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Abstract

This thesis contributes new knowledge to an understanding of how people's social networks in the early modern theatre shaped the drama they created. By studying the lives of people working in the theatre, attending to biographical details not hitherto fully considered, it recasts received narratives of theatre history. Where theatre historians often tell stories of competition and combat, it finds evidence too for considerable amity across webs of relationships that are here called 'social networks'.

This thesis offers new biographical facts about life events for the actor Richard Bradshaw and the actor-writer William Rowley. In addition, it endeavours to change the way historians think about collaborative playwriting in the period. Based on quantitative analysis, this thesis shows the rates of collaboration to be about half the rate of heretofore accepted estimates.

Chapter One considers in detail the narratives that historians construct about the early modern theatre and the problems associated with them. It reviews the various classes of evidence used in later chapters and the uses to which such evidence can reasonably be put. Chapter Two explores an industry in expansion in the 1590s, re-examining the well-known duopoly narrative and reconsidering the various professional pursuits and diverse residences of actors and playwrights in the period. Chapter Three looks at the following decade, the 1600s, and the re-emergence of troupes of boy actors into an expanding and stabilising industry. Chapter Four shows how collaborative writing, though prevalent, was not as frequent as is usually thought; it also shows stark differences in rates of staging collaborative drama between companies.
Each chapter closes with a biographical case study of a theatre person whose life is considered in terms of their social network. An examination of such networks is then used to reshape the way we understand events in their life and broader currents that involve the entire early modern theatre industry. Thinking about who interacted with whom and why adds a new layer of complexity to our collective model of how this entertainment industry produced the period's extraordinary proliferation of highly valued plays.
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Note on Referencing

Early modern quotations from literary works are taken from the earliest printed edition unless otherwise stated (as with the discussion of *Hamlet's* early versions in Chapter Three). Quotations of this sort have not been modernised other than the use of modern 's' for early modern long 's'. Quotations from surviving historical documents are similarly unmodernised. On first mention, every early modern play title is followed by the date of its first performance in brackets, thus: *Love's Labour's Lost* (1594-1595) or *The Case is Altered* (1597). For plays by Shakespeare, dates or date spans are taken from the Second Edition of the *Oxford Complete Works* (2005). For extant works not by Shakespeare dates are taken from Zachary Lesser and Alan B. Farmer's *Database of Early English Playbooks* (2007). For lost plays, dates are taken from the *Lost Plays Database* maintained by Roslyn L. Knutson, Matthew Steggle and David McInnis (2016). If another scholar's dates are contingent on the argument being presented (as in James P. Bednarz' version of the War of the Theatres in Chapter Three), then plays are presented with the dates of first production in brackets as assumed by those scholars.

Where necessary, dates have been silently adjusted to recognize the New Year on 1 January. Numbers in play titles are given in Arabic numerals; where a play has more than one part its part number is also given in Arabic numerals. For example: *1 Henry 6* and *2 Sir John Oldcastle*. References to all other sources are by parenthetical author-date-page citation, in which the date is that of the source's publication, and they are keyed to the single Works Cited list at the end of the thesis. In such a reference, the author's name and/or the date of publication is omitted if it appears in the preceding sentence.
Introduction

The Social Network

Any early modern gentlemen of note knew Richard Burbage and Will Kemp. This is what we are told by the character Will Kemp in the anonymous 2 Return from Parnassus, first performed 1601-1603 (Anonymous 1606, G2v). These actors were worth knowing; it was important to one's standing to know them. In its simplest terms, this thesis will show just that: in the early modern theatre, whom one knew mattered. The relationships one maintained shaped one's experiences in the profession and the drama it produced. Relationships were not just maintained with fellow theatre professionals. Individuals interacted with people beyond the theatre. These non-theatrical individuals may well have known other theatre professionals, tying people together at various degrees of separation. Just where interactions took place affected their quality and consequence. Spaces, such as churches, taverns, streets, theatres, and institutions, such as livery companies, schools, universities, staged such interactions and were themselves interacted with.

The web formed by these interactions is a person's social network, the topic for this thesis. Observing these interactions and considering theatre professionals' relationships with spaces, institutions and other people helps shape our understanding of the theatrical past. Just how best to observe these relationships is outlined in detail later in this Introduction and in Chapter One. Stephen Greenblatt's well-known mission statement in Shakespearean Negotiations – 'I began with a desire to talk with the dead' (1988, 1) – is useful to a point, but, as will become clear, in some instances a direct engagement with individuals is less useful than simply observing them. Therefore, I might recast Greenblatt: I begin with a desire to observe the dead.
The concept of the network so pervades modern life that it can become a hindrance to an understanding of how it relates to the early modern theatre and the world around it. Two primary spheres of modern existence are awash with references to networks. In professional life, as a verb, 'to network' means to forge links with other people, groups and organizations. People are encouraged to network as though an end in itself, as though expansion of an individual's network alone will create professional progress. As such, 'opportunities to network' are heralded for their own sake, rather than for a specific purpose. That is not to say that the early modern theatre was without successful 'networkers', characters keen to interact with the purpose of benefitting from the relationship; nor is it to say theatre professionals did not attend events that would serve as ideal sites of 'networking' interactions – taverns, churches, theatres, company halls – where introductions to new people would have been routine.

'Social networking' on social networking websites is the second feature of modern life in which the network is foregrounded. Here, a person's network is represented digitally by 'friending' or 'following' or 'linking' with another, mostly, though not exclusively, in response to real-world interaction. Effectively, such sites allow for a cataloguing and displaying of 'latent ties', the links between people and those in their extended network (Haythornwaite 2005, 136–37). This social networking is popularly assumed to be an end in itself, though this is not the view of researchers in the field. One widely cited paper, for instance, found that 'On many of the large SNSs [Social Network Sites], participants are not necessarily "networking" or looking to meet new people; instead, they are primarily communicating with people who are already a part of their extended social network' (Boyd and Ellison 2007, 211). This capability of digitally articulating a person's network is a direct growth of the (World Wide)
Web 2.0, a term that first appeared in 1999 (DiNucci 1999, 32). Web 2.0 was to be 'understood not as screenfuls of text and graphics but as a transport mechanism, the ether through which interactivity happens' (DiNucci 1999, 32). It is the notion of interactivity that allows for online networking where the Web 2.0 'encourages and amplifies the user's role in the browsing experience' (Cervinschi and Butucea 2010, 40).

The phrase 'social network' is a distinctly modern one. First recorded in the autobiography of British-American temperance lecturer John B. Gough in 1845, it is not recorded again until the middle of the 20th century (OED social, adj. and n. S2). From 1960, Google's Ngram Viewer shows an explosion in use through to 2000 (Michel et al. 2011). Gough's first use of the term is interesting, not least because the usefulness of his mentioned network contrasts with those of the early modern theatre. Having recently 'entered the matrimonial state', Gough describes a renewed 'craving after society' which led him to 'become involved in a dissipated social network whose fatal meshes too surely entangled me, and unfitted me for the active exertion which was now rendered doubly necessary' (Gough 1845, 35). Gough is caught in his own social network, ensnared in its net-like features. This sense of inclusion in a network as causing harm is not what we find in the narratives of this thesis. Here, the social networks of early modern theatre confer clear overall advantages in the professional lives of their subjects, though they are not without particular moments of acrimony.

Intentionally, this thesis reflects back a modern concept onto early modern people. It does so with the understanding that although early moderns were not thinking in terms of 'social networks' they nevertheless inhabited them. This is borne in mind throughout and the work is cautious about attributing 'networking' activities because of it. As a modern concept
the social network has been the subject of increasing academic interest. Largely, attention has focussed on the social network online. One useful borrowing I make from this scholarship is its terminology. A person's connections or network – that is, the people they know in a particular sphere of their life – is their social graph (Hicks 2010). This graph is comprised of nodes that mark individuals and places interacted with, and edges, or vertices, that mark links between these nodes (Bucher 2015, 2).

To this general network terminology I add my own measures. For instance, the breadth and depth of a person's network is considered. The breadth of a social network relates to how many theatre professionals are known by another given theatre professional. The depth of a social network pertains to relationships beyond the professional theatre, with depth endeavouring to conjure a sense of a network cutting across social strata. As an example, were we to encounter an actor who began his career on stage in a boy company, graduating to an adult company at maturity before moving around several further adult companies and then retiring from the profession we might mark his network as especially broad. Such an actor would have worked with a large number of other actors through his career, as well as doubtless interacting with a good number of playwrights, impresarios, bookkeepers and other playhouse personnel. His network, from this picture, would have little depth since the persons he interacted with were largely from one stratum, his own profession. Conversely, a playwright who wrote for a couple of companies and who also wrote poetry for a number of aristocratic patrons (perhaps including the monarch), attended university, oversaw his plays going through the printshop, and finally took holy orders could be said to have a deep network because of the diversity of social classes his work put him in contact with. Although these examples are hypothetical, we will indeed meet in this thesis real historical figures with broadly these experiences.
A final consideration for network terminology is the intensity with which an edge is traversed between two nodes. We might imagine a weak link between two actors who belonged to the same company for only a few months before spending the rest of their careers in different troupes. A more intense, or stronger, link, would be formed between two playwrights who lived in the same parish and collaborated on plays together repeatedly over a number of years. These measures – depth, breadth and intensity – are used to signal the relative strengths of argument throughout what follows, but without being formalized in the presentation of graphs.

