Journal X

Volume 2
Number 2 *Spring 1998*

Article 3

1997

All Hopped Up: Beer, Cultivated National Identity, and Anglo-Dutch Relations, 1524-1625

George Evans Light
Mississippi State University

All Hopped Up: Beer, Cultivated National Identity, and Anglo-Dutch Relations, 1524–1625

George Evans Light

George Evans Light, Assistant Professor of English at Mississippi State University, writes about early modern English culture from alehouses and theater to naming practices, memory, and identity.

I would like to begin with something that we will recognize, at least generically, as a joke. Thus Henry Peacham in *The Worth of a Penny* (1641):

> I remember, when I was in the Low Countries, there were three souldiers, a Dutchman, a Scot, and an Englishman, for their misdemeanours condemned to be hanged: yet their lives were begd by three severall men, one a Bricklayer, that he might help him to make bricks & carry them to walls; the other was a Brewer of Delft, who beg'd his man to fetch water, and do other worke in the Brewhouse; now the third was a Gardiner, and desired the third man to help him to worke in, and to dresse an Hop-garden: the first two accepted their offers thankfully, this last the Englishman told his Master in plaine termes his friends never brought him up to gather Hops, but desired he might be hang'd first: and so he was. (10)

In other words, during the Thirty Years War, some military justice is about to be meted out to three various men, but three local businessmen intercede by "begging" the lives of these felons; that is, they accept liability for the men in exchange for indentured servitude of some prescribed length. The Dutch and Scots felons gladly accept the trade-off of life for labor, working for a bricklayer and brewer respectively; however, the Englishman refuses his good fortune. While the apparent moral of this anecdote is an exemplary notion of the ubiquitously idle masterless

man, I will argue that its curiously obscure punch line masks deeply felt cultural anxieties about the nature of what it means to be English; that is, does the Englishman refuse his new job out of sheer class disdain for working, or is his refusal due to a particular cultural prejudice against the job of gathering hops?[1] Moving from jokes to their comic effects, following Freud following Heymans, we expect *Verbluffung* (bewilderment) succeeded by *Erleuchtung* (illumination): just such illumination is the goal of this essay.

In the century from 1524 to 1625, beer replaced the more traditional ale as the constitutive national drink of the English, a fact enabled by the introduction of cultivated hops. Concurrently, this period, especially the latter half, saw an enormous growth in the sense of English self-identification, due in no small part to constant fears of and then the ultimate defeat of the Armada.[2] In *Forms of Nationhood*, Richard Helgerson goes so far as to claim originary status with respect to national self-fashioning for a generation of mid-Tudor authors of the middling sort born between 1551 and 1564 and active between the 1580s and the 1640s (1ff.). Alan G. R. Smith at once expands and narrows this historical moment: "The changes of the 1530s also led to the formal establishment of an English 'nation state,' a realm subject to no outside authority. . . . [T]he feeling of national identity and uniqueness continued to grow reaching an apogee in the reign of Elizabeth" (88, 89). Whatever the historical framework, these Elizabethans certainly engendered "a national cultural formation that has . . . survived for the last four centuries on the British Isles" (Helgerson 299-300).[3] Like Helgerson, I am specifically interested in how Elizabethans and Jacobeans themselves created and then defined their own national identity. Unlike him, however, I do not accept with an unquestioning Eurocentric glee that this Elizabethan English cultural formation "has served as a sequentially engendering paradigm for nations throughout the world," a phrase far too reminiscent of history written by colonial victors. Instead, I focus my argument temporally, geographically, and psychically within the confines of Elizabethan and Jacobean England.

I believe that the two phenomena (the replacement of "English" ale with "Dutch" beer and the growth of English nationalism), linked however humorously in our opening joke, were related. In this essay, I examine just how drunkenness served as a generic marker of otherness for European ethnic groups on the verge of national self-identification. Specifically, the English were determined to blame their own perceived national inebriety on foreign agents, especially the Dutch. However, even this assertion bore a kernel of truth, as the Dutch were fundamental in the development of the large-scale English brewing trade because they originally imported hops into Britain and then later purchased the exported product for resale in the Low Countries. The essay closes with a reconsideration of these competing nationalisms by examining, in some detail, two English plays with important Dutch characters in the paired contexts of militarism and commercialism.

Drunkenness and Nationalisms

Our joke plays upon ethnic and national biases: a willing Dutchman, a loutish Scot, and a haughty Englishman.[4] In fact, the triumvirate of felons is really a pair of doubles with the Englishman a member of both: English-Dutch and English-Scots. Each pair consists of the English and a race against whom they defined themselves, but with whom they felt some amity and connection. I focus on the former pair. The English and Dutch were either great allies, as leading Protestant countries who jointly fought Spanish Catholic ambitions for a "unified" Europe, or great rivals, fighting over the true form of religion and the emerging commerce of the high seas, not to mention cloth production — often in quick succession, especially during the seventeenth century.[5] As G. K. Hunter asserts, "The inhabitants of the Low Countries ('Dutch' and 'Flemings') were the best-known strangers in Elizabethan England" (17).[6] But what explains the prevalence of drinking images connected with two of their three potential employers: the brewer and the hop gardener?

Drink and drunkenness were concerns of great interest in late-Tudor and early Stuart England. Typically the problem of excessive drinking was demonized as something alien and other. In 1617 the English traveler Fynes Moryson epitomized this trend, as he saw fit to recount the drinking habits of the many nations he visited. Thus at German feasts, there was "endlesse drinking" (84); "Drunkennesse" was their "almost sole vice" (165). "Danes passe (if it be possible) their neighbour Saxons in the excesse of their drinking" (101). Poles were "as stout drinkers as the Germans" (104). The Swiss claimed moderation, "yet drunkennesse hath much patronage among the best sort" (91). Only the French avoided the tar of drunkenness. It "is reprochfull among the French, and the greater part drink water mingled with wine" (135).[7]

While excessive drinking was prevalent throughout Europe, nowhere was it more noticed than in the Netherlands. Moryson stated that "Netherlanders use lesse excesse in drinking then the Saxons, but more then other Germans. . . . But I will truly say, that for every day drinking . . . doe they use so great excesse as the Saxons" (99).[8] Thomas Wilson's *Art of Rhetorique* (1560) provided a prescriptive catalogue of national characteristics in which the Dutch were known for their drinking:

