog, / And spit upon [his] Jewish gabardine" (*MoV* 1.3.107–108). Antonio freely admits to these accusations: "I am as like to call thee so *again*, / To spit on thee *again*, to spurn thee, too" (*MoV* 1.3.125–126, my emphasis). Shylock is even convinced that Antonio is actively working against him not only by "lend[ing] out money gratis, and bring[ing] down / The rate of usance here with us in Venice"

(*MoV* 1.3.40–41). When he explains his motivations behind "hav[ing] the heart of [Antonio] if he forfeit" to Tubal, he also states that if Antonio were "out of Venice, I can make what merchandise I will" (both *MoV* 3.1.114–116). Jessica's elopement with Lorenzo aided by Antonio's friends Salanio and Salarino (cf. *MoV* 2.6.1–69) represents only the last straw for Shylock:

> Prior to Jessica's betrayal, Shylock detested Antonio, but this hatred was moderated by practical motives; after Jessica's unfaithfulness, Shylock has become monomaniacal in his quest for revenge (Trepanier 2014: 209).

As mentioned above, Shylock enters the court justifiably confident that he will get his bond because the Venetian state cannot risk calling into question the very basis of their economy (cf. *MoV* 3.3.26–31). He is thwarted in the end by Portia who not only finds a loophole in the bond as it "doth give [Shylock] here no jot of blood" (*MoV* 4.1.302) but also manages to secure his wealth for Antonio and the Venetian state:

> The law hath yet another hold on you.
> It is enacted in the laws of Venice,
> If it be proved against an alien
> That by direct or indirect attempts
> He seek the life of any citizen,
> The party 'gainst the which he doth contrive
> Shall seize one half his goods; the other half
> Comes to the privy coffer of the state,
> And the offender's life lies in the mercy
> Of the Duke only, 'gainst all other voice (*MoV* 4.1.343–352).

In seizing Shylock's possessions, which they eventually allow him to "render [...] Upon his death" (*MoV* 4.1.379–380) to his daughter and her husband, and by making his conversion a condition for his pardon (cf. *MoV* 4.1.383), Portia and the Venetians outdo the lady in *Il Pecorone*, who only insists that the Jew "will get nothing at all" (*Il Pecorone* 57). Shylock's forced conversion most likely does not change the fundamental nature of his treatment by the Christians. As Brett Hirsch points

out, even "sincere conversion and successful assimilation of Jews in the early modern English imagination was ultimately treated with suspicion or as a joke, a laughably futile activity" (2008: 127). Whereas Jessica's willingness to convert and her marriage to Lorenzo contribute at least somewhat to allaying the suspicions the Christians of Venice and Belmont might still harbour towards her, Shylock remains an outsider to their society. He loses not only his source of income but also his usefulness for the Venetian merchants that to some extent had probably tempered their hostility against him:

> The Christian commandment of loving thy neighbor appears to have failed as a political principle to organize the city: commerce, contract, and profit have provided the path to stability, cooperation, and toleration (Trepanier 2014: 204).

In his last scene of the play, Shylock is forced to convert. While Venice may give itself the appearance of being impartially just and tolerant towards the Other, the encounters between Shylock and Jessica with the Venetian Christians ultimately reveal a deeply prejudiced and flawed society that makes a truly shared community from which both parties involved can prosper impossible. The trial is the ultimate metaphor for this failure because none of its potential outcomes allow for a continued productive coexistence. The options are either state-sanctioned murder or the loss of the basis for their economic system. The play opts for the later but also ends before the repercussions of this decision are felt by the Venetian society.

3.2 Othello

The Merchant of Venice is technically a comedy but one where the "joy of the three marriages with which this 'comedy' conventionally ends is darkened, almost overshadowed, by hard questions left unresolved" (Freed 2009: 55). In contrast to that, *Othello* "greets us as a comedy, with Othello and Desdemona overcoming the impediment of the patriarchal blocking figure Brabantio" that is then "translated into a tragedy that ends with five deaths, the lovers among them" (both Orlin 2014:

2). The shift in genre is also accompanied by a change of location as the plot moves from Venice to Cyprus. Although only the first act is actually set there, the myths of Venice outlined above still permeate the entire play. In addition to Venice's famed tolerance for other cultures and religions that affects how Othello is treated by the Venetians in the play, it is, in particular, Venice's reputation as "*Venezia-città-galante*" (McPherson 1990: 38) forms the groundwork on which Iago builds his plan to destroy Othello.

Like *The Merchant of Venice*, which adapts a lot of its central ideas from Giovanni Fiorentino's *Il Pecorone*, *Othello*, too, takes the structure of its main plot and its main characters from an Italian novella: Giovanni Battista Giraldi Cinthio's *Gli Heccatommithi, which was published in 1565.*[57] *Yet, Othello also recalls not only what John Gillies terms the "disturbing* porosity of Antonio's Venice" (1994: 137) but also the "memory of his kinsman, another man 'of royal siege,' the Prince of Morocco" (Berger 2013: 88). Like Portia, who associates Morocco's "complexion" with "a devil" (both *MoV* 1.2.124), many of the characters exhibit some form of prejudice against Othello based on the colour of his skin.

Yet, unlike Morocco, whose intercultural encounter in Belmont ends with his swift removal from there, Othello at least at the beginning appears to be integrated well into Venetian society. Roderigo's motivated insult of Othello as "an extravagant and wheeling stranger / Of here and everywhere" (*Oth* 1.1.135–136) is contradicted by Othello's position within the play. Its subtitle, "The Moor of Venice", clearly establishes Othello as part of Venetian society which is further strengthened by his role as Venetian "general" (*Oth* 1.2.36), who receives the Duke's "special mandate for the state affairs" (*Oth* 1.3.73). In this, *Othello* is reflective of early modern England as well. As Onyeka Nubia has shown, there was a much larger Black presence in early modern England than is commonly acknowledged. These were, he argues, "not all slaves, or transient immigrants who were considered as dangerous strangers and

57 As Michael Neill points out, while "no English translation is known to have existed before the mid-eighteenth century", verbal parallels in Shakespeare's play suggest that he "almost certainly read [it] in the original" (both ²2008: 22). See also Freed 2009: 48–49, which explores some of the possible resources Shakespeare could have used to "acquire a reading or speaking knowledge of Italian" (2009: 49).

the epitome of otherness" but held "important occupations in Tudor society, and were employed by powerful people because of the skills they possessed" (both 2016: 2). Shakespeare's portrayal of his "Moor of Venice" combines those two aspects and in doing so, reflects many of the early modern English attitudes towards Black people.

The third party in the intercultural encounters in *Othello* are the Ottoman Turks. Seen as "a deviation, and an emblem of immorality and heresy" as well as a "'religious threat' and racial 'other'" (both Barin 2010: 39), they present a constant yet never really tangible threat to Venetian society even though they do not appear on stage. In the following, I am going to explore the intercultural encounters between the Venetians, the Moor of Venice, and the Turks in order to show how they again reveal how the seemingly fruitful co-existence between Self and Other is not only actively destroyed by an individual motivated by a personal grudge but also by the society itself that undermines its professed tolerance through its actions.

3.2.1 Venetians, Moors, and Turks

As mentioned before, Venice's wealth originated from its trade with the East. To safeguard its trade routes, Venice also needed to establish and maintain a great military power. When Othello appears on stage for the first time, he puts himself in this context when he speaks of the "services which [he] [has] done the Signory" (*Oth* 1.2.18). Iago has previously stated that he has fought under Othello "At Rhodes, at Cyprus, and on other grounds, / Christian and heathen" (*Oth* 1.1.28–29). With a renewed Turkish threat against Cyprus,[58] the Duke and the Senate send for Othello to "straight employ [him] / Against the general enemy Ottoman" (*Oth* 1.3.49–50). Othello is chosen because he is objectively the best candidate:

58 As the First Senator remarks, the news that the "Turkish preparation makes for Rhodes" (*Oth* 1.3.14), are identified as "a pageant / To keep us in false gaze" (*Oth* 1.3.19–20). This again brings up the difference between appearance and reality that permeates the entire play.

> The Turk with a most mighty preparation makes for Cyprus. Othello, the fortitude of the place is best known to you; and though we have there a substitute of most allowed sufficiency, yet opinion, a more sovereign mistress of effects, throws a more safer voice on you (*Oth* 1.3.220–224).

Appointing Othello as their general seems to be reflective of the historical practice in Venice which is described in several sources. Gasparo Contarini states that "the Captaine Generall of our Armie […] is alwaies a straunger" (1599: 132). The reason behind this, he claims, is "a lawe solemnely decreede, that no Gentleman of *Venice* should haue the charge and commaundement of aboue fiue and twentie souldiers" even though "the same law hath not beene in these times of ours altogether obserued" (1599: 132).[59] A similar observation can be found in William Thomas's account:

> By sea the Uenetians theim selfes gouerne the whole, and by lande they are serued of straungers, both for generall, for capitaines, and for all other men of warre: because theyr lawe permitteth not any Uenetian to be capitaine ouer an armie by lande. (Fearyng I thynke Caesars example) (Thomas 1549: 81–82).

Othello is established as a vital part of the Venetian society because his "services" (*Oth* 1.2.18) are essential for the maintenance of the Venetian trade. The Duke's advice for Brabantio after the latter has to accept Othello as his son-in-law harkens back to the previously discussed example of Jessica's 'fairness'. Othello's description as "far more fair than black" (*Oth* 1.3.288) similarly hinges on his usefulness in defending Venice from the Ottoman threat.

Yet, this line also indicates that no matter how 'fair' "the noble Moor has appeared in the scene, [...] Othello is, before all else, 'black'" (Cheesman 2016: 1156). During the early modern period, the Moor was "a figure who was visible within English society in person and in print, par-

59 While J.R. Hale discounts Contarini's claim that this was an actual law, he contends that this practice "was based […] at least on common sense; a group which never mustered more than 2500 adult males was too small to add military to its naval, mercantile and political and administrative responsibilities" (1984: 330).

ticularly in descriptions of Africa, in travel narratives, and on the stage" (Bartels 1990: 434). As mentioned above, Othello evokes *The Merchant of Venice*'s Prince of Morocco, who introduces himself to Portia by asking her to "[m]islike [him] not for [his] complexion, / The shadowed livery of the burnished sun / To whom [he] [is] neighbour and near bred" (*MoV* 2.1.1–3). This already suggests "that he has been conditioned by experience to anticipate mistreatment by white society" (Harrington 2017: 54). Othello also calls to mind the "strong tradition on the Elizabethan stage of black characters being played as snarling villains, as in the anonymous revenge tragedy *Lust's Dominion* and [Shakespeare's] own *Titus Andronicus*" (Dickson 2016: n/a). Othello's visible difference speaks, as Farah Karim-Cooper argues, to "the pathological fear of 'otherness' and dark complexions that [Shakespeare] had witnessed in his own culture" (2016: n/a).

We can see this fear also reflected in official documents of the period. In an "open letter to the lord mayor of London and the aldermen and his brethren, and to all other mayors, sheriffs" in 1596, Elizabeth I had expressed precisely this fear:

> Her majesty, understanding that there are of late divers blackmoors brought into this realm, of which kind of people there are already here too many, considering how God hath blessed this land with great increase of people of our own nation as any country in the world, whereof many for want of service and means to set them on work fall to idleness and to great extremity ([1596] 2019: n/a).

In a second letter written about a month later, Elizabeth again states that concerning a request by a "merchant of Lubeck" "to transport so many blackamoors from hence", she "doth think it a very good exchange and that those kind of people may be well spared in this realm being so populous and numbers of able persons the subjects of the land and Christian people that perish for want of service" ([1596] 2019: n/a).[60] Emily

60 Kaufmann 2008: 366–371 takes a closer look at the "merchant of Lubec" mentioned in these documents and his interactions with Robert Cecil arguing that "Elizabeth's government never envisaged an expulsion of blacks, but was merely trying to fend off another debtor with a patent" (2008: 366).

Bartels contends that "the initial group targeted for deportation were 'Negroes' captured from a Spanish colony in the West Indies" (2006: 308) during a venture that was lead by John Hawkins and Francis Drake. It was their "political position [as prisoners of the ongoing Anglo-Spanish conflict]", Bartels argues, "[…] that made them especially useful and suspect to the queen" (both 2006: 310) rather than "a full-scale deportation" (2006: 307) of all black people from England.[61] But the documents still clearly distinguish between the *people of our own nation* and *those kind of people*, which reveals at least some anxiety about the potential of a "multi-ethnic society and the blurring of social boundaries that accompanied it" (Karim-Cooper 2016: n/a).

As Michael Neill highlights, "Moorishness was almost as capable as Jewishness of concealing its [...] Otherness within the body of the Same" due to the "notorious indeterminacy of the term Moor itself" (both 1998: 364):

> it could refer quite specifically to the Berber-Arab people of the part of North Africa then rather vaguely denominated as 'Morocco,' 'Mauretania,' or 'Barbary'; or it could be used to embrace the inhabitants of the whole North African littoral; or it might be extended to refer to Africans generally (whether 'white,' 'black,' or 'tawny' Moors); or, by an even more promiscuous extension, it might be applied (like 'Indian') to almost any darker-skinned peoples – even, on occasion, those of the New World (Neill 1998: 364).

Othello's origins are equally unclear. He claims that he "fetch[es] [his] life and being / From men of royal siege" (*Oth* 1.2.21–22) but remains vague about the geographic origin of his royal ancestors. Likewise, the account he gives before the Duke and the Senate about "the story of [his] life / From year to year" (*Oth* 1.3.129–130) for which he claims Desdemona fell in love with him (cf. *Oth* 1.3.162–169) does not contain any concrete geographical information. There are some striking verbal

61 Onyeka Nubia raises a similar point when discussing the examples of two Africans arguing that they become "'persons of interest' to English authorities" not because of their ethnicity but "their connections and affiliations" (both 2019: 13–14).

parallels to John Pory's translation of Leo Africanus's *A Geographical History of Africa*, which was published in 1600. The title page identifies the original author of the book as "a More, borne *in Granada, and brought vp* in Barbarie", which is echoed in Iago's reference to Othello as "a Barbary horse" (*Oth* 1.1.111). In the preface *To The Reader*, John Pory summarises Leo Africanus's life in terms that evoke remarkably similar images to Othello's story:

> For how many desolate cold mountaines, and huge drie, and barren deserts passed he? How often was he in hazard to haue beene captiued, or to had his throte cut by the prouling *Arabians,* and wilde Mores? And how hardly manie times escaped he the Lyons greedie mouth, and the deuouring iawes of the Crocodile? (1600: n/a).

Othello also describes the various "most disastrous chances" (*Oth* 1.3.134) including "being taken by the insolent foe / And sold into slavery" (*Oth* 1.3.136–137) as well as traversing "antres vast and deserts idle, / Rough quarries, rocks, and hills" (*Oth* 1.3.140–141).

His references to the "Cannibals that each other eat" (*Oth* 1.3.143) and the "Anthropophagi, and men whose heads / Do grow beneath their shoulders" (*Oth* 1.3.144–145) additionally allude to the context of the European exploration of the Americas. The term 'cannibal' is used frequently for example in Walter Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* as a synonym for "the Caribs" ([1596] 2013: n/a) and other tribes of South America. Raleigh also mentions "a nation of people whose heads appear not above their shoulders" ([1596] 2013: n/a):

> though it may be thought a mere fable, yet for mine own part I am resolved it is true, because every child in the provinces of Aromaia and Canuri affirm the same. They are called Ewaipanoma; they are reported to have their eyes in their shoulders, and their mouths in the middle of their breasts, and that a long train of hair groweth backward between their shoulders (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a).

Othello's account then marks him indeed as the 'extravagant wheeling stranger / Of here and everywhere' (1.1.134–35) as which Roderigo describes him.

Yet, it is precisely Othello's position as an early modern Moor that enables him to "uniquely represent[…] the intersection of European and non-European cultures" as he "calls into being discrete and discriminatory inscriptions of history, race, and ethnicity, segregating Europe from other cultures (or rather, other cultures from Europe)" and simultaneously also "calls those inscriptions into question" (all Bartels 2008: 5). Like the Goths and the Amazons discussed earlier, Othello's portrayal in the play reflects "Renaissance imaginings of the exotic – of the cultural 'other' – that were at once glamorous and dangerous" (Karim-Cooper 2016: n/a).

The Ottoman Turks are the third party involved in the intercultural encounters in *Othello*. They are introduced as Venice's "general enemy" (*Oth* 1.3.50) threatening its hold on Cyprus. The danger of an impending invasion evokes the historical context of the Battle of Lepanto between Venice and the Holy League on the one side and the Ottoman Empire on the other. This battle "marked the first significant victory for a Christian naval force over a Turkish fleet and the climax of the age of galley warfare in the Mediterranean" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. *Lepanto*). While this victory had little long-term effects in curbing the expansion of the Ottoman Empire, it immensely bolstered European confidence. This is evident, for example, in the poem James I composed about it while he was still King of Scotland. In the poem, the victory is declared "a wondrous worke of God" (*Lepanto* 1) and framed in the context of a battle between God and Satan (cf. *Lepanto* 38–91). When Othello figures himself as the "malignant and turbaned Turk" and "circumcised dog" (*Oth* 5.2.352 and 5.2.354) during his suicide speech, he is also alluding to this poem's "circumsised Turband Turkes" (*Lepanto* 10).

Yet, as Shakespeare's audience would have been well aware, "Cyprus's ultimate fate was to fall to the Ottoman Empire" (MacCrossan 2020: 247). Richard Knolles describes the Turkish conquest of Cyprus as the island's "fatall ruine" (1603: 867) and states that

> the losse wherof not without cause grieued many Christian princes, as sometime a kingdome of it selfe, and now a prouince of the Turkish empire: our sinnes, or the euill agreement of Christian princes, or both, the cause thereof I know not, neither if I did, durst I so say (Knolles 1603: 867–868).

His *Generall Turkish History*, from which this passage is taken, was published in 1603, around the time that Shakespeare was probably writing *Othello*. As Colm MacCrossan points out, the "anti-Turk rhetoric" that is present in Knolles's account highlights that the loss of Cyprus "will have carried tragic meaning" (both 2020: 248). This not only puts more emphasis on the importance of Othello's services for the Venetian empire but also establishes the Turks as an existential threat that proves pervasive in the course of the play.

The various associations Shakespeare's audiences would have had with the parties involved in the play's intercultural encounters form the context for Othello's tragedy. Othello himself can be read as "an amalgamated, multicultural subject, whose identity extends provocatively beyond any preordained geographical boundaries or any ready-made tensions or elisions between Venetian, Turk, and Moor" (Bartels 2008: 2). How the Venetians treat him throughout the play, therefore, reveals the truth behind the various myths of Venice and in doing so, shows how the fundamental disconnect between appearance and reality leads to the destruction of not only Othello himself but also the destabilisation of the Venetian society that has lost its most capable general.

3.2.2 Othello in Venice

The play opens with Iago and Roderigo discussing their mutual hatred towards an initially unnamed Moor to whom Iago sarcastically refers as "his Moorship" (*Oth* 1.1.32). They both hate him because they hold him responsible for thwarting their ambitions. While Roderigo is in love with Othello's newly wedded wife Desdemona, Iago "hold[s] him in [his] hate" (*Oth* 1.1.6) because Othello has preferred "Michael Cassio, a Florentine […] That never set a squadron in the field / Nor the division of a battle knows" (*Oth* 1.1.19–23) instead of Iago to be his lieutenant:

> And I – of whom his eyes had seen the proof
> At Rhodes, at Cyprus, and on other grounds
> Christened and heathen – must be beleed and calmed
> By debitor and creditor. This countercaster,
> He, in good time, must his lieutenant be,
> And I – God bless the mark – his Moorship's ensign (*Oth* 1.1.27–32).

Both of them proceed to describe Othello with racial terms like when Roderigo calls him "thick-lips" (*Oth* 1.1.66) and "an extravagant and wheeling stranger / Of here and everywhere" (*Oth* 1.1.135–136) as well as imagery aiming to dehumanise Othello as an "old black ram" (*Oth* 1.1.88) and a "Barbary horse" (*Oth* 1.1.111). Brabantio later on expresses his hatred for Othello in equally problematic terms when he refers to Othello as "the sooty bosom / Of such a thing as thou" (*Oth* 1.2.70–71) and declares Desdemona's attraction to him impossible:

> She is abused, stolen from me, and corrupted
> By spells and medicines bought of mountebanks.
> For nature so preposterously to err –
> Being not deficient, blind, or lame of sense –
> Sans witchcraft could not (*Oth* 1.3.61–65).

He too is motivated in his rejection not merely by Othello's Otherness as a Moor but because he feels threatened in his patriarchal authority by his daughter's disobedience.[62]

Here and throughout the play, several characters use "stereotypes that classify and condemn Othello as a black man" (Bartels 1997: 45). Yet, already in the first act, these stereotypes are exposed as untrue. Othello resists all of Iago's attempts to incense him against Brabantio. He is confident enough in his merit that he does not care if Brabantio "prated, / And spoke in such scurvy and provoking terms / Against [Othello's]

62 When Iago tries to get Brabantio's attention during this scene, he calls out that he should "[l]ook to your house, your daughter, and your bags!" (*Oth* 1.1.80). This harkens back to Shakespeare's other Venetian daughter who secretly runs away with a lover who does not share her cultural and religious background and also steals her father's money (cf. *MoV* 2.6.34–60).

honour" (*Oth* 1.2.6–8). "Let him do his spite", Othello responds to Iago, "My services which I have done the Signory / Shall out-tongue his complaints" (both *Oth* 1.2.17–18). He also sees no reason to hide from what they presume are Brabantio and his men:

> […] I must be found:
> My parts, my title, and my perfect soul
> Shall manifest me rightly (*Oth* 2.1.30–32).

Accordingly, Othello remains calm and polite during his confrontation with Brabantio. While Brabantio calls him a "foul thief" (*Oth* 1.2.62), "an abuser of the world", and "a practiser / Of arts inhibited and out of warrant" (both *Oth* 1.2.78–79) and consistently uses the singular pronoun 'thou' to show his disrespect for him (cf. *Oth* 1.2.62, 63, 71, 73, 74, 77, and 87), Othello replies with "Good signor" (*Oth* 1.2.60) and the polite form of the pronoun of address (cf. *Oth* 1.2.60–61 and 84–85).

As the following scene before the Duke and the Senate shows, Othello has every right to be confident. Iago claims that Brabantio "hath in his effect a voice potential / As double as the Duke's" (*Oth* 1.2.13–14) and will "put upon [Othello] what restrain and grievance / The law, with all his might to enforce it on, / Will give him cable" (*Oth* 2.1.15–17). But that contradicts the notion of the impartiality of Venetian justice outlined earlier in this chapter. Accordingly, Iago is proven wrong even though the Duke initially promises Brabantio that

> Whoe'er he be that in this foul proceeding
> Hath thus beguiled your daughter of herself
> And you of her, the bloody book of law
> You shall yourself read in the bitter letter,
> After your own sense, yea, though our proper son
> Stood in your action (*Oth* 1.3.66–71).

But when Brabantio reveals that he is accusing Othello and reiterates his allegations against him, the Duke also reminds him that

> To vouch this is no proof
> Without more wider and more overt test
> Than these thin habits and poor likelihoods
> Of modern seeming do prefer against him (*Oth* 1.3.107–110).

Even though Brabantio is a senator, he is not above the law and needs to prove that Othello made Desdemona fall in love with him "with some mixtures powerful o'er the blood, / Or with some dram conjured to this effect" (*Oth* 1.3.105–106). Not only is Othello allowed to defend himself "in [his] own part" (*Oth* 1.3.75) against Brabantio's accusations. Both the first Senator and the Duke also imply that they think it likely that Desdemona's love for Othello came "by request and such fair question / As soul to soul affordeth" (*Oth* 1.3.114–115). After Othello's account, the Duke even admits that he thinks "this tale would win [his] daughter too" (*Oth* 1.3.171). Desdemona's testimony only solidifies these statements as it turns out that she was indeed "half the wooer" (*Oth* 1.3.175). Brabantio ultimately is unable to prove his allegations against Othello and therefore has to accept the marriage.

While critics have tended to view Othello as "literally and figuratively out of place, catastrophically 'unable to grasp' 'Venetian codes of social and sexual conduct'" (Bartels 2008: 156), the first act also establishes Othello as "'Venetian' enough that he requires no qualification before the representatives of Venice" (Bartels 2008: 1). The play does not address Othello's status within the Venetian society directly. Only Roderigo refers to him as a "stranger" (*Oth* 1.1.135). Yet, as Gasparo Contarini writes, there have been examples of "some forrain men and strangers" who "haue beene adopted into this number of citizens, eyther in regard of their great nobility, or that they had beene dutifull towardes the state, or els had done vnto them some notable seruice" (both 1599: 18). This clearly would also apply to Othello and "[his] services" (*Oth* 1.2.18). Othello's status does not matter in the end because as highlighted above, Venetian justice was equally accessible to both strangers and citizens. Unlike Antonio in *The Merchant of Venice*, Brabantio does not have the aid of a cross-dressing lady of Belmont to interpret the law in a way that reinforces the society's homogeneity.

