

HOSPITALITY IN SOME WORKS BY THOMAS HEYWOOD

HOSPITALITY
IN
SOME WORKS BY THOMAS HEYWOOD

By
CHRISTOPHER LASER, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

© Copyright by Christopher Laser, August 2009

MASTER OF ARTS

McMaster University

(English)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Hospitality in Some Works of Thomas Heywood

AUTHOR: Christopher Laser, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor H. Ostovich

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 114

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I examine representations of hospitality in four works by Thomas Heywood: *1 and 2 Edward IV* (1599), *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603), *The English Traveller* (1633), and *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634). In the early modern period the practice of hospitality was integral to social relations, facilitating the consolidation of social ties, status and influence. Concurrent with these four plays, the period from approximately 1580 to 1630 contained an increasing interest and anxiety about the practice of hospitality and its apparent decline. Through an examination of the representations of hospitality in these plays, in relation to contemporary concerns surrounding early modern hospitality, I show that these plays exhibit a variety of anxieties and concerns about the practice of hospitality. In particular, I argue that the plays exhibit anxieties about masculine identity and the social responsibilities of householders; that the hospitable relation between host and guest, though intended to be socially edifying, may provide an avenue for social disruption and subversion due to the specific functions and expectations surrounding hospitality; and about female participation in hospitality, which often results in the exclusion of women from the benefits of the conventional system of hospitable exchange.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In a very real way this thesis would not exist in its present form without the sustained influence and generous contributions of Dr. Helen Ostovich, whose interest in *The Late Lancashire Witches* provided the initial spark for my interest in Thomas Heywood's work and the early modern practice of hospitality. Her continued support, assistance and patience have been invaluable as I have attempted to form early ideas into a finished thesis.

I wish also to thank my family for their immense support for all of my academic pursuits, and for their particular support and understanding during the completion of this thesis, which has eased and salved the inevitable difficulties that arose.

Finally, I wish to thank Eva Lane, who has been a constant partner and support during the composition of this thesis. Without you, the process would not have been as enjoyable, nor the work as good.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vi
1: Introduction: Heywood, Hospitality, and the Home	1
Thomas Heywood	6
Early Modern Hospitality	14
The Home	18
2: Host and Guest: Hospitable Subversion of the Hospitable Bond	37
3: Women and Hospitality: Hospitable Exclusions	82
4: Valediction: Hospitable Anxieties	103
Bibliography	110

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>1E</i>	<i>1 Edward IV</i>
<i>2E</i>	<i>2 Edward IV</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>The English Traveller</i>
“Familiarities”	“Edward IV’s Secret Familiarities and the Politics of Proximity in Elizabethan History Plays”
<i>Hospitality</i>	<i>Hospitality in Early Modern England</i>
“Idea”	“The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England.”
<i>LLW</i>	<i>The Late Lancashire Witches</i>
<i>WK</i>	<i>A Woman Killed with Kindness</i>

But before being a question to be dealt with, before designating a concept, a theme, a problem, a program, the question of the foreigner is a question *of* the foreigner, addressed *to* the foreigner. (Derrida 3)

Does hospitality consist in interrogating the new arrival? Does it begin with the question addressed to the newcomer [...]: what is your name? [...] Or else does hospitality begin with the unquestioning welcome, in a double effacement, the effacement of the question *and* the name? (27-9)

The question of hospitality is thus also the question of the question. (29)

1: Introduction: Heywood, Hospitality, and the Home

Almost four hundred years before Jacques Derrida delivered these words in 1996, Thomas Heywood's *Edward IV*, the earliest subject of this study, appeared in the stationers register.¹ While this correspondence is nothing more than chronological coincidence, it is significant, I think, that four hundred years has not made these texts completely foreign to each other. Rather, the same problems and tensions of hospitality that Derrida theorizes in the "Question d'étranger [Foreigner Question]" (3)² are driving forces for not only *Edward IV* but also many of Thomas Heywood's other works, including *The Late Lancashire Witches*, *The English Traveller*, and Heywood's most praised play: *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. All four plays are structured around the relation of guests and hosts, and the unique demands and allowances that arise from such a relation. Derrida captures the central concern of these plays when he recognizes that,

¹ *Edward IV* was registered on August 28, 1599.

² Rachel Bowlby, in her Translator's Note for *Of Hospitality*, notes that étranger "covers both 'stranger' and 'foreigner' in English" (ix); however, she has chosen primarily to use 'foreigner,' "because it was most appropriate in most of the contexts," while she reserves 'stranger' for where it is "necessary or conventional" (ix). The result is that the title of the first seminar, "Question d'étranger", in her translation becomes "Foreigner Question" (3).

even if we aim to offer hospitality to the guest, which he calls the foreigner, we are faced with a dilemma: Does hospitality demand anything from the guest or the host, or is hospitality most truly hospitable when it is entirely open and giving, demanding nothing? Derrida discusses this dilemma more fully in a subsequent seminar entitled “Pas d’hospitalité [Step of Hospitality / No Hospitality]” (75), claiming, “it is as though the laws (plural) of hospitality, in marking limits powers, rights, and duties, consisted in challenging and transgressing *the* law of hospitality, the one that would command that the “new arrival” be offered an unconditional welcome” (77). There is, therefore, always a conflict between the many “conditional” (77) laws that govern the actual performance of hospitality and the ideal, “unconditional” law of hospitality (79).

Derrida’s formulation of this irresolvable but necessary conflict within hospitality may seem primarily theoretical and highly abstract to his listeners and readers who receive his words from a modern, western, or especially a North American, perspective. For such readers, who are not familiar with hospitality as a “categorical imperative” (75), the inherent conflict of hospitality is itself foreign. Indeed, to illustrate his argument Derrida turns primarily to Classical Greece for the *Apology of Socrates* and *Oedipus at Colonus*, and to the biblical hospitality of Lot in Sodom, and a Levite and his Concubine.³ Derrida’s examples are foundational to Western culture, but despite their influence the hospitality that they exhibit is still removed from the average experience of the modern Westerner, for whom hospitality is generally “a private form of behavior,

³ The story of Lot can be found in Genesis 19:1-9. The story of a Levite and his Concubine can be found in Judges 19:23-30. Derrida also mentions that the story of Lot is preceded by another example of biblical hospitality: when Abraham entertains the same angels that later stay with Lot. Derrida does not go into detail, promising to return to Abraham’s hospitality later, but the biblical account can be found in Genesis 18, particularly verses 1-22.

exercised as a matter of personal preference within a limited circle of friendship and connection” (Heal, *Hospitality* 1).

Of course, the modern western experience of hospitality as “private,” “personal” and “limited” is also quite foreign to the expectations and practices of hospitality in the early modern period (1). But the value of a study of early modern hospitality, through drama in this case, is that the early modern period is also not classical Greece or the biblical Levant. By this I mean that the early modern period, and its drama, is perhaps not *as* foreign as Derrida’s emblems of hospitality. The early modern period offers ways of recognizing ourselves, and conceiving of hospitality, that are different from what an examination of *Oedipus at Colonus* will reveal. To give only one example, the “shift from a feudal to a capitalist society” and the “rise of the middle class” in the early modern period still reverberate in the modern era (Sharpe 133).

But among the additional benefits of a study of early modern hospitality is that it provides instances where Derrida’s theoretical impasses are lived experiences. In *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, Felicity Heal recounts the attempted shaming of Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby by members of the Eure clan. The shaming was partially in response to political ambition and religious differences, since Hoby was a Puritan among Catholics. The Eures “decided to visit upon [Hoby] the unusual punishment of an unbidden hunting party made up of the young bloods of the locality, which proceeded to humiliate him in his own home, finally insulting Lady Margaret [Hoby] and doing significant damage to his property” (*Hospitality* 13). Hoby apparently “entertained” the group “to the letter” (Palmer, *Hospitable Performances* 181), but in a subsequent effort to

recover lost honour, Hoby took legal action against his guests in Star Chamber because “the lawes of hospitalite [were] by them [the defendants] so greatly vyolated” (qtd in Heal, *Hospitality* 13).⁴ The Eures claimed in response that Hoby had already been “shamed” because of past “inhospitable and discourteous behavior” and a “lack of generosity to the hunting-party” (Heal, *Hospitality* 13-14). This extreme example exhibits the complexities of the practice of hospitality in early modern England, especially due to the demands of honour, which compel a host to entertain guests, rendering him vulnerable to dishonor from those same guests during their visit.

This incident also indicates that early moderns were quite aware of the complexities of hospitality and able to manipulate the demands and conventions of hospitality to their own ends. This awareness and anxiety surrounding hospitality is also evident in the plays to be considered. In *Edward IV*, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, *The English Traveller* and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Thomas Heywood clearly mines the demands and difficulties of hospitality to drive the drama. In *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, if Wendoll were not welcomed, Anne would not fall. In *The English Traveller*, Young Geraldine maintains an emotional affair with Mrs. Wincott as a frequent guest of Old Wincott, but in order to preserve propriety he begins to stay home, allowing a new guest, Dalavill, to complete Mrs. Wincott’s seduction. In *The Late Lancashire Witches* a community is shaken, not by guests, but by hosts and two competing forms of hospitality. And in *Edward IV* the absolute demands of a kingly guest destroy the lives of

⁴ The visit is recorded, quite briefly, in the diary of Lady Margaret Hoby in the entries of August 27 and 28, 1600. In a note, Dorothy M. Meads provides a more detailed account of the incident, including portions of Sir Thomas Hoby’s complaint, 269-272 n368.

commoners. Furthermore, the elements of hospitality within each play are invigorated by their link to the real concerns of an early modern audience, who really practice hospitality, for whom hospitality is an important social practice, and whose practices are represented and shaped by these plays.⁵

But before I can establish the role of hospitality in these plays, it is important to consider some of the perpetual issues in the works of Thomas Heywood, as well as some characteristics of the plays that I will be examining. For instance, a consideration of criticisms of Heywood's frequent use of multiple plot dramatic structure and an exploration of his frequent focus on the concerns of the middle classes will help to create a fuller discussion of hospitality. Similarly, we must also consider some of the social expectations and practices that existed around hospitality in the early modern period, as well as the material conditions that were a part of hospitable practice. In other words, a detour will help us later illustrate that hospitality becomes complicated both because of its complex structure as a social practice, and because it intersects with many other concerns in the plays. To use one example, hospitality in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* does not begin and end when Frankford invites Wendoll into his home.

⁵ In his essay "Culture," Greenblatt writes of the relation of a literary text and the culture that produced it. He writes that "texts are cultural by virtue of social values and contexts that they have themselves successfully absorbed" (12). This absorption gives texts a 'life' of their own, by encoding them with, what Greenblatt calls, "social energy" (*Shakespearean Negotiations* 6). Social energy is produced "by moving certain things – principally ordinary language but also metaphors, *ceremonies*, dances, emblems, items of clothing, well-worn stories, and so forth – from one culturally demarcated zone to another" (7 emphasis mine), as in the movement from everyday life to the theatre.

Thomas Heywood

It is unfortunate to begin an introduction to Thomas Heywood as an apology, particularly because the apology must often retrace the paths of the former disparaging truisms. Many of the criticisms of Thomas Heywood, however, point to areas in need of development, rather than firmly established evaluations. Escaping such negative evaluations of Heywood as a dramatist is, nevertheless, difficult when the seminal account of Heywood's life and works, A.M. Clark's *Thomas Heywood: Playwright and Miscellanist*, succumbs to unfavourable opinions. At the beginning of his assessment of Heywood's dramatic contributions, A. M. Clark declares that "Heywood is decidedly a poet 'of the second Magnitude'; and he has rightly been called 'the model of a light and rapid talent,' for talent, rather than genius, is the appropriate word" (208). Clark echoes earlier critics and falls in line with others, such as Eugene Oliphant, who state their objections more strongly: "Surveying [Heywood's] work as a whole, we find that he has little creative power, little poetic quality, no subtlety of versification, and generally no ability to breathe in the persons of his drama the breath of life" (46). These damning aesthetic assessments are perhaps due to a tendency to compare Heywood to Shakespeare, a tendency which David Cook suggests begins with Charles Lamb, who quotably called Heywood a "prose Shakespeare" (qtd in Cook 353), an epithet that Oliphant considers "not a fortunate one" because it raises unapproachable expectations. But Oliphant is not completely derogatory, citing as strengths Heywood's "absence of affectation, the moral tone of his work, ... a strong theatrical sense [and] a power of simple pathos" (46). Oliphant, here, establishes the entrenched sides in the Heywood

debate: Heywood may be a second rate poet, but he conveyed clear morals and powerful, if simple, emotion. What some have considered to be Heywood's strengths, however, have not always escaped further criticism, criticisms expressed by none other than T.S. Eliot:

These indisputable plays exhibit what may be called the minimum degree of unity. Similar subject-matter and treatment appear in several; the same stage skill, the same versifying ability. The sensibility is merely that of ordinary people in ordinary life – which is the reason, perhaps, why Heywood is misleadingly called a 'realist.' Behind the motions of his personages, the shadows of the human world, there is no reality of moral synthesis; to inform the verse there is no vision, none of the artist's power to give undefinable unity to the most various material. (Eliot 175)

Eliot captures three main criticisms that must be answered in an examination of Thomas Heywood: a lack of unity within the plays, a concern with (mere) ordinary life, and a lack of elevating artistry.

Several critics address these negative opinions of Heywood, though they usually employ *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, which is already deemed by many to be a "masterpiece" (Hazleton 600) of "superlative excellence" (Oliphant 46), though the praise is often qualified.⁶ The charge that Heywood's plays possess a "minimum degree of unity" (Eliot 175) is perhaps a consequence of his use of multiple plots in nearly a third of his plays, and a critical hypervigilance that plays should "observe Aristotle's dictum" and only "be concerned with one thing" (Townsend 97). But as Richard Levin

⁶ Most criticisms are usually directed at the subplot of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, whose structural relation to the plot is discussed below. A few examples include A.M Clark, who claims that the subplot of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* merely "dilute[s] the Frankford plot" (231); Spencer Hazleton, who finds the subplot "sentimental in the worst of all possible senses" (600); Walter Pritchard Eaton questions the unity, characterization and motivation. The other main focus of criticism is Anne; Henry Hitch Adams finds her "at no point, completely convincing" and claims that her 'fall' is not "adequately motivated" (157).

notes, the “apparently superfluous subplots” of many Renaissance plays are “in fact integral parts of a coherent overall structure possessing a kind of unity not contemplated in the *Poetics*” (3).

Predating Levin, Freda L. Townsend argues convincingly that in the cases of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, *A Challenge for Beautie*, *Fortune by Land and by Sea* and *A Mayden-head Well Lost* Heywood did not merely add sub plots to fill out the length of his plays. Instead he “combined two actions, not indeed into the Aristotelian unity, but into a varied whole in which one action complimented or complicated the other” (Townsend 110). Townsend argues that in these plays by Heywood the double plots either “complement each other” for the sake of a central theme, or there is a “cause and effect relationship” between the plots (99), with *A Woman Killed with Kindness* belonging to the former category. Townsend also discusses *The English Traveller* and *The Captives*, whose plots, she admits, seem to have “no thematic or causal relationship” (99), but in the case of *The English Traveller* she argues for the artfulness of Heywood’s management of the two plots. Claiming that if they are not united, they are at least artfully managed, Townsend attempts to refute another common criticism of Heywood.

Michel Grivelet begins where Townsend leaves off and argues that the two plots of *The English Traveller* engage with two complementary themes, which the title of the play hints towards. In summary, the two plots each revolve around a young man. One young man, Young Lionel, lives a prodigal lifestyle at home while his father is away travelling, and when his father returns Young Lionel tries to elaborately hide his

prodigality. In the ‘main plot,’ the other young man, Young Geraldine, returns from his own travels to re-enter and then exit his former social circle because of his unseemly friendship with his friend’s wife, Mrs. Wincott, only to have her ‘betray’ him with another friend. In light of these two developments, Grivelet claims that “the house idea is as essential to Young Lionel as its counterpart, the travel idea, is to Young Geraldine. And both plots, through similitude and contrast, fall within the same perspective” (59). Following Grivelet and Townsend, I hope to indicate that the multiple plots of both *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller* may be linked through other themes, specifically a concern with hospitality, and thereby to reinforce the dramatic unity of these two plays and provide more evidence for the richness of Heywood’s artistry.

The plots of the other two plays that will be discussed in this study are not divided as strictly as in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*. *The Late Lancashire Witches* contains two families, the Generouses and the Seelys, who have their respective story lines. The Generous story primarily revolves around the night-time activities of Mistress Generous, who happens to lead a community coven of witches, while Master Generous is an upstanding member of the conventional community. The Seely plot follows an inversion of the Seely’s familial and domestic hierarchy, where the father “in all obedience kneels unto his son” (*LLW* 1.1.255) and the mother “presumes not in the daughter’s sight/ without a prepared curtsy” (257-8). The son and daughter defer also to the former “maid” and “groom,” their new masters (261, 264). But these two plots are almost singular because they combine two of Townsend’s proposed plot

relations, since the plots “complement each other” to “illustrate some central theme,” in this case the dangers of unordered or inverted social relations, and a “cause and effect relationship” (99) between the plots because the witchcraft of Mrs. Generous and her coven is suspected (*LLW* 1.1.269), and later revealed at Lawrence and Parnell’s wedding (3.1), to be the real source of disruption of the Seely family.

The plots of *The Late Lancashire Witches* are not vastly unrelated, but some critics have still questioned its dramatic unity, partially due to speculation about the respective contributions of Heywood and his collaborator, Richard Brome. James Wallace assumes that “Heywood wrote the spectacles of witch mischief and ancient village ritual, and Brome wrote about the inversion of social order in the Seely household” (vi). But aside from authorial concerns, the primary attraction, and issue of contention, in *The Late Lancashire Witches* is the “spectacles of witch mischief” (vi), with “spectacles” often taking on a pejorative connotation. Perhaps the earliest response to the play is by one Nathaniel Tomkyns, who claims that “though there be not in it [...] any poetickall Genius, or art, or language [...], or application to vertue,” it is still an “excellent new play,” which is full of “ribaldrie,” “fopperies to provoke laughter,” and “divers songs and dances” (qtd in Findlay 150). Aside from a recent edition of the play by Helen Ostovich, the witchcraft in the play has rarely been viewed as a serious contribution to the play as a whole in subsequent analyses. For instance, Robert Reed calls many of the “notions of witchcraft” that are contained in *The Late Lancashire Witches* “exaggerated or grossly distorted” (186). These distortions supposedly “stress the sensational aspects of the [witch] trial” that provided much of the play’s material

(187). The last straw for Reed is the servant Lawrence's "mysteriously removed" genitals, which show that Heywood and Brome "were not concerned with serious drama" (187). Anthony Harris' 1980 commentary, fifteen years after Reed's, comes to a similar conclusion, asserting that *The Late Lancashire Witches* "is comparable with the popular ballads whose appearances coincided with the more sensational cases of the period," which were "padded out with a rag-bag miscellany of stock folklore material" (178). Both Reed and Harris, unfortunately, fall in line with a general critical undervaluing of Heywood's dramatic artistry in the other plays that we have discussed so far.⁷

But though the witchcraft in *The Late Lancashire Witches* certainly provides elements of comedy and spectacle to the play, it is not irrelevant, thematically, to the rest of the play. Instead, the actions of the witches are not generally disruptive, but rather specific, symbolic actions that provide a counterpoint to the values of the larger community. *The Late Lancashire Witches* is relevant to this study because of the kind of witchcraft that occurs as well as the targets of the witches. Far from being a "rag-bag miscellany" (178), the witches' efforts all invert rituals of hospitality, as well as the social and economic structures within the community that support hospitality.

As in the case of *The Late Lancashire Witches*, the critical interest in *Edward IV* has focused primarily on one aspect of the play. In the former play, real 'witches' of Lancashire provided the inspiration for the dramatic events. Similarly, *Edward IV* exploits the popularity of a 'real' figure in the person of Jane Shore, the mistress of Edward who fell out of royal favour when Richard III ascended to the throne. The critics,

⁷ They also provide a cautionary example for the critic who is looking for a play's "connection with the historical events" (Harris 178), an example relevant to the current study.

no doubt like Heywood's early modern audiences, often find Jane Shore to be the most interesting aspect of the play.⁸ The Jane Shore plot, indeed, relegates King Edward IV himself to a supporting role, and his meeting with the Tanner of Tamworth and his campaign in France become mere theatrical digressions. The attention that Heywood bestows upon Mistress Shore, and her "virtual canonization" (Stirling 166), is all the more notable because she, the focus of this chronicle history, is a tradesman's wife elevated to a tragic heroine. This elevation is made possible, according to Henry Hitch Adams, because "she possesses virtues in a higher degree than other persons of any social class," having an "eminence of character" instead of an "eminence of birth" (95).

Heywood also places character over birth more generally throughout the play, and chooses to highlight the "sentimental trials of ordinary people" (Bevington 242). Aside from Jane Shore's goodness and generosity as a royal mistress, the prentices of London become heroes early in the play when they defeat threatening rebels "without the assistance of their ling'ring king" (*IE* 9.66). Furthermore, social mobility occurs based on merit and hard work, as in the example of Mayor Crosby who was a foundling. Matthew Shore even resists Edward's efforts to 'gentle his condition' after valorous combat (9.229-239), though others, like the Mayor, do not have similar objections.

⁸ Richard Helgerson closely considers the development of, and differing emotional responses to, the figure of Jane Shore while defending Heywood's characterization of her ("Weeping for Jane Shore," *Adulterous Alliances*, 33-56). D.F. Rowan, though he has a somewhat negative assessment of Heywood's *Edward IV*, provides an earlier survey of Jane Shore and the works that she has inspired ("Shore's Wife," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 6.3 (Summer, 1966): 447-464). For an examination of how Heywood's Jane Shore fits into the complaint tradition see Richard Danson Brown's "'A Talkatiue Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted In)': Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint," (*The Review of English Studies* 49.196 (1998): 395-415).

The prominent virtue and valor of commoners distinguishes *Edward IV* from Shakespearean history plays, as Jean Howard argues. But Howard, responding to Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood*, cautions that Heywood's emphasis on the middle-class is not necessarily a virtue in and of itself, and the commons are not "inherently egalitarian or politically progressive" (137). Heywood is also not "inclusive in any simple sense," since the monarch and aristocracy are "peripheralized" (145), while Heywood also "criminalizes [...] the poorest members of the commonwealth" (150), creating a "differently exclusive" England than Shakespeare (149).

