Iman Sheeha, 'Of counsel with [m]y mistress': The mistress–servant alliance in Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's The Changeling (1622), Cahiers Elisabethains: late medieval and renaissance English studies, 0 (in press) pp. 1-20. © The Author(s) 2021. DOI: 10.1177/01847678211069467.

'Of counsel with [m]y mistress:' The Mistress-Servant Alliance in Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's *The Changeling* (1622)

Iman Sheeha

Domestic service in *The Changeling* (1622) has been the focus of several studies focusing on its depiction of the resentment of service, the inversion of the hierarchies governing the master-servant relationship, and its containment of transgressive servants.[1] Analyses have mostly focused on De Flores as an embodiment of contemporary fears about servants.[2] Focused on the servant's agency, these studies neglect his *mistress's* agency and thus the play's engagement with the contemporary anxieties surrounding women's domestic authority, especially their power over servants. They also tend to ignore two other servants, Diaphanta and Lollio, whose relationships with their mistresses are equally revealing of those anxieties. This article aims to fill in this gap, arguing that *The Changeling* stages alliances between a household mistress and her servants as threatening to patriarchal authority.[3] It revises the dominant critical reading of the play which insists on a binary between the two plots based on a construction of the household mistresses in each as opposites, showing that while the castle plot dissolves the mistress-servant alliances, the hospital plot is far less reassuring to masters among the audience.

Women's Authority within the Early Modern Home

'[T]he only institution in which early modern women consistently exercised authority,' as Jessica Tvordi writes, 'was within the home.'[4] Early modern moralists often acknowledged that, while wives occupied an inferior position in relation to their husbands, they held positions of authority over their servants.[5] They were, as William Gouge stresses, 'farre the most excellent … of all other inferiours.'[6] The emphasis on women's roles as domestic governors, as literary critics and historians have shown, cannot be separated from the way early modern culture witnessed an increasing emphasis on the individual household as a nucleus of order.[7] Women's roles in domestic government, and especially their authority over servants, were fraught with anxieties.[8] Moralists fretted about the potential for familiarity that a shared domestic space could facilitate. Juan Luis Vives warned against such intimacy in words that continued to be echoed throughout the century: 'Let nat ye maistres be ouer pleasant of speche to her men seruantes neither compenable and mery nor vse moche co[n]uersacion with them nor bolde none of them to play and dalye with her.'[9] The potential of a mistress's domestic

authority to overturn the gender hierarchy is detectable in injunctions for physical correction of female servants to be carried out by mistresses and of menservants by masters.[10] But anxieties about women's supervision of male inferiors were not limited to tension. The scenario of a male servant or apprentice plotting with his mistress-lover to kill his master is familiar both in court records and in popular literature.[11]

Anxieties about women's domestic authority manifested themselves in many ways. Wendy Wall's study of domesticity has shown that housewifery featured in the cultural imagination in terms of its association with blood and violence.[12] Frances E. Dolan, focusing on petty treason, has argued that the domestic features in both dramatic and street literature as a dangerous space.[13] Similarly, Natasha Korda has drawn attention to the anxieties provoked by the housewife's 'unsupervised supervision of the household.'[14] Korda's analysis relates to the goods that wives supervised, but the anxiety was no less acute when it came to the mistress's supervision of her servants. Apart from Dolan, this scholarship has focused on the mistress as an isolated figure within the home, a conception of the household that was far from true in this period. Mistresses were hardly solitary figures confined within the home. In theory, the home guarded female sexuality so much so that it became synonymous with the female virtues of silence, obedience, and chastity.[15] This theory rests on a rigid division of space whereby men belong to the world and women to the home as articulated by Edmund Tilney: 'The office of the husbande is to go abroad in matters of profite, of the wife, to tarry at home, and see all be well there … . The office of the husbande is, to deale, and bargaine with all men, of the wife, to make or meddle with no man.'[16] Nonetheless, women often left their homes to participate in the social life of their neighbours.[17] Additionally, they did not have to leave their homes for a chance 'to meddle with … m[e]n.' The home was a space of production as well as consumption, for shops were commonly run from home. This fact was neatly demonstrated in an entry in the artisan Nehemiah Wallington's diary that records a maidservant finding him alone in the shop and questioning him what he was doing in there (perhaps suspecting another suicide attempt) then 'persuad[ing] [him] to go up to bed.'[18] Her movements between shop and bedchamber are revealing of the oneness of this space and its accessibility to servants.

Beside male servants and apprentices, shops attracted customers and thus undermined the home's capability to protect its mistress's chastity.[19] The woman in the shop who is treated as sexual goods by male customers is a common dramatic trope, what Leslie Thomson terms 'the Jane Shore paradigm.'[20] We need only think of Jane Shore, whose seduction is facilitated by

her labour in her husband's jeweller's shop in Heywood's *Edward IV, Part I* (1599) or of her namesake in Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (1599) who, unlike Heywood's heroine, remains true to her marriage vows.[21] '[T]he wife who shares running the shop with her husband,' in Thomson's words, 'is depicted as not only an object of desire—put on display like a commodity for sale—but also a figure whose role in running the shop gives her a significant degree of freedom and authority.'[22] My contribution to the existing scholarship on *The Changeling* lies in my focus on its engagement with these anxieties, and especially its exploration of the alliances that mistresses forged with servants.

'[E]ngaged so jointly:' De Flores and Beatrice-Joanna

The relationship between Beatrice-Joanna and De Flores has attracted extensive critical attention. The dominant critical reading argues that Beatrice-Joanna, despite her professed loathing of her servant, unconsciously desires him.[23] What is missing from these accounts is an appreciation of the way their alliance invokes anxieties about women's domestic authority and the potential for transgression that their power over servants constitutes. Critical responses to this relationship have also failed to contextualise it within similar early modern stage representations of mistress-male servant alliances, thus the tropes clustering around such alliances and deployed in *The Changeling* have largely gone unnoticed.