Regardless of whether the Duke and the senators actually believe what they profess about Othello or whether they just need his aid against the "general enemy Ottoman" (*Oth* 1.3.50), they do not appear to share the prejudice against the Moor. In this portrayal, the play largely follows Cinthio's depiction: in the novella, it is stated that the Moor "was dear" ([1565] 2019: n/a) to the Venetian signory and that they even bestow "the honor [of appointing him the captain of the men-at-arms in Cyprus" which they give "only to noble, strong, and loyal men who have proven their worth" (both [1565] 2019: n/a). Similarly, the Duke and the senators in Shakespeare's play treat Othello respectfully throughout the entire scene and are the first characters to address him with his name. They consistently refer to him as "Othello" (cf. *Oth* 1.3.49, 111, 127, 221, and 278) instead of simply calling him the "Moor" or any of the previously mentioned descriptors.[63] The "racial epithets of the opening scenes" (Bartels 1997: 45) that are spoken in absentia before Othello's first appearance on stage, therefore, express more about the characters using them than they do about the character they are spoken about. They "help place Roderigo, Brabantio, and Iago outside polite society, the vulgarity of their sexual imagery calling their otherwise respectable social and political standing into question". The motives behind their racist descriptions only serve to further undermine their attempts of Othering Othello.

Throughout the first act at least, Othello is presented as a well-integrated member of Venetian society. Like the nameless Moor in Cinthio's novella who is described as

> a very valiant man, who, because of the advantages of his person, and because he had proven his great judgment and his lively intelligence in matters of war, was dear to those lords who in rewarding virtuous deeds surpass those of all other republics (Cinthio [1565] 2019: n/a),

63 There are two exceptions as the firth senator and one of the other senators call him "Moor" (*Oth* 1.3.48 and 289) but each of them qualifies the term with the positive attribute: "valiant" (*Oth* 1.3.48) and "brave" (both *Oth* 1.3.289) respectively.

Othello is a capable general who has fought against Venice's enemies several times; he is respected by the duke and the senators; even Brabantio apparently once held him in high regard as he does not object to Othello's claim that Brabantio "loved [him], oft invited [him], / Still questioned [him] the story of [his] life" (*Oth* 1.3.128–129); and he is loved by Desdemona who, according to her father, has previously "shunned / The wealthy curled darlings of our nations" (*Oth* 1.2.67–68). Both Venetian society, which is protected from the existential threat of the Ottomans, and Othello, who marries Desdemona and therefore can enjoy a "full fortune" (*Oth* 1.1.66), profit well from this shared community. It is only when the dynamics of this partnership change that Iago is able to exploit some very Venetian stereotypes to his advantage.

3.2.3 Othello in Cyprus

This shift is accompanied by a change of location as well: to deal with the Turkish fleet, which is "bearing with frank appearance / Their purposes toward Cyprus" (*Oth* 1.3.39–40), Othello and the other main characters leave Venice in separate ships. The Turkish threat is seemingly quickly dealt with off-stage as their fleet has suffered "a grievous wrack" (*Oth* 2.1.23) as a "desperate tempest hath so banged the Turks / That their designment halts (*Oth* 2.1.21–22). While that same tempest has also dispersed the Venetian fleet (cf. *Oth* 2.1.34–35), they all arrive safely in Cyprus where the rest of the play takes place.

In the aforementioned *Generall Turkish History*, Richard Knolles describes Cyprus as "one of the most fruitfull and beautifull islands of the Mediterranean (1603: 867). While he focuses mostly on "the bloudie warres betwixt the Turke and the Venetians, with their Christian confederats" and "how it came first into the hands of the Venetians, and by what right of them so long possessed […] vntill it was now by *Selymus* the great Turke against all right injuriously demaunded, and at length by strong hand by him wrested from them" (both 1603: 843), he also mentions that Cyprus was strongly associated with the goddess Venus:

> It was in antient time called *Macaria,* that is to say, Blessed. The people therein generally liued so at ease and pleasure, that thereof the island was dedicated to *Venus,* who was there especially worshipped and thereof called CYPRIA (Knolles1603: 843).

Both the military context and the connection to the goddess of love are important for Othello. His tragedy, while it is first and foremost a tragedy of a jealous husband murdering his faithful wife, to which I am going to return shortly, also has a political dimension.

Cyprus in the early modern period serves "as a conceptual boundary for what has been termed 'the Greater Middle East'" since its "repeated susceptibility to conquering armies throughout its history gave it a different kind of liminal status" (both Mac Crossan 2020: 240). The fact that the island's political situation was under almost constant threat due to "its geographical location – in close proximity to Turkey and the Holy Land, but also easily accessible by sea from continental Europe and North Africa" (MacCrossan 2020: 240) is exemplified by Shakespeare's inclusion of the immanent Turkish "most mighty preparation […] for Cyprus" (*Oth* 1.3.220–221). Shakespeare goes beyond what he has found in his source where the relocation to Cyprus comes as part of a routine "change in the men-at-arms that they are wont to maintain in Cyprus" for which they "sent the Moor to be captain of those soldiers" (both Cinthio [1565] 2019: n/a). This, as Colm MacCrossan points out, creates "an opportunity for the extension of the plot's impact beyond the private sphere and into the public" with "much further-reaching consequences" (both 2020: 240). The domestic tragedy of Othello, therefore, "stands separate from the dramatic fact of his forfeited value to the Venetian state and the citizens of Cyprus" (MacCrossan 2020: 241). As Cyprus's governor, Othello's personal fall already proleptically enacts the political fall of Cyprus to the Ottoman Empire. With Othello's suicide, Venice loses its most capable general (cf. *Oth* 1.3.221–227) and in turn, will also lose Cyprus to the Turks.

Yet, the loss of "one of Venice's richest territorial possessions and a bastion between Islam and Western Christendom" (Montgomery Byles 1996: 158) is already conceived before Othello's death. In act 4, scene 1, Lodovico arrives in Cyprus with a letter for Othello by which, as Lodovico states, the duke and senators "do command [Othello] home,

/ Deputing Cassio in his government" (*Oth* 4.1.227–228). Given how he is portrayed throughout the play, Cassio seems a poor choice as a substitute for "the warlike Moor" (*Oth* 2.1.27) and "brave Othello" (*Oth* 2.1.39) regardless of whether Iago's initial assessment of Cassio as

> […] a great arithmetician,
> […] That never set a squadron in the field,
> Nor the division of a battle know
> More than a spinster – unless the bookish theoric (*Oth* 1.1.18–23)

is true or merely the result of Iago's frustrated ambitions. Cassio himself admits that he has "a very poor and unhappy brains for drinking" (*Oth* 2.3.30–31) and that he is "unfortunate in the infirmity" (*Oth* 2.3.37). While the ensuing fight in the streets are part of Iago's design to discredit Cassio and Desdemona (cf. *Oth* 2.3.44–59), Cassio is too easily drawn into fighting Roderigo. As Colm MacCrossan argues, "Othello loses his temper in the riot scene not just because Cassio is drunk and making a fool of himself" and "hardly seems bothered […] by Montano's injury" (2020: 244) but because of the context in which this fighting takes place:

> […] What, in a town of war
> Yet wild, the people's hearts brim-full of fear,
> To manage private and domestic quarrel?
> In night, and on the court and guard of safety?
> 'Tis monstrous! (*Oth* 2.3.204–208).

In its vulnerable geographic position as "the nearest location of both the Turkish threat to Venice and the Venetian threat to the Ottoman Empire" (MacCrossan 2020: 247), its governor cannot risk that his people put their "private and domestic quarrel" before their duties of protecting the safety of the island. Othello's exclamation "Are we turned Turks, and to ourselves do that / Which Heaven hath forbid the Ottomites" (*Oth* 2.3.161–162) characterises the unrest they are causing with their fighting not only as immoral and barbarous (cf. *Oth* 2.3.161–163 FN) but also as equally threatening to the security of Cyprus as the Turks who only coincidentally were prevented from attacking by the

destruction of their fleet by the "foul and violent tempest" (*Oth* 2.1.35).[64] Cassio is easily provoked by Roderigo and proves to be "so slight, so drunken, and so indiscreet an office" (*Oth* 2.3.268–269). As Montano rightly points out, "'tis a great pity that the noble Moor / Should hazard such a place as his own second / With one of an ingraft infirmity" (*Oth* 2.3.129–131).[65] In their decision to replace Othello with Cassio, the duke and the senators also hazard the security of their possession of Cyprus. Unlike in *The Merchant of Venice*, where the characters risk their lives and possession as well and, in fact, gain what they desired (cf. *MoV* 1.3.152–155 and 3.2.2–150), the historic context of the Ottoman victory against Venice and the following Turkish occupation of Cyprus makes clear that the Venetian government in *Othello* risked too much and in doing so, will eventually lose its important outpost.

Othello's criticism of Cassio and the others, however, also foreshadows his private tragedy. It is precisely Othello's "pursuit of his 'private and domestic quarrel' [that] removes him from his responsibilities 'on the court and guard of safety' at the moment of the island's greatest need" (MacCrossan 2020: 244) even before Lodovico arrives with his dismissal from Venice. The basic elements of Othello's domestic tragedy are already present in Cinthio's novella, which the narrator summarises as the story of "a blameless, loyal, and loving woman, through traps set by a villainous heart and the weakness of one who is more credulous than he should be, is killed by a faithful husband" (Cinthio [1565] 2019: n/a). Like her counterpart, who proclaims that she

> want[s] to come with you wherever you go, even if it means walking through fire in my nightgown rather than travelling with you by sea in a safe and well-equipped ship as I am about to do, and even if there are dangers and hardships I want to share them with you (Cinthio [1565] 2019: n/a).

64 Othello's phrase also foreshadows his own internal conversion into the "malignant and turbaned Turk" (*Oth* 5.2.352).

65 Even though the whole incident is orchestrated by Iago, he only exploits the character's existing weaknesses as he does with Othello as well.

Desdemona, too, insists on accompanying Othello to Cyprus instead of staying behind in Venice (cf. *Oth* 1.3.246–257). Interestingly, Desdemona arrives without and before her husband, which seems to symbolise that she has managed to overcome the restraints put on women by the patriarchal society of Venice. This is further highlighted by Cassio's reference to her as the "great captain's captain" (2.1.74). This description indicates a possible undermining of traditional hierarchies. Desdemona is here depicted as ranking higher than Othello. She is also integrated into the war context through this military vocabulary, which Othello reinforces when he addresses her a "my fair warrior" (*Oth* 2.1.177). Desdemona uses the same term when she calls herself an "unhandsome warrior" (*Oth* 3.4.147) later in the play.

Cyprus, therefore, seems to initially live up to its connection to the goddess of love as both of them seem to content and happy in their marriage:

> Othello: [...] I fear
> My soul hath her content so absolute
> That not another comfort like to this
> Succeeds in unknown fate.
> Desdemona: The heavens forbid
> But that our loves and comforts should increase
> Even as our days do grow.
> Othello: Amen to that, sweet powers! (*Oth* 2.1.185–190).

Yet, Iago's plot to "put the Moor / At least into a jealousy so strong / That judgement cannot cure" (*Oth* 2.1.291–293) sets the domestic tragedy in motion.

What is interesting about how Iago goes about his plot is that it relies on common stereotypes about the Venetians in more than one way. As David McPherson points out, "the favourite vice to attribute to the Venetians was sexual licentiousness" (1990: 43). While William Thomas contends that "If any man woulde saie, there were no woorthy men amongest the Uenetians, he shoulde greatly erre" (1549: 83), he nonetheless admits that

> many of theim trade and bringe vp theyr children in so muche libertee, that one is no sooner out of the shell, but he is hayle felow with father and friend, and by that time he cometh to .xx. yeres of age, he knoweth as muche lewdnesse as is possible to be imagined. For his greatest exercise is to goe amongest his companions, to this good womans house and that. Of whiche in Uenice are many thousandes of ordinarie, lesse than honest (Thomas 1549: 84).

Desdemona's defiance of her father further illustrates this claim. As Joyce Green MacDonald puts it, Desdemona's rejection of her father's authority over her "demonstrates for Brabantio, and for that segment of the audience which identifies with the perspective of a beleaguered white father confounded by "his" women's waywardness, the consequences of inadequate gender and racial controls" (2016: 207).

But Iago goes further than that by making use of Othello take Desdemona "for that cunning whore of Venice" (*Oth* 4.2.90). In doing so, Iago exploits the aspect of the myth of Venice that "historians have dubbed *Venezia-città-galante*" (McPherson 1990: 37), which was almost always portrayed in a negative light in contrast to the other components discussed earlier. Brabantio already hints at this perception when he warns Othello: "Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see: / She has deceived her father, and may thee" (*Oth* 1.3.290–291). Both Iago and Brabantio portrays Desdemona as conforming to "the widely received public image of the licentious, untrustworthy Venetian woman" (Freed 2009: 52). We can see a similar conflation in Thomas Coryat's *Crudities*. Having "taken occasion to mention some notable particulars of their women", he seamlessly moves on from his description of Venetian wives to Venetian courtesans because they are, as he insists, "a thing incident and very proper to this discourse, especially because the name of a Cortezan of Venice is famoused over all Christendome" (both Coryat 1611: 261). Like Coryat, Othello conflates those two categories and eventually believes the accusations against his innocent wife.

Iago's deception also makes use of the fact that Othello very much conforms to a Venetian stereotype himself even though he denies this in his final speech when he asks the other Venetians to "Speak of me as I am […] / Of one not easily jealous" (*Oth* 5.2.341–344). It is pre-

cisely Othello's jealousy that characterises him as Venetian. Discussing the reasons why the Venetians tolerate and even welcome the presence of the many courtesans within their city, Thomas Coryat claims that Venetian men

> thinke that the chastity of their wives would be the sooner assaulted, and so consequently they should be *capricornified*, (which of all the indignities in the world the Venetian cannot patiently endure) were it not for these places of evacuation (1611: 264–265).

Iago, despite his various attempts of Othering Othello throughout the play, relies on Othello being just like the other Venetian men. Iago himself states twice that one of the reasons why he "hate[s] the Moor" (*Oth* 1.3.375) is the rumour that Othello has had an affair with Iago's wife Emilia, which he "for mere suspicion in that kind, / Will do as if for surety" (*Oth* 1.3.377–378). The second time he raises this point is after they have arrived in Cyprus where he admits that he is

> […] partly led to diet my revenge,
> For that I do suspect the lusty Moor
> Hath leapt into my seat – the thought whereof
> Doth, like a poisonous mineral, gnaw my inwards;
> And nothing can or shall content my soul
> Till I am evened with him, wife for wife (*Oth* 2.1.285–290).

Iago and Othello both share the stereotypical Venetian inclination towards jealousy and extreme behaviour in their reaction to the suspicion that they may have been 'capricornified'.

Othello's final scene also functions to reinforce his Venetian identity in "his darkest, most self-destructive moment" (Bartels 2008: 2). As soon as he finds out that he has been betrayed by Iago, he is no longer sure of who he is when he answers as "he that was Othello: here I am" (*Oth* 5.2.282) to Lodovico's question about Desdemona's murderer. While Michael Neill glosses this line as "Othello's renunciation of his name" and "the effective cancellation of his Venetian identity" (*Oth* 5.2.282 FN), I would argue that this marks only a temporary confusion

before Othello reaffirms himself as a Venetian once more during his last monologue. Othello begins by reiterating his earlier statement about the "services which I have done the Signory" (*Oth* 1.2.18) which he was then rightfully confident would protect him from Brabantio's "complaints" (*Oth* 1.2.19): "I have done the state some service, and they know't" (*Oth* 5.2.338). Yet, this time he realises that his past services are overshadowed by his murder of Desdemona – and as previously argued also by risking the safety of Cyprus because he neglected his duties as its governor to carry out his "private and domestic quarrel" (*Oth* 2.3.206). Accordingly, he dismisses them as as irrelevant in this situation (cf. *Oth* 5.2.339). He then asks the other Venetians to "Speak of me as I am", "nothing [to] extenuate" and not to "set down aught in malice" when they "shall these unlucky deeds relate" (all *Oth* 5.2.340–342). But what is interesting is how he frames the story he wants them to tell of him:

> […] then must you speak
> Of one that loved not wisely, but too well;
> Of one not easily jealous, but being wrought,
> Perplexed in the extreme; of one whose hand,
> Like the base *Indian*, threw a pearl away
> Richer than all his tribe; of one whose subdued eyes,
> Albeit unused to the melting mood,
> Drops tears as fast as the *Arabian* trees
> Their medicinable gum (*Oth* 5.2.342–350, my emphasis).

The two similes he uses to describe himself seem to associate him again with the "extravagant and wheeling stranger / Of here and everywhere" (*Oth* 1.1.135–136). While these similes are on the one hand "exotically suggestive figures of the East" (Bartels 2008: 2), Othello also evokes dramatic geographies associated with Venice since India[66] and Arabia allude to the source of the Venetian wealth in its trade with the East.

66 As Michael Neill points out, there is a difference between the Quarto version which reads *Indian* and the Folio which has *Iudean*. I follow his reading that it would make more sense for Othello to figure himself as an Indian who acts out of ignorance rather than aligning himself with Judas, see Neill ²2008: 464.

Yet, he goes even further than that when he eventually confines "himself within the more readable, potentially incriminating opposition between Venetians and Turks" (Bartels 2008: 2) by simultaneously framing himself as both Self and Other:

> And say besides, that in Aleppo once,
> Where a malignant and a turbaned Turk
> Beat a Venetian and traduced the state,
> I took by th' throat the circumcised dog,
> And smote him – thus.
> *He stabs himself* (*Oth* 5.2.338–355).

By aligning himself with the Turk who not only represents Venice's "general enemy Ottoman" (*Oth* 1.3.50) but more specifically an individual, who actively harms a Venetian citizen and betrays the Venetian state, Othello again acknowledges both the political and the domestic components of his tragedy.

But Othello also distances himself as far as he is able to from his murder of Desdemona by framing his actions as those of the "malignant and […] turbaned Turk" (*Oth* 5.2.339) and figuring himself as the "Turk-killing defender of the Venetians" (Bartels 2008: 2). In doing so, Othello portrays himself as both Self and Other at the same time. This again prefigures the blurring of the boundary between the two that occurs in the third phase of the portrayal of the intercultural encounters on which I am going to focus in the final chapter.

4 Inversion: From the Centre to the Margin

For the final chapter of this thesis, I want to turn my attention to two of Shakespeare's late plays: *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*.[67] Written towards the end of the first decade of James I's reign as king of England, they present a tonal and thematic departure from the other plays I have discussed in this thesis. Both are very much Jacobean plays in that they address more openly central concerns of James's domestic and foreign policy after his ascension to the English throne in 1603 because of Shakespeare and his acting company's closer relationship with their new royal patron:

> Shakespeare's position as chief playwright for the King's Men, the persistent concern of his plays with matters of power and politics, and the availability of his writing to different constructions have led to all of his Jacobean plays being read as topical commentaries on James and his court, and, in some cases, as modelled upon royal writing (Rickard 2015: 210).

In *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest*, therefore, questions of empire, national identity, dynastic succession, and the nation's role in an increasingly globalised world are even more prominent and urgent than in Shakespeare's earlier plays. Like the plays discussed above, the two romances still have at their core encounters between the Self and Other and still negotiate how these influence the characters and society involved in them.

67 The idea of lateness for the plays I am looking at has been criticized by modern scholars since it comes "from an understanding of the creative process that foregrounds the author at the expense of other significant determining elements in the construction of a play, arguably denying us as much perspective as it provides" (McMullan 2009: 24); see also McMullan 2007. The term *romance* is similarly problematic (cf. McMullan 2009: 6–7). As Vaughan and Vaughan point out in their "Introduction" to the Arden edition of *Temp*, "the dramatic category [of romance] was unknown in Shakespeare's era" ([2]2011: 11). The Folio groups them either among the comedies (*Temp*) or tragedies (*Cym*). I am still using the term *late plays* in this thesis but in a purely chronological sense of the word.

They do so, however, with a significant twist. In doing so, the plays reflect changing attitudes towards globalisation in Jacobean society:

> The history of English colonisation to the beginning of the reign of James I was one of failure. [...] The hopes for profit raised by Elizabethan promoters of colonies had proved false […]. The experience of failure produced a decisive turn in the ideology of Jacobean colonisation. The promoters of Jacobean colonies were increasingly deeply committed to a neo-Roman and quasi-republican scepticism of profit as a threat to the pursuit of civic action (Fitzmaurice 2003: 58).

The intercultural encounters in *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* attest to this scepticism. Both plays combine elements of the encounters discussed in the previous chapters: they portray intercultural encounters that are the result of a transgression of boundaries and stage a shared community between different cultures. But they not only change which characters are transgressing but also invert the direction of the transgression from the centre to the margins of the known world. Additionally, they portray the resulting shared community no longer in the centre of power but in the realm of the Other. In doing so, both *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* significantly complicate the intercultural encounters at their core and increasingly blur the distinctions between the various parties involved in them.

4.1 Cymbeline

Cymbeline is one of the less popular and less well known of Shakespeare's plays. As Michael Billington writes in his review for *The Guardian* of the Royal Shakespeare Company's 2016 production, it "has rarely had a good press," citing George Bernard Shaw's infamous verdict calling it "stagey trash of the lowest melodramatic order" (both 2016: n/a). Critics have often admonished that there are several convoluted plot threads with "some thirty denouements in the final scene, except that they are not revelations for the audience, who know all but one of them already" (King 2005: 1), and the (more or less) happy conclusion seems only possible through a literal deus-ex-machina. The play is rarely performed

and "compared to the familiar greats in the Shakespeare canon – *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth* – it has been sorely neglected and only determined Shakespeare enthusiasts are familiar with the play" (Johnson 2000: 3).

But at the same time, *Cymbeline* is also an incredibly fascinating and complex play: "It is highly experimental – and highly conventional. Part history, part myth, with elements of fairy tale, romance and murder thriller thrown in, it does not fit common conceptions of Shakespearean design" (King 2005: 1). At the play's core, we find encounters between the Self and the Other which offers an intriguing twist on the central questions and issues I have been discussing so far. By staging a conflict between the Roman Empire and the Britons, *Cymbeline* negotiates questions of national identity and colonialism that become highly topical in the context of the play's own contemporary political and social discourse around the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Richard Hingley describes this period as "particularly significant in the development of ideas about ancestral origins" (2008: 23). James I had become King of England in 1603 and the early years of his reign were marked by his efforts to unite England and Scotland as well as the establishment of the first English colonies on American soil which James sanctioned through a royal charter.[68] *Cymbeline*'s setting in Roman Britain is an intriguing choice because this setting evokes ideas and issues connected both to the domestic and the exotic. In doing so, the play addresses both the "changing ideas about English (and British) identity" and the "context of overseas ventures in Ireland and America" (both Hingley 2008: 18).

The play opens with the royal court of the eponymous Cymbeline in Britain's capital at a moment of crisis and turmoil. Two courtiers are discussing recent and pertinent events: not only have the male heirs been missing for twenty years which in itself would be dire circumstances for a royal family; in addition to that, the remaining heir, Cymbeline's daughter Innogen, has thrown her father's dynastic endeavours

68 Traditionally credited as first permanent English settlement on American soil is Jamestown in Virginia established in 1607. Previous attempts had failed. The most famous example is probably the settlement on Roanoke Island from 1585 which was also called the Lost Colony because in 1590, it was found abandoned without any trace of the former settlers (cf. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. *The Lost Colony of Roanoke*).

into jeopardy by marrying a man of obscure ancestry. While the actual political conflict only arises at the peripeteia of the play and most of the first half of the play is dedicated to the jealousy plot between Innogen, Posthumus and Iachimo, the context of Romans and Britons is evoked right away in the expositional conversation between the two courtiers:

> Second Gentleman: What's his name and birth?
> First Gentleman: I cannot delve him to the root: his father
> Was called Sicilius, who did join his honour
> *Against the Romans* with Cassibelan,
> But had his titles by Tenantius whom
> He served with glory and admired success,
> So gained the sur-addition Leonatus
> (*Cym* 1.1.27–33, my emphasis).

The first thing we learn about Posthumus's father is that he fought "[a]gainst the Romans with Cassibelan" (*Cym* 1.1.30) which forms the basis for Posthumus's claim of genteel status rather than a noble heritage (cf. *Cym* 1.1.29 FN). Symptomatic for the relationship between Britain and the Roman Empire throughout the play, British "independence from Rome is always already compromised by a kind of co-dependence on Rome for the validation of manly virtue" (Kahn 1997: 161). Cymbeline later similarly traces his honour back to Augustus knighting him while at the same time insisting on Britain's independence from Rome (cf. *Cym* 3.1.44–68). His evocation of national identity apart from Rome is then immediately complicated by the play's temporal localisation which takes place "by way of Roman, rather than British, markers" (Crumley 2001: 299).

The names of both Posthumus and Innogen additionally evoke the context of ancient Britain and national identity. Both names recall figures connected to Brutus, who is Aeneas's great-grandson (*Hol. Chron.* 2.1) and mythological founder of Britain:

> When Brutus had [...] brought the Iland fullie vnder his subiection, he by the aduise of his nobles commanded this Ile (which before hight Albion) to be called Britaine, and the inhabitants Britons after his name, for a perpetuall memorie that he was the first bringer of them into the land (*Hol. Chron.* 2.4).

In Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Brutus's wife is called Innogen (cf. *Hol. Chron* 2.2) and the name of his grandfather is Posthumus (cf. *Hol. Chron* 2.1). They all belong to Britain's mythological, pseudo-historic past created by medieval chroniclers like Geoffrey of Monmouth and their early modern successors like Raphael Holinshed to show that "Britain was more than an outlying colony of Rome, with an independent identity reaching back into time immemorial" (Butler [11]2015: 37).

The Britons' insistence on their independent identity and the rejection of their dependence on Rome are also the driving factors behind the conflict that forms the peripeteia of the play. The Roman ambassador Caius Lucius enquires after the outstanding "three thousand pounds" (*Cym* 3.1.9) of tribute which Britain has to pay as a result of their defeat against Julius Caesar. The response comes not from Cymbeline himself, as could have been expected for such an important political matter. The Queen and Cloten reply in his stead. They paint the picture of an island that is independent of and impenetrable by outside forces or, as Cloten exclaims, "A world by itself" (*Cym* 3.1.13), echoing almost verbatim a claim made by James I in his first speech to Parliament in 1604 (cf. James I [1604] 1995: 136).

The Queen then launches into a monologue outlining the uniqueness and superiority of the Britons compared to the other countries Rome has conquered and to the Roman Empire itself:

> Remember, sir, my liege,
> The kings your ancestors, together with
> The natural bravery of your isle, which stands
> As Neptune's park, ribbed and paled in
> With oaks unscalable and roaring waters,
> With sands that will not bear your enemies' boats,
> But suck them up to th'topmast. A kind of conquest
> Caesar made here, but made not here his brag
> Of 'Came, and saw, and overcame'. With shame –
> The first that ever touched him – he was carried
> From off our coast, twice beaten; and his shipping,
> Poor ignorant baubles, on our terrible seas
> Like eggshells moved upon their surges, cracked

> As easily 'gainst our rocks. For joy whereof
> The famed Cassibelan, who was once at point –
> O giglot Fortune! – to master Caesar's sword,
> Made Lud's Town with rejoicing fires bright,
> And Britons strut with courage (*Cym* 3.1.16–33).

In this speech, we can see the influence of various sources for ancient Britain with which Shakespeare and his audience would have been familiar.

During the early modern period, many classical texts were rediscovered, which had a huge impact on conceptions of national identity as well as colonial discourses at the time. In this chapter, I am going to look at two of those texts, Julius Caesar's *Bello Gallico* and Tacitus's *Agricola*, and how they would have influenced the way Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* portrays Roman Britain. Many of these texts were translated into English during the sixteenth century and were used to "provide a comprehension of the geography and history of Roman Britain and the character of the pre-Roman and Roman populations" (Hingley 2008: 3). As I am going to show, a common thread throughout these texts is that Britons are portrayed as distinctly different from the Roman conquerors. They are described as the Other – barbarians that are completely foreign to the Roman culture that encounters them. This, in turn, complicates the intercultural encounters at the heart of Shakespeare's play.

In addition to the Roman historiographies, we can trace another line of influence from texts like Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* which were written centuries after the fact but were highly influential nonetheless. Monmouth's *Historia*, in particular, was a great success and very popular – a fact to which the over 200 surviving manuscripts can attest (cf. Reeve and Wright 2007: vii). Shakespeare most likely used this text as a source either directly or indirectly via Holinshed's *Chronicles* not only for *Cymbeline* but also for *King Lear* for which we find the earliest version in Monmouth's *Historia*. Monmouth's account has been increasingly questioned with regards to its historical accuracy since the first half of the 1500s (cf. Hingley 2008: 2), but has remained popular and influential as a grand narrative of British mythology (cf. Butler [11]2015: 36).

Shakespeare combines ideas from both these traditions and the political discourse of his time to create his own vision of Roman Britain. In the following, I want to focus on three aspects of the description of Britain in his sources and how they are echoed in Shakespeare's play in order to work out how his audience would have reacted to its central intercultural encounters. What pictures of Britain do his various sources draw? How do they portray the Britons? And finally, how do they depict the encounters between Romans and the Britons?

4.1.1 Geography

Both Julius Caesar's *Bello Gallico* and Tacitus's *Agricola* devote large portions of their accounts of military campaigns into Britain to describing the geography of the island and present the Britons as capable fighters who manage to resist the highly superior military might of the Roman Empire. Unlike the English chronicles, which will be discussed later, however, they do not see the Britons as exceptional because they are able to do so effectively and for such a long time. Instead, they argue that the Romans were hindered in their inevitable victory over the Britons by the island's unfamiliar geography.

Caesar's *Bello Gallico* recounts his two expeditions across the channel in 55 and 54 BC respectively in retaliation for the Britons aiding the Gauls against the Romans (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 4.20). The narrator of the text reveals that Caesar is unable to ascertain

> what was the size of the island, nor what or how numerous were the nations which inhabited it, nor what system of war they followed, nor what customs they used, nor what harbors were convenient for a great number of large ships (*Caes. B.G.* 4.20).[69]

Britain's remote location at the edges of the known world from a Roman perspective results in a lack of knowledge about the island's geography and its inhabitants. This turns out to be the greatest threat to Caesar's campaign against the Britons once he leaves Gaul.

69 "neque quanta esset insulae magnitudo neque quae aut quantae nationes incolerent, neque quem usum belli haberent aut quibus institutis uterentur, neque qui essent ad maiorem navium multitudinem idonei portus reperire poterat".

Caesar's first landing at Britain's coast is not met with easy success. Not only is the coastal geography of the island "by no means a fit place for disembarking" (*Caes. B.G.* 4.23)[70] but the advancing Roman army also encounters unexpected heavy resistance from the "barbarians" (*Caes. B.G.* 4.24). In the account of the ensuing battle, we are also told repeatedly that the Britons use the geography of the coast to their advantage (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 4.24–26). Only after several changes in strategy are the Romans able to secure their victory and force the Britons to "sent embassadors to Caesar to negotiate about peace" (*Caes. B.G.* 4.27).[71] Caesar demands hostages from them and accepts their surrender (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 4.27). But the Britons soon break this agreement because they realise the precarious situation of the Roman army:

> A great many ships having been wrecked [...], having lost their cables, anchors, and other tackling, were unfit for sailing, a great confusion, as would necessarily happen, arose throughout the army; for there were no other ships in which they could be conveyed back, and all things which are of service in repairing vessels were wanting, and, corn for the winter had not been provided in those places, because it was understood by all that they would certainly winter in Gaul (*Caes. B.G.* 4.29).[72]

The Britons resolve to use this to their advantage and mount an attack against the Roman camp.

During his second campaign, the weather is even less kind to Caesar's fleet. Again, the narrator highlights the geographical advantages of the Britons as well as their specific fighting style calling the place of the ambush on the Romans "admirably fortified by nature and by art" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.9).[73] In addition to that, the stormy weather off the coast again proves fatal to the Roman fleet as

70 "ad egrediendum nequaquam idoneum locum".
71 "statim ad Caesarem legatos de pace miserunt".
72 "Compluribus navibus fractis, reliquae cum essent funibus, ancoris reliquisque armamentis amissis ad navigandum inutiles, magna, id quod necesse erat accidere, totius exercitus perturbatio facta est. Neque enim naves erant aliae quibus reportari possent, et omnia deerant quae ad reficiendas naves erant usui, et, quod omnibus constabat hiemari in Gallia oportere, frumentum in his locis in hiemem provisum non erat".
73 "locum nacti egregie et natura et opere munitum".

> almost all the ships were dashed to pieces and cast upon the shore, because neither the anchors and cables could resist, nor could the sailors and pilots sustain the violence of the storm; and thus great damage was received by that collision of the ships (*Caes. B.G.* 5.10).[74]

The Britons again use the ensuing problems in the Roman camp and attack.

When Tacitus writes his *Agricola*, Britain is no longer an unknown entity. Many writers, he acknowledges early on in his first book, have described the geographic makeup and location of Britain although he accuses them of embellishing the facts with their eloquence against which he proposes his account based on "faithful adherence to the facts" (Tac. Agr. 1.10).[75] The popular description of Britain as an island shaped like a two-edged axe[76] recalls the defensive nature of the island's geography that is a common theme throughout Caesar's *Bello Gallico*.

Tacitus also takes up the idea of the island's geography and remoteness protecting them from approaching armies. This, he thinks, makes the Britons confident in their ability to defeat the Romans following the example of their southern neighbours on the continent:

> Yet how inconsiderable would the number of invaders appear did the Britons but compute their own forces! From considerations like these, Germany had thrown off the yoke, though a river and not the ocean was its barrier (*Tac. Agr.* 1.15).[77]

Britain, he states, has the additional advantage that it is cut off from the mainland. This creates another obstacle to any army trying to invade because "nowhere has the sea a wider dominion" and its "many cur-

74 "prope omnes naves adflictas atque in litore eiectas esse, quod neque ancorae funesque subsisterent, neque nautae gubernatoresque vim tempestatis pati possent; itaque ex eo concursu navium magnum esse incommodum acceptum".

75 "Ita quae priores nondum comperta eloquentia percoluere, rerum fide tradentur". The English translations are taken from Gills 2018.

76 Tacitus does not agree with these descriptions because, as he says, the form only looks like an axe if Caledonia is left out (cf. Tac. Agr. 1.10).

77 "Quantulum enim transisse militum, si sese Britanni numerent? Sic Germanias excussisse iugum: et flumine, non Oceano defendi".

rents running in every direction" (both *Tac. Agr.* 1.10)[78] make a crossing dangerous. The sea also "does not merely flow and ebb within the limits of the shore, but penetrates and winds far inland, and finds a home among hills and mountains as though in its own domain" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.10).[79] All this makes traversing the channel difficult because it requires more time and special skills as well as an adequate number of ships to transport the troops.

The island's geography also plays an important role when the Britons come to serve as a positive model for discussing ideas of national identity and heritage in the wake of James I's ascension to the English throne. In 1603, he became king of both England and Scotland but the two kingdoms remained formally separate (cf. King 2005: 47). Propagated as the natural progression from his personal union, James's plans were not supported by a majority of the English parliament. As Andrew Thrush highlights, James "had under-estimated English hostility to the Scots and the profound implications of statutory union" (2017: n/a). So while "politically, single nationhood […] would remain merely an aspiration until the realms were integrated by statute in 1707" (Butler [11]2015: 39), it was still important for how James perceived and styled himself as King of England and Scotland. Accordingly, it became a key element of his first speech to parliament, which he held in March 1604.

James's argument for a statutory union interestingly has its basis in the geography of the island. England and Scotland already form a union, he claims, because they are "separated neither by Sea, nor great Riuer, Mountaine, nor other strength of nature, but onely by little small brookes, or demolished little walles" (James I [1604] 1995: 135). He takes this even further by implying divine providence:

> But what should we sticke vpon any naturall appearance, when it is manifest that God by his Almightie prouidence hath preordained it so to be? Hath not God first vnited these two Kingdomes both in Language, Religion, and similitude of maners? Yea, hath hee not made vs all in one

78 "nusquam latius dominari mare, multum fluminum huc atque illuc ferre".
79 "nec litore tenus adcrescere aut resorberi, sed influere penitus atque ambire, et iugis etiam ac montibus inseri velut in suo".

> Island, compassed with one Sea, and of it selfe by nature so indiuisible, as almost those that were borderers themselues on the late Borders, cannot distinguish, nor know, or discerne their owne limits? (James I [1604] 1995: 135).

As king of both England and Scotland, he sees himself in the perfect position to bring about this divinely ordained union and create a united kingdom as "a little World within it selfe, being intrenched and fortified round about with a naturall, and yet admirable strong pond or ditch, whereby all the former feares of this Nation are now quite cut off" (James I [1604] 1995: 136). The dissolution of the divisions between the countries also prefigures the ideological one:

> For euen as little brookes lose their names by their running and fall into great Riuers, and the very name and memorie of the great Riuers swallowed vp in the Ocean: so by the coniunction of diuers little Kingdomes in one, are all these priuate differences and questions swallowed vp (James I [1604] 1995: 137).

James sees it as his destiny to bring about this union which he "doubt[s] not but […] will please God to prosper and continue for many yeeres" and bestow "all other blessings of Inward and outward Peace" (both James I [1604] 1995: 137).

Cymbeline takes up the tradition of the Britons using the geography to their advantage during the battle in act 5 as Belarius points out when he encourages his fellow Britons to fight against the Romans:

> Stand, stand! We have *th'advantage of the ground*,
> The lane is guarded. Nothing routs us but
> The villainy of our fears" (*Cym* 5.2.11–13, my emphasis).

Posthumus's remark shortly afterwards that the lane "ditched, and walled with turf […] gave advantage" (*Cym* 5.3.14–15) to the Britons echoes this idea as well.

The importance of the geography for Britain is most poignant, however, earlier in the play when the Queen argues that the island itself is

protecting its inhabitants. Highlighting the "natural bravery of [the] isle" (*Cym* 3.1.18), the Queen's speech to the Roman ambassador is strongly reminiscent of John of Gaunt's "sceptred isle" monologue from *Richard II* (cf. *R2* 2.1.40–68). Both characters maintain that nature itself created Britain as an impenetrable fortress surrounded by the sea functioning as a "moat defensive" (*R2* 2.1.48) able to reduce the Roman Empire's fleet to mere "baubles" (*Cym* 3.1.27) and "eggshells" (*Cym* 3.1.28). Both speeches also allude to James's idea of divine ordination. The Queen does so by evoking "Neptune" (*Cym* 3.1.19) who in Stuart iconography is portrayed as the "patron deity of the island" (*Cym* 3.1.19 FN).[80]

Additionally, the Queen's argument begins and ends with a truly Galfridian focus on the exceptional bravery of the Britons. Written centuries after the fall of Roman Britain and from a British point of view, Geoffrey of Monmouth is understandably more concerned with portraying the Britons as equal to the Romans. Throughout his depiction of the conflict with Caesar, he takes great liberty with the historical evidence by denying Caesar any victory against the Britons. He also refrains from mentioning any of the natural and geographical obstacles in Caesar's path to Britain and focuses instead at length on the decisive battle which ends with a victory by the Britons, who were "favoured by God" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.3.33, my translation)[81] and manage to force Caesar back to Gaul (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.3.33–36). Monmouth's Caesar is defeated again and again in battle by Cassibelaunus who in the end only surrenders because he has been betrayed by one of his close allies, Androgeo, the Duke of Trinovantum, who had felt slighted by him (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.4–9). Caesar accepts the surrender of the Britons because Androgeo threatens to return to Cassibelaunus's side if he does not, and the yearly tribute of 3000 pounds of silver is agreed upon before Caesar returns to the continent (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.9).

This idea of the undefeated Britons is taken up in *Cymbeline* through the invocation of the "ancestors" (*Cym* 3.1.17), who were able to defy Caesar and beat him twice, humiliating him for the first time in his life

80 For the effect of the irony of the Queen using a god from the Roman pantheon to assert Britain's independence from the Roman Empire, see chapter 4.1.3.
81 "favente Deo".

(cf. *Cym* 3.1.23–29). Citing probably the most famous quote attributed to Caesar, "'Came, and saw, and overcame'" (*Cym* 3.1.24) but ridiculing it as a "brag" (*Cym* 3.1.23), the Queen emphasises the exceptionality and superiority of the Britons compared to both other countries the Romans have conquered and the Roman Empire itself. Cymbeline's immediate response follows this line of argument. By recalling his lineage from Mulmutius, he "reclaims the past for his nation, allowing Britain to compete with Roman antiquity" (Escobedo 2008: 68). His repeated use of the determiner *our* in "our ancestor" (*Cym* 3.1.52), "our laws" (*Cym* 3.1.53 and 3.1.58) and "our good deed" (*Cym* 3.1.57) emphasises this distinctly British identity as a "warlike people" (*Cym* 3.1.50) free from Roman interference. This again marks an attempt to emancipate England from its portrayal as uncivilised barbarians in classical sources by creating a mythological British past that is separate from the Roman Empire.

4.1.2 The Britons

We can also see two main traditions, on which *Cymbeline* builds when it comes to the play's portrayal of the Britons themselves. Throughout Monmouth's *Historia*, the Britons are depicted as incredibly brave and fiercely determined to defend their freedom (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.2). Accordingly, Monmouth's Caesar is less of a strategic genius and more of an overreaching and selfish tyrant trying to subdue the world for his own gain and glory (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.1). Monmouth's Cassibelaunus,[82] whom he promotes to "King of the Britons" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.2.1, my translation)[83] and introduces right at the beginning of the conflict with Caesar rather than as a last resort as in Caesar's *Bello Gallico*. Like Cymbeline in Shakespeare's play, Monmouth has his Cassibelaunus declare an equal status for himself and the Britons based on his claim that "like the Romans, [they] are descended from Trojan nobility" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.2.5–6, my translation).[84] As discussed previously, this descent from Troy forms an important part of the idea of the *translation imperii*.

82 This is the historical equivalent of Cassibelan in Shakespeare's play. In *Caes. B.G.*, we find the spelling "Cassivellaunus".
83 "rex Britonum".
84 "qui a Troiana nobilitate, sicut Romani, descendimus".

Unlike the play, however, Monmouth portrays Kimbelinus's[85] relationship with the Roman Empire as amicable throughout his entire reign: Kimbelinus, we are told, was raised by Emperor Augustus himself and "held the Romans in such great friendship that he willingly gave them tribute when he could have refused to do so" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.10.7–8, my translation).[86] The conflict with Rome only starts after Kimbelinus's death under the rule of his son Gwider, who refuses to pay the tribute. In retaliation, Emperor Claudius leads an army against him (cf. *Mon. Hist.* 4.11). Again, the Romans are unable to defeat the Britons on the battlefield: "they dispersed all the Romans in this way and Claudius himself was forced to flee to his ships" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.11.12–13, my translation).[87] It is only through subterfuge that the Romans manage to force the Britons to surrender under the rule of the Roman Empire again. One of the Roman generals, a man named Lelius Hamo, devises a plot to get near to Gwider and kill him:

> But among the fighting, Hamo […] threw down his own armour and put on a British armour and like one of them fought against his own, encouraging the Britons to quickly assault the Romans promising them victory. Indeed, he knew the British language which he had learned in Rome from British hostages. Then he gradually gained access to the king and using a favourable moment stabbed him […]. He then escaped from the enemy troops and was received back among his people (Mon. Hist. 4.11.13–20, my translation).[88]

Gwider's brother Avigarus, taking up the title and apparel of his brother, leads his army to face Emperor Claudius, who "feared the king's audacity

85 Kimbelinus, Gwider, and Avigarus become Cymbeline, Guiderius, and Arviragus in Shakespeare's play.

86 "Hic in tantam Romanorum amicitiam venerat, ut, cum posset tributum eorum detinere, gratis daret".

87 "Dissipatis itaque omnibus Romanis, ipsum Claudium ad naves fugere coegit".

88 "Sed inter bellandum Hamo […] abiectis armis propriis, capit Britannica arma defunctorum in bello et quasi unus ex ipsis pugnabat contra suos, exhortans Britones ad insequendum Romanos, citum promittens ex illis triumphum. Noverat enim linguam Britannicam, quam didicerat Romae inter obsides Britonum. Deinde accessit paulatim iuxta regem, adituque invento, quod cogitaverat explevit et regem, […] mucrone percussum suffocavit. Elapsus deinde ab hostium catervis, sese inter suos recepit".

and the courage of the Britons" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.12.8, my translation).[89] So instead of fighting the Britons, Claudius offers peace and his daughter's hand in marriage "if [Avigarus] acknowledges that the kingdom of Britain would surrender to Roman rule" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.12.10–12, my translation).[90] After some deliberation, Avigarus reluctantly agrees to this after his advisors persuade him that "it would not be a disgrace to submit to the Romans when they have the whole world under their rule" (*Mon. Hist.* 4.12.14–15, my translation).[91]

The Britons in the classical sources are portrayed less favourably. Both Caesar and Tacitus also make a point to describe them as less exceptional. The narrator of the *Bello Gallico* highlights the similarities between the Britons and their southern neighbours across the channel. Describing how the Britons build their dwellings, their food sources, their use of iron rings as currency, and their various other customs (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 5.12–14), he finds that these are "for the most part very like those of the Gauls" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.12).[92] The only difference he finds is that "the climate is more temperate than in Gaul, the colds being less severe" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.12).[93]

Throughout, the narrator characterises the Britons as a dishonourable people who again and again go back on their word and "enter[…] into a conspiracy" (*Caes. B.G.* 4.30)[94] every opportunity they get. The account of the first major battle between Romans and the Britons also gives a description of the fighting style of the Britons which relies on ranged weapons, charioteers and infantry (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 4.33). As the narrator admits, this style was unknown to the Romans and would have been successful, had it not been for Caesar's tactical brilliance (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 4.34).

The Britons still resist Caesar's attempts to subduing them when he returns for his second campaign a year later (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 5.8). The Britons use Caesar's preoccupation with salvaging the remainder of his

89 "Quippe timebat regis audaciam Britonumque fortitudinem".
90 "Verum, pro subeunda concordia, pactus est Claudius se filiam suam Avirago daturum, tantum ut se cum regno Britanniae potestati Romanae subiectum cognosceret".
91 "Dicebant autem non esse dedecori subditum esse Romanis cum totius orbis imperio potirentur".
92 "fere Gallicis consimilia".
93 "Loca sunt temperatiora quam in Gallia, remissioribus frigoribus".
94 "rursus coniuratione facta".

ships after a terrible storm and fortifying a camp to amass new troops under the leadership of Cassivellaunus (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 5.11). The Britons, who "dye themselves with wood, which occasions a bluish color, and thereby have a more terrible appearance in fight" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.14),[95] take advantage of the fact that the Romans "on account of the weight of their arms, inasmuch as they could neither pursue [the enemy when] retreating, nor dare quit their standards, were little suited to this kind of enemy" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.16).[96] In the description of the following war, which also forms the prehistory of Shakespeare's play, the narrator highlights the tactical cunning of the Britons in addition to the aforementioned natural advantages of the island. Cassivellaunus's base is across the river Thames and "can be forded in one place only and that with difficulty" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.18).[97] Besides, it is "defended by woods and morasses" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.21).[98] The Britons manage to keep the Romans at bay using ambushes and avoiding to "ever engage with [them] in very large numbers" (*Caes. B.G.* 5.17).[99]

Caesar eventually triumphs over Cassivellaunus after the latter surrenders because he was deserted by his allies (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 5.22). The peace negotiations follow the same pattern that Caesar had established earlier in his *Bello Gallico*. He demands hostages as well as an annual tribute to Rome (cf. *Caes. B.G.* 5.22), which the Britons accept. He then returns to Gaul to deal with uprisings there. It seems that for the time being at least, the Britons acquiesce to this peace agreement as Caesar does not return to Britain and the *Bello Gallico* accordingly does not mention the Britons any more.[100]

Writing almost a century after Caesar's account when the Romans had more experience with the Britons, Tacitus also devotes a larger portion of his account to describe them in more detail. Like Caesar, he

95 "Omnes vero se Britanni vitro inficiunt, quod caeruleum efficit colorem, atque hoc horridiores sunt in pugna aspectu".
96 "propter gravitatem armorum, quod neque insequi cedentes possent neque ab signis discedere auderent, minus aptos esse ad huius generis hostem".
97 "quod flumen uno omnino loco pedibus, atque hoc aegre, transiri potest".
98 "silvis paludibusque munitum".
99 "neque post id tempus umquam summis nobiscum copiis hostes contenderunt".
100 Tacitus tells us that this was due to the fact that Caesar was preoccupied with the Civil War in Rome, cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.13.

presents them as highly connected to the other tribes on the European continent, tracing their influences in the physical appearance of the various British tribes:

> Thus, the ruddy hair and large limbs of the Caledonians point out a German derivation. The swarthy complexion and curled hair of the Silures, together with their situation opposite to Spain, render it probable that a colony of the ancient Iberi possessed themselves of that territory. They who are nearest Gaul resemble the inhabitants of that country; whether from the duration of hereditary influence, or whether it be that when lands jut forward in opposite directions, climate gives the same condition of body to the inhabitants of both (*Tac. Agr.* 1.11).[101]

In addition to that, Tacitus also observes a close connection through their religious beliefs, their language, and their audacity in battle and fear in defeat which he finds similar to those of the Gauls (cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.11). Yet, the Britons still show "more ferocity, not being yet softened by a long peace" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.11).[102] Despite that, he claims, they "cheerfully submit to levies, tributes, and the other services of government, if they are not treated injuriously; but such treatment they bear with impatience, their subjection only extending to obedience, not to servitude" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.13).[103]

Like Caesar, Tacitus also finds that the Britons are not to be trusted to keep a treaty. He presents the example of the rebellion under the leadership of Boudicca, which was particularly devastating for the Romans. As soon as they are "relieved from present dread by the absence of the governor, [they] began to hold conferences, in which they painted the miseries of servitude, compared their several injuries, and inflamed

101 "namque rutilae Caledoniam habitantium comae, magni artus Germanicam originem adseverant; Silurum colorati vultus, torti plerumque crines et posita contra Hispania Hiberos veteres traiecisse easque sedes occupasse fidem faciunt; proximi Gallis et similes sunt, seu durante originis vi, seu procurrentibus in diversa terris positio caeli corporibus habitum dedit".