Despite not graphically representing the networks discussed in this thesis, my work draws on the findings of researchers who do approach networks in such a way. Social networks are studied graphically and empirically by social scientists across a broad range of disciplines. Using mathematical formulae, they can determine the extent and limits of a subject's network and, importantly, study the impact that a given network can have on a subject. Social networks, in sociological terms, 'include digital and online networks', such as those we have already encountered, as well as 'face-to-face relationships, political associations and connections, economic transactions among business enterprises, and geopolitical relations among nation states and international agencies' (Scott 2017, 2). Though this thesis will work with a narrower definition it is important to appreciate just how varied and broad a subject's network might be.

This thesis is concerned exclusively with a person's social graph, those people the subject actually knows. This means, for our purposes, a person's network begins and ends with the people with whom they interact. It is here that we look for the influence of a person's
network. Not all impacts will be equal, and not all relationships will be of equal weight. That is, with some subjects their family members may play an important role in their life, making stronger links in their network than, say, their colleagues in their acting company. For others, though, it might be a collaborator or a patron that appears to more readily impact their life. Because of this thesis's concern with the various weights of relationships – the intensity of the vertex between two nodes – and because the data to construct anything close to a full social network for early modern theatre people is largely absent, explanatory studies are favoured over graphical representations.

People beyond one's immediate connections influence their lives too. The reigning monarch would have had, or could have had, a significant impact on the lives of early modern theatre people. How much tax was demanded of them, their official religion, and whether the nation was at war might all be decided by a ruler and would shape people's lives a great deal. Influence over someone's life in some way, however, does not mean being part of their social network here. Importantly, it is the sociological view – that you can learn something useful about people's lives by studying those with whom they interact – that is employed here for the study of the early modern theatre.

The Scope and Structure of the Thesis

The thesis has two main research aims. Its first aim is to contribute to an ongoing debate in theatre history about the organization of, and relationships within, the industry of the early modern professional stage. On one hand, much has been written, some of which is surveyed in Chapters Two and Three, that characterizes the early modern theatre industry as a ruthless proto-capitalist marketplace with its members kept in thrall by a small band of
financiers who offered no artistic input but greedily took the profits. On the other hand, however, some scholarship, most notably from Roslyn L. Knutson, has argued that the industry was much more fraternal in its make-up. The industry was, in this second model, something like a quasi-medieval guild. To address its first research aim this thesis might simply ask: what does studying the social networks of theatre professionals tell us about the nature of the industry? A second aim of this work is to explore how professionals' social networks influenced the drama of the period. This is examined in relation to the period's collaboratively written drama and the acting personnel and their specialisms available to playwrights.

Put broadly, this thesis avers that understanding the relationships of theatre professionals can (1) help us make better sense of the industry and world in which participants worked and (2) help us better understand the drama they created. To address these questions, the thesis comprises four chapters. 'Chapter One: The Intersection of Personal and Professional Lives in Drama, Evidence and Interpretation' develops further some of the ideas and methods discussed later in this introduction. It focusses on the social network as an area of study, with particular reference to the early modern theatre. It deals closely with biography, and the biographical case study, as a method for analysing early modern lives. Most importantly, it examines numerous classes of evidence used by theatre historians and weighs their various merits and shortcomings. In so doing, it highlights the assumptions that historians make about the data with which they work, and the sort of claims that can be made with such assumptions in mind. Devoting a chapter to outlining the thesis's method and the problems that are encountered every time a new piece or type of evidence is introduced serves to free the later chapters from such considerations. That is, Chapter One discusses the nuances and problems of arguments based on, for example, early modern
baptismal records so that when such records are referenced in later chapters their introduction need not be prefaced with a series of caveats about their provenance and reliability.

Chapters Two and Three approach social networks in much the same way as one another, but focus on different periods. 'Chapter Two: The Social Networks of the 1590s Duopoly and Beyond' discusses the considerable transformations of the London theatre industry in the final decade of the sixteenth century. In particular, it re-examines Andrew Gurr's evidence and arguments for an official duopoly of two companies – the Lord Chamberlain's men and the Admiral's men – emerging in 1594 in light of the networks of theatre professionals involved. It appraises objections to Gurr's narrative from other theatre historians and, importantly, shows how a study of individuals' social networks can add new information to a debate about the nature of the early modern theatre. To do this Chapter Two concludes with the presentation of biographical case studies of particular theatre professionals. Chapters Three and Four conclude in the same way. Without the ability to present a full biography for every theatre professional, this work necessarily draws on illustrative case studies instead. These are chosen to offer expositions of a person's social network and, crucially, to throw light on particularly important moments in the theatre history. In Chapter Two the life of the little-known player Richard Bradshaw is presented. His life in the profession and the network he created illustrates a cooperative relationship between otherwise competitive companies. The chapter finishes with a case study of Anthony Munday's life. His biography witnesses a continuing cooperation with theatrical figures through his career and highlights the breadth of economic pursuits with which an early modern playwright might engage. The study of Munday's life helps answer important questions about the playwright's sources of income in a theorized proto-capitalist industry.
'Chapter Three: The 1600s, The Re-emergence of the Boy Companies into a Competitive Marketplace' continues where Chapter Two finished with regard to the economics of the theatre industry and the relationships between its interconnected parts. The chapter begins with a discussion of the theatrical marketplace at the opening of the seventeenth century, the continued operation of the (now officially decreed) duopoly described by Gurr, and the re-emergence of troupes of boy actors playing in theatres in St Paul's and in the Blackfriars precinct. Space is afforded to a re-examination of an especially barbed period of theatre history, the so-called War of the Theatres, and the scholarship surrounding it. Arguments are presented for the War as representing a long-running, and serious, dispute between the adult companies and the newly emergent boy companies. The plausibility of an alternative view, that the War was a marketing ploy that staged faux animosity and satire to draw in playgoers, is also given serious attention. Once again, the chapter concludes with a study of the life of a theatre professional, in this case the actor-playwright Nathan Field. We see how his professional life and network was shaped by moving from a boy company to an adult company and evidence emerges to suggest that his success is partly attributable to careful career planning based on successful development of his social network.

'Chapter Four: The Mechanics of Dramatic Collaboration' departs from the chronological narrative to study the phenomenon of dramatic co-authorship across the period. The chapter spends some time laying out the various kinds of dramatic collaboration, from plays revised by someone other than the original author, to plays that were written in teams, as well as instances of 'active' collaboration where writers worked on a play together at the same time. Just why playwrights collaborated is a central question of the chapter and it considers the financial implications of co-authorship, the speed of production, the need for
training and supervision in the writing process and the friendly relationships it appeared to create and foster. Addressing the mechanics of collaborative dramatic writing helps us assess how the networks created by theatre professionals shaped the drama that got written. William Rowley is the subject for this chapter's case study and his life is that of a prolific collaborator working frequently with friends. Importantly, we see geography play an important role in his network; Rowley repeatedly worked with writers with whom he shared a parish.

The thesis's final section is the 'Conclusion: The Impact of Social Networks on Early Modern Drama'. It picks up the topic of the influence of networks on drama from Chapter Four and narrows in on it. The conclusion summarises the thesis's findings from each chapter and the study as a whole. As with the other major chapters it draws on brief biographies of theatre professionals to amplify previously stated arguments with a focus on how such findings influence the way we understand the period's drama. Concerning methodology, this chapter argues that biographical approaches to the study of a complex social phenomenon such as a newly emerging entertainment industry are viable and illuminating so long as historians find appropriate means to incorporate participants' lived experiences of the social networks that they formed.

This thesis makes several original contributions to knowledge. First, in its biographies it uncovers several heretofore unknown biographical facts about theatre people. Primarily, these are found in life records of the various subjects and pertain to events that were rigorously recorded in the early modern world: baptisms, marriages, and deaths. Some of these discoveries fill what were formerly total gaps in a person's life, as with the discussion of Richard Bradshaw's birth in Chapter Two. Other discoveries give us new dates, or substantially altered ones, for key events in the life of theatrical persons. This is the case with
records of William Rowley's birth in Chapter Four. These claims are tempered, however, with the acknowledgement that names alone do not make identifications of persons entirely secure: it is difficult to be certain that a sixteenth or seventeenth-century record relates to a specific man and not another with the same name.

One particularly significant contribution to knowledge comes in Chapter Four. Its analysis shows rates of collaborative playwriting to be far lower than has previously been estimated. Even before accounting for some extant plays likely containing the writing of more than one author that are still (wrongly) considered the product of sole authorship, this thesis shows the prevalence of collaboration to be about half of the usually accepted rate. Where Gerald Eades Bentley approximated 50% of drama in the Renaissance theatre to have been collaboratively written (1971), analysis of extant and known-but-lost plays shows that rate to actually be around 25%. Such a fact matters significantly to the way theatre historians and literary scholars approach authorship in the period, not least because with a full dataset we can see individual differences emerge. Some writers collaborated more than others, at a rate far in excess of the mean average. The rates of staging collaborative drama among companies varied wildly: from 0% to 50% of the oeuvre for companies with enough known plays to make a percentage figure meaningful. This discovery becomes especially significant when considered alongside the ground-breaking work of authorship attribution by computational stylistics. A solid grounding in what is known about collaborative authorship and its prevalence can help direct attribution scholarship to fruitful topics.

A final contribution to knowledge concerns the thesis's main narrative: a study of the social networks of the early modern theatre shows those involved getting along well, more often than not, and benefitting from having other theatre professionals in their network.
Studying the lives of theatre professionals, paying particular attention to the people they knew and with whom and where they worked shows the effects of cooperation far outweighing those of competitiveness. Though it is unsurprising to remark that some people clearly got along well while working in the theatre, previously imagined sites of animosity come through in this study as also harbouring convivial relations. Indeed the lives of all theatre people presented in this study show people working productively with other members of their profession, and members of other professions. This pleasant collegiality extended beyond the bounds of company affiliation, or geographic or theatre-based proximity. This thesis shows apparently unenforced cooperation between members of the same profession in the face of what we have wrongly imagined as zero-sum competition. In fact, virtuous circles abound.