The mistress-male servant destructive alliance is a common motif in the subgenre of early modern domestic tragedy. Both *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham* (1592) and *A Warning for Fair Women* (1599), for example, stage alliances between mistresses and male servants that unsettle domestic and social hierarchies and prove fatal to household masters. Central to these representations is the sense of these bonds as replacing a previous one between the servant and his master. *Arden* stages the sealing of the murder deal between Mistress Arden and the servant, Michael, as displacing his bond with his master by having her intercept him on his way to do service for his master.[24] The very purpose of the alliance is the elimination of Michael's master. Similarly, *A Warning* depicts the alliance between Mistress Drury and her servant, Roger, as not only murderous to one household master, but also dangerous to all orderly patriarchal households. The two, the servant reveals, have turned the seduction of citizen wives into a career.[25]

In *The Changeling*, the alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and De Flores evokes many of these tropes. This alliance replaces the servant's bond with his master, Vermandero. We learn early on that De Flores is a 'gentleman' who is '[i]n good respect with [Beatrice-Joanna's] father and follows him.'[26] In fact, he is so close to Vermandero that Beatrice-Joanna anticipates difficulty in asking for his dismissal. In Act 2, scene 1, experiencing yet another distressing encounter with De Flores, Beatrice-Joanna determines to 'get him quite discarded' from her father's service (2.1.94). However, aware of the bond they share, she realises that she needs to find a moment when her father is in a 'good mood' to grant her request (2.1.93). Beatrice-Joanna's choice of terminology, 'to discard,' is crucial. The dominant sense of 'to discard' is 'to dismiss or discharge from employment, service; to deprive of an office or post,' meanings immediately applicable to her intention. The term, however, has a less common meaning, suggesting 'to cast or take (a thing) away from another person by force.'[27] This suggests that Vermandero and De Flores share so close a bond that separating them amounts to an act of violence. De Flores is so close to his master that he has custody of the castle keys (2.2.166, 3.3.s.d.), a privilege extended only to trusted servants.[28]

The alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and De Flores replaces his bond with his master. This displacement is registered when, Beatrice-Joanna, following the successful recruitment of De Flores into her murder plan, offers him 'recompense,' 'salary,' 'wages,' as he contemptuously refers to the offered money (3.4.52, 64, 66). Wages were paid by masters to their servants. Although she denies she is offering De Flores payment ('Why, thou mistak'st De Flores: 'tis not given/ In state of recompense' (3.4.51-1)), her own words contradict her assertion. A few lines earlier, she has already framed the ring as a 'fee:' 'At the stag's fall the keeper has his fees,' proceeding to offer the object: 'I pray bury the finger, but the stone [i.e. the ring]/ You may make use on shortly: the true value,/ Take't of my truth, is near three hundred ducats' (3.4.41, 43-5). The idea that their alliance severs the master-servant bond is best registered when Beatrice-Joanna expects the servant to leave her father's service after the murder: 'When the deed is done,/ I'll furnish thee with all things for thy flight;/ Thou mayst live bravely in another country' (3.2.143-4).

Deploying the tropes surrounding the mistress-male servant alliance that both *Arden* and *A Warning* have employed, *The Changeling* depicts the alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and De Flores as perverting ideals of service relationships. Burnett has analysed the sense of inversion that permeates the relationship, concluding that the play 'stands, finally, as a dramatization of

a horrifying scenario—the abandonment by the servant of his role and his domination (and even reformation) of the society that has held him in thrall.'[29] Burnett's work allows me to focus on other aspects of this alliance that are represented as perverting the ideals of service relationships.[30]

Evoking Mistress Arden, Beatrice-Joanna perverts the role of household mistress. One of the most important duties of mistresses was moral instruction of their servants. The institution of service existed partly to contain disruptive urges associated with youth. As Anthony Fletcher writes, '[a]dult males … were generally agreed that considerable restraint was needed to curb rash and headstrong youths.'[31] Entering service (or apprenticeship) placed the young man or woman under figures of authority who would be responsible for not only providing food, shelter, and wages, but also moral instruction. Undermining the very purposes of service, Beatrice-Joanna involves her servant in murder. Importantly, she frames murder as a form of service for which De Flores should expect payment. Critics have often focused on the double meanings of the words both characters use during this exchange and which seem to elude Beatrice-Joanna. For example, she invites De Flores to do her 'service,' offering money since, she explains, 'thy service [is] dangerous,/ Thy reward shall be precious' (2.2.121, 129-30), an offer that can be read in sexual terms given the contemporary connotations of 'service' and 'reward.'[32] However, the primary sense of these words refers to service and duty. Beatrice-Joanna, in other words, uses her position of authority and De Flores's duty to obey to manipulate him into carrying out the murder. In the process, Beatrice-Joanna inverts another important role of household mistresses: caring for the sick.[33] *A Warning* depicts a virtuous mistress who owns 'a soveraigne thing,/ To help a sodaine surfeit presently' (A2v; 1. 200-1). She is said to put this knowledge to good use: when 'a poore woman,/ … had surfeited,' Mistress Saunders 'went her selfe, and gave her but a dramme' which 'holp her strait, in less than halfe an houre' (A2v; 1. 211-7). Beatrice-Joanna is the inverse of Mistress Saunders,. Examining De Flores's scars, she promises to make him 'a water [that] shall cleanse this/ Within a fortnight' (2.2.80, 82-3). Her performance of housewifery is a mask for criminal intentions.

Beatrice-Joanna's alliance with De Flores also results in the perversion of service. One of the most important duties of household servants was guarding masters' possessions, the bodies of women being understood as part of these goods. [34] 'Whatsoeuer is committed by masters vnto their seruants,' William Gouge writes, 'they must so carefully preserue, as it be not lost,

spoiled, or impaired vnder their hands, whether they be things within doores, or without.'[35] Instead of guarding his master's possessions, De Flores endangers them, even setting the castle on fire in an attempt to force Diaphanta out of Alsemero's bedchamber (on whom more later) (4.3.31-2). Even Beatrice-Joanna, though desperate to remove her waiting woman from Alsemero's bed, hesitates because '[t]hat may endanger the whole house' (4.3.34). As a result of De Flores's action, at least part of the castle, Diaphanta's chamber, is burnt down (5.1.101). Importantly, this act on De Flores's part follows close on the heels of his defloration of his mistress.

The mistress-servant alliance allows the articulation of tensions between male and female servants that were very much part of domestic micro-politics and 'exacerbated,' as Bernard Capp observes, 'by living in such close proximity.'[36] Such conflicts were triggered when the gender hierarchy was upset, such as when older maidservants supervised younger males. *The Changeling* does not suggest age or status disparity between De Flores and Diaphanta. However, following the forging of his alliance with Beatrice-Joanna, De Flores expresses deep resentment towards Diaphanta, a reaction that Burnett reads as a reflection of the 'gendered gradations of degree among servants' where the male servant belongs to a 'superior category to [that of] the female servant.'[37] His outburst also attests to the disorder that Beatrice-Joanna's alliance with her servant has introduced into the household. Learning that Diaphanta has failed to leave Alsemero's bedchamber (4.1.126-7), he embarks on a misogynistic diatribe: 'Who'd trust a waiting-woman?' he reprimands his mistress (5.1.15). Waiting women, he explains, 'are termagents,' overbearing and quarrelsome, as well as lustful, for 'they fall upon their masters/ And have their ladies' first-fruits. They're mad whelps;/ You cannot save them from game royal then' (5.1.16-19). Nor does he stop at this verbal aggression. His plan to set Diaphanta's chamber on fire successfully makes her leave Alsemero's chamber, but he goes further, shooting her and dragging her charred body across the stage (5.1.110-11). The alliance between mistress and male servant, then, throws all domestic relationships into disarray and gives violence free reign.