102 "Plus tamen ferociae Britanni praeferunt, ut quos nondum longa pax emollierit".

103 "Ipsi Britanni dilectum ac tributa et iniuncta imperii munia impigre obeunt, si iniuriae absint"

each other" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.15).[104] The Britons crushingly defeat several Roman garrisons and omit "no species of cruelty with which rage and victory could inspire barbarians" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.16).[105] Even though this rebellion is quelled eventually, Tacitus admits that the Roman hold on Britain remains fragile as the Britons are just waiting for another opportune moment (cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.18).

Under Agricola's tenure as the governor of Britain, the Britons rebel again. As Tacitus shows in his report of a speech by "Calgacus, the most distinguished for birth and valor among the chieftans" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.29),[106] the Britons realise the strength of their numbers and assemble an army of over thirty thousand men (cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.29):

> We, at the furthest limits both of land and liberty, have been defended to this day by the remoteness of our situation and of our fame. The extremity of Britain is now disclosed; and whatever is unknown becomes an object of magnitude. But there is no nation beyond us; nothing but waves and rocks, and the still more hostile Romans, whose arrogance we cannot escape by obsequiousness and submission. These plunderers of the world, after exhausting the land by their devastations, are rifling the ocean (*Tac. Agr.* 1.30).[107]

Calgacus's argument again begins by highlighting the geographical advantage of the liminal position and island nature of Britain. But, he argues, this is no longer enough to ward off the Romans. Instead, they need to rely on their "rage and valor" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.37).[108] In the end, however, the Romans still remain victorious due to tactical superiority

104 "Namque absentia legati remoto metu Britanni agitare inter se mala servitutis, conferre iniurias et interpretando accendere".
105 "nec ullum in barbaris [ingeniis] saevitiae genus omisit ira et victoria".
106 "inter pluris duces virtute et genere praestans nomine Calgacus".
107 "Nos terrarum ac libertatis extremos recessus ipse ac sinus famae in hunc diem defendit: nunc terminus Britanniae patet, atque omne ignotum pro magnifico est; sed nulla iam ultra gens, nihil nisi fluctus ac saxa, et infestiores Romani, quorum superbiam frustra per obsequium ac modestiam effugias. Raptores orbis, postquam cuncta vastantibus defuere terrae, mare scrutantur".
108 "ira virtusque".

(cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.36–38) and because the Britons are fractured into small principalities and occupied with infighting (cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.12).

This last aspect is also an issue which James I raises in his speech to Parliament in March 1604. There are two aspects that he views as "the greatest hinderance" that keep England from achieving "their many famous and glorious conquests abroad" (both [1604] 1995: 136). These are its constant need to defend "themselues at home, and keep[…] sure their backe-doore" (James I [1604] 1995: 136) against Scotland as well as the "Ciuill warres" which "are more cruell and vnnaturall then warres abroad" (both James I [1604] 1995: 134). Both these problems, he claims, are solved by his ascension to the English throne: "GOD hath with my Person sent vnto you, […] Peace within, and that in a double forme" (James I [1604] 1995: 134). He is not only descended "lineally out of the loynes of Henry the seuenth" so that in him "is reunited and confirmed […] the Vnion of the two Princely Roses of the two Houses of LANCASTER and YORKE" (James I [1604] 1995: 134) but also king of both England and Scotland. Therefore, his new union can now focus on becoming the great power they are destined to be by God (cf. James I [1604] 1995: 135).

Cymbeline again combines those different attitudes towards the Britons. We can make out the Britons' tendency towards underhand tactics observed in the Roman sources in the Queen and Cloten's behaviour throughout the play. In her frequent asides, the Queen reveals that she is exactly "[a]fter the slander of most stepmothers" (*Cym* 1.1.71) as we see her openly professing her sympathy for Innogen and Posthumus (cf. *Cym* 1.1.70–84), while actively working against them behind their backs (cf. *Cym* 1.1.103–106). She is also directly characterized by Cornelius as malicious and untrustworthy (cf. *Cym* 1.5.34–35). The parallels to Boudicca also help to characterize the Queen in *Cymbeline* as a representative of the "old Elizabethan rhetoric of English separateness" (both Butler [11]2005: 42) which contradicts James's idea of a peaceful union and therefore contributes to the Queen's characterisation as one of the play's main antagonists. The first gentleman's description of Cloten as "a thing / Too bad for bad report" (*Cym* 1.1.16–17) as well as Cloten's plan to dress up as Posthumus to take revenge on him and Innogen also reveal him to be close to the Roman depictions of the Britons.

Cymbeline, too, seems to conform to the negative image of the Britons transported in the classical sources. He similarly uses his opponents' current indisposition to his advantage. Throughout most of the last act, Cymbeline himself shows no signs of wanting to reconcile with Rome. When Lucius is brought before him, Cymbeline's intention is still to execute him and the other captives:

> Thou com'st not, Caius, now for tribute. That
> The Britons have razed out, though with the loss
> Of many a bold one, whose kinsmen have made suit
> That their good souls may be appeased with slaughter
> Of you their captives, which ourself have granted (*Cym* 5.4.69–73).

This is harkening back to the opening scene of *Titus Andronicus* where Titus tells Tamora that the dead "ask a sacrifice […] / [t]'appease their groaning shadows that are gone" (*Tit* 1.1.127–129). As argued above, the sacrifice of the prisoners is "the first sign that the city is becoming barbaric in its practices" since "Rome prided itself on not allowing human sacrifice" (both *Tit* 1.1.127 FN). The fact that Cymbeline sanctions a practice deemed "barbaric" by the Romans to assert Britain's ability to compete with Rome is not only ironic. It is also symptomatic for Cymbeline's Britain which has been continuously descending further into chaos due to the disappearance of the heirs to the throne.

At this point, Cymbeline has already been informed of the Queen's plots against him and her ulterior motifs for advising him to break with Rome. Despite his later claim that he was only "dissuaded by our wicked Queen" (*Cym* 5.4.461) from paying the outstanding tribute to Rome, it takes a literal deus-ex-machina to make him reconsider. For most of the scene, he seems to feel very secure in his position as king because of the Britons' victory over the Roman forces. Accordingly, he intends to take full advantage of this by killing his prisoners. It is not until after all of the revelations have happened that he even speaks of pardoning the captives (cf. *Cym* 5.4.420–421) and only until after the soothsayer's reading of Jupiter's tablet that he announces his intention to pay the tribute (cf. *Cym* 5.4.457–463).

This direct divine intervention is an exceptionally rare occurrence in Shakespeare's work. It echoes James's idea of divine providence discussed earlier and enables a conclusion that is in line with Jacobean domestic and foreign policy. By the end of the play, Cymbeline is finally able to overcome both political and "priuate differences" (James I [1604] 1995: 137) to focus on fulfilling the divine prophecy of the "Roman eagle [soaring] / [f]rom south to west" (*Cym* 5.4.4468–469). This vision shows Britain taking up the mantle of the Roman Empire in an extension of the concept of the *translatio imperii* and finally achieving "their many famous and glorious conquests abroad" (both James I [1604] 1995: 136), just like James I plans to do after uniting England and Scotland.

There are also examples of extraordinary Galfridian bravery in *Cymbeline*. During the decisive battle between the Romans and the Britons, the Britons are on the brink of losing as Posthumus tells a Lord who fled the battle:

> […] The King himself
> Of his wings destitute, the army broken,
> And but the backs of Britons seen, all flying
> Through a strait lane; the enemy full-hearted,
> Lolling the tongue with slaught'ring – having work
> More plentiful than tools to do't – struck down
> Some morally, some slightly touched, some falling
> Merely through fear, that the strait pass was dammed
> With dean men hurt behind […] (*Cym* 5.3.4–12).

Cymbeline himself is captured by the Romans (cf. *Cym* 5.2.10 SD). The Britons' defeat is only averted due to the exceptional bravery of the four individuals, whom Cymbeline calls the "Preservers of [his] throne" (*Cym* 5.4.2) and "the liver, heart, and brain of Britain" (*Cym* 5.4.14): Belarius, Guiderius, Arviragus, and Posthumus. They rally the Britons and encourage them to stand their ground (cf. *Cym* 5.2.11–14). Together, they manage to free Cymbeline and turn the tide of the battle in favour of the Britons. Lucius comment shows that this is a completely unexpected reversal of how the battle had been going: "It is a day turned strangely" (*Cym* 5.2.17). The Britons emerge victorious at

the end of the battle thanks to the great valour demonstrated by those four which then inspires the rest of the Britons to emulate them as well (cf. *Cym* 5.3.24–51).

Innogen, too, is portrayed as exceptionally brave throughout the play. Butler argues that by altering Boccaccio's novella, which is a main source for the jealousy plot, Shakespeare is "keeping Innogen out of heroic adventures and displacing her from the centre of the story" (Butler [11]2015: 25). Yet while Innogen's bravery is not as ostentatious as the one displayed by the male characters, she is consistently brave throughout the play. She not only stands up to her father and marries Posthumus against his explicit orders but also justifies her action to his face and does not back down (cf. *Cym* 1.124–150). This act of rebellion against her father can, in this case, be seen as heroic because she conforms to the Galfridian ideal while her father does not and therefore has to be challenged. When Posthumus pretends to be in Wales and asks her to come and see him, she does not hesitate but immediately plans her escape from court with Pisanio and proclaims: "Accessible is none but Milford way" (*Cym* 3.2.83). She is not at all concerned with the dangers such a journey would entail, as she is fully focused on reuniting with her husband (cf. *Cym* 3.2.79–83). When she learns of Posthumus's plan of having her killed for supposed adultery, she decides not to return to the court. Following Pisanio's advice, she disguises herself as a boy and travels alone towards Milford Haven to confront Posthumus (cf. *Cym* 3.4.139–152). On her way to Milford, it is only her "resolution" which keeps her going:

> I have tired myself, and for two nights together
> Have made the ground my bed. I should be sick,
> But that my resolution helps me […] (*Cym* 3.6.2–4).

She overcomes her fear out of necessity and enters the cave where Belarius and the princes live despite stating that "I were best not call; I dare not call" (*Cym* 3.6.19).

The name she takes up in her disguise also signifies her exceptionality. She calls herself "Fidele" (*Cym* 3.6.58) which is derived from the Latin *fidelis* 'loyal, faithful'. Upon meeting Fidele, the Roman ambas-

sador Lucius remarks that "[t]hou dost approve thyself the very same; / Thy name well fits thy faith, thy faith thy name" (*Cym* 4.2.379–380). Throughout the play, she remains loyal to her husband Posthumus even though he ordered her death and in doing so, stands up to her father (cf. *Cym* 1.1.130–150) as well as Lucius (cf. *Cym* 5.4.101–107). Posthumus draws attention to her Galfridian bravery when he calls her the "temple / Of virtue" (*Cym* 5.4.220–221) when he thinks he has caused her death.

Interestingly, none of these five characters are present at Cymbeline's court for the majority of the play. Posthumus is banished in the first act; Innogen leaves in the third; and Belarius and the princes only travel there in the last. Their return, and thus by proxy the return of honour and bravery, is the final necessary step to bring about the reconciliatory conclusion of the play. Only when the identities of all of them are revealed does Cymbeline renounce his plan to execute the prisoners and agree to pay the outstanding tribute to Rome.

4.1.3 Romans and Britons

When Innogen takes on the name Fidele, she further illustrates a surprising fact about a significant number of Shakespeare's Britons: the royal doctor, Cymbeline's children, and Posthumus all bear Latin names.[109] This is symptomatic of what Andrew Escobedo describes as an always already "Romanized" Britain (2008: 70). This *Romanized Britain* is aware of its place within the larger context of the Roman Empire and embraces Roman culture. While this notion is present throughout the entire play, it is only in Cymbeline's final decision to pay the outstanding tribute that it is openly acknowledged (cf. *Cym* 5.4.474–483). The "ambivalence in Britain's emulation of Rome" (Kahn 1995: 164) is foreshadowing the "idea of a westering empire, power passing from […] Rome to James's new British *imperium*" (Butler [11]2005: 38). This idea is at the heart of the soothsayer's prophecy (cf. *Cym* 5.4.465–474) and, as mentioned above, takes up ideas from topical discourses of the

109 Another interesting name in this regard is Euriphile, the princes' nurse, which literally translates to "Lover of Europe" (3.3.103 FN) which again highlights Britain's connection to the continent (cf. Boling 2000: 64)

seventeenth century. These early modern ideas are then combined with elements of the relationship between the Romans and the Britons from the depiction in the classical sources.

The relationship between Britons and Romans does not play a role in the *Bello Gallico* since it focuses more on Caesar's military successes and does not deal with Britain after Caesar leaves in 54 BC. This is because, as Tacitus argues, Caesar's campaign should "be considered rather to have transmitted the discovery than the possession of the country to posterity" (*Tac. Agr.* 1.13). There simply was hardly any relationship between Romans and Britons to describe other than that of enemies in battle at the point in time that Caesar is writing his account. Tacitus, by contrast, proves to be a highly productive source for this topic. As mentioned above, he writes from a later point in time when Roman rule over Britain had been established for over a century. Additionally, his subject is a governor of Britain who is very much concerned with the day to day relations between the Empire and its subjects.

Tacitus's account indicates that the relationship between the Roman Empire and the Britons remains tenuous at best throughout the Roman occupation, even though the situation improves somewhat under the rule of his titular character, Agricola. To dissuade the Britons from any further revolts against the Romans, Agricola tries

> by a taste of pleasures, to reclaim the natives from that rude and unsettled state which prompted them to war, and reconcile them to quiet and tranquillity, [and] incite[s] them, by private instigations and public encouragements, to erect temples, courts of justice, and dwelling-houses (*Tac. Agr.* 1.21).[110]

Through Agricola's efforts, the Britons begin to adopt the Roman language as well as their customs (cf. *Tac. Agr.* 1.21).

We can see this in *Cymbeline* as well since the Roman Empire is the touchstone to British identity throughout the play. As mentioned above,

110 "Namque ut homines dispersi ac rudes eoque in bella faciles quieti et otio per voluptates adsuescerent, hortari privatim, adiuvare publice, ut templa fora domos extruerent, laudando promptos, castigando segnis".

the validation of Posthumus's station relies on the honour his father won through fighting the Romans (cf. *Cym* 1.1.30). Cymbeline himself acknowledges his close ties to the Roman Empire only a few lines after he asserted Britain's independence from it: "Thy Caesar knighted me; my youth I spent / Much under him; of him I gathered honour" (*Cym* 3.1.67–68). This contradiction prepares the eventual acceptance of Roman rule by the end of the play. The dichotomy of Britain and Rome is dissolved because the Britons eventually "return to the Roman model, but on their own terms" (Escobedo 2008: 70).

Accordingly, it is not the Queen's assertion of national independence that accurately describes the political situation of Cymbeline's Britain. Instead, it is Innogen who "presents and experiences Britain, wandering through it, calling up its place names, and describing its natural situation" (Mikalachki 1995: 317). In contrast to the Queen's earlier evocation of the "natural bravery of the isle" (*Cym* 3.1.18), Innogen reacts to Pisanio's suggestion to leave Britain (cf. *Cym* 3.4.133–134) with a series of questions: "Where then? / Hath Britain all the sun that shines? Day, night, / Are they not but in Britain?" (*Cym* 3.4.134–136). Unlike the Queen, Cloten, and Cymbeline, Innogen does not derive from this a claim of British independence:

> I' the world's volume
> Our Britain seems as of it, but not in't;
> In a great pool a swan's nest. […]
> There's livers out of Britain (*Cym* 3.4.136–139).

Where the "unscalable and roaring waters" (*Cym* 3.1.20) the Queen evoked in her monologue was protecting Britain from invasion and interference from the outside, Innogen's metaphor of the swan's nest portrays "Britain's isolation from Europe […] [as] more of a shortcoming" (*Cym* 3.4.138 FN). The image Innogen creates "registers the costs as well as the achievements of […] Britain's isolation [which] looks protective but means exile to the global periphery" (Butler [11]2005: 44). This is also expressed by the fact none of the Britons ever reach Milford Haven, even though they evoke its name constantly as a destination. This town has a particular significance as what Martin Butler calls "the sacred spot of

Tudor nationalism" ([11]2005: 44) due to its pivotal role as the place where Henry Tudor landed with his army in 1485 to take the English throne from Richard III. *Cymbeline*'s Britain, as this failure suggests, has not yet found its national identity or its place in the wider world around it.

Accordingly, the Queen's monologue fails to produce the patriotic effect that John of Gaunt's speech has in *Richard II*. It does so, not because her words are less convincing or "unattractive" (Escobedo 2008: 67), but because her speech, while actively propagating a separation from Rome, is heavily indebted to Roman models: she is citing from Caesar (cf. *Cym* 3.1.24) and also evokes Neptune, the *Roman* god of the Sea, as Britain's protector (cf. *Cym* 3.1.19). This along with her characterisation as one of the play's main antagonists further undermines her credibility.

We can see this 'Romanization' of Britain permeating the entire play. In addition to the Queen's evocation of Neptune, the Roman god Jupiter is also referred to frequently by various Britons (cf. *Cym* 2.3.118, 2.4.98, 3.3.88, 3.5.84, 3.6.6, 3.6.42, 4.2.206, 5.3.84). There is also a Temple dedicated to him in Cymbeline's capital (cf. *Cym* 5.4.480) and he even makes an onstage appearance as a literal deus-ex-machina to bring about the reconciliatory conclusion (cf. *Cym* 5.3.156–177).

Similarly, the decisive battle between the Romans and the Britons through which the Britons seemingly secure their independence from Rome "is indebted both to native and to Roman models of valor" (Kahn 1995: 164). It references "not only Holinshed's description of Haie and his sons fighting off the Danes, but also Livy's famous account of Horatius at the bridge" (Kahn 1995: 164). In Livy's story of the legendary battle at the Sublician bridge, a small group of men are fighting with "miraculous audacity [which] stupefied the enemies" (*Liv. 2.10,* my translation*).*[111] They are the only ones fighting against an invading army while their compatriots are fleeing in fear (cf. *Liv.* 2.10). Horatius Cocles and two others successfully manage to drive the invading enemy back, saving the city (cf. *Liv.* 2.10). After the battle, the state and its citizens "show gratitude for such virtue through the placing of a statue in the Comitium, the giving of land […], as well as private endeavours which

111 "ipso miraculo audaciae obstupefecit hostis".

stood out from the public honours" (cf. *Liv.* 2.10, my translation).[112] In *Cymbeline*, we see Posthumus, Belarius, and the Princes fulfil the role of Horatius and his compatriots. They, like their models from Roman history, use the advantage of "a narrow lane" (*Cym* 5.3.52) to fend of the Roman army, who outnumber the Britons and, according to Posthumus's account, have "work / More plentiful than tools to do't" (*Cym* 5.3.9–10). As Ros King remarks, this is a tactic usually associated with Roman warfare (cf. 2005: 93–94). Thus, even the depiction of the culmination of Britain's strive for independence from the Roman Empire cannot hide its indebtedness to Roman models.

British identity as distinctly different from Rome becomes particularly unstable in this battle scene as several key characters change sides multiple times: Posthumus, an exiled Briton, arriving as part of the Roman army, "disrobe[s] […] / Of these Italian weeds, and suit[s] [himself] / As does a Briton peasant" (*Cym* 5.1.22–24) and manages to turn the tide of the battle in favour of the Britons only to change back into his "Roman costume" (*Cym* 5.3.74 SD) after the victory; Innogen, a princess of the Britons, returns from Wales to Britain as a Roman page; Belarius only joins the fight after remarking that Cymbeline "Hath not deserved [his] service nor [the princes'] loves" (*Cym* 4.4.25) and only because he cannot dissuade the princes (cf. *Cym* 4.4.48–54).

This complicated relationship between Romans and Britons gains an interesting topicality in the context of early Jacobean imperialism. After several failed attempts at establishing settlements in America, James's reign saw a renewed interest in the 'New World'. In 1606, James I granted a charter to the Virginia Company, allowing them to colonise parts of the eastern coast of North America. In 1607, the first permanent and lasting English settlement on American soil was established in Jamestown in Virginia, named after both James I and his predecessor Elizabeth I respectively. The Roman Empire, on the one hand, provides early modern English imperial ambitions with an example to emulate. On the other hand, it complicates any straightforward analogy because of its reversed perspective:

112 "Grata erga tantam virtutem civitas fuit; statua in comitio posita; agri […] datum. Privata quoque inter publicos honores studia eminebant".

> On one level, [the Britons] represent indigenous inhabitants in a colonial terrain inevitably succumbing to the power and control of a more advanced civilization. At the same time, [...] the attitudes of individual Britons to invasion and processes of Romanization, all act as ways of measuring the success or failure of the colonial policies and leadership of the current monarch and his immediate predecessor. The Romans represent an alien and hostile conquering force finally overcoming the Britons' independence but, at the same time, they also imaginatively stand in for the British in contemporary Virginia (Jowitt 2003: 475–476).

Claire Jowitt is here writing about John Fletcher's *Bonduca* but her assessment also holds true for Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*.

The encounter between Romans and Britons is at the heart of the play. *Cymbeline* adds a new layer to the issues discussed in this thesis because it complicates the portrayal of the encounters between the Self and the Other by reversing the roles of the parties engaged in them. The Britons are the colonised in the play which puts them into the role traditionally fulfilled by the Other whereas the Self becomes the Other. The movement the play describes, therefore, is no longer a transition from the margins to the centre, as we have seen in *Titus Andronicus* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, but the other way around. Additionally, *Cymbeline*'s encounters also deviate from the portrayal of a shared community in Shakespeare's Venetian plays. The play still portrays a co-existence between the Romans and the Britons. But the plot unfolds in the realm of and from the perspective of the colonised Other, suppressed and fighting back against the colonisers. By combining influences from Roman historiographies, medieval myths, and contemporary political discourse, Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* blurs the distinction between the colonising Self and the colonised Other because they are always already both at the same time: "If the Britons are Romanized, the Romans are Britonized" (Escobedo 2008: 70). The isolationism championed by the Queen, Cloten, and Cymbeline ultimately gives way to a union between Rome and Britain.

In doing so, the play echoes central issues of Jacobean national identity and foreign policy. We can see this clearly in the Soothsayer's vision:

> Last night the very gods showed me a vision –
> I fast and prayed for their intelligence – thus:
> I saw Jove's bird, the Roman eagle, winged
> From the spongy south to this part of the west,
> There vanished in the sunbeams; which portends,
> Unless my sins abuse my divination,
> Success to th'Roman host (*Cym* 4.2.245–351).

As Heather James points out, this reading of the vision "prefigures the extension of Augustus' power over Britain" (1997: 153). As the following scenes show, however, this is not what happens. Instead of a Roman victory, the Britons win because of Galfridian bravery and advantageous use of the natural geography by Belarius, the Princes, and Posthumus (cf. *Cym* 5.2.1–5.3.63) as discussed earlier. While still maintaining a Roman victory of sorts, the Soothsayer adapts his second interpretation of the vision to portray more accurately what actually occurred:

> The fingers of the powers above do tune
> The harmony of this peace. The vision
> Which I made known to Lucius ere the stroke
> Of this yet scare-cold battle, at this instant
> Is full accomplished. For the Roman eagle,
> From south to west on wing soaring aloft,
> Lessened herself, and in the beams o'th'sun
> So vanished; which foreshadowed our princely eagle,
> Th'imperial Caesar, should again unite
> His favour with the radiant Cymbeline,
> Which shines here in the west (*Cym* 5.4.464–474).

This time, the Roman victory consists in reconciliation with "the radiant Cymbeline" (*Cym* 5.4.473) rather than a straightforward "Success to th'Roman host" (*Cym* 4.2.351).

The imagery he uses in both readings, however, is quite revealing. Both times he describes the Roman eagle vanishing in the western, i.e. British, sunbeams. Even though the soothsayer still glosses it as a Roman victory, Roman authority is vanning as the British sun is out-

shining and eventually replacing it. This again references the idea of *translatio imperii*. Accordingly, the resolution of the conflict is not the victory in the battle but the return of the lost princes:

> Cymbeline's sons enjoy an undisturbed line of descent from Rome to Britain and from classical to early modern sources […] The boys reinvent Roman virtues and synthesize Livy, Plutarch, and Holinshed (James 1994: 186).

Raised in the "hard pastoral world, an ethical and physical boot camp" (James 1997: 185) in Wales, the ancestral home of the Tudors, Guiderius and Arviragus also return essential British values. In his first speech to Parliament, James I, too, styled himself as the bringer of "Inward and Outward peace" (James I [1604] 1995: 137), who is cutting off "all the former fears of this Nation" and allowing them to pursue "their many famous and glorious conquests abroad" (both James I [1604] 1995: 136). The former colonised, then, do indeed become the future coloniser.

