Representations of India on Jacobean Popular Stages

ANDERSON, Susan

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

http://shura.shu.ac.uk/28369/

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

ANDERSON, Susan (2013). Representations of India on Jacobean Popular Stages. Theatre Survey, 54 (1), 7-25.

Copyright and re-use policy

See http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html

Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive
http://shura.shu.ac.uk

Representations of India on Jacobean Popular Stages.[1]

What is signified by the terms India and Indian? Conceptualized as a distinct subcontinent both contained within and separate to the wider category of Asia as a whole, how has India "as a multilayered concept been framed and manifested in theatre"? This article examines as a case study the portrayal of India in early seventeenth century popular theatre in London, specifically in the way that the image of India is invoked in two of the Lord Mayors' Shows written for the City of London by the playwright Thomas Middleton. Middleton's use of images of and references to India participate in some of the ways in which India was conceptualized at a key stage for the establishment of the framework for subsequent colonial discourse. Colonial discourse was thus shaped within and by popular culture and spectacle, and this article takes as a premise that a historical long view can illuminate the development of the concept of India within English, and later British, society and identity, and its material consequences. As Teltscher notes, the early seventeenth century marked the beginning of a transition in the way relations with India were seen in England, that is, "from trading partner to ruling power".[2] This development was enacted and effected through the kinds of representations that this article examines, presented and paraded through the streets of London.

The examination of India as represented in Middleton's Shows will demonstrate the ways in which relations between England and particular geographical regions were presented for popular audiences in the early seventeenth century. Furthermore, the concept of India will be shown to invoke both specific and non-specific connotations, which inflect each other, creating a conflated sense of 'India' as a broad type of foreignness that invites a particular kind of response. As Ania Loomba notes in her introduction to the text of Middleton’s *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue* (1622), the personification of India “is not just a generalized seventeenth-century trope for a feminized Orient but marks a specific playing with specific histories”.[3] Without assuming a teleological inevitability, this article will assert that the representation of India in Middleton’s Shows was part of a paracolonial discourse that enabled later, more intensive forms of colonialism. This discourse was promulgated in the public sphere by a popular form of theatre that crossed boundaries between elite and non-elite social forms and modes of performance.

Although less often attended to in theatre history than Shakespearean drama, the street theatre and pageantry of the period also had the power to define the terms upon which engagement with varying kinds of national and cultural difference was to be imagined. Configurations of India, Indianness and the Other on these stages also participated in the identity formation of a heterogeneous range of observers. The ways in which India is presented in such circumstances creates a set of generic expectations which, as has been demonstrated in relation to travel writing,[4] provides the interpretive framework for what is subsequently perceived about the world and relations within it.

Middleton’s place in the theatrical canon as the author of some of the most well-known non-Shakespearean Shakespearean drama is not based upon his Lord Mayors’ Shows. For instance, in his 1983 edited collection “*Accompaninge the Players”: Essays Celebrating Thomas Middleton*, Kenneth Friedenreich provided an introduction entitled ‘How to Read Middleton’, which presented an overall characterization of Middleton’s drama, by which is meant the plays.[5] This is despite a contribution by David Bergeron later in the volume, which does discuss one of Middleton’s Lord Mayor’s Shows. Certainly, when Friedenreich talks about reading

Middleton, he is assuming that the subject for discussion will be scripts from the commercial theatre. Bergeron is the main exception to the way that the Lord Mayors' Shows have usually been dismissed by theatre scholars. Like other forms of early modern occasional drama, they are dramatic texts that do not seem to count as drama. The symbolism of early modern occasional spectacle has been too esoteric for an understanding of theatre as mimesis, and its connections to patronage and power irretrievably sullied its claim on any notions of artistic integrity. When occasional drama is considered, it is read in the service of acting as a context for the proper subject of scholarship: Shakespearean drama.

The dominance of the commercial theatre in accounts of the theatrical culture of what is, after all, often referred to as the 'Shakespearean period' bears examination, then.[6] That the paradigm of economic criticism is well-established for Shakespearean theatre studies is, surely, partly because circumstantial economic material is broadly what has survived as evidence. Instead of artefacts like buildings, clothing, props etc., what remains for analysis are legal/economic forms such as contracts, Henslowe's 'diary' (really a book of accounts), legal proceedings, rent agreements, the Stationer's register and so on. The nature of the evidence makes it likely that theatrical enterprise is read as capitalist enterprise, making performances which take place within a venture like the Globe auditorium more fitting to this model of defining theatre.[7]

As the recuperation of the court masque in the criticism of the last 30 years has shown, close examination of the densely symbolic texts of occasional drama can reveal illuminating and contradictory ideologies that refine our understanding of the operations of power and of theatre.[8] This article is thus partly about encouraging a similar trajectory for our understanding of the Lord Mayors' Shows, as well as about differentiating them from other forms of spectacle and drama, and offering some ways in which independent critical interest in them can be sustained.

Tracey Hill's work on Anthony Munday and her most recent book, which is specifically on the Lord Mayors' Shows, are the most up to date studies in what is still an emerging field.[9] She takes a material approach to the Shows, situating them within their performance contexts. There still remains much work to be done in establishing theoretical underpinnings both for understanding these Shows within performance culture, and for reading these texts qua texts.

The London Lord Mayors' Shows were an annual public celebration of the inauguration of the new Lord Mayor. They incorporated theatrical and spectacular elements from a range of theatrical traditions, including the pre-reformation religious pageantry that was suppressed in England during the sixteenth century.[10] By the early seventeenth century they had developed into an elaborate and multilayered spectacle that included a waterborne pageant, a procession through the streets of London, oath-taking, feasting, and religious observances. The procession followed a prescribed route that took in the most significant landmarks in the City, and included pauses for short theatrical vignettes and tableaux. These praised the new Lord Mayor and typically presented allegorical or historical figures that emphasized some aspect of the City's privileges, or the new Lord Mayor and his livery company.[11]

Earlier criticism of these Shows, like that of the masque, engaged in a kind of spot-the-reference descriptiveness, which, though useful, gave rise to the stumbling-block of perceived incoherence. R. C. Bald suggested that the form of the Shows necessarily precluded what he termed "serious artistic achievement", because nobody could see a 'whole' Show and witness all of the 4-5 pageants that took place at the different stopping points. Furthermore, the entire business was simply about "lavish display", and therefore can be discounted as saying anything artistic and therefore interesting.[12]