In her description of the middle-class values at the heart of *Edward IV*, Jean Howard describes Heywood's history as "domesticated," and "serving the interests of a social group whose identity was bound up with the household as a site of work and affective life" (141). Here we can see that the middle class values of *Edward IV* also extend to the other texts in this study that are more clearly domestic in nature.⁹ This chronicle history's relevance to our study of hospitality is also based in its domesticity, and the invasion of state affairs into the home, which often use the language of hospitality or occur in situations of hospitality. For instance, while laying siege to London, Smoke describes the rebels as "a troop of travelers,/ that fix their eyes upon a furnished feast [London]" (*IE* 3.81-2), while Falconbridge threatens to sleep with Jane "in [Matthew Shore's] own house" (4.47), figuring a threat to the state as a domestic invasion. That threat finds fulfillment when Jane succumbs to Edward, who lays his own "violent siege"

⁹ An affinity for middle class values is perhaps a distinctive mark of much of Heywood's work. In *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, Louis B. Wright calls Heywood a "spokesman, and at times the propagandist, of concepts common to the middle class" (637). In "Heywood and the Popularizing of History," Wright argues that Heywood also strove to make his non-dramatic works accessible to the populace.

(19.10) and “intrude[s] like an unbidden guest” (19.78), ultimately destroying the Shore household. In *Edward IV*, and arguably in the other texts I will consider, the home and the state are irrevocably intertwined. But again I begin to gesture at things too far ahead. Before we can discuss the further significance of the home as a stage for hospitality, we must define the central term of this study – hospitality – as it was understood and practiced in the early modern period.

Early Modern Hospitality

In *The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England*, Felicity Heal cites George Wheler’s 1698 definition of hospitality from his pamphlet entitled *The Protestant Monastery*. Wheler claims that hospitality is the “Liberal Entertainment of all sorts of Men, at ones House, whether Neighbour or Strangers, with kindness, especially with Meat, Drink and Lodgings. Hospitality is an excellent Christian practice” (qtd in “Idea” 66). Heal cites Wheler’s definition because it clearly indicates the primary features of hospitality that are found in other sources: the intended recipients, the location, the materials, and the basis. Heal expands upon this definition, writing that a host should welcome all guests “regardless of social status or acquaintance” (“Idea” 67), and noting that the home is the primary location for this welcome. According to Heal, hospitality is a “household activity” (67) that centres upon the “goods best afforded by [the home] – food, drink and accommodation” (67), but particularly a “communal meal” (87). Lastly, the justification for hospitality, at least in many of the pamphlets, is that it is a “Christian practice,” indicating that the practice of hospitality had moral and ideological value.

Wheler's 1698 definition is somewhat removed from the publication dates of our plays, but Wheler, in fact, appears near the conclusion of a period of heightened concern about hospitality. According to Heal, the period between "the 1580s and the 1630s" saw an extraordinary "proliferation of comment and advice" about hospitality (68). The plays considered in this study appeared within this period. *Edward IV* (1599), our earliest play, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603) appear near the midpoint of this period, while our latest plays, *The English Traveller* (1633) and *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634), appear near the end of this period of intense interest. Because the plays bracket the latter half of this period they provide an excellent sample of the social concerns of the period, as well as indicating changes over the period. For example, the latter plays deal more evidently with hospitality, which may reflect the intensification of interest in hospitality in the period.

George Wheler's definition of hospitality also implicitly defines *who* may practice hospitality. Because a host is enjoined to provide "*Liberal* Entertainment of all sorts of Men" (qtd in "Idea" 66, emphasis mine), few could afford the *ideal* of open hospitality. Hospitality was expected from all levels of society, and all were advised to "give entertainment within their means" (Heal "Idea" 69), but open and generous hospitality was primarily the province of the "rich and especially the landowning elite" (69). Hospitality was associated with the wealthy due to practical concerns, but it was also ideologically associated with the gentry and nobility because of "an intimate connection between gentility and good housekeeping" (69). The performance of hospitality, then,

was also a mark of social status and gentility, a way for the host to “dramatize his generosity, and thereby reveal his hegemony” (Heal, *Hospitality* 6).

A host’s hospitality also requires a guest. The relation of host and guest is, however, a complicated one, largely *because* of the connection between performed social status and hospitality. The literature concerned with hospitality, according to Heal, displays an “almost ludicrous obsession with rank and degree,” which is manifested in proscriptions regarding the “seating of each social group at table,” and the “reception of strangers” (12).¹⁰ The rules surrounding hospitality ensure the proper relation between host and guest, based on considerations such as comparative social status. Even the stage of hospitality, the home, expressed “hierarchical values,” since the structure of the home provided both “social as well as physical demarcators” (29). But at the same time, guests also fell under the protection of the host. Heal gives the example of Henry Neville, who resisted the arrest of his guest because of a host’s responsibility to protect “not only his family, ‘but also [...] their friends sojourning or abiding with them by way of hospitality’” (7).

Hospitable responsibility also extends beyond the home to the larger community, since part of a host’s “responsibility was to care for the poor” (Heal, “Idea” 75). What we would now call charity was often subsumed under the term ‘hospitality,’ indeed hospitality could often strictly refer only to acts of charity. For instance in *Christian Hospitalitie Handled Common-Place-Wise* (1632), Caleb Dalechamp writes:

Hospitalitie falsly so called is the keeping of a good table, at which seldom or never any other are entertained than kinsfolk, friends and able

¹⁰ Heal here points to an example from the 1440s: John Russell’s *Book of Nature*.

neighbours [...] This is not hospitalitie, though it be commonly graced with that title, but it is good fellowship or some such like thing. (qtd in Heal, “Idea” 75)

Dalechamp’s criticisms illustrate the disparity between early modern and modern expectations for hospitality. In the modern west, “kinsfolk, friends and able neighbours” are the most welcome and expected guests, but Dalechamp claims that *restricting* hospitality to these categories is not hospitality at all, a strange proposition for moderns. But though hospitality was often prescribed for the benefit of the poor, “moderate entertainment of peers was accepted even by strict Protestant authors” (Heal, “Idea” 77). On multiple levels, then, hospitality was a way of “strengthening community” (78) between family, friends, foreigners and other members of the larger community, and it is this fact that is most relevant to our study. Though the characters within the plays are primarily of the gentle class, class differences are significant in a variety of hospitable interactions, particularly in *Edward IV* and *The Late Lancashire Witches*. In these cases, and throughout the study, it is important to remember that hospitality was an extremely significant component of the social fabric of a community, both greasing the wheels of social intercourse, and performing a role that is in some ways analogous to modern social welfare.

If open hospitality supported a gentleman’s identity as a gentleman, helping to distinguish him from lower classes, and if hospitality played a significant role in the formation of social bonds between individuals within communities, then it should be no surprise that English ideas about hospitality extended again, beyond local communities, and were an important part of English national identity. According to Heal, the English

held a high view of their own hospitality, resulting in proclamations, such as Laurence Humphrey's, that the English "have bene ever counted the chief honourers of straungers" (71). Furthermore, the English "regularly," and favourably, compared their hospitality to other European nations (71), and Heal notes that when receiving strangers from other countries there was a "concern for the collective reputation of the realm" (*Hospitality* 11). Therefore, when we speak of hospitality in the plays, we are also addressing a fundamental component of English identity, and the hospitality that is offered and received may be reflective of the nation as a whole.

The Home

As I have defined hospitality and its significance in early modern England, I have progressed through a set of expanding 'homes' that, in part, define themselves by their hospitality and define themselves against foreigners. But moving back down the chain, we return to the fundamental stage and setting of hospitality – the household – where most of the hospitable interactions of our plays take place and where we can begin our examination of how hospitality operates in each play.

Since hospitality was a way for the host to "dramatize his generosity, and thereby reveal his hegemony" (Heal, *Hospitality* 6), and since the stage of this drama is the household, it should not be surprising that in each of the plays in this study households, houses, and what houses represent are important to the dramatic development and the characters themselves. In his 1624 *Elements of Architecture*, Henry Wotton outlines the significance of the home:

Every mans proper Mansion house and home, being the theatre of his Hospitality, the seat of self-fruition, the Comfortablest part of his own life, the Noblest of his sons inheritance, a kind of private principedom; Nay to the Possessors thereof and Epitome of the whole World; may well deserve by these Attributes, according to the degree of the master, to be decently and delightfully adorned. (qtd in Heal, *Hospitality* 6)

Wooten draws attention to four important elements of the home that also concern our plays: the role of the house in hospitality as performance; the analogy between home and state, since a home is a “principedom”; the importance of a home as inheritance and link between generations; and the identity between the master and the home, which should be “adorned” because of the many “attributes” of a house that are all based upon the relation of the house to the master. There are a few implications for our study that can be drawn from Wooten’s description of the home. First, in our consideration of hospitality, we must recognize that the home is inseparable from the practice of hospitality, being the “theatre” of hospitable practice. As a part of the drama of hospitality, the physical structure of houses was “well arranged to express [...] hierarchical values” (*Hospitality* 29). The typical arrangement of a house, which was by no means universal, consisted of a kitchen, buttery, and pantry at one end of the home, separated from the great hall by a screens passage. The great hall itself contained a dais, for further demarcation, and was more fully divided from the Great Chamber and other private rooms. The house, therefore, physically enforces hierarchical divisions and allows geographic gradations in status, such as where in the house a guest might eat. The door to the house and the gate to the estate are also significant boundaries in the practice of hospitality, since the gate marks the “immediate limit of the lord’s territory,” and because the gate performed an important filtering function: entrance by the gate usually “implied acceptance into the

house” (30). At the gate the poor might also receive food “with rituals as formal, if not as elaborate, as those associated with the reception of the nobility” (33). Heal notes that “the hierarchical system could also be presented dynamically as the guest moved from gate to hall to chamber” escorted by their host (32), a “chamber usher [or] an usher or marshal for the hall” (31). Guests of higher status were brought closer to the host, while the poor and needy may be given food at the gate.

The structure of the home enclosed a space that was heavily inscribed by ideology. For instance, according to Wooten, a house is a “private principedom” (qtd in *Hospitality* 6). The analogy between state and household was common and earlier expressed by John Dod and Robert Cleaver, who claim that “a household is as it were a little commonwealth” (qtd in Orlin 85).¹¹ With this analogy in mind it may be possible to read a view of the state in the domestic situations in our four plays, and in the ways that the households are threatened.¹²

Wooten also notes a home’s value in a “sons inheritance [sic]” (qtd in *Hospitality* 6), which is a major concern in three of the plays that we are considering. The concern for a house and the lineal value with which it is imbued takes its most troubling form in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. After embracing bankruptcy to avoid selling his family’s last house, Mountford offers his sister Susan to “satisfy the debt” (14.75) to Acton, who paid for his release from debtor’s prison. For Mountford, the “virgin title” of his lineal home that had “never yet [been] deflowered” (7.24) holds more value than his sister’s

¹¹ From Dod and Cleaver’s *Godly Form of Household Government* (1598)

¹² Orlin herself argues that making a householder a patriarch of a “little commonwealth” is a way for “monarchic government” to “naturalize itself” (86).

honour. Though Mountford's concern for his home is bewildering to modern audiences, it indicates how serious the violation of the integrity of Frankford's home is in the other plot; the symbolic implications of Anne and Wendoll's adultery are at least as important as the adultery itself.

In addition to the Mountford plot in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, a concern for preserving householding status and the precarious transition of a house from father to son hovers in the background of both *The Late Lancashire Witches* and *The English Traveller*. In *The Late Lancashire Witches*, Arthur asks Master Generous to lend money to solve a troubling financial situation involving "a Manor, the best part of [his] estate,/ mortgag'd to one slips no advantages" that he wishes to "have redeem'd" (1.1.223-5). Generous agrees to supply the security on the condition that the papers of the agreement remain in his possession, "else how should I secure my own estate?" (1.1.233). Arthur's efforts to save his home are caught between both plots: Arthur must seek out Generous's help through the social bonds created by hospitality because his kinship bonds with Seely have been disrupted by the Lancashire witches' witchcraft. Gregory, the son of Seely, has "prevented" (1.2.81) his father from helping Arthur, who is Seely's nephew. The inversion of the Seely household allows the son, Gregory, to dictate his own interests to his father. Gregory emphasizes his prior claim, as a son, to the assets of the Seely estate, and questions Seely's fatherly concern if he will "enter in bonds for his nephew, so to endanger [the son's] estate to redeem [the nephew's] mortgage" (1.2.77-8).

Arthur and Gregory's concern to maintain their status as potential or current householders speaks to the importance of a house and household as a signifier of

masculine status in early modern society. In her discussion of early modern definitions of manhood, Alexandra Shepherd claims, “in the patriarchal framework of evaluation, to be of worth as a man presupposed a degree of economic independence,” a form of status that is secured by householding (206). Shepherd uses the term householder to refer to married men, since “marriage was privileged as the primary bond upon which a household was founded” (70).¹³ The term household, therefore, primarily refers to a social grouping as opposed to a structural space. The house is, however, an implicit requirement for a household to exist, and criticisms directed against unmarried – that is, non-householding – men equated them to “fugitive persone[s]” who had “noe place to abide in” (qtd in Shepherd 206). In other words, managing a household secured a man to a place via the home that housed his household. Within masculine identities, therefore, there existed a division between stable, householding men and impermanent journeymen. Merry Wiesner, examining journeymen in early modern Germany, identifies an alternative masculine identity that was available to men who did not have access to the more conventional status markers of marriage and householding. According to Wiesner: “Transience, prodigality, physical bravery, and comradliness made one a true man among journeymen, in sharp contrast to the master’s virtues of thrift, reliability, and stability” (qtd in Shepherd 210-11). This distinction is documented clearly in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* where Frankford exits “into the hall” (1.75) while the group of householding but unmarried men “reconstitutes itself through the hawking challenge” (Orlin 143). In

¹³ Keeping in mind the primacy of marriage in the formation of a household, the marriage of Lawrence and Parnell in *The Late Lancashire Witches* becomes a logical necessity. The two servants had “been in love these three years” (1.2.210), but as the new heads of the inverted household they “mu’ [must] wed” (213).

The Late Lancashire Witches, the social bonds of the young men are fostered through their “hunting” (1.1.1 sd; 2.4.21) and jeering Whetstone for being a “bastard” (2.4.37).

Young Lionel, in *The English Traveller*, is a similar example, being a non-householding male who attempts to gain masculine status as a “prince of prodigality, and the very Caesar of all young citizens” (2.1.80-1). Young Lionel, later, even pretends to have actually secured a home of his own. In the absence of his father, Young Lionel, along with his servants and guests, misspends his “hours/ in drunken surfeits,” and loses his “days in sleep” and the “nights in revels” (1.2.21-3). Concurrent with the return of Old Lionel, Young Lionel must face his debts on the “borrowed money to supply [his] prodigal expenses” (3.2.4-5). In order to convince Old Lionel to pay the debt, Young Lionel’s servant, Reignald, claims that the son has purchased “land and houses” (3.2.84) with the money that his father had supplied before his travels (3.2.72-4). Instead of an inverted parable of the prodigal son, Reignald gives the impression that Young Lionel has enacted a version of the parable of the talents by purchasing the home of the neighbouring Ricott (3.2.110).¹⁴ Young Lionel is entirely dependent upon his father for financial security, since he lives on money that his father provides while away, much like the significant cohort of young males in the other three plays who are dependent upon their fathers and other more established men for economic aid. Such men include the previously mentioned Arthur, who needs Generous’ assistance to retain his mortgage, and Gregory, who waits to acquire the family estate while still living under his father’s roof.

¹⁴ The parable of the Prodigal Son can be found in Luke 15:11-32. The parable of the talents, which discusses two servants’ prudent investment and a third servant’s imprudent investment during their master’s absence, can be found in Matthew 25:14-28. A comparable parable also occurs in Luke 19:11-28.

But within *The English Traveller*, even Young Geraldine, who has been made a “complete gentleman” (1.1.21) from his travel experience, is still dependent upon his father. Young Geraldine still lives with his father and, in response to Dalavill’s insinuations of an affair with Wincott’s wife, becomes occupied by “occasions/ Of weighty and important consequence/ Such as concern the best of [his father’s] estate” (3.1.129-131) that often draw him to “London” (3.3.30). Unsurprisingly, Arthur and Geraldine are frequently guests in the respective homes of the more established Generous and Wincott, since they lack the means and setting to be hosts themselves.¹⁵ Old Geraldine once hosts Wincott, Wincott’s wife, Dalavill and Prudentilla, but though they share a home, Old Geraldine, not his son, is the “noble host” (3.1.35) to whom the guests are “bound .../ For this great entertainment” (3.1.1). Young Geraldine’s status as a non-householder, because he is both unmarried and dependant upon his father, shows the seriousness of his oath to Wincott’s wife. Her infidelity with Dalavill, breaking both her marriage vow to Wincott and her oath to Young Geraldine, leaves Young Geraldine “sworn to be a stale/ for terms of life” (5.1.169); that is, he must remain unmarried, forfeiting the full status of manhood. The situation of Wendoll also provides a parallel to Arthur and Young Geraldine, since Frankford describes him as one “of small means, yet a gentleman/ of a good house, somewhat pressed by want” (*WK* 4.31-2). In three plays, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, *The English Traveller* and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, younger gentlemen who are in financial straits or who lack households and financial

¹⁵ Mayor Crosby in *1 Edward IV* also falls into this category, claiming that a wife is a necessary component of the practice of hospitality when preparing for a visit from King Edward, when he laments that he is a “widower,/ And lack[s] a Lady Mayoress in such need” (16.39-40)

independence are welcomed into the homes of more established gentlemen.

Interestingly, in two cases, Generous and Wincott, the older gentlemen who lack heirs instate their young guests into an inheritance (*LLW* 5.5.142-4; *ET* 5.1.256-8). Generous and Wincott formalize the social ties created by hospitality and confer manhood upon formerly financially dependent gentlemen by bestowing their property.

The hosts in these plays are often as defined by their possession of homes and households as their young guests are by their lack of a household. The early modern period, as Kari Boyd McBride notes, was a time of “perceived rapid social and economic change [where] legitimacy became increasingly performative” (48). Many householders had only recently become wealthy and then, as now, great houses helped “demonstrate their wealth and their position” (49). But in addition to the signification of status that a house denotes, what distinguishes the hosts most firmly from their young guests, who, like Arthur, may own houses, is that the hosts are married. An unmarried man who may own a home is, according to Cornelius Agrippa’s *De sacramento matrimonii*, like “a stranger in his inn” because he “hath not settled a house” (qtd in Orlin 150). Just as the structure of a house speaks to the owner’s status in society, the management of the household, including his wife, also reflects upon the character of the householder. McBride cites Lorna Hutson to claim that “‘supervision of wife and household’ are inseparable from each other and are ‘synechdoches’ for noble praxis” (5). If a man failed to manage his household or his wife, as the husbands in the four Heywood plays do, then he was “doubly culpable,” being “condemned for the forfeiture of [his] authority over others as well as over [himself]” (Shepherd 73). Peter Stallybrass makes a related point in

his discussion of *Othello*, when he claims that “through marriage, the woman’s honor, like her property, is incorporated into her husband’s” (137).¹⁶ The masculinity, honour and social position of our householders –Frankford, Mountford, Generous, Seely, Wincott, Old Lionel, Matthew Shore – is therefore at stake when their wives stray or they lose control of their household, since “heading a household ... was often equated with manhood itself” and was often a “precondition of men’s political involvement” (70). The practice of hospitality in society and in these plays is a way of demonstrating social status, where householders engage in a “performance of legitimacy” (McBride 48), but at the moment that their legitimacy and status is most displayed they are also most at risk. Most hosts in our plays witness the dissolution of their household, the symbol of their masculinity and social status, due to their open hospitality, which was also supposed to define their masculine social status.

Unfortunately for the hosts in our four plays, part of a husband’s maintenance of a household, and therefore part of his prescribed role as a man, included the “dutie” to “travel abroad, to seeke living” (qtd in Shepherd 76).¹⁷ In our plays, the husband is ever pulled away from the home, and his absence opens the door to infidelity after the husband has opened the door to his guest. For instance in *Edward IV*, after Edward has met Jane Shore as a guest at the mayor’s dinner (16.84-5), he first attempts to seduce Jane when she “attend[s] the shop [herself]” (17.11) and while Matthew Shore is “in

¹⁶ Shepherd claims that this transferral of honour usually reflected positively upon married men, and married men, as a result, “had a greater claim to trustworthiness,” since, in one view, “honesty was the ‘portion’ which men ‘get by their wives’ (73-4)

¹⁷ From Dod and Cleaver’s *A Godly Form of Housholde Government*; Linda Woodbridge clarifies, though, that this dictate “would have applied rather narrowly, mainly to traveling merchants.” Rather, she claims, “most early modern workers did not commute” (162).

Cheapside” (17.17). Shore’s goldsmith shop is a symbol of Matthew Shore’s financial independence, his trade, and, therefore, his status in society, much like the houses are for characters in *The Late Lancashire Witches*, *The English Traveller*, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. *A Woman Killed with Kindness* contains a household seduction during Frankford’s absence that forms a type from which the other plays diverge, either by occurring outside the home, during the absence of a character who is not the husband, or by not involving seduction. In *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Wendoll seduces Anne when Frankford is “riding out of town” (6.62). Frankford later uses the prospect of his absence to entrap the adulterous couple, claiming:

I have a matter to be tried tomorrow
By eight o’clock, and my attorney writes me¹⁸
I must be there betimes with evidence
Or it will go against me. Where’s my boots? (11.53-6)

Frankford insists that he must ride that night, and entreats Wendoll to “use/ The very ripest pleasure of [his] house” in his “absence” (63-4). Of course, Wendoll takes this opportunity to “sup” in Anne’s “private chamber” (91-2), and they are both later discovered by Frankford “close in each other’s arms” (13.42).

The Late Lancashire Witches also acknowledges the dangers of a husband’s absence. When the young gallants are shown their ‘true’ fathers by witchcraft, it turns out that they have all been illegitimately sired while their supposed fathers were away at the “Lancaster ‘sizes” (4.5.39)¹⁹, “hunting” (58), or engaged in “business at the Lord President’s court in York” (71-2). Master Generous’ household in *The Late Lancashire*

¹⁸ The letter purportedly comes from the city of York (11.47), a detail important to the later argument.

¹⁹ Lancaster Assizes

Witches is also vulnerable when he is absent. Mistress Generous, for instance, meets with her fellow witches “commonly when [Master Generous is] abroad, and sometimes/ When you are full of business at home” (2.2.95-6). The meeting of the witches that occurs in the play also occurs while Master Generous is called away on “some business that may hold [him] for two days” (4.2.222). Mistress Generous is similarly able to perform her witchcraft as a part of her performance of hospitality in the Generous home, when she and Whetstone invite the young gallants to dinner and show them their illegitimate fathers, because Master Generous is “pack’d out of town” (4.4.31). Witchcraft in the Lancashire community thrives in Master Generous’ absence. During and perhaps due to his absence, the Lancashire witches are able to disrupt other households, such as the Seelys, and corrupt the hospitality of Generous’ own household. Like Frankford, Master Generous is often drawn from his home on business, which is an expected part of a husband’s role. But Master Generous is also drawn from his home by a desire for the city of London and the products that it offers. Master Generous remembers when he and Robin “drunk last term in London at the Mitre/ In fleet Street,” where they imbibed, what Generous calls, “the very spirit of the grape,/ Mere quintessence of wine” (2.2.136-9). Drawn to London to do business during the “last term,” Master Generous becomes more connected to the capital through his desire for a London product. Describing Generous’ thirst for the wine, Robin admits, “since he/ was last at London and tasted the divinity of the/ Mitre, scarce any liquor in Lancashire will go/ down with him” (2.6.14-17). The community and the household are both vulnerable when Master Generous is absent, and

so it should be no surprise that Moll Spencer's witchcraft encourages Master Generous' connection to the capital, allowing Robin to "fetch [the wine] from London" (3.2.4).

