



Introduction

Shakespeare, Minted

Graham Holderness

Shakespeare made money, enabled many others to make money and wrote extensively about money. In 1970, Shakespeare *became* money. The cover design of this book features a detail from the British £20 note, first issued by the Bank of England in 1970 and withdrawn from circulation in 1991. Shakespeare was the first non-royal historical personality to appear on a banknote. From this privileged position on the national currency, his image presided over a two-decade period of enormous economic turbulence, which saw de-industrialization of Britain's heavy industries (coal, steel and motor production), declines in manufacturing and infrastructure, the failure of a Labour government to resolve the crisis, and the triumph of Margaret Thatcher. By the end of those two decades, the £20 note Shakespeare stood on was worth, as a consequence of inflation, eight times less than it had been.

The image of Shakespeare on the note, designed by Bank of England employee Harry Ecclestone, was derivative, being that of the best-known sculpted representation of Shakespeare, the marble

Notes for this section begin on page 13.

statue commissioned by public subscription, designed by William Kent, executed by Peter Scheemakers and erected in Westminster Abbey as a memorial to the national poet in 1741. Sculpture from this period tended to commemorate rather than imitate the person, overtly using the person's physical attributes as a source for the direct communication of cultural meaning. It functioned therefore both as a collective tribute, drawing on what was already a substantial fund of reverence and admiration; as a memorialization of a pre-eminent genius of English culture; and as an official emblemization of Shakespeare's reception into the structures of national authority and power, constituted by church, state and monarchy. Housed in Westminster Abbey, the image of a writer becomes expressive of the spirit of a nation. Here representation is at its most impersonal, a lapidary codification of the signs of cultural power. The features of Shakespeare scarcely resemble any of the extant portraits, but are constituted by those conventions of idealized depiction that transformed the eighteenth-century English aristocracy into a pantheon of classical characters.

The semiotics of the statue also enact in microcosm a relation between the figure and its institutional space. The form of Shakespeare is shown leaning on a pedestal, embossed with the faces of a pantheon of English monarchs. The supportive pedestal expresses monumental authority and links the image to its surrounding context of royal and state power. The figure by contrast expresses relaxed contemplation and nonchalant mastery: the pose is derived from the conventional Elizabethan image of the melancholy young man leaning against a tree (as in Nicholas Hilliard's famous miniature of 'Young Man among Roses'). Thus, the artefact juxtaposes the weight and stability of the monumental context against an aristocratic insouciance, a relaxed grace and elegant languor appropriate to the eighteenth-century image of the man of letters. The pile of books surmounting the pedestal partakes of both dimensions: the solid, weighty, heavily bound records of monumental achievement – they are merely props for the casual elbow of the leaning poet, rapt in an impassioned stillness of meditation.

The history of its reproduction actually began very early, and in a context that neatly illustrates the relationship between bardolatrous reverence for the symbol of cultural hegemony, and its reduction to tourist curiosity in the acquisition of commodified bardic mementos. In the form of a leaden copy executed in a mass-production

factory at Hyde Park Corner, Scheemakers's statue appeared as a centrepiece in David Garrick's Great Shakespeare Jubilee, held in Stratford in 1769. Garrick's Jubilee can be regarded as the great formal inauguration of 'bardolatry' as a national religion: the moment, in the words of one scholar, that 'marks the point at which Shakespeare stopped being regarded as an increasingly popular and admirable dramatist, and became a god'. At the same time, it employed as a central symbolic icon an image of Shakespeare which became, in a later age of mechanical reproduction, an instantly recognizable souvenir. In terms of cultural commerce, the Scheemakers statue offered the perfect form for reproduction and circulation and, as a miniature souvenir, became a standard item in the old curiosity shops of Stratford-upon-Avon. The movement from fetishized object of worship to fetishized token of commodity production is a graphic curve typical of the cultural distribution of the Shakespeare industry.