This domestic chaos was only to be expected, for, by rejecting her position of subjection, Beatrice-Joanna models insubordination for her servants. 'Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English dramatists,' as Deborah G. Burks writes, 'linked women's sexual continence and their submission to the authority of their fathers and husbands not only to the well-ordering of family life, but to the preservation of social order.'[38] Moralists often emphasised the parallels between

the various domestic relationships. Treatises such as William Gouge's *Of domesticall duties* (1622), or John Dod and Robert Cleaver's *A Godly Form of Household Government* (1598) demonstrate, by their very structure, that commentators saw a parallel between the wife's relationship with her husband and the servants' relationships with their employers. It only follows, then, that a breakdown of one domestic relationship will result in disruptions in others. This idea was captured most powerfully in *Arden* where, following the murder of Master Arden through the instigation of his wife, her servant, suggests that he and his fellow servant, Susan, 'sit down too' to the dinner table (14.288–9). Beatrice-Joanna's withdrawal of obedience to those 'above her' constitutes the context for De Flores's withdrawal of *his* obedience to her: her withdrawal of her duty to those above her has severed her from the networks that authorised her superiority over the likes of De Flores and, in Joseph M. Duffy's words, 'has separated [her] from the privileges of her past—from the privacy of rank, the protection of family, and the esteem of a lover - and has isolated her in kinship with a dark paramour.'[39] 'You're the deed's creature,' the servant informs his mistress, 'you [are] one with me' (3.4.140, 143), stressing her new status as his equal now that she has rejected her duty. It is not surprising then that Beatrice-Joanna's act of petty treason, will come back to haunt her in the form of another act of petty treason directed at her this time, her own servant's murder of her in Act 5, scene 3.

'These women are their ladies' cabinets:' Diaphanta and Beatrice-Joanna

Invested in exploring women's alliances within the home, *The Changeling* dedicates considerable stage time to developing the relationship between Diaphanta, a waiting woman, and Beatrice-Joanna. Their alliance introduces a new angle to the play's interest in domestic relationships: women's alliances. This aspect of the play has not received the attention it deserves, for while its depiction of Diaphanta has been described as 'a cautionary emblem of the disorder that women's service can engender in domestic settings,' the disorder generated by the *alliance* between the female servant and her mistress remains largely unexplored.[40] Historians have productively examined the relationships between women in early modern England, arguing that 'gossips' were both a source of support to each other and a cause for anxiety among men.[41] A woman's '[f]emale neighbours and relations provided,' in David Cressy's words, 'almost constant companionship, bringing with them a wide range of wisdom, experience, and advice concerning precautions, procedures, and protocols.'[42] Men, however, often regarded women's gatherings with suspicion, as it was thought women discussed the

sexual performance of their husbands and exposed their failures, as Samuel Rowlands's pamphlets on gossips reveal.[43]

Texts such as Rowlands's suggest that a woman's gossips were not constant presences in the household. They also often seem to be social equals. Absent from these accounts are the women that mistresses, like Beatrice-Joanna, had access to within the house: their maidservants. Mistresses and maidservants spent considerable amounts of time together performing domestic activities and 'pursuits from which,' as Burnett writes, 'husband[s] [were] conspicuously excluded.'[44] Conduct literature frequently cautioned husbands against meddling in their wives' domestic concerns, creating, in effect, a domestic space where mistresses and maidservants worked together away from male intervention. John Dod and Robert Cleaver, for example, list some aspects of domesticity 'in which the husband giveth over his right unto his wife: as to rule and govern her maidens; to see those things that belong unto the kitchen, and to huswifery, and to their household stuff.'[45] A husband who did not heed this advice could find himself shamed as 'cotquean.'[46] This combination of advice and shaming tactics created a sense of the sites devoted to housewifery as female spaces, a perception that resulted in anxieties about what women got up to together in the absence of male supervision.

While maidservants may not fit within the definition of the 'gossip,' given their social inferiority, they shared with gossips their gender and the potential for subversion that women's gatherings often evoked. *The Changeling* registers the anxiety about these bonds in Alsemero's comment following Diaphanta's escorting him into the secret place where he will meet her mistress: 'These women are their ladies' cabinets,/ Things of most precious trust are locked into 'em' (2.2.6-7). It seems that, even when they serve a man's interests, women's alliances with their maidservants evoked suspicion. Alsemero's reference to waiting women as 'cabinets' is in itself damning, for these small cases were used to store objects connected with women's supposed vanity, such as jewels, and were themselves used as decorative objects.[47] Alternatively, as Orest Ranum maintains, they were private rooms reserved for the use of women for intimate meetings.[48] Both senses associate Diaphanta with female sin and transgression.

The early modern stage offers many examples of alliances between mistresses and maidservants that stress the sense of danger to patriarchy they pose. In *Othello*, for example, Desdemona and Emilia discuss unfaithfulness, attractive men, and women's lot in a patriarchal

society (3.4.34-5, 92-5). Similarly, in *Arden*, a mistress and maidservant conceal the master's murdered body and the clues to the murder left on the floor (14.251, 254). In these two examples, women's alliances with their female servants undermine established hierarchies. This section argues that *The Changeling*'s depiction of the alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and Diaphanta participates in this tradition, drawing on contemporary anxieties about women working closely with their maidservants and using the legitimate power they held over them to challenge the existing domestic and social hierarchies.

The Changeling's Diaphanta is modelled on the figure of the sexually avaricious female servant depicted frequently on the stage. This figure, as Michelle M. Dowd writes, was based on the construction of the female servant as 'potentially disruptive and sexually available.'[49] Examples include Margaret in Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing* (1600) and Putana in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Diaphanta is presented as one such figure at the beginning of the play. Before she even speaks, Jasperino, Alsemero's friend, reads her as available for sexual 'board[ing]' (1.1.91). Their conversation quickly turns to the explicitly sexual: 'I could show you such a thing with an ingredient that we two would compound together, and if it did not tame the maddest blood i'th' town for two hours after, I'll ne'er profess physic again' (1.1.144-7). The play substantiates Jasperino's impression of Diaphanta as a lustful maidservant when, later on, she eagerly accepts her mistress's offer that she replace her in the marital bed. Once the bed-trick has been arranged, Diaphanta can barely contain her excitement: to her mistress's business-like concern with logistics ('We must study the carriage of this business'), Diaphanta replies: 'I shall carry't well, because I love the burden,' referring to the bearing of Alsemero's weight during sex (4.1.123-5).

The alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and Diaphanta is forged over their shared experience of having a female body whose uncertainty constituted a source of anxiety to men and whose inscrutability, in Jennifer Panek's words, the play is much concerned with.[50] It is a critical commonplace that, in *The Changeling*, 'women's bodies, with their ability to change shape and hide secrets, represent a threatening nature which the taxonomies and structures of patriarchally conceived culture must at all costs control.'[51] However, the fact that it takes collaboration between two women for that threat to materialise has not been commented on. Their shared experience enables them to work together to fool Beatrice-Joanna's husband into taking Diaphanta's virginal body for that of the wife who has already lost her virginity. Their alliance constitutes a threat to the patriarchal household. They not only manage to deceive a man out of

his right to a virginal bride and so to exclusive ownership of her body, but also cause the erasure of status distinction. As a result of the plan, a servant is taken for a mistress, and a master ends up taking a servant for his noble born wife, thus exposing the performativity of status and the lack of inherent social distinction. Crucially, the space within which the bed-trick is hatched is a closet, Alsemero's, described by Beatrice-Joanna as a 'right physician's closet …/ Set round with phials—every one her mark too' (4.1.20-1). The closet is intriguing because it has no equivalent in either of Middleton and Rowley's sources, John Reynolds's *The triumphs of Gods revenge against the crying and execrable sinne of willfull and premeditated murther* (1621) and Leonard Digges's translation of Don Gonçalo de Cespedes y Meneses's *Gerardo the vnfortunate Spaniard* (1622). Hopkins has argued that Alsemero's closet constitutes an appropriation of a female space. '[T]raditionally, she writes, 'as evidenced by the titles of such cookery books as *A Closet for Ladies and Gentlewomen* and *The Good Huswifes Closet*, [the closet was] a space demarcated for the exclusive use of women, and one, moreover, associated with the domestic skill of food preparation.'[52] Additionally, the activity in which Beatrice-Joanna and her waiting woman engage in the closet evokes women's culinary practices which constituted a source of anxiety. Sara Pennell has argued that the well-represented trope of the wife who poisons her husband 'is symptomatic of contemporary suspicions of female culinary and medicinal competencies and the arenas in which those competencies were developed.'[53] Taking glasses off shelves, tasting them, examining their qualities, and consuming them, the mistress and servant perform a perverted version of a common domestic task: cooking. Beatrice-Joanna and Diaphanta's presence in a space culturally associated with women's culinary activities, then, evokes the danger that both women's alliances and their housewifery constituted and renders the association between these two women suspect.

Like the depictions of mistress-servant alliances in *Arden*, *A Warning*, and in the relationship between Beatrice-Joanna and De Flores, the bond between mistress and waiting woman perverts service relationships. Conduct literature instructed mistresses to keep 'a diligent eye' on 'the behauiour of … seruants.'[54] Employers often took interest in their servants' marital plans.[55] Beatrice-Joanna, in the keen interest she takes in her servant's sexuality, is a parody of the ideal mistress. Her policing of Diaphanta's body aims not at ensuring the servant's chastity, but at the dark purpose of substituting the servant's body for her own in the marital bed and so covering up her own sexual transgression. In a dark inversion of the mistress's duty to help her servant to an advantageous marriage, Beatrice-Joanna helps her servant into an adulterous bed.

The Changeling manages the anxieties surrounding the mistress-maidservant alliance by dissolving it. Neither mistress nor servant is depicted as loyal. Diaphanta disobeys her mistress and stays beyond the agreed time: 'Pardon frailty, madame,' she pleads, 'In troth I was so well I e'en forgot myself' (5.1.77-8). Her mistress, for her part, immediately turns against her. Feeling impatient about the servant's delay, Beatrice-Joanna turns to verbal aggression: 'This strumpet serves her own ends, 'tis apparent now' (5.1.2). She is quick to distrust her waiting woman, confiding in the audience that 'I have some suspicion of her faith to me,/ Because I was suspected of my lord,' despite the fact that the play offers no evidence that Diaphanta has exposed her mistress's liaison with De Flores (5.1.8-9). Before De Flores suggests setting Diaphanta's chamber on fire, her mistress has already made the decision to rid herself of the inconvenient servant who knows too much: 'No trusting of her life with such a secret' (5.1.6). De Flores's suggestion is welcomed immediately by the agitated mistress who licenses the murder: 'do what thou wilt now' (5.1.33). As Margot Heinemann writes, 'it is she, not De Flores, who first decides that Diaphanta must be killed as untrustworthy.'[56] Nor does the mistress's betrayal of her waiting woman end here. Following Diaphanta's murder, Beatrice-Joanna performs an act of ultimate betrayal. To her father's query as to why the fire 'should … come there [i.e. into Diaphanta's chamber],' Beatrice-Joanna explains that her waiting woman is 'in her chamber negligent and heavy:/ She 'scaped a ruin twice' (5.1.102-5). She, in other words, inscribes her servant in a discourse of negligent service, eliciting Vermandero's censorious remark against all maidservants: 'Those sleepy sluts are dangerous in a house,/ An they be ne'er so good' (5.1.6-7). Beatrice-Joanna, then, betrays the alliance that was forged on the basis of shared female experience for a bond that is based on status and patriarchal identification.

The play leaves the nature of Diaphanta's betrayal of her mistress ambiguous. While Alsemero claims that Diaphanta has reported her mistress's liaison (5.3.54-6), it is unclear whether he is telling the truth, or using a fictional confession to push Beatrice-Joanna to confess her crimes. The play, however, is clear that Diaphanta is working to further her own ends. Following her agreement to replace her mistress in the marital bed, Diaphanta articulates her social ambition. The money she will earn in this way will, she fantasises, help her to 'a justice now;/ I bring a portion with me' (4.1.129-30). As a final stroke to any sense of loyal service Diaphanta's action might suggest, the play presents an image that inscribes her within the discourse of treacherous service. The Diaphanta figure in the source drowns when her mistress pushes her into a well.[57] *The Changeling* changes drowning to burning. The image of a maidservant burnt alive invokes

the punishment meted out for female petty traitors.[58] This is the fate that Holinshed records for the Ardens' maidservant as well as her mistress.[59] In staging a female alliance that is dissolved by both parties' betrayal of each other, the play offers a reassuring fantasy to the male members of its audience, those who experienced such an alliance as a threat, to the effect that female bonds are transient.

'Mistress: you perceive that I am privy to your skill:' Isabella and Lollio

The Changeling's hospital plot offers a mistress-servant alliance which complicates the reassuring endings to the alliances of mistress and servants in the castle plot. It has become a critical commonplace to read Isabella, the wife of the asylum master, as a foil to the castle plot's Beatrice-Joanna. Where Beatrice-Joanna proves adulterous, so the argument goes, Isabella proves chaste.[60] This final section challenges this reading, arguing that, far from being a reassuring male fantasy about female incorruptibility within the home, Isabella embodies many of the anxieties about mistresses' domestic authority over servants that we saw at work in the castle plot. While the alliances Beatrice-Joanna forges with her servants are dissolved, the alliance between mistress and servant in the hospital plot survives the ending, remaining a threatening spectre that haunts the final lines of the play.