Lawrence Manley implicitly disputes the charge of incoherence in his account of the Shows by pointing out that the pageants that were performed on different parts of the route joined the procession, so that, by the end of the Show "a continuous and complete sequence [was] visible in its entirety to all and any spectators who lined the culminating portion of the route".[13] However, "all and any" is surely an optimistic assessment of the potentially rather frustrating experience of witnessing such street theatre. Manley over-emphasizes continuity, because the circumstances of the Shows' performances hardly can have permitted such a complete and clear view. Eyewitness accounts of the Shows highlight a great deal of pushing and shoving amongst the crowds, and competition amongst more elite spectators to find space at windows that overlooked any part of the route. Orazio Busino, who saw *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry* in 1617 reported that "we saw a huge mass of people, surging like the sea, moving here and there in search of places to watch or rest – which proved impossible because of the constant press of newcomers".[14] Furthermore, payment records show that it was common practice to employ whifflers, equipped with various weapons including fireworks, to keep the processional route clear. It seems likely that most people who saw part of the pageant can only have seen part of it. It also seems unlikely that many of these witnesses can have heard the speeches so carefully preserved by the texts. As much is admitted by Anthony Munday in his description of the Ironmongers' Show of 1609, when he justifies using adult actors to deliver the speeches as opposed to children, whose voices would be inaudible against the tumult of "a crowde of such noyse and uncivill turmoyle" (lines 101-2).[15]

The Shows are not gesamtkunstwerke. Their “chaotic mixture”, to quote Busino again,[16] is open to a deconstructive approach, whereby the performance might be understood as a kind of deliberately overwhelming total theatre. To look for coherence in this genre is thus either to miss the point, somewhat, or to be insufficiently critical of the textual description’s own unifying agenda. The Shows enlist a productive kind of incoherence to enable them to incorporate conflicting ideas and ideologies, and to co-opt diverse groups. The Shows articulate the power of the civic authorities, shutting down normal access to heavily populated areas of the city. In this sense they can be seen as an imposition of ideology, but they take place within their own sets of contingencies and limitations. The surviving texts can show us what kinds of statement are possible in such contexts, and the ways in which the priorities of the trading elites of the City could be formulated for a range of audiences.

Perhaps because of the unusual level of organizational skills required, comparatively few playwrights wrote Lord Mayors’ Shows. Thomas Middleton received repeat commissions, writing seven Shows in total between 1613 and 1626. These repetitions partly reflect what must have been a good working relationship between Middleton and his patrons, particularly the Grocers’ Company, and suggest implicit approval of the allegorical schemes that Middleton devised and incorporated into the Shows.

These allegorical schemes both praised and pressured the lord mayor, articulating both his privileges and responsibilities upon the principle of *laudando praecipere*, or to teach through praising.[17] The Shows took place in some of London’s busiest streets, imposing their presence upon the City, and in doing so, defining the City, representing it to itself within locations that operate synechdochically within the pageant. The Shows are also cognizant of a much broader audience, however, and the statements made in this context constitute a polysemic form of address that attempts to simultaneously contain contradictory perspectives.

In order to do so, the Shows often invoke images of foreign or ‘strange’ peoples and places. These images blend traditional modes of allegorical personification with representations of the places that provided the London trading companies with the wealth that enabled them to occupy their dominant social position. Furthermore, the images of foreignness presented in the pageants worked to establish and consolidate a sense of English identity that foregrounded the role of the London mercantile elite, and enlisted the support and approbation of other social classes within London. Pramod K. Nayar argues that, in travel literature, “the various tropings of India were transformative in nature, proposing particular roles for the English in India”.[18] The way that India was presented on stage in the same period has a similar function, but additionally, the spectacle in turn creates and consolidates a sense of Englishness as a cross-social category, aligning the interests of the merchants and profiteers with those of observers from other social classes and positionings.

Whilst seeking to disentangle the connotations of the term ‘India’, this article nevertheless does not deny that the entanglement itself is part of the term’s power. The term harnesses together associations in a way that pre-empts perceptions. Nevertheless, it is important not to reproduce the conflations that inhere in the seventeenth-century terminology. I follow Archer’s view that the term Indian reflects the way that attitudes which were developing in relation to the ‘New World’ became transferable and also began to apply to a part of the world that was not ‘new’ to Europeans. Thus, the trade links established in the early part of the seventeenth century by the English East India Company are presented in the Shows as a form of discovery and of newness, making a clear conceptual link to the ventures of the new world colonists such as the Virginia Company, despite their projects being carried out in completely different locations and circumstances. This conflation is what Archer terms "paracolonial".[19] It is in this light that this article will examine Middleton's presentation of India and Indianness, showing that the conceptual overdetermination of these terms is particularly apt for a theatrical form which exploits the instability of its performance conditions to engage with multiple identities, social figurings and global relations.

One thing that needs to be stressed in an account of the performance context is that the particular bodies that enacted the images of the Indian and the Indian Woman in Middleton's Shows were neither Indian nor female. In this period, roles in pageantry were taken by professional actors from the liveried acting companies, and this included the boys' companies and boys who worked in the adult companies, playing women's roles. In the commercial theatre, the ironic disjunction between boy actor and role is regularly exploited to create what Witmore calls "a tickling frisson".[20] By contrast, on pageant stages, the child performer's malleability and lack of agency engenders a transparency grounded in "children's proverbial cognitive incompleteness, sexual immaturity, proclivity for mimicry, and appetitive absorption".[21] The child actors on pageant stages function as *apparent* agents whose supposed semiotic emptiness offers a view through the body of the actor into another place, thus presenting a miniaturized, powerless, biddable, and reassuringly contained vision of the Other.[22]

Although the bodies being described are thus not Indian and not female, and often not adults either, the figures they are enlisted to represent sometimes are. It is incumbent upon this article to investigate why in these examples, this theatrical form engages with these particular transformations and not others. It is through the mimetic representation of India that these pageants offered a symbolic engagement with the wider world malleable enough to encompass a range of meanings and priorities. By examining the specific representations of these texts, we can see how this kind of signification participates in early colonial discourse.