4.2 The Tempest

Like *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest* is set on an island at the margins of the known world. At its core, it, too, is concerned with intercultural encounters which are complicated because their portrayal blurs the distinction between Self and Other. Unlike *Cymbeline*, however, *The Tempest* ranks highly among the previously mentioned "familiar greats in the Shakespeare canon" (Johnson 2000: 3) and has received plentiful attention. As Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan put it in their introduction to the Arden edition of the play, "*The Tempest* has been a play for all eras, all continents and many ideologies" ([2]2011: 1).

Traditionally, criticism of the play has focused on two different approaches. Highlighting the play's many metadramatic elements and considering the circumstances of it supposedly being Shakespeare's last play or at least the last one written without collaboration, it has been glorified as what Katrin Trüstedt calls a "Komödie des Spiels" (Trüstedt 2011: 10). This reading demonstrates the power of theatre and constitutes something akin to "not only Shakespeare's farewell to the stage,

but his dying breath, signalled by his liberation of the life-spirit Ariel" (Smith 2019: 3007).[113] In this context, Prospero has been frequently read as Shakespeare's self-insert character. Emma Smith addresses the problems of this syllogistic reading when she states that

> there is no definitive external evidence to confirm that *The Tempest*, written and performed in 1610–11, is Shakespeare's final play [...]. It is because we want the play's closing movement to read as Shakespeare's farewell to the stage that we place *The Tempest* at the end of Shakespeare's career, and then we use that position to affirm that the play must dramatize Shakespeare's own feelings at the end of his career (both 2019: 306).

In colonial and postcolonial contexts, *The Tempest* has alternatively been interpreted as a "Komödie des Rechts" (Trüstedt 2011: 10) where Prospero's taking over the island from Caliban is seen either as favourable or reinterpreted as an act of oppression (cf. Trüstedt 2011: 10). Both these contexts are highly relevant to the questions discussed in this thesis. In *The Tempest*, issues of colonialism and power are intimately linked to metadramatical explorations to the potential of the theatre which adds an interesting new element to the discussion of early modern globalisation. *The Tempest*'s "*dual* topography" (Hulme 1986: 107) means that the island which, while firmly set in the Mediterranean by the textual evidence, also clearly evokes images of the Americas and the Caribbean. Against this background, Prospero's relationship to Caliban has often been discussed from various angles and theoretical backgrounds. Yet, this is by no means the only example of an intercultural encounter in the play.

In the following, I want to look at how the various encounters with the – from a European perspective – Other on the island influence the European nobles and their sense of identity. Before focusing on these, however, I want to first examine again possible sources and contexts that would have been accessible to Shakespeare and that *The Tempest*

113 During the Shakespeare Institute's marathon reading of Shakespeare's canon in May and June 2020, Martin Wiggins has suggested that while *Temp* was not Shakespeare's last play as a playwright, it most likely was his last one as an actor and that he would probably have played Prospero.

would have evoked for its audiences. There have been two main tendencies which interpret *The Tempest* either in the context of classical antiquity with a focus on its indebtedness to the "classical utopian tradition, as begun by Plato's *Republic*" and its Mediterranean context or in relation to "the issue of imperialism [...], with its possible connections to Montaigne's essay 'Of Cannibals' and reports on the colonization of Virginia" (both Cantor 2016: 897). In the following, I am going look at both these contexts before attempting to produce a synthesis of these traditions. As a final step, I am going to highlight the various encounters that take place on the island. These are shaped by the early modern discourses about processes of globalisation that have been at the centre of my exploration of the plays in this thesis. In turn, they also contribute to these discussions and complicate the encounters between the various characters that meet on the island at the heart of the play.

4.2.1 New World

The Tempest draws on a great variety of contexts and themes as inspiration. One of these is made explicit in Miranda's reaction to the arrival of the European nobles at Prospero's cell:

> O, wonder!
> How many goodly creatures are there here!
> How beauteous mankind is! O *brave new world*,
> That has such people in't! (*Temp* 5.1.181–184, my emphasis).

Miranda, who arrived on the island when she was "not / Out three years old" (*Temp* 1.2.40–41) and barely "remember[s] / A time before [she and her father] came unto this cell" (*Temp* 1.2.3–39), here uses a term which carries connotations of the Americas, which were 'discovered' by the Europeans in the early modern period. Her exclamation is echoing "the response of European explorers to exotic peoples, fauna and flora in a remote new world" (Vaughan and Vaughan ²2011: 4). In doing so, Miranda's term in many ways forms the basis for "the received wisdom about William Shakespeare's *Tempest* [...] that this is the play about the colonization of the New World" (Wilson-Okamura 2003: 709).

Even though *The Tempest* is one of the few Shakespearean plays that conform to the normative unity of space as it is set only in one place, Martin Butler calls it "Shakespeare's travel drama" (2016: n/a). He argues that it is

> a play responding to the enlarged geographical and mental horizons created by European exploration into distant places. It stages the disconcerting effects of surprise and estrangement provoked by the burgeoning literature of global discovery, with its reports of new and wonderful lands (Butler 2016: n/a).

While these claims have been qualified in recent years, with critics admitting that the play "is not primarily about America", the play's imagery and topological connections still "link the drama thematically to the travellers' tales that so delighted readers of Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*" (both Vaughan and Vaughan ²2011: 4).

Despite the play being textually situated in the Mediterranean somewhere between Naples and Tunis, its topological connections to the 'New World' are plentiful and can be found in various allusions through the play. Miranda's direct reference to the "brave new world" (*Temp* 5.1.183) with which I started this section is the most obvious example of these. Interestingly, it also sets the theme for the encounters between the Self and Other on the island as it "upsets our assumptions by presenting the colonial encounter as if from the point of view of the soon-to-be disenchanted native" (Butler 2016: n/a).

Ariel's mention of the "still-vexed Bermudas" (*Temp* 1.2.229) directly alludes to one of the key documents for *The Tempest*: William Strachey's *A True Reportory* which was published in 1625 but quite possibly circulated as a manuscript around the time Shakespeare was writing his play (cf. Vaughan 2008: 256–257).[114] In his account, Strachey retells the

114 In 2007, Roger Stritmatter and Lynn Kositsky published an article attacking the dominant theory that Strachey's account was the primary source of inspiration in "thought, image, and language" (447) arguing that both "the lack of evidence for Shakespeare's access to the document [and] […] the lack of evidence that it ever circulated at court, or even existed in its published form until after the earliest recorded Tempest performance" (450) as well as "William Strachey's reputation as a plagiarist" (453) disprove this theory. Alden T. Vaughan

events of a storm that resulted in the wreck of the *Sea Venture* on its way to Virginia:

> We found it to be the dangerous and dreaded Iland, or rather Ilands of the *Bermuda*: whereof let mee giue your Ladyship a briefe description, before I proceed to my narration. And that the rather, because they be so terrible to all that euer touched on them, and such tempests, thunders, and other fearefull obiects are seene aud heard about them, that they be called commonly, *The Deuils Ilands*, and are feared and auoyded of all sea trauellers aliue, aboue any other place in the world (Strachey [1610] 1625: 1737).

Strachey's *True Reportory* also provides plenty of inspiration for *The Tempest* in terms of the play's plot. Separated from the rest of the fleet, the surviving crew and passengers of the *Sea Venture* are stranded on the island of Bermuda (cf. Strachey [1610] 1625: 1734–1735), eventually rebuild their ship and after a year, finally arrive at their original destination (cf. Strachey [1610] 1625: 1754–1756). This is very close to the story of the European nobles in *The Tempest*, who are similarly shipwrecked (cf. *Temp* 1.1.), miraculously saved, and eventually able to continue their journey as intended (cf. *Temp* 5.1.307–317).[115]

Caliban offers several topological references to accounts of early modern 'discoveries' in the Americas as well: his name is an anagram of the term 'can[n]ibal'. This echoes both Montaigne's essay *Of the Canniballes*, whose influence on *The Tempest* I am going to discuss later in this chapter, as well as Christopher Columbus's account of his landing in

refutes these and similar claims in an article in 2008 where he accuses Stritmatter and Kositsky as well as several others of "flout[ing] ascertainable facts about Strachey as a writer, the date of his narrative, and the evolution of that narrative" and of "overlook[ing] or outright deny[ing] the impact on English public opinion of the events of 1609–10" (both 246). For the purpose of my paper, Strachey's text is relevant more because it is shedding light on exactly this public opinion around the first decade of the seventeenth century rather than because it is providing a certifiable source for *Temp*.

115 The major difference between Strachey's narrative and *Temp* lies in the fact that the journey in the latter is explicitly a return home to Naples (cf. *Temp* 1.2.232–237) – representative of the 'Old World' – instead of a journey to the 'New World'. I am going to discuss the ramifications of this classical context in the next part of this chapter.

the 'New World' where the name is used for the first time for "the indigenous inhabitants of what became known as the Caribbean (through a parallel development of the same native word)" (Hulme 2002: 6). Additionally, Caliban promises to teach Stephano how to catch the "nimble marmoset" (*Temp* 2.2.167), which is an animal native to the same region and was introduced to Europe by Portuguese explorers (cf. Butler 2016: n/a); and his "dam's god Setebos" (*Temp* 1.2.347) references a Patagonian deity (cf. Butler 2016: n/a).

Furthermore, Trinculo explicitly compares Caliban to a native inhabitant of the 'New World' when he sees him for the first time:

> Were I in England now (as once I was) and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would five a piece of silver. There would this monster make a man; any strange beast there makes a man. When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead *Indian* (*Temp* 2.2.27–32, my emphasis).

Trinculo's focus on the economic possibilities associated with the European explorations here echoes descriptions by many of the accounts of the 'discoveries' in the Americas. One example for this is Thomas Hariot's *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*, in which he tries to persuade possibly interested but still hesitant English citizens to become settlers of the newly established colony of Virginia. The colony's great potential, he argues, lies primarily in "commodities there alreadie found or to be raised, which […] as by way of trafficke and exchaunge with our owne nation of England, will enrich your selues the prouiders" (Hariot 1588: 8–9). By commodifying Caliban, then, *The Tempest* further highlights its connection to the context of early modern English engagements with the 'New World'.

Another topical allusion can be found in the choice of Milan and Naples as Prospero's regained dukedom and Alonso's kingdom respectively. Both cities became part of the Spanish Empire under Charles V following the Spanish victory at the Battle of Pavia in 1525 (cf. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. *Italy* under *History: Early modern Italy*). Peter Hulme even calls *The Tempest* "the most Spanish of Shakespeare's plays" (2002: 1) because of its many "Spanish con-texts […]: pastoral fiction,

romances of chivalry, and travel accounts" (2002: 7). The travel narratives, in particular, are highly relevant because a significant part of the early modern English discourse of the 'New World' is framed within the context of an English-Spanish antagonism. One prominent example of this comes from *The Famous Voyage of Sir Francis Drake*, which was published in the *Principal Navigations* by Richard Hakluyt in 1589. The account of Drake's circumnavigation of 1577 to 1580 is full of anti-Spanish rhetoric, condemning "the cruell and extreme dealings of the Spaniards" (Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 113) while at the same time highlighting the "naturall and accustomed humanitie" (Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 119) of Drake and the English explorers. During the circumnavigation, Drake and his crew also regularly engage in acts of piracy against Spanish ships, which the narrative frames as a retributive measure:

> while wee were here [i.e. Island of Canno], we espied a shippe, and set saile after her, and tooke her, and found in her two Pilots and a Spanish Governour, going for the Islands of the Philippinas: wee searched the shippe, and tooke some of her marchandizes, and so let her goe. Our Generall at this place and time, thinking himselfe both in respect of his private injuries received from the Spaniards, as also of their contempts and indignities offered to our countrey and Prince [i.e. Queen Elizabeth I] in generall, sufficiently satisfied, and revenged (Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 118).

Furthermore, the narrator of *The Famous Voyage* frequently emphasises how respectful the English treat the indigenous peoples they encounter. This is contrasted with the way the Spanish mistreat them:

> We continuing our course, fell the 29. of November with an Island called la Mocha, where we cast anchor, and our Generall hoysing out our boate, went with ten of our company to shore, where wee found people, whom the cruell and extreme dealings of the Spaniards have forced for their owne safetie and libertie to flee from the maine, and to fortifie themselves in this Island. We being on land, the people came downe to us to the water side with shew of great courtesie, bringing to us potatoes, rootes, and two very fat sheepe, which our Generall received and gave

> them other things for them, and had promise to have water there: but the next day repayring againe to the shore, and sending two men aland with barrels to fill water, the people taking them for Spaniards (to whom they use to shew no favour if they take them) layde violent hands on them, and as we thinke, slew them (Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 113).

Walter Raleigh makes a similar point in his *Discoverie of Guiana* when he reports of his stay at Puerto de los Espanoles about Don Antonio de Berreo, the governor of the Spanish settlement there. Raleigh explicitly mentions that Berreo "had long served the Spanish king in *Milan*, *Naples*, the Low Countries, and elsewhere" (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a, my emphasis). This interesting parallel to the places of origins of both Prospero and Alonso is intensified when Raleigh continues to describe what is reported to him about Berreo's treatment of the indigenous population:

> every night there came some [Indians] with most lamentable complaints of his cruelty: how he had divided the island and given to every soldier a part; that he made the ancient caciques, which were lords of the country, to be their slaves; that he kept them in chains, and dropped their naked bodies with burning bacon, and such other torments (Raleigh [1596] 2013: n/a).

The treatment Caliban and Ariel, as well as Ferdinand, receive from Prospero and the other is highly reminiscent of these descriptions. Both Caliban and Ariel are referred to by Prospero as his "slave" (*Temp* 1.2.270 for Ariel and i.a. 1.2.309 and 1.2.314 for Caliban) and Prospero forces them to comply with his orders through threats of torture and violence (cf. *Temp* 1.2.294–296 and 1.2.326–331). Similarly, his 'punishment' for Ferdinand being "a traitor" (*Temp* 1.2.461) is to "manacle [his] neck and feet together" and to only give him "Sea water" and "fresh-brook mussels, withered roots, and husks" (all *Temp* 1.2.462–464) to eat and drink. Prospero admits that all this is only a pretence to make "this swift business [of Ferdinand and Miranda's courtship] […] uneasy, lest too light winning / Make the prize light" (*Temp* 1.2.451–453). Yet, the different forms of punishments are remarkably similar to what we find in English accounts of Spanish cruelty towards the indigenous peoples

in the 'New World'. The fact that Prospero as the duke of Milan would have been a Spanish noble only adds to that association.

Beyond these topical allusions, we can also find the 'New World' influence on a thematic level in what John Gillies identifies as Shakespeare's translation "into poetic and dramatic terms [of] a pair of rhetorical *topoi* that are crucial in forming the official portrait of Virginia", namely "the ideas of temperance and fruitfulness" (both 1986: 676). These ideas are most explicitly expressed in the betrothal masque Prospero stages for his daughter and Ferdinand (cf. Gillies 1986: 686), as the language of the blessing of the spirit-goddesses Juno, Ceres, and Iris reflects:

> Juno: Honour, riches, marriage-blessing,
> Long continuance and *increasing*,
> Hourly joys be still upon you.
> Juno sings her blessings on you.
> Ceres: Earth's *increase*, foison *plenty*,
> […] Spring come to you at the farthest
> In the very end of harvest.
> Scarcity and want shall shun you.
> Ceres' blessing so is on you.[...]
> Iris: You nymphs, called naiads of the windring brooks,
> With your sedged crowns and ever-harmless looks,
> Leave your crisp channels and on this green land
> Answer your summons, Juno does command.
> Come, *temperate* nymphs, and help to celebrate
> A contract of true love […]
> (*Temp* 4.1.106–133, my emphasis).

In this passage, the spirit-goddesses use many of the terms that we also find in accounts like that of Thomas Hariot's *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* where he concludes that

> the ayre there is so temperate and holsome, the soyle so fertile and yeelding such commodities as I haue before mentioned […] I hope there remaine no cause wherby the action [i.e. settling in Virginia] should be misliked (Hariot 1588: 46).

The Famous Voyage contains similar descriptions for both the Cape of Joy, which according to the narrator has a "good temperature and sweete ayre, a very faire and pleasant countrey with an exceeding fruitfull soyle" (Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 107), as well as the "rich and fruitfull" and "divers and plentiful" Island of Barateve (both Hakluyt [1589] 2014: 130). These ideas are also present when Gonzalo and Adrian elaborate on the island's "subtle, tender and delicate temperance" (*Temp* 2.1.45), its "lush and lusty [...] grass" (*Temp* 2.1.55) and comment on it offering "everything advantageous to life" (*Temp* 2.1.52).

In the same scene, Gonzalo launches into a lengthy account of what he would do, "Had [he] plantation of this isle" (*Temp* 2.1.144). 'Plantation' here evokes the context of colonialism by using a term associated with the "settling of people, usually in a conquered or dominated country; *esp.* the planting or establishing of a colony" (*OED* s.v. *plantation* 1b).[116] Gonzalo's monologue is also heavily indebted to the aforementioned essay *Of the Canniballes* by Michel de Montaigne, where he describes the indigenous people of Brazil (cf. [1603] ²2011: 325) which he depicts as being in an "exceeding pleasant and temperate situation" ([1603] ²2011: 327). The inhabitants, he writes, "not onlie exceed all the pictures wherewith licentious Poesie hath prowdly imbellished the golden age" (Montaigne [1603] ²2011: 236). They also have

> no kinde of traffike, […] no name of magistrate, nor of politike superioritie; no use of service, of riches, or of poverty; no contracts, no successions, no dividences, no occupation but idle; no respect of kindred, but common, no apparrell but naturall, no manuring of lands, no use of wine, corne, or mettle. The very words that import lying, falsehood, treason, dissimulation, covetuousnes, envie, detraction, and pardon, were never heard of amongst them" (Montaigne [1603] ²2011: 236–237).

Gonzalo almost verbatim echoes these ideas in his description of his "plantation" (*Temp* 2.1.144) when he talks about his "commonwealth['s]"

116 The first use of the term 'plantation' in this sense was in the context of the settlement of English colonialists in Ireland, specifically Ulster, and then later expanded to similar settlements in the Americas (cf. *OED* s.v. *plantation* 1b and 4a).

(*Temp* 2.1.148) social and political order (cf. *Temp* 2.1.148–165).[117] He then again invokes the island's fruitful characteristics typical for the contemporary writings about Virginia when he says that "nature should bring forth / Of its own kind all foison, all abundance" (*Temp* 2.1.163–164). Interestingly, Gonzalo and Adrian's discussion of the 'New World' possibilities of the island is firmly embedded within an explicitly 'Old World' context. Right before Gonzalo's plans for his hypothetical 'plantation', he and Adrian reference the *Aeneid*, when they debate if their Tunis corresponds to the classical Carthage (cf. *Temp* 2.1.77–85). Additionally, the goal of Gonzalo's plantation is "T'excel the Golden Age" (cf. *Temp* 2.1.169), an allusion to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In the next part of this chapter, I am therefore going to discuss exactly these 'Old World' contexts and attempt to synthesise both 'worlds' to focus on a close reading of the varied intercultural encounters in *The Tempest* that negotiate these contexts as well as contemporary political and social discourses.

4.2.2 Old World

Revisiting the dialogue in which Miranda exclaims the famous line "O brave new world" (*Temp* 5.1.183) that evokes the context of early modern exploration in the Americas, it becomes clear that her perspective is not the dominant perspective of the play. "'Tis new to *thee*" (*Temp* 5.1.184, my emphasis), Prospero immediately corrects her. From his European point of view, as well as from that of Shakespeare's predominantly English audiences, the nobles would be recognisable as representatives of the 'Old World' of the European Mediterranean with its roots in classical antiquity. Textual evidence also firmly sets the island of *The Tempest* in this world. Prospero and Miranda have washed ashore after being set adrift "some leagues to sea" (*Temp* 1.2.145) off the coast of Italy in a "rotten carcass of a butt, not rigged, / Nor tackle, sail, nor mast" (*Temp* 1.2.146–147). Furthermore, the European nobles at the beginning of the play are shipwrecked off the island's coast on their

117 Gonzalo, as Sebastian and Antonio rightly point out, prefaces his account with the hypothetical "Had I plantation of this isle […] And were the king on't" (*Temp* 2.1.144–146) which undermines his position but not his general allusion to the context of Early Modern explorations of the 'New World'.

way back from Tunis to Naples (cf. *Temp* 2.1.70–74). The island, therefore, has to be located geographically somewhere in the Mediterranean rather than the Atlantic.

The aforementioned allusions to Ovid and Vergil further serve to situate the play in this Mediterranean world. The "Golden Age" (*Temp* 2.1.169) Gonzalo evokes after his lengthy deliberations about his "plantation of this isle" (*Temp* 2.1.144) alludes to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (cf. Golding [1567] 1904: 1.103–128)[118] as does Prospero's abjuration speech (*Temp* 5.1.33–50) which draws heavily on imagery from Medea's rejuvenation of Aeson in book seven: like Prospero, she calls on "ye Elves of Hilles, of Brookes, of Woods alone, / Of standing Lakes, and of the Night" (Golding [1567] 1904: 7.265–266),[119] boasts that she has made "the calme Seas rough, and make y rough Seas plaine / And cover all the Skie with Cloudes, and chase them thence againe" (Golding [1567] 1904: 7.269–270),[120] and proudly proclaims:

> [...] I make the Mountaines shake,
> And even the Earth it selfe to grone and fearfully to quake.
> I call up dead men from their graves: and thee O lightsome Moone
> I darken oft, though beaten brasse abate thy perill soone
> Our Sorcerie dimmes the Morning faire, and darkes y Sun at Noone
> (Golding [1567] 1904: 273–277).[121]

These verbal echoes of Medea's claims in Prospero's abjuration speech[122] not only present a challenge to the conventional image of him as a

118 Since Shakespeare's language in *Temp* echoes Arthur Golding's translation much more directly than his allusions to *Ov. Met.* in *Tit*, I am not using the Loeb translation in this chapter. As Sarah Annes Brown suggests, Golding's translation "was a vital influence on [Shakespeare's] reception of Ovid" and "would have given Shakespeare a more direct and uncluttered vision of Ovid's world" even though "Shakespeare appears to have been familiar with at least some parts of the *Metamorphoses* in the Latin" (all 1994: 4).

119 The Latin versions of the Golding passages are taken from the 1916 Loeb edition of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: "auraeque et venti montesque amnesque lacusque, dique omnes nemorum, dique omnes noctis" (*Ov. Met.* 7.197–198).

120 "concussaque sisto, / stantia concutio cantu freta" (*Ov. Met.* 7.200–201).

121 "et mugire solum manesque exire sepulcris! / te quoque, Luna, traho, quamvis Temesaea labores / aera tuos minuant; currus quoque carmine nostro / pallet avi, pallet nostris Aurora venenis!" (*Ov. Met.* 7.204–209).

122 For a more detailed comparison of the different versions of Medea's speech in Ovid, Golding, and Shakespeare, see Brown 1994: 6–9.

white Renaissance magus but also ground the play in the context of classical antiquity.

Beyond those textual parallels, Jonathan Bate argues, "Shakespeare was almost always Ovidian […] because [his writing] was constantly attuned to the forces of sexual desire" (2019: 15). In Ovid, he claims, Shakespeare "found the things that made him a poet and a dramatist: magic, myth, metamorphosis, rendered with playfulness, verbal dexterity, and generic promiscuity" (Bate 2019: 11). *The Tempest* certainly provides ample examples for interpretations of these Ovidian topics. Most of the main characters[123] in the play undergo a metamorphosis of some kind which is usually brought about or at least helped along through magical means. The storm which can be seen as the play's inciting moment is not only an impressive demonstration of Prospero's magical powers (cf. Höfele 2008: 90) but also serves a didactic purpose as the characters' first step towards their metamorphosis on the island.

Prospero's metamorphosis is unsurprisingly the most profound in the play since he is also its main character. His miraculous change of heart to take part "with [his] nobler reason 'gainst [his] fury" (*Temp* 5.1.26) summarizes his transformation throughout the play. He has explicitly brought the nobles onto the island by his "so potent art" (*Temp* 5.1.50) to "requit" (*Temp* 3.3.71) their "foul deed" (*Temp* 3.3.72) of deposing and exiling him. That he suddenly decides that "[t]he rarer action is / [i]n virtue than in vengeance" (*Temp* 5.1.27–28) seemed unlikely at best only a few lines earlier when he boasted that "[a]t this hour / lies at my mercy all mine enemies" (*Temp* 4.1.262–263). The epilogue completes this development in a highly metadramatic gesture which transforms the magician-turned-duke back into an actor on a bare stage. By giving up his highly theatrical magic powers, Prospero initiates the play's "final gesture of resignation" where the "world of the play cancels itself in Prospero's address to the audience" (both Höfele 2000: 66).