> And not onely are matters set out by description, but men are painted out in their colours. . . . The Englishmen for feeding and chaunging for apparell. The Dutchman for drinking. The Frenchman for pride & inconstance. The Spanyard for nimblenes of body, and much disdaine: the Italian for great wit and policie: the Scots for boldnesse, and the Boeme for stubbornesse. (178–9)

As Hunter notes, "Surveys of the time were fond of making lists of French, English, Spanish, etc., national characteristics" (43). For example, Henry Butte's *Dyets Dry Dinner* (1599) discussed an "English Foole" and his penchant for foreign habits: "wanton Italianly; Go Frenchly: Duchly drink: breath Indianly" (P4r). In *2 Henry IV*, Hal states,

> Belike then my appetite was not princely got, for, by my troth, I do now remember the poor creature, small beer . . . as thou hast not done a great while, because the rest of thy low coun-tries have [made a shift to] eat up thy holland. (2.2.9–11, 20-2)

Commentators have been quick to note the punning on "low countries" and "holland," but none have seen fit to mention the more literal relation between "small beer" and its homeland. John Taylor in writing his *Drinke and Welcome* (1637) assumed authorship by one "painefull and industrious Huldricke Van Speagle, a Grammaticall Brewer of Lubeck," whose work Taylor has translated from "the high Dutch tongue" (title page). Richard Young in *The Drunkard's Character* (1638) juxtaposed English to Dutch inebriety (Aa8–Aa8v). The dipsomaniacal Dutchman even became a stock character in Renaissance drama (Haugton's, *Englishmen for My Money* [1598], Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* [1599], Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho!* [1604], Middleton's *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's* [1611], and especially Belchier's *Hans Beer*-Pot [1618]).[9]

The English went even further, blaming the Dutch for English social problems. Much of this anxiety, of course, was economic; as Joyce Appleby notes, "Dutch success obviously puzzled Englishmen. . . . Dutch prosperity, like Dutch land, seemed to have been created out of nothing" (74). From the late 1570s through to the Civil War, social and moral commentators developed a commonplace that drunkenness was a sin only introduced into England after soldiers returned from the Low Countries, a "metaphysical" commodity destroying the moral economy much as "their command over the products of other nations" threatened those nations' real economies. In his *Pierce Penilesse* (1592), Thomas Nashe complained:

> let me discend to superfluitie in drinke: a sinne, that euer since we haue mixt our selues with the Low-countries, is counted honourable: but before we knew their lingring warres, was held in the highest degree of hatred that might be. (1: 204–5)

Even the historian William Camden believed the English "learned by these Netherland warres to drowne themselues with immoderate drinking" (3: 2). As late as the 1630s, Samuel Pepys claimed that the English learned the custom of drinking healths while stationed in the Netherlands (5: 172, n. 4).

The English were not alone in this demonization of inebriety as a cultural marker of the other. Moryson stated that the Swiss "say that excesse came into the Commonwealth, together with the accepting of military stipends from forraigne Princes" (91). That most famous Elizabethan tourist, the Swiss Thomas Platter, had this to say about his trip to London: "I have never seen more taverns and ale-houses in my whole life than in London" (189), implying that the English were drunkards. This finding was confirmed by a lunch given by the mayor, where "[t]he drinks consisted of the best beer and all manner of heavy and light wines to follow, as for instance, Greek, Spanish, Malmsey, Lanquedoc, French and German" (Platter 158).[10] Rabelais also noted the drunkenness of the English, when he said Jobelin Clotpoll, Gargantua's second tutor, might "die in that manner, drunk like an Englishman" (1: 61).[11]

As Chris Highley has shown, drawing upon Foucault, national identity in this period was often defined in terms of that which was either not present or somehow perceived to be other; thus the English defined their own civilization relative to their neighboring other, the Celtic Fringe of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland.[12] Moryson demonized this fringe in terms of its drinking as well, specifically citing the latter two cultures for their excesses: "The excesse of drinking was then farre greater in generall among the Scots then the English," while the Irish "use excesse therein" (156, 162). The English also defined their sober nation relative to its sodden neighbor and ally just across the Channel, the States General of Holland; however, continental visitors, even prior to the 1590s, were quick to notice the excessive drinking of the English. Clearly drunkenness as a foreign and alien phenomenon was a widespread cultural paradigm in the Renaissance; what is important is not so much the "truth" of such assertions but rather their very existence. Consider the following exchange in *Othello*:

> *Iago.* Some wine, boys!
> *Cas.* 'Fore [God] an excellent song.
> *Iago.* I learn'd it in England, where indeed they are most potent in potting: your Dane, your German, and your swag-bellied Hollander, — Drink, ho! — are nothing to your English.
> *Cas.* Is your [Englishman] so exquisite in his drinking?
> *Iago.* Why, he drinks you, with facility, your Dane dead drunk; he sweats not to overthrow your Almain; he gives your Hollander a vomit ere the next pottle can be fill'd. (2.3.74–85)

Here all the usual suspects are rounded up and their various drinking capacities displayed for our mirth. Ostensibly a Venetian and thus foreign view of the English character and culture, Iago's paean clearly played as nationalist propaganda to the groundlings, if not to the rest of the audience.

Hops and English Identity

While I have expounded on the drunken stereotypes inscribed in our opening ethnic joke, I have not yet explained how the punch line ties into an emergent national identity. What are hops and why would an Englishman refuse to grow them other than out of laziness? A brief historical background will establish the importance of beer — the chief by-product of hops — to the material production of normative cultural values. Because the water in early modern England, especially that in London, was virtually undrinkable, the everyday drink was some sort of alcohol, which has the dual virtues of killing off all bacteria while providing an ample caloric intake.[13] Originally this drink was ale, but by the 1590s production and market forces had combined to replace ale with beer.