An illuminating comparison can be made here with Joseph Roach's development of the notion of "vicariousness" as a pioneering feature of English theatre, whereby leisure becomes a "synthetic experience".[23] Although he specifies the seventeenth century for his chronological selection, Roach's account concentrates on the Restoration theatre, and thus can be backdated to the earlier part of the period, as well as broadened to include non-theatrical performance. This is not least because the Restoration and eighteenth-century tropes he identifies in 'The Global Parasol' function through their continuation and development of established associations.[24] Notwithstanding Roach's persuasive account of the theatre auditorium itself as the site of vicarious tourism, pageantry of the street also projects an experiential engagement with ideas of foreignness.

Further comparisons can also be made with the travelogue – a genre that the Lord Mayor's Show can in some ways be said to parallel. In the case of a Lord Mayor's Show, place itself comes to London, recreated for pageantry. Instead of reading a travel narrative, the viewer of the pageants experiences the foreign as a tourist. Nayar establishes the way in which, in travel narratives of India, "aesthetics … furnishes a descriptive vocabulary that enables the English traveler to cast India in ways that call for particular kinds of colonial or imperial responses".[25] Thus the way in which the 'foreign' is represented in such narratives participates in a pre-existing discourse, one partly established by public pageantry.

The beasts and wonders described in travel narratives would be familiar to their readers from other travel narratives, and indeed, fidelity to pre-existing descriptions has been shown to be more relevant to judging the quality of travel narratives than their relationship to actual places and events. This genre, rather than presenting a record of experience, is usually, in fact, a collection of quotations about place, stitched together from prior textual sources. As Jonathan P. Sell and other commentators have demonstrated, the truth value of these texts is of a different order to that which we would apply to modern guide books and travel writing.[26] Pageantry provided an animated version of the stereotypical images of foreign places presented in travel narratives, a set of imagery independent of the geographical specificity of the places it nominally represented.

Nevertheless, there were, of course, ‘real world’ connections between some aspects of the Shows and the places they invoked. One clear reason for the Shows’ engagement with India is its growing importance in the global trade activities of the London merchants. Middleton’s 1617 pageant, *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry*, honored Sir George Bowles, that year’s new Lord Mayor and member of the Grocers’ Company.[27] The Grocers were the livery company most closely associated with the activities of the English East India Company, being one of the principal buyers and distributors of the pepper that formed the East India Company’s staple product in the first two decades of its existence.[28] Bowles was also personally associated with the English East India Company, having been an investor in the Company’s early voyages. Accordingly, two aspects of the cluster of associations of the term India were prominently displayed in linked pageants in the 1617 Show. The first that features in the description is what is described as a “company of Indians” though its only title is “the first invention”:

> A company of Indians, attired according to the true nature of their country, seeming for the most part naked, are set at work in an island of growing spices: some planting nutmeg trees, some other spice trees of all kinds; some gathering the fruits, some making up bags of pepper; every one severally employed. These Indians are all active youths, who, ceasing in their labours, dance about the trees, both to give content to themselves and the spectators (lines 42-51).[29]

The pageant shows a group of laborers working on the land, turning agricultural labor from a process into a spectacle. The description highlights nakedness as a natural and expected signifier of their nationality. This is unsurprising because nakedness, or partial nakedness, is “one of the recurring figures” of narratives of New World encounters, as Scott Manning Stevens points out,[30] and is a trope frequently associated with the term ‘Indian’ in the playtexts of the period.[31] The ‘nakedness’ of the actors reveals the spectacularization of the young male body on stage. The “active youths” cavort about the stage for the pleasure of the spectator. Whether or not this can be read as titillating for the viewer,[32] the power is invested in the gazer, and the objectification of these figures is grounded in their assumed desire to please, a reading that transfers the pliability of the obedient child performer onto the Indian laborers they represent.

Of course, the description reassures the reader that these figures wish to both please the spectators and “content … themselves” (line 50), a fortuitous combination that allows European superiority to be naturalized, and to conceal the violence that is involved in extracting the labor from the Non-European peoples involved. The figure of the happy laborer aligns the racial other with the laboring other.[33] Never idle, the idealized ‘Indian’ body is constantly engaged in productive labor of either an economic or aesthetic kind, both of which are presented as in the service of European spectators. Thus, varying modes of objectification intersect in this scene, where youth, class, labor and ethnicity/geographical location are all essentialized and put on display.

In this case, the homogenization of the performing figures is also in operation, through implied contrast, upon the spectators, who are, in turn, homogenized as a part of an assumed elite. As Loomba notes, barbarity and violence against native peoples is generally attributed to the Dutch and/or Portuguese trader-colonists, rather than the English.[34] The tableau is thus a way of representing and validating this particular Lord Mayor's involvement with the English East India Company, but also by extension, the entire project of the Company, aligning one of the most influential early engines of colonialism with an implicit sense of Englishness.

The pepper in particular and the spices referred to by the text place the referent of this pageant as the spice islands located in the East Indies – not what would be referred to as 'India' today. The term 'Indian' in the early seventeenth century was, as this demonstrates, extremely vague, and could refer to residents of the West Indies, the mainland of North and South America, the East Indies, and the entire area of India and Pakistan. In etymological terms, the valley region of the river Indus is the origin of the term – thus, modern-day Pakistan – a very specific and distinct region of the world. One might be forgiven, therefore, for dismissing the use of this term as so hopelessly ill-informed and vague as to be completely meaningless, but therein lies the importance of its usage in the context under discussion.

This slippage in terminology is a displacement. Its very indeterminacy demonstrates the point of colonial discourse analysis that the Other is a necessary reflection in Western identity-formation. It tells us not about India, but about London, Middleton, and the world he is creating in his pageant. Images of India, as Singh notes, "did not converge", rather they "proliferated in a range of associations".[35] In this particular case, the movements of Middleton's 'Indians' present a stylized form of labor and a stylized signification of their assumed acquiescence to European methods and European control – in Spivak's terms, the "worlding" of the Third World. Spivak herself refers to this overlapping terminology when she notes that the label 'American Indian' "commemorates a factual error on the part of Columbus", and compares this to the British use of the term sati to refer to the practice of widow self-immolation.[36] Spivak brushes over the important point, noted by Thomas Hahn, that, far from being a "simple error" on Columbus's part, this conflation "actually reflects a major aspect of late medieval and early modern ideology".[37]

The profusion and variety of references to the term India and its cognates on London stages at the beginning of the seventeenth century testifies to a productive ambiguity in the term and an epistemological confusion that, through its very obfuscation, clears space for a cipher through which Western, and specifically English, identity can be created. Often, this is through a sense of hyperbole. So 'the Indies' are invoked as a pair in Shirley's *The Grateful Servant* (1629) in order to denote unimaginable wealth. India or the Indies are also often featured in lists of places intended to give a sense of adventure and travel. For example, 'the Indies' is one of the destinations of Antonio's ships in *The Merchant of Venice*. This part of the meaning of the term depends on a sense of extreme distance, and there are multiple examples of this connotation in the drama of the period.[38] Thus India or the Indies comes to signify somewhere almost unimaginably distant and different, irrespective of any actual location.