In *The English Traveller*, London also appears as a destination for Young Geraldine. After Dalavill has suggested that an affair with Wincott's wife is behind Young Geraldine's tendency to "absent himself from home" (3.1.58). Young Geraldine protests when confronted that "never from her lips/ came unchaste kiss, or from her constant eye/ look savouring of the least immodesty" (3.2.228-230), but in order to assure the "firm credit" of Young Geraldine's claims (232), Old Geraldine asks his son to "forbear the house" of Wincott (237). No longer a guest at Wincott's home, Young Geraldine must take his business for his father "much abroad/ at London, or elsewhere," because it is "term" and "lawyers must be followed; seldom at home,/ and scarcely then at leisure" (3.3.30-2). And though Wincott is absent from his own bed "of purpose" to meet Young Geraldine (4.3.80-1), which enables Dalavill and Wincott's wife to share a "sweet night" (4.4.2), in a larger sense Young Geraldine's absence, not Wincott's, allows the affair between Dalavill and Wincott's wife. *The English Traveller* also portrays other kinds of household vulnerabilities that arise from a householder's absence. Indeed, Old Lionel's absence while he "merchandised abroad" (3.2.86) is the precondition for Young Lionel's prodigality and household misrule, which form the substance of an entire plotline.

All four plays derive negative effects from a householder's absence, even though, as has been noted, part of a husband's role included the "dutie" to "travel abroad, to seeke living" (qtd in Shepherd 76). Most of the householders in our plays are, indeed,

absent due to business or legal affairs: Matthew Shore is “in Cheapside” (*IE* 17.17), the home of “Goldsmiths’ Row” (17n); Generous too goes away on “some business” (*LLW* 4.2.222); the legitimate fathers of the young gallants in *The Late Lancashire Witches* are cuckolded while away on legal business at the “Lancaster ‘sizes” (4.5.39) or engaged “at the Lord President’s court in York” (71-2); Old Lionel “merchandised abroad” (*ET* 3.2.86); Young Geraldine visits “London” for legal matters (3.3.30); and Frankford purports to be drawn to “York” (*WK* 11.47) by a message from his “attorney” (54). In the plays that are not located in a city, the husband’s business often draws them to cities, such as London, Lancaster or York. These three plays may be taking part in contemporary fears that the “pull of the metropolis” was responsible “for the failure to exercise traditional social responsibilities,” such as hospitality and charity (Heal, “Idea” 82). The concern about the draw of London and the consequent lapse in hospitality is even expressed by the English monarchy. In 1603, James I, among other monarchs, made repeated proclamations for landowners to return to their homes in the country in order to practice hospitality, “whereby the reliefe of the poorer sort of people is taken away, who had from such Houses much comfort and ease towards their living” (qtd in McBride 97).²⁰ But providing for the poor was not the only concern that surrounding a ‘decay of hospitality.’ Heal notes that “writers at the turn of the sixteenth century frequently remarked that the flight to London involved the breaking up of the gentry household”

²⁰ McBride notes that other proclamations of James I that concern hospitality and the return to the country occur in 1614, 1615, 1617, 1622, 1623 and 1624 (96). McBride refers to Larkin and Hughes’ *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, in which they show that other monarchs before and after James I made similar proclamations related to hospitality (96 n10).

(“Idea” 88-9), an effect that parallels the broken households in these four Heywoodian plays once hospitality has been transgressed.

In the early modern period it was “firmly held that the English had fallen from some previous standard of domestic excellence”; however, Heal clarifies that “good housekeeping has always been believed to be in decline and the golden age of the good host has always just disappeared” (80). Heal also claims, though, that the marked increase of comment on hospitality in the period between 1580 to 1630, which contains our plays, indicates that writers of the period were “acutely aware” that they were “living through a period of major social change occasioned both by immediate economic difficulties and by the shifting attitudes of the élite” (80). The latter two plays, *The English Traveller* and *The Late Lancashire Witches* express both an anxiety about the decay of hospitality and an awareness of social change that Heal locates in other contemporary sources. In the *Late Lancashire Witches*, for instance, Arthur praises Master Generous with that claim that “without flattery/ you may be call’d the sole surviving son/ of long since banish’d hospitality” (1.1.191-3).²¹ Similar sentiments are applied in *The English Traveller* to Young Lionel by Roger, a servant of Wincott and a clown. After a long, and punning, description of the revelry and feasting at Young Lionel’s house, Roger declares that “His guests are fed by the belly, and beggars served/ at his gate in baskets. He’s the adamant of this age, the daffodil/ of these days, the prince of prodigality, and the very Caesar of all young citizens” (2.1.78-80). The irony of Roger’s high praise for admittedly prodigal revelry becomes a critique of the state of English society. *A Woman Killed with Kindness*,

²¹ This statement also, perhaps, invokes the lineal and legitimating properties of householding, of which hospitality was an important expression.

The English Traveller and *The Late Lancashire Witches*, particularly, express anxiety about a householder's absence by the serious social effects that occur during a householder's absence. In *The Late Lancashire Witches*, witchcraft flourishes during the absence of the "sole surviving son" of hospitality (1.1.191-3). The audience, observing what happens when true hospitality is temporarily absent, has a chance to see the state of country society if hospitality were to completely disappear. The absence of householders and the related decay of hospitality, either among hosts or guests in these three plays, are also seemingly the cause of the dissolution of whole households, and in the case of Young Lionel in *The English Traveller* throwing neighbours and whole communities into confusion due to Reignald's attempts to cover up Young Lionel's prodigality.

The importance of preserving hospitality in the country house is further emphasized in *The Late Lancashire Witches*, where the witches choose to feast in a socially marginal space, instead of a household. After the witches disrupt the wedding of Lawrence and Parnell in 3.1, they gather in what "looks like an old barn" (4.1.5-6) to feast upon "all the cheer that was prepar'd to grace/ the wedding feast" (28-9). The abnormality of hospitality in this marginal space becomes evident through the barn's, quite literal, inverse relation to a house. The witches, for instance, do not retrieve food and drink from a "cellar" (2.2.129), as in Master Generous' home. Instead, the wine stolen from "merchant's cellars" (64), is pulled down "from above" on "ropes," along with "meats," "plates and vessels" (64 sd; 56 sd; 67 sd; 71 sd). As we shall later observe, the inverted space of the barn is part of a larger motif of the witches' inverted hospitality that may be both socially dangerous and redemptive.

Just as the location and space of the witches' barn in *The Late Lancashire Witches* shapes, and is shaped by, the kind of hospitality that is offered in the space, the structures and materials of hospitality, such as gates and chambers, influence the practice of hospitality in each play. Household structures and a householder's relation to them become more significant because householders are identifiable with their houses, as Heal points out: "the household in some measure *was* its head, its behavior the physical presentation of the attributes of the man" (*Hospitality* 7, emphasis given). This identification between house and householder underlies the familiar form of the country house poem, which praises "the virtue of the lord of the estate (usually defined by his hospitality) through a description of the virtuously husbanded house, lands, and women" (McBride 106). Lena Cowen Orlin claims that Frankford enacts this "convergence between self and place" when he is discovering Anne and Wendoll off stage (149).²² Orlin points out that Frankford has an intimate knowledge of his own home, identifying which key opens which door while still outside his own gate (*WK* 13.16): "This is the key that opes my outward gate,/ this is the hall door, this my withdrawing chamber" (8-9). Frankford recites a movement of escalating intimacy that guests might also experience when welcomed by a host, from the gate to the hall to the chamber. But in the last instance, the most familiar room betrays him:

But this, that door that's bawd unto my shame,
Fountain and spring of all my bleeding thoughts,
Where the most hallowed order and true knot
Of nuptial sanctity hath been profaned.
It leads to my polluted bedchamber (10-14)

²² Orlin extensively catalogues the "material surroundings of Frankford's 'household,'" 145-151.

Orlin notes that “rather than identifying, [Frankford] is rediscovering his walls, his doors, his rooms” after they have been “transformed” (149). Not only has Frankford’s house, a familiar space and symbol of himself, become unfamiliar, but the house seems to have actively betrayed him, being, in the case of the bedchamber door, a “bawd.” Frankford’s secret entrance into this now unfamiliar space renders him an “intruder in his own house” (149). He is himself transgressing the thresholds and boundaries of his own home.

Outside the gate of his own home, Old Lionel also finds himself treated as a stranger to his own home. Instead of a welcome, Lionel finds his “own gates shut upon him and bar[ring] their master entrance” (*ET* 2.2.136-7).²³ Although he is initially pacified by the story that the house has become haunted by a formerly murdered guest and the promise that his son has purchased a neighbouring home, when the Reignald’s plot is discovered Old Lionel takes the form of a more violent invader. Locked out of his home, which has become Reignald’s “sanctuary” (4.6.215), Old Lionel calls for “ladders” (243) and “faggots” (249),²⁴ threatening to “set fire upon the house/ rather than this endure” (249-50). Young Lionel had been praised earlier for feeding “beggars ... at his gate” (2.1.78-9), but his father, the true head of the household, receives less than a beggar’s welcome. In a sense, Lionel’s attack on his home is appropriate, since, in the form of his servant Reignald, his household has opposed him and rebelled against Old Lionel’s headship.

²³ Heal identifies the trope of the “Mock-Beggar’s Hall” where a traveler is turned away from an empty house as a “favourite with the ballad makers of the Jacobean and Caroline periods, and was readily invoked whenever the flight of the lute to London was condemned” (Heal, *Hospitality* 8). Heywood cleverly alters this image by presenting a home that is locked to its master and is indeed occupied.

²⁴ “A bundle of sticks, twigs, or small branches of trees bound together” such as “for use as fuel” (“Faggot, fagot” OED).

In *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*, perhaps because a guest's transgressions occur while he or she is still in the home, there is a cocommittant concern with the physical boundaries of a home that is expressed in the trope of confinement, keys and locks. Frankford recognizes his home by its keys, which he must secretly copy. But confinement also appears in the Mountford plot, in which Mountford is forced to endure in lieu of sacrificing his home. Mountford's imprisonment echoes a kind of forced hospitality, however, since when he learns that Acton has paid his debt he asks that the jailor "double my irons, and my sparing meals/ put into halves, and lodge me in a dungeon/ more deep, more dark, more cold, more comfortless" (*WK* 10.89-91). Mountford speaks of his imprisonment using the hospitable tropes of room and board, except he is a kind of confined guest. *The English Traveller* incorporates this trope into the Lionel plot. Just as Old Lionel is locked out of his home, Young Lionel is locked inside. Reignald is apparently attempting to shield Young Lionel from his father, promising to "make/ that prison of your fears you sanctuary" (2.2.66-7), but Reignald modulates his rhetoric so that the house itself seems to become a prison. The home then becomes a "supposed jail" from which Reignald may eventually "bail" Young Lionel from (72-3), before it ultimately becomes a very real location of incarceration, where Reignald not only will bail his Master but also "must play the jailer" (96). The transition from Reignald's offer of "sanctuary" (67) to his position as jailer occurs, significantly, as Young Lionel gives the keys to the house to Reignald (98-9).

The home as a site of hospitality is fraught with a variety of values and vulnerabilities: a home's structure assisted the hierarchical division that is central to early

modern hospitality; a household and its management was a signifier of masculinity; absence from the home also created anxiety, both because the home was considered a refuge and because an absent householder could not fulfill his societal expectations. In the following chapters these values become the points at which hospitality and a household are also most vulnerable. In chapter two, I will examine the relation of the host and the guest, which, in these plays often transgresses the hierarchical social bounds at the heart of hospitality and the structure of the home. In chapter three, I will examine the female experience of hospitality, which is primarily an experience of exclusion and expulsion. The female experience of exclusion and expulsion is heavily related to the gendering of hospitality and the proper application of a householder's hospitable responsibilities, both of which I have begun to indicate with the connections between masculine identity and the home.

2: Host and Guest: Hospitable Transgressions of the Hospitable Bond

In chapter one, the home and the household were shown to play important roles in the practice of hospitality. But though hospitality in the early modern period typically required a household, the importance of the household was that it designated a householder and constituted a “theatre of his Hospitality” within which the householder could act as a host (qtd in Heal, *Hospitality* 6). As has been illustrated in chapter one, however, the household becomes vulnerable when the host is absent. The anxieties within these plays about the absence of the householder, combined with a general cultural “uncertainty about the standing of a gentleman detached from his household” (Heal, *Hospitality* 24), illustrate that the householding host is the primary component in the practice of hospitality. The household is important, but secondary, and, as Heal notes, an accepted early modern host “could even lack the basic support of a household” (Heal, “Idea” 69). The guest, in contrast, is the “necessary instrument” that allows a householder to perform his “proper function” as host (Heal, *Hospitality* 9). The fundamental requirement for the practice of hospitality, therefore, consists of this relation between the host and the guest.

This hospitable relation was “rhetorically” opposed to the exchanges of the marketplace and the “cash nexus” (19). But the commodities exchanged in the hospitable relation, which were acknowledged by the early modern English, were merely “less tangible” goods, such as “honour, loyalty, alliance, and beneficence,” though the “friendships” fostered through hospitality were “scarcely altruistic” (20). These social ties, which might be genuine or calculated, are ever present alongside the practice of

hospitality in *Edward IV*, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Late Lancashire Witches*. As the hosts in these plays practice hospitality, which exhibits their gentility and legitimacy as householders and also supports the formation of positive and necessary social bonds, their hospitality also contains the spectre of empty convention, inappropriate familiarity and social advancement.

Derrida describes some of the problems that likely affected early modern hosts as they practiced hospitality. Derrida writes that “absolute or unconditional hospitality ... presupposes a break with hospitality in the ordinary sense,” which otherwise results in a “pact” between host and guest (“Foreigner Question” 25). Derrida elaborates that:

absolute hospitality requires that I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner ... but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I *give place* to them ... without asking of them either reciprocity (entering into a pact) or even their names” (25 emphasis given).

The hosts in these plays seem to offer both kinds of hospitality. They seem to offer unconditional access, while also expecting that their relation to their guest will also be bound by certain laws and result in certain benefits. Indeed, what may seem like completely open hospitality may actually be a part of the ‘pact’ between host and guest. Master Generous, in his frequent expositions on his own hospitality draws attention to the conventions that may govern the hospitable relation. But no characters in these plays open up their homes in the unconditional sense that Derrida delineates, and Derrida recognizes that hospitality cannot exist if the host is unable to exercise “sovereignty of oneself over one’s home,” which may be exercised by “filtering, choosing, and thus by excluding and doing violence” (55). Derrida claims that such filtering, which is now

accomplished by “current technological developments,”²⁵ also occurs via the more primitive thresholds of windows and doors (61). Each level of technology restructures “space in such a way that what constitutes a space of controlled and circumscribed property is just what opens it to intrusion” (61). These areas and points of access, which subdivide the space of the home beyond the gate and the door, allow a host to filter his guests, bestowing greater intimacy on guests of higher status or familiarity.²⁶ Household divisions allow a host to express a greater familiarity with a guest, while such familiarity could also threaten the integrity of the home. Early modern hospitality, then, is characterized by “two objectives: the desire of the householder to maintain internal power, and his wish/obligation to display this [internal power] through extroverted gestures of generosity” (Heal, *Hospitality* 9). Since these two objectives are often at odds, Derrida notes a “paradoxical effect” of hospitality, which is a “pervertibility ... that is always possible and in truth virtually inevitable, bound to happen: the effacement of the limit between private and public, the secret and the phenomenal, the home (which makes hospitality possible) and the violation or impossibility of the home” (65).

If conventional hospitality, according to Derrida, might begin by asking, “What is your name?” (27), then it is also, perhaps, a good place to begin a study of Heywood’s hosts. Who are they? And how do they welcome, or ‘interrogate,’ *their* guests? Within these four plays there is a variety of conventional hosts, who, with the exception of the hosts in *Edward IV*, are also usually married householders: Frankford, Master Generous,

²⁵ Derrida is referring, specifically to modern electronic technologies, such as “fax and electronic mail” (59).

²⁶ See Heal, *Hospitality* 31-36.

Wincott, Old Geraldine, Hobs the Tanner of Tamworth, and Mayor Crosby. In *The Late Lancashire Witches*, Master Generous is clearly marked as a host. His very name implies that he practices a hospitable “Liberal Entertainment” that George Wheler might praise (Heal, “Idea” 66). Master Generous in particular seems to live up to his name, verging on archetype, at least according to Arthur, who raves of Master Generous:

where a loving welcome is presum'd,
Whose liberal table's never unprepar'd,
Nor he of guests unfurnish'd. Of his means,
There's none can bear it with a braver port
And keep his state unshaken. One who sells not
Nor covets he to purchase, holds his own
Without oppressing others, always press'd
To endear to him any known gentleman
In whom he finds good parts. (*LLW* 1.1.36-44)

Arthur lists a variety of characteristics, beginning with praise for Generous's hospitality that is displayed in his “loving welcome” and “liberal table” (36-7). Guests are, as a result, such constant presences that they are furnishings for the Generous home.²⁷ But though his hospitality is “liberal,” Generous does not fall into prodigality, which might render his “state” unstable. Arthur claims that Generous does not sell or covet, linking the practice of hospitality with the proper management of one's household.²⁸ Generous's hospitality is not open and unlimited, but it does accord with early modern guidelines, which advocated that hospitality be tempered with prudence (Heal, “Idea” 73). The author of *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Servingman* (1598), like Arthur,

²⁷ Heal notes that a house “served to embody the qualities of its owner” (*Hospitality* 6). In the case of Master Generous, this embodiment is quite literal, since his guests, representations of his hospitality, become ‘furnishings’ for his home.

²⁸ What seem to be economic concerns are revealed to be situated in the comprehensive operations of the household itself, illustrating the etymology of economy, which relates to the ancient Greek *oikos*, meaning house (See “Economic” and “Oeconomus” OED).

warns of the dangers of covetousness that may taint liberality, which is properly a mean between extremes:

According to thy abilitie mainteyne Hospitalitie: for that is the harbourer of two hopes, prayse and prayers: yet let Liberalitie be the Linke to light thee, lest Covetousness might corrupt, or Prodigalite procure penurie. *In Medio concistet virtus* [sic], every meane betwixt two extreaemes is a vertue: so is liberalitie, betwixt avarice and prodigalitie. (qtd in Heal, “Idea” 74)

Arthur’s praise of Generous also speaks to the effect that hospitality and a gentleman might have upon the larger community. The dangers of covetousness are clear in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, when Shafton seeks to swindle Charles Mountford of his last property (5.49-53). The negative effects of selling, however, seem to be less clear. But perhaps it speaks to the responsibilities of a gentleman towards his community. As has been addressed above, one concern surrounding hospitality was that the gentry were perceived to be leaving their country estates to live or spend time in London (Heal, “Idea” 80-82). If the gentry no longer live in their communities they would no longer be able to “exercise traditional social responsibilities” (82), which would include the “reliefe of al the poore country about them” (qtd in Heal, “Idea” 82).²⁹ Selling one’s estate and coveting the estates of others result in the displacement or departure of the gentry and their hospitality. The claim that Generous is “a character not common in this age” (*LLW* 1.1.45-6) expresses a conventional nostalgia for a “vanished age of hospitality” that may have also reflected real social changes among the gentry (Heal, “Idea” 80).

Arthur lastly notes that Generous always seeks to “endear to him any known gentleman/ in whom he finds good parts” (*LLW* 1.1.43-4). Arthur, here, reveals one of

²⁹ From Richard Curtey’s *Care of a Christian Conscience* (1596).

the primary functions of hospitality, which is the “strengthening [of] community” (Heal, “Idea” 78), but he also reveals an aspect of Generous’s hospitality that falls short of the ideals of early modern pamphleteers. Since Generous seems to show a preference for welcoming gentlemen and Arthur does not praise Generous’s hospitality to the poor, Generous’s hospitality may not extend far beyond his own class. Though, Heal notes, a certain amount of hospitality offered to one’s equals was accepted, Henry Bedel implored hosts to “feede not your equals” (77), and Caleb Dalechamp makes a distinction between good fellowship and hospitality; the former being the entertainment of “kynsfolk, friends and able neighbours” (qtd in Heal, “Idea” 75 n39). Dalechamp, John Downname and William Gouge concede, however, that there is a hierarchy of responsibility for the householder, who is responsible, first, “for his immediate family and spiritual kindred, then for the wider kin, for neighbours and friends, for strangers and finally for enemies” (Heal, “Idea” 77).

Arthur’s praise of Generous provides a window into the community responsibilities of a hospitable householder. Master Generous, somewhat strangely, also comments on his own hospitality. His claims about his own hospitality seem to establish that he practices a legitimate and legitimating form of hospitality. But a host that speaks highly of his own hospitality also seems to render his hospitality questionable. Generous gives an interesting welcome to his three guests that is both self-referential and establishes some of his expectations for the hospitable relationship that they are entering into:

Gentlemen, welcome! ‘Tis a word I use;
From me expect no further compliment.

Not do I name it often at one meeting;
Once spoke (to those that understand me best
And know I always purpose as I speak)
Hath ever yet sufficed, so let it you.
Nor do I love that common phrase of guests
As ‘we make bold’, or ‘we are troublesome’,
‘We take you unprovided’, and the like.
I know you understanding gentlemen
And knowing me, cannot persuade yourselves
With me you shall be troublesome or bold,
But still provided for my worthy friends
Amongst whom you are listed. (*LLW* 1.1.160-173)

Throughout his extended welcome, Generous draws attention to hospitality as a performance while simultaneously disavowing his own performance. Generous begins by expanding upon his single welcome, claiming that it shows that he means it when he speaks it. The problem of things seeming to be what they are not, often in the form of “flattery” (191) contrasting with “plainness” (177), is interwoven throughout the play and has direct relevance to Generous himself, whose wife is not what she seems to be. Hospitality, according to Generous, is also apparently susceptible to the same falseness and seeming that, throughout the play, is part of the anxiety around witchcraft. Generous tries to create a kind of personal authenticity, in that he always “purposes as he speaks” (164). He claims to dislike the “common phrase[s] of guests” (166), which are used insincerely or have perhaps lost their meaning because they are so “common” (166). The phrases that Generous dislikes are related to the way that guests perform their role as guests. The phrases “we make bold,” “we are troublesome” or “we take you unprovided” are particularly interesting for the apparent awareness on the part of guests that their presence may be a form of irritant or intrusion upon their host (167-8). Though Master Generous seems to disdain the posturing of guests in general, he emphasizes that these

clichés are particularly unnecessary because his three guests are his “worthy friends” (172).