The contradictory apotheosis of this statuesque image was its incorporation into the design of the British £20 note, where the mystical aura of monumental magnificence and the millionfold multiplicity of mechanical reproduction occupied a single dimension. The device on the banknote transacted a complex exchange of values: the currency of Shakespeare as a cultural token, a symbol both of high art and national pride, enhanced the material worth of the promissory note, while the high value of the note itself conferred a corresponding richness on the symbol of national culture. A banknote is both a sign of value and a legal contract, a 'bond' between citizen and state: the exchange of such symbolic tokens represents both a constitutive material activity and a process of bonding and socialization. The fortunate holder of a Shakespeareanized banknote possessed both monetary wealth and aesthetic richness, and by virtue of that possession was integrated, both materially and culturally, into the dominant cultural-financial system. Here, the solid bulk of another major apparatus of British society, the Bank of England, was articulated with the marble gravity of Shakespeare and the immense solidity of Westminster Abbey, in an institutional configuration grouped to link the strength of a currency with the power of traditional authority.

The paper portrait of Shakespeare probably represents the culmination of eighteenth-century bardolatry: but it represents also its terminal point. Here, all the contradictions of the bardic ideology are held in a paradoxical unity. That which is specific, unique and

supremely individual, here appears in its most generalized, impersonal form. The incomparable, irreplaceable, unrepeatable genius of Shakespeare is fragmented by the process of mechanical reproduction into millions of identical simulacra. Those specialized public domains which are in reality the private spaces of our society's prominent individuals are here offered for imaginative occupation by anyone possessed of that minimal financial qualification, as Buckingham Palace used to be occupied every morning by a million breakfast plates slapped onto a million cheap table mats. But the overriding premise of this ideological structure is that authority and power are vested in the material presence of a concrete substance, embodied in the solidity and weight of a positivistic 'reality'. The banknote may be merely fragile paper, but it bears the signature of authority, the images of reliability, the stamp of power. The mysterious potency symbolized by the financial token is by definition absent (even a banknote is really abstract 'credit', declares itself explicitly to be a 'promise'); but it is a god with a countenance of marble, with feet of lead and with printing presses of solid steel. What happens however when, as we see today, the identity of money as abstract value supersedes and obliterates the character of money as material substance?

In the contemporary, social economy money is, as David Hawkes explains in this volume, 'derivative': money is plastic or virtual, debt and credit, profit and investment, figures scrolling across a computer screen, even an invisible 'digital currency', as much for the private citizen as for the industrialist or commercial entrepreneur. Wealth is no longer piled up in greasy banknotes or accumulated amid the clashing cacophony of industrial production, but instead amassed through technological media, realized in the vacuous non-existence of the futures market. Commercial exchange at even the simplest level is more likely to proceed via the plastic or digital authorization of credit as through an exchange of physical tokens like coins or notes.

The traditional iconography of Shakespeare reproduction traded in effects of mass and solidity, gravity and substance. But in the late 1980s, banks began to issue 'cheque guarantee cards' that incorporated an image of Shakespeare into a new postmodern iconography of credit authorization. Whereas the bardic image on the banknote only symbolically authorized value, on the 'Bardcard' it did so literally, since the image was depicted in the form of a high-technology visual 'hologram', designed to inhibit fraudulent use and reproduction. Most of the holograms used the Droeshout portrait of Shake-

speare, but one was developed from a photograph, which was not a copy of a standard Shakespeare portrait but rather a photo of a costumed actor pretending to look like Shakespeare.

The authenticity of the card was thus demonstrated not by a display of cultural power, but by a technological coup d'œil. In terms of content, the image approached grotesque self-parody, since the proof of individual ownership, by the cardholder, of certain resources of credit held by a bank was attested by the most fraudulent and artificial means imaginable: a hologram of a photograph of an actor pretending to be ... Shakespeare. Where the traditional imagery of the Scheemakers statue invoked cultural and economic solidity, the image of the Bardcard was pure postmodernist surface, yielding to the efforts of interpretation only a ludicrous self-reflexive playfulness. Where the £20 note pointed to the legitimate state ownership and control of both economic and cultural power, the Bardcard proved your title to credit by displaying the image of a major author whose responsibility for the cultural productions attributed to him has been consistently and systematically questioned. This quality was compounded by the reverse of the card, where the holder's signature authorized individual ownership of its power, irresistibly recalling the hugely contested scrawl of the six signatures attributed to Shakespeare. One wonders how the bank would react to a cardholder who signed their name with the flexible and cavalier approach to spelling also visible in those 'Shakespearean' autographs. The police asked a thief arrested in possession of a stolen Bardcard why he hadn't used it. 'It didn't', he confessed, 'look a bit like me'.