A further important parallel can be found in the analysis of Juan E. Tazón. He identifies the development in the early 17th century from a view of the 'Indians' of the 'New World' as owners of their land who are to be traded with on a par with other nations to a view of them as ignorant savages who are therefore poor husbands of the land and in need of European tutelage.[39] Hadfield suggests that this idea is "ubiquitous" in sixteenth century accounts of the 'New World'.[40] This is a crucial conceptual shift that enables the logic of colonialism, and which we can see being articulated in relation to an entirely different group of people in Middleton's pageant, partly because the difference is concealed by the blurriness of the term 'Indian'.

There is still a difference, however, between this kind of imperialism and colonial logic, because the personification of India oversees this display, seated at the top of a tableau in a chariot that follows the dancing Indians.[41] The display of Indian bodies and/as commodities exemplifies Sara Ahmed's refinement of Marx's formulation of commodity fetishism. She contends that it "involves the displacement of social relations of labor *through the transformation of objects into figures*".[42] Middleton's pageant demonstrates three stages of this process, whereby India is not only figured through the mimetic body (the laborers), metonymically associated with commodity through their production and proximity to the spices, but also the symbolic body of the personified 'India'. It is this latter figure that constitutes a fantasy that, as in Ahmed's formulation, works to conceal the social and material relations that produce it. The semiotic instability of the boy actor and the figure of 'India' are thus particularly apt for the Show's evasive engagement with the morally-ambiguous concepts of accumulation and profit, during a period when such practices were being transformed by the emergence of capitalism.[43]

L. S. Stavrianos argued that pre-capitalist imperialism is exploitative, but not transformative. Pre-capitalist imperial powers plundered territories through war, but did not make fundamental changes to the economic structures of those communities.[44] Middleton's text demonstrates the emergence of capitalist imperialism, where unending expansion is self-perpetuating and labor is reorganized to support that expansion. So as the personification of Industry remarks, the quality of industry

> […] gets both wealth and love, which overflows
> With such a stream of amity and peace,
> Not only to itself adding increase,
> But several nations where commèrce abounds (lines 80-3).

According to Stavrianos, this kind of imperialism wrought radical social changes in the territories involved, but Middleton shows how this also applied to the colonizing power. Industry's speech uses an appeal to a kind of proto-fair trade by suggesting that the benefits that accrue from the expansive activities of the merchants are enjoyed by all – all nations, including trading partners homogenized as nations (including India). This also includes by implication other residents of London and, by extension, England, a presupposition of nationhood which works to create that which it takes for granted, and enables anybody who considers themselves 'industrious' to claim a stake in the pageant's praises (though not necessarily in the wealth that underpinned them).

Richmond Barbour cautions against reading global imperial designs into Jacobean culture, emphasizing that imperial rhetoric in the period centered around the unification of England and Scotland, and the control of Ireland. He notes that the "eastern initiative" of the early seventeenth century "was driven primarily by capital investment, not dynastic political design".[45] Any royal imperative to expand territorially must, therefore, be subsequent to mercantile expansionism as conceived of as part of a 'national interest'.

The Shows in performance conflate symbolic and real locations to define this sense of nation. Civic pageantry, unlike commercial drama, in some sense attempts to 'transcribe' the city. Here, I take rather literally Jean Howard's remark that "through its fictions drama helped less to transcribe than to construct and interpret the city".[46]

She concentrates on commercial theatre, but civic pageantry is surely even more closely connected to material conditions, imposing a performativity on the space it is representing, and recruiting the locations of civic life (water conduits, meeting places, streets and so on) into the performance of the idealization of civic community. The pageant thus ‘writes’ itself onto the material space of the city streets in an extension of de Certeau’s conceptualization of walking as a speech act. The pageant procession, in de Certeau’s terms, appropriates the “topographical system”, engages in a “spatial acting-out of the place”, and “implies *relations* among differentiated positions”.[47]

These relations are drawn out by Manley’s parallels between the route of the Lord Mayors’ Shows and that of other forms of processional spectacle during the early modern period, in particular the royal entry (the ceremonial entry of a monarch to the city, usually after their coronation). Manley notes that these processional forms share a central core that comprises “a hallowed ceremonial route between London’s two main hilltops,” also demarcated by two churches – St Peter’s Church on Gracechurch Street, and St Paul’s cathedral, the latter being, as Manley puts it, “the ceremonial heart of the metropolis”.[48] The associations of this heavily symbolic route provided an important source for the Shows’ promiscuous intertextuality. They offered the viewer the potential to make connections across the various displays of civic authority, royal power, and quotidian usage that occupy the same space at different times. The route took in the busiest streets of the city, traversed daily by all elements of London’s population. Landmarks, physical space, past events, and daily movement were thus enlisted by pageantry into its allegorical scheme, making the ordinary symbolic.[49]

A further layer of symbolic space is added by the textual description of the pageant. Because a map is concerned with describing places and the relations between them, the written text of the Show can be conceptualized as a kind of map of a map.[50] It translates the spatial significance of the event into a condensed and portable form. The travel narrative transcribed onto the city is retranscribed, and the text acts as a guide, giving signposts and instructions on the mental turns the reader takes in the course of remembering or reconstructing an event in the imagination that took place in time and space.

The Show texts offer a reconfiguring of the relations between everyday spaces as ceremonial and fantastical. Instead of fixed, spatial relations become flexible and mobile. For example, in Middleton’s 1626 Show *The Triumphs of Health and Prosperity,*[51] the Beautiful Hill is a reconfiguration of place within place, figuring London to itself, and detaching locus from location.