Generous goes on to describe his own performance as a host. He claims that as soon as he was aware that the three men were coming, he “instantly/ Rose from [his] chair to meet [them] at the gate/ And be myself [their] usher” (179-81). Generous exhibits the familiarity and intimacy of his relationship with his guests by the manner in which he receives them.³⁰ In the other plays, when a host receives a guest there is an usher, or other servant, who declares that a guest has arrived, identifies the guest, and then escorts him into the home (*WK* 4.15-24; *ET* 1.1.50-1; 4.2.25-6; *IE* 14.21-29). The roles of the porter and the usher would allow for a negotiation between the integrity of the household and the accommodation of guests. Heal notes that a porter would normally guard an “open gate” which would be closed during a meal (*Hospitality* 9), exhibiting the openness of the household, while also guarding the household’s integrity, allowing in “only those outsiders who were considered of suitable status, or were on appropriate business” (30). The usher then continues the work of the porter, being responsible for placing guests within the household “with a proper regard to their rank and degree” (31). While these servants might maintain the hierarchy of a household, which places a householder at the top, Generous collapses the barriers between himself and his guests by meeting them “at the gate” (*LLW* 1.1.180).

³⁰ In *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Anne creates a similar disruption, perhaps exhibiting an unnatural intimacy, when she enters with Wendoll “as his usher,” having “already heard the visitor’s report” (Orlin 169). See *WK* 4.35sd-38.

Just as he provided a set of stock phrases that he disdains to hear in the mouths of guests, Generous recites phrases that he, ironically, claims he will not say:

Nor shall you find,
Being set to meat, that I'll excuse your fare
Or say 'I am sorry it falls out so poor'
And 'had I known your coming we'd have had
Such things and such', nor blame my cook, to say
'This dish or that had not be sauc'd with care' –
Words fitting best a common hostess' mouth
When there's perhaps some just cause of dislike
But not the table of a gentleman;
Nor is it my wife's custom. In a word,
Take what you find and so. (1.1.181-91)

Master Generous again calls attention to the possibility that hospitality may fall into empty performance, while also performing an apparently meaningful form of hospitality. Generous himself performs two interesting rhetorical moves: he attaches his hospitality to his gender and to his gentility. He allows that a “common hostess,” perhaps, might use these hospitable commonplaces, but that they are inappropriate for a gentleman. Generous's relegation of these phrases to a common hostess associates poor hospitality with a female figure, which may be informed by early modern expectations that a *proper* host would be a head of household, and hence male.³¹ But Generous tempers his gendering of improper hospitality by mentioning, almost as an afterthought, that his wife would also not make excuses for their hospitality, presumably because they are unnecessary. Generous notes that his wife does play a role in the performance of hospitality, a practice that might prevail among gentle households in the early modern

³¹ Heal, in “The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England,” notes that such an expectation is at least present in the prescriptive literature of the period, which largely “addresses itself to the head of the household” (69).

period,³² and introduces her character as a hostess, a role which she performs later in the play, as a witch.

Generous's preemptive protestations call into question his qualities as a host. Even though he is renowned as a liberal gentleman, it is possible that his friends *have* taken him by surprise, and "had [he] known" they were coming, he might be more prepared. Generous's provisions are not bottomless, as evidenced by a cellar that can be "drunk dry" (2.2.129), though he earlier claims that his "cellar can afford it" (1.1.218). More importantly, these passages illustrate that early modern audiences, guests, and hosts would be aware of the performative nature of hospitality and the presence of such stock phrases. These phrases become more interesting when they are found, without self-consciousness, in the mouths of Frankford and Wincott.³³ When Frankford, Wincott, Jane Shore, and even Generous himself make offers of hospitality, it becomes less certain that they are being as open as they seem to be. Frankford, for instance, invites Wendoll to use "my table and my purse:/ they are yours" (*WK* 4.63-4), and Anne echoes the sentiment when she relays Frankford's later instruction to Wendoll to "be a present Frankford in his absence" (6.77). Wincott, similarly, welcomes Young Geraldine with a request to "think this your home, free as your father's house,/ And to command it as the master on't" (*ET* 1.1.91-2). Frankford and Wincott may be making genuine offers of

³² A wife might perform a variety of hospitable roles. One specific role might be a carver of the meat, as Ann Christensen notes, quoting the ninth Earl of Northumberland and Thomas Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* (1573), who exhorts the reader: "'Let huswife be carver'" (qtd in Christensen 78).

³³ Wincott, who perhaps provides a model of the kind of host that Master Generous dislikes, excuses his own hospitality to Dalavill and Geraldine, claiming that "you take us unprovided, gentlemen" (*ET* 1.1.197). Wincott also grants a welcome "once more" (*ET* 1.1.185), contrary to Master Generous's professed values (*LLW* 1.1.160-4). In *The English Traveller*, Reignald uses hospitable convention to avoid showing Old Lionel a house that he claims to have purchased, protesting that "to take them unprovided were disgrace" (3.2.124).

hospitality, or they may be making offers as empty as the modern exhortation to ‘make yourself at home.’ Such hospitable exhortations are symptomatic of the relation between a host and his guest, and they purport a particular closeness that is further cultivated by the host’s hospitality, whether a host genuinely means his invitation or not.

The relation of Frankford and Wendoll provides a clear case of how a close relationship elicits hospitality and is made closer by that hospitality. Like Master Generous in *The Late Lancashire Witches*, Frankford’s name, which Lena Cowen Orlin notes implies that he too is “liberal, bounteous, generous [and] lavish” (*Private Matters* 159),³⁴ characterizes him as a host and indicates that his relation to Wendoll will be characterized by the guest-host relationship. When Wendoll arrives at Frankford’s door with news of murder, Frankford assesses Wendoll in a similar manner to that he has used when delineating his own characteristics:

This Wendoll I have noted, and his carriage
Hath pleased me much by observation.
I have noted many good deserts in him:
He’s affable and seen in many things,
Discourses well, a good companion,
And though of small means, yet a gentleman
Of a good house, somewhat pressed by want.
I have preferred him to a second place
In my opinion and my best regard. (*WK* 4.26-34)

Frankford has, fifteen lines earlier, praised Anne as his “chief” felicity (9), and has quickly elevated Wendoll to “second place” (34). This sudden elevation and intimacy forms a part of what Mario DiGangi calls Wendoll’s “homoerotic relation to John

³⁴ In *I Edward IV*, King Edward uses the word ‘frank’ with this very connotation: “And have our country subjects been so frank/ And bountiful in their benevolence/ Toward our present expedition?” (*IE* 21.1-3).

Frankford,” which renders the act of adultery with Anne “all the more heinous” (50). DiGangi points to Wendoll’s description of his relationship with Frankford, where he claims, “I am to his body/ as necessary as his digestion, / and equally do make him whole or sick” (6.40-2). DiGangi emphasizes the bodily effect that Wendoll claims upon Frankford, but Wendoll is also invoking the motif of hospitality when he speaks of digestion, which emphasizes the hospitable basis of his relation to Frankford. That Wendoll is speaking of their bond in terms of hospitality becomes clearer when lines 39 and 40 are taken into account: “He cannot eat without me,/ Not laugh without me.” Wendoll’s reference to digestion then fits into a larger context of commensality and entertainment; that is, hospitality rather than a purely erotic or bodily relation.

The trace of hospitality is also found in other aspects of the establishment, development and disruption of Frankford and Wendoll’s relationship. Frankford and Wendoll are familiar to each other before Frankford invites Wendoll into his home, since Wendoll is a guest at Frankford’s wedding (1.1 sd) and Wendoll mentions that Frankford has “oft” given him “many favours” (4.72-3), but their relationship becomes more intimate when Wendoll enters Frankford’s house to be a “daily guest” (8.7). To modern audiences, the speed with which Frankford pledges that Wendoll shall be “welcome to me for ever” (4.83) is likely just as strange as the speed with which Anne succumbs to adultery. Wendoll may be Frankford’s “closest friend” (511) as Louis B. Wright claims,³⁵ but their relationship, like other hospitable relationships, may not be solely

³⁵ See Wright’s “The Male Friendship Cult in Thomas Heywood’s Plays.” Lena Cowen Orlin in “Virtue and Domestic Interest” in *Private Matter and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* also examines the friendship of Frankford and Wendoll, and its decay, among the context of Seneca’s *De*

“altruistic” (Heal, *Hospitality* 20). Their relationship may, rather, border upon service.

Alan Bray notes that in the early modern period both “masters and their close serving men would be ‘gentle’ men” (190), and it was once not unusual for children of the gentry to undertake a “period of service” (Heal, *Hospitality* 165), nor for a gentleman to take “into his household the sons of his gentry supporters” (Bray 192), though the practice was in decline by the seventeenth century. The relationship of service was once a “basis of personal connection and political influence” (Heal, *Hospitality* 167), but at the turn of the sixteenth century relations among the gentry were changing:

The county élite was envisaging itself more and more as a unified governing class with a common relation to the crown and commonwealth, and less as men whose honour and status were wholly bound up in a highly personal and particularized network of affinity and allegiance. This was, of course, only a shift of emphasis, and special relationships between families certainly persisted, but it was marked enough to involve a withering of interest in household ritual and open hospitality. (Bryson 144)³⁶

Frankford and Wendoll have a friendship, but one which may have inherited the “cultural form[s]” of service (Bray 192). Such a relationship would correspond with Frankford’s consideration of Wendoll’s personal attributes as well as his class and family situation when he decides to invite Wendoll into his home.³⁷ As a host, Frankford welcomes Wendoll into his home not as an act of pure generosity, but as a way of cultivating social

beneficiis, Aristotle’s *Ethics*, Cicero’s *De amicitia*, as well as early modern contemporary writings on friendship; see especially 158-172.

³⁶ See also 81-2 in Heal’s “The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England.”

³⁷ If Frankford and Wendoll are joined by friendship and service, it might also explain Nicolas’s immediate dislike for Wendoll (*WK* 4.84-87), who may be usurping Nicolas’s place as Frankford’s most intimate servant. For a further discussion of the relationship of Frankford and Nicholas, which considers the possibility that Nicholas is somehow jealous of, or displaced by, Wendoll, see Wendy Wall’s *Staging Domesticity* 201-7.

ties within his community and circle of influence. Not only are Frankford and Wendoll described as friends, but throughout *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, as well as the other plays, hospitality results in the guest and the host being “bound” to one another (4.72), as I will discuss further below. The cultivation of such relationships was often the express purpose of hospitality, and as one practice declined so did the other. What Wright and Orlin see as friendship, and which DiGangi calls a homoerotic relationship, must be considered within the complex social purposes and definitions of friendship. Their friendship resembles a relationship of service, where one gentleman takes in another, and is at base inextricable from the same system of relations that fosters the practice of hospitality.

As a sign of the hospitable relation between Wendoll and Frankford, nearly immediately upon Wendoll’s entry into the household their relationship is inaugurated by “dinner” (4.82). But hospitality and its modes of speech, paradoxically, are also present as the social bonds, which hospitality formerly fostered, are broken. For instance, when Wendoll kisses Anne, she expresses her confusion as a “maze” that she fears “will prove the labyrinth of sin” (6.158-9). Wendoll reframes this metaphor and claims that the path that they are embarking upon is “the path of pleasure and the gate to bliss,/ which on your lips I knock at with a kiss” (160-1).³⁸ Orlin notes that Wendoll, here, “conflates possession of Anne’s body with entrance, occupation, and appropriation of Frankford’s

³⁸ In *The English Traveller*, similar words find their way into the mouth of Young Geraldine, though the context is slightly different. When he seeks to give Wincott’s wife a “visitation” in her bed chamber, ultimately discovering that she has betrayed Wincott and himself, he claims that the way to her chamber is the “path that leads to my delight./ [He goes in at one door and comes out at another] And this the gate unto’t” (4.3.120-1). Young Geraldine acts the part of Frankford, while mouthing the words of Dalavill. Young Geraldine occupies an ambiguous position, which may imply that his intentions with Wincott’s wife were less honourable than they first appeared.

house” (174), which also corresponds to the “worldview that identifies women as the ultimate signifier of male property” (176). But it also shows that Wendoll conceives of himself as fundamentally a guest, an outsider, even as he tries to take on the role of a “present Frankford” (*WK* 6.77). Though he may attempt to be the master of the house he remains the guest. The phrase emphasizes his relationship to Frankford as a hospitable one, as well as reinforcing the sense of transgression, as he is always an outsider seeking entry, never quite at home. As a guest, Wendoll’s surest form of access to Anne is to exploit the vulnerabilities of hospitality. By Scene 11, Wendoll eventually fully accepts Frankford’s invitation to “keep his table, use his servants,/ and be a present Frankford in his absence” (6.76-7), which may be a hospitable convention. When Frankford leaves on his ostensible business, Wendoll notes in an aside:

I am husband now in Master Frankford’s place
And must command the house. [Aloud, to Anne] My pleasure is
We will not sup abroad so publicly,
But in your private chamber, Mistress Frankford. (11.89-92)

It was not uncommon for meals to be “taken in individual chambers by the lord and lady and even their guests” and guests of high status³⁹ might also eat “at the lord’s board in his chamber” (Heal, *Hospitality* 154; 31), but Wendoll exploits a hospitable display of social intimacy. Instead of giving access to exhibit hospitality like a true host, Wendoll uses ‘hospitality’ to gain access to Anne. But in his effort to exploit hospitality, he forgets his true responsibilities as master of the house and host, since his actions leave Cranwell, the other guest, alone and “spared from supper” (*WK* 11.97). Wendoll is also unaware that

³⁹ Heal draws the line at the “son of a baron” or higher (*Hospitality* 31).

son/ To have made my estate to my name hereditary, I should have gone contented to my grave” (1.1.181-3).⁴³ In many ways the relationship of Wincott and Geraldine⁴⁴ closely resembles the relationship of Frankford and Wendoll, and Heywood uses many of the same hospitable tropes to describe their relations. After Geraldine has decided to avoid Wincott’s house for the sake of propriety, he encounters Dalavill, who informs him of Wincott’s state in Geraldine’s absence:

O, you’ve grown strange
To one that much respects you. Troth, the house
Hath all this time seemed naked without you.
The good old man doth never sit to meat
But next his giving thanks he speaks of you;
There’s scarce a bit that he at table tastes
That can *digest* without a ‘Geraldine’,
You are in his mouth so frequent, he and she
Both wondering what *distaste* from one or either
So suddenly should alienate a guest
To them so dearly welcome. (3.3.15-25, emphasis mine)

The relation between Wincott and Geraldine is described in a variety of hospitable terms. Like Generous’s guests (*LLW* 1.1.38), Geraldine was such a frequent guest that he furnished the house, and his absence renders the house “naked” (*ET* 3.3.17). Even in his absence, though, Geraldine is still present, as a thought, at Wincott’s table. Like Wendoll he has become linked to his host’s digestion, which his absence seems to impede. Just as Geraldine’s absence seems to have disrupted the meals and hospitality at Wincott’s house, there also seems to be a similar expectation that Geraldine no longer visits because the hospitality has been lacking; Wincott wonders if Geraldine has developed a “distaste”

⁴³ See also *ET* 1.1.96-8.

⁴⁴ This and future references to Geraldine refer to Young Geraldine. His father will be referred to by his full name: Old Geraldine.

for either of his hosts (3.3.23; 4.3.3), and Geraldine addresses this specific concern at the beginning of their midnight meeting, assuring Wincott that his hospitality, as the cornerstone of their relationship, has not been the reason for his absence (4.3.26-30).

Both Lena Cowen Orlin and Wendy Wall have discussed the relation of Wincott and Geraldine.⁴⁵ The familiarity of their relation is more contextualized than the relation of Frankford and Wendoll, and the reality of their relationship is reinforced by the open affection that Wincott, especially, displays. For a description of their relationship, both Orlin and Wall cite Geraldine's perception of his relationship with Wincott: "He studies to engross me to himself/ And is so wedded to my company/ He makes me a stranger to my father's house" (1.1.69-71; Orlin 265; Wall 211). Wincott uses similar terms to describe the relationship that the death of his adulterous wife now allows: the "marriage of [Wincott and Geraldine's] love" (5.1.253; Orlin 267; Wall 213). For Orlin, Geraldine is an object of "competition" (264) and a "commodity" that is described in the language of "borrowing, lending, and of use" (ET 3.1.25). Wall emphasizes an alternate valence of 'engross' to claim that Wincott is attempting a process of "subsumption" that is "imagined in corporeal, marital, and spatial terms" (211). Wall seeks to show that "embodiment is the play's key vocabulary for describing human bonds" (210). In Wall's view, Geraldine also endures a kind of commodification, as food, perceiving "cannibalism" (212) in Dalavill's claim that Geraldine is "in [Wincott's] mouth so frequent" (ET 3.3.22).⁴⁶ Wall provides a very insightful analysis of the bodily relations

⁴⁵ See Orlin's *Private Matters and Public Culture* 251-2, 264-9; and Wall's *Staging Domesticity* 210-3.

⁴⁶ See also 3.3.58-60: "Ever your name is in my master's mouth, and sometimes, too,/ in hers [Wincott's wife], when she hath nothing else to think of."

and disruptions that are at the heart of *The English Traveller*; however, her Freudian framework for subsumption and incorporation overlooks the prevalence of hospitality as a represented historical practice in the play. Hospitality, ironically, subsumes the discourse of subsumption and incorporation in the play. A focus on a subcategory of hospitality – consumption and subsumption – is blind to the process by which Wincott attempts to subsume Geraldine or, in Orlin's terms, the process that enables Geraldine to be commodified. Wall claims that the play "suggests that Wincott's opening of his body/home, like Frankford's,⁴⁷ sets into motion a passionate and potentially destructive cycle of human absorption that spirals beyond his control" (211), but the reasons for such instability and destruction are found in the contradictory demands of hospitality – the means by which Wincott seeks to 'woo' Geraldine.

From the beginning of *The English Traveller*, Heywood establishes that Wincott and Geraldine are involved in a culturally acceptable and mutually hospitable relationship. The opening action of the play consists of Geraldine and his "friend" (1.1.1) Dalavill on their way to "visit" (28) Wincott, who is unaware of their visit (50-1). And though Wincott is apparently unprepared (197), he welcomes Geraldine and Dalavill into his home. Far from a one-sided 'subsumption', Geraldine seeks to visit Wincott, even as Wincott seeks to welcome Geraldine as a guest. Wincott's home seems usual because of its apparent perpetual openness to Young Geraldine, since it was "never private" and, like

⁴⁷ Wall discusses the relation of Frankford and Wendoll in similar terms. She claims that Frankford incorporates Wendoll, by which she means a Freudian "corporeal model for the abstract process of identification" (204). This process in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* parallels the relation of Wincott and Geraldine, as she conflates incorporation and subsumption (205). Wall also locates "cannibalism" in Nicholas's efforts to expose Wendoll and secure his own favour with Frankford, which he describes as penetrating "into Frankford's heart" (206).

Frankford, Wincott wishes Geraldine to “think this your home, free as your father’s house, and to command it as the master on’t” (91-2). The primary sign of Geraldine’s love, according to Wincott, is that Geraldine would act like the master of the house. This may be a conventional welcome, as Frankford echoes these sentiments to Wendoll, but Wincott adds a condition to Geraldine’s mastery: “Call boldly here, and entertain your friends/ As in you own possessions. When I see’t/ I’ll say you love me truly, not till then” (93-5).⁴⁸ Geraldine is to be both a host and a guest.⁴⁹ Wincott bestows hospitable agency upon Geraldine, who may bring others, as he brings Dalavill, into Wincott’s house.

Hospitality, from the beginning, is the language of their relation, since Wincott expresses his love by the practice of hospitality, and he wishes that Geraldine will reciprocate with further expressions of hospitality. Wincott links hospitality and affection, which are then paired throughout the play. Wincott’s wife, to whom Geraldine swears an oath of fidelity and future marriage (2.1.279-287), also uses the language of hospitality to express her affection for Geraldine when she welcomes Geraldine to her as yet chaste bedchamber. She claims that her bedchamber is “as free to you as your own father’s house,/ And you as welcome to’t” (209-11). Parroting the same language as her husband to welcome Geraldine, the language of hospitality becomes an affectionate discourse. The recontextualization of this welcome also indicates that affection underlies

⁴⁸ Frankford, like Wincott, does include Wendoll’s own practice of hospitality in his invitation when he, through Anne, requests that Wendoll “keep his table” (*WK* 6.76). Though a slight difference, Wincott links Geraldine’s practice of hospitality specifically to his reciprocal love and seemingly requests that Geraldine play the host even while Wincott is present, and Frankford requests Wendoll to play the host while he is absent.

⁴⁹ This ambiguous position is reinforced when the chambermaid Bess tells Geraldine about Dalavill and Wincott’s wife’s adultery: “You bear the name of landlord, but another/ Enjoys the rent” (3.3.72-3), as well as at the end of the play when Geraldine, the guest, discovers that Dalavill has ‘cuckolded’ him. See note 13.

Wincott's practice of hospitality, though his hospitality may have the appearance of convention.

Like Geraldine's "midnight" meetings with Wincott's wife (2.1.209), Wincott's secret meeting with Geraldine in 4.3 is similarly a *hospitable* tryst, as Wincott has "of purpose ... parted beds,/ Feigning [himself] not well, to give [Geraldine] meeting," so that nothing may be "suspected by [his] wife" (4.3.80-82). Orlin, therefore, notes that the meeting contains a double transgression: the first is the contravention of Geraldine's "father's commands," and the second is "Wincott's infidelity to his wife" (266). This meeting, the moment of the most intimate bond between Wincott and Geraldine, also happens to contain the only meal displayed in the play: "A table and stools are set out, with lights, a banquet, and wine" (4.3.1sd). Rather than seeking to consume or subsume Geraldine, Wincott, rather, offers her food. Though Wall reads "cannibalism" (212) in the report that Geraldine is "in [Wincott's] mouth so frequent" (3.3.22), there is a mutuality to the relationship between Geraldine and Wincott, who wants from Geraldine's "own mouth/ To be resolved, and I hope satisfied" (4.3.5-6), whether "I [Wincott], or any of my house,/ Should be th' occasion of the least *distaste*" (2-3 emphasis mine). Since they relate within a mutual, hospitable relation, both Geraldine and Wincott find themselves in the other's mouth, either as an aid to digestion or as possible cause for distaste. There exists, not a pure subsumption, but an albeit cannibalistic commensality that occurs within the conventional commensality of Wincott's hospitality.