In the hospital plot, the mistress-servant alliance is forged within a domestic space characterised as disorderly in two important respects. Firstly, its master, Alibius, whose name suggests absence, instead of presiding over his household, deputises his servant, Lollio: 'thy watchful eye/ Must have employment: I cannot always be at home' (1.2.32-3). The servant will later describe his role as that of a 'governor' (3.3.184, 220). Lollio's task is clearly spelt out: he should 'watch out her [his mistress's] treadings, and in my absence/ Supply my place' (1.2.38-9). This deputisation goes against contemporary theory and practice. Writers of conduct literature often recognised that householders' commitments took them out of the house. In a master's absence, the wife acted as his deputy. Thomas Tusser, for example, instructs: 'When husband is absent, let huswife be chiefe.'[61] Alibius's deputising of his servant denies his wife her legitimate right to govern the house in his absence and constitutes the context within which the alliance between mistress and servant is forged.

Alibius's deputisation of his servant renders the mistress an outsider, a visitor to the madhouse presented with the spectacle of madness as entertainment. Like a visitor, she asks her own

servant: 'Come on, sir:/ Afford me the pleasure of your Bedlam./ … Pray, sir, let me partake/ If there be such a pleasure [as you claim]' (3.3.23-4, 29-30). Symptomatic of this disorderly household, instead of managing her domestic space, she becomes dependent on Lollio to familiarise her with the different functions of the wards in her own home. 'When you have had a taste of the madmen,' he promises, 'you shall (if you please) see Fool's College, on the other side. I seldom lock there: 'tis but shooting a bolt or two, and you are among 'em' (3.3.36-9). She even must ask her servant for the keys of the wardrobe as she plans her spectacle of madness (on which more later) (4.3.51). This is a dramatic shorthand for her displacement from her place as mistress, for keys belonged to household mistresses by rights and were only lent to trusty servants for the accomplishment of relevant tasks, as we saw De Flores do. Isabella, then, far from being co-governor with her husband, is treated as an object that needs to be kept hidden from inquisitive eyes. Aware of the January-May marriage he has entered ('My wife is young;' 'I am old' (1.2.16, 19)), the paranoid Alibius keeps his wife concealed within the home. The fear is that, conceived of as an object that attracts viewers, '[t]he daily visitants that come to see/ My brainsick patients,' worries Alibius, will 'see my wife' (1.2.52-4). Alibius insists that his servant make sure she remains concealed: 'come they to see/ Our madmen or our fools, let 'em see no more/ Than what they come for. By that consequent/ They must not see her' (1.2.81-4). Early on then, the play establishes both the disorderly nature of this household and its master's contradictory conception of his home as both a safe space that guards his wife's chastity (because he can lock doors and appoint servants to guard them) on the one hand and one whose boundaries are porous (being inhabited by patients and visited by 'gallants …/ Of quick enticing eyes, rich in habits,/ Of stature and proportion very comely' (1.2.54-6)) on the other.

Isabella's relegation to the position of an outsider is particularly conspicuous given the peculiar nature of her household. Past criticism, focusing on the madhouse's similarity to London Bedlam, has so far failed to notice that Alibius's madhouse is modelled on the early modern shop.[62] Like a shop owner, Alibius runs his business from home, receiving 'customers' in the domestic space. His house is similar to Nehemiah Wallington's, for example, who records in his diary a traumatising event involving the dislodgment of a huge log that shows the shop being shared by both a customer being shown 'bed staves' and Wallington's own child, Sarah, who 'was playing in the shop.'[63] It is the fact that his business and his household share the same space that causes Alibius unease, for he realises that his business attracts 'gallants,' who thus have an excuse to invade his home and interact with his wife. Middling-sorts wives who

populate city comedies tend to be engaged in their husbands' business, often at a great risk to their chastity, as discussed above. Examining the figure of the merchant's wife in the drama, and especially in Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, Ann C. Christensen has argued that Dekker's play 'diminishes [the wife's] commercial authority.'[64] Christensen's argument is supported by evidence about contemporary social practice, which reveals that women's contribution to the economic activities of their menfolk was crucial.[65] 'It was generally accepted,' as Capp writes, 'that a tradesman's wife would help in the business, usually in the shop, where her knowledge, reliability, and a friendly manner could prove a valuable asset.'[66] Wallington's wife, Grace, certainly helped in the shop, for he praises her 'care and diligence' when left in charge of the shop.[67] Later in the century, William Stout's sister, Elin, frequently appears in his autobiography as assisting in the shop.[68] Modelled on the shop, Alibius's madhouse raises questions about the capacity of the house to safeguard and contain women's sexuality. The shop, on the stage and in early modern culture, made wives visible to customers and other men, such as apprentices who were a vital part of trade and who lived in their master's household.[69] The madhouse plot interrogates Alibius's confidence that his wife, kept indoors, is safe from male attention. Ironically, Isabella will be seduced within the house that is supposed to guard her chastity. The notion of the home as a space that, contrary to contemporary theorisation, does not safeguard, but rather endangers, women's chastity, which the castle plot explores, then, is central to the hospital plot as well.

Just as the castle plot depicts the alliance between a mistress and her male servant as disruptive of male bonds, Isabella's alliance with Lollio dissolves his bond with his master. When we first meet Alibius, he is concerned about the chastity of his wife and feels close enough to his servant to share his fears. 'I would wear my ring on my own finger,' Alibius complains, indicating the sexual nature of his anxiety, which he will go on to make even more explicit with his choice of the verb 'use:' 'Whilst it is borrowed it is none of mine,/ But his that useth it' (1.1.26-9). Lollio replies in kind, the imperative he uses as well as the intimate topic he is invited to comment on suggesting his closeness to his master: 'You must keep it on still, then; if it but lie by, one or other will be thrusting into't' (1.1.30-1). The close bond between master and servant is indicated by Alibius's reflection on Lollio's apparently long term of service in his household and their shared history: 'The diligence that I have found in thee,/ The care and industry already past,/ Assure me of thy good continuance' (1.2.4-6). Alibius further invokes this bond by informing Lollio that 'my trust/ Is on thee, and I account it firm and strong' (1.2.66-7). The

alliance between these men, then, is forged over a woman's body, its purpose the prevention of the husband's cuckoldry.