The Tempest is also indebted to Vergil's *Aeneid* in a similar if more superficial way than it is to Ovid. As Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor argue, "Shakespeare is not usefully to be described as a Virgilian

123 Notable exceptions from this observation are Antonio and Sebastian, as well as their low-comedy counterparts Stephano and Trinculo.

poet" because "his reading of Virgil did not result in a profound modification of his sensibility and imagination in the way that his reading of other books did" (both 2004: 89–90). Nonetheless, there are echoes of the *Aeneid* in the play's direct references to Dido and Carthage by Gonzalo and Adrian mentioned before (cf. *Temp* 2.1.77–86)[124] as well as in the parallels in terms of the play's structure.[125] Like *The Tempest*, the *Aeneid* opens with a storm: Aeneas is "much buffeted on sea and land by violence from above, through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath" (*Verg. Aen.* 1.3–4).[126] The storm similarly serves as a means of revenge (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 1.8–11) and eventually facilitates the love story between Dido and Aeneas, who "outworn by every mischance of land and sea, and destitute of all" (*Verg. Aen.* 1.598–599)[127] is offered refuge in Carthage for himself and the other Trojan survivors (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 1.598–600).

Gonzalo's reference to "widow Dido" (*Temp* 2.1.77) opens up another association, closer to Shakespeare's professional home on the London theatre stage in the form of Marlowe's *Dido, Queene of Carthage*, written in collaboration with Thomas Nashe in the late 1580s. As Deanne Williams argues, the play can be read as praise of Queen Elizabeth I's "*de facto* decision to remain single" while the portrayal of Dido's ambiguous status "as, at once, colonizer and colonized, predator and victim, eastern and western reveals the intensely labile roles that Queen Elizabeth I chose and was expected to perform" (both 2006: 32). In presenting Dido as a complex character, Marlowe and Nashe's play also draws attention to the central dichotomy of the early modern encounters with the Other:

124 Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor argue that Shakespeare would have inherited "a rather more complex tradition" of the Dido myth "whereas for most moderns Dido is primarily a Virgilian creation" (both 2004: 91), naming both rival versions of it in Plutarch, Boccacio, and Ovid (cf. 2004: 91–92) as well as "the at least partial identification of Queen Elizabeth ('Eliza') and Dido, whose alternative name was Elissa" (2004: 91) as reasons for a more complicated Virgilian interpretation of the reference by Gonzalo and Adrian. For the purpose of this thesis, the source for the reference is again not of a material concern.
125 See Donna Hamilton for a more detailed analysis of the "significant and undeniable links between the *Aeneid* and *The Tempest*" (1990: 3).
126 "multum ille et terris iactatus et alto / vi superum, saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram".
127 "terraeque marisque omnibus exhaustos iam casibus, omnium egenos".

> Paradoxically, Elizabeth was the marker for England's national identity, while her identification with Dido constructed her as the quintessential Other: exotic and eroticized, because different, and dangerous, because female (Williams 2006: 32).

By referencing Marlowe's play, *The Tempest* draws its audience's attention away from the Mediterranean and towards early modern London and questions of English national identity once again.

This connection is even more intensified because of Dido's connection with Aeneas. As argued above, the Trojan lineage that several of Shakespeare's sources claim for the Britons connects them mythologically with Aeneas and was used to assert their equality to Rome. Through this topological connection, *The Tempest*, which seems ostensibly to be populated by Milanese and Neapolitan nobles and more or less exotic islanders, suddenly also evokes the context of early modern Britain. The island of *The Tempest*, thus, becomes "a microcosmic rendering of the Jacobean world" (Marshall 1998: 388) and "an extension of the British myth extant in plays such as *Cymbeline*" (Marshall 1998: 391).

It is through this indirect route from these 'Old World' readings via Jacobean England that my reading of the play has led back to its 'New World' beginnings. In the long and extensive criticism of *The Tempest*, both the 'New World' and the 'Old World' readings have found various proponents. Yet, as David Scott Wilson-Okamura states,

> any attempt to take sides on this question is probably doomed to failure, not because the judgement of futurity favors indecision (it doesn't) but because the sources and the setting of the play point, resolutely, in both directions (Wilson-Okamura 2003: 709).

While looking at the various encounters between the Self and the Other that *The Tempest* stages, therefore, I am focusing on examining the play's dramatic geography, which simultaneously evokes the various contexts of both traditions. Ina Habermann proposes a similar concept when she describes the play's topology, which "morph[s] […] the Mediterranean into the New World" and in doing so, forges "unexpected and yet necessary links" (both 2012: 71).

One of these links can be found in the geographical locations of both the English colony in Virginia and the Mediterranean setting of *The Tempest*:

> One particular aspect of Jamestown […] rests on a simple geographical fact: the latitude of Jamestown is within a degree of that of classical Athens (37°12'33" N versus 37°58'47" N, a difference about 50 miles). Raleigh's settlement was a bit further south at 35°52'55" N (just below the Peloponnese); the Bermuda Islands, where Gates and Summers were shipwrecked (and which are named in *The Tempest*, 1.2.230), lie at about 32°18' N, still within the Mediterranean ambit (Sokol 2008: 157).

This latitudinal similarity is relevant in the context of what Mary Floyd-Wilson describes as "geohumoralism" (2003: 2), which "proves to be the dominant mode of ethnic distinctions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (2003: 1). Originating from classical antiquity in the writings of Aristotle, Galen, and Pliny among others (cf. Floyd-Wilson 2003: 2), geohumoralism had been used to analyse "the causes and essence of national difference" and had been popularized in Shakespeare's time by "the political theorizing of popular continental writers such as Jean Bodin and Giovanni Botero, authors whose writings were newly translated into English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (both Feerick 2003: 35). The theory divides the world into three climatic regions – north, middle, and south – and assigns physical and mental characteristics to the groups living in those respective areas:

> The people therfore of the middle regions haue more force than they of the South, & lesse pollicie: and more wit than they of the North, & lesse force; and are more fit to command and gouerne Commonweales, and more iust in their actions. And if we looke well into the histories of all nations, we shall find, That euen as great armies and mightie powers haue come out of the North; euen so the hidden knowledge of Philosophie, the Mathematikes, and other contemplatiue sciences, are come out of the South: and the politike sciences, lawes, and the studie thereof, the grace of well speaking and discoursing, haue had their beginning in the middle regions, and all great empires haue bene there established (Bodin [1606] 1962: 550).

From this geohumoral standpoint, then, the Mediterranean and the 'New World' would be considered part of the temperate middle zone. Accordingly, the Old and New Worlds "are not only confounded or contrasted in the play but also are imagined as in some ways equivalent" (Sokol 2008: 157). This topological connection between these two distant regions enables us to look at *The Tempest* again with the fascinating combination of domestic and exotic issues which Shakespeare and his contemporaries would have been interested in exploring in the context of an increasingly globalised world where "the local had become so 'globalized' that it was already difficult to isolate in Shakespeare's London" (Hulme and Sherman 2000: 7).

4.2.3 Intercultural Encounters on the Island

Since *The Tempest* evokes a wide variety of contexts, it seems that the island's exact "geographical location is less important than the fact that it is nameless, uncharted and largely unexplored" (Vaughan and Vaughan ²2011: 4–5). As such, it can be seen almost as a blank slate onto which various ideas and concepts can be projected. Accordingly, the island can be interpreted by the characters stranded on it in different ways. Above all, it provides the play's *green world* – a stage removed from the everyday world of early modern Europe which makes the intercultural encounters that occur throughout the play possible in the first place.

Like in *Cymbeline*, the intercultural encounters at the core of *The Tempest* complicate the distinctions between domestic and alien, foreigner and native, Self and Other, as the directionality of the movement in the play is reversed. In *The Tempest*, an island at the margins of the known world becomes the locus of interaction for characters from its perceived centre: Prospero, who was the Duke of Milan, and Miranda, "his only heir / And princess" (*Temp* 1.2.58–59), were "blessedly holp" (*Temp* 1.2.63) to the island following Antonio's usurpation of the dukedom; the king of Naples, his son, and the other European nobles are shipwrecked on the island "by [Prospero's] art" (*Temp* 1.2.1) on their way back to Naples from the king's daughter's wedding in Tunis. There are only two characters that do not fit into this pattern. Ariel and Caliban are what could be considered natives to the island. Caliban is intro-

duced as a "freckled whelp, hag-born" (*Temp* 1.2.283), whom his mother, in Prospero's words, "did litter *here*" (*Temp* 1.2.282, my emphasis). Ariel's origin is not addressed in the play other than that he was already on the island when Sycorax, another transgressing foreigner, arrived, and that he served her until she banished him into "a cloven pine" (*Temp* 1.2.277). Caliban seems to be the one with the closer connection to the island, proudly proclaiming it to be his heritage from his mother (cf. *Temp* 1.2.332), whereas Ariel, as an airy spirit, is less bound to it. He can travel freely even as far as the "still-vexed Bermudas" (*Temp* 1.2.229) and after he is released, he sings about flying "After summer merrily" (*Temp* 5.1.92).

The Tempest not only inverts the direction of the transgression found in Shakespeare's earlier plays *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Titus Andronicus* but also changes who is transgressing. In the earlier plays, the transgressive characters are clearly marked as the Other: the Goths for the Roman Empire and the Amazons for Ancient Greece. In *The Tempest*, they are characters whom Shakespeare and his audience would have perceived as the Self. Like *Cymbeline*'s shared community of Romans and Britons, *The Tempest* also stages a co-existence of islanders and outsiders, which unlike the ones in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* does not take place in the centre of power but at the margins.

There has been a long tradition of Shakespearean scholarship interpreting the play in the context of "Tudor and Stuart England's incipient empire", where "Prospero commandeers a distant island and imposes his superior technology (book, magic) and his language as tools of conquest and domination" (both Vaughan and Vaughan ²2011: 39). But in contrast to this, the encounters on the island reveal that the relationship between the supposed coloniser Prospero and the supposed colonised Ariel and Caliban is more complex. Like the characters themselves, their relationship also undergoes a fundamental transformation throughout the play.

Exiled from Milan and "By foul play [...] heaved thence / But blessedly holp hither" (*Temp* 1.2.62–63) to the island, Prospero comes to the island as an outsider. The "bare island" (*Temp* Epilogue 8) itself ostensibly does not offer much in terms of "means to live" (*Temp* 2.1.53) unless to someone familiar with it. Unable to navigate the island on his own,

Prospero needs the help of Caliban and Ariel to survive. In this, Prospero resembles the Venetians in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, who are, as argued above, highly dependent on Shylock and Othello for their economic and political survival. Caliban is in a position to help Prospero because he is not only well acquainted with the island but also willing to show him "all the qualities o'th'isle: / The fresh springs, brine pits, barren place and fertile" (*Temp* 1.2.338–339). When Caliban meets another helpless foreigner later on in the play, he elaborates on what sort of assistance he can offer:

> I'll show thee the best springs; I'll pluck thee berries;
> I'll fish for thee and get thee wood enough.
> […] I prithee, let me bring thee where crabs grow;
> And I with my long nails will dig thee pignuts;
> Show thee a jay's nest and instruct thee how
> To snare the nimble marmoset; I'll bring thee
> To clustering filberts and sometimes I'll get thee
> Young scamels from the rock (*Temp* 2.2.156–169).

It is interesting to note here that Caliban's help, for the most part, consists in securing the basic means to live on the island in the form of food and drink. This again highlights the parallels to the English experience in North America (cf. Sokol 2008: 165–168). Prospero and Caliban's relationship is initially marked by mutual affection between them:

> [...] When thou cam'st first
> Thou strok'st me and made much of me; would'st give me
> Water with berries in't, and teach me how
> To name the bigger light and how the less
> That burn by day and night. And then I loved thee (*Temp* 1.2.333–337).

Yet, as we find out a few lines later, the relationship turns sour very quickly. Once Caliban shares his knowledge of the island, Prospero is able to focus on other things than the necessity to procure food and drink: "Cursed be I that did so!" (*Temp* 1.2.340), Caliban exclaims, remembering their first interactions and implying that Prospero would

not have survived without his help, much less been able to establish his own rule over the island.

Even after Prospero has become more familiar with the island, his rule still relies heavily on Caliban as Prospero himself admits:

> […] as 'tis,
> We cannot miss him; he does make our fire,
> Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices
> That profit us […] (*Temp* 1.2.311–314).

Ariel, too, is essential to every step of Prospero's revenge and dynastic plans acting as his spy across the island and intervening when necessary:

> [...] I come
> To answer thy best pleasure, be't to fly,
> To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
> On the curl'd clouds, to thy strong bidding task
> Ariel and all his quality (*Temp* 1.2.189–193).

He charms Ferdinand and leads him with his music to Prospero and Miranda (cf. *Temp* 1.2.376–443). This is necessary for Prospero's dynastic ambitions, as he needs Miranda and Ferdinand to fall in love and marry so that his future descendants will rule over both Naples and Milan. The first meeting between the future husband and wife "goes on / As [Prospero's] soul prompts it" (*Temp* 1.2.420–421) thanks in large part to Ariel bringing Ferdinand there and setting the scene (cf. *Temp* 1.2.409–427).

Later, Ariel intervenes in the murder plot of Antonio and Sebastian. He wakes up Gonzalo before Sebastian can kill him:

> My master through his art foresees the danger
> That you, his friend, are in, and sends me forth
> (For else his project dies) to keep them living (*Temp* 2.1.297–300).

Although he claims that his "master […] foresees the danger" (*Temp* 2.1.297), he seems to be acting on his own accord since he feels the need to let "Prospero, my lord, […] know what I have done" (*Temp* 2.1.327).

After that, Ariel sows dissent and confusion among the second group of conspirators around Caliban, by impersonating Trinculo's voice (cf. *Temp* 3.2.43, 60, and 73). He informs his "master" of this (cf. *Temp* 3.2.115) as well and distracts them until Prospero is ready to deal with them (cf. *Temp* 4.1.170–184).

Ariel is also the one carrying out Prospero's metadramatic plays within the play. He not only "perfom[s] to point the tempest that [Prospero] bade [him]" (*Temp* 1.2.195) but also "[b]ravely the figure of this harpy" (*Temp* 3.3.83) to punish Alonso, Antonio, and Sebastian for their roles in deposing Prospero. The masque Prospero has Ariel and his spirits perform to celebrate the betrothal between Ferdinand and Miranda is a further demonstration of Ariel's powers:

> Thou and thy meaner fellows your last service
> Did worthily perform, and I must use you
> In such another trick. Go bring the rabble
> (O'er whom I give thee power) here to this place.
> Incite them to quick motion (*Temp* 4.1.35–39).

Finally, Ariel has to fulfil Prospero's promise of "calm seas, auspicious gales / And sails so expeditious that shall catch / Your royal fleet far off" (*Temp* 5.1.315–317) before he is set free.

Caliban and Ariel are obvious candidates for the Other in the play. Throughout the play, Prospero is actively Othering them which is an essential part of establishing and maintaining his control over the island. Ariel is introduced in the *List of Roles* as "an airy spirit" (*Temp* 0.15), which he confirms later in the play (cf. *Temp* 5.1.20). Prospero also describes Ariel as "air" (*Temp* 5.1.21), thereby establishing a clear distinction (cf. *Temp* 5.1.21–24). Caliban, too, is variously described as non-human: Prospero calls him "thou earth" (*Temp* 1.2.315), and "thou tortoise" (*Temp* 1.2.317) before Caliban appears on stage for the first time; later on "beast" (*Temp* 4.1.140) and "devil" (*Temp* 4.1.188), as well as "fish" (*Temp* 2.2.25) and "monster" (*Temp* 2.2.30) will be added to the list of non-human descriptors used for Caliban. Ariel and Caliban's topological connection to the 'New World' and early modern imperial-

ism as well as their subsequent post-colonial interpretation have helped to cement their status as the Other of *The Tempest*

But the distinction is not as clear-cut as the islanders are representatives of the Other and Europeans embody the Self. Miranda's previously mentioned quote is emblematic for the central issue outlined here. Her attribution of the "brave new world" (*Temp* 5.1.183) to the distinctly 'Old World' Europeans problematises the difficulty of distinguishing between these two worlds on the island. In this context, it is also telling that both she and Ferdinand fail to correctly identify each other when they meet for the first time. When asked by Prospero to "say what thou seest yond" (*Temp* 1.2.410), i.e. Ferdinand, Miranda responds:

> What is't, a spirit?
> Lord, how it looks about! Believe me, sir,
> It carries a brave form. But 'tis a spirit.
> […] I might call him
> A thing divine, for nothing natural
> I ever saw so noble (*Temp* 1.2.410–420).

Ferdinand, in turn, is certain that Miranda is "the goddess / On whom these airs attend" (*Temp* 1.2.422–423). This conflation of human Self and supernatural Other is further encouraged through Prospero's metadramatic set pieces. His last meta-play, the "discover[ing] [of] Ferdinand and Miranda" (*Temp* 5.1.171 SD) playing chess, invites the audience to compare those human actors to his previous spirit actors who have exclusively performed his other meta-plays up to this point.

Even in seemingly clear cases like Caliban and Ariel, the distinction between Self and Other is established only to be immediately blurred again. Ariel, even though he is the most evident Other due to his nature as "an airy spirit" (*Temp* 0.15), also displays distinctly human qualities as the following dialogue between him and Prospero shows:

> Prospero: […] Say, my spirit,
> How fares the King and 's followers?

Ariel: Confined together
In the same fashion as you gave in charge,
Just as you left them; all prisoners, sir,
In the line grove which weather-fends your cell.
They cannot budge till your release. The King,
His brother, and yours abide all three distracted,
And the remainder mourning over them,
Brimful of sorrow and dismay; but chiefly
Him that you termed, sir, the good old Lord Gonzalo.
His tears runs down his beard like winter's drops
From eaves of reeds. Your charm so strongly works 'em
That if you now beheld them, your affections
Would become tender.
Prospero: Dost thou think so, spirit?
Ariel: Mine would, sir, were I human.
Prospero: And mine shall (*Temp* 5.1.5–20).

Even though, as Prospero points out, Ariel is "but air" (*Temp* 5.1.21), he sympathises with the European nobles and ultimately persuades Prospero to take part "with [his] nobler reason 'gainst [his] fury" (*Temp* 5.1.26) and to pardon them. Prospero himself marvels that Ariel has "a touch, a feeling / Of their afflictions" (*Temp* 5.1.21–22). He is explicitly non-human as he states himself, "*were* I human" (*Temp* 5.1.20, my emphasis), and as is evident from Prospero's frequent reference to him as "spirit" here and throughout the play.[128] But it is because Ariel shows compassion with the Europeans that Prospero feels the need to do so as well: "shall not myself / (One of their kind, that relish all as sharply, / Passion as they) be kindlier moved than thou art?" (*Temp* 5.1.22–24). Prospero only arrives at the conclusion that "The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance" (*Temp* 5.1.27–28) because of Ariel. This confers to the "self-confessedly non-human native islander an extraordinary

128 Prospero pretty consistently refers to Ariel either by using his name or the term 'spirit', often modified with an adjective and/or possessive determiner. There are only five exceptions to this: "malignant thing" (*Temp* 1.2.257), "my slave" (*Temp* 1.2.270), "my industrious servant" (*Temp* 4.1.36), "my diligence" (*Temp* 5.1.241) and "chick" (*Temp* 5.1.317). All of those instances happen when Prospero seems to be rather emotional.

moral authority […] independent of rank, hierarchy, nation, climate, or 'race'" (Sokol 2008: 167). The difference between Ariel and Prospero, therefore, is asserted only to be resolved again within just a few lines.

The same is true for Caliban. Despite Prospero's considerable efforts to Other him, Caliban, too, is presented as emphatically not so different from the European characters. Prospero even admits as much when he excludes Caliban from his observation that before his arrival on the island, it was "not honoured with / A human shape" (*Temp* 1.2.336–337). When Miranda states that Ferdinand is "the third man that e'er I saw" (*Temp* 1.2.535), she puts Caliban on an equal level with Prospero and Ferdinand, as does Prospero when he chides his daughter for her advocacy for Ferdinand saying that she is foolish for thinking "there is no more such shapes as he, / Having seen but him and Caliban" (*Temp* 1.2.582–583). Prospero and Miranda's attempts to teach Caliban further affirm his humanity:

> They have attempted what can be done only to a human; there is no hint that they tried to teach language and astronomy to an animal or a fish. Caliban proved, in their judgment, impervious to nurture, but he did learn their language, and he continues to serve them in wholly human ways (Vaughan and Vaughan 1991: 11).

The fact that Prospero's treatment of Ferdinand up until the masque follows the same pattern he previously employed with Caliban and Ariel reinforces the similarities between them, blurring the distinctions between Self and Other in the process. Prospero makes this explicit when he tells Miranda "To th'most of men, this is a Caliban" (*Temp* 1.2.481) to justify his actions against Ferdinand.[129] Like Caliban, Ferdinand has to "remove / Some thousands of these logs and pile them up, / Upon a sore injunction" (*Temp* 3.1.9–11). Both Caliban and Ferdinand are suitors of Miranda, even though Ferdinand is, in the end, Prospe-

129 Prospero is here deliberately playing the role of the *senex* from classical comedy: "this swift business / I must uneasy make, lest too light winning / Make the prize light" (*Temp* 1.2.451–453). That does not, however, detract from the parallel construction of Ferdinand and Caliban.

ro's choice because of his importance for his dynastic plans.[130] Using his magic powers and threatening violence in case of disobedience (cf. *Temp* 1.2.461–474), Prospero ensures that he remains in control of everyone on the island.

The blurring of the boundary between Self and Other is most pronounced in the development of the play's undisputed main character: Prospero. During his expositional explanation of how Miranda and he ended up on the island, he gives an account of his time as "the Duke of Milan and / A prince of power" (*Temp* 1.2.54–55):

> […] at that time
> Through all the signories [Milan] was the first,
> And Prospero the prime duke, being so reputed
> In dignity, and for the liberal arts
> Without a parallel; those being all my study,
> The government I cast upon my brother
> And to my state grew *stranger*, being transported
> And rapt in secret studies (*Temp* 1.2.70–77, my emphasis).

This passage highlights Prospero's role as an Other, a "stranger" as he calls himself, already in Milan. Even though he repeatedly tries to shift the blame onto his "false brother" (*Temp* 1.2.92) and his "evil nature" (*Temp* 1.2.93), it also becomes clear that his status as an Other makes it easier for his brother to depose him. Antonio is already the acting duke of Milan because, for Prospero, his "library / Was dukedom large enough" (*Temp* 1.2.109–110). From Antonio's perspective, it seems reasonable to "think[...] [Prospero] incapable" (*Temp* 1.2.111) "Of temporal royalties" (*Temp* 1.2.110). Prospero himself admits that he was "neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated / To closeness and the bettering of [his] mind" (*Temp* 1.2.76–77). Even though he claims that Antonio and his co-conspirators "durst not" (*Temp* 1.2.140) destroy Prospero and Miranda because "So dear the love [his] people bore [him]" (*Temp*

130 I am here reading Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda as his way of trying to establish a dynasty of his own – hence his choice of words: "I had *peopled* else / This isle with Calibans" (*Temp* 1.2.420–421, my highlighting) – which makes sense from his perspective as there are only the three of them on the island until the arrival of the other Europeans.

1.2.141) and opted for painting "With colours fairer […] their foul ends" (*Temp* 1.2.143), this seems a very unlikely scenario given the fact that he also asserts that the public did not understand the value and importance of his studies (cf. *Temp* 1.2.90–92). The only reason they might object to the deposition of their duke is that it comes at the price of "giv[ing] [the King of Naples] annual tribute, […] do[ing] him homage, / Subject[ing] […] to his crown, and bend[ing] / The dukedom yet unbowed […] / To most ignoble stooping" (*Temp* 1.2.113–116). It seems more likely, therefore, that Antonio managed to depose Prospero so easily and without a "mark so bloody" (*Temp* 1.2143) because Prospero had been effectively Othering himself.[131]

On the island, Prospero starts out as a transgressing Other, adding another layer to his Otherness. But by the time the play opens, he has adapted to the island which puts him in a position of power over the newly arrived Europeans. There is no doubt that Prospero is "the lord on't" (*Temp* 1.2.457) and he does not face any serious opposition from his subjects. None of the rebellion attempts throughout the play endanger him and his dynastic plans because he is in full control of everything through his "so potent art" (*Temp* 5.1.50) and his control over "Ariel and all his quality" (*Temp* 1.2.193).[132] Through Ariel, he is constantly informed of the whereabouts of all the different factions on the island and by the end of act four, he can confidently state that "At this hour / Lies at my mercy all mine enemies" (*Temp* 4.1.262–263).

This is possible because Prospero is different from both the European nobles and the islanders, a sort of double Other. His "potent art", which is an appropriation of divine power, enables him to exact his

131 Geraldo de Sousa makes a similar point in his book, but focuses on the nature of Prospero's studies, i.e. witchcraft, as the main reason of Antonio's successful overthrow (cf. 1999: 160–162). Since Prospero refers to his magical practices as his "secret studies" (*Temp* 1.2.77), it seems unlikely that anyone else knew what exactly he was studying.