Shakespeare and money: boom or bust? Whether we agree with John Maynard Keynes that 'we were just in a financial position to afford Shakespeare when he presented himself', or with Douglas Bruster that in fact, since Shakespeare entered the theatre business in a time of economic slump, poor harvests and theatre closures, he arrived just as we were least able to afford him, Shakespeare's art has been inextricably involved with the market economy, and with emergent and eventually dominant capitalism.¹ Capitalizing on the emergence of a professional theatrical market in late sixteenth-century London, Shakespeare, in the course of becoming one of the greatest writers in history, made money for himself, and created the basis for incalculable sums subsequently made by those who have profited from reproducing, selling and trading in his work.

Notwithstanding the obviousness of this relationship between art and commerce, as Siobhan Keenan and Dominic Shellard have pointed out, ‘the world of Shakespeare studies has been slower to acknowledge the economic importance of Shakespeare’s works and name, despite the fact that the scholarly Shakespeare industry has itself been partly based on the ongoing marketability of England’s most famous playwright and his art’.²

As well as being a successful entrepreneur in the metropolitan theatre industry, Shakespeare himself was also, as Paola Pugliatti reminds us in her chapter in this volume, a moneylender and a speculator in property (both in Stratford and London), in land, in agricultural produce and supplies, and in ecclesiastical tithes. In fact his biographical record displays an overwhelming abundance of evidence about money, property dealings, and commercial transactions, compared with a relative deficiency of evidence pertaining to writing, acting and theatrical entrepreneurship. This discrepancy has long troubled admirers of his work, and even prompted some to speculate that Shakespeare the businessman and Shakespeare the poet may even have been two different people. Since the eighteenth century there has been a sense of incongruity about the sort of financial activity Shakespeare clearly was involved in (e.g. usury and the legal pursuit of small debtors, the proposed enclosure of common lands, and dubious property speculations), which do not sit well with the lofty moral character expected of a national poet and universal bard. The Shakespeare who may have lied in court about a financial bond, bought a house through trustees so his wife couldn’t inherit it and participated in a planned enclosure of common land in Stratford seems in some way unqualified to be the author of *Timon of Athens*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *King Lear*.³ This incongruity is actually reflected in the design of the £20 note, which features the balcony scene from *Romeo and Juliet*. The choice of play seems at first glance curiously inappropriate: is not this drama the great poetic protest of romantic passion against mercenary morality and commercialized relationship? Utterances of elevated and idealized passion – ‘Beauty too rich for use, for earth too dear’ – seem to juxtapose incongruously with ironic effect against the symbolism of monetary value. Until, that is, we realize, as Manfred Pfister demonstrates here in his chapter on the sonnets, that the languages of love and finance are in Shakespeare’s poetry inextricably involved: ‘rich’, ‘use’ and ‘dear’ all have double meanings, both romantic and commercial.

Shakespeare's biographers have tended to be divided between approval and antipathy towards Shakespeare the businessman. It would on the other hand, be probably true to say that most Shakespeare criticism is anti-capitalist, formed as it was in the heat of Victorian intellectual critiques of industry, finance, commerce and the accumulation of wealth, and dominated into the twentieth century by critical schools resolutely hostile to the culture of capitalism, demonized as 'mass civilization'. When Marx invoked Shakespeare's work in support of his critique of capitalism, as well as subsuming continental philosophy, he was building on a long British tradition of radical rhetoric, albeit often mounted from a reactionary perspective, condemning the system as, in Thomas Carlyle's phrase, reductive of all social relations to the 'cash nexus between man and man'.