The symbolic properties of place are also an important element of the early modern travelogue, where, as Nayar points out, “physical and moral topographies” are conflated,[52] a process labeled by Teltscher as “moralizing geography”.[53] Localized features of climate, landscape, disease and so on become symbolic of “moral conditions”.[54] This, too, is the modus operandi of pageantry which represents physical topography in order to convey moral or symbolic meaning, whether this is explicitly allegorical (as in the case of the Beautiful Hill) or whether an actual place is made to stand in for symbolic meaning (as in the case of Middleton’s description of the Continent of India from *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue* in 1622).

Returning for the present to *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry* of 1617, we find another mode of symbolic engagement that illuminates the influence of capitalist transformations upon concepts of nationhood and identity. The 1617 Show creates a punningly homophonous link between India and Industry, implying that they are interdependent. There is a complex of associations here that are part of Middleton’s strategy of productive ambiguity. Blurring distinctions between terms, the pageant enables the praise of merchant Industry that creates “both wealth and love” (line 80) and suggests interdependence between them, and between the work of the merchants and the contact with clearly differentiated Otherness, here signified by the term ‘India’. Although at the centre of the display, India remains silent, and it is the figure of Industry who speaks.

The internationality of Industry is also promoted through the Pageant of Several Nations which follows, to illustrate Industry’s claim that nations which trade with each other not only increase their own levels of wealth, but also enjoy the preserving effects of “harmonious peace” (line 84), preventing the depredations and costs of war. Potentially a nod to the Jacobean pacifist policy, the pageant promotes the trading activities of the city merchants as the perfect means to promulgate the policy of peace, as well as its chief boon.

The intermingling of nations is also synaesthetically figured in several ways. Industry introduces the Pageant of Several Nations as “a joy true, though so strangely mixed” (line 86). This terminology can incorporate a reference to the foreignness of the nations represented, as well as the sense of unusualness of the pageant.[55] The various nations engaged in trade “Taste the harmonious peace so sweetly sounds” (line 84), and the representatives of the French and Spanish nations are reported to “thirst” to speak (line 112). To this admixture of senses, sight is added when the spectator is encouraged by Industry to enlist a “gracious eye” (line 85) to enjoy the imminent pageant. This is presumably an appropriate sense to use, despite the speeches, because most of the nations personified remain silent, and the French and Spanish speeches were not translated in performance (though a translation is supplied in the printed text).

Although India is given a separate and prominent presence in the Show overall, she does not figure in the Pageant of Several Nations. Only Western European nations are given speeches, and the rest of the Western (and mainly European) nations are therefore lumped together, with India presented as different and exceptional. The Eurocentric colonialist view thus emerges, where India is seen as a place to exploit, where goods can be obtained and then sold on to other nations (the other nations therefore, being on a more equal footing). Apart from the way in which this illuminates the emerging priorities of colonialism, the pageant demonstrates the ways in which these are underpinned by the priorities of commerce.

Across the drama of the early modern period, the concept of India becomes quasi-proverbial as denoting excessive wealth, particularly in the form of precious stones and metals.[56] The commonest form of reference is to gold or to mines, a link that may initially seem to be specific to the Spanish areas of South America. Certainly, references to tobacco in some contemporary drama suggest that a specifically South American context is being invoked. Such instances of specificity do not undo the overall vagueness of the term – rather they yoke within it the more specific meanings that are attached to geographical areas. For instance, in Jonson's *The Alchemist,* the 'Indies' is elastic enough to refer to an area where the Dutch fleet is located (i.e. the East Indies) and an area considered to be the possession of the King of Spain (i.e. South America).[57] The ultimate geographical fluidity of the 'referent' of these terms is demonstrated by Jonson's earlier use of the term in the play, however, when Mammon claims that the Philosopher's Stone will enable him to transform the tin and lead mines of Devonshire and Cornwall into goldmines – and so "make them perfect Indies" (2.1.36).

Gold is thus a key image for the conflation of different locations within the term India and its cognates. Whether or not gold is indeed literally to be found in any particular place, it comes to stand for the riches acquired through trade conducted there. Despite the geographical specificity of such resources, through the image of gold, these areas synechdochically come to stand for a merged understanding of all places signified by the term India. Gold is a particularly pertinent image in this Show, because the flow of gold bullion was an especially fraught issue in relation to the conduct of the English East India Company. The Company had been given special permission to export gold bullion, a controversial privilege that they had to struggle to protect in the context of prevailing economic theory.[58]

The description of *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry* uses the term gold repeatedly, drawing the reader's attention to, for example, the gold key held by the figure of Wealth at her heart, and the golden crown of Perfection. India's position as adjacent to, rather than part of the Pageant of Several Nations implicitly presents her as the source for all of the gold decorating the pageant. Gold is thus a resource which she produces but does not use herself and freely gives up.

India reappeared, both as person and place in Middleton's 1622 Show for the Grocers' Company, *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue*.[59] The description relates that a display

> bearing the title of the Continent of India, a triumph replenished with all manner of spice-plants and trees bearing odour, attends his Honor's arrival in Paul's Churchyard: a black personage representing India, called, for her odours and riches, the Queen of Merchandise, challenging the most eminent seat, advanceth herself upon a bed of spices, attended by Indians in antique habits: Commerce, Adventure and Traffic, three habited like merchants, presenting to her view a bright figure, bearing the inscription of Knowledge, a sun appearing above the trees in brightest splendor and glory (lines 39-49).

Describing India as a continent reifies a sense of the conflated connotations of the term as inhering in an actual place. Both movable and static in the Show overall, the

Continent paradoxically gestures towards both fluidity and solidity, again, enabling the pageant to accommodate contradictory meanings.

In this pageant, as in 1617, both Indian and English bodies are represented, but there is a key distinction between the way in which these representations are described in terms of clothing. One set of actors are described in metaphor as “Indians in antique habits” (lines 45-6). Another set are enumerated and described literally: “three habited like merchants” (lines 46-7). In these descriptions, we see how the possibility of subjectivity is subtly closed off for certain types of people, identified by clothing (and, implicitly, complexion, if the adjective “black” is assumed to also apply to India’s attendants). The strangeness of the Indian Other is emphasized by the adjective “antique” which, rather than ancient, here means something more like odd or strange. It contains echoes of the word ‘antic’, which is commonly used in the texts of court masques to connote behavior that is bizarre. Although sometimes threatening, the antic/antique terminology more usually connotes a performance whose strangeness is quaint and entertaining.