Geraldine also reciprocates Wincott's hospitality, replicating early modern hospitable practices. Since Geraldine does not have an estate of his own, his father must host on his behalf, welcoming Wincott, his wife, Prudentilla, and Dalavill (3.1). In this context, Geraldine is reduced to an "usher," with the promise that he may "one day" be "master" (31-2). While the Wincott household visits, Old Geraldine issues an invitation that resembles Wincott's earlier invitation to Geraldine: "There's no pleasure that the house can yield/ That can be debarred from you" (29-30).⁵⁰ Though Geraldine may have become a "stranger to [his] father's house" (1.1.71), which his father half-seriously affirms (3.1.6-9), a reciprocal open welcome renders Wincott's welcome less unusual and less the expression of a one-sided subsumption. Wincott's invitation to Geraldine instead falls within the context of conventional and, more importantly, reciprocal welcomes and visits, which were "designed to keep ... liberality and civility in motion: to reify and fructify them by constant interchange" (Heal, *Hospitality* 20).

Neglecting the specifically hospitable relationship of Wincott and Geraldine also ignores the possibility that Geraldine himself may gain from their relation. He is not merely a commodity to be subsumed, and his role as a guest also provides possibilities to bolster his own social and economic situation. As a guest of Wincott, a position that he seeks, Geraldine is able to work towards establishing and expanding his own estate. Wincott approves of Geraldine because Geraldine is "nobly propertied" (1.1.73), which, if taken in another sense, may be a mutual sentiment. One method of securing an estate and expanding his holdings is through marriage to Wincott's wife. In a private interlude

⁵⁰ This invitation of apparently open hospitality, parallel to Wincott's and Frankford's, also results in a minor but symbolic transgression when the guests 'deflower' Old Geraldine's garden (3.1.100sd-103).

with her, Geraldine claims that the only thing he “craves” is “to have a place next” Wincott in her “bosom” (2.1.248-9, 247). But when she asks if he would “stretch it further” (251), he asks her to “confer [her] widowhood” on him when Wincott “be called hence” (256). As Wincott’s “neighbour” (1.1.72, 84), Geraldine already has a “place next” Wincott, and his efforts to secure Mistress Wincott’s widowhood may, indeed, stretch his estate further to include his neighbour’s property. The result would be the formation of a household around Geraldine and Wincott’s wife, then widow, which also furnishes the resources to maintain an estate separate from his father, with whom he still resides. As evidence of this motive, when he describes his past relationship with Wincott’s wife, Geraldine lapses into monetary metaphors: “In those times,/ Of all the treasures of my hopes and love/ You were th’ exchequer, they were stored in you” (2.1.232-4). Wincott’s wife responds that she “should have been [his] trusty treasurer” (237), extending the conceit, wherein she is associated with monetary wealth. By swearing and securing an oath of future marriage, Geraldine is performing a preemptive widow hunt. Like other young men of the period, Geraldine lacks the “resources required for masculinity and gentility” (Clark, *Comedy* 90) and pursues a (prospective) widow, a figure who was often “hunted for her money” on the early modern stage.⁵¹ Geraldine is aware that his request may be interpreted as the avaricious desire for Wincott’s death, and so he offers a labyrinthine qualification of his request to defend its propriety:

Your husband’s old, to whom my soul doth wish
A Nestor’s age, so much he merits from me.

⁵¹ Though “sex-starved, rich, old widows” were popular figures on the stage, in *Comedy, Youth, Manhood in Early Modern England* Ira Clark delineates the many “disparities between dramatic representations and demographic data” surrounding early modern widows (88).

Yet if (as proof and Nature daily teach
Men cannot always live especially
Such as are old and crazed) he be called hence,
Fairly, in full maturity of time,
And we two be reserved to after life,
Will you confer your widowhood on me? (*ET* 2.1.252-9)

Though Geraldine protests, the very fact that he has considered the issue and proposed a future marriage speaks to his less than altruistic relation with Wincott, which his hospitable interactions both facilitate and conceal. Whether he seeks Wincott's wife out of desire for her – and to fulfill the sentiment that they “two should have matched” (227) – or whether he seeks her to secure Wincott's estate, or both, Geraldine gains from his position as Wincott's frequent guest. As a guest he gains access to Wincott's wife, while he also promises to gain from Wincott's death. Geraldine shares, in this case, the position of “some gallants/ That bury thrifty fathers, [who] think't no sin/ To wear blacks without but other thoughts within” (5.1.259-61).⁵²

But as Wincott's guest, Geraldine is also able to secure benefit through multiple avenues. He gains access to Wincott's wife, while also cultivating a close relationship with Wincott himself. Though Geraldine seemingly loses the prospect of Mistress Wincott's widowhood and Wincott's estate due to her infidelity, his fortunes are restored, quite literally, when Wincott bestows his estate upon Geraldine as the play concludes. What was first made available through hospitable access is secured due to a close relationship fostered by hospitality. When Wincott bestows “the lands that [he has] left” (5.1.256), both Wincott's wish for an heir and Geraldine's efforts to secure Mistress

⁵² Geraldine is also not be the only character in these four plays to seek a neighbour's estate, let alone in *The English Traveller*: Shafton desires Charles Mountford's estate because “it lies/ So near a lordship that [he] lately bought” (*WK* 7.13-4), while Reignald pretends that Young Lionel has purchased Ricott's home, which “next adjoins” Old Lionel's estate (3.2.109).

Wincott's widowhood are resolved. Much like heterosexual marriages do in other plays, the final "marriage" of Wincott and Geraldine confers masculine status on Geraldine (5.1.253). If he is subsumed, as Wendy Wall argues, it is certainly a complex subsumption by which the object of desire is also affirmed and gains significant social status, which was secured through Geraldine's participation in the performance of hospitality.

In *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*, hospitality creates a space that allows for the development of familiarity, which may become inappropriate due to its ability to advance aspiring young guests beyond their "desert" (*WK* 6.34). Heywood reverses the scenario in *1 and 2 Edward IV* by making the guest a king. Unlike the hosts of the other plays, who seek familiarity with their guests and are overwhelmed when their guests overreach, King Edward controls the relation of familiarity between himself and his hosts. His use of familiarity is often for his own ends, frequently becomes inappropriate given his position, and disrupts the relationship of reciprocity between host and guest that is at the heart of hospitality.

Edward IV exhibits more extremely than does *A Woman Killed with Kindness* or *The English Traveller* the consequences of a guest being master of the house. When royalty, or guests "more exalted" than the host, visited a household in the early modern period, the head officers of a household would often perform a certain "ritual inversion" (Heal, *Hospitality* 32). The head officers would offer their staves "to show that the *hierarchical principle* was retained intact, despite the natural authority of the householder over his own social territory" (32, emphasis mine). During a royal visit, control of a

household was, similarly, often taken over by “royal officials” (32). Unlike Wendoll or Geraldine who are offered control of a household, perhaps symbolically, as part of a hospitable welcome, Edward occupies a very real position of power as a royal guest. A royal visit also conferred honour and influence upon a host due to the familiarity and access that the hospitable relation allows.⁵³

On its surface, hospitality in *Edward IV* seems to operate in a manner similar to other royal hospitable occasions by conferring honour upon the hosts. As a reward for Matthew Shore’s and the Mayor’s victory over Falconbridge, along with knighthoods (*1E* 9.218-23), Edward grants his presence at a banquet:

Because we could not stay to dine with you
At our departure hence, we promised,
First food we tasted at our back return
Should be with you; still yielding hearty thanks
To you, and all our London citizens,
For the great service which you did perform
Against that bold-faced rebel, Falconbridge. (16.62-68)

But what was intended to show his thanks for the bravery of the citizens becomes primarily a relation between Jane and Edward. As part of his efforts to develop familiarity between Jane and himself, Edward frequently emphasizes Jane’s separation from Matthew Shore due to her role as “our Lady Mayoress” (43), a transgressive and new domestic arrangement arising out of hospitable necessity. Edward seems to take perverse glee in the situation, asking, “Master Shore, tell me how you like this:/ My Lord Mayor makes your wife his Lady Mayoress?” (131-2). Edward uses Jane’s new title consistently throughout the episode (130, 139) and even corrects himself to reinforce the

⁵³ See Daryl Palmer’s *Hospitable Performances* for instances of hospitably secured royal influence (11-22), including the hosting of Elizabeth I and James I by the Cecils (12-14).

transgressive change and his own desire: “And farewell Mistress Shore – Lady Mayoress, I should say/ ’Tis you have caused our parting at this time” (174-5).

As Edward abruptly leaves he invokes the ability of hospitality to reinforce and reconcile social connections, claiming, “We’ll meet once more to make amends for this” (177). Edward’s sudden departure interrupts and defers the commensal familiarity that the occasion was supposed to facilitate. Rowland notes that any abrupt breaking of hospitality in the early modern period, as Edward’s, demonstrated an “often irretrievable collapse of solidarity amongst the society assembled” that was “analogous to the refusal of the sacrament” (43). Mayor Crosby gives voice to the effect of Edward’s broken hospitality:

O, how the sudden sickness of my liege
Afflicts my soul with many passions!
His highness did intend to be right merry;
And God, he knows how it would glad my soul
If I had seen his highness satisfied
With the humble entertainment of his Mayor. (190-5)

But Edward has, indeed, created a certain commensality and bond of familiarity with Jane. Jane is placed in a special relation to Edward, the guest, since she must take the role of hostess, welcoming (105-8) and offering “*amour propre*” to her guest (Heal, *Hospitality* 12; *IE* 16.101). King Edward returns special attention that ultimately becomes somewhat closer to simple *amour*. Given a choice of those present, including the heroic Matthew Shore or Mayor Crosby, Edward is most enthusiastic about drinking to “you elected Mayoress” (*IE* 16.130), requesting a “bowl of wine” from the Mayor (129). When the Mayor brings the wine, Edward changes his mind and asks Mayor

Crosby to “drink to us” (135) and then “we will pledge ye” (137). But Edward does not reciprocate Crosby’s pledge:

Fill full our cup. And Lady Mayoress,
This full carouse we mean to drink to you;
And you must pledge us, but yet no more
Then you shall please to answer us withal
[He drinks, and the trumpets sound; then wine is brought to her, and she offers to drink.]
Nay, you must drink to somebody. Yea, Tom,
To thee? Well sirrah, see you do her right,
For Edward would. *[Aside]* O would to God he might! (139-145)

Jane apparently does not drink because the pledges are interrupted by a messenger, but Edward has already established the tone of this banquet. Edward secures a pledge from his Mayor, but he feels no compulsion to return the pledge. Edward, rather, drinks to Jane and seeks for her also to drink. Edward, the guest, controls the exchange and reciprocation of hospitality to join Jane and himself more closely, while Matthew Shore is excluded and practically silent throughout the entire event.

This manipulation of familiarity through hospitality is not unusual for King Edward. Immediately preceding his dinner at Mayor Crosby’s home, Edward had visited the home of Hobs the Tanner of Tamworth, using disguise to control how hospitality fosters familiarity, a device that he later employs in his seduction of Jane. Edward’s meeting with Hobs superficially seems to offer an ideal context for distinctly English hospitality. But what seems to be a relatively normal hospitable interaction is really part of an elaborate jest.⁵⁴ In the tanner episode, the play moves away from the city and the

⁵⁴ I am grateful to Dr. Helen Ostovich for highlighting this feature of the play. Along with his jest with Hobs, Edward’s time in France is marked more by “sport” (2E 7.22, 106) than war, and Jane herself perceives that Edward is “disposed to jest” (1E 17.49).

court to a countryside and set of conventions, including “mistaken identities, disguises, and wandering nobles,” that proceed from the romance tradition and English ballads (Palmer, “Familiarities” 302).⁵⁵ The environs of Hobs the Tanner seem to exemplify an “idealized rusticity” that would provide a “natural theatre” for hospitality (Heal, “Idea” 70).⁵⁶ Running against the grain of this apparent context, Hobs proves reluctant to engage the disguised king, suspecting Edward to be a “thief” (*IE* 11.81). Though Hobs is charitable to the “poor” (17), he does not welcome or give hospitality to relative unknowns as hastily, and with as little knowledge, as Frankford and Wincott welcome Wendoll and Dalavill.⁵⁷

Hobs ultimately welcomes “Ned” (13.122) to “beef and bacon, and perhaps a bagpudding” as well as a “posset” and a “bed” (90-2). Hobs’s daughter Nell also, suggestively, appears among the food that Edward is welcome to. When Edward visits, the tanner produces hospitality that is only limited by his relative lack of resources.⁵⁸ Hobs freely offers, however, the food that he does have, which includes “good barley

⁵⁵ Rowland argues for a variety of ballad influences (27-35), though “King Edward IIIjth and a Tanner” (26) is clearly a primary influence. Rowland also argues, quite interestingly, for the influence of the Robin Hood ballad tradition, see especially 32-4.

⁵⁶ In early modern conceptions of hospitality Heal notes a “tendency to think in terms of two dichotomies: those of country (hospitable) and city/court (inhospitable), and past (hospitable) and present (inhospitable).” She continues, “What both images have in common is the definition of customary hospitality as ‘other’, as belonging to some time, space, or social group that was not part of the centralist, modern paradigm from which most observers [of hospitality] operated” (*Hospitality* 112). A poor tanner living in the country and of an indefinite period of the past due to his ballad roots fits all three categories of otherness.

⁵⁷ Wincott accepts Dalavill on the basis of being “the friend/ Beloved of him whom you so much commend,/ The noble Master Geraldine” (2.1.11-3). Merely because of this association, Wincott finds Dalavill’s “worth unquestioned” (16).

⁵⁸ Heal notes that a “host could, in principle, be of any social standing,” though “when men thought of open entertainment they logically thought above all of those who could treat the household as a cornucopia of plenty, the rich and especially landowning élite” (“Idea” 69).

bagpudding, a piece of fat bacon, a good cow heel, ... and a brown loaf” (15-6).⁵⁹ Hobs expects that his hospitality will be both accepted and reciprocated. When his guests “neither talk nor eat”, Hobs tries to prompt his guests, asking “what news at the court?”, and imploring them to “do somewhat for your meat” (76-7). For Hobs the practice of hospitality involves reciprocation at its most fundamental level, but Edward and Sellinger refuse to participate and offer conversation in exchange for their food. Though Edward does not eat, he does still create a special familiarity with the hostess in a manner that “prefigures the more flagrant violation of hospitality at the Lord Mayor’s banquet” (71-6n). As at Mayor Crosby’s house, Edward does not return his host’s pledge (89-90), but chooses, instead, to “drink to [his] wife that may be”: Nell (94). Edward seemingly refuses to partake in commensality with his subjects unless they are of sexual interest.

Although he does not violate Hob’s home as fully as he violates the domesticity of Matthew Shore’s household, Edward hardly engages in good-faith hospitality with Hobs, since Hobs’s ignorance of his guest’s true identity, which admittedly enables their hospitable meeting, also forms the basis of a grand “jest” (13.115) for a King who must have his “humour” (117). Hobs gains beneficial access to King Edward due to his earlier hospitality and resultant familiarity with his monarch, but there is a sense in which Edward “mean[s] to be a little merry” at Hob’s expense (23.7), particularly as confirmation of the pardon is delayed:

HOBS. I thank ye, good gentleman Mayor, but I care not for no
meat. My stomach is like to a sick swine’s, that will

⁵⁹ The simple fare is matched by simple accommodations: “clean sheets” that are “coarse, good, strong hemp” and a “chamber pot” made out of a “fair horn” (*IE* 14.118-21). Rowland also notes that “Hobs’s reference to diminishing sales of even ‘clout-leather’ (11.9) at the opening of the play succinctly indicates the precariousness of his economic position” (29).

neither eat nor drink till she know what shall become of
her pig. Ned and Tom, you promised me a good turn
when I came to court: either do it now, or go hang
yourselves.

EDWARD. No sooner come the King, but I will do it. (23.64-70)

Hobs refuses the hospitality of the Mayor in his pursuit of a pardon for his son, shunning reciprocal hospitality until Ned keeps his promise. Edward, however, seems to put off his revelation indefinitely, since as long as Ned is present, the King cannot come to grant the pardon. Edward, furthermore, does not benevolently end his game as Hobs's exasperation grows, but his jest is instead "marred" by the master of St. Katherine's, who is not in on the joke (74). Hobs receives a somewhat mixed welcome in return for his hospitality, leaving him with a pardon for his son (23.95), travel compensation (98-9), and a dinner invitation (151-2), but at the expense of being gulled by the King.⁶⁰

The hospitable episode in Mayor Crosby's home facilitates the acquaintance of Edward, the monarch, and Jane Shore, his subject. In the Hobs plotline, Edward reveals his identity to help Hobs, but with Jane Edward uses hospitality and the revelation of his identity to exercise his royal prerogatives for his own desires. After Jane first resists Edward's advances in scene seventeen, Edward returns to press his case. In scene nineteen, Edward recalls the social position whereby they first met, as guest and hostess, though with a more negative valence: "Thou mayst convict me, beauty's pride, of boldness,/ That I intrude like an unbidden guest" (19.77-8).⁶¹ Due to the combined demands of hospitality and deference to her monarch, Jane also takes up her former role

⁶⁰ Hobs's hospitality is certainly less than ideal, however. He claims, for instance, that he only welcomed 'Ned' and 'Tom' "for want of better guests" (*IE* 18.112).

⁶¹ Matthew Shore reinforces the idea of the King as a bad guest who is particularly dangerous because of his power: "And let me tell ye, he that is possessed/ Of such a beauty fears undermining guests;/ Especially a mighty one like him" (*IE* 20.46-8).

and welcomes King Edward: “Most welcome to your subject’s homely roof:/ The foot, my sovereign, seldom doth offend,/ Unless the heart some other hurt intend” (80-2). Jane welcomes Edward, while also reminding him that it is not the presence of a guest that is dangerous but what a guest intends to do once access to a home is secured. Faced with further refusals from Jane, Edward resorts to his kingly prerogatives, which “enforce” an invitation that cannot be refused (108):

Thou must, sweet Jane, repair unto the court.
His tongue entreats, controls the greatest peer;
His hand plights love, a royal scepter holds;
And in his heart he hath confirmed thy good;
Which may not, must not, shall not be withstood. (103-7)

Edward mixes language that might woo Jane with language that orders her to comply.

Edward performs a kind of self blazon that gives dual purposes to the parts of his body:

Edward’s tongue both entreats and controls; his hand both plights love and holds a scepter; and his heart confirms Jane’s good, but yet cannot be withstood or resisted.

Edward’s manner of speech recalls the concept of the King’s two bodies, which is the idea that a king possessed both a body natural and a body politic. The concept was

“codified” in 1562 during the reign of Elizabeth I and was often used to justify

“monarchical power and infalliability” (Carroll 127).⁶² Edward here resembles Wendoll,

who seduces Anne from the position of the guest, even as he seeks to wield his dominant position. But what is most dangerous about Edward’s seduction of Jane, which

consistently occurs under the auspices of hospitality, is the mixing of the king’s two

bodies within his invitation. Edward acknowledges how unusual and inappropriate it is

⁶² For further discussion of the concept of the King’s two bodies see William C. Carroll’s “Theories of Kingship in Shakespeare’s England”, 127-9.

when, for Jane's sake, "majesty [is] disrobed!/ Riches made poor, and dignity brought low" (1E 19.84-5). Edward seems to usurp himself to gain Jane's affection, which seems to repeat the very problem that began the play: Edward has "basely" taken a "subject of [his] own" for a wife (1.26). The main problem in Edward's seduction of Jane Shore, therefore, is that she is his subject, and of a much lower class.

The danger of such a renunciation of status is reinforced by its opposite: the strictly unaspiring and loyal Matthew Shore. Matthew Shore first refuses to be knighted for his role repulsing Falconbridge's rebellion because of his "own unworthiness" to be "advanced with Aldermen, with our Lord Mayor, and our right grave Recorder" (9.232, 234-5). By comparing his advancement to that of others of higher status, Matthew Shore resists primarily because he perceives that it is improper to become equal to those who were originally higher than himself. Matthew seems inflexible in his loyalty and deference to the King, and seems only concerned with "the honour of your majesty" (16.134), even after Jane becomes Edward's mistress.⁶³ Unlike Hobs, who has the advantage of unknowingly encountering King Edward, Matthew Shore refuses to be familiar with his king. The result for each man is quite significantly different. But though Hobs's familiarity with King Edward leads to a seemingly positive outcome, the play does not indicate that Matthew and Jane Shore could have avoided their fates by increasing the performance of their familiarity with Edward. Jane suffers her fate, rather, because her familiarity with Edward is enforced by his monarchical power (19.108). The

⁶³ Matthew Shore accepts his fate quite stoically and generally refuses to speak against the actions of his King. See, for instance 1E 20.74-5, 79-81, 84-5, 94-96; 22.97-9, 107-13; 2E 12.82-6. In light of Matthew's forbearance to even speak of King Edward (1E 20.96), Richard Helgerson notes that resistance to Edward is "unthinkable" for Jane and Matthew Shore (*Forms of Nationhood* 239).

main problem seems to be that Edward's familiarity with commoners, especially when also playing the role and enjoying the prerogatives of king, is inappropriate. It becomes inappropriate through the mixing of class roles and through the descent of the king. Edward's descent, within a hospitable framework, has a destructive effect comparable to that of Wendoll's and Geraldine's advancement through hospitality. Hospitality, therefore, becomes the subject of anxiety in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller*, and *Edward IV* because it has enabled the mixing, advancement, and descent of these men in a manner that disrupts social order.

In *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller* and *The Late Lancashire Witches* the practice of hospitality is consistently linked to the formation and cultivation of social bonds; the language of binding, with significant etymological links to obligation, is ever present. Many of the utterances, indeed, echo each other. Both Wendoll and Geraldine speak of being "bound" to their hosts by many "favours" (*WK* 4.72-3) and "courtesies" (*ET* 1.1.65). Wendoll even invokes his bond with Frankford when he attempts to seduce Anne. In a kind of modified Petrarchan conceit, Wendoll woos Anne by proclaiming his unworthiness to hold Frankford's affection: "This kindness grows of no alliance 'twixt us –/.../I never bound him to me by desert" (6.32-4). When Anne acknowledges that Wendoll is "beholden" to Frankford, Wendoll agrees, and modifies her statement to include her: "I am bound unto your husband and you too" (6.88). In *The English Traveller*, both host and guest acknowledge that they are bound to one another, specifically through the exchange of hospitality. Wincott, the seemingly perpetual host, welcomes his guests by stating that he is "bound" to them for visiting him

“at so short a warning” (*ET* 5.1.47). Wincott seems especially aware of the uses and obligations that attend hospitable practice, since as a guest, Wincott acknowledges that he and his household are “bound” to Old Geraldine because of “this great entertainment” (3.1.1). Old Geraldine then returns the sentiment (3.1.137) after Wincott promises that Geraldine will “not be the last remembered” in his will (136). The hospitality of Master Generous similarly causes Arthur to claim that he is “oblig’d” (1.1.236) to Generous and to promise “love and service” (2.2.48), while Generous himself wishes to be “beholden” to his guests (195). These bonds are, of course, the intended purpose of hospitality and they form the “web of obligations that held the society of England together” (Bray 105), while also constituting the means “by which men had traditionally advanced themselves” (124). But along with the positive, intended purpose of these bonds lurks the possibility for their corruption.