**The Social Network in the Early Modern Theatre and the Case for Biography**

There are, of course, precedents for this thesis's concerns. On occasion, the social network has been considered by theatre historians. Peter Holland's depiction of the social world of London and its geography is typical:

Shakespeare's circle is a theatre circle. If we think of London as a city, by far the largest city in the country, but still with a population of under two hundred thousand, everybody must have known everybody else, to some extent. And that produces a kind of intimacy between the different places of entertainment, the different theatres, between the different writers who would meet at their favourite taverns, but also at their favourite booksellers or places like St Paul's Churchyard where booksellers had their works on show and for sale . . . as well as of course visiting each other's work in different theatres to get a sense of what the competition was doing. (Holland and Sinclair 2000)

Holland conjures a vivid image, one that will serve as a blueprint of sorts for the biographical inquiries found here. As previously stated, these inquiries endeavour to foreground how the relationships of professionals informed their lives and work. I deviate from Holland's model
in part, however. This work draws a clear line between the associations of people who know and interact with each other and the imagined networks supposed in phrases like 'with a population of under two hundred thousand, everybody must have known everybody else' (Holland and Sinclair 2000). Emphatically, everybody did not, indeed, could not, have known everybody else. In fairness, Holland was speaking generally, in an effort to convey the level of interconnectedness in early modern London and this work is indebted to such ideas. But this thesis is exclusively concerned with what we might call hard networks, or strong networks, vertices between nodes that interact directly and for which we have evidence.

Others, thinking like Holland, have imagined theatre professionals inhabiting a shared space. Peter Stallybrass, for instance, wrote, in a discussion of Renaissance authorship, about 'a network of collaborative relations . . . between writers and acting companies, between acting companies and printers, between compositors and proofreaders, between printers and censors' (1992, 601). Perhaps more specifically, using Philip Henslowe's and Edward Alleyn's papers, Grace Ioppolo theorised a world of theatrical networks: 'dramatists as well as actors, company managers, theatre owners and other personnel lived in a highly interrelated theatrical business world' (2006, 11). This interrelated world is captured in what follows, along with moves made 'casually, capriciously or shrewdly among companies, theatres and professions' (Ioppolo 2006, 11). T. W. Baldwin saw much the same thing in his understanding of the theatre world. The actors were 'closely connected to each other' (T. W. Baldwin 1961, 161). The theatre business was 'founded, especially in Shakespeare's day, both in theory and in practice on a closely knit, self-propagating society of friends' (T. W. Baldwin 1961, 161). Though some scholars clearly show an awareness of the importance of relationships in the theatre profession – and we shall meet more in later chapters – such relationships are rarely central to their discussion.
Not paying close attention to a person's relationships risks missing important information. A loose notion that these people worked together in the theatre is self-evident: they had to do so in order to stage plays. Even a cursory study of theatre people's families tells us much about the industry. Playwrights and actors would often marry the children of other playwrights and actors (Honigmann and Brock 1993, 6). Parents would name their children after theatre colleagues (Honigmann and Brock 1993, 6). Relationships were more than professional; people got on outside of work. In turn, this suggests a level of companionship within the industry. Baldwin imagined the profession as a clan. Again, we shall meet similar arguments in detail in later chapters, but they are worth introducing here since they are the basis for an understanding of the theatre world through its networks.

Scott McMillin came close to arguing for a network-centred approach when writing in favour of repertory study. He suggested that companies were the 'organizing units of dramatic production' and that to garner a full understanding of the period's theatre we should be 'placing the staged plays in a social network to which both the players and their audiences – perhaps even the playwrights – belonged' (McMillin 2001, 111). McMillin favoured the company as his focus, whereas I take a person's biography. And although McMillin's imagined network included an audience – far from the hard vertices of interaction we are concerned with – the important message is the same: examining a social network can tell us new things about the early modern theatre. Aware of the differences between apparently similar approaches to theatre history, William Ingram hypothesised 'an evolving series of maps' each with its own focus and area of speciality (1997, 225). The approach of examining historical data through a person's biographical social network is one such map.
Katherine Duncan-Jones took a network-centric approach momentarily in *Shakespeare: An Ungentle Life*. In discussing the Belott-Mountjoy law case of 1612, where Shakespeare deposed, she noted how the legal records 'map out a social network that connects the two playwrights [Shakespeare and George Wilkins], both with the highly respectable citizen Daniel Nicholas and with the bloody-minded but prosperous tire-maker Christopher Mountjoy' (Duncan-Jones 2010, 280). Through the records, Duncan-Jones also saw how Shakespeare would likely have known Humphrey Fludd, a King's trumpeter and stepfather to Stephen Belott, another of those involved in the suit. By tracing the biographical links related to the lawsuit Duncan-Jones took something like the approach of this thesis, but only as an isolated instance within a larger work that used a different methodology. Even so, and with only a small number of characters, the examination of a person's biography or the examination of several biographies simultaneously shows theatrical relationships that might otherwise have been unremarked upon: not only do they show us a moment in Shakespeare's life, but a moment in the lives of others.

There has been recent work that has more fully considered biography and social interactions of theatre professionals. Most notable is the recent *The Shakespeare Circle* by Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells (2015b). By taking as subjects those people close to Shakespeare (members of his family, friends, his actor colleagues, collaborators) the collection called itself an 'alternative biography', one focussed on the people around its main subject. For that reason, the focus on people and relationships in a subject's life, its method is close to the one employed here. It differs significantly, however, in making Shakespeare the assumed centre of a network. Edmondson and Wells figure Shakespeare as the middle from which 'many different kinds of circles . . . emanate', the biographies they present start 'from the centre of Shakespeare's life and help to shape its peripheries' (Edmondson and Wells
Such assumptions about the centrality of a subject to the world around them are not only the preserve of the Shakespearean scholar. James Loxley did the same for his subject: '[Ben] Jonson installed himself at the centre of a social network predicated on the repeated recognition of his talents' (2005, 32). As we shall see, the narratives of the biographies presented in this thesis are not tales of predetermined centres and peripheries; certainly none begins with the assumption that its subject occupies rarefied space at the centre of its own network. Rather, we see subjects in webs with many moving vertices. Our subject's node might be central to theatre history for a moment, but more regularly that node is one of many in a broad tapestry with no start, end or middle.

Biographical study 'seeks to recreate in words the life of a human being' and is 'sometimes regarded as a branch of history' (Kendall 2009). This use of biography as a method for historical research is valuable. It can be the tool to tell us about the historical past. Paul Murray Kendall considered Sir Winston Churchill's life of his ancestor John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, as 'a history (written from a special point of view) of Britain and much of Europe during the War of the Spanish Succession' (2009). It is to this that my approach with biography aspires. We read about the life of Anthony Munday, for example, in Chapter Two but will ask what it might tell us about the theatre world of Renaissance London more generally. Attempting as much is not without its problems. The pursuit of objectivity in historiography is ultimately futile and the attendant problems are given a full treatment in Chapter One. This realization is likely behind the modern appreciation of history and biography as separate forms of literature (Kendall 2009). One certain problem with biography is the inevitable influence of the personality of the biographer. At a recent panel on biography at the World Shakespeare Congress, James Shapiro noted that a biography (of Shakespeare,
in his example) is partially a reflection of the biographer; the biographer cannot help but colour his narrative with his own biases (J. Shapiro 2016).

Indeed, the biographer is not generally appreciated. Brenda Wineapple provided a selection of typical commentary on the practice of biographical writing:

Rudyard Kipling called it the 'higher cannibalism'; George Eliot said it was a 'disease of English literature.' Edmund White dubbed it 'the judgment of little people avenging themselves on the great.' [Vladimir] Nabokov labelled it 'psycho-plagiarism' (I'm not sure what that means, but it sounds bad), and of course Oscar Wilde said that nowadays 'every great man has his disciples, and usually it's Judas who writes the biography.' (Wineapple 2016, 84)

And yet, done well, biography can be an enlightening and enlivening gateway to the past. It is clearly considered a useful tool judging by its current prevalence. It has 'become, in the West, the dominant area of nonfiction broadcasting and publishing, from television to the Internet' (N. Hamilton 2007, 1). Likewise, if the tool were simply a disease it would not have spread beyond life study; but it has, at least as an evocative metaphor.

Rather than presenting a life of a person, authors have used biography to write about concepts, places and things. A recent selection illustrates as much. Peter Ackroyd wrote London: The Biography (2005), Daniel Bodanis wrote a biography of the famous equation E=MC² (2000) and Melvyn Bragg wrote The Adventure of English: The Biography (2003). In the same vein, the physicist Lawrence Krauss wrote the biography of a unit of physics in Atom: An Odyssey from the Big Bang to Life on Earth . . . and beyond (2001). Even in the scholarship around Shakespeare and the early modern theatre, biography has stood out as a useful method of study, notable for its versatility. It can clearly be recast, without the need for a cradle-to-grave style approach. As we have seen, Wells and Edmondson recently provided a biography of Shakespeare that focussed on the people around Shakespeare, rather than the
man himself. Lucy Munro has applied the tools of biography to repertory study, taking an acting company as subject in her book on the children of the Queen's Revels (2005). Shapiro, for his part, has specialised in a biography by biopsy, examining a single year of Shakespeare's life at a time (2006, 2015). It is in part because of its extraordinary utility that I use biography throughout this thesis to illustrate my arguments about theatrical networks and theatre history. The result is intended to be a new history of the early modern theatre itself.
Chapter One: The Intersection of Personal and Professional Lives in Drama, Evidence and Interpretation

In June 1613 Robert Daborne, a playwright, owed Philip Henslowe, a theatre impresario, a play. In a manoeuvre doubtless familiar to professional writers, he offered a partially complete script to buy him more time; his draft had been delayed, he explained in a letter, by the need to appear in court. To demonstrate his renewed commitment however, Daborne assured the theatre manager he had been up past midnight working on his play. In a perhaps less recognizable move, Daborne also requested an advance against a newer, but also incomplete, work. According to the letter, Henslowe would have the play in six days’ time, in order to read through with the theatre company’s actors. Daborne was not as good as his word: a week later a second letter explained that the first play was not yet complete. He had been tinkering with the ending, and part of the third act, but the company now had at least some of the play. These letters, along with several others, survive in a cache at Dulwich College and were published by W. W. Greg in 1907 as Henslowe’s Papers; they hold some of the richest information we have about early modern playwriting (1907, 73–74). Quite what the information tells us about theatrical life is less clear. A select example illustrates the difficult nature of surviving theatre historical evidence. Though specific to these epistles, the issues outlined below represent the problems facing a theatre historian. Drawing on a particular element of the letter below, and examining how scholars have rendered it as evidence will begin to show what this thesis must be wary of. Because of this, Daborne’s letters serve as an ideal gambit, offering lessons to be borne in mind throughout this thesis.