The latter three actors who represent the qualities of Commerce, Adventure and Traffic are densely representative on several levels. As Middleton’s text explains, the lord mayor and both sheriffs of the city were all members of the Grocers’ Company that year. To signify this, the three men who held these positions the previous time that this coincidence had occurred are, according to the text, also represented by these three actors, “matched and paralleled with these three […] as worthy successors” (lines 106-7). On one level, then, the individuated English bodies are set against a vague and undefined ‘Indian’ anonymity. Furthermore, on another level, Commerce, Adventure and Traffic are personified as a holy trinity of mercantile virtues who also enact an idealized version of first contact by presenting the Queen of

Merchandise with an emblem of Knowledge: "a bright figure, bearing the inscription of Knowledge, a sun appearing above the trees in brightest splendor and glory" (lines 47-9).

Thus, the power of consciousness is vested in Western authority and delivered by its agents. This is confirmed by the speech delivered by the black Queen, who asserts

> … through my best part runs
> A spring of living waters, clear and true,
> Found first by knowledge, which came first by you,
> By you, and your examples, blessed commerce,
> That by exchange settles such happiness (lines 59-63).

The exchange is the trading of the "gums and spices" for the religious truth of conversion. This moves from the earlier model of imperial exploitation to something closer to the colonizing impulse. Rather than all parties benefiting in the same way from trade, the exchange becomes unequal. The black Queen states "All wealth consists in Christian holiness" (line 79), eliding the way that the merchants also acquire literal wealth. This significantly modifies the construction of economic interest in the 1617 Show, where wealth is presented as accruing to all parties.[60]

The colonizing power of the merchants' universalized knowledge is dramatized at the end of the 1622 Show when the personification of Honor presents a Globe of Honor that represents the transcendence of the merchants over the worldly, even as it asserts their dominance of the world.

> And as I, Honor, overtopping all,
> Here fix my foot on this orbicular ball,
> Over the world expressing my command;
> As I in this contemptuous posture stand,
> So every good and understanding spirit
> Makes but use only of this life t'inherit
> An everlasting living; making friends
> Of Mammon's heaps got by unrighteous ends;
> Which happy thou stand'st free from, the more white
> Sits Honor on thee, and the cost more bright

> Thy noble brotherhood this day bestows:
> Expense is graced when substance follows shows (lines 292-303)

The awkwardness of the strained poetry of these lines attests to a conflict between praising the profits accrued by the merchants, and distancing it from the powerful negative associations of hoarding and excessive wealth. Later texts partly resolve this problem through the trope of religious conversion, a goal which, as Singh notes, becomes a crucial element of the "moral imperative for the discovery, and later conquest, of the non-Christian, 'heathen' lands" in accounts of India in the period.[61] Nevertheless, in Middleton's pageantry, the conversion rationale is still presented as in addition to the primary goal of trade and money-making. Rather than seeking to conceal the mercantile motivation, Middleton's pageantry celebrates the economic productivity of the merchants as an end in itself.[62]

Middleton's struggle to accommodate capitalist practices into the rhetoric of praise necessitated by his genre derives from the fact that he is still working within an aristocratic model of virtue, where inherited wealth is the marker of aspirational social status. Middleton's figuring of India as woman initiates a reconceptualization of power and trade that is necessary for the establishment of colonial and economic dominance, and enables the subject-formation of the London trading elite. There is an important contrast in Middleton's texts between the absolute specificity of London (down to particular parishes, streets, churches, etc) and the deliberate non-specificity of India as woman. The 'body' of the city is far more clearly articulated than the body of the human figure made to stand in for the idea of India.

It is not somehow incidental that it is the Indian woman who is invoked by Middleton. In the pageantry discussed in this article, the world is staged in the city in Middleton's shows, and in particular, India is 'staged' and through being staged, conceptualized. Although it is important to recognize that the dominant mode of representation in pageantry, as in much of early modern culture, is allegorical and not mimetic, the mixture of the two results in a slippage between them, so that symbolic meanings become attached to actualities.

The sleight of hand that Middleton's Shows perform is not just to homogenize the Other as Indian Woman, and the Indian Woman as Other, but to homogenize the audience for the pageant in relation to this demarcation of Western identity. The Othered bodies on display presuppose a homogenized English audience which is itself figured through the singularity of the lord mayor – nominally the audience, or "beholder" of the Show.

The written texts themselves form a separate component of these mechanisms of homogenization because they are the most prominent element of the archival material that forms the basis of analysis. Unlike other forms of archival material gathered by theatre historians, the Show text is already an archive constructed by the agents and participants themselves. The texts make and remake memory, restating what readers already know in terms of a collective narrative that privileges the livery companies, and those who are highly placed within those companies. This is most often done in terms of the Shows' presentation of London, the mayoralty and the livery companies themselves. For example, in Anthony Munday's Shows, dead Lord Mayors are frequently presented as having returned from the grave to give their blessing to current proceedings. Current events are interwoven with representations of historical and mythological figures and of historical and legendary events. The texts blur distinctions between accounts of the lived experience of current events, of agreed historical narratives, and of myths of nationhood, civic pride and class identities.

The texts themselves, then, encourage the reader to accept the dichotomy, identified by Diana Taylor, "between the *archive* of supposedly enduring materials (i.e., texts, documents, buildings, bones) and the so-called ephemeral *repertoire* of embodied practice/knowledge (i.e. spoken language, dance, sports ritual)".[63] In this sense, then, the texts have what might be described as a 'telescopic' relationship to the events they relate, because they both expand upon and contract their source event in particular ways to constitute an archive. These evasions, additions and concealments can be examined to excavate their ideological engagements.

Further to this, however, as Taylor notes, "instead of privileging *texts* and *narratives*, we could also look to scenarios as meaning-making paradigms that structure social environments, behaviors and potential outcomes".[64] The idea of the scenario could be applied productively to the Shows as a whole, but more important for this article is the particular scenario relating to India that they reiterate. This is a repeated playing-out of unequal exchange cast as fair trade, a scenario whereby dominating mercantile relations become the mode through which engagement with the Indian Other is to be understood. The concept of India is invoked in Middleton's pageantry to establish an English identity against the bulwark of the 'strange' or foreign, in a scenario which also specifically celebrates the economic and trading activities of the lord mayor, his company and the other members of the merchant elite, by presenting them as heroic.