One simple technological improvement accounted for this transformation from ale to beer — the introduction of hops production on a large scale in England.[14] This transformation encoded the curiously mixed nature of national

self-consciousness. Beer, a Dutch invention, unlike English ale, was made with hops, which served as a preservative.[15] This foreign triumph, however, was neither straightforward nor immediate. The original reception of both the plant and its by-product beer was underwhelming. Hops in its wild form was native to England, but as a cultivated crop it had to be reintroduced from Europe in the 1400s.[16] During Henry VI's reign a petition was presented to Parliament against the "wicked weed called hops" (Fuller 1: 493). As a going economic concern, however, hops production did not begin in England until the 1520s, when Flemish farmers began cultivating it in Kent (Bickerdyke 71).[17] Later, such "Dutch who settled in Colchester, Canterbury, and Sandwich in the 1560s retained the legendary Dutch work habits, according to Thomas Manley, who compared them to the 'lazy, wastfull, and disorderly' English" (Appleby 76). A popular but unreliable distich ran: "Hops, Reformation, bays and beer / Came into England all in one year" (Bickerdyke 67).[18] An alternative version in Henry Buttes' *Dyets Dry Dinner* emphasized the fifth-column element of Dutch brewing practices:

> Besides the necessitie hereof [of hops] in brewing of Beere, is sufficiently knowne to *Germany* and *England*, and all these Northerne parts of the worlde: yet I know not how it happened (as he merrily saith) that heresie & beere came hopping into England both in a yeere. (G4r)

In other words beer is northern in its origin as is the Protestant Reformation that Henry VIII's failed divorce set in motion. Hops's association with heretical Protestantism as significant Dutch exports breeds a kind of xenophobic hysteria; hops may be necessary for beer, but beer belongs in other "Northerne parts" than England. Henry VIII went so far in 1530 as to enjoin the Royal brewer to put "neither hops nor brimstone into the beer" (Bickerdyke 71).[19] Not only was the spice devilish, it was also foreign, attributes that were far from mutually exclusive. Andrew Boorde in his *Dyetary* (1547) played up the nationalist characteristics of drink: "Ale for an Englysshe man is a natural drynke. . . . Bere . . . is a naturall drynke for a Dutche man. And nowe of late dayes it is moch vsed in Englande to the detryment of many Englysshe men" (10). As late as 1574, Reynolde Scot in his *A Perfite Platforme of a Hoppe Garden* was instructing Englishmen how to grow hops based on Dutch methods he had seen at Poppering; he also accused the Dutch of "dazeling us with the discommendation of our soyle, obscuring and falsifying the order of this mysterie" (B2v).[20] Notice the quasi-religious metaphors at work here, as if the Dutch were false angels who misrepresented the Eden that was England by "dazeling" its inhabitants.

By the 1580s, however, there was a clear change of heart. The economic viability of hops as a crop and the market penetration of its most significant by-product, beer, necessitated a revision of English cultural heritage. Hops was recuperated as a "native" plant within the herbal literature (Gerarde 737–8).[21] Authorities complained of a lack of beer for the English Armada due to a shortage of hops! (Public Record Office, SP 12/215 fol. 55). The English even distinguished between native hops, which were good, and the foreign version

filled "with any powder, dust, dross, sand, or other soil whatsoever " (Fuller 1: 493, quoting *Statues of the Realm* 1 JI c.18). A royal investigation by the lord treasurer in the 1590s found that hops grown "beyond sea" were seldom used in domestic brewing because they "were boyled before they came over" and "would moulder to verry duste" (British Library, Landsdowne MS 71 fol. 65r). Admittedly, during this period there was some linguistic confusion over ale and beer; however, at any time after the 1580s when the proper distinction was made, beer was praised for its medical and dietetic advantages over ale, specifically for those accorded by the inclusion of hops (Culpeper 130).

Similarly, English authorities sought to legislate against foreign competition. As far back as 1289, the Norwich Leet Roll recorded the following fine: "De Ricardo Somer quia vendit cervesiam / flandrensem occulte per quod Ballivi / perdiderunt custumam . . . ijs" [Of Richard Summer because he sells Flanders ale privily, whereby the Bailiffs have lost custom] (Hudson 21).[22] Such efforts were widespread, especially at the local level in and around London. Legislation against or limiting the scope of foreign brewers has a long history dating back to at least the 1460s (Guildhall Library, *London Letter Book L* fol. 25). Alehouses owners were "enjoyned not to suffer any tapster that is a forreyner to draw or offer any beere or ale for or under them" (Corporation of London Record Office, Repertories 30 fol. 40v).[23] Like other trades regulated by the guilds,

> No Inholder, vintner, winesellor, hostiller, pybaker (?), cooke, tippler or huxter or any other shall buy anie manner of Ale or beere to sell by retaile but of freemen enfranchized and inhabitinge within the fredom and liberties of the saide cittie. (Guildhall Library, MS 5496 fol. 8v)

Just such an exclusionary law allows the economic resolution brought on by a "*deus ex machina* supplied by a Dutch captain who, as an alien merchant, could not sell his shipload of goods directly on the London market" in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (Seaver 93). Of course, this anxiety over foreign competition is also part and parcel of the cultural fantasies of self-determination that underlie nationalist sentiment; surely Dutch beer was not a staple import of Britain because even with hops as an ingredient the product still did not keep well enough to be transported long distances. Israel demonstrates that most Dutch brewing occured in big "inland towns . . . which produced a good deal of beer, mostly for local consumption locally but also in the south Netherlands" (18).

This curious shift in the status of hops exemplifies the fluid and transformational nature of cultural and national identities in this period. As illustrated by Boorde in 1547, beer originally was considered a "Dutch" drink. A scant thirty years later, however, the English crowed about their "beere exceedinge in goodnesse faire the beere that anie of them can brewe in the lowe countries" (British Library, Landsdowne MS 71 fol. 50r). Conversely, only after Leicester's failed military campaign of 1587 ended serious English intervention in the Low Countries was drunkenness perceived as a continental sin imported back from the Netherlands to England; the high correlation between vagrants and

ex-soldiers seemed to solidify this truism (Beier 93-5).[24] For the English in the 1590s, beer remained a troublesome product as well as a cherished element of their national heritage. Well into the seventeenth century, John Taylor, the Water-poet, was still rehearsing cultural xenophobia around alcohol praising "english Ale" against foreign beer (B3v). Such old habits die hard.

Now we must turn to related internal debates over the status of beer in English society and the definition of England itself as a nation. I will focus on how these issues were dramatized in the popular theater.