132 As B.J. Sokol remarks, "Caliban's rebellion is also far more intelligent in its aims than that of the upper-class Italians Antonio and Sebastian, whose assassinations and fratricide would gain them only the status of King of Naples (and king's aide), quite meaningless in the wilderness" (2008: 165). Caliban's strategic skills, he argues, are further parallels between him and the Algonkians encountered by the English settlers in Virginia who "were evidently very effective in the planning and execution of their trade warfare against Jamestown" (Sokol 2008: 165). Nevertheless, the threat to Prospero's rule is virtually non-existent.

revenge on those who have deposed him and to control everybody on the island. It also allows him to exert his influence over the theatre audience watching *The Tempest*. It is his perspective on events that they are presented with, filtered through his experiences and ulterior motives. The most impressive example of this is the breaking of the theatrical contract in Act 1, scene 2 when Prospero reveals the true nature of the sea storm. Until this scene, the audience has had every reason to take what was presented on stage as signifiers of what actually happens in the theatrical discourse. But in his conversation with Miranda, Prospero acknowledges that the storm was an illusion created by his art. In doing so, he emerges above all conventions and also echoes Christopher Marlowe's titular character Doctor Faustus, who is similarly appropriating divine power and consequently punished (cf. *DFA* 5.2.91–116). In contrast to Faustus, Prospero redeems himself after he falls from the height of power.[133]

Nonetheless, a return to Milan will be difficult for Prospero. Even though he reclaims his title by proudly proclaiming himself as "The wronged Duke of Milan" (*Temp* 5.1.107), his position is less secure than he makes it out to be. Just a few lines before that, he admits to Ariel that he "was sometime Milan" (*Temp* 5.1.86). The past tense of the verb in this line highlights Prospero's liminal position. His experiences on the island have shown him that he cannot maintain this status as a double Other if he wants to return home. So in order to become the Duke of Milan again, he needs to "discase" (*Temp* 5.1.85) himself and put on his old "hat and rapier" (*Temp* 5.1.84) that mark his former status. More importantly, he needs to give up his magic, the symbol of the privileged position of power he has held throughout the entire play.

In the epilogue, we see him struggling to accept this new less powerful identity:

133 Andreas Höfele states that Prospero's appropriation of divine power would qualify as a classical *hybris* motif except that it lacks one essential component: "Hybris, von ihren griechischen Paradigmen her verstanden, ist keine, wenn sie nicht bestraft wird" (2008: 90). I would argue that Prospero does fall, as evidenced by his abjuration speech (cf. *Temp* 5.1.53–69) and his final speech (cf. *Temp* Epilogue 1–20), and that his punishment is just self-imposed rather than ordained from a higher power. This is because Prospero, as the play's playwright and director figure, emerges as the highest power of the play until he hands it over to the audience in his epilogue.

> Now my charms are all o'erthrown
> And what strength I have's mine own
> which is most faint (*Temp* Epil. 1–3).

Prospero has a hard time to find his place in a world where, similar probably to Shakespeare's increasingly globalised early modern England, seemingly stable categories no longer hold up. His exchange with Caliban in the last scene attests to this as well: "this thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine" (*Temp* 5.1.275–276). Prospero here recognises the fundamental similarities between himself and Caliban, thereby ultimately blurring the distinction between the Self and Other. By acknowledging both his and Caliban's shared humanity and by accepting his new position, Prospero makes explicit what was implicitly already present in the intercultural encounters in the previous plays discussed in this thesis.

5 Conclusion

Analysing the intercultural encounters as negotiations of processes of early modern globalisation in the six Shakespeare plays selected for this thesis has revealed two main tendencies in their portrayal throughout his career as a playwright. First, we can see that the characters in the plays react to perceived threats to their identity by creating and fervently maintaining the distinction between Self and Other, even or particularly when faced with evidence that suggests an essential similarity between them. This is, as Stephen Orgel writes, fundamental to the understanding of how we perceive ourselves and the world in which we live:

> Our sense of the other depends on our sense of its relation to ourselves; we understand it in so far as it differs from us, and conversely, we know ourselves only through comparison and contrast, through a knowledge of what we are not – we construct the other as a way of affirming the self (Orgel 2003: 19).

The intercultural encounters staged in Shakespeare's plays show that all characters involved are using this distinction to make sense of their identity as well as their relationship with the wider world around them.

As argued above, the Romans in *Titus Andronicus* keep up the distinction between 'civilised' Romans and 'barbarous' Goths because their sense of identity is threatened both by the ten years war with the Goths as an external enemy and by an internal threat to their core values and beliefs through 'unroman' behaviour by their leaders. By the final act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the patriarchal order of Theseus's Athens has been successfully challenged by the female authority of the Amazon queen, which helps to avert the tragic potential made apparent in the play within the play. Yet, Theseus's continuous attempts of subduing and containing Hippolyta's subversive powers illustrate how insecure his sense of identity is. Even though Hippolyta uses her powers in a positive way to persuade Theseus to allow the lovers to marry, the ambivalent attitudes towards female authority evident in various early modern sources on both domestic and foreign Amazons still show that

female authority was regarded as at least somewhat suspicious. In *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, the dichotomy between Self and Other becomes even more difficult to uphold because there is no transgressive element to the intercultural encounters. Both Self and Other co-exist at the centre of power and for the most part, this shared community is beneficial for all parties involved. Yet, these two plays also feature some of the most fervent attempts of Othering through the racist and dehumanising use of language which several of the Venetian characters use as legitimisation for exploiting the characters they mark as the Other. Shylock and Othello are only accepted as long as they are useful to the community either through providing monetary means to the Venetian Christians or by defending the state from the attacks by the Ottoman Empire. Once they are no longer immediately needed, however, the Venetians break the rules of the shared community and shift the power balance to their own advantage. Prospero's rule over the island in *The Tempest* similarily relies on Othering Caliban and Ariel in order to justify his oppression of them. Through his magic powers, he is able to control everybody on the island and exert his will over them. In *Cymbeline*, then, it is the colonised Britons who are attempting maintain their sense of identity in the face of the external threat by the Roman Empire demanding tribute and the internal dynastic crisis after all three heirs to the throne have gone missing. To emancipate themselves from the Roman Empire, Cymbeline, the Queen, and Cloten all highlight their exceptionality and actively ignore how intertwined their history has been and how much their identity is already shaped by Roman models.

Second, the plays explored in this thesis also reveal a tendency to ultimately blur the distinction between Self and Other even while they are trying to maintain it. This is already present in the early plays like *Titus Andronicus*, where the Romans' insistence on Othering the Goths is exposed as attempts to maintain a mere fiction. Almost from the beginning of the play, the interactions between Romans and Goths show that there are no fundamental differences between them. Romans and Goths equally use examples from classical Roman literature and mythology to make sense of their situation and to legitimise their actions. Additionally, Shakespeare's early modern English audience would have been able to identify with both sides involved in the inter-

cultural encounters in the play: on the one hand, they are the historical descendants from the Goths, who are portrayed in various sources as one of the Germanic tribes that invaded Britain after Rome retreated. On the other hand, Elizabethan England styled itself as the successor to the Roman Empire in the sense of the *translatio imperii*. This double identification already indicates the blurring of the boundaries between the self and the other even more apparent in later chapters. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Hippolyta's metonymic connection to the 'domestic' Amazons, such as Elizabeth I, and those that explorers like Walter Raleigh supposedly found in the 'New World' evoke the contexts of early modern discourses on female authority and colonial endeavours. She embodies these contexts through her double characterisation as both Athenian wife and Amazonian queen, which she does not lose through her transgression. Instead, this double nature continues to challenge Theseus's patriarchal order throughout the entire play. This further highlights that the distinction between Self and Other is less stable and less clear than the characters involved in the intercultural encounters want to admit. Even in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, the various attempts of Othering and excluding the Other only serve to disguise a fundamental similarity between them. Not even the eventual destruction of this co-existence can erase this entirely. Both Shylock's English name and Othello's topological connection to early modern England serve to illustrate this point. The blurring of the boundaries between Self and Other becomes most pronounced in Shakespeare's romances discussed in the final chapter of this thesis. Through inverting the directionality of the transgressive movement and relocating the shared community from the centre of power to the margins, both *Cymbeline* and *The Tempest* complicate the intercultural encounters between Romans and Britons and islanders and Europeans respectively. In doing so, they raise challenging questions about issues of national identity and the nation's role in an increasingly globalised world that would have been topical for Shakespeare's own time.

The various attitudes portrayed in the six plays analysed in the thesis reflect early modern engagements with processes of globalisation. As English explorers ventured out into a to them unknown world and brought back new knowledge about the world and its inhabitants, the

necessity to think about their own identity as an emerging nation and empire as well as their role within the wider context of the world became more pressing. The plays' settings evoke a great variety of contexts and associations beyond their immediate European geography. In doing so, they negotiate what it means to live in a world that is becoming more connected as its people become increasingly aware of the wider world around them in this first era of globalisation in a modern sense. As the amount and intensity of intercultural encounters increased, the reactions to them become more immediate. Therefore, these issues also increasingly take centre-stage as we move through Shakespeare's canon from the late Elizabethan period into the early Jacobean era when the first coordinated colonial endeavours were sanctioned by the crown.

The attitudes towards these intercultural encounters and the parties involved in them are also attitudes that, as mentioned above, have shaped discourses about national identity and the nation's role in an increasingly globalised world in the centuries following this initial period of intercultural encounters. Their consequences are still felt today. It is important, therefore, to look at these early examples from Shakespeare's plays to understand where these attitudes come from and how they have evolved over time. They are also questions that we are still tackling with today. While Shakespeare "may have been decoupled from his (to us) uncomfortable longstanding role as a shining beacon of British genius and civility to the world" (Marcus 2017: 4), he is still used as a symbol of British national identity. In an article for *The Telegraph*, Boris Johnson infamously called for immigrants to learn "the language of Shakespeare" "for their sake" (2015: n/a). Shakespeare has been further used to illustrate points on both sides of the Brexit debate as Emma Smith has argued in an article for *The Guardian* in 2019:

> [Shakespeare's] plays can very easily function as a kind of confirmation bias, where we find exactly what we are looking for. The allure of such topical readings is ultimately narcissistic: Shakespeare is our contemporary, our own world is the most interesting of all, and the plays mirror our own times and our own views (2019: n/a).

Even more recently in summer 2020, the protests across the world have reignited the discussion about how we deal with the consequences of imperialism which had its ideological beginnings in the early modern period and has fundamentally shaped the world as we know it today. Racial inequality and capitalist exploitation are direct results of this development. Its consequences are palpable in the "lack of diversity in the field of premodern literature and drama and the marginalisation of scholars of colour" (Karim-Cooper 2020: n/a). They are also present in "print, on stage, on screen, and in the popular imagination" where Shakespeare has remained "as a monument to whiteness" (both Espinosa 2020: n/a). Even in 2020 racist attitudes towards actors of colour playing certain roles persist as Globe Ensemble actor Leaphia Darko writes in a recent blog:

> I know that for some people in the audience it won't really matter whether I have 500 lines or 50 in the role or how many years of training I've put into my craft, in the minds of those people, Shakespeare and melanin simply don't mix. I assume because Shakespeare writes of the human condition, that in their mind I am not one, not fully, not quite (2020: n/a).

These developments are not new as author and educator Preti Teneja summarised in the closing panel of the third annual *Shakespeare and Race Festival* hosted by Shakespeare's Globe, which was streamed live on Youtube on August 23, 2020:

> How can we reckon with our history, if our present continues to perpetrate its worst ravages on its most vulnerable and disenfranchised [...]? Slavery happened. Colonisation happened. And it is still happening [...]. The evidence and effects of that are everywhere (In Conversation: Reckoning with Our Past 00:06:16–00:07:05).

Shakespeare's plays are shaped by and in turn, shape the discourse of early modern globalisation. They reflect then-contemporary attitudes towards early modern England's emerging sense of national identity as well as its attitudes towards other cultures and religions. The plays and the ideas they negotiate have influenced discourses of globalisation

in later eras and still do so to this day. The complex dynamics involved in the intercultural encounters portrayed in the plays analysed in this thesis as well as their real-world equivalents shed light on these conversations.

They also highlight eras where these conversations have not been taking place or not to the extent that they would need to have happened. Shakespeare should be a part of these conversations. But similar to the statutes of slave traders and colonialists that have been toppled from their pedestals by protesters trying to make their voices heard, we also need to bring Shakespeare down from the pedestal that the ideology of imperialism has put him on and let other voices into our conversation about fundamental issues that still affect our globalised society today. Postcolonial theory and the numerous rewritings of Shakespeare's plays have made great strides towards opening up the conversation to the people, who traditionally have been left out entirely or have been actively silenced. As the recent debates have shown, however, there is still a lot to be done especially in the way Shakespeare and history are frequently taught and how his plays are performed both on stage and on screen. Shakespeare and his plays should be accessible to everyone regardless of the colour of their skin, their religion, or their cultural background. As argued in this thesis, the way the intercultural encounters in the plays often present us with difficult questions without offering easy solutions. Prejudice and discrimination are a part of these encounters as is ultimately the acceptance of differences not as justification for oppression but rather as a celebration of the human condition.

Appendix I:
Use of the term *World per play*

Play	Number of times the word WORLD and its derivates are used
1H4	24
1H6	10
2GENTS	9
2H4	17
2H6	22
3H6	13
ADO	12
ANT	44
AWW	16
AYL	30
COR	21
CYM	24
ERR	7
H5	17
H8	19
HAM	27
JC	19
JOHN	29
LEAR	21
LLL	32
MAC	6
MM	17
MND	7
MOV	15
OTH	30
PER	15
R2	23
R3	30
ROM	19
SHREW	25
TEM	8
TIM	15
TIT	10
TN	12
TRO	16
WIV	6
WT	12
Total	**679**

Source: Open Source Shakespeare, https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020]. The concordance search does not list multiple occurrences per speech. The additional occurences have been added manually by the author of this thesis.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A Midsummer Night's Dream. Dir. Nicholas Hytner. With Gwendoline Christie, Oliver Chris, and Hammed Animashaun. *NTLive Youtube* 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Punzss5sHto [accessed June 25, 2020] no longer available online.

Africanus, Leo. *A geographical historie of Africa, written in Arabicke and Italian. Translated and collected by Iohn Pory*. London: Eliot's Court Press impensis Georg Bishop 1600. https://www.proquest.com/books/geographical-historie-africa-written-arabicke/docview/2240855884/se-2?accountid=14596 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Apollodorus. *The Library, Volume I: Books 1–3.9*. ed. and trld. James G. Frazer. *Loeb Classical Library 121*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1921.

Apollonius Rhodius. *Argonautica.* ed. and trld. William H. Race. *Loeb Classical Library 1*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2009.

Aske, James. *Elizabetha triumphans.* London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Gubbin, and Thomas Newman 1588. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A22071.0001.001 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Bodin, Jean. *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*. ed. Kenneth Douglas McRae. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press [1606] 1962.

Caesar, C. Julius. *The Works of Julius Caesar. Parallel Latin/English*. ed. and trld. W.A. McDevitte and W.S. Bohn [ca. 51/50 BC] 1896. https://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/jcsr/index.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Chaucer, Geoffrey. "The Knight's Tale". *The Riverside Chaucer*. Eds. Larry D. Benson and Christopher Cannon. Oxford: Oxford University Press [1476] 2008, 37–65.

Cicero, M. Tullius. *Pro Archia. Post Reditum in Senatu. Post Reditum ad Quirites. De Domo Sua. De Haruspicum Responsis. Pro Plancio.* ed. and trld. N.H. Watts. *Loeb Classical Library 158*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1923.

Cicero, M. Tullius. *Tusculan Disputations*. ed. and trld. J.E. King. *Loeb Classical Library 141*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1927.

Cinthio, Giovanni Battista Giraldi. "Cinthio's Tale". *Othello*. ed. Jessica Slights. *Internet Shakespeare Editions* [1565] 2019. https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Cinthio_M/complete/index.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Contarini, Gasparo. *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*. trld. Lewes Lewkenor. London: Edmund Mattes 1599.

Cooper, Thomas.. Thesaurus linguæ Romanæ & Britannicæ. London: Henry Denham. *Early English Books Online* 1578. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A19275.0001.001 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Coryat, Thomas. *Coryats crudities hastily gobled vp in five moneths trauells in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia co[m]monly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the trauelling members of this kingdome*. London: William Stansby 1611. [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Elizabeth I. "Letters Permitting Deportation of Blackamoors from England". *Othello*. ed. Jessica Slights. *Internet Shakespeare Editions* [1596] 2019. https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Elizabeth1596_M/index.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Euripides. *Cyclops. Alcestis. Medea.* ed. and trld. David Kovacs. *Loeb Classical Library 12*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1994.

Fiorentino, Giovanni. *The Pecorone of Ser Giovanni*. ed. and trld. William G. Waters. London: Lawrence and Bullen [1558] 1897.

Fletcher, John and Philip Massinger. "The Sea Voyage". *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon: Volume 9, The Sea Voyage, The Double Marriage, The Prophetess, The Little French Lawyer, The Elder Brother, The Maid in the Mill*. ed. Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1622] ²2008, 1–94.

Gill, N.S. "Translation of the Agricola by Tacitus." *ThoughtCo*, Jun. 14 2018. https://www.thoughtco.com/introduction-to-the-agricola-by-tacitus-119061.

Globe on Screen. William Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream. Dir. Dominic Dromgoole. With Michelle Terry, John Light, and Pearce Quigley. Opus Arte. DVD 2013.

Golding, Arthur. *The Xv Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis, Translated Oute of Latin into English Meeter, by Arthur Golding Gentleman, a Worke very Pleasaunt and Delectable*. London: Willyam Seres 1567. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A08649.0001.001 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Hakluyt, Richard. "The famous voyage of sir Francis Drake into the South sea, and therehence about the globe of the whole earth, begunne Anno 1577". *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1589] 2014, 101–132.

Hariot, Thomas. "A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia (1588)" ed. Paul Royster. *Electronic Texts in American Studies* 20 [1588] 2007. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/etas/20 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Herodotus. *History. Volume 1*. ed. and trld. G.C. Macaulay. Project Gutenberg EBook 2008. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/2707/2707-h/2707-h.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Holinshed, Raphael. "The first and second volumes of the Chronicles". *The Holinshed Project* 1587. http://english.nsms.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/toc.php?edition=1587 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

James I. "Speech to Parliament of 19 March 1604". *King James VI and I. Political Writings*. ed. Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1604] 1995, 132–146.

James I. "The Lepanto Of Iames The Sixt, King of Scotland". *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres*. Edinburgh: Robert Waldegraue 1591. https://www-proquest-com.emedien.ub.uni-muenchen.de/docview/2240926642?accountid=14596 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Jonson, Ben. *Bartholomew Fair*. Project Gutenberg EBook [1614] 2014. www.gutenberg.org/files/49461/49461-h/49461-h.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Jordanes. "De Origine Actibusque Gothorum". ed. Theedrich Yeat 2016. https://www.harbornet.com/folks/theedrich/Goths/Goths1.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Knolles, Richard. *The generall historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the rising of the Othoman familie: with all the notable expeditions of the Christian princes against them. Toge-*

ther with the liues and conquests of the Othoman kings and emperours faithfullie collected out of the best histories, both auntient and moderne, and digested into one continuat historie vntill this present yeare 1603. London: Adam Islip 1603. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A04911.0001.001 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Knox, John. *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstruous Regiment of Women*. Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul 1558. https://www-proquest-com.emedien.ub.uni-muenchen.de/docview/2240899496?accountid=14596 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Lambarde, William. *A perambulation of Kent conteining the description, hystorie, and customes of that shyre*. London: H. Middleton for Ralphe Nevvberie 1576. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A72509.0001.001 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Lily, William. *Lily's Grammar of Latin in English: An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche, and the Construction of the Same*. ed. Hedwig Gwosdek. Oxford: Oxford University Press [1542] 2013.

Livy. *History of Rome, Volume I: Books 1–2*. ed. and trld. B.O. Foster. *Loeb Classical Library 114*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1919.

Livy. *History of Rome*, *Volume V: Books 21–22*. ed. and trld. J.C. Yardley. *Loeb Classical Library 233*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2019.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Jew of Malta*. ed. James R. Siemon. London: Methuen Drama [c.1592] ³2009.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus.* Ed. David Scott Kastan. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company [1604] 2005.

Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *Historia regum Britanniae, a variant version edited from manuscripts*. ed. Jacob Hammer. Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy Of America [ca. 1136] 1951. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.medievalacademy.org/resource/resmgr/maa_books_online/hammer_0057.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. "Of the Canniballes". *The Tempest. Appendix 1: Sources*. eds. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. London: Methuen/Arden Shakespeare [1603] ²2011, 325–336.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses.* trld. Frank Justus Miller. rev. G.P. Goold. *Loeb Classical Library 42*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1916.

Pepys, Samuel. "Monday 29 September 1662". *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* [1662] 2005. https://www.pepysdiary.com/diary/1662/09/29/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Pliny. *Natural History, Volume VIII: Books 28–32*. trld. W.H.S. Jones. *Loeb Classical Library 418*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1963.

Plutarch. *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*. ed. and trld. Bernadotte Perrin. *Loeb Classical Library 46*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1914.

Polybius. *The Histories, Volume III: Books 5–8*. trld. W.R. Paton. rev. F.W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. *Loeb Classical Library 138*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2011.

Raleigh, Walter. *The Discovery of the large, rich, and beautiful Empire of Guiana*. Project Gutenberg Ebook [1596] 2013. http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2272 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Ravenscroft, Edward. *Titus Andronicus, or, The rape of Lavinia acted at the Theatre Royall: a tragedy, alter'd from Mr. Shakespears works*. London 1687. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A59525.0001.001 [accessed May 25, 2020].

Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. ed. Jonathan Bate. London: Bloomsbury/The Arden Shakespeare [ca. 1592] ²2018.

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. ed. R. A Foakes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [ca. 1595] 2003.

Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. ed. John Drakakis. London: Bloomsbury/Arden Shakespeare [ca. 1596] ²2013.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. ed. Michael Neill. Oxford: Oxford University Press [ca. 1604] ²2008.

Shakespeare, William. *Cymbeline*. ed. Martin Butler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [ca. 1610] ¹¹2015.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. London: Bloomsbury/Arden Shakespeare [ca. 1611] ²2011.

Shakespeare, William. *The RSC Shakespeare. Complete Works*. eds. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. Houndsmill: Macmillan 2007.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. ed. Risa S. Bear [1596] 1995. http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/fqintro.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Strachey, William. "A true reportory of the wracke, and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates Knight". *Purchas his Pilgrimes. In five bookes*. ed. Samuel Purchas. London: Printed by William Stansby, for Henrie Fetherstone [1610] 1625, 1734–1758. https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/stracheys-a-true-reportory-of-the-wreck-in-bermuda [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Tacitus, P. Cornelius. "Agricola". *The Latin Library Online* [ca. 98] 2019. http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/tacitus/tac.agri.shtml#10 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Thomas, William. *The Historie of Italie a Boke Excedyng Profitable to be Redde: Because it Intreateth of the Astate of Many and Diuers Common Weales, how Thei Haue Ben, [and] Now be Gouerned*. London: Thomas Berthelet 1549. https://www-proquest-com.emedien.ub.uni-muenchen.de/docview/2264211560? accountid=14596 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Velleius Paterculus. *Compendium of Roman History. Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. trld. Frederick W. Shipley. *Loeb Classical Library 152*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1924.

Vergil. *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid: Books 1–6.* ed. and trld. H. Rushton Fairclough. rev. G.P. Goold. *Loeb Classical Library 63*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1916.

Vergil. *Aeneid: Books 7–12. Appendix Vergiliana*. ed. and trld. H. Rushton Fairclough. rev. G.P. Goold. *Loeb Classical Library 64*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1918.

Secondary Sources

Acosta, Elizabeth Valdez. "Open Doors, Secure Borders: The Paradoxical Immigration Policy of Belmont in *The Merchant of Venice*". *Shakespeare and Immigration*. eds. Ruben Espinosa and David Ruiter. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing 2014, 177–198.

Antonucci, Barbara. "Romans versus Barbarians: Speaking the Language of the Empire in *Titus Andronicus*". *Identity, Otherness and Empire in Shakespeare's Rome*. ed. Maria Del Sapio Garbero. Farham: Ashgate Publishing 2009, 119–130.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies. The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge ^{3}2013.

Bailey, Lisa, Lindsay Diggelmann, and Kim M. Phillips. "Introduction". *Old Worlds, New Worlds. European Cultural Encounters, c. 1000–1750*. eds. Lisa Bailey, Lindsay Diggelmann, and Kim M. Phillips. Turnhout: Brepols 2009, 1–9.

Balmaceda, Catalina. *Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 2017.

Barin, Filiz. "*Othello*: Turks as 'the Other' in the early modern Period". *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 43.2 (2010), 37–58.

Bartels, Emily Carroll. "Making more of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41.4 (1990), 433–454.

Bartels, Emily Carroll. "Othello and Africa: Postcolonialism Reconsidered". *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54.1 (1997), 45–64.

Bartels, Emily Carroll. "Too Many Blackamoors: Deportation, Discrimination, and Elizabeth I". *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 46.2 (2006), 305–322.

Bartels, Emily Carroll. *Speaking of the Moor*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2008.

Bate, Jonathan. *How the Classics made Shakespeare*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press 2019.

Bate, Jonathan. "Introduction". *Titus Andronicus*. ed. Jonathan Bate. London: Bloomsbury Arden ²2018, 1–119.

Belsey, Catherine. 1991. "Love in Venice". *Shakespeare Survey 44: Shakespeare and Politics*. ed. Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 41–54.

Berger, Harry Jr. *A Fury in the Words: Love and Embarrassment in Shakespeare's Venice*. New York: Fordham University Press 2013.