But when, from the 1980s onwards, some radical critics began to study Shakespeare as an economic and cultural phenomenon, as the Shakespeare 'industry', the Shakespeare 'trade' or what Terry Hawkes influentially styled 'Bardbiz',⁴ their emphasis was far more focused on matters of politics and philosophy, especially around the concept of ideology, than it was with the economic studies that were central to Marx's project. In the 1970s, teachers and students were certainly reading Marx, but in the relatively accessible form of the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* rather than the forbidding economic theory of *Capital* or the *Grundrisse*. Both John Drakakis and David Hawkes remind us, in their chapters in this volume, of the centrality of the economic in Marxist-influenced critical interpretations of Shakespeare.

It is only in the past decade that this deficiency in Shakespeare studies has been more widely addressed, and Shakespeare as *Homo economicus* once again brought to the fore. Scholars such as Douglas Bruster, S. P. Cerasano, Andrew Gurr, Siobhan Keenan, Melissa Aaron and Roslyn Lander Knutson have produced new studies of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre industries and the economic contexts surrounding the playwrights and the acting companies.⁵ Other critics have explored Shakespeare's poetry and plays in relation not only to the economic context of their production, but also to modern economic theories, following the school known as 'New Economic Criticism', which is concerned not only with 'the social, cultural and economic contexts in which individual or related works have been produced' but also with 'understanding texts as systems of exchange' and with more formalist emphases such as 'studying

exchanges between characters and economic tropes in language'.⁶ As Peter F. Gray, author of *Shakespeare and the Economic Imperative*, has observed in 2012, 'New Economic critical work' is 'rooted in semiotic and historicist practices' but also, 'often employs formalist methods to discuss the interplay between literature and the economic'.⁷ The contributors to this volume make full use of these new, or newly current, critical paradigms. For example, in her chapter on *The Merchant of Venice*, Alessandra Marzola deploys the methods of the new economic criticism, situating the familiar moral dilemmas of the play within historic debates about the role of morality within economics and religion.

We are now in a much better position, as the international contributors to this volume abundantly demonstrate, to evaluate Shakespeare's importance within the global economy. Shakespeare's works can be read to prompt awareness of the growing importance of collapsing and reforming trade barriers between nations in the present, as well the close and complex relationship between economic and political power and culture in a historical perspective. Rui Carvalho Homem, in his chapter, situates some of Shakespeare's less familiar plays within a modern global context of contemporary financial and geopolitical crises. Shakespeare's characters and stories certainly played an important role in his own time in a historical and cultural context in which a new system of mercantile economy was developing out of geographical discoveries, and common law was trying to keep pace with current debates and regulations aimed at facilitating commerce. It should therefore come as no surprise that economic themes and motifs rank high among the pressing cultural concerns to which Shakespeare gave shape in his works. This rapid, dramatic rise to prominence of economic questions is typically reflected in the pervasive monetary subtext of Shakespeare's language, and the sometimes surprising ubiquitousness, as Manfred Pfister ingeniously demonstrates in his chapter on the sonnets of economic language and metaphor in his plays and poems.

Collectively, the authors in this volume have made substantial contributions to financial, economic and commercial studies of Shakespeare, to work on early modern cultural, political and economic power, and to detailed analyses of Shakespeare's most economically-focused plays, including *The Merchant of Venice* and *Timon of Athens*.

David Hawkes is author of *The Culture of Usury in Renaissance England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), and *Shakespeare and*

Economic Theory (London: Bloomsbury, 2015). His chapter 'Shakespeare and Derivatives' argues that the twenty-first century has witnessed the rise to power of images in every aspect of human endeavour, including those of commerce, finance and economics. Speculative financial derivatives have achieved a predominant place in the economy, spin and perception rule the political sphere, and technological media ensure that we spend our lives surrounded by images of all kinds. Reading the works of Shakespeare reveals the roots of this process in the early modern period, when the iconoclasm of the Reformation, popular protests against usury, and the campaign against ritual magic combined to provide an ethically based popular resistance to the power of signs.