Parts of Daborne’s letters have been picked over and pressed into service as evidence of practices within the Renaissance theatre. Consider this line: 'J [Daborne] have took extraordynary payns wth the end & altered one other sccean in the third act which they have
now in parts' (Greg 1907, 74). Quite what the 'parts' the theatre company were in receipt of is disputed. Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey, in Shakespeare in Parts, sought to employ the excerpt above to help make a case that the unfinished play had been turned into actors' parts – that is, a continuous document containing only the lines spoken by one actor during a particular play, with each speech prefaced by a cue line – that were 'already distributed and semi-learned' (2007, 61). They reasoned that this was because of the 'urgency' needed to begin learning a play 'when it had barely been written' in order to expedite the actors' 'learning process' (Palfrey and Stern 2007, 61). Other scholars have read Daborne's line the same way. T. J. King, whilst tracking how Henslowe's company acquired a play script and readied it for performance, offered the same snippet of Daborne's letter as proof and followed it with: 'here the playhouse scribe apparently began to prepare the actors' parts even before the author had finished writing the play' (1992, 9). Brian Vickers read it the same way and explained it thus: 'he has still not finished the play, but the company are evidently already rehearsing it . . . and the playhouse scribe has started to copy out the actors' parts' (Vickers 2002, 29). All reach the same conclusion: an unfinished work made it into the hands of the actors, and King and Vickers add in an intermediary step without evincing additional evidence. It was, they decided, the playhouse scribe who began to write up actors' parts (1992, 9; 2002, 29). Agreement in interpretation between three sets of prominent scholars writing over fifteen years suggests a degree of consensus in the debate over what Daborne's letter might tell us.

Elsewhere though, historians mark the evidence as pointing a different way. Gabriel Egan, for one, argued that the letter fits into a broader pattern of work for Daborne where he would 'send Henslowe bits . . . as he completed them' (2014, 20). Emphatically, he purported to demonstrate that Daborne's reference to 'parts' was not to the cuescripts used in rehearsal.
His is not the only dissenting voice; strangely, Tiffany Stern has appeared to assent to this view of Daborne's meaning too. In a 2004 essay, Stern relied on the same passage of Daborne's letter above, the same one she leant on in Shakespeare in Parts, to explain how a play might have existed in a playhouse: 'it may have been made up of a loosely tied bundle of papers, consisting of a book of dialogue (or several if the play were submitted piecemeal as some of Daborne's were)' (2004, 166). On two occasions she entered the debate with different interpretations of the same reference to 'parts': either 'parts' means sets of lines for a player to learn, as in 'actors' parts', or it is portions of a completed play, as in 'parts of the whole'. The two are mutually exclusive: it cannot be both.

The example of Daborne's letter is designed to be illustrative. The documentary evidence relating to the early modern theatre and the people who worked in it is difficult to make sense of. Though we might frequently find conviction from those writing about it, we should seldom find certainty. The disagreement over Daborne's use of 'parts' was showcased here not to appoint a winner – though it does seem difficult to imagine an efficient company wasting expensive paper on a set of actors' parts for an as yet unfinished, unlicensed play only to need to emend them all following completion, censorship and the author's rewrites – but to highlight how little in the material theatre historians work with is clear-cut. The letter provides other lessons, relevant at the beginning of a thesis, though admittedly more mundane. In her own discussion of Daborne's revisions, Grace Ioppolo cited the same part of the letter, but misdated it to 1614 (2012, 90). (This is likely no more than a typographical slip, but a reader without access to the original, or a transcription, would know no better and might build a flawed argument from it, particularly when the letter is frequently considered as one of a set, all from 1613). One errant conclusion that might be drawn from the wrong date could be that Daborne took over a year to make his revisions: 'extraordinary pains' indeed. A
similar, harmless-until-proven-otherwise, slip came in Brian Vickers' commentary. He misquoted a portion, transposing two words and making the line run 'which they now have in parts' rather than 'which they have now in parts' (2002, 29). Daborne's syntax is important and additional barriers to meaning are unwelcome. Indeed, Egan used Daborne's sentence construction to help make his case (2014, 20). It is atypical to begin such work by noting such minor slips and typographical errors but in a chapter concerned with how accurate the information the thesis will present is, they become relevant if only as a cautionary tale for what follows.

Beyond differences in interpretation, and the importance of accuracy, Daborne's letter also displays another problem encountered by the theatre historian. It borders on cliché to observe that scant evidence survives from the period. There are sizeable holes in some of what does survive, and there are myriad things to which we have only a reference, making them tantalizingly out of reach. Worse than knowing what you don't have is not knowing: this too, is the default state for a lot of information on the Renaissance theatre. It is in this light that we might view Tiffany Stern's shifting arguments regarding Daborne's delivered 'parts'. Too often there is too little evidence to go around and this perhaps is why Stern ends up deploying the same evidence to support opposing narratives. Daborne's letter offers useful conclusions about the need to not stretch the evidence we have; there are some questions of theatre history to which the current answer has to be 'we don't know'. This response has to be preferable, and more useful in time, than asking too much of our evidence. In reality, the evidence of the period that survives would take the work of full careers to consult and marshal. The various types of evidence that remain, what is done with it, and how it is drawn on for this study are discussed below.
A single line from a single letter shows the need for the careful handling of information, an awareness of how else data might be interpreted, and caution in forcing evidence into a narrative's desired arc. Andrew Gurr's introduction to *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* offers a vivid picture of such matters:

Historians make their pictures from fragments, like a mosaic. Mosaics only make sense when the fragments are put into recognizable relationships with one another, which is not easy when most of the pieces available have fuzzy edges, like a soft jigsaw. The resulting construct suffers from the jigsaw enthusiast's desire to make a complete picture out of the fragments, inventing linkages to make them fit what guesswork suggests ought to be there. . . . The multitude of fragments can be arranged in too wide a variety of ways for comfort, and no simple picture can be made from them. (1996, 3)

Gurr goes on to use an analogy of a camera: his work is 'like all histories, a moving picture' meaning that 'varying camera angles can change the look of these soft fragments' (Gurr 1996, 3). (What Gurr labelled as a camera angle William Ingram called a 'map' in the Introduction). Perhaps most poetically, Gurr employs a different metaphor: 'writing history is a field game played in a fog by untested rules' (1996, 3). Gurr's opening to *Playing Companies*, coupled with the lessons of Daborne's letter, outline broadly how this thesis will treat its evidence and, importantly, what the jigsaw enthusiast will not do with it.

Though this work intends to be scrupulous in its use of historical data as evidence, it allows some certain licence – following historical precedent – regarding the periods discussed in Chapters Two, Three, and Four. R. A. Foakes articulated two temptations when studying the 'distant historical past' of which my chapters are ostensibly guilty:

The first is to see a sudden, sharp break with the past taking place at some date such as the coming to the throne of Elizabeth I (1558), or James I (1603), as though a transformation in all aspects of society happened in those instants. The second is to telescope the passage of decades of change into a single, homogenized period like 'the age of Elizabeth', as though forty-five years could be focused in a single, unchanging image. (Foakes 2003, 1)
Chapters Two and Three appear to succumb to temptation one, in marking a decade-long period as distinct from the next. Chapter Four apparently succumbs to temptation two, bundling a period of 75 years and treating it as a homogeneous whole. There is good reason for each choice.

The chapters concerning the 1590s and the 1600s observe splits of practicality and not of a hard temporal divide. Because of this, Chapter Three, say, accommodates a long 1600s, and allows for the inclusion of evidence from outside that decade. The line marking each chapter as concerned with a particular period of 10 years is a line of best fit, not a dividing wall. In so doing I am in good company: E. K. Chambers allowed his *Elizabethan Stage* (1923a, 1:viii) to run on to 1616, 13 years after the death of Elizabeth I. Adopting a softer-edged approach allows for a decade to be a useful organizing unit, but not to be such a rigid container as to not permit useful data from elsewhere to be drawn on.