Billington, Michael. "Cymbeline review – the RSC's bizarre romance comes straight from the heart". *The Guardian*. May 11, 2016. https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/may/11/cymbeline-review-rsc-royal-shakespeare-theatre [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Blits, Jan H. *The Soul of Athens: Shakespeare's* A Midsummer Night's Dream. Oxford et. al: Lexington Books 2003.

Boling, Ronald J. "Anglo-Welsh Relations in Cymbeline". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51.1 (2000), 33–66.

Bosman, Anston. "Shakespeare and globalization". *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. eds. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press ²2011, 285–302.

Bridge Theatre. "*A Midsummer Night's Dream*". *BridgeTheatre.co.uk* 2020. https://bridgetheatre.co.uk/whats-on/a-midsummer-nights-dream/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Broude, Ronald. "Roman and Goth in Titus Andronicus". Shakespeare Studies 6 (1970), 27–34.

Brown, David Sterling. "Remixing the family: Blackness and domesticity in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*". *Titus Andronicus. The State of the Play*. ed. Farah Karim-Cooper. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2019, 111–134.

Brown, Sarah Annes. "Ovid, Golding, and the Tempest". *Translation and Literature* 3 (1994), 3–29.

Burns, Thomas S. *Rome and the Barbarians, 100 BC-AD 400*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 2003.

Butler, Martin. "Introduction". *Cymbeline*. ed. Martin Butler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press ¹¹2015, 1–74.

Butler, Martin. "*The Tempest* and the literature of wonder". *British Library Online* March 15, 2016. https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/the-tempest-and-the-literature-of-wonder [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Cantor, Paul A. "The Shores of Hybridity: Shakespeare and the Mediterranean". *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2016), 896–913.

Carney, Jo Eldridge. "'I'll Find a Day to Massacre Them All": Tamora in *Titus Andronicus* and Catherine de Médicis". *Comparative Drama* 48.4 (2014), 415–435.

Carney, Jo Elridge. "'Honoured Hippolyta, Most Dreaded Amazonian'". *'High and Mighty Queens' of early modern England*. Eds. Carole Levin, Debra Barrett-Graves and Jo E. Carney. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2003, 117–131.

Chaudhuri, Sukanta. "Introduction". *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2017.

Chernaik, Warren. *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2011.

Chessman, Tom. "*Othello* 1.3: "Far more fair than black". *The Cambridge guide to the worlds of Shakespeare*. ed. Bruce R. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2016, 1156–1161.

Coodin, Sara. *Is Shylock Jewish?: Citing Scripture and the Moral Agency of Shakespeare's Jews*. Edinburgh University Press 2017.

Coral, Jordi. "Anxious householders: theft and anti-usury discourse in Shakespeare's Venetian plays". The Seventeenth Century 30.3 (2015), 285–300.

Crumley, J. Clinton. "Questioning History in *Cymbeline*". *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 41.2 (2001), 297–315.

Cruz, Anne J. and Mihoko Suzuki. "Introduction". *The rule of women in early modern Europe*. Eds. Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki. Urbana Ill. u.a.: University of Illinois Press 2009, 1–10.

Crystal, David and Ben Crystal. "Characters by part sizes". *Shakespeare's Words* 2020. https://www.shakespeareswords.com/Public/LanguageCcompanion/CharactersParts.aspx [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Dahlgreen, Will. "Shakespeare 400 years on: every play ranked by popularity". *YouGov* 2016. https://yougov.co.uk/topics/lifestyle/articles-reports/2016/04/22/shakespeare-400 [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Darko, Leaphia. "Renewing my vows in the wake of the hurricane". *Shakespeare's Globe Blogs and Features*. August 22, 2020. https://www.shakespearesglobe.com/discover/blogs-and-features/2020/08/22/renewing-my-vows-in-the-wake-of-the-hurricane/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Dickson, Andrew. "Othello: the role that entices and enrages actors of all skin colours". *British Library Online*. March 15, 2016. https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/othello-the-role-that-entices-and-enrages-actors-of-all-skin-colours [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Döring, Tobias. "Welttheater". *Welt-Komposita. Ein Lexikon*. eds. Thomas Erthel, Robert Stockhammer, Tobias Döring, Martin von Koppenfels, Inka Mülder-Bach, and Robert Stockhammer. Leiden: Wilhelm Fink. E-Book 2020.

Drakakis, John. "Introduction". *The Merchant of Venice*. ed. John Drakakis. London: Bloomsbury/Arden Shakespeare ²2013, 1–159.

Escobedo, Andrew. "From Britannia to England: Cymbeline and the Beginning of Nations". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.1 (2008), 60–87.

Espinosa, Ruben. "A darker shade of Shakespeare". Shakespeare's Globe Blogs and Features. August 23, 2020. https://www.shakespearesglobe.com/discover/blogs-and-features/2020/08/23/a-darker-shade-of-shakespeare/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Feerick, Jean E. "A 'Nation. . . Now Degenerate': Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, Nova Britannia, and the Role of Diet and Climate in Reproducing Races" *Early American Studies* 1.2 (2003), 30–70.

Fetters, Bronwen. "Pivotal and Puzzling: The Indian Boy in A Midsummer Night's Dream". Aletheia 1.1 (2016), 2–9.

Findley, Alison and Vassiliki Markidou. "Introduction". Shakespeare and Greece. eds. Alison Findley and Vassiliki Markidou. London and New York: Bloomsbury Arden 2017, 1–44.

Fitzmaurice, Andrew. "The Moral Philosophy of Jacobean Colonisation". Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500–1625. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003, 58–101.

Floyd-Wilson, Mary. English Ethnicity and Race in early modern Drama. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003.

Flynn, Dennis O. and Arturo Giráldez. "Globalization began in 1571". Globalization and Global History. eds. Barry K. Gills and William R. Thompson. London: Routledge 2006, 232–247.

Foxhall, Lin. Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2013.

Freed, Eugenie R. "'News on the Rialto': Shakespeare's Venice". Shakespeare in Southern Africa 21 (2009), 47–59.

Friedman, Michael D. and Alan Dessen. Shakespeare in Performance: Titus Andronicus. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press 2013.

Giddens, Eugene. "Masculinity and Barbarism in *Titus Andronicus*". *early modern Literary Studies* 15.2:1 (2010–2011), 1–35 http://purl.oclc.org/emls/15–2/giddtitu.htm [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Gillies, John. "Shakespeare's Virginian Masque". ELH 53.4 (1986), 673–707.

Gillies, John. Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1994.

Gills, Barry K. and William R. Thompson. "Globalizations, global histories and historical gloabilities". Globalization and Global History.

ed. Barry K. Gills and William R. Thompson. London: Routledge 2006, 1–17.
Golinelli, Gilberta. "In Dialogue with the New: Theorizations on the New World in Titus Andronicus". Identity, Otherness and Empire in Shakespeare's Rome. ed. Maria Del Sapio Garbero. Farham: Ashgate Publishing 2009, 131–144.
Greenblatt, Stephen. Tyrant. Shakespeare on Politics. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company 2019.
Grogan, Jane. "'Headless Rome' and Hungry Goths: Herodotus and Titus Andronicus". English Literary Renaissance 43.1 (2013), 30–61.
Guttal, Shalmali. "Globalisation". Development in Practice 17.4–5 (2007), 523–31.
Habermann, Ina. "'I shall have share in this most happy wreck': Shakespeare's Topology of Shipwreck". Shakespeare Jahrbuch 2012: Seefahrt, Schiffbruch und Maritime Abenteuer. ed. Sabine Schülting. Bochum: Kamp 2012, 55–72.
Hale, J.R. "Manpower". The Military Organisation of a Renaissance State: Venice c.1400 to 1617. eds. M.E. Mallett and J.R. Hale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1984, 313–366.
Hamilton, Donna B. Virgil and The Tempest: The Politics of Imitation. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press 1990.
Hamilton, Sharon. Shakespeare's Daughters. Jefferson/London: MacFarland 2003.
Hardwick, Lorna. "Ancient Amazons". Greece & Rome 37.1 (1990), 14–36.
Harries, Brian J. "The Fall of Mediterranean Rome in Titus Andronicus". Mediterranean Studies 26.2 (2018), 194–212.
Harrington, Gary. "'Shadowed livery': Morocco in The Merchant of Venice". Linguaculture 1 (2017), 53–62.
Hart, Jonathan L. Representing the New World. The English and French uses of the example of Spain. New York, NY: Palgrave 2001.
Hart, Jonathan L. Columbus, Shakespeare and the interpretation of the New World. New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2003.
Hatch, Jenavieve. "5 'Wonder Woman' Amazons On The Power Of Their All-Woman Army". Huffington Post. June 15, 2017. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/5-wonder-woman-amazons-all-woman-army_us_5936cc94e4b0cfcda917f13e [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Hattaway, Michael. "'Seeing things': Amazons and cannibals". Travel and drama in Shakespeare's time. Eds. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996, 179–192.
Hawes, Greta. Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Heather, James. The Goths. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers 1996.
Helgerson, Richard. Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1992.
Hingley, Richard. The Recovery of Roman Britain 1586–1906. A Colony so Fertile. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2008.
Hirsch, Brett D. Werewolves and Women with Whiskers. Figures of Estrangement in early modern English Drama and Culture. University of Western Australia, PhD dissertation 2008.
Hirsch, Brett D. "Counterfeit Professions: Jewish Daughters and the Drama of Failed Conversion in Marlowe's The Jew of Malta and Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice". EMLS Special Issue 19 (2009), 4.1–37.
Höfele, Andreas. "'So Potent Art': Magic Power in Marlowe, Greene and Shakespeare". The Iconography of Power. Ideas and Images of Rulership on the English Renaissance Stage. eds. György E. Szönyi and Rowland Wymer. Szeged: JATEPress 2000, 53–72.
Höfele, Andreas. "Shakespeares Sturm. Religion, Wissenschaft und die Magie des Theaters". Theater im Aufbruch. Das europäsiche Drama der Frühen Neuzeit. eds. Roger Lüdeke and Virginia Richter. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2008, 84–100.
Holderness, Graham. Shakespeare and Venice. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing 2010.
Holland, Peter. "Theseus' Shadows in A Midsummer Night's Dream". Shakespeare Survey 47 (2007), 139–151.
Hollis, Gavin. The Absence of America. The London Stage 1576–1642. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015.
Howatson, M.C. ed. The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Oxford University Press 2011.
Hulme, Peter and William H. Sherman. "Introduction". 'The Tempest' and Its Travels. eds. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. London: Reaktion Books 2000, 3–11.

Hulme, Peter. Colonial Encounters. Europe and the native Caribbean, 1492 – 1797. London and New York: Methuen 1986.
Hulme, Peter. "Shakespeare's Spanish Tempest: Colonial Sources, Postcolonial Readings". The Sir Henry Thomas Memorial Lecture 2002. http://repository.essex.ac.uk/2831/1/The_Spanish_Tempest.pdf [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
James, Heather. Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997.
Jansen, Sharon L. The monstrous regiment of women. Female rulers in early modern Europe. New York NY u.a.: Palgrave Macmillan 2002.
Johnson, Boris. "For their sake, immigrants must speak the language of Shakespeare". The Telegraph. March 8, 2015. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/11457877/For-their-sake-immigrants-must-speak-the-language-of-Shakespeare.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Johnson, David. "Cymbeline". Shakespeare 1609: Cymbeline and the Sonnets. eds. Richard Danson Brown and David Johnson. Houndsmill: Macmillan 2000, 3–41.
Jowitt, Claire. "Colonialism, Politics, and Romanization in John Fletcher's 'Bonduca'". Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900 43.2 (2003), 475–494.
Jowitt, Claire. "Robert Wilson's The Three Ladies of London and its Theatrical and Cultural Contexts". The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama. eds. Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012, 309–322.
Kahn, Coppélia. Roman Shakespeare. Warriors, Wounds, and Women. London/New York: Routledge 1997.
Kaplan, M. Lindsay. William Shakespeare The Merchant of Venice. Text and Contexts. New York: Palgrave 2002.
Kaplan, M. Lindsay. "Jessica's Mother: Medieval Constructions of Jewish Race and Gender in The Merchant of Venice". Shakespeare Quarterly 58.1 (2007), 1–30.
Kaplan, M. Lindsay. "The Merchant of Venice, Jews, and Christians". The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Religion, ed. Hannibal Hamlin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019, 168–183.

Kaplan, M. Lindsay. "Introduction". The Merchant of Venice. The State of the Play. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2020, 1–16.
Karim-Cooper, Farah. "Strangers in the city: the cosmopolitan nature of 16th-century Venice." British Library Online. March 15, 2016. https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/strangers-in-the-city-the-cosmopolitan-nature-of-16th-century-venice [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Karim-Cooper, Farah. "Introduction". Titus Andronicus. The State of the Play. ed. Farah Karim-Cooper. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2019, 1–11.
Karim-Cooper, Farah. "Anti-racist Shakespeare". Shakespeare's Globe Blogs and Features. May 26, 2020. https://www.shakespearesglobe.com/discover/blogs-and-features/2020/05/26/anti-racist-shakespeare/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Kaufmann, Miranda. "Caspar Van Senden, Sir Thomas Sherley and the 'Blackamoor' project". *Historical Research* 81.212 (2008), 366–371.
Kehler, Dorothea. "'That Ravenous Tiger Tamora'. Titus Andronicus's Lusty Widow, Wife, and M/other". Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays. ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York and London: Garland Publishing 1995, 317–332.
King, Ros. Cymbeline. Constructions of Britain. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing 2005.
Kliger, Samuel. The Goths in England: A Study in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Thought. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1952.
Kulikowski, Michael. Rome's Gothic Wars: From the Third Century to Alaric. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2006.
Kunat, John. "'I have done thy mother'. Racial and sexual geographies in Titus Andronicus". Titus Andronicus. The State of the Play. ed. Farah Karim-Cooper. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2019, 89–110.
LaPerle, Carol Mejia. "'If I might have my will'. Aaron's affect and race in Titus Andronicus". Titus Andronicus. The State of the Play. ed. Farah Karim-Cooper. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2019, 134–156.
Levin, Carole, and John Watkins. Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 2009.
Liebler, Naomi Conn. "Getting It All Right: Titus Andronicus and Roman History". Shakespeare Quarterly 45.3 (1994), 263–278.
Loomba, Ania. Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002.

Loomba, Ania. "The Great Indian Vanishing Trick – Colonialism, Property, and the Family in A Midsummer Night's Dream". A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare. Second Edition. ed. Dympna Callaghan. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons 2016, 181–205.

Low, Polly. "General Introduction." The Athenian Empire. ed. Polly Low. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2008, 3–13.

MacCrossan, Colm. "'What, in a Town of War … to Manage Private and Domestic Quarrel?': *Othello* and the Tragedy of Cyprus". Shakespeare 16:3 (2020), 239–257.

MacDonald, Joyce Green. "Black Ram, White Ewe: Shakespeare, Race, and Women". A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare. ed. Dympna Callaghan. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons 2016, 206–225.

Mace, Nancy A. "The History of the Grammar Patent from 1620 to 1800 and the Forms of Lily's Latin Grammar." The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 100.2 (2006), 177–225.

MacInnes, Ian. "'Ill Luck, Ill Luck?': Risk and Hazard in The Merchant of Venice". Global Traffic: Discourses and Practices of Trade in English Literature and Culture from 1550 to 1700. eds. Barbara Sebek and Stephen Deng. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2008, 39–55.

Macsiniuc, Cornelia. "Paradoxes of Disbelief". Acta Iassyensia Comparationis 6 (2008), 264–272.

Marcus, Leah S. How Shakespeare Became Colonial: Editorial Tradition and the British Empire. London and New York: Routledge 2017.

Marshall, Tristan. "The Tempest and the British Imperium in 1611". The Historical Journal 41.2 (1998), 375–400.

Martindale, Charles, and A.B. Taylor. "Introduction". Shakespeare and the Classics. eds. Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004, 1–6.

McMullan, Gordon. Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing. Authorship in the Proximity of Death. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2007.

McMullan, Gordon. "What Is a 'Late Play'?". The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Last Plays. ed. Catherine M.S. Alexander. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2009, 5–28.

McPherson, David. Shakespeare, Jonson, and the Myth of Venice. London and Toronto: Associated Presses 1990.
Metzger, Mary Janell. "'Now by My Hood, a Gentle and No Jew': Jessica, The Merchant of Venice, and the Discourse of early modern English Identity." PMLA 113.1 (1998), 52–63.
Mikalachki, Jodi. "The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and early modern English Nationalism". Shakespeare Quarterly 46.3 (1995), 301–322.
Minton, Eric. "Shakespeare Plays Popularity Index". Shakespeareances 2020. http://www.shakespeareances.com/wherewill/Play_Popularity_Index.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Montgomery Byles, Joanna. "Shakespeare and the Cyprus setting". Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen 25 (1996), 155–160.
Muldrew, Craig. "Interpreting the Market: The Ethics of Credit and Community Relations in Early Modern England". Social History 18.2 (1993), 163–183.
Mullan, John. "Shakespeare and Italy". British Library Online. March 15, 2016. https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/shakespeare-and-italy [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Neill, Michael. "'Mulattos,' 'Blacks,' and 'Indian Moors': Othello and early modern Constructions of Human Difference". Shakespeare Quarterly 49.4 (1998), 361–374.
Neill, Michael. "Introduction". Othello. ed. Michael Neill. Oxford: Oxford University Press ²2008, 1–179.
Nevett, L.C. "Gender Relations in the Classical Greek Household". The Annual of the British School at Athens 90 (1995), 363–381.
Nubia, Onyeka. *Blackamoores: Africans in Tudor England, their presence, status and origins.* Doctoral thesis, University of East Anglia 2016.
Nubia, Onyeka. England's Other Countrymen: Black Tudor Society. London: ZED 2019.
Nunn, Nathan, and Nancy Qian. "The Columbian Exchange: A History of Disease, Food, and Ideas." The Journal of Economic Perspectives 24.2 (2010), 163–88.
Open Source Shakespeare. 2020. https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Orgel, Stephen. Imagining Shakespeare. A History of Texts and Visions. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2003.
Orlin, Lena Owen. "Introduction". Othello. The State of Play. ed. Lena Owen Orlin. London: Bloomsbury Arden 2014, 1–16.
Pagden, Anthony. Lords of All the World. Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France. c.1500-c.1800. New Haven: Yale University Press 1995.
Pfister, Manfred. "'The Passion' from Winterson to Coryate". Venetian Views, Venetian Blinds. English Fantasies of Venice. eds. Manfred Pfister and Barbara Schaff. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi 1999, 15–27.
Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone". Profession 91 (1991), 33–40.
Pratt, Mary Louise. Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturization. London and New York: Routledge 1992.
Publicover, Laurence. Dramatic Georgraphy. Romance, Intertheatricality, and Cultural Encounter in early modern Mediterranean Drama. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017.
Reeve, Michael D. and Neil Wright. "Introduction". Geoffrey of Monmouth. The History of the Kings of Britain. ed. Michael D. Reeve and trld. Neil Wright. Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2007, vii-lxxvi.
Rickard, Jane. Writing the Monarch in Jacobean England: Jonson, Donne, Shakespeare and the Works of King James. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2015.
Robertson, Roland. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. London: Sage 1992.
Royal Shakespeare Company. "A Midsummer Night's Dream". RSC.org.uk 2020. https://www.rsc.org.uk/a-midsummer-nights-dream/ [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Schleiner, Winfried. "'Divina Virago': Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon". Studies in Philology 75.2 (1978), 163–180.
Schmidt, Thomas. "Plutarch's Timeless Barbarians and the Age of Trajan". Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Imperial Power in the Age of Trajan. eds. Philip Stadter and Luc Van der Stockt. Leuven: Leuven University Press 2002, 57–71.
Schülting, Sabine. "Bringing 'this monstrous birth to the world's light': Colonial mimicry in early modern writing". Erfurt Electronic Stu-

dies in English 1996. http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic96/schulte/13_96.html [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Schwartz, Kathryn. Tough Love. Amazon Encounters in the English Renaissance. Durham, London: Duke University Press 2000.
Shakespeare's Globe. "In Conversation: Reckoning with our past". Shakespeare and Race Festival Globe Theatre 2020. YouTube 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVpIXgyGXXc# [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Shapiro, James. Shakespeare and the Jews. New York: Columbia University Press ²2016.
Smith, Emma. "May as Polonius, Gove as Cassius: is Brexit a Shakespearean tragedy?". The Guardian. April 12, 2019 https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/apr/12/brexit-tragedy-worthy-of-shakespeare-emma-smith [accessed Oct 15, 2020].
Smith, Emma. This is Shakespeare. London: Pelican Books 2019.
Sokol, B.J. Shakespeare and Tolerance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2008.
Sousa, Geraldo de. Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters. Houndsmill: Macmillan 1999.
Sousa, Geraldo de. "'My hopes abroad': The Global/Local Nexus in The Merchant of Venice". Shakespeare and Immigration. eds. Ruben Espinosa and David Ruiter. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing 2014, 37–57.
Steger, Manfred. Globalization: a very short introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press ⁴2017.
Stock, Lorraine K. "Amazons". Women and Gender in Medieval Europe. Ed. Margaret C. Schaus. London: Routledge 2006, 16–17.
Stritmatter, Roger and Lynne Kositsky. "Shakespeare and the Voyagers Revisited". Review of English Studies 58 (2007), 447–472.
Teramura, Misha. "Black Comedy: Shakespeare, Terence, and Titus Andronicus". ELH 85.4 (2018), 877–908.
Thrush, Andrew. "On this Day: 21 November 1606: The proposed union between England and Scotland". History of Parliament Online. November 21, 2017. http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/periods/stuarts/day-21-november-1606-proposed-union-between-england-and-scotland [accessed Oct 15, 2020].

Tosi, Laura and Shaul Bassi. "Introduction". Visions of Venice in Shakespeare. eds. Laura Tosi and Shaul Bassi. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing 2011, 1–15.

Trepanier, Lee. "Contract, Friendship, and Love in The Merchant of Venice". Perspectives on Political Science 43 (2014), 204–212.

Trüstedt, Katrin. Die Komödie der Tragödie. Shakespeares »Sturm« am Umschlagplatz von Mythos und Moderne, Rache und Recht, Tragik und Spiel. Konstanz: Konstanz University Press 2011.

Vaughan, Alden T. "Sir Walter Ralegh's Indian Interpreters, 1584–1618." The William and Mary Quarterly 59.2 (2002), 341–76.

Vaughan, Alden T. "William Strachey's 'True Reportory' and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence". Shakespeare Quarterly 59.3 (2008), 245–273.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Virginia Mason Vaughan. Shakespeare's Caliban. A cultural history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason and Alden T. Vaughan. "Introduction". The Tempest. eds. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. London: Methuen/Arden Shakespeare ²2011, 1–138.

Wiggins, Martin. British Drama 1533–1642. A Catalogue. Vol. III: 1590 – 1597. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013.

Wiggins, Martin. British Drama 1533–1642. A Catalogue. Vol. V. 1603 – 1608. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015.

Williams, Deanne. "Dido, Queen of England". ELH 73.1 (2006), 31–59.

Wilson, Richard. "Voyage to Tunis: New History and the Old World of The Tempest". ELH 64.2 (1997), 333–357.

Wilson, Richard. Wordly Shakespeare. The Theatre of Our Good Will. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2016.

Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. "Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare's Tempest". ELH 70.3 (2003), 709–73.

Globalisierung ist kein modernes Phänomen, sondern so alt wie die Menschheit selbst. Die Begegnung mit anderen Kulturen spielt dabei eine zentrale Rolle: Die Art und Weise, wie Individuen und Gesellschaften darauf reagieren, ermöglicht uns nicht nur tiefe Einblicke darin, wie andere Kulturen wahrgenommen werden, sondern auch in das eigene Selbstverständnis.

Die vorliegende Dissertation untersucht genau diese interkulturellen Begegnungen in einer Zeit, die als eine der einflussreichsten Epochen der Globalisierung im modernen Sinn gilt: die Frühe Neuzeit in England. Am Beispiel von sechs ausgewählten Stücken William Shakespeares (*Titus Andronicus, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, Othello, Cymbeline* und *The Tempest*) wird die Entwicklung der Darstellung dieser Begegnungen in drei Phasen nachgezeichnet, die durch die Ausrichtung der zentralen Grenzüberschreitung (*transgression, presence* und *inversion*) definiert wird. Diese Entwicklung reflektiert, so die Leitthese der Arbeit, die soziokulturellen Diskurse der Entstehungszeit der Stücke, welche zu verstehen helfen, wie Prozesse der frühneuzeitlichen Globalisierung aufgegriffen, fort- und umgeschrieben sowie mitgestaltet wurden.

Katrin Bauer arbeitete nach ihrem Englisch- und Geschichtsstudium als wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Department für Anglistik der LMU München, wo sie 2021 promovierte. Ihre Schwerpunkte sind Shakespeare und das Theater der Frühen Neuzeit. Sie verbrachte 2019/2020 ein Forschungssemester am Shakespeare Institute in Stratford-upon-Avon und ist Mitglied der Deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft.

37,90 €
ISBN 978-3-487-16183-9
www.olms.de