Instead of the real being the starting point for mimetic representation, the imagined accounts of India and Indianness on London pageant stages become the starting point for understanding the actual. Teltscher demonstrates that this is the case in relation to the commercial stage in her analysis of Thomas Roe's references to Marlowe's Tamburlaine in his account of the Mughal court.[65] Roe, the first English ambassador to the Mughal court, was himself part of the London mercantile elite. Both his grandfather and uncle had been Lord Mayor of London, and his role as ambassador is conflated with that of trade envoy.[66] This is not to imply a teleological inevitability about the subsequent development of colonial discourse and the British imperial engagement with India. Nevertheless, as Singh suggests, there is a "modality of colonialism" which persists and which "enabled the power of the colonial and, later, the nationalist state to expand and consolidate". [67] Thus, despite the utter irrelevance of the representations of India on stage to material conditions, mimesis becomes the way in which these representations are read and implemented. If, as Greenblatt suggests, "the discourses of colonialism actually do much of the important work of colonialism",[68] then the ways in which India was represented in Jacobean London's pageantry are deeply implicated in the development of colonial practice and ideology.

---

[1] This essay is based on a paper delivered as half of a joint session on 'Constructing and Reconstructing 'The Other': Changing Representations of Indian Women in British Imperial Discourses of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries' with Dr Di Drummond at the inaugural meeting of the Yorkshire Women's History Network, 25 June 2011.

[2] Kate Teltscher, *India Inscribed: European and British Writing on India, 1600-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 2.

[3] Ania Loomba, Introduction to *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue*, ed. by David Bergeron in Thomas Middleton, *The Collected Works*, ed. by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 1718.

[4] As Hadfield comments, 'the fiction comes first' (Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance 1545-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 7).

[5] The essay reads the texts in terms of moral schematics. 'How to Read Middleton', in Kenneth Friedenreich, ed., *'Accompaninge the Players': Essays Celebrating Thomas Middleton, 1580-1980* AMS Studies in the Renaissance no. 8. (New York: AMS Press, 1983), 1-14.

[6] Shakespeare's lack of contribution to genres such as pageantry and pamphlets is, in fact, rather anomalous compared to his contemporaries, yet, as the Author *par excellence*, he has been a determining model for early modern authorship.

[7] A presentist approach would emphasize the way that this bias primarily emerges not from the nature of the material that survives, but from the way that theatre historians' current concerns shape the archive. See, for example, Catherine Belsey's historicizing of New Historicism in Hugh Grady and Terence Hawkes, eds. *Presentist Shakespeares* (London: Routledge, 2007), 27-45.

[8] See, for instance, David M. Bevington and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) and Martin Butler's *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

[9] Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture Theatre, History, and Power in Early Modern London, 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004) and *Pageantry and Power: a Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010).

[10] Most commentators consider that the sixteenth century Shows partly functioned as a replacement for religious pageantry such as the Corpus Christi day processions. See Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985); Robert

---

Withington, *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*, 2 vols. (New York: Blom, 1963); David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971).

[11] The livery companies were essentially a combination of trade association and quasi-masonic fraternity. Membership of a company was a requirement to trade legally within the city. The company of the new Lord Mayor in any given year was responsible for organizing the ceremonies surrounding the handover of the position, and this included sponsoring the Shows.

[12] R. C. Bald, 'Middleton's Civic Employments,' *Modern Philology* 31 (August 1933): 75.

[13] Manley, 259.

[14] 'Orazio Busino's Eyewitness Account of *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry*', trans. by Kate D. Levin, in *Thomas Middleton, The Collected Works*, ed. by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 1264-70 (lines 89-92).

[15] Reproduced in *Pageants and Entertainments of Anthony Munday: A Critical Edition*, ed. by David Bergeron (New York: Garland Pub, 1985). Munday's organization of this Show was the subject of complaints by the Ironmongers Company, who objected that, amongst other things, "the children weare not instructed their speeches", an element which had been expressly specified in their agreement with Munday (D. J. Gordon and Jean Robertson, eds., *A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London, 1485-1640*, Malone Society Collections 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), 76 (hereafter referred to as Malone Society Collections 3). The initial agreement between Munday and the Company is reproduced on p. 73).

[16] 'Orazio Busino's Eyewitness Account', line 92.

[17] Manley, 215.

[18] Pramod K. Nayar, *English Writing and India, 1600-1920: Colonizing Aesthetics* (London: Routledge, 2008), 3.

[19] John Michael Archer, *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India and Russia in Early Modern Writing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 1-22.

[20] Michael Witmore, *Pretty Creatures: Children and Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Cornell University Press, 2007), 105. See also Edel Lamb, *Performing Childhood in the Early Modern Theatre: The Children's Playing Companies, 1599-1613* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

[21] Witmore, 96.

[22] Witmore associates the child performers of royal pageantry with automata, showing that early modern ideologies of childhood constructed children as "thoughtless agents of […] transmission", making them peculiarly apt to take on roles as allegorical figures in civic display (91).

[23] Joseph Roach, 'Vicarious: Theater and the Rise of Synthetic Experience' in Worthen, William B, and Peter Holland, eds. *Theorizing Practice: Redefining Theatre History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 121.

[24] As he demonstrates in his examination of the parasol as a kind of floating signifier of foreignness and class (Joseph Roach, 'The Global Parasol: Accessorizing the Four Corners of the World' in Felicity A. Nussbaum, ed., *The Global Eighteenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 93-106.

[25] Nayar, 1.

[26] Jonathan P. A. Sell, *Rhetoric and Wonder in English Travel Writing, 1560-1613* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

[27] *The Triumphs of Honor and Industry* (1617) was Middleton's second Lord Mayor's Show. His first, *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613), had also been sponsored by the Grocers, and set a high water mark for expenditure on the Shows of the period. The Shows of the intervening three years were all written by Anthony Munday. In 1617, Munday received £5 compensation from the Grocers "for his paines in drawing a proiect for this busynes". Thomas Dekker received a similar payment of £4 (Malone Society Collections 3, 93).

[28] See K. N. Chaudhuri, *The English East India Company: The Study of an Early Joint-Stock Company, 1600-1640* (London: Cass, 1965).