In his stimulating work on friendship in *The Friend*,⁶⁴ Alan Bray examines a specific form of friendship between men that functioned as a kind of ritual kinship, much as marriage did and still does (214). According to Bray, in the early modern period “sworn brotherhood” (104) existed as a form of “voluntary kinship” in conjunction with marriage.⁶⁵ But according to Bray, there also existed a contrasting image of male friendship: the sodomite. Bray claims that though the image of the friend was “far removed” from the sodomite they also “occupied a similar terrain” (186). Both incorporate a “physical closeness” and rehearse similar “gestures,” such as the “embrace

⁶⁴ I am grateful to Dr. Helen Ostovich for bringing this work to my attention.

⁶⁵ Alan Bray lists other ritual kinships, such as those created by baptism – “Godparenthood” (111) – and betrothal, which “might precede the marriage itself by several years but which created binding relations” (104).

and the shared bed” (186). Bray here leaves out another gesture of friendship: the shared table, which he had earlier included alongside the embrace and the shared bed, though there seems to be no reason why the shared table may not be reinserted as a gesture of friendly intimacy that became “open to a darker interpretation” (191) and “read in a different and sodomitical light than the one intended” (193). This open quality of the shared table is illustrated quite clearly in these four plays. The difference between friendship and sodomy seems to be that the former was “expressed by orderly ‘civil’ relations and the other in subversive” (186). Though the subversion of the sodomite remains vague, Bray suggests that the sodomite somehow transgressed social and class boundaries, through ‘friendship’ or familiarity, or that the friendship was somehow “mercenary” (190).⁶⁶ Bray elaborates:

If someone has acquired a place in society to which he was not entitled by nature and could then perhaps lord it over those who were naturally his betters, the specter likely to be conjured up in the minds of an Elizabethan was not the orderly relationship of friendship between men but rather the profoundly disturbing image of the sodomite, that enemy not only of nature but of the order of society and the proper kinds and divisions within it. (191)

With the exception of *Edward IV* in which a King woos a commoner, intimate relations in the plays, such as friendships, are usually between men of a similar, gentle, status.

However, these relationships, which are created through and marked by hospitality, do also seem to have suspicious elements that parallel the anxiety surrounding the sodomite.

When used properly, hospitality forms social bonds and may improve one’s social

⁶⁶ Daryl Palmer’s term ‘familiarity’ overlaps with Bray’s ‘friendship.’ Both possess positive associations as well as the subtle possibility of impropriety. Palmer writes that familiarity is “frequently less than alliance but more than recognition, implying but not guaranteeing favor. ... Familiarity embraced opposites: it could signify fitness *and* the erring abeyance of proper ceremony between ranks. The term could be used to describe intimacy *and* undue intimacy” (“Familiarities” 287).

standing, but there also seems to be the suspicion, at least in these four plays, that hospitality's potential to shape social order and form social bonds also has the potential to disrupt and destroy that same order and those same bonds. The danger of hospitality seems to be particularly heightened because hospitality is ideally given freely; hospitality and the social gains that result from it may not be things to which a guest is "entitled" (Bray 191).

Most of the guests in these four plays gain from their hospitable relationships, and all of the guests also use the circumstances of hospitality to actively pursue further gains. In *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Wendoll, through his relation with Frankford, has gained status in the larger community. He claims that Frankford has "made me companion with the best and chiefest/ In Yorkshire" (*WK* 6.38-9). Wendoll also pursues further gains by attempting to turn his symbolic appointment as a householder – a "present Frankford in his absence" (6.77) – into a real usurpation where he declares himself "husband now in Master Frankford's place" and immediately proceeds to consummate his new status by sleeping with Anne (11.89). Geraldine similarly gains, as has been discussed, from his close relation with Wincott, which allows Geraldine to expect a place in Wincott's will (*ET* 3.1.136-7) and eventually receive "the lands that [Wincott has] left" (5.1.256). Geraldine's position as guest also allows access to Wincott's wife, and he seeks to secure her "widowhood" (2.1.259), which would again allow him to receive Wincott's estate. The access that hospitality provides Geraldine is integral to his own plans, since, as soon as he no longer has access to Wincott's wife's

“bedchamber” (209), she bestows her affections on Dalavill, who retains hospitable access.

But what is notable about Wendoll’s and Geraldine’s gains through hospitality is that they both claim that they do not deserve their host’s generosity. Twice when speaking of Frankford’s generosity, which binds them together, Wendoll claims that he “shall never merit you least favour” (*WK* 4.74) and that he “never bound [Frankford] to [himself] by desert” (6.34). Wendoll goes on to describe himself as “a mere stranger, a poor gentleman,/ A man by whom in no kind [Frankford] could gain” (35-6). Geraldine speaks in similar terms when he describes Wincott’s “unmerited love,” and he claims he is “ignorant/ Which way I should deserve it” (*ET* 1.1.76-8). Their claims of unworthiness would, seemingly, exclude them both from the gains that hospitality has made available to them as well as from the very reception of hospitality, which, as a proffered means of social security and elevation, is a gift in and of itself. This kind of undeserved benefit and social elevation, of which Bray claims Elizabethans were suspicious, is precisely what Matthew Shore is trying to avoid when he refuses his knighthood on the grounds of his “unworthiness” in relation to his compatriots of higher status (*IE* 9.232-5). To accept a social elevation equal to your superiors would disrupt the “order of society and the proper kinds and divisions within it” (Bray 191). Though Matthew avoids what he perceives to be inappropriate advancement – in so far as it is inappropriate considering his role repulsing the rebellion – Edward’s seduction of Jane fails to maintain proper boundaries of class and status, since Edward must partially disavow his status in order to woo her

and Jane herself gains power and influence,⁶⁷ solely due to her intimacy with King Edward. In a similar manner, Wendoll's and Geraldine's use, or attempted use, of hospitality to quickly secure estates from other families may disrupt the order of society, even as it resembles the proper development of social affinities and advancement. Geraldine's inheritance from Wincott especially stands in contrast to his occupations when he is not a guest: the concerns and business of his father's estate (3.1.129-32), which requires work, not feasting, to maintain and secure.

Similar concerns about advancement through hospitality may also be found in *The Late Lancashire Witches*. Like Wendoll and Geraldine, Arthur benefits socially and monetarily from his relationship with Master Generous, which had been fostered through hospitality. Their hospitable bond is significant enough that it ultimately displaces the blood kinship of Generous and Whetstone, which presumably would include an inheritance: "I utterly discard [Whetstone] in [Mistress Generous's] blood,/ And all the good that I intended him/ I will confer on this [*indicates Arthur*] virtuous gentleman" (5.5.142-4). Arthur also seeks to use a hospitable situation with Master Generous to become bound to him in other ways. Arthur approaches Master Generous to "prompt you memory in motion" of Generous's promise:

to become bound with [Arthur], or if the usurer
(a base, yet the best, title I can give him)
Perhaps should question that security
To have the money ready. (1.1.227-30)

⁶⁷ It should be noted, however, that Jane uses her influence for socially positive ends. Jane is able to secure pardons (*IE* 22.30), including Matthew Shore's (*2E* 12.107-8), seeks to restore lands (*IE* 22.39-40), and chooses not to grant suits that she thinks would "wound the commonwealth" (22.66), such as if a suitor desires to transport "corn" to "foreign realms" (22.62-3). Rowland notes that the importance of keeping corn in England would resonate strongly with early modern audiences of the play who were experiencing "harvest failure" and "dearth" (20).

The displacement of Whetstone is fitting in light of Arthur's suit, since Arthur pursues the security offered in a hospitable relationship because Seely, Arthur's blood relation, is "unfit to be solicited" (242) due to the inversion of his household, though Seely is neither "unwilling or unable" to help (241). But alongside the prospect of Arthur's social gain through Generous's hospitality exists another feature of Bray's definition of sodomitical friendships. Since Generous's hospitality and generosity encompass not only the "less tangible assets of honour, loyalty, alliance, and beneficence" but also the material exchange of the "cash nexus" (Heal, *Hospitality* 19-20), the spectre of "mercenary" companionship looms behind the ideally non-monetary reciprocities of early modern hospitality (Bray 190).⁶⁸

In *The Late Lancashire Witches*, Generous, through the system of hospitable relations, does not only save Arthur from the threat of the usurer and therefore juxtapose the two systems of obligation and exchange, but Generous also borrows the terms of usury, lending, and debt to describe hospitable relations. The juxtaposition of hospitality and usury not only dramatizes the conflict between systems of social exchange but also illustrates that the two systems did not merely oppose each other. Instead, the language of usury and monetary exchange seems to infiltrate the language of hospitality, such that the pitfalls and anxieties that surround usury may also surround hospitality, particularly if hospitality is corrupted or misused. Though he often speaks idealistically of his own hospitable practice, Master Generous's hospitality also becomes implicated in the process

⁶⁸ Bray also notes the difficulties of distinguishing between friendship, "mere collusion and cynical self-advancement" (125).

of money lending and usury. Generous seeks for his guests to “wink” at the poor behaviour of Whetstone while they are all “at table” (1.1.206-7). In exchange for this request, which would make the practice of hospitality more agreeable, Generous would be “beholden” to them as a “grateful debtor” (1.1.195-6).

The English Traveller takes up, more expansively, both the threat of usury, and the relation between hospitable exchange and usury. The theme is introduced in 3.1, when Wincott and his household visit the home of Old Geraldine. Wincott praises Old Geraldine's hospitable generosity (3.1.2-4) and then continues to praise Old Geraldine's generosity in 'lending' his son, Young Geraldine:

WINCOTT. And in this
By trusting him to me, of whom yourself
May have both use and pleasure, you're as kind
As moneyed men, that might make benefit
Of what they are possessed, yet to their friends
In need will lend it gratis.

WIFE. And like such
As are indebted more than they can pay
We more and more confess ourselves engaged
To you for your forbearance.

PRUDENTILLA. Yet you see,
Like debtors such as would not break their day
The treasure late received we tender back,
The which the longer you can spare, you still
The more shall bind us to you.

OLD GERALDINE. Most kind ladies,
Worthy you are to borrow, that return
The principal with such large use of thanks.

DALAVILL. [*aside*] What strange felicity these rich men take
To talk of borrowing, lending, and of use,
The usurer's language right. (3.1.9-26)

The scene that immediately follows Wincott's monetary conceit introduces the threat of the usurer in the Lionel plot. According to Reignald, the household of Young Lionel has

“borrowed money to supply/ Our prodigal expense, broke our day,/ And owe him still the principal and use” (3.2.4-6). It is not likely an accident that hospitality is described in terms of usury and then the pitfalls of usury are displayed. Though the conversation in 3.1 does not seem to point to the degeneration of hospitality through mercenary friendships and self-interest, it does speak to the difficult social bonds that hospitality may create. The exchange of Geraldine between houses in reciprocal hospitality binds the two households (3.1.21). There seems to be, as a result, a mutual debt. In the passage above, Old Geraldine is the lender, but he also expresses a debt to Wincott for the “oft and frequent welcomes given my son” (6), which “this and more/ Many degrees, can never countervail” (4-5). Geraldine himself, in an oft-quoted passage, uses similar language to describe his relationship to Wincott:

I am so bound in many courtesies
That not the least, by all th’ expression
My labour or industry can show,
I will know how to cancel. (1.1.65-8)

Geraldine is unable to quantify, in monetary terms, the debt he owes Wincott for his hospitality. Because a usury conceit that is used to describe an unpayable social debt in 3.1 is followed by a representation of an unpayable monetary debt, the serious danger of the monetary debt may be easily transferred to the social debt. But what happens if one is unable to fully reciprocate an act of generosity or hospitality?

An unpaid or unpayable debt, both social and monetary, seems to be a dangerous, but not unfamiliar, position in these Heywood plays. Arthur alludes to this kind of position when he professes to Master Generous that he remains “a man oblig’d to you/ Beyond all utterance” (*LLW* 1.1.236-7). King Edward also notes that, since Matthew

Shore refused to be knighted, “we are your debtor still” (*IE* 16.86), and then in an apparently playful comment “condemn[s]” Matthew Shore of “discourtesy” (90). But the clearest example of the “heavy burden” of generosity is Sir Charles Mountford (*WK* 14.72). Mountford is first imprisoned after being caught in a usurious trap by Shafton (7.28-31, 34) and is later “bound to satisfy [his] debt” to Sir Francis Acton, whom he hates (79), because Acton paid his original, monetary debt.⁶⁹ In the cases of Edward and Mountford hospitality, specifically, has not created their burdensome, unpayable debt, and the case of Arthur is only tangentially related to the hospitality that characterizes Master Generous, but the prominence of such burdensome debts due to generosity, alongside the unpayable hospitable debt in *The English Traveller*, indicates that hospitality as a gift or act of generosity may also create asymmetrical social debts. Orlin quotes Owen Feltham’s essay “That Great Benefits Cause Ingratitude” (1623) to explain this phenomenon in relation to Wendoll and Frankford, though it applies to all guest-host relations in these plays:

Extraordinary favors make the giver hated by the receiver, that should love him. ... Benefits are so long grateful, as we think we can repay them: but when they challenge more, our thanks convert to hate. It is not good to make men owe more than they are able to pay. (qtd in Orlin 170)⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Mountford’s predicament is exacerbated by his “unthankful kinsmen” (*WK* 10.6), including a cousin (9.32), a former tenant (26), and an uncle (9). The uncle claims, exhibiting the influence of monetary relations at the expense of kinship, that Mountford “lost my kindred when he fell in need” (17). Orlin sees Mountford’s situation as further evidence, alongside the adultery of the Frankford plot, of the “relentlessly contestatory” male relationships in the play.

⁷⁰ From Owen Feltham’s “That Great Benefits Cause Ingratitude” (1623).

The frequent threat of usury in relation to hospitality, which itself is described in usurious terms, draws attention to the ways that hospitality, and the bonds of intimacy and obligation that it created, could also have darker effects than the reification and fructification of “liberality and civility” within a community, which was the avowed goal of reciprocal hospitality (Heal, *Hospitality* 20). Like early modern sworn friendships, which constituted a fundamental relation of society while also possibly evoking the subversive and disorderly figure of the sodomite, hospitality also exists alongside the threat of corruption and resultant social disruption. In these four plays hospitality exists as an apparent source of social order, forming bonds between men and households. But hospitality can also contain the potential for social disruption, such as when it facilitates bonds of intimacy that lead to inappropriate social advancement, and the transgression of social bounds. And even when these bonds do not transgress social bounds, there is the ever present possibility that the bonds of hospitality may be burdensome, especially when the expectation of reciprocity cannot be fulfilled.

I opened this chapter quoting Derrida, who claims that hospitality contains a certain “pervertibility ... that is always possible and in truth virtually inevitable” (65). In the four Heywood plays that are the focus of this study hospitality creates and solidifies social bonds. Hosts are generally of a higher, more established status than their guests, and a guest’s intimacy with his or her host often produces benefits. But hospitality also always has the possibility of being corrupted, and many of the plays are aware of and express anxiety about the darker possibilities of hospitality. Particularly in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller* the social bonds fostered in a hospitable

relationship may be an acceptable form of social edification or they may allow for inappropriate advancement that, in the plays, often seeks to displace the host. Hospitality may allow access to men of influence, such as in *King Edward IV*, who are able to use their power on behalf of commoners such as Hobs, or hospitality may provide the king access to the commoners who cannot resist his power. Hospitality may also, as Master Generous laments, cease to be a genuine expression of social connection, instead becoming a set of conventions and performances that may, furthermore, become a burden upon those who engage in hospitable relations. Concerning the performance of early modern English hospitality, Heal notes that “household ordinances are rich in advice about the application of [household] social geography to the reception of strangers” (30). A guest’s status will affect both where a guest will be seated for the meal (31) as well as how the guest will be welcomed (32-3). According to Heal, the heart of these “gestures,” which constitute the very performance of hospitality itself, “lay in their public acknowledgment of the demands of the honour code, in the continual reaffirmation of hierarchy, and in the contribution of the host to the maintenance of proper social order” (33). But precisely those values that hospitality most strongly supports are also the points of greatest social vulnerability due to hospitality. Each play dramatizes the hospitable values of social order based upon bonds of obligation and familiarity, while these same bonds ultimately break other bonds of social cohesion, throwing households and society into disorder.

3: Women and Hospitality: Hospitable Exclusions

In the previous chapter, I discussed the relation of the host and the guest, and the ways that the intended effects of hospitality – such as creating socially necessary and beneficial bonds – also tended to exist alongside the possibility and fear that those same social effects would be exploited or corrupted. Focusing on the hospitable bond between host and guest illuminates overlooked characteristics of the relationships of relatively high status males. Such a focus, however, neglects the pivotal female figures in each play. In some cases, such as in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*, the women of the plays may be incorporated relatively easily into the represented social systems of exchange, though usually as an object of exchange that facilitates male bonding, in accordance with early modern conceptions of women as property (Stallybrass 127).⁷¹

Women are not the only gift that may be exchanged between the men of these plays, but the role of women as a gift or conduit for male bonding points to an important characteristic of the bonding system of hospitality, which applies to most women in these four plays. In her seminal essay “The Traffic in Women,” Gayle Rubin delineates the social implications for women who are gifts:

If women are the gifts, then it is the men who are the exchange partners. And it is the partners, not the presents, upon whom reciprocal exchange confers it quasi-

⁷¹ Viviana Comensoli writes of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* that “the references to Anne as an extension of Frankford reaffirm the prevalent Renaissance view of women as hoardable property” (73). Lena Cowen Orlin also writes that the “displacement” of male-male desires onto Anne in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* “offers us one further insight about notions of property and anxieties of possession in the early modern period: these notions and anxieties could be and often were transferred to and cathected in women” (172). In reference to *The English Traveller*, Orlin perceives Geraldine to be the object of “competition” (264) and a “commodity” (265), but Wincott’s Wife still provides a “pretext for and intersection of [male] homosocial, homoerotic, and testamentary longings” (252).

mythical power of social linkage. The relations of such a system are such that women are in no position to realize the benefits of their own circulation. As long as the relations specify that men exchange women, it is men who are the beneficiaries of the product of such exchanges – social organization. (37)

What is true of a system in which women are gifts is also true of hospitality in these plays. Men are the primary producers and recipients of hospitality in these plays while the women are variously excluded from the social benefits that hospitality provides, not always because they are gifts but because they are not the givers. The exclusion and expulsion of women from hospitable performance in these plays occurs even as they are exploited and then blamed for the failure of the same reciprocal hospitality that excludes them.⁷² In response, many women embrace an alternative hospitality that is removed from the conventional bonds of reciprocation, and which may be figured as hostile to the operation of society and communities within these plays.

At least one early modern writer believed that the laws of hospitality extended to include the wife of a household. In a creative argument against wife-beating, William Heale writes that “none who entered into an others house, should for the time of his aboad there, suffer any kind of iniury upon any occaision” (qtd in Heal, *Hospitality* 5).⁷³ Heale considered this maxim to apply to wives, since they, like guests, had also entered

⁷² Daryl W. Palmer makes a similar point in *Hospitable Performances* when he claims “women certainly stood by their men in the hosting, but in the reckoning of gains and losses, only the position of the male host ‘counted’” (38). He further claims that representations of hospitality seem to “constitute a special arena for such contests in which women’s agency is refashioned” (37). Palmer argues for a gradual displacement of female hostesses based on their relative absence (37) and from the progression of female hostesses beginning from the more positive hostess in Peele’s *The Old Wive’s Tale* (1595) to the later Lady Macbeth (1623), who is “dangerous and deserve[s] displacement” (38). Palmer calls this suggestion “tentative and necessarily hypothetical” (38), and though this chapter cannot produce definitive support for Palmer’s hypothesis, these four Heywood plays, which Palmer does not consider, lend further weight to his argument, especially since the expulsion of women from conventional hospitality often takes a very literal form in these plays.

⁷³ From *An Apologie for Women, or an Opposition to Mr. G[ager] His Assertion. That is was Lawfull for Husbands to Beate their Wives*, 1609.

their husband's home, though perhaps more permanently than others. In Heale's view, the husband "takes her into his own hospitality; receives her into his own protection, and himself becomes her sole guardian" (qtd in Heal, *Hospitality* 5). Though appearing six years before Heale's treatise, *A Woman Killed with Kindness* seems to presuppose Heale's argument, particularly given Frankford's characterization as a host and his non-violent punishment for Anne's adultery. Anne seems to occupy a dual position in relation to Frankford by being both property and guest. As a form of property, she is among the "ripest pleasure[s] of [Frankford's] house" that Frankford invites Wendoll to enjoy (11.64). And Anne is also later associated with Frankford's property when she becomes the "blemish of [Frankford's] house" (*WK* 13.117), leading Viviana Comensoli to claim that Anne's fall is "one and the same with her 'infect[ion]' of Frankford's property" (73). But the impact of Anne's "infectious thoughts" (*WK* 13.126) is worsened by her previously close relation to Frankford, which he characterizes in hospitable terms, asking, "Did I not lodge thee in my bosom?" (112). Though her transgression results in her exile from Frankford's home – a fitting fate for someone whose soul has already been "wandering" and who has violated a household's hospitality (6.149) – Anne continues to be Frankford's guest, since she moves to his "manor seven mile off" (13.164).

But though she may be a guest and receives nominal provision at the end of the play, the practice of hospitality in Frankford's household does not benefit Anne, ironically, because she is a conduit for the administration of hospitality. Anne is initially integral to Frankford's hospitality, as Frankford requests her to "use [Wendoll] with all thy loving'st courtesy" (4.79). The danger of female hospitality here is quite different

from that of Lady Macbeth, another dramatic hostess, who Daryl Palmer claims is “dangerous and deserve[s] displacement” (*Performances* 38). Anne is instead vulnerable through her offer of hospitality, which she openly acknowledges by her qualification that “as far as modesty may well extend,/ It is my duty to receive your friend” (*WK* 4.80-1). Anne must later welcome Wendoll herself due to Frankford’s absence, becoming a *means* for Frankford to “do unto you his most kind commends” (6.71). By the end of that same scene she has been seduced. As I have noted in the previous chapter, Jane Shore takes a similar role in *1 Edward IV* as a hostess who issues a qualified but formal welcome to her guest: “on my Lord Mayor’s behalf,/ I do such duty as becometh me,/ To bid your highness welcome to his house” (16.104-5). Jane’s welcome has a similar result: the guest desires and eventually seduces her.