In the case of Chapter Four and the tendency to conflate the historical past, evidence is so scant it is necessary, particularly when its aim is to survey and analyse the surviving metadata from the period's plays. Usefully, this analysis guards against extreme conflation. For instance, one way this study analyses the drama produced is by considering which company staged it: most companies only survived for a fraction of the period assessed in the chapter. The Chamberlain's-King's men, the most successful and long-lived company, lasted 48 years. Also in defence of this practice is the fact that some dates really do signal a break with what went before. The world really was different after 11 September 2001. In theatre history 1567 and the construction of the Red Lion is often considered as marking a firm break with the past, as is the closure of the theatres in 1642.
**What constitutes evidence?**

We must next consider what in general, and for this work, constitutes evidence and what the historian should do with it. Ingram, in paraphrasing Nancy Partner, explained that evidence only becomes such when we transform something that is 'evident', that is, extant, into a 'meaningful piece of a past whole' (2008, 5). Neatly, Partner's articulation conceptualizes the historian as an active agent, endowing meaning and, using the fuzzy edged pieces of Gurr's analogy, writing their own narrative. This can pose problems. On one hand, scholars could deliberately exclude evidence that might contradict the story they wish to tell, or the conclusion they wish to reach. Conversely, in an effort to avoid such a trap, historians could compensate too much and attempt to 'limit history to the accurate presentation of data' (Vince 2000, 13). Despite the second approach appearing preferable, devoid of scholarly manipulation, R. W. Vince outlined 'two obvious reasons' why this approach is impractical:

In the first place, almost by definition, historical data can provide only indirect and incomplete information concerning the past; the most logically rigorous analysis of fragmentary evidence can yield results that are wrong. In the second place, even the most “scientific” of historians . . . bring to their data assumed pattern of meaning. (2000, 13)

Ingram, in considering the boundary between theatre history and fiction, averred that 'the dominant mode in the writing of theater history nowadays is . . . narrative' noting that 'much writing in theater history today is not unlike the final chapters of a good mystery novel' (2008, 2–3). In a survey-of-the-discipline-style chapter Ingram drew on theoretical viewpoints to demonstrate that 'literature and history' are 'once more converging' (2008, 4). His 'literature' and 'fiction' characterized the work of the historian as creating a narrative from their chosen evidence. His use of 'history' paralleled Vince's sense of 'accurate presentation of data'. This work will aim to track a path between the two, exercising caution in both directions.
Numerous documents have survived that might be considered a 'meaningful part of a past whole', though not as many as theatre historians might like. 'Throughout this century', Alan C. Dessen wrote in 1996, scholars have:

pored over and argued about a few noteworthy documents (the Swan drawing, several other drawings or illustrations, Philip Henslowe's papers, the Fortune contract, some surviving theatrical "plots," a few eyewitness accounts of performances) in an attempt to recover or reconstitute the staging practices of English Renaissance drama. (1996, 44)

Conspicuously, Dessen neglected to mention playtexts, manuscript and printed, but he was correct in principle: these items are employed to support scholars' interpretations and from them, predominantly, spring most of our competing narratives about early modern theatre practice. With the addition of a handful more sources of information we can widen our gaze to the world around the early modern theatre too. Each type of evidence discussed below is problematic in some way: some types are fragmentary; some are misleading; some are difficult to decipher, both practically and intellectually; some are difficult to collect and collate; and some appear to contradict others. Each type of evidence this study draws on, and their various nuances, is outlined below: they are split, roughly, into non-theatrical and theatrical documents. We must consider what it is reasonable to infer from each, and, for whom it was originally intended: that is, who wrote it, who was going to read it, and what for? All evidence is not created equal; more pertinently, we must remember that what we now call evidence was not created with the idea of informing people about a past epoch.

Non-theatrical Evidence

One type of documentary evidence that remains is early modern life records. That is, entries into various registers and record books created at significant life events: baptism,
marriage, burial. Early modern England had 'an increasing interest in and reliance on bureaucratic record-keeping, documentary evidence and verifiable proofs' (Stewart 2008, 299). This is a boon for any historian interested in the people of Renaissance England and is particularly useful for the study of social networks and social geography. Not all the records created remain, but a good number have endured. Largely, these are parish records: records kept by a church about their congregations in an administrative capacity. This was achievable because the life events they documented were religious in nature and administered by a church; note that they mark a person's date of baptism and burial, not their date of birth and death. Where they survive, parish registers are assumed to be reliable sources of information. Their genesis as administrative records means they would only have been of use if they were accurate. Though we might hypothesize an instance where a parish clerk might be induced to falsify records, to ensure a couple's marriage was entered and appeared to occur before that same couple had a child baptised say, it cannot have been a common practice since detection would be easy, the penalty for the clerk would be severe, and the results would be apparent in the surviving data. Assuming their veracity, we are able to track people through the records from very close to their birth until their death, sometimes knowing when they married and had children. Because the records are tied to a local area, that is, a parish, we can also determine a person's rough residential location at these junctures.

Where parish records might mislead is in being mined to deliver information en masse. Church attendance was compulsory in Shakespeare's England: services were to be attended at least every Sunday (Singman 1995, 24). We might therefore expect a parish register to hold complete information about the make-up of a parish. There is, however, good evidence to suggest that this is not the case. People adherent to the Catholic faith refused to attend Protestant services and were supposed to pay fines as recusants (Singman 1995, 24);
members of this group avoided officialdom and hence are under-represented in parish records. By way of an example, we know that John Shakespeare, father of William, was fined for non-attendance at the Eucharist in 1576. This was 'once thought to be evidence of recusancy' though it 'now appears to have been a result of severe financial difficulties obliging him to stay at home for fear of process of debt' (Loewenstein and Witmore 2015, 31). Either way, it means that church records, particularly in those parts of the country that still harboured significant numbers of adherents to Catholicism, can be deficient when pressed holistically.

Evidence in parish records can be further complicated by modern attempts to make it accessible. Various efforts have been made to transcribe and publish particular parish registers from the period with varying results. Alan H. Nelson, at the more reliable end, has transcribed, and made available online, the parish register of St Leonard's Shoreditch from 1558-1640 (2005). St Leonard's parish, home to the actors' church of the same name, is of particular interest because it contained the homes of multiple people associated with the theatre: Nelson offers a separate page containing this information. In the hands of a professional palaeographer, the information is likely to be transcribed accurately for online use. Other efforts are more mixed. Generally, online access to early modern parish registers is thanks to a proliferation of genealogy sites, designed for people interested in unearthing their family history. Many of these sit behind a paywall, but some, like https://familysearch.org, operated by the Mormon Church, are largely open. Transcriptions of early records on these sites are variable. The best contain high resolution images for the enquirer to consult, in addition to a searchable transcription of the record. Despite their flaws, they offer powerful access to data otherwise too disparately located to search practically. I could, for example, query such databases for marriage records across all London parishes over a given timespan.
in an effort to determine the marital status of a dramatist that was previously unknown rather than studying several dozen sets of records at several dozen churches across London.

Beyond parish registers, other formally kept records hold information about lives in early modern England. Different types of legal records are extant, for example. There are myriad types of such document, meaning a full review is impractical. For brevity, such records are grouped here into those that involved people being called to account – attending a trial, giving depositions, providing competing stories – and those that do not. The second group, like parish registers and church records, are treated broadly as reliable by scholars, with little apparent reason to falsify entries. We might also assume that those entries concerned with money – taxes and tax assessments, for instance – are especially dependable since those creating them had legal and financial incentives for accuracy. William Shakespeare's name appears on these kind of records in 1597 and 1598; he was assessed for tax in St Helen's parish in the ward of Bishopsgate but didn't pay (Chambers 1930a, 2:87–88). He was not, as is sometimes claimed, fined 5s for failing to pay (Kinney 2012a, 8): the 5s was due as an additional instalment from a previous tax assessment (Chambers 1930a, 2:88). The tax collectors submitted an affidavit attesting the fact that they could not find Shakespeare to extract the money (Chambers 1930a, 2:88). The example illustrates what these type of records can tell us. We learn geographical and temporal information directly: Shakespeare is listed as being of St Helen's between 15 November 1597 and 1 October 1598, presumably residing there. Indirectly, there is sometimes more to be gleaned: the accounts include the amount of subsidy Shakespeare was due to pay, based on a government evaluation of his assets. In turn, this could lead scholars to making a speculative calculation of Shakespeare's net worth at this point. Legal records of this kind provide useful data about
early modern people's whereabouts, when they appeared in particular locations and can often shed light on other elements of their lives.

Legal accounts become murkier when we move beyond a straightforward transaction to consider litigation. As a result, the information a biographer can extract becomes more problematic. It was a 'litigious age' (Bate 2009, 9) as the 'late sixteenth century witnessed a dramatic increase in litigation' (O’Callaghan 2009, 6). And, though this means there are more records to assess, it also means there are more puzzles to decipher. Consider, for instance, one issue on the periphery of London's theatre world. George Wilkins, with whom Shakespeare collaborated on *Pericles* (1607-1608), owned and operated a tavern; in actual fact, good evidence suggests that the tavern 'also operated as a brothel' (Parr 2004). Either way he was certainly familiar with the 'red-light world' of early modern London (Salkeld 2015, 289). Though Wilkins appeared in many legal suits in the period, the example here concerns his wife: Katherine Wilkins, nee Fowler or Fowles. She was also not unknown to the bench (Prior 1972, 143–44). In August 1614 she sued a neighbour, Joyce Patrick, for labelling her a 'bawd' repeatedly in a late-night altercation (Eccles 1975, 251). For her cause Mrs Wilkins called on Richard Langford, a bellman, to describe how he heard Patrick rail 'you mistres Sweetemeat you will doe more with an inche of candell then some will doe with a whole pound, Wilkinses wiefe I speak to thee' (Eccles 1975, 251). Disappointingly, the precise meaning of this lively slur might be lost to history. To add weight to her case, Wilkins also had Anne Jackson, servant to the Wilkins' household, and John Terrey, a brewer, attest Patrick's 'bawd' outburst. In response, Patrick brought forth witnesses who sought to defame the character of Wilkins' witnesses: the bellman was a 'very poor and needy person', the brewer had supposedly kept company with lewd women and had confessed to spending 20s in one evening at Wilkins' house (Eccles 1975, 251). (20s, incidentally, would have bought a
lot of beer if the Wilkins' establishment only operated as a tavern). One of Patrick's witnesses claimed that Patrick's accusation had, in fact, been directed towards a Megge Trappes, 'a common whore' (Eccles 1975, 251).