The bond between master and servant is dissolved before Isabella even enters, for her mere presence in the household undoes it. Lollio, consumed by desire for his mistress and thus echoing De Flores in the castle plot, is ready to betray his master for her sexual favours. His conversation with his master in Act 1, scene 2, is riddled with bawdy references to his mistress. Confiding in his servant about a 'secret' (his fears of being cuckolded), Alibius fails to catch Lollio's punning on 'secret' as 'secret parts' and reference to his dangerous proximity to this secret: 'I was ever close to a secret, sir' (1.2.3). Lollio continues with his bawdy puns: to his master's reference to the carnal 'knowledge' of his wife's body that he needs to prevent any man from having, the servant quips: 'Well, sir, let us handle that between you and I,' 'handle' carrying sexual connotations (1.2.14). In this conversation, even Lollio's promise, 'I'll do my best, sir' to watch Isabella, suggests sexual 'doing' (1.2.40). With the mistress's entrance in Act 3, scene 3, Lollio's eagerness to substitute a (sexual) bond with her for the one he has with his master is immediately staged. Replying to her exasperation with being 'ke[pt] in this pinfold [i.e. prison]' and her pleading with him to 'Let me be doing something,' Lollio, in line with his earlier pun, suggests a form of 'doing' that involves both mistress and servant: 'You shall be doing, if it please you; I'll whistle to you if you'll pipe after,' 'pipe' suggesting both singing and fellatio (5-6).[70] It is not surprising, then, that, spying on his mistress's interaction with Antonio (one of Vermandero's men disguised as an 'idiot' to secure access to Isabella whom he hopes to seduce) from 'the upper room,' Lollio uses the information not to inform his master of this betrayal, but rather to blackmail his mistress to have sex with him in return for silence (3.3.124). His next move is to demand his 'share' in the sexual pleasures that he expects Antonio will soon enjoy (3.3.265). It is at this point that a bond is forged between the mistress and servant, its terms based on concealing the goings-on in the household from his master.

The mistress-servant bond, like the alliance between Beatrice-Joanna and her servants, displaces an earlier alliance between the servant and his master. Almost reproducing verbatim the scene in which Alibius and his servant solidified their bond over her body, Isabella instructs Lollio to 'Be silent, mute—/ Mute as a statue' and thus to conceal his knowledge of her interactions with Antonio from his master (260-1). Failure to comply with her wishes, she threatens, will mean certain death, for she will, she promises, inform Antonio that 'his injunction/ For me enjoying shall be to cut thy throat' (3.3.261-2). The new alliance is sealed

visually with the entrance of Alibius and Isabella's instruction to her servant: 'No more: your master' (3.3.266). The fact that Lollio does indeed keep Isabella's interactions secret attests to her successful severing of his alliance with his master and the new bond he now shares with her. This bond is further stressed when, contrary to his promise to his master, Lollio acts as a go-between for his mistress and her suitors, delivering love letters and even reading them out loud for her (4.3.4-29). Perhaps the best articulation of the new alliance is Lollio's description of himself as 'privy to [his mistress's] skill,' in a reference to his complicity in Isabella's liaisons (4.3.36).

Contrary to the dominant critical response, Isabella, in her interactions with both her lustful servant and the two disguised suitors, does *not* react as a chaste wife. Her injunction to Lollio to keep silent about what he has witnessed in his master's absence suggests as much. Furthermore, her different reactions to advances from men are revealing. When approached by Antonio, She flirts back: 'You are a fine fool indeed;' 'You're a parlous fool;' 'A forward fool too!,' the latter statement uttered in response to Antonio's kissing which does not seem to meet with any objections (3.3.136, 142, 146). When, however, Lollio tries to make advances on her, Isabella snaps: 'You bold slave, you!' (3.3.242). Isabella, in other words, does not deny favours to any man apart from her husband, as a chaste wife should, but rather *chooses* who to grant these favours to. In a revealing move, she does not threaten to expose the disguised lovers to her husband or insist they leave the household. Instead, she promises Antonio: 'As you are a gentleman, I'll not discover you,' letting him decide when to leave: 'When you are weary, you may leave the school' (3.3.157-8). 'Just what is her motive for letting him stay at the asylum,' wonders Jay O'Berski, 'if not to see more of him in the future?'[71] While the expectation that Antonio will eventually get 'weary,' perhaps tired of trying to seduce her suggests that Isabella intends to keep her vows, her ambiguous remarks, however, suggest otherwise. When she first hears about the new 'fool's' 'proper body,' she is eager to meet him (3.3.25). Following Antonio's revelation of his true identity, she informs Lollio that she 'like[s] the fool … passing well,' insisting that she does not desire to 'be rid' of him and urging her servant to 'Let him stay a little' (3.3.165-6, 179-80). Perhaps, the most ambiguous remark she makes about Antonio is her answer to Lollio's enquiry as to whether the 'fool' 'is … not witty, pretty well[?]' (3.3.167). 'If he hold on as he begins,' Isabella replies, 'he is like to come to something,' a statement that could either suggest to Lollio that his 'fool' is benefiting from his schooling, or to Antonio that he might find her responsive (3.3.168-9). This ambiguity leaves her actual thoughts on marital infidelity inaccessible, but it also keeps the prospect of her

infidelity alive. It is in her disguise as a madwoman, however, that her desire for Antonio and disappointment at its frustration are most explicitly staged.

Isabella's adoption of the madwoman disguise with the help of her servant has been variously interpreted. The consensus is that she never intends to seduce Antonio and only 'feign[s] unchastity.'[72] This reading has textual basis, for Isabella tells her servant that she intends to 'use' the suitors only in the 'fair sense,' which Lollio understands in the sexual sense (4.3.46-7). However, the text also suggests that Isabella expresses an element of desire in her interaction with Antonio. Echoing Antonio's wooing of her earlier, she touches him, pulling him down ('Here's wax enough below, Icarus'), drawing attention to his fall ('He's down, he's down,/ What a terrible fall he had!), then instructing him ('Stand up') and inviting him suggestively: 'let us tread the lower labyrinth' (4.3.111-4). 'Fall' and 'stand' have already acquired sexual connotations in the conversation she had with her servant just before she dons her disguise: 'The first place is thine, believe it, Lollio,/ If I do fall,' the mistress promises her servant (4.3.39-40). 'I fall upon you;' 'I stand to my venture,' he replies (4.3.41, 43). Isabella's bawdy references multiply: 'Let me suck out those billows in thy belly,' 'billows' punningly suggests 'penis.'[73] She even evokes the 'moon,' a euphemism for female genitalia, inviting him to 'stay in [it] with [her]' (4.3.127). Isabella's actions seem designed to humiliate Antonio by only revealing herself once he has rejected her (4.3.130-1). However, in informing Antonio that she 'only put on this habit of a frantic,/ … to beguile the nimble eye of jealousy [her husband's? Lollio's?]' and her disappointment ('And am I thus rewarded?') before she exits lurks a sense of frustrated desire (4.3.134-7). There is genuine disappointment in her chiding of Antonio for failing to recognise her ('You, a quick-sighted lover?) and a withdrawal of favours granted earlier ('Come not near me') as well as an articulation of the adverse effects of his rejection on her: 'I came a feigner [of madness] to return stark mad' (4.3.139-41).