The vulnerabilities of a female hostess likely owe to the relationship of food, gender and sexuality. Among other early modern authors who connect female eating with sexuality, Richard Brathwait writes in *The English Gentlewoman* (1631) that “*Luscious fare* is the fuell of euery inordinate concupiscence” and that “By restraint of this, you shall learne to moderate your desires” (qtd in Green 56, emphasis given).⁷⁴ Reina Green notes that Anne may, indeed, be characterized by similar cupidinous desires, since Frankford asks Anne if her adultery was because of any “want” (*WK* 13.106). Frankford asks ironically if she was not “supplied/ With every pleasure, fashion, and new toy – / Nay, even beyond my calling?” (107-9). It is possible that Anne does not desire “every

⁷⁴ Reina Green also cites a 1581 translation of Barthoélemy Batt who recommends that young women “not eate openly ... in the feastes and banquetes of her Parentes, lest shee see such meats as shee might desire and lust after” (qtd in Green 56). The concern here might be as much about the ‘meats’ as the people present at such a banquet.

pleasure” and that Frankford has merely supplied Anne, unasked, with pleasures, fashions and toys out of his characteristic generosity. Green suggests, however, that Frankford’s questions imply that “Anne has an appetite for wasteful trifles, a whim that he has tried to appease” (63), which is also certainly possible. In either case, whether Frankford seeks to meet Anne’s original desire or is merely generous, by supplying Anne it is possible that Frankford has actually increased her desire, sexual or otherwise, in accordance with Brathwait’s understanding of the cyclical relation of food and sexual desire.⁷⁵ The effects of hospitable participation are, therefore, quite different for early modern men and women.⁷⁶ While Wendoll gains status and social connection as a guest of Frankford’s house, as I have demonstrated in the previous chapter, Anne has few positive outcomes available to her as a participant in her husband’s hospitality. Anne’s personal success or failure in the hospitable practice, which she performs at Frankford’s request and on his behalf, reflects ultimately upon her husband. Peter Stallybrass notes that “through marriage, the woman’s honour [linked primarily to chastity], like her property is incorporated into her husband’s” (137). For this reason, Frankford includes “the blemish of my house” as a reason for chastity alongside “fear of shame, regard of honour” and his “love” (*WK* 13.116-7). Green notes that Frankford “fails to consider how his own openness to, and desire for, his friend may have led to the destruction of his marriage”

⁷⁵ Wendoll’s desire for Anne may also be linked to his reception of hospitable sustenance, which, as Orlin notes, may “arouse” his “sexual appetite” (173).

⁷⁶ The differing effects may also be a reflection of differing relations to food. Nancy Gutierrez claims that “whereas men are encouraged to practice a ‘middle way’ in their eating habits, the message to women is that they should be excessively austere in regulating their diet, since they are more in danger of losing control of their physical cravings, whether for food or for sex” (14). This perspective may, however, be tempered by the claims of Caterina Albano, who notes that in early modern England “the threat of dearth and food shortage was constantly present” which indicates that the ability to choose particular eating habits may itself be a privilege not universally enjoyed (94).

(63), but Frankford also provides little assistance for his wife, though she deserves protection as a ‘guest’ of his house. Frankford’s frequent meals and generosity throughout the play seem to undermine Anne’s chastity. But more damningly, Frankford leaves his home when he suspects Anne and Wendoll’s adultery, even encouraging Wendoll to “use/ The very ripest pleasure of my house” (WK 11.63-4). Anne attempts to secure Frankford’s continued presence (57-8) and offers to wake him early the next morning so that he need not leave that night (68). When her suggestions fail, she tries to be rid of Wendoll by suggesting that he “bear [Frankford] company” (76). But when Frankford again refuses, she is left to “yield through fear” (113). Just as she is a mere instrument in Frankford’s hospitality, she also becomes merely instrumental to Frankford’s hospitable trap.

Anne’s hospitality seems only to be an extension of her husband’s, and Frankford’s hospitality not only leaves her vulnerable but also seems to expedite her fall. Receiving few benefits from hospitality, and finally expelled from Frankford’s hospitable household, she removes herself still further from hospitable practice. As part of Anne’s exile, she rejects the core components of hospitality: “I never will nor eat, nor drink, nor taste/ Of any cates that may preserve my life./ I never will nor smile, nor sleep, nor rest” (16.101-3). Though Frankford provides her a “manor” (13.164), Anne seems to reject the amenities that it may provide. Though Orlin claims that Anne’s suicide is a “convenience for the male characters” (175), Green sees an “attempt at self-assertion through the only

method available to her” (Green 66).⁷⁷ Christopher Frey and Leanore Lieblein go further and argue that Anne’s self-assertion has a specific target: “her husband and the role of food in the patriarchal society he embodies” (48). According to Frey and Lieblein, Anne’s starvation has two related components. Anne’s wish to have her “breasts seared” if it would “redeem [her] honour” (*WK* 13.134) rejects her own hospitable capabilities by withdrawing “her power to nourish” (Frey and Lieblein 60), but there is also a larger rejection of Frankford’s hospitality and its purposes:

By voluntarily self-starving, Anne violates the body perceived as property, and resists and successfully eludes the male-determined symbolic order that engulfs her in the opening wedding scene and that her husband maintains throughout the play by way of his table. (61)

In this final rejection, Anne removes herself from the system of hospitality that had used her as an object for exchange and to facilitate male social bonds. The practice of hospitality offered Anne none of the advantages that either Frankford or Wendoll may have hoped to gain. But the punishment for the failure of their hospitality is carried almost completely by Anne herself due to her expulsion from her community and from her husband’s house, both of which were constituted by hospitable performance and the social bonds that it created. In response, however, Anne chooses to reject conventional hospitality, and at least in some respects her rejection of hospitality may achieve a

⁷⁷ Anne’s starvation is often characterized in two non-exclusive ways. Gutierrez claims that it is “religious salvation *and* political resistance” (35) that is also a form of “self-assertion” (48). Comensoli follows a similar route claiming that the starvation “would have been interpreted by early modern audiences as a form of purification of the soul” (82). Comensoli grants Anne’s agency in her choice to starve, but claims that her death “upholds a conservative ideology of gender” (82). Along with her claim that Anne asserts herself in her starvation, Green argues against the interpretation that Anne’s starvation would be an acceptable form of “penance” (65). All three note that Anne’s starvation also relates to her sexuality as a means of “control” (Gutierrez 48), “suppression” (Comensoli 82), and as a form of renunciation that has rendered Anne “permanently closed” (Green 67).

measure of “control” as well as “Frankford’s submission” to her desire for recognition and reunion (Frey and Lieblein 61).

As a woman expelled from hospitality largely due to sexual openness, having received no benefit from hospitality, and either rejecting or establishing an alternate form of hospitality, Anne provides a model by which we may trace the hospitable experience of other women in these plays. In *The English Traveller*, Anne’s usual analogue is Wincott’s Wife, who also commits adultery and dies. Like Anne she becomes a means for male bonding, as Wincott “encourages” her intimacy with Geraldine “in order himself to purchase Geraldine’s presence (Orlin 252).⁷⁸ But though Mistress Wincott’s death is a form of expulsion from the hospitably constituted and vulnerable male society, there are other hospitable expulsions in the Lionel subplot, which reinforce the general theme throughout these plays of the expulsion of female sexuality from male hospitality.

Michel Grivelet, in his defense of the unity of *The English Traveller*, notes that “the house idea is as essential to Young Lionel as its counterpart, the travel idea, is to Young Geraldine” (59). Both plots are joined not only through this contrast but also due to the importance of hospitality in both plots: Lionel’s⁷⁹ household presents a spectacle of inverted hospitality in contrast to Wincott’s apparently conventional hospitality. Where Wincott welcomes Geraldine liberally and often, Lionel’s household treats his guests poorly⁸⁰ and even withdraws hospitality. The withdrawal of hospitality, however, seeks

⁷⁸ Orlin points to Wincott’s observation that “My wife and [Geraldine] in youth were playfellows/ And nor now be strangers” (1.1.87-8).

⁷⁹ All instances of Lionel refer to Young Lionel. His father will be denoted by Old Lionel.

⁸⁰ Aside from the “massacre of meat” that conflates Young Lionel’s hospitality with violence (2.1.82), Reignald notably concocts a ghostly guest to prevent Old Lionel from discovering his son’s prodigality. The ghost haunts the house because of his hospitable mistreatment. The ghost, via Reignald,

vainly to avoid one form of openness, female sexuality, while embracing other prodigalities.

In chapter two, I noted that Master Generous's hospitality is praised because "there's none can bear it with a braver port/ And keep his state unshaken" (*LLW* 1.1.39-40). Generous's hospitality remains in accord with the idea that hospitality, though required to be open, must also "temper generosity with prudence" (Heal, "Idea" 73). Lionel's household, in contrast, is characterized by "drunken surfeits" and "revels" such that it seems he keeps "Christmas all year long" (*ET* 1.2.2-4). His hospitality is not merely open but common, with clear sexual implications:

[Old Lionel's] modest house
Turned to a common stew, his beds to pallets
Of lusts and prostitutions, his buttery hatch
Now made more common than a tavern's bar,
His stools, that welcomed none but civil guests,
Now only free for panders, whores and bawds,
Strumpets and such? (1.2.31-37)

That Lionel's hospitality is problematic points to an important characteristic of hospitality. Heal notes that hospitality in the early modern period did not exist as a simple opposition of closure (bad) and openness (good) but as a form of "enclosure" (*Hospitality* 8). The transformation from stranger to guest was important, and was, in many ways, the fundamental action of hospitality. Heal writes, "to allow total openness would have been to deny the significance of this transition, and hence the integrity of the household and its head" (8). Though "the test" of commendable hospitality was a "buttery door constantly

claims that he came "With gold and jewels to this fatal house,/ Where seeking safety I encountered death./ The covetous merchant, landlord of this rent,/ To whom I gave my life and wealth in charge,/ Freely to enjoy the one robbed me of both" (2.2.194-198). The situation also provides another instance of the use of hospitality for monetary gain, which is perhaps as disdainful as the murder.

open for the poor” (8), Lionel’s “buttery hatch” (*ET* 1.2.33) has become too open, creating a kind of hospitality that has more in common with a prostitute than a “loyal wife” (165).

The presence of “panders, whores and bawds” (*ET* 1.2.36) signifies Lionel’s hospitable failure, but he does not take responsibility for the openness that has resulted in his common house. Lionel instead blames Scapha, a bawd, and Blanda, a whore. After using storm imagery to describe the ill that may befall a young man, figured as a house, he utters an aside as they enter:

O here’s that hail, shower, tempest, storm and gust
That shattered hath this building, let in lust,
Intemperance, appetite to vice; withal,
Neglect of every goodness. (135-8)

In Lionel’s eyes the problem comes from without, and the problem may, therefore, be resolved by removing the offender. The contrast between extreme openness and reserved enclosure arises again when Scapha advises Blanda that she should not set her “affection only upon one” (159), because when one, such as Blanda’s love Lionel (150), “hath nothing left to help himself, how can he harbor thee?” (179). Scapha’s philosophy of expediency is offensive to Lionel because he fears to lose Blanda’s love (170-2), even though such openness mirrors his own. In order to contain Scapha’s prescription of openness, Lionel issues a ‘hospitable’ punishment that bears many of the hallmarks of Anne Frankford’s and Jane Shore’s fate:

My parsimony shall begin in thee
And instantly; for from this hour, I vow
That thou no more shalt drink upon my cost
Nor taste the smallest fragment from my board.
I’ll see thee starve I’the street first. (182-6)

As in Anne's case, starvation seems to be the cure for sexual openness. Lionel seeks to remove what he perceives to be sexual openness by marginalizing Scapha, who is unable to join the guests who arrive to be entertained immediately after her punishment. Lionel also marginalizes Scapha in a more general social sense by associating her with witchcraft, an association that also occurs in *The Late Lancashire Witches*. Lionel calls Scapha, by turns, "this hag, this beldam" (194), a "witch," and a "damned enchantress" (209-10). As a guest seemingly opposed to Lionel's household, Scapha fits the paradoxical profile of witches, who were "domestic 'outsiders within'" (Dolan 175). Lionel makes Scapha a scapegoat, blaming her and punishing her for his own hospitable failures, which he does not actually renounce, as evidenced by his inquiry if there will be "wenches" (259).⁸¹

In reference to Old Lionel's final expulsion of "that wanton" and "her company" (4.6.283-4), Wendy Wall notes that Old Lionel creates a "gynophobic all-male preserve" (210). But Old Lionel has only completed what his son attempted incompletely and not without irony earlier in the play. Lionel's inverted hospitality places the host in a threatening position, where guests are in danger of violence or of the withdrawal of hospitality. The female guests, particularly, are in danger of expulsion due to their persistent association with sexual openness,⁸² which is enjoyed and sought by Lionel himself; Lionel's inverted hospitality includes these women until a scapegoat is required in order to banish a representative of Lionel's own prodigal hospitality.

⁸¹ Lionel himself also notes that he has not fully reformed: "In youth there is a fate that sways us still/ To know what's good, and yet pursue what's ill" (1.2.264-5).

⁸² As another example, though the women "fared best" in relation to the violence in the "massacre of meat" (ET 2.1.71, 82), their fate during the revel takes a particularly sexual tone, since even "she that had least ... by this time hath her belly full" (73-4).

The Late Lancashire Witches contains further examples of the mistreatment of guests, which may reflect more conventional concerns about the proper hospitable reception of guests, particularly those who are poor. In this play the witches are marginalized figures that threaten the practice of ‘proper’ hospitality, both through their disruption of community hospitality and food networks and through their own inversions of hospitality. The association of witches, food and hospitality is not particularly unusual:

In shaping their stories of witchcraft, women focused on an encounter with the suspected woman involving either an exchange, usually of food or food-related items, or a failed exchange of food, or sometimes merely a discussion about food. On other occasions, an exchange or failed exchange resulted in disrupted food production. (Purkiss 413)⁸³

The witches of the play, in their first appearance, establish that food disruption is one of their primary occupations by performing a dance in the field where they are meeting so that “cockle, darnell, poppia wild/ May choke [the field owner’s] grain and fill the field” (*LLW* 2.1.18-9). The witches fittingly end their series of hospitable and food disruptions at the final productive destination for grain: the “mill” (4.1.137). This disruption of the food supply would be especially poignant for early modern audiences for whom “the threat of dearth and food shortage was constantly present” (Albano 94),⁸⁴ and indeed a

⁸³ A typically cited scenario is based upon the work of Keith Thomas and Alan Macfarlane who claim that witchcraft accusations “often began when a poor, elderly, unmarried woman demanded charitable assistance and was denied; those who denied her, fearing her bitterness and vengefulness, ameliorated their panic and guilt by turning the tables: They accused her of bewitching them” (Dolan 172). Diane Purkiss notes that not all cases fell into this model and provides an exception to the ‘rule’ (412).

⁸⁴ If not displaced onto witches, food shortages, as Caterina Albano notes, were often blamed on other groups of ‘selfish’ individuals. A royal proclamation blamed food shortages not on natural dearth, but on the “greediness of sundry persons who preferred raising prices, to the great oppression of the poor” (qtd in Albano 95).

lack of food due to a “crisis in the rural economy” was often a contributing context for witchcraft accusations (Purkiss 413), not least in the case of the Lancaster witches.⁸⁵

The threat of dearth may also be observed in the witches’ disruptions of hospitality, such as the wedding of Lawrence and Parnell. As the Seelys’ attempt to celebrate the marriage of their servants, at which Moll, Doughty, Arthur, Shakstone, Bantam, and Whetstone are guests (*LLW* 3.1.34sd), the witches turn the wedding cake into “bran” (54) and fly the best food “out o’ the chimney top” (122). Food is clearly a central concern of the scene, which contains contrasting catalogues of lavish, good food and disgusting, witchy delicacies. Seely reviews the “bill of fare” as the guests exit to receive their food from the dresser (84):

For forty people of the best quality, four messes
of meat, viz: a leg of mutton in plum broth, a dish
of marrowbones, a capon in white broth, a sirloin
of beef, a pig, a goose, a turkey, and two pies. For
the second course: to every mess four chickens in
a dish, a couple rabbits, custard, flan,
Florentines, and stewed prunes. (86-92)

The witches turn this lavish feast into food that more closely resembles “need-food,” which denoted “kinds of foodstuffs often considered unhealthy and mainly seen as animal-food or inedible foodstuffs” (Albano 97):

The meat is flown out o’ the chimney top, I think,
and nothing instead of it but snakes, bats, frogs,
beetles, hornets, and humble-bees. All the salads
are turned to Jew’s-ears, mushrooms, and
puckfists, and the custards into cow-shards! (*LLW* 3.1.122-6)⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Of the Lancashire witch trials, John Swain argues that there “were economic aspects to many of the episodes in 1612 described by Potts [a court clerk], and to the events of 1633-34, but that these do not directly explain the trials and operated indirectly through a variety of social situations” (74).

The witches seemingly inflict dearth upon the Seely household, which is nonetheless still provided with “cold meats” and “wine” (149-50).

A possible reason for the witches ‘disruption’ of the food becomes evident when the witches do not merely discard the food that they have stolen, but themselves eat “all that hath lately been prepar’d/ For the great wedding feast” in a barn (4.1.56-7), pulling it from down from above. The intersection of witchcraft and food may point to the material reality of early modern witches. Alison Findlay writes that “it is vital to remember that the powerful feminist model of the witch is at odds with the material reality of most of the victims accused, who were vulnerable and poor” (154). The witches in *The Late Lancashire Witches* possibly experience this vulnerability first hand. Gillian Dickinson, a witch, exclaims to a boy: “Sirrah, you have serv’d me well to swinge me thus!/ You young rogue, you have us’d me like a dog!” (*LLW* 2.4.20-1). Though perhaps intended comically, since she had the shape of a dog while the boy abused her, her accusation likely resonates with the experience of accused witches in early modern England. The boy’s apparently capricious abuse of a weaker animal may also point to a failure of the community that might not treat its weaker members well.

The possibility that the community has neglected these older women out of suspicion, deeming them witches, now begins to illuminate the play’s other concern: hospitality. Findlay writes, in a paraphrase of Alan Macfarlane’s formula, that witchcraft

⁸⁶ Using *Macbeth* as an example, Wendy Wall notes that witchy fare may not have been as unusual to early moderns as to moderns: through the lens of [early modern] cookbooks, these witchcraft scenes take on a slightly more complicated valence; for when the witches call for body parts in their grotesque brew, they don’t *invert* medical remedies as much as exaggerate their sinister nature. After all, some of the ingredients in the cauldron ... aren’t that different from the body parts that surface in household guides” (199).

accusations may arise in part because of “an increasing gap between richer and poorer villagers [that] was accompanied by inadequate official structures for dealing with the problem of poverty and subsequent guilt on the part of substantial householders” (154). Hospitality, though not an ‘official’ structure, addresses itself to the problem of the poor and disenfranchised. Heal writes that “most moralistic literature left the virtuous host in no doubt that his primary responsibility was to care for the poor” and that “in the sixteenth century [hospitality] often referred exclusively to acts of charity” (“Idea” 75). Though Master Generous claims to offer liberal hospitality, in his private moments he also harbours some reticence about caring for strangers, complaining, “Is’t for my profit to buy hay and oats/ for every stranger’s jades?” (*LLW* 4.2.59). Master Generous seems to be a model host, though his hospitality, as seen in chapter two, also includes the impulses of monetary exchange and usury. His hospitality has perhaps neglected the more vulnerable members of the community.

Mistress Generous, however, who is introduced as a prospective hostess (1.1.190), also provides a certain hospitality, though usually as a part of her activities as the leader of the witches. If Master Generous has neglected vulnerable members of the community, it is possible that Mistress Generous’s ‘witchcraft,’ such as the feast in the barn, may be meant to feed hungry and impoverished women. Such a role would be consistent with “one of the paradigms of virtuous female behaviour,” according to Heal: “service to the community through the giving of alms and the ministration to the sick and needy in their own homes” (*Hospitality* 179). Mistress Generous therefore may practice a proper form of hospitality that becomes figured as inverted and threatening because of

anxieties about female hosts and the reception of the poor, and because it indicates a deficiency in the practice of conventional male hospitable exchange.

Mistress Generous's hospitality becomes a more blatant critique of patriarchal social structures during a "supper" at which she wishes to "put a trick upon" Arthur, Shakestone and Bantam because they called Whetstone a "bastard" (*LLW* 4.4.5-7). When his guests arrive, Whetstone, who "command[s]/ The house in the absence of [his] uncle" (4.5.7-8), gives the appearance of intimacy by moving from the "noise of the hall" to a "more private room" (1-2). With the assistance of Mistress Generous's witchcraft, Whetstone 'shows' the three gallants that they are the progeny of lower class workers who slept with their mothers while their legitimate fathers were away. Whetstone seeks to show that "there are more By-blows [bastards] than bear the name" (85-6). Whetstone and Mistress Generous use a hospitable occasion to insult their guests and correct what they perceive to be mistreatment based upon a patriarchal dichotomy of legitimate/illegitimate offspring. In their hospitable revenge they illustrate the vulnerabilities of hospitality which may be turned as a social weapon upon one's guest, as well as the vulnerabilities of patriarchal social structures that are supported by hospitality, since the gallants are apparently the progeny of guests to their mother's home.

If Mistress Generous provides ambiguous charitable aid to those hospitality neglects, while she herself is excluded from conventional hospitable practice, Jane Shore provides a more clearly positive instance of the same figure that also resonates with Anne

Frankford.⁸⁷ As in *The Late Lancashire Witches* the threat of dearth and food shortage is ever present in *1 & 2 Edward IV*. The rebel Falconbridge refers to food problems, though he claims that he does not wish to mend “measures, or the price of corn” (*1E* 2.30). But the rebels are nevertheless associated with the desire for food and seen as threats to the food supply. Smoke tells the troops to look upon London “as a troop of hungry travellers,/ that fix their eyes upon a furnished feast” (81-2), and Chub predicts that their entrance into London will supply them with all manner of food from the “bakers,” “brewers,” “Costermongers,” “poulters,” “butchers,” and “vintners” without having to pay (90-96).

Within this context of general hunger, Jane Shore offers charity.⁸⁸ Jane’s sexual openness with Edward allows her to be charitably open to poor subjects. Brackenbury claims that Jane’s “purse is always open to the hungry” (*2E* 9.29). Jane also secures pardons for her husband (*2E* 12.107-8) and others (*1E* 22.30), as well as restoring lands that have been “taken perforce by his highness’ officers” (*1E* 22.39-40). When she is unable to grant a suit immediately, she offers another form of hospitable relief: “Your suit, my friend, requires a longer time;/ Yet since you dwell so far off, to ease your charge,/ Your diet with my servants you may take” (49-51). Jane also tries to limit food shortages for the general population, which might apply more to her audiences who had experienced “four consecutive crop failures” than to her time in history (Rowland 20), by

⁸⁷ For an early comparison between Jane Shore and Anne Frankford see Hallett D. Smith’s “A Woman Killed with Kindness.” *PMLA* 53.1 (Mar., 1938): 138-147.