John Drakakis, well known as the editor of *Alternative Shakespeares*, also edited the Arden 3 edition of *The Merchant of Venice*.⁸ In 'Shakespeare, Reciprocity and Exchange', Drakakis invokes Kojin Karatani's *The Structure of World History* (2014), which argues that too little attention has been paid in Marxist historiography to the issue of 'exchange'.⁹ In several Shakespearean texts, 'exchange' and 'reciprocity' are of vital importance in sustaining social cohesion; in *Romeo and Juliet*, for example, radical disruptions of patterns of reciprocity and exchange expose an ambivalence that, in certain critical circumstances, inheres in language itself. The disruption that results from the perversion of these values is felt at every level of the social order, but particularly in the sphere of the 'economic', where money and trade become metaphors for the disturbance of the relation between language and action, word and object. This disruption is represented as a product of 'nature' but it also becomes a feature of a historically over-determined human psychology, and leads to a critical examination of different forms of government and social organization.

Rui Carvalho Homem is co-editor of *Gloriana's Rule: Literature, Religion and Power in the age of Elizabeth*.¹⁰ In 'Offshore Desires: Mobility, Liquidity and History in Shakespeare's Mediterranean', Homem probes the ability of Shakespearean drama to provide expressive resources for coming to terms (conceptually, discursively) with current crises. These include both the power games of global finance and those disasters that ostensibly concern other strands of geopolitics. This chapter focuses on two plays, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*, the actions of which unfold in the eastern Mediterranean – an area of the world associated, in the late modern

imagination, with either mobility as pleasure (mass tourism and its apparatus) or mobility as crisis (disputed territories, the plight of displaced populations). It highlights the close bonds between prevalent modes – satire and farce in *The Comedy of Errors*, romance in *Pericles* – and the plays’ distinct strategies for representing human mobility: the sense of agency proper to acquisitive urges the victimhood of forced displacement.

Alessandra Marzola is co-author of *Shakespeare and the Power of Difference*.¹¹ In ‘Pity Silenced: Economies of Mercy in *The Merchant of Venice*’, Marzola argues that while the mercantile value of mercy in *The Merchant* has been often highlighted, the diminished role of pity has received scant attention. She demonstrates that the ways mercy is shown to subsume and eventually incorporate pity throw light on the play’s negotiation of contentious religious and political approaches to the spectres of poverty and/or impoverishment that threaten the emerging mercantile economy. A rereading of relevant scenes retraces the Catholic implications of the safety-net potential of pity, which, unlike the Protestant worldly pity of the sonnets, here seems bound for repression. In Portia’s final donation to the merchants of Venice, even the lingering allusions to Catholicism are neutralised and put to the service of vested interests: a conflation of Christian and Jewish usury that cuts across all religious divides. Such allusions, she contends, are possibly reminiscent of the Monti di Pietà (Mounts of Piety) existent in Italy since 1462 to counter Jewish usury.

Manfred Pfister is co-editor of *Venetian Views, Venetian Blinds: English Fantasies of Venice*.¹² In “‘Love Merchandized’: Money in Shakespeare’s Sonnets”, Pfister re-examines the famous love poems that are, as he observes, not the obvious first choice for discussing matters of finance, money and economic transaction. He argues that in fact the ideas outlined by Karl Marx on ‘The Power of Money’ in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* are as relevant to the sonnets as they are to plays such as *Timon of Athens*. Pfister’s reading foregrounds their dialogue with terms and developments in early modern banking and focuses on metaphors of economic transaction that run through the whole cycle; indeed, a third of them figure love, its wealth and truth, use and abuse, in terms of investment in order to project an alternative economy beyond the self-alienating world of banking/financial gain. This imbrication of the erotic with the economic comprises also the writing of love sonnets, a competitive gamelike economic transaction. Soneteering is a way of ‘merchan-

dizing love' that inevitably casts a capitalist shadow across the supposedly most sincere expression of love.