Though we might trust the veracity of the legal records themselves, it is impossible to decrypt the information they hold about this series of events from the competing testimonies. At a four hundred year remove we are unable to determine whether the bellman is a reliable witness or not, or, indeed, whether Katherine Wilkins was a bawd. There is considerable value to them despite this. The entries give us a firm date for when cases were heard, giving, at least, a date by which the actions dealt with had occurred. Additionally, it is likely that, providing they were not crucial elements to a case, some of the more mundane facts recorded were solid. In this category we might include people's ages, professions, and places of residence. An obvious exception might occur if a person whose profession involved illegal activity, a prostitute perhaps, was called to the stand. Finally, such records provide a feel, doubtless impressionistic, of the type of area, people, events that spawn them: they give a sense of local colour. We must also remember that cases surviving in extant records only document those with grievances. We have received a skewed dataset, showing only those with serious enough complaints to seek legal intervention and the resources to pursue it. Records of this kind tell us precious little of the numberless masses who passed through life without cause for the state's intervention. Mark Eccles, commenting on the case précised above, concluded that 'the moral may be that so many dwellers in this suburb near Smithfield were immoral that the pot often called the kettle black, but not every charge need be taken as gospel' (1975, 251).
Beyond the state and the church, other institutions kept accounts of their own. The two English universities kept records ranging from admissions and lists of scholars to ledgers tallying spending on food. Again, these are generally assumed to be accurate, with little obvious reason to falsify an account and written predominantly for internal administrative purposes. Like all types of evidence outlined in this chapter they are subject to the vagaries of early modern spelling. Christopher Marlowe's appearances in the registers of Cambridge University demonstrate this. His first record in the buttery calls him Christopher 'Marlen' (Rutter 2012, 5), he took his B. A. in 1583 rendered as 'Xrof Marlyn', and his M. A. in 1587 listed as 'Chr. Marley' (Fleay 1891, 2:60). As with other records above, the registers give at least an indication of a person's whereabouts at the given time. Interestingly, on occasion, absence of evidence can be evidence of absence. That is, a record missing where we might expect to find one can be as illustrative as one found. Using the same sources that told him of Marlowe's scholarship and food and drink expenditure, Charles Nicholl was able to establish that Marlowe's 'attendance' from 1585 'became irregular' but that his spending on victuals was 'conspicuously higher' than it had previously been (Nicholl 2008a). This led to the conclusions that Marlowe wasn't at university as often as he should be, he was collecting his scholarship less frequently than in earlier years, and that he'd been making money elsewhere, allowing for the increased purchasing power. Fortunately the hole in the record left by non-attendance is filled by a Privy Council memorandum stating that Marlowe's absence was excusable because he'd been doing 'her Majesty good service' (Burnett 2003, vii).

London livery companies, like the universities, kept their own records. Often these documented members, their dues and their apprentices. As with others, these shed further light on people's whereabouts at a particular time and place. In addition, livery companies, as working organizations, kept records of day-to-day dealings, some of which are extant. These
contain rich information for scholars about the administration of a working company. In particular, they often detail expenditure on civic entertainments and Lord Mayor's shows, naming the dramatists involved and their contributions. This is especially useful for this study as it provides a mine of little-known information about theatrical collaboration away from the professional stage. By making a successful extraction from this mine, David M. Bergeron was, in his words in 1996, able to overturn 'nearly 180 years of scholarship' that 'documented [Thomas] Middleton's presumed contempt for his lesser contemporary Anthony Munday' (1996, 461). Tackling the records of livery companies holistically, David Kathman has convincingly shown how important the information held by them is to an understanding of the early modern professional theatre: a significant number of actors were freemen of the companies and the formal apprenticeship system of the livery companies was similar to the informal one of the theatre companies (2004a). Here, and in later chapters, I follow other scholars in treating the records as a reliable source of information.

Discussed above are sets of data that give specific, non-theatrical information. Elsewhere, the historian can glean things from more generalized artefacts. Laws tell us directly what was officially proscribed, or what was expected. The 1572 act for the Punishment of Vagabonds and for the relief of the poor and impotent demonstrates this. It mandated that any people, above the age of fourteen, taken 'begging' or 'vagrant wandering and misordering themselves' were to 'be brought before' one of a number of local officials (Chambers 1923b, 4:269). If convicted, such 'rogues' could expect to be 'grievously whipped' and branded on the ear. Reoffenders would be deemed felons and those convicted a third time would 'suffer paynes of Death and losse of Land and Goodes as a Felon without Allowance or Benefyte of Cleargye or Sanctuary' (Chambers 1923b, 4:270). The 1572 act is important to theatre historians because it is explicit in defining 'Comon Players of Enterludes' as among
the outlawed vagrants. To avoid punishment, players needed to 'belong' to 'any Baron of this Realme' or 'any other honorable Personage of greater Degree' (Chambers 1923b, 4:270). Certainly, we might point to this as a pivotal moment for the patronage of acting companies: the latter part of Elizabeth's reign did see a proliferation of patronised troupes (Gurr 1996). What we must be cautious of, however, is the assumption that the edict on the punishment of vagabonds immediately halted the unwanted behaviours. A longer view shows that versions of the same law had existed in various form since 1531. And it was restated in 1598 and 1604 (Chambers 1923b, 4:260–334). This example serves generally: a formal injunction against a behaviour is no guarantee that it did not occur. A case might be made, though, that it is a guarantee of a behaviour occurring prior to a law's formulation: it would be difficult to imagine legislative time spent proscribing unpractised acts.

Sermons occupy a similar space as laws when considering them as evidence. Though a prelate might rail against something at St Paul's Cross it would be wrong to assume that their intervention curtailed behaviours. In the same way that it would be inefficient to create laws against activities that were not actually prevalent, it is unlikely that preachers lamented wholly illusory transgressions. Sermons and laws, when drawn on, are done so with this in mind. They mark only the wishes of those in power, religious or governmental, not a projection of society's actual conduct.

Some surviving documents were not intended to formally record information at all. Those covered above have survived in far greater numbers largely thanks to their bureaucratic purposes. But, there are a number of documents that survive of a more informal nature that offer information about early modern life. Such documents have different issues regarding reliability. Take personal correspondence: it offers a rare insight into moments of
local colour not afforded by more official records, but the accuracy of what they document is perhaps more uncertain. 'Letters' are 'more likely to approach the vernacular of the past', they contain the 'language of the private sphere . . . allowing us to glimpse the daily life of ordinary folk' (Nurmi, Nevala, and Palander-Collin 2009, 13–14). Personal correspondence is not a singular category: they exist on a continuum between entirely private correspondence and semi-public epistles. We might expect love notes swapped by each half of a courting couple to be intended only for the other, but 'members of the nobility and the educated elite sent letters to friends or colleagues knowing (indeed, often hoping) that these would be copied, circulated in manuscript and eventually published' (Wiesner 2013, 290). Employing a letter as evidence demands a consideration of its origin, we must ask: for whom was this letter intended? We might also ask: for what was this letter intended? A letter's content can tell us about its reliability as much as its genesis.

On 4 June 1601 the playwright Samuel Rowley wrote to theatre manager Philip Henslowe: 'I pray you deliver the rest of the money to John Day and Will Haughton due to them of the *Six Yeomen of the West*' (Greg 1907, 57). Rowley's scratched, two-line request for the release of funds documents the everyday of early modern theatre administration and there is little reason to doubt the authenticity of its contents. The letter details a business transaction between theatre professionals, written by another theatre professional; it seems unlikely it was ever intended for a readership beyond its recipient. Elsewhere however, the contents of surviving letters are not so straightforward. The play *Eastward Ho!* (1605), written by George Chapman, Ben Jonson and John Marston, proved so incendiary that its authors were imprisoned (Burnett 2006). The play lampooned the Scottish accent and King James' 'traffic in knighthoods' (Fossen 1999, 157). From prison, Jonson and Chapman sent letters to noblemen protesting their innocence regarding the seditious scenes. Jonson did so at
the expense of the others: they 'utter, sometimes, their own malicious meanings, under our words' (Jonson 1816, I:cxxxix). Chapman tried to explain that he was not to blame either: the 'chief offences are but two Clauses, and both of them not our own' (Burnett 2006). At least one early study in authorship attribution gave the scene containing the offensive remarks to Chapman (Lake 1981, 164). This attribution was accepted by the more recent Revels edition of the play (Fossen 1999). Jonson is implicated elsewhere though: all three authors worked closely on the final draft, with Jonson 'going over the whole making improvements and changes'; at the least he 'copied out the final draft' (Gossett 2004b, 193). Clearly, one of the playwrights, and perhaps both, lied in their letters in an attempt to save themselves. The goal of a letter's content is important when considering how much weight it is afforded. All the letters outlined here were written for the private, rather than public, perusal of their addressee, but whereas Rowley's documents a routine exchange Chapman's and Jonson's have a clear motive to manipulate the truth. This, broadly, demonstrates how letters will be considered in later chapters. Indeed, the letters of Chapman and Jonson are met again in a wider context later in this thesis.