⁸⁸ As noted above, Heal writes that care for the poor was so central to the practice of hospitality that “in the prescriptive writing of the sixteenth century [hospitality] often referred exclusively to acts of charity” (“Idea” 75).

refusing a suit to transport “corn” to “foreign realms” (*IE* 22.62-3).⁸⁹

Jane’s charity, more generally, stands in contrast to Edward’s broken hospitality, especially because “Edward was renowned, particularly in the London chronicles, for assiduously courting London’s governors with lavish feasting” (Rowland 42), but also because of Edward’s relation to his subjects. Jane herself provides an example of the dangerously powerful proclivities possessed by Edward. Edward is often familiar with his subjects but they do not often benefit. For instance, Edward does not impose a “tax” but instead “mildly doth entreat/ [his subjects’] kind benevolence” (*IE* 18.22, 25-6). Using similar language to that of his later seduction of Jane (20.104) – both reminding his subjects of his power while claiming not to use it – Edward *entreats* his subjects to give him money as a “benevolence” (18.26) by which he will know their love (104). Jane, in contrast, *bestows* a “small benevolence/ on the poor prisoners in the common gaol” (*2E* 9.1-2), and furthermore refuses recompense for her hospitable charity (*IE* 22.33-5). Jane’s charity is both exceedingly open as well as outside the normal systems of hospitable exchange and reciprocation in which the men of these four plays engage.

As I discussed in chapter 2, Jane is made vulnerable to Edward largely through their hospitable meeting. Her familiarity with Edward gives her influence that she uses liberally for the common good as a form of hospitable charity, but “the case is altered now the King is dead” (*2E* 15.24). Jane claims that “with [Edward’s] life, my favouring friends are fled” (25), and it is, therefore, fitting that her falling fortunes are expressed as

⁸⁹ Heywood embraces a conception of dearth espoused by royal proclamations, which stressed the “responsibility of those who tried to withhold corn from town-markets to increase its price” (Albano 95).

hospitable expulsion. Brackenbury reports Richard III's proclamation that dictates Jane's fate in the play:

On pain of death, that none shall harbor you,
Or give you food, or clothes to keep you warm;
But, having first done shameful penance here,
You shall be then thrust forth the city gates,
Into the naked, cold, forsaken field. (18.102-6)

Jane's punishment includes expulsion from the shelter of the city, as well as the severance of social ties, since she may not be harboured in any home. Jane's closest relationship, with Mistress Blage, is broken by the proclamation. With a mind for her own self-interest, Mistress Blage refuses to host Jane after she becomes aware of Richard's proclamation, protesting, "I love you well, but love myself better" (137).⁹⁰ Blage initially rejects Jane because she is "my King's enemy" but then adds the reason, paralleling every other expulsion from hospitality in these four plays, that Jane has been a "wicked liver" and "unchaste" (149-50). Jane inquires about a "barn or stable" (166), but she is even rejected from the resort of the Lancashire witches. Blage had earlier welcomed Jane using a hospitable invitation that is pervasive and conventional in these four plays: "Use me, command me, *call my house your own,*/ And all I have, sweet lady, at your will" (15.21-2 emphasis mine). But after Richard's proclamation, Blage converts her previous hospitality into a commercial exchange, figuring her home as an inn. When Jane asks for the return of her "jewels" (18.176), Blage replies:

I know of none.
If there be any, I'll be so bold
As keep it for your diet, and your man's

⁹⁰ When Blage welcomes Jane initially, she attests that she loved Jane during Edward's reign, since his death, and "ever shall" (2E 15.28).

It is no little charge I have been at,
To feed your dainty tooth since you came hither;
Beside, house-room, I am sure, is somewhat worth. (177-82)

After Jane completes her penance she describes her situation. Her recourse to hospitable modes of speech reinforces the role that broken hospitality has played in her fall, both as seduced hostess and expelled guest:

Then welcome, nakedness and poverty.
Welcome, contempt. Welcome, you barren fields.
Welcome, the lack of meat, and lack of friends.
And, wretched Jane, according to thy state,
Sit here, sit here, and lower, if might be.
All things that breathe, in their extremity
Have some recourse of succor; thou hast none.
...
Come, patience, then; and though my body pine,
Make then a banquet to refresh my soul.
Let heart's deep-throbbing sighs be all my bread;
My drink, salt tears; my guests, repentant thoughts. (20.35-53)

Jane charts her expulsion from hospitality and community in the language of hospitable seating arrangements, imagining herself to be the lowest.⁹¹ But her repentance, and perhaps an imagined redemption, is also deeply associated with hospitality, as she imagines her penitential sufferings as components of a banquet. As she did during Edward's reign – and as do the witches in *The Late Lancashire Witches* – when she has been made vulnerable through hospitality, Jane Shore seeks to embrace an alternate form of hospitality that contrasts with the surrounding social practice.

In A Woman Killed with Kindness, The English Traveller, The Late Lancashire

⁹¹ In *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, Heal notes that seating arrangements provided a “living embodiment” of social hierarchy and an expression of the “elaborate and intricate rules of precedence and rank” (30) that were central to the practice of hospitality. Heal writes that hospitable conduct literature sometimes exhibits an “almost ludicrous obsession with rank and degree,” which may be expressed by giving “minute attention to the seating of each social group at table” (12).

Witches, and *1 & 2 Edward IV*, women are often caught within male exchanges of hospitality even as they are excluded from hospitality's benefits. Anne Frankford, Jane Shore and Scapha the bawd become objects of exchange, or they may exist as mere "pretext[s] for and intersection[s] of [male] homosocial, homoerotic, and testamentary longings" (Orlin 252). As objects of exchange or competition within the framework of hospitality, Anne, Jane and Scapha are excluded from the social benefits of their own exchange. Mistress Generous and the other Lancashire witches are similarly excluded, though primarily because of their economic, instead of sexual, vulnerability. In response to their hospitable expulsion Anne, Mistress Generous and Jane Shore reject the conventional hospitality that men in the plays practice. Anne's rejection takes the form of starvation, which "violates the body perceived as property" by opposing Frankford's hospitable control (Frey and Lieblein 61). Mistress Generous and Jane Shore seek to perform an alternative form of hospitality that challenges the male systems of hospitable reciprocation, either by theft or charity. The cost of existing outside of hospitality, for all of these women, is particularly high. In many cases their expulsion from hospitable benefits relates to the apparent incompatibility of hospitality and radical openness, which is manifested primarily as female sexuality. After their expulsion Anne, Mistress Generous and Jane Shore pursue very different approaches of reconciling with male hospitable practice. Anne seeks to close her former openness, Jane seeks absolute, charitable openness, and Mistress Generous seeks to violate hospitality's openness. All three approaches still, to an extent, violate and reject male hospitality, and so all three characters, therefore, still face punishment or death for their hospitable violations.

4: Valediction: Hospitable Anxieties

Felicity Heal writes that “it is impossible to read early modern texts without attaching the prefix ‘decay of’ to the notion of hospitality, for it was firmly held that the English had fallen from some previous standard of domestic excellence” (“Idea” 80). Whether or not hospitality was truly in decline,⁹² the anxieties that surround hospitable practice were an important component of early modern English culture. For those who offered it, hospitality could be a means of bolstering reputation, solidifying social ties and sustaining “social, and even political, power” (67). Though the ideal of open, liberal hospitality was usually the preserve of the wealthy (69), through hospitality the upper strata of society could encounter other segments of society, often those with fewer social and economic resources, such as the poor and the stranger (67). Whether among equals or disparate social classes, hospitality, with its varied and elaborate codes, was a point of intersection and negotiation for a wide variety of social forces and pressures that found their epicentre in the early modern household, therefore becoming fundamentally caught up in early modern formations of gender as well as the structure and function of the family. As a fundamental social practice, with varied and far reaching implication, it is hardly surprising that hospitality should engender a certain amount of social anxiety, particularly if changes in hospitable practice were perceived to occur (68).⁹³

In her comments on the perceived decline of hospitality, Heal notes that these cultural anxieties found their way into early modern “proverbs and ballads at the level of

⁹² Heal suggests that the lament for the decay of hospitality must be tempered by the understanding that the idea is “neither new nor unique to England” (“Idea” 80).

⁹³ Evidence for increased social anxiety surrounding the practice of hospitality is also found merely in the anomalous “proliferation of comment and advice in the half-century between the 1580s and the 1630s” (Heal, “Idea” 68).

popular culture” (*Hospitality* 94), and, as I have attempted to show, they may also be found on the early modern stage, in Thomas Heywood’s *1 & 2 Edward IV*, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Late Lancashire Witches*. There are two benefits from this approach. First, the artistry of Thomas Heywood is often questioned, primarily due to disparaging comparisons to William Shakespeare. While others have argued that Heywood employs a distinctly different but nonetheless valuable approach to the theatre in comparison to Shakespeare,⁹⁴ this study works to illustrate how deeply Heywood was concerned with the exploration of fundamental social practices, their conflicts, tensions and implications. And second, Heywood’s plays, like all works of art according to Stephen Greenblatt, “contain directly or by implication much of [the situation of their production] within themselves” (“Culture” 13), by virtue of a “sustained absorption” (13) of their surrounding “social values and contexts” (12). Heywood’s plays, therefore, also illuminate the tensions and conflicts that attend early modern hospitable practice.

Heywood’s plays contain complex representations of hospitality that not only unify many of the plays but also intersect with other threads of social importance. In my section on the home, in chapter one, I explored the home and household as the presumed setting for hospitality. The proper management of the home, of which the practice of hospitality plays a significant component, was strongly linked to masculine identity.

Throughout these four Heywood plays, men and their social roles are heavily defined by

⁹⁴ See, for instance, David Cook’s “*A Woman Killed with Kindness*: An Unshakespearean Tragedy”; Daryl W. Palmer’s “Edward IV’s Secret Familiarities and the Politics of Proximity in Elizabethan History Plays”; and Jean Howard’s “Other Englands: The View from the Non-Shakespearean History Play” in *Other Voices, Other Views: Expanding the Canon in English Renaissance Studies*.

their possession or lack of a household, which was established through not only the possession of a home but also their marital status (Orlin 143). Since masculine and social legitimacy are caught up in the household and the practice of hospitality, a considerable thread in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Late Lancashire Witches* is a concern for estates and households: houses are the object of avarice, homes are inspected for purchase, estates are bequeathed, money is borrowed and lent to secure an estate, and money is refused in order to retain the security of the lender's estate. The ideological significance of a present householder in a house is so significant that the importance of possession is matched by the persistent negative associations with a householder's absence, the foremost being the absence of a husband allowing adultery. A dilemma exists in which men were drawn away from home by business matters, though their absence made their marital and masculine status questionable. Many of the husbands in these plays are likewise drawn to large, nearby cities, but the "pull of the metropolis" was also often blamed for the "failure [of householders] to exercise traditional social responsibilities," like hospitality (Heal, "Idea"). The householders in the plays, as a result, become trapped between conflicting social imperatives. The householder's absence allows a guest to transgress the integrity of the household and embody the domestic and social consequences of failed hospitality.

The practice of hospitality, particularly the relation of host and guest, also carries a certain amount of anxiety. The practice of hospitality in each play plays an important role in the formation of social bonds and ritual kinship relations, as I discussed in chapter two. The various kinds of ritual kinships in early modern society, according to Alan Bray,

“readily overlapped and created that web of obligations and friendship that held the society of England together” (105). *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller* provide ready examples of the overlap of hospitality and ritual kinship. Wendoll’s relation with Frankford resembles the “movement of adolescents between families to act as servants in other households ... linking household to household” (105).⁹⁵ Wincott’s relation to Geraldine, in contrast, bears the hallmarks of sworn brotherhood. When Wincott and Geraldine employ the terms “marriage” (ET 5.1.253) or “wedded” (1.1.70) to describe their relationship, they use terms that “could be used comfortably both for a ‘wedded’ or sworn brother and for a ‘wedded’ wife” (Bray 94).⁹⁶ These fundamental social ties, however, contain the possibility of subversion, and in each play the hospitable relationship is the primary point of vulnerability. The practice of hospitality is characterized by and legitimizes social hierarchy, while it also contains the potential to join individuals and households together across class and status bounds, a possibility that may become inappropriate and subversive, as illustrated in *Edward IV* as well as *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*. In each play, furthermore, the process of hospitable binding, the reciprocal exchange that creates a “web of obligations” (105), may begin to resemble the non-personal, self-interested and quantifiable exchanges of commerce. Hospitality, therefore, becomes a conflicted social arena in which the fundamental values of society may be either affirmed or transgressed.

⁹⁵ Though Wendoll is not an adolescent, the process of accepting the children from other gentle households into roles of service sets a precedent for the relation and motivations of Frankford and Wendoll.

⁹⁶ Alan Bray writes that “a ‘wed’ in Middle English was a pledge or covenant,” which usually took place at the “church door” (29).

Within the hospitality and the systems of exchange and kinship with which it overlaps in these plays women perform a particularly different role than do men. This difference was my concern in chapter three. While men exchange hospitality and seek to reap the rewards of social bonds and status, women are often caught within the practice as objects of exchange and contestation, receiving neither the social benefits of the host nor the protective benefits of the guest. Gayle Rubin writes that women, when they are gifts, “are in no position to realize the benefits of their own circulation” (37). As the lynchpin upon which the exchange often depends, the women in these plays are often blamed when the hospitable bond fails, and excluded to remove their perceived openness, often figured as sexuality and infidelity. The husbands hardly recognize how their own hospitable openness or hospitable failure has rendered their wives vulnerable. Excluded from the benefits of hospitality and expelled from the hospitable community, some of the women in these plays – Anne Frankford, Jane Shore, and Mistress Generous – reject hospitality as practiced by the men in these plays, either by rejecting food or by seeking to offer an alternate form of hospitality. In their vulnerable position outside of hospitality, which accentuates their vulnerability ‘within’ hospitality, these women take the position of the poor and the socially outcast, for whom hospitality, in the presence of dearth, has failed to care. Ironically, the very failure of hospitality – partially manifest in the existence of the unaided poor – may be traced to the rejection of female openness, since female sexual openness finds a direct parallel in the liberally open purse of Jane Shore, for instance. Similarly, Mistress Generous’s care for the vulnerable women in her community provides a socially threatening analogue to what Master Generous’s

hospitality may lack. The plays, therefore, may engage in a conflicted nostalgia that mourns the loss of liberal hospitality even as it participates in the exclusion of key hospitable characteristics.

In the epilogue to *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Heywood tells an anecdote of “an honest crew, disposed to be merry” (1). The men taste the same wine and produce different opinions. Heywood concludes:

Unto this wine we do allude our play,
Which some will judge too trivial, some too grave.
You as our guests we entertain this day
And bid you welcome to the best we have.
Excuse us, then: good wine may be disgraced
When every several mouth hath sundry taste. (13-18)

Heywood establishes a hospitable relationship between the players and the audience, one that seemingly allows for the openness of interpretation. The analogy is fitting but also troubling when placed at the end of a play that is driven by the violation of open hospitality. I have attempted to trace the varied conflicts and anxieties that exist within early modern hospitable practice, as represented in these four Heywood plays, but how far into the fabric of society might these anxieties extend? I believe that we must begin with Heywood’s analogy and ask: To what extent do the vulnerabilities and anxieties surrounding hospitality inform that other early modern communal experience: the theatre? In his essay “Culture,” Stephen Greenblatt provides an inroad when he writes that “anthropologists are centrally concerned with a culture’s kinship system ... and with its narratives” (15). He continues, “The two concerns are linked, for a culture’s narratives, like its kinship arrangements, are crucial indices of the prevailing codes governing human mobility and constraint” (15). In writing about hospitality, Heywood

creates narratives that are fundamentally concerned with the kinship systems, their potential and anxieties, in early modern England. In *Edward IV, A Woman Killed with Kindness, The English Traveller and The Late Lancashire Witches*, therefore, Heywood forms a dynamic depiction of the concerns, desires and anxieties at work in the fundamental social fabric, that “web of obligations,” that “held the society of England together” (Bray 105).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Henry Hitch. *English domestic or, Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642*. New York: Columbia UP, 1943.
- Albano, Caterina. "The Starving Body on the Elizabethan and Jacobean Stage." *European Studies* 17 (2001): 93-104.
- Bevington, David. *Tudor Drama and Politics*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1968.
- Bowlby, Rachel. Translator's Note. *Of Hospitality*. By Jacques Derrida and Anne Dufourmantelle. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
- Bray, Alan. *The Friend*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Brown, Richard Danson. "'A Talkative Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted In)': Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint." *The Review of English Studies* 49.196 (1998): 395-415.
- Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. *Masters and Servants in English Renaissance Drama and Culture*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997.
- Carroll, William C. "Theories of Kingship in Shakespeare's England." *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Histories*. Ed. Richard Dutton and Jean Elizabeth Howard. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. 125-145.
- Clark, A.M. *Thomas Heywood*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.
- Clark, Ira. *Comedy, Youth, Manhood in Early Modern England*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.
- Comensoli, Viviana. *Household Business*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Cook, David. "A Woman Killed with Kindness: An Unshakespearean Tragedy." *English Studies* 45 (October): 352-72.
- Derrida, Jacques and Anne Dufourmantelle. *Of Hospitality*. Trans. Rachel Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
- DiGangi, Mario. *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

- Dolan, Frances E. *Dangerous Familiars*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1994.
- Downer, Alan S. *The British Drama*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950.
- Eaton, Walter Prichard. *The Drama in English*. New York: C. Scribner, 1930.
- Eliot, T.S. "Thomas Heywood." *Selected Essays*. 1932. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1972.
- "Faggot, fagot, n.¹" *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 28 Aug. 2009 <<http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50081658>>.
- Findlay, Alison. "Sexual and Spiritual Politics in the Events of 1633-34 and *The Late Lancashire Witches*." *The Lancashire Witches: Histories and Stories*. Ed. Robert Poole. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. 146-165.
- Frey, Christopher and Leanne Lieblein. "'My breasts sear'd': The Self-Starved Female Body and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*." *Early Theatre* 7.1 (2004): 45-66.
- Green, Reina. "Open Ears, Appetite, and Adultery in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*." *English Studies in Canada* 31.4 (Dec. 2005): 53-74.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "The Circulation of Social Energy." *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988. 1-20.
- , "Culture." *The Greenblatt Reader*. Ed. Michael Payne. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 11-17.
- Grivelet, Michel. "The Simplicity of Thomas Heywood." *Shakespeare Survey*. Vol. 14. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961.
- Guitierrez, Nancy A. *'Shall She Famish Then?'*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Harris, Anthony. *Night's Black Agents: Witchcraft and Magic in Seventeenth-Century English Drama*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1980.
- Harrison, Henry. *Surnames of the United Kingdom: A Concise Etymological Dictionary*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1969.
- Hazleton, Spencer. *Elizabethan Plays*. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933.
- Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

- , "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 102 (Feb. 1984): 66-93.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Adulterous Alliances*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- , *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Heywood, Thomas. "The English Traveller." A Woman Killed with Kindness and Other Domestic Plays. Ed. Martin Wiggins. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. 199-281.
- , *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV*. Ed. Richard Rowland. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005.
- , *A Woman Killed With Kindness*. Ed. R.W. Van Fossen. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1961.
- , "A Woman Killed With Kindness." A Woman Killed with Kindness and Other Domestic Plays. Ed. Martin Wiggins. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. 69-128.
- Heywood, Thomas and Richard Brome. *The Witches of Lancashire*. Ed. Gabriel Egan. New York: Theatre Arts Books/Routledge, 2002.
- Hoby, Margaret. *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*. Ed. Dorothy M. Meads. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1930.
- Howard, Jean. "Other Englands: The View from the Non-Shakespearean History Play." *Other Voices, Other Views: Expanding the Canon in English Renaissance Studies*. Ed. Helen Ostovich, Mary Silcox, and Graham Roebuck. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999. 135-153.
- Levin, Richard. *The Multiple Plot in English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- McBride, Kari Boyd. *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Oliphant, Ernest Henry Clark. *Shakespeare and his fellow dramatists*. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1929.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen. *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1994.

- Ornstein, Robert. "Bourgeois Morality and Dramatic Convention in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*." *English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Standish Henning, Robert Kimbrough and Richard Knowles. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1976.
- Ostovich, Helen (ed.). Introduction. *The Late Lancashire Witches* by Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome. *The Richard Brome Electronic Edition*. HRI Sheffield, 2009.
- Palmer, Daryl W. "Edward IV's Secret Familiarities and the Politics of Proximity in Elizabethan History Plays." *English Literary History* 61.2 (1994): 279-315.
- , *Hospitable Performances*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 1992.
- Purkiss, Diane. "Women's Stories of Witchcraft in Early Modern England: The House, the Body, the Child." *Gender & History* 7.3 (Nov. 1995): 408-432.
- Reed, Robert R. *The Occult on the Tudor and Stuart Stage*. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1965.
- Rowland, Richard. Introduction. *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV*. By Thomas Heywood. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005.
- Rowan, D.F. "Shore's Wife." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 6.3 (Summer, 1966): 447-464.
- Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. Ed. Linda J. Nicholson. New York: Routledge, 1997. 27-62.
- Sharpe, J.A. *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760*. London: Arnold, 1997.
- Shepard, Alexandra. *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Smith, Hallett D. "A Woman Killed with Kindness." *PMLA* 53.1 (Mar., 1938): 138-147.
- Spencer, Hazelton. *Elizabethan plays: written by Shakespeare's friends, colleagues, rivals, and successors*. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933.
- Stallybrass, Peter. "Patriarchal Territories: the Body Enclosed." *Rewriting the Renaissance: the discourses of sexual difference in early modern Europe*. Ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy Vickers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. 123-142.

- Stirling, Brents. *The Populace in Shakespeare*. New York: Columbia UP, 1949.
- Swain, John. "Witchcraft, economy and society in the forest of Pendle." *The Lancashire Witches: Histories and Stories*. Ed. Robert Poole. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. 73-87.
- Townsend, Freda L. "The Artistry of Thomas Heywood's Double Plots." *Philological Quarterly* 25.2 (April 1946): 97-119.
- Wallace, James. "A Note on the Staged Reading." *The Witches of Lancashire*. By Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome. Ed. Gabriel Egan. New York: Theatre Arts Books/Routledge, 2002.
- Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Wright, Louis B. *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1935.
- , "The Male-Friendship Cult in Thomas Heywood's Plays." *Modern Language Notes* 42.8 (Dec. 1927): 510-514.