Beer, Englishness, and the Popular Stage

Typically, Renaissance stage Dutchmen either provide local cosmopolitan color or comic dialect effects (see Middleton's *No Wit No Help like a Woman's* and Haughton's *Englishmen for my Money*); however, in two specfic instances they actually produce a commentary on emergent nationalism. I wish to examine two very different plays: one extremely well known (Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*), the other virtually unknown (Daubridgcourt Belchier's *Hans Beer-Pot*). Through these plays, we will see how the English constructed their own national identity with respect to and/or with the help of drunken Dutchmen specifically.

In Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, Rowland Lacy's disguise as Hans Meulter places him in a tradition that includes Shakespeare's Prince Hal. Both are aristocrats who seek to understand the baser sort by frequenting their tippling haunts, only "Tom, Dick, and, Francis" (*1 Henry IV* 2.4.8) are here replaced by the journeymen, Firk, Hodge, and Ralph; unlike Hal, however, Lacy does not seek to lead such London lads into foreign combat. Rather he avoids his commission as "Chief colonel of all those companies / Mustered in London and the shires about / To serve his Highness in those wars of France" (1.47–9), and chooses instead to serve the gentle craft of shoemaking. This disguise serves mutliple purposes: at once comic, economic, and perhaps even xenophobic.

The comic nature of Hans is twofold: alcoholic and linguistic. Lacy's second appearance in the guise of Hans after his Hal-like soliloquy in act 3 defines the stereotype of the droll, dropsical stage Dutchman, while marrying the two themes in a comic drinking song:

Der was een bore van Gelderland,
Frolick sie byen;
He was als dronck he could niet stand,
Upsee al sie byen;
Tap eens de canneken,
Drincke, schone mannekin. (4.42–7)

[There was a boor (peasant or country clown) from Gelderland
Merry they are
He was so drunk he could not stand,

Drunk they all are.
Pour another cup,
Drink, pretty little man]

This language is actually "a mixture of Dutch and English" and typical of Renaissance stage dialects, which were primarily used for Irish, Scottish, and Welsh characters (R. Dekker 62). Although Firk has been insistently hinting at his thirst, his master Eyre only relents out of hospitality for the newly hired Dutch journeyman: "Hodge, entertain him. . . . Come, my last of the fives, give me a can. Have to thee, Hans!" (4.105–20).

The play is rife with puns on gentle (Bevington 110; Seaver 100). Eyre and his journeyman as well as Lacy practice "the Gentle Craft" (3.4). Indeed, Eyre seems to manifest gentility in many of his actions, as in the drinking scene above. Ultimately Eyre becomes a true gentleman as he is both elected lord mayor and granted "[o]ne honour more" by the king (21.130). However, this world of gentility is bounded by harsh economic and political realities. David Scott Kastan has shown how the very work of the play is work itself. The arrival of the Dutch "ship of merchandise" which empowers Simon Eyre's ascension to the lord mayoralty precisely mimics contemporary reality (7.134). In contrast to European powers that got rich on the plunder of colonialism, "the Dutch . . . had made their money in a most mundane fashion. . . . [B]road-bottomed Dutch fluyboats had plied the waters of the North Sea in a seemingly endless circulation of European staples" (Appleby 73). Consider the ship's "sweet wares": "Prunes, almonds, sugar candy, carrot-roots, turnips — O, brave fatting meat" (7.139–41). Firk expounds on a brave new world of seemingly exotic comestibles; however, the seriousness of trade still seeps in. Most critics seem to think Firk mistakenly either lists turnips as exotic or includes them by association; however, turnips were to become an essential part of England's rural-agricultural economy, for their planting allowed quicker renitrification of fields than simply letting them lie fallow.[25] Already they were used as both a table item and as a replacement crop for hops. The savvy Dutch merchant knows there is much profit to be had in such a plain tuber. Similarly, Hans is hired on as a journeyman by Eyre because he is, as Hodge asserts, "Fore God, a proper man and, I warrant, a fine workman" (4.63–4) and because even a native son like Firk threatens to quit if Hans is not hired. As Bevington notes, "this even-handedness" in Dekker's presentation of Hans "is remarkable in view of the strength of feeling in London about cheap immigrant labor" (111).

Finally, however, there is a tinge of xenophobia to Dekker's play world: Firk would have Eyre hire Hans so "that I may learn some gibble-gabble. 'Twill make us work the faster" (4.51–2). Although primarily good-natured, Firk's interest in Hans and his skills displays a typical English anxiety about superior Dutch industry; as Bevington notes, there was "resentment of foreign labor from the Lowlands" (101). Indeed, "Dekker manages to have it both ways with his audience about xenophobic stereotypes: they can laugh at Firk and yet condescend to Hans's beer drinking German drollery" (111).[26] Much of this xenophobia is based on Britain's seemingly unique situation as a fortress island girt against the conflict ravaging Europe; throughout the period leading up this

play, the last decade of the sixteenth century and of Elizabeth's reign, England was consumed both by a sense of strife and one of apocalypse (Seaver 87-8).[27]

However, the play more than compensates for this xenophobia by also allowing Hans to be the agent of Eyre's ascendancy. In this interpretive version of a play that presents a moral lesson on the virtues of hard work in the guise of the shoemaking lord mayor, Dekker's invention allows the disguised noble Lacy to help a London tradesman. The enabler of this aid is the Dutch disguise by which Lacy can converse with the Dutch captain. Here, Dekker scores a double point: the industry and success of Dutch merchants are given nationalistic acceptance by underlying a constitutive myth of English urban self-creation; and, at the same time, the disguise allows a noble free range in the commercial world of the city. However, it is only a disguise, and there comes a time for it to be doffed. Lacy manages to turn even this act to good effect by telling Eyre:

> Let me request you to remember me.
> I know your honour easily may obtain
> Free pardon of the King for me and Rose,
> And reconcile me to my uncle's grace. (20.43–6)

Now he knows the lord mayor and can "change a man" (1.151) as he could not at the play's beginning. But the pardon he seeks is great for he has been, as Lincoln claims, a traitor "heaped" with "desertless favours . . . / To be commander over powers in France" (21.47, 48, 49), a position he forsook for "love's desire" (57).