James Tink, editor of *Seeing Animals after Derrida*,¹³ examines the challenges of localizing Shakespeare through theatrical adaptation and considers some of the problems of 'presentist' approaches to the early-modern text. His chapter 'Staging *Timon of Athens* in the Downturn' analyses the production of *Timon* at the Royal National Theatre, London in 2012, directed by Nicholas Hytner and starring Simon Russell Beale. This was a defiantly topical and localized interpretation of the play that made reference to the current economic downturn in the U.K. and Europe, and the recent protests in the City of London by the Occupy movement. The chapter discusses how significantly the text was revised and adapted to fit these topical British concerns about London, politics and the finance sector and assesses how successfully these changes were developed in performance. The chapter also considers in what other ways Shakespeare and Middleton's text has been received in recent literary criticism of the play in order to better understand how the drama has been interpreted as a commentary on the present economic situation. In particular, the theme of linguistic and symbolic breakdown in the drama can be related to contemporary arguments in political philosophy, such as by Slavoj Žižek, regarding language, authority and the social order. The chapter also speculates on how the drama lends itself to ideas of politics, and in what ways the London production illustrated some limitations of the presentist approach. The chapter finally speculates on the ramifications of contemporary Shakespeare reception in local and global contexts.

Although Shakespeare is known to have enjoyed considerable financial success, actors and playwrights of the early modern period were known to be poor. In her chapter "'Fill Thy Purse With Money": Financing Performance in Shakespearean England', Tiffany Stern, author of *Making Shakespeare: from Page to Stage*¹⁴ and *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*,¹⁵ explores the question of what it meant for Shakespeare to be a 'sharer' in his theatre company, and to what extent the theatres were focused on economic gain as much as the production of successful plays. She takes into consideration the infrastructural and contextual economic practices of the theatres, including transport and the consumption of goods such as food, tobacco, drinks, books and jewellery, and connects these patterns of commercial exchange to monetary and financial allusions in the plays.

Paola Pugliatti is author of *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England*.¹⁶ In 'Biography and Shakespeare's Money: Portraits of an Economic Persona', Pugliatti cites Robert Bearman's *Shakespeare's Money* as 'the first economic biography of William Shakespeare', but also as the latest specimen of an innovative trend in Shakespeare biography which has come to the fore over the last decade.¹⁷ While the vein of cradle-to-grave biographies seems to be exhausted, new attention is being devoted to parts of Shakespeare's life, with an attitude that has been seen as 'microhistorical' or 'disintegrationist'. The chapter discusses this new kind of sensitivity to biography in general, and Shakespeare biography in particular. It starts out by addressing certain developments in the theory and practice of life writing during the second half of the twentieth century, which are today becoming ever more substantial; it then examines the progress of Shakespeare biographies and, in particular, how the issue of money has been tackled since Nicolas Rowe first dealt with it.

Sujata Iyengar, author of *Shakespeare's Medical Language*,¹⁸ argues in her chapter 'Shakespeare and the Hybrid Economy' that the established critical terms 'adaptation' and 'appropriation' should be considered under a new rubric as 'transformation'. To evoke either 'adaptation' or 'appropriation' is to evoke copyright law. She suggests that Shakespearean appropriations potentially metamorphose or mutate culture, literary form, creativity, pedagogy and, most provocatively, the market economy, in part because Shakespearean texts antedate current copyright law, and thus any use we make of them is already 'transformative'. In particular, Shakespearean appropriations transform creative production and intervene in contemporary commodity culture or the hypermediatized, monetized creative self. Shakespearean transformations in both legacy and emerging media also offer models for the new hybrid creative economies predicted ten years ago by Lawrence Lessig, in part because of Shakespeare's 'spreadability' (Jenkins, Ford, and Green's term for content that can be remixed, shared, grabbed and so on) and its 'stickiness' (a marketing term popularized by Grant Leboff that connotes the power to draw repeat users who forge a lasting connection with the source material).