Unlike the castle plot, the hospital plot does not offer closure on the mistress-servant alliance. In Act 5, scene 2, Alibius reveals to Vermandero that ''Twas my wife's fortune …/ to find out lately/ Within our hospital of fools and madmen/ Two counterfeits slipped into these disguises,/ Their names Franciscus and Antonio' (70-4). While the revelation seems to offer the baffled Vermandero an (wrong) answer to the puzzle of Alonzo's disappearance, it raises questions about the extent of Alibius's knowledge about the two men found in his household and what exactly his wife has revealed to him. It seems that, while Alibius has been told that Vermandero's men had dwelled in his asylum for a while, he remains oblivious as to the true

purpose of their disguise: the seduction of his wife. In choosing not to stage the conversation in which Isabella reports Franciscus and Antonio to her husband, the play refuses, in the final lines, to contain anxieties about women's domestic authority. The fact that Lollio is absent from the final scene and thus does not participate in the collective listing of changes that the various characters have undergone only stresses this lack of closure. While 'beauty' is said to have 'changed/ To ugly whoredom' and 'servant obedience to a master-sin: imperious murder,' the ending does not stage a servant, Lollio, promising to change into a loyal keeper of his master's madhouse, or a faithful overseer of his possessions. Instead, the ending has Alibius himself promise to renounce his jealousy, significantly in response to his wife's prompting: 'Your change is still behind …/ You are a jealous coxcomb' (5.3.209-11). Alibius, in response, embraces reform: 'I see all apparent, wife, and will change now/ Into a better husband' (5.5.213-4). Alibius's change into a trusting husband, coupled by Isabella's less than straightforward performance of chastity, and Lollio's failure to undergo a similar transformation work to keep the threatening spectre of the dangerous alliance between mistress and servant in the audience's minds. Isabella's soliloquy in Act 3, scene 3, best registers this sense of foreboding that hovers over the play's ending: 'Would a woman stray,/ She need not gad abroad to seek her sin;/ It would be brought home one way or other' (231-3). The home, inhabited by resourceful mistresses and easily manipulated servants, proves a site of danger to masters, rather than a safeguard of chastity.

Conclusion

The Changeling is deeply invested in exploring the alliances that mistresses form with their servants within the home. This investment cannot be understood apart from contemporary anxieties surrounding women's domestic authority, and especially the power they held over servants. These anxieties tend to take gendered forms. On the stage, women's alliances with male servants are often sexual in nature and (though not always) murderous in purpose. The examples of Mistress Arden's alliance with her servant and Webster's Duchess of Malfi's alliance with her steward are cases in point. Women's alliances with their female servants, by contrast, do not have to be murderous in intention to threaten patriarchal order. Female alliances are threatening because they give women space to voice their grievances and share experiences. As mistress and maidservant plot together, patrilineal descent comes under threat, the patriarchal double standard is questioned, and men's possession of female bodies is challenged. In a memorable scene from another Middleton play, female bonds even threaten

the physical structure of the house itself. In *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, the monstrous gossips gathering around a childbed in Act 3, scene 2, according to a bitter husband, make the chamber hot with their 'thick bums,' and end up emptying their bladders on the floor.[74]

A prominent aspect of the depiction of the mistress-male servant alliance is that they replace existing bonds between masters and those servants. Mistresses violate male bonds and turn servants against their masters. In *The Changeling*, these anxieties are managed in the castle plot while they remain alive in the hospital plot. Both plots expose contemporary perceptions of the house as a safeguard and container of female sexuality. Although neither Beatrice-Joanna nor Isabella leaves her house more than once (the former, with her father, to attend church service in 1.1; the latter, with her husband, to attend the wedding in the castle in 5.3), both experience temptation and form alliances that undermine patriarchal control within their homes. In this, *The Changeling* differs from such plays as *A Warning*, or *Women Beware Women* where temptation comes from the street and through domestic thresholds, a window or a doorstep.[75] The play suggests that husbands and fathers are foolish to think women are rendered safe within the home. It also exposes the anxiety-inducing contradiction in advice literature which maintains that the home contains female power while at the same time insisting that it is the proper space for the female exercise of power.

Notes

---

[1] Michael Neill, ed, introduction to *The Changeling* (London: A & C Black, 2006); Neill, 'A Woman's Service:" Gender, Subordination, and the Erotics of Rank in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries,' in *The Shakespearean International Yearbook* 5, ed. Michael Neill (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 127-44; Mark Thornton Burnett, *Masters and Servants in English Renaissance Drama and Culture: Authority and Obedience* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997); Burnett, '*The Changeling* and Masters and Servants,' in *Early Modern Drama: A Critical Companion*, ed. Garrett A. Sullivan et. al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 298-308. John Higgins analyses the play's engagement with Frances Howard, the Countess of Somerset's servants ('"Servant obedience changed to master sin:" Performance and the Public Transcript of Service in the Overbury Affair and *The Changeling*,' *Journal of Early Modern Studies* n. 4 (2015), 231-258, http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-15807.)

[2] Burnett, '*The Changeling* and Masters and Servants,' 299.

[3] Even though the play is a collaborative work, I treat it as one coherent whole. For a similar view, see Joost Daalder in his introduction to the New Mermaids edition (London: A & C Black, 1990), xviii; Mark Hutchings, introduction to *The Changeling: A Critical Reader*, ed. Mark Hutchings (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2019), 4.

[4] Jessica Tvordi, 'Female Alliance and the Construction of Homoeroticism in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*,' in *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 116

[5] See Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988), Ch. 2; Lena Cowen Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (London: Cornell University Press, 1994), ch. 2.

[6] Gouge, *Of domesticall duties* (London, 1622), sig. C5r.

[7] Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, 23. See also Orlin, *Private Matters*.