Another category of writing also covered by the term letters exists, unlike those discussed above. Dedicatory epistles often appear at the beginning of printed works and allow authors to ingratiate themselves to patrons or prospective patrons. William Shakespeare's dedication to Henry Wriothesley in Venus and Adonis (1592-1593) is typically fawning: 'I know not how I shall offend in dedicating my unpolisht lines to your Lordship . . . I . . . vow to take advantage of all idle hours, till I have honoured you with some grauer labour' (Shakespeare 1596). Claiming rhymed iambic pentameter is somehow 'unpolished' seems difficult to defend. Dedicatory epistles are also processed through the print-shop where non-
authorial changes might have occurred. As such, these paratexts are examined, and drawn on with this in mind.

Other types of evidence occur from the deliberately public sphere. Collectively, we might term them 'topical allusions'. These can be extremely useful indicators of someone's contemporary esteem, or the way in which commentators thought. Contemporary references to people or works also give an effective end-date by which they must have been performed or published (or at least have been publically circulated as with some poems shared in manuscript). Famously, the pamphlet titled *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592) gave us our first topical allusion to Shakespeare, bringing him out of the so-called lost years and a gap in the historical record that began in 1585. The *Groatsworth* is attributed to Robert Greene, though recent scholarship conceives Henry Chettle, the playwright and publisher, as the more likely author (Jowett 1993). In it the author bemoans an 'upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers' and parodies a line from *3 Henry 6* (1591) while complaining that 'with his Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde' he 'supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you' (Greene and Chettle 1592, F1v). He is, 'in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrey' (Greene and Chettle 1592, F1v). Like letters, these forms of reference to someone or something can show emotion or nuance in a way that official documents cannot. They are not always immediately accessible, however. And, for every layer of supposed decryption applied by scholars, we must add a layer of uncertainty about the conclusion. At no time in the above quotations, and I have excerpted the most overt allusions, is Shakespeare named directly. Yet most major biographies decide that Shakespeare is the object of the *Groatsworth*'s ire (Lee 1917; Chambers 1930b; Honan 1998; Ackroyd 2005; Weis 2008; Bate 2009; Potter 2012; Es 2013). Where topical allusions are explicit about their subject, or where
we are satisfied that a veiled reference is clear enough to identify a subject, we might then, as with letters, consider who wrote it, to what end, and for whom to read.

Sometimes information doesn't survive first hand. Inevitably, this means it reaches us via a conduit; in turn, this allows for the additional introduction of unreliability. John Aubrey, towards the end of the seventeenth century, wrote a series of biographical vignettes titled *Brief Lives* (1669-1696). One such vignette concerned Francis Beaumont, the playwright, who is often paired with John Fletcher, not least because of the 1647 folio of plays published under both their names. Aubrey, who had not known Beaumont and was writing several generations after his death, stated, amongst other errors, that Beaumont had attended Queen's College, Cambridge (Aubrey 1999, 21): he had not, he had attended Broadgates Hall (later Pembroke College), Oxford (Finkelpearl 2006). Stanley Wells summarized Aubrey’s contribution to biography thus: ‘scrappy and often unreliable but nevertheless continuously entertaining’; the entry on Beaumont was ‘gossipy’ (2006, 194). This might be borne in mind throughout when dealing with anecdote or second hand account. A writer, sometime after the fact, with a readership to entertain and money to be made, without the benefit of knowing the subject, and without the subject or those close to them still alive for verification or correction, might feel the need to flesh out a scant historical haul or to plug gaps in the factual record with accounts of their own devising. Accounts of this nature are approached with caution.

The above comprises a non-exhaustive list of different types of non-theatrical evidence that will be drawn on throughout this thesis; though not every piece will have been covered in detail, most will broadly fit into one of the above categories. Below is a further discussion of theatrical evidence that might be employed to help us better understand early modern dramatic networks.
Theatrical Evidence

One of the more formal types of surviving theatrical documents is company patents, issued at the formulation of a troupe. They are about as accurate a document as scholars might want about the beginnings of a company. The Lady Elizabeth's Men's patent, for example, survives from 27 April 1611. It outlines, at the behest of King James I, the permissions of the players in the company named for 'our deere daughter the ladie Elizabeth' (Chambers 1923c, 2:246). The patent named players, John Townsend and Joseph Moore; detailed playing spaces, the 'vsuall howses' about 'our Cittie of London'; specified touring venues, 'Towne halles…Guyldhalles, Schoolehowses'; and described how the company would adhere to previously existing structures, 'our will and pleasure is that all authoritie . . . belonginge . . . to the maister of the Revelles . . . shall remayne' (Chambers 1923c, 2:246–47). Whoever copied out patents would have needed to be precise, not only to satisfy King James but also because the new company would need their patent to demonstrate their legitimacy in London and the provinces. It might be reasonable to deduce therefore, that those named were the lead players in the company and that they would make up its core wherever it went. Similarly, we might use it for information about playing spaces outside of London: though town halls and guildhalls are readily associated with playing, schoolhouses are not. And yet, their inclusion in this patent, as distinct from universities, tells us that they were used as playing spaces too. It is an official document, much the same as the laws discussed above. Because of this, historians consider it, and those like it, as accurate.

One thing that the Lady Elizabeth's Men's patent fails to mention is the names of other company members, beyond the two assumed leads. Other patents do include a fuller list of company membership. The King's Men's royal patent from May 1603 lists nine of the playing
company – Lawrence Fletcher, William Shakespeare, Richard Burbage, Augustine Philips, John Hemminges, Henry Condell, William Sly, Robert Armin, and Richard Cowley and the 'rest of theire Associates' – whilst outlining their permission to perform 'Comedies Tragedies histories Enterludes morals pastorals stageplais, and suche others as theie have already studied' (Gurr 2004c, 254). Other state papers mention company members too, though often not as explicitly or unequivocally as scholars would like. A year after the King's Men's patent was issued, members of the company were paid for attending on the Spanish ambassador at Somerset House. The payment was made out to 'Augustine Phillipes and John Hemynges' and was 'for thallowaunce of themselves and tenne of theire Fellowes his majesties groomes of the chamber' (Gurr 2004c, 254). Though we learn about company members from each, neither document offers a complete list of names. From the patent and the ambassadorial payment together, we get a sense of the size of the company. The patent names nine members and, loosely, makes room for additional 'associates'; the record of payment is more concrete, it names two members and allows for 10 more. Through this blended approach to the evidence we are able to infer that the King's Men, at the beginning of James I's reign, had around 12 adult members. More pertinent for consideration here though is the fluidity shown by the documents' authors in detailing the actors. These documents were created for practical use by, or at the behest of, the state: they were not conceived to leave a full record of acting company membership. As such, the authors wrote with their own purposes in mind – seemingly to officially endow a company with royal patronage and to document a payment from the state to the company respectively – rather than to leave an accurate record of the company. We must bear this in mind throughout: though theatre historians now hunt for references to actors, companies, and playhouses, in surviving documents these mentions were not necessarily central to the motives of the documents' creators.
Playing companies and those associated with them were capable of creating their own formal records. On 8 January 1600 the theatre manager Philip Henslowe, and his partner (and son-in-law) Edward Alleyn, entered into a contract with a carpenter, Peter Street, for him to build them a theatre near 'Goldinge lane in the pishe of S<e Giles w{h}oute Cripplegate' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 307). The resulting theatre was known as the Fortune. The contract specified, amongst much else, that certain of the new theatre's elements were to emulate the 'late erected Plaiehowse On the Banck', the Globe (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 308). Documents of this type offer a high level of confidence regarding their veracity to the modern scholar. As S. P. Cerasano explained: the manuscript contract would 'have been identified by the legal establishment . . . as a document called an "indenture"' that represented an agreement between two or more parties (2009, 80). Indentures are reliable not only because they embodied mutual financial and legal obligations that all parties would want to have accurately defined but also because they used anti-tampering technology:

Identical copies of the agreement were written on a single piece of parchment or vellum, and then these were cut apart in a serrated or sinuous line. Hence, after it was cut, the border of the manuscript was notched or "indented." The purpose for this procedure was simple: if, for any reason, there was a dispute over the agreement that had been made by the parties involved, the manuscripts could be brought together, and the edges tallied, indicating that they were parts of one and the same document. (Cerasano 2009, 80–81)

In addition, these documents had further safeguards: signatures were 'to be witnessed by two persons, with the addition of formal seals' (Cerasano 2009, 81). We might, therefore, be tempted to take the word of the contract as accurate. Unfortunately, one example must serve to chasten this desire, since a record of intention is not a record of achievement. The Fortune contract stated that Street was to be paid 'the full some of ffower hundred & ffortie Poundes' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 309). Yet cross referencing Henslowe and Alleyn's accounts showed John Orrell that the actual cost of the building eventually ran to at least £509; Alleyn later
recollected that it had actually cost £520 (1993, 144). That this type of document can be created to the most exacting standards and yet not offer an accurate record of the past prompts caution.