Like any English play on nationalism, *The Shoemaker's Holiday* owes more than a little debt to Shakespeare's *Henry V*. I have already argued that Lacy's disguise mimics those of Hal, although he obviously lacks the latter's battle experience. We perhaps most clearly see this debt in the play's royal conclusion: the moment at which the royal prerogative supersedes the royal grant of a journeyman's holiday in commercial London, the moment when the troops return to the Continent: "Come, lords, a while let's revel it at home. / When all our sports and banquetings are done, / Wars must right wrongs which Frenchmen have begun" (21.194–6). This time apparently no Dutch disguise will serve Lacy, nor has he need of one, having wooed and won Rose.

Some twenty years later at the onset of the Thirty Year's War, Daubridgcourt Belchier returns to these issues of beer and nationalism and to the source text of *Henry V* in his "closet" drama, *Hans Beer–Pot, his Invisible Comedy of See me and See me not*. The play, apparently printed in London in 1618, interestingly reverses our beverage flow. Hans, a sodden country servant who likes to "cracke a pot" (B3r) with soldiers while on his master's business in Utrecht, continually seeks "cans of *English* Beere" (D4v; emphasis added). The play was most likely intended for a fervently nationalistic English audience, although no evidence that the play was ever performed in London exists; nor is it certain that it was performed in Utrecht for expatriates and soldiers, even though the title page claims that the play was "ACTED In the Low Countries, by an honest Company *of Health-Drinkers*"; one can imagine a sort of early modern version of the soldiers' review in *South Pacific*. Belchier himself lived in Utrecht

from 1617 and died there in 1621 (Webb and Stephen 4:144). The play becomes something of a fount of cultural nostalgia for the Elizabethan world of the 1590s even as its "plot" disintegrates into a tissue of set speeches in three acts followed by a pseudo-Petrarchan pastoral song about a "Queene" (H2v).

Throughout the play, England is the cultural measuring stick even while Holland is the setting. In an early speech, later repeated and embellished with respect to martial accomplishments, "Cornelius Harmants, a rich Country Gentlemen" (Bv) explains at least his own fascination with all things English:

> What courting calst thou them, thou rubst me up,
> To thinke upon the times forepast, I saw
> In *Englands* Court so famous and renownde
> Of great *Elizaes* blessed memory
> That ayded so these troubled Netherlands
> With men and money; still oh, oh, still me thinkes
> I see those Worthies marching on earthes Stage;
> The famous *Essex*, *Norreis*, *Sidney* too,
> And wisest *Vere*, that held *Ostend* so long,
> Gainst hells foule mouth, and Spanish tyranny,
> As yet his complices can testifie. (B4r)

This speech brings the spirit of *Henry V*'s St. Crispin's Day speech to life, as the names "Familiar in his mouth as household words, / . . . / Be in their flowing cups freshly rememb'red" (4.3.52, 55). Of course, given the probable audience for the play, it can also be seen as a spirit booster: you soldiers now should want to live up to the reputation of your predecessors. Furthermore, it perpetuates the myth of Elizabeth I as gallant, generous, and warlike, when the reality is that she had mixed feelings about active involvement in the Low Countries (see note 5). Also, for a play printed in 1618, it proffers a nostalgic vision of a late English greatness. While James had no interest in continental squabbles, Belchier, himself an expatriate who would die in a siege of Utrecht, praises "*Elizaes* blessed memory / That ayded so these troubled Netherlands."

The fascination with Britain goes beyond its martial prowess to its economic prowess, as English commodites are all the rage. Beyond Hans's taste for English beer, the "rich merchant Garland" (Bv), son-in-law to Cornelius, also orders "two cans of your best English beere" (Er). Later, Cornelius in a moment of unfettered profligacy invites the tapster Joaske Flutterkin to his house "[t]o eate some venison, here 'tis novelty; / It came from *England*, baked in Rye paste" (F3r). Even the lower orders have the same fascination. "Pasquill Beeremond a Sentinell" (Bv) desires "a Tankard full of Spanish Wine / Like those in *London* Water-bearers use" (F4v) and will eat some "Pies" on his journey of "[t]hree English miles" (Gr) that surely must be like the venison pastry just described.

The play further intermixes things Dutch and English in its economic theory. While the Dutch were usually seen as innovators even to the point of English anxiety, Belchier has his Dutch characters learn from their English compatriots. Thus Cornelius is described by Flutterkin:

O theres a man lives bravely, keepes an house,
Releeves the poore, his gates be never shut;
His tables free, theres meat for honest men:
He livde in *England*, learnt that countrey guise,
For Hospitality, few such be here:
Yet frugall too, was never prodigall,
Spends nothing more, but what he well may spare,
He borrowes nought, nor lends on usurie:
Yet hath ynough. (G4r-Ev)

If anything, Flutterkin is mimicking English complaints about Dutch economic success. As Appleby notes, The Dutch "enjoyed a burgeoning trade, a remarkable prosperity, had plenty of money, high land values, high prices, and the lowest interest rate in Europe. A group of English writers were convinced that Dutch success stemmed from their low interest rate" (88). This well-meaning moderation runs through the entire family. "Hanneke, his wife" (Bv) has a similar approach to life:

As God doth blesse the earth with great encrease,
And in great measure send us ten for one:
So must those blessings carefully be kept,
And not with wretchlessse heed, let runne at large,
For so huge heapes of wealth consume to nought,
And like fayre buildings unrepayrde, decay.
Yet must not beastly miching niggardize,
Cause us forget our selves, and those that want,
But give releefe from our aboundant store:
We have enough, our charge is not so great,
One daughter shee's bestowed richly, and
Her portion payde, no penny more in debt,
Two sonnes besides, and they provided for,
The yongst at Schoole, the other trayles a Pyke,
And for preferment lookes each day, each houre. (B2r-v)

Hans the servant praises his mistress as "the best that ever trode on shooe: / I would not chaunge my life to be Lord Mayor / Of that fayre towne of *London*" (B3r) — not Amsterdam or Utrecht; again England is the fount of value and meaning.[28] The aforementioned elder son Younker, although deemed a profligate by his family for suffering from the "fancies of unbrideled youth" (B2r), is in fact his father's son, a sober sort who shares the wealth: "In this Ile please you, but Ile drink no more" (E2r). The two are finally reunited in their love of martial affairs. Younker complains that "it grieves me much / To see poore Souldiers walke in mean attire; / And lesse respect that have deserv'd well[,]" for which he blames "times corruption" (G3r-v). In response to this Cornelius returns to his favorite tale:

When I was in my flowre of youth, and livde
in Englands Court, that swarmde with Marrtialists,

Seaman and Souldiers, there had great respect,
Were set by; honourd more than other men. (G4r)

He continues for another 30 lines with a catalogue of English heroes and closes with a stirring refrain: "Blest be that hand which brought this blessed peace; / And blest be those that pray it never cease" (Hr). Like father like son: Younker himself has absorbed his father's speeches and, as we shall see, his nostalgic love of England.