[8] Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern* (London. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 97.
[9] Juan Luis Vives, *A very frutefull and pleasant boke called the Instructio[n] of a Christen woma[n]* (London, 1529), sig. I4v.
[10] Gouge, *Of domesticall duties*, sig. Vv3v.
[11] Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 230; Frances E. Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550–1700* (London: Cornell University Press, 1994), chaps. 1-2.
[12] Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 193.
[13] Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*, 5.
[14] Natasha Korda, *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 92.
[15] Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, 79.
[16] Edmund Tilney, *The flower of friendship* (1578) ed. Valerie Wayne and Introduction (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 120-21.
[17] Bernard Capp, *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family, and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 27 and ch. 7, Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, 14; Gowing, *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Yale University Press, 2003). 29; Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-century London (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989),* 41.
[18] Paul E. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), 23.
[19] David Kathman, 'Grocers, Goldsmiths, and Drapers: Freemen and Apprentices in the Elizabethan Theater,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (Spring, 2004), 3.
[20] Leslie Thomson, '"As proper a woman as any in Cheap:" Women in Shops on the Early Modern Stage,' *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* 16 (2003), 151, http://www.jstor.com/stable/24322899.
[21] On representations of tradesmens' wives, see Ann C. Christensen, 'Being Mistress Eyre in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* and Deloney's "The Gentle Craft,"' *Comparative Drama* 42. no. 4 (Winter 2008): 451-480.
[22] Thomson, '"As Proper a Woman as Any in Cheap", 148.
[23] This view was perhaps best expressed by Daalder, xxvi. But see Roberta Barker and David Nicol, 'Does Beatrice Joanna Have a Subtext?: *The Changeling* on the London Stage,' *Early Modern Literary Studies* 10, no. 1 (May, 2004): 1-43.
[24] M. L. Wine, ed., *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham* (London: Methuen, 1972), I.142-4. Further references to the play are to this edition and will appear parenthetically in the text.
[25] Charles Dale Cannon, ed., *A Warning for Fair Women: A Critical Edition* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), sig. B4r; iii.450–52. Further references to the play are to this edition and will appear parenthetically in the text.
[26] Douglas Bruster, ed., *The Changeling*, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 1.1.130, 135; 2.1.49. All references to the play are from this edition and will be cited in parenthesis in the text.
[27] *OED*, 'Discard,' v. 2a; 1b.
[28] William Wentworth, 'Advice to his son,' in *Wentworth Paper*s (1597-1628). Vol. 12, ed. J. P. Cooper. (London: University College, 1973), 14.
[29] Burnett, '*The Changeling* and Masters and Servants,' 298.
[30] Burnett, *Masters and Servants*, 101.
[31] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1995), 211.
[32] Christopher Ricks, 'The Moral and Poetic Structure of *The Changeling*,' *Essays in Criticism* X, no. 3 (1 July 1960): 290–306, https://doi.org/10.109.
[33] For women and physic, see Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England: 1550–1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 96; Paul Griffiths, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560–1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 313-20.
[34] Peter Stallybrass, 'Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed,' in M.W. Ferguson, M. Quilligan and N.J. Vickers, eds., *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 123-42.
[35] Gouge, *Of domesticall duties*, sig. Rr8r.
[36] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 164; Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, 202-4.
[37] Burnett, '*The Changeling* and Masters and Servants,' 304.
[38] Deborah G. Burks, '"I'll Want My Will Else:" *The Changeling* and Women's Complicity with Their Rapists,' *English Literary History* 62, no. 4 (Winter, 1995), 762.

[39] Joseph M. Duffy, 'Madhouse Optics: *The Changeling*,' *Comparative Drama* 8, no. 2 (Summer 1974): 193, http://www.jstor.com/stable/41153331.
[40] Michelle M. Dowd, 'Desiring Subjects: Staging the Female Servant in Early Modern Tragedy,' in *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama* ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 140.
[41] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 50.
[42] David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 35.
[43] Samuel Rowlands, *A crew of kind gossips* (London, 1613), sig. D3r.
[44] Burnett, *Masters and Servants*, 128. Jane Whittle, 'Housewives and Servants in Rural England, 1440-1650: Evidence of Women's Work from Probate Documents,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 15 (2005), 1-74 (73).
[45] Orlin, *Private Matters*, 102
[46] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 50.
[47] *OED*, 'Cabinet,' n. 5a.
[48] Orest Ranum, 'The Refuges of Intimacy,' in Roger Chartier, ed., *A History of Private Life: III. Passions of the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989): 246-48.
[49] Dowd, 'Desiring Subjects,' 134; Burnett, *Masters and Servants*, ch. 4.
[50] Gowing, *Common Bodies*, 33, 40. Jennifer Panek, 'Shame and Pleasure in *The Changeling,' Renaissance Drama* 42, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 201, https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/678123.
[51] Lisa Hopkins, *The Female Hero in English Renaissance Tragedy* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002), 12.
[52] Hopkins, *Female Hero*, 15.
[53] Sara Pennell, '"Pots and Pans History:" The Material Culture of the Kitchen in Early Modern England'. *Journal of Design History* 11, no. 3 (1998), 208.
[54] Dod and Cleaver, *A godlie forme of householde gouernment*, sigs. F5r-F5v.
[55] See Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers,* 15, 150.
[56] Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1980), 177.
[57] Leonard Digges*, Gerardo the vnfortunate Spaniard* (London, 1622), sig. G8v.
[58] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 177. On petty treason, see Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*, chaps. 1-2.
[59] Cited in Wine, ed., *Arden of Faversham*, 158.
[60] See Irving Ribner, *Jacobean Tragedy: The Quest for Moral Order* (London: Methuen, 1962), 135-36; Cristina Malcomson, "As Tame as the Ladies": Politics and Gender in *The Changeling*,' *English Literary Renaissance* 20, no. 2 (1990), 323-4, 336, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1990.tb01015.x; Richard Levin, *The Multiple Plot in English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 35-6. The only critic to contemplate the possibility that Isabella might be considering being unfaithful is Panek, 'A Performance History,' 44.
[61] Tusser, *Fiue hundreth points of good husbandry*, sig. S1r.
[62] Carol Thomas Neely, 'Hot Blood: Estranging Mediterranean Bodies in Early Modern Medical and Dramatic Texts,' in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage* (London: Routledge, 2004), 62.
[63] Seaver, *Wallington's World*, 59.
[64] Christensen, 'Being Mistress Eyre,' 454-5.
[65] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 28; Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 44.
[66] Capp, *When Gossips Meet*, 42.
[67] Seaver, *Wallington's World*, 85, 123.
[68] J. D. Marshall, *The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster, 1665-1752* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), 96, 99, 105.
[69] Seaver, *Wallington's World*, 10.
[70] Jennifer Panek, 'A Performance History', 37
[71] Jay O'berski, *The Changeling: A Guide to the Text and the Play in Performance* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2012), 41.
[72] Sara D. Luttfring, 'Bodily Narratives and the Politics of Virginity in *The Changeling* and the Essex Divorce,' *Renaissance Drama* 39 (2011): 97-128, https://www.jstor.org/stable/41917484 115.
[73] Daalder, ed., *The Changeling*, 4.3.n116.
[74] Linda Woodbridge, ed., *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, in* Taylor and Lavagnino, ed., *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works,* 193, 195-8.
[75] Gowing examines the prevalence of doors and doorsteps in defamation accusation in *Domestic Dangers*, 98-99. Orlin sees the proliferation of thresholds in court cases as fictions suggesting their conventionality and safety

as sites for female participation in the street life: 'Women on the Threshold,' *Shakespeare Studies* 25 (1997): 50-8.