The afterthought appended to this volume, a short story entitled 'Best for Winter', is a creative attempt to imagine what might have gone on in Shakespeare's mind as he was writing *The Winter's Tale*, thinking about his financial and property dealings and re-

acting to his immediate physical surroundings. The stream-of-consciousness method imitates James Joyce and Anthony Burgess. Quotations from *The Winter's Tale* and other plays are mingled with imagined memories of Shakespeare's rural childhood, extracts from the documents recording his commercial transactions and everyday details from his London biography. The story attempts to connect the Shakespeare biography, the working of the creative imagination and the historical economic context into a single complex discourse. The 'hybridity' explicitly discussed in the play, here identified as an inextricable interweaving of the imaginative, the social and the economic, is shown to be the very essence of both writing and of life.

Graham Holderness is the author or editor of some 60 books. His work can be divided into three strands: literary criticism, theory and scholarship, especially in Shakespeare studies; the pioneering of an innovative new method of 'creative criticism'; and creative writing in fiction, poetry and drama. Key critical works include *The Shakespeare Myth* (Manchester UP, 1988), *The Politics of Theatre and Drama* (Routledge, 1992), *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Bloomsbury, 2000), and *The Faith of William Shakespeare* (Lion Books, 2016). Works of creative criticism, which are half criticism and half fiction, include *Nine Lives of William Shakespeare* (Bloomsbury-Arden Shakespeare, 2011); *Tales from Shakespeare: Creative Collisions* (Cambridge University Press, 2014) and *Re-writing Jesus: Christ in 20th Century Fiction and Film* (Bloomsbury, November 2014). He has also published two novels: *The Prince of Denmark* (University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001), and the historical fantasy novel *Black and Deep Desires: William Shakespeare Vampire Hunter* (Top Hat Books, 2015).

Notes

1. John Maynard Keynes, *A Treatise on Money*, 2 volumes (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1930), vol. 2, 124, and Douglas Bruster, *Drama and the Market in the age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 18.
2. Siobhan Keenan and Dominic Shellard, 'Introduction' to their edition *Shakespeare's Cultural Capital: his economic impact from the sixteenth to the twenty-first century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 1.
3. See Graham Holderness, *Nine Lives of William Shakespeare* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), 76–89.

4. See Graham Holderness (ed.), *The Shakespeare Myth* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988); Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), and Terence Hawkes, 'Bardbiz', in *Meaning by Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 1992).
5. S. P. Ceresano, 'Theatrical Entrepreneurs and Theatrical Economics', in Richard Dutton (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 380–95; Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Siobhan Keenan, *Acting Companies and their Plays in Shakespeare's London* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Melissa Aaron, 'Theatre as Business', in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 421–32; Roslyn Lander Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
6. Mark Osteen and Martha Woodmansee, 'Taking Account of the New Economic Criticism: an Historical Introduction', in their edition *The New Economic Criticism: Studies at the Intersection of Literature and Economics* (London: Routledge, 1999), 35, 36, 37.
7. Peter F. Grav, 'Taking Stock of Shakespeare and the New Economic Criticism', *Shakespeare* 8.1 (2012), 111–136. And see his book *Shakespeare and the Economic Imperative*, "What's aught but as 'tis valued?" (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).
8. John Drakakis (ed.) *Alternative Shakespeares* (London: Methuen, 1985) and (ed.) *The Merchant of Venice*, Arden 3rd series (London: Bloomsbury, 2010).
9. Kojin Karatani, *The Structure of World History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014).
10. Rui Carvalho Homem and Fátima Vieira, eds, *Gloriana's Rule: Literature, Religion and Power in the Age of Elizabeth* (Porto: University of Porto, 2006).
11. Davide Del Bello and Alessandra Marzola, *Shakespeare and the Power of Difference* (Rome: Aracne, 2011).
12. Manfred Pfister and Barbara Schaff, eds, *Venetian Views, Venetian Blinds: English Fantasies of Venice* (Amsterdam: Brill Rodopi, 1999).
13. James Tink, *Seeing Animals After Derrida* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017).
14. Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: from Page to Stage* (London: Routledge, 2004).
15. Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
16. Paola Pugliatti, *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
17. Robert Bearman, *Shakespeare's Money* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
18. Sujata Iyengar, *Shakespeare's Medical Language* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2011).