The militarism of the play turns to further comic effect when Serieant Goodfellow tries his hand at debating Younker in "construction of *Ouids* verses" (Er) and on various other matters "Italian, Spanish, English, Dutch, or French" (Dv). Their debate soon turns to matters military, as Younker prevails over his less-educated tavern comrades:

The question which I prosecute is this,
If horse or foot should haue preheminence:
They are needfull both, to make an armie vp:
Yet those great Armies which the *Tartars* usde,
Were all of horse; so were the Persians
Till later times English *Shirleis* taught
The use of foot, and how to entrench a Campe. (E2r)

In this continuing discourse on the "disciplines of war" (Shakespeare, *Henry V*, 3.3.96-7), Younker could be Fluellen himself. Like all his father's discourses before him, his has its own nationalistic and nostalgic agenda praising foot over horse, "[w]hen *Henry* th' eight of famous memory, / Wan *Bolleigne* from the French" (Fv). Here again the Tudor myth is firmly founded on continental victories.

Both Belchier and Dekker reinscribe Anglo-Dutch relations after their own fashion to further nationalist agendas, be they attempts to solidify support for foreign wars amongst all strata of London society or attempts to remember an earlier age when English glory was gained on Dutch soil. In that sense, they invert our opening joke, which operates on its own kind of nostalgia. Written in the mid-seventeenth century when the royal houses of England and the Dutch Republic were linked in marriage, Peacham's joke fondly remembers a much earlier Tudor England brought up on "local" ale instead of "foreign" beer, and it evokes a mythical time when matters continental, be they hops or war, did not threaten the English way of life. In *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, Dutch hard work is not a threat but rather a support for the morality tale of Eyre's rise. Beer becomes a sign of holiday festivities but also of comradeship, even across classes. *Hans Beer-Pot* similarly signifies good fellowship across the various orders as "two cans of your best English beere" (Er). Its mid-Jacobean nostalgia looks back at closer Anglo-Dutch relations under Elizabeth and fantasizes a home away from home for Englishmen like Belchier himself amongst the Anglophilic Dutch community of Utrecht. In both plays, hopped beer combines the best of Dutch and English spirits.

Notes

An earlier and much different version of this paper focussing on the *Henriad* was delivered at "Reinterpretations: the New Heaven, New Earth of the Past," the 23rd annual regional meeting of the Northwest Conference on British Studies at the University of Oregon (October 11–12, 1991). For their helpful suggestions, I would like to thank the anonymous reader for *Jx*, Judith Bennett, Michael Bristol, Ivo Kamps, Seth Lerer, Ania Loomba, Ron Rebholz, David Riggs, Bradley Rubdige, and Paul Seaver. Derede Arthur shared her expertise on nationalism; Jeff Erickson alerted me to the Dickensian usage of "Hollands." I especially would like to thank the staffs of the libraries at the University of California at Berkeley, the British Museum, the Corporation of London Record Office, the University of California, Davis, the Guildhall, Mississippi State University, the Public Record Office (Chancery Lane), and Stanford University for their generous support. The essay is dedicated to S. Smith, J. Tetley, and T. & R. Theakston.

1. While I'm more interested in national identity expressed in terms of alcohol, the English traditionally viewed themselves as superior to other Europeans and explained their idleness by pointing to the paradise in which they lived. Thus Richard Morison in condemning the Pilgrimage of Grace notes the difference between the English and other Europeans: "Other men, that are borne in bare countreys, and can not lyue, onles they moche trauayle the world, auoyde myserie by their great labour and toyle. In Englande the grounde almoste nourisheth us alone. . . . God hath gyuen us to good a countrey, we maye here to many of us lyue ydle" (E4v).

2. Defining nationalism and determining when it first arose is a vexed problem in social and political theory. For some recent important work, see Anderson; Armstrong; Colley, *Britons* 5-9; Corrigan and Sayer; Elton; Gellner; Hechter 47-73; Helgerson; Newman; Samuel 1: 1–56; Anthony Smith; and Tilly. According to Peter Sahlins, national identity is organized around "the social or territorial boundaries drawn to distinguish the collective self and its implicit negation, the other," a formulation I find useful in my argument even if the North Sea separates England from the Low Countries (270-1).

3. Here Helgerson's diachronic argument gets away from itself. The Irish certainly did and do not share this English enthusiasm. Nor do the Scots, as the recent devolution debates make clear.

4. The joke belongs to the genre, "There were three men, an x, a y, and a z." As Henri Bergson notes, "repetition is the favourite method of classic comedy. It consists in so arranging events that a scene is reproduced either between the same characters under fresh circumstances or between fresh characters under the same circumstances" (121-2).

5. For good discussions of the changing relationship between the English and the Dutch during the seventeenth century, see Duffy 27-31, and Edmundson. Recently Wallace MacCaffrey has neatly summarized Anglo-Dutch relations during Elizabeth's reign: "For the English the long-term advantages were equally important. The experience of the years since 1572 had made the estab-

lishment of an independent regime in the provinces an axiom of English policy. . . . By 1585 it was painfully clear that only direct English intervention could prevent the restoration of Spanish power in the Low Countries, wielded by a monarch whose well-founded suspicion of English intentions was fast hardening into relentless enmity. . . . By 1598 it was beginning to become apparent that such a goal did not necessarily demand a general peace, that there was a half-way house in which England could withdraw from active participation in the Low Countries campaign without breaking altogether the cords that bound her and the States-General in a common interest" (298). For more on economic and military rivalries, see Pincus, "Popery" and "Republicanism."