[29] References to all Middleton's works are taken from Thomas Middleton, *The Collected Works*, ed. by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007) and given as line numbers in the text.

[30] Scott Manning Stevens, 'New World Contacts and the Trope of the "Naked Savage"', in *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Elizabeth D. Harvey (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 126.

[31] For example, in a scene from Middleton and Rowley's *A Fair Quarrel* (c.1615), the Bawd refers to being stripped "naked as an Indian" as an example of humiliating punishment (4.4.39-40). The 'nakedness' of 'Indians' was, as this example shows, quasi-proverbial. Stevens explores the way that

---

the trope of the “naked savage” was presented as evidence for the entirely contradictory views that Indians were either “insatiably licentious” or “wholly devoid of this sin” (Stevens, 132).

[32] Richmond Barbour explores some of the valences of the adolescent male body in “‘When I Acted Young Antinous’: Boy Actors and the Erotics of Jonsonian Theater,” *PMLA* 110.5 (October 1995): 1006–1022.

[33] Taylor sees laborphobia as a far more significant social prejudice than color- or xenophobia in the period (Gary Taylor, *Buying Whiteness: Race, Culture and Identity from Columbus to Hip Hop* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 166-70.

[34] Loomba, 1716.

[35] Jyotsna G. Singh, *Colonial Narratives/Cultural Dialogues: ‘Discoveries’ of India in the Language of Colonialism* (London: Routledge, 1996), 19.

[36] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’, in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (London: Macmillan, 1988), 305.

[37] Cited in Archer, 4.

[38] Orlando’s poetry in *As You Like It* satirizes this as cliché in the lines ‘From the east to western Ind, | No jewel is like Rosalind’ (*As You Like It*, ed., Alan Brissenden (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 3.2.84-5).

[39] Juan E. Tazón, ‘The Evolution of a Stereotype: The Indian in English Renaissance Promotional Literature’, in *Beyond Pug’s Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice*, ed. by C.C. Barfoot (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), 127-8.

[40] Hadfield, 11.

[41] The pageant thus figures pre-colonial and neo-colonial models of exploitation, which are indirect because local elites, or in Spivak’s terms “comprador indigenous capitalists”, co-operate with imperial trade, to oppress the subaltern labor force (Spivak, 287). The comprador is necessary for this fantasy of capitalist imperial domination because the exploitation of the Indian labor is not based on the as-yet-unformulated system of race but class. Gary Taylor has argued that Middleton is situated at the very moment where white and black become specifically racial categories in English (though he stresses that race is an anachronistic concept). He locates Middleton’s 1613 Show, *The Triumphs of Truth*, as the first recorded instance of the use of the term ‘white’ to refer to a social group in this way. See Taylor, *Buying Whiteness*, 125.

[42] Sara Ahmed, *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality* (London: Routledge, 2000), 5).

[43] The timing, nature, and effects of the emergence of capitalism continues to be a crux of historical and historiographical debate. See, for example, Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict and London’s Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), and T.H. Aston and C.H.E. Philpin eds., *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). I follow the approach of Ellen Meiskins Wood, outlined in *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View*, 2nd edn. (London: Verso, 2002).

[44] As Stavrianos says “the tribute went to one ruling elite rather than another” (*Global Rift: The Third World Comes of Age* (New York: Morrow & Co, 1981), 36-7.

[45] Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London’s Theatre of the East 1576-1626*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 45 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 40).

[46] Jean E. Howard, *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1590-1642* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 3.

[47] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 97-8.

[48] Manley, 221-39

[49] In this respect, Paul Connerton’s notion of the “accumulative practice of the same” is shown to intersect across a variety of time frames, creating links between daily, weekly, annually, and rarely recurring public practices and events (Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, Themes in the Social Sciences (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 34).

[50] I am influenced here by David Wiles’s discussion of processional theatre more generally in *A Short History of Western Performance Space* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), and by Joseph Roach’s notion of the way that what he calls “mental maps” operate powerfully to define our responses to place and space (Roach, ‘The Global Parasol’, 106).

[51] *The Triumphs of Health and Prosperity* (1626) was Middleton’s last Show. It celebrated the mayoralty of Cuthbert Hacket, a member of the Drapers’ Company. Displays featured in the Show included a ‘Sanctuary of Prosperity’ and a ‘Fountain of Virtue’. The textual description copies its

---

opening lines from Middleton's first Show, *The Triumphs of Truth* of 1613. This is somewhat ironic, because, having started his Show-writing career with the most expensive of the era, Middleton ended on a much more constrained budget, notwithstanding the Show's title.

[52] Nayar, 24.

[53] Teltscher, 19.

[54] Nayar, 24.

[55] As pointed out by Levin in her annotations to the Oxford edition of Middleton (1257).

[56] This imagery is echoed in the clichés of profusion and excess in later travel writing identified by Nayar (9).

[57] Ben Jonson, *Volpone and Other Plays*, ed. by Michael Jamieson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966). Hereafter cited in text. The references to Dutch and Spanish interests occur respectively at act 3, scene 2, lines 23-4 and 48-9.

[58] Chaudhuri, 20.

[59] *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue* marked the 1622 mayoralty of Peter Proby, a member of the Grocers' Company. Along with the black Queen, allegorical figures also gave speeches, including Antiquity, Virtue, and Honor. The Show's celebratory view of trade might seem odd when one considers that the massacre of English traders by Dutch forces at Amboyna had occurred in February 1622, as Loomba points out (1717). According to Chaudhuri, however, news of these events did not reach England until May 1624 (65).

[60] This partial recasting opens the way for later textual representations of India in which, as Viswanathan observes, economic exploitation is concealed within an ostensible attitude of disinterested observation (cited in Teltscher, 9).

[61] Singh, 22. Her phrasing also reveals the way that religious faith can be constituted within place rather than people at this period. The principle of *cuius regio eius religio* suggests that faith is a public performance of the kind enacted by the black Queen, whose conversion enlists entire peoples to Christianity.

[62] He thus anticipates a 1628 petition by the English East India Company that, according to Singh, presents a moral imperative in terms of trade itself (see Singh, 25).

[63] Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 19.

[64] Taylor, 28.

[65] Teltscher, 21-28.

[66] See Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, 151.

[67] Singh, 8.

[68] Stephen Greenblatt, 'Introduction: New World Encounters' in *New World Encounters*, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), xvi.