6. See also Pettegree and Grell. In the census of 1567, 2030 out of 2730 aliens counted in London were Dutch (Kirk and Kirk 365). Similarly in 1573, there were believed to be 60,000 Flemings in England (Traill and Mann 3: 500).

7. However, this lack of excessive drinking may be read negatively, as a marker for the effeminacy of the French. As Alan Sinfield notes, "In *Henry V*, the superior manliness of the English is so insisted upon that it comes to appear the main validation of their title: because they are more manly than the French, they are more fit to rule anywhere" (130).

8. For a general discussion of English travellers in the Low Countries, see Stoye 239-325. For good discussions of alcoholic consumption in the Low Countries, see Schama 189–220 and Van der Wee 126–8, 281–3.

9. For a more thorough discussion of this topic specifically and the role of national identity generally in Renaissance drama, see Hoenselaars.

10. Notice how most types of wine are assigned a nationality.

11. The translation is mine. The original runs "si d'auenture il mouroit ainsi sou comme vn Angloys."

12. Christopher Highley says that conceptually "the English organized their Celtic neighbors through a network of flexible and shifting relationships that allowed the English to both distinguish and where appropriate make strategic connections between them" (92). For more on Britains and Others, see Colley, "Britishness and Otherness" 309–29.

13. Consumption data for the early modern period is notoriously hard to come by and unreliable. Josephine A. Spring and David H. Buss note that "[b]eer consumption reached a maximum of 832 pints per person pr yr (or 2.3 pints pr person pr day) in 1689" (568). However, in *The English Alehouse*, Peter Clark notes that "[i]n 1545 soldiers in the English garrison at Boulogne probably drank about 4 1/2 gallons each of beer a week or rather more than 2 quarts a day" (109).

14. Today the terms ale and beer have collapsed to have basically the same meaning, but in terms of sixteenth-century brewing they had quite distinctive significations; ale was traditionally and then legally a mixture of fermented malt, water, and yeast; beer substituted hops for the yeast. For the legal definition of ale, see *London Letter Books L* 31. For a good explanation of the tortuous semantic transformations of the terms "ale" and "beer," see Mathias xvii-xix.

15. Intriguingly, gin, first distilled by Franciscus Sylvius in Leiden in the seventeenth century, has a similar cultural history. The beverage was intro-

duced to England by soldiers returning from the Low Countries. Late into the nineteenth century, gin was also called Hollands. The standard work on the Dutch brewing industry remains R. Dekker's *Holland in Beroering*.

16. Clark 31–2; Mathias 3–4; and Monckton 18. The etymologies of beer and hops in the OED illustrate the changing nature of this reception. Hops is first mentioned c. 1440 as a plant used in the brewing process. Beer, while an ancient English word, is rarely used in Old English, except in poetry. It becomes common only in the sixteenth century, just as the product takes off.

17. To this day Kentish hops are among the finest in the world and highly sought after. Anchor Steam, a San Francisco microbrewery, imports Kentish hops for its fine ales and beers.

18. Two other versions of the ditty are extant:

Hops and turkeys, carp and beer
Came into England all in one year

and

Turkeys, carps, hops, pickerel, and beer
Came into England all in one year.

Note that this tune already highlights the unique nature of England's insularity; outside products had to come into England. This ditty provides the traditional but unprovable date of 1524 for cultivated hops introduction to England by the Dutch.

19. Perhaps the use of sulfuring, whereby sulfur was added to old hops as a preservative, accounts for the ban on brimstone; however, the hellish connotations of fire and brimstone were a commonplace. See Genesis 19:24 and Revelations 19:20 in the *Geneva Bible*.

20. This how–to manual was so popular that it went through three editions in four years.

21. A century later, Culpeper wrote of "such things only as grow in England, they being most fit for English bodies" (title page), in which he included hops.

22. Hudson mistakenly translates "cervesiam" as beer; however, the foreign nature of the drink and its relation to the fine are worth noting.

23. Here "forreyner" is a wider term denoting anyone not free of the city, but that would include foreigners in the more modern sense. As Ian Archers notes, "immigrants mainly from the Netherlands and France" were typically called "strangers or aliens" (131).

24. Gregory A. Austin provides a useful caveat: "Camden, Nashe, and Shakespeare, among others blame this [prevalence of drunkenness] on Dutch influence, but it is also clearly rooted in a variety of major domestic changes occurring since at least the mid-century" (180).

25. John Gerarde demonstrated the English turnip's relationship to the Dutch in two ways. First, "[i]t groweth in fields and divers vineyardes, or *hoppe gardens* in most places of England" (178; emphasis added). Second,

> They of the lowe countries does give the oile which is pressed out of the seede, against the after throwes of women newly brought to bed, and also do minister it to yoong children against the wormes, which it both killeth and driveth foorth. (178)

The significance of turnip husbandry for the four-crop rotation system which spawned England's agricultural revolution was a discovery of the mid-seventeenth century (Kerridge 269–77). For the standard interpretation of the turnip, see Smallwood and Wells' edition of *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (Dekker 125, n. 139–40).

26. Confusing the Dutch and the German is typical of this period.

27. Here contemporaries have it both ways: they see England as distinct from Europe and in some ways safe, but they also note that their island is occupied by other "races," especially the Scots — some of whom display French Catholic leanings. The fear of Scotland or Wales proving a backdoor into England for Catholic forces proved prescient with the Jacobite invasions of the eighteenth century, even if the invasions themselves failed.

28. Surely this remark is a nod towards Dekker's play.

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 1991.

Appleby, Joyce Oldham. *Economic Thought and Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.

Archer, Ian. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Armstrong, John A. *Nations before Nationalism.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1982.

Austin, Gregory A. *Alcohol in Western Society from Antiquity to 1800: A Chronological History.* Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio Information Services, 1985.

Beier, A. L. *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England 1560-1640.* London: Methuen, 1985.

Belchier, Daubridgcourt. *Hans Beer-Pot, his Invisible Comedy of See me and See me not.* London, 1618.

Bergson, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic.* Trans. Cloudsley Bereton and Fred Rothwell. New York: Macmillan, 1914.

Bevington, David. "Theatre as Holiday." Smith, Strier, and Bevington 101–16.

Bickerdyke, John. *The Curiosities of Ale and Beer: An Entertaining History.* London, 1889.

Boorde, Andrew. *A compendyous regyment or a dyetary of healthe newly corrected with diuers addycyons.* London, 1547.

British Library, Landsdowne MS 71.

Buttes, Henry. *Dyets Dry Dinner.* London, 1599.

Camden, William. *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, Late Queene of England.* 1615, 1625. Trans. R. Norton. London, 1630.
Clark, Peter. *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830.* London: Longman, 1983.
Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 309–29.
—. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
Corporation of London Record Office, Repertories, 30.
Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
Culpeper, Nicholas. *The English Physition Enlarged with Three Hundred, Sixty and Nine Medicines made of English Herbs.* London, 1684.
Dekker, R. *Holland in Beroering.* Baarn, 1982.
Dekker, Thomas. *The Shoemaker's Holiday.* Ed. R. L. Smallwood and Stanley Wells. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979.
Duffy, Michael. *The Englishman and the Foreigner.* Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986.
Edmundson, Rev. George. *Anglo-Dutch Rivalry During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1911.
Elton, G. R. "English National Selfconsciousness and the Parliament in the 16th Century." *Nationalismus in Vorindustrieller Zeit.* Ed. Otto Dann. München: R. Oldenburg Verlag, 1986. 73–82.
Fuller, Thomas. *The History of the Worthies of England.* 3 vol. Ed. P. Austin Nuttall. London, 1840.
Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
Geneva Bible. Geneva, 1560.
Gerarde, John. *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plants.* London, 1597.
Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodomitries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.
Grell, Owen. *Dutch Calvinism in Early Stuart London.* Leiden: Brill, 1989.
Guildhall Library, *London Letter Book L.*
—. MS 5496.
Hechter, Michael. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.
Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
Highley, Christopher. "Wales, Ireland and *1 Henry IV.*" *Renaissance Drama* 21 (1990): 91-114.
Hoenselaars, A. J. *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: A Study of Stage Characters and National Identity in English Renaissance Drama, 1558–1642.* Rutherford, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1992.
Hudson, William. *Leet Jurisidiction in the City of Norwich During the XIIIth and XIVth Centuries.* Publications of the Selden Society. Vol. 5. 1891.
Hunter, G. K. "Elizabethans and Foreigners." *Shakespeare Survey* 17 (1964): 37–52.

Israel, Jonathan Irvine. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477–1806*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

Kastan, David Scott. "Workshop and/as Playhouse." *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*. Ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991. 151–63.

Kerridge, Eric. *The Agricultural Revolution*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1967.

Kirk, R. E. G.,and Ernest F. Kirk, eds. *Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London from the Reign of Henry VIII to that of James I. Part 1. 1525–1571*. Publications of the Huguenot Society of London. Vol. 10, Pt. 1. Aberdeen, 1900.

MacCaffrey, Wallace T. *Elizabeth I: War and Politics 1588-1603*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992

Mathias, Peter. *The Brewing Industry in England, 1700-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1959.

Monckton, H. A. *A History of English Ale and Beer*. London: Bodley Head, 1966.

Morison, Richard. *A Remedy for Sedition*. London, 1536.

Moryson, Fines. *An Itinerary*. London, 1617.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Nashe*. 5 vol. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1910.

Newman, Gerald. *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740-1830*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.

Peacham, Henry. *The Worth of a Peny: or A Caution to keep Money*. London, 1641.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary*. 11 vol. Ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970-83.

Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Seventeenth-Century London*.. Ed. M. G. Brock et al. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986.

Pincus, Steven C. A. "Popery, Trade and Universal Monarchy: The Ideological Context of the Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Dutch War." *English Historical Review* 422 (1992): 1–29.

—. "Republicanism, Absolutism and Universal Monarchy: English Popular Sentiment during the Third Dutch War." *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History*. Ed. Gerald MacLean. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 241–66.

Platter, Thomas. *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*. Trans. Clare Williams. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.

Public Record Office. State Papers 12.

Rabelais, François. *Les Oevvres de Maistre François Rabelais*. 6 vol. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1868–1903.

Rye, William Brenchley. *England as Seen by Foreigners*. London: J. R. Smith, 1865.

Sahlins, Peter. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

Samuel, Raphael, ed. *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*. 3 vol. London: Routledge, 1989.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1988.

Scot, Reynolde. *A Perfite Platforme of a Hoppe Garden*. London, 1574.

Seaver, Paul. "The Artisanal World." Smith, Strier, and Bevington 87-100.

Shakespeare, William. *Henry IV Pt. 1*. Ed. David Bevington. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

—. *Henry IV Pt. 2*. Ed. A. R. Humphreys. New York: Methuen, 1966.

—. *Henry V*. Ed. Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

—. *Othello*. Ed. M. R. Ridley. New York: Methuen, 1958.

Simpson, J. A., and E. S. C. Weiner, preps. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 20 vol. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.

Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Smith, Alan G. R. *The Emergence of a Nation State: The commonwealth of England, 1529-1660*. London: Longman, 1984.

Smith, Anthony. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

Smith, David L., Richard Strier, and David Bevington, eds. *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Spring, Jospehine A, and David H. Buss. "Three Centuries of Alcohol in the British Diet." *Nature* 270 (1977): 567-72.

Statutes of the Realm. 11 vol. in 12. London, 1817.

Stoye, John Walker. *English Travellers Abroad 1604-67: Their Influence in English Society and Politics*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1952.

Taylor, John. *Drinke and welcome; or the famous historie of the most part drinks, in use now in Great Britaine and Ireland*. London, 1637.

Tilly, Charles, ed. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.

Traill, H. D., and J. S. Mann, eds. *Social England*. 6 vol. London: Cassell & Co., 1901–4.

Van der Wee, Herman. *The Low Countries in the Early Modern World*. Trans. Lizabeth Fackelman. Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1993.

Webb, Sidney, and Leslie Stephen, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 63 vol. New York: Macmillan, 1885–1900.

Wilson, Thomas. *Art of Rhetorique*. Rev. ed. 1560. Ed. G. H. Mair. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1909.

Young, Richard. *The drunkard's character, or, a true drunkard*. London, 1638.