Perhaps the most well-known documents that we now employ as evidence of Renaissance theatrical practice are those grouped together as Philip Henslowe's 'diary'. The diary is probably the fullest evidence in a class we might term documents of theatrical management. What scholars think of as the homogeneous set of theatrical accounts, as edited and published as *Henslowe's Diary* by W. W. Greg between 1904 and 1908 (1904-1908) and R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert in 1961 (1961), are actually surprisingly eclectic. The signatures of many other writers are present: Robert Daborne and Samuel Rowley, as discussed above, have letters included; other dramatists' correspondence with Henslowe makes up part of the edited text of the document cache too. And, to draw another proximate example, the contract to build the Fortune is also probably in the hand of a professional scribe, namely one William Harris (Cerasano 2009, 82). The contents of Henslowe's personal documents occupy a broad range. Card tricks, medications, aphorisms, memoranda of personal events, the putting of his horse out to grass, the details of a farm he might have looked to purchase, and, perhaps most bizarrely, measurements of Edward Alleyn's wainscoting, all have space alongside theatrical entries (Carson 1988, 5). Neil Carson noted that this 'is sometimes seen as evidence of Henslowe's disorganized mind or sloppy methods' but in fact was 'perfectly normal for his time' (Carson 1988, 5). Cerasano, in addressing her own question – 'for what use was Henslowe's book compiled?' – asserted that far from being slovenly 'it was a memorandum book, very much "in process," kept by its owner for personal use' and it was 'apparently adequate' for his purposes (2005, 83). The fact that issues of Henslowe's practice need addressing perhaps signals something about the diary's assumed reliability. However, inconsistency in notation coupled with quirks of material chosen to be
recorded do not necessarily indicate inaccuracy or unreliability, but might reflect merely an unorthodox or unfamiliar system. Pertinently, Henslowe's was a private record of transactions: its creator had an obvious reason to maintain its accuracy, without which it would serve no useful function, and so we might tentatively assume its veracity. Certainly, the theatrical information it holds is uniquely valuable to the theatre historian.

A wider consideration that Henslowe's diary prompts is how far the practices it records can be assumed to be indicative of the Renaissance theatre as a whole. No such trove of documents survives for other companies in the period and so it is tempting to apply the evidence contained in Henslowe's papers as widely as possible. Much as we might like to extrapolate its data across the acting companies of the period, it doesn't readily square with other available evidence. Henslowe's diary, amongst much else, details his management of the Admiral's Men at the Rose playhouse and the various playwrights who wrote for them. The Admiral's Men performed plays by a host of playwrights at the Rose, a theatre owned by Philip Henslowe. As landlord, Henslowe received a half-share of each day's gallery takings (Foakes and Rickert 1961, xxxii); he also lent money to the company to buy plays and apparel. The other major company of the 1590s, the Lord Chamberlain's Men, did things differently. They were run by a core of actor-sharers who owned a stake in the company; this group found the capital to buy plays and split the profits from performing them. They favoured, in the person of Shakespeare, an 'attached professional' (Bentley 1971, 37), a playwright who wrote exclusively, or virtually exclusively, for their one company. Shakespeare was not the sole provider of plays to the Chamberlain's Men and they also used freelancers, but Henslowe's company had no resident company playwright at all. The Lord Chamberlain's company also, through the family of one of their actor-sharers, Richard Burbage, owned their theatre: the Theatre in Shoreditch (Bowsher 2012, 55). These
differences help highlight the possible problems in assuming Henslowe and the practices detailed in the diary are typical of other acting companies.

Another class of evidence, a subset of documents of theatre management, is documents actively used for performances that are not scripts of the plays. This group's members form a list short enough to cite in its entirety: it comprises several extant playhouse plots and a single surviving actor's part for Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (1591). Both pose problems of interpretation. Of particular interest for this thesis are the playhouse plots: seven survive in total (Beckerman 1989, 109). Greg showed how these could be employed to ascertain details of 'Elizabethan stage history' (1925, 274). More recently, T. J. King employed them to demonstrate that 'authors of the period carefully planned the number of actors required for each play' (King 1992, 6). Despite scholars mobilizing these documents to strengthen their arguments there is little certainty around their exact use in the theatre. Plots name actors involved in a production, for instance, and this is not immediately controversial. Acting together in a single play production is a definite social connection, a hard vertex between two theatrical figures and will be treated as such throughout the thesis. Arguments concerning these documents' specific theatrical uses, however, will be treated with considerably more caution. In particular, we do not know if plots were primarily reference documents to be consulted during a performance or if their main purposes served the preparations for performance by supporting the processes of dramatic composition, casting of roles, and the gathering of properties.

The single largest category of evidence from the period survives in the form of extant plays. A small number of these exist in manuscript, whilst the overwhelming majority are printed playbooks. These playbooks offer the largest dataset available regarding drama of the
period: the words of the several hundred extant plays can, thanks to transcription and digital search tools, be queried simultaneously. Printed plays also offer other data that are equally valuable and rarely given in manuscripts: they almost always hold information about the dating of a play; its authorship; its company attribution; its printer; its publisher; and (via consideration of reprinting rates) its popularity. They can lead historians astray, however. We know, for example, that title pages mis-attribute and mis-date works. Four times in the first decade of the seventeenth century Shakespeare's name (or his suggestive initials) appeared on the title pages of plays he did not write. *Thomas Lord Cromwell* (1600, published 1602), *The London Prodigal* (1604, published 1605), *The Puritan, or The Widow of Watling Street* (1606, published 1607), and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1605, published 1608) were attributed to him in print. Rather than error, this misattribution appears to have been a marketing ploy. By this stage in his career, Lukas Erne has argued, Shakespeare had become 'Shakespeare' the brand: 'a name with which publishers expected to make money' (2003, 68). This insight forces scholars to evaluate a title page's reliability before accepting its evidence. In most instances, unless there is good reason to suppose otherwise, title pages will be considered accurate.

Extant plays, through the methods of computational stylistics, also yield information about authorship that was inaccessible to earlier scholars. The use of various computerised linguistic tests supported by rigorous statistical checks can help us determine the authorship of anonymous works, or discern collaborative authorship in a work previously thought to be sole-authored. Fresh evidence of collaboration is fresh evidence of new, growing or affirmed networks between playwrights, stationers and theatre companies. Of course, there are significant disagreements on the details in the field. In 2012 Emma Smith and Laurie Maguire published an article claiming Thomas Middleton as a collaborator of Shakespeare in
All's Well that Ends Well (Maguire and Smith 2012). In direct response Brian Vickers and Marcus Dahl published an article, claiming to refute Maguire and Smith's attribution (2012). Elsewhere, Thomas Merriam and MacDonald P. Jackson disagree over shares of Henry VIII (Merriam 2014), MacDonald P. Jackson and W. E. Y. Elliott and R. J. Valenza disagree over attributions in Sir Thomas More (1592-1595), and MacDonald P. Jackson disagrees with Brian Vickers over attributions, and methodology (2014, 113–14). For non-specialists on the outside peering in, it is likely to be difficult to know who is right. Those cited here are a rough cross section of ongoing debates; there are also large areas of consensus among attribution specialists. Typically, it is these areas of consensus that are drawn on throughout; where an argument requires evidence that is contested by attribution specialists it is highlighted.

Another use to which we can put extant play texts from the period is in the creation of doubling or casting charts. These are graphical representations of the practicalities of performance with regard to the number of actors required to stage a play, and they have been created for only a few dozen of the plays surviving from this period. According to Foakes 'it is evident from early printed texts that plays were constructed with the doubling of parts in mind' (2003, 47). Beyond the playhouse plots mentioned above, we have limited direct information about how the doubling of parts might have occurred. A systematic charting of the minimum casting requirements of a particular play script (maximizing the doubling to reduce the head-count) tells us the absolutely smallest size of any company that could perform that play, but of course it does not tell us the actual size of any company that did perform it because other considerations (such as actors' specialities) might have prevailed.
Nevertheless, in their biographical study of the Queen's Men, Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth Maclean were confident that in their chosen company's plays 'sameness rather than variety is a leading characteristic, especially when it comes to such basic theatrical characteristics as casting, doubling, staging and dramaturgy' (1998, 98). That is, continuity of practice was more common than innovation. This perceived ability to recover historical stage practices without more than a few shreds of evidence is impressive, but should be qualified. It will be difficult, like so much else in theatre history, to prove that a scholar's reconstructed doubling chart accurately depicts that of an early modern performance. Despite this, Richard Fotheringham presented a series of examples drawn from play texts that hinted, in his estimation, at how doubling took place (1985). Scholars have continued to create them, or include them in editions of plays (King 1992; Manley and MacLean 2014). One must remember that though they can be a useful tool, what they capture is an historical abstraction not concrete evidence.

A final category of theatrical evidence to consider is 'lost' evidence. Though somewhat paradoxical, study of lost evidence can yield surprisingly encouraging results. The study of lost plays, for instance, is proving to be fruitful. An online database and two recent books on the topic attest as much (Steggle and McInnis 2014; Steggle 2015; Knutson, Steggle, and McInnis 2016). Such studies and resources show us there are different degrees of lost. Matthew Steggle and David McInnis discuss, for instance, 744 lost plays from the different types of theatre in the period. Of those, we know anything from the name of the play, through to having surviving scraps of a manuscript or playbook for the work. This is, therefore, a decidedly tenuous class of evidence. Asking too much of the data held in lost plays is tempting. We shall see, for instance, in Chapter Two, the temptation to claim an extant play as a lost play by another name.
One of the more famous lost plays is Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Won* (1595-1596). We know of its existence because of the appearance of its name in Francis Meres' *Palladis Tamia*. We learn that Shakespeare is the best among the English for comedy and that we should witness his *Love's Labour's Won* (Meres 1598, OO2r). Since this mention scholars have sought to locate the play. With no luck in discovering it, scholars have tried to count it as an alternative title for an extant play. Some argue that it is an alternative title for *Taming of the Shrew* (1590-1591) since Meres did not put it in his list (Weis 2008, 158). Such activities were checked, however, when in 1953 a list of books was discovered (and dated to 1603) that named *Love's Labour's Won* next to *The Taming of A Shrew* (Woudhuysen 2014, 79–80). Some critics still cling to the notion that it was an alternative title because the book list names *A Shrew*, a separate play to Shakespeare's *The Shrew* (Weis 2008, 158). Even considering the reference to a different *Shrew* play, Henry Woudhuysen thought it 'unlikely' that *Love's Labour's Won* was *The Taming of the Shrew* by another name (2014, 80). Lost plays are useful for giving us a better sense of the drama created in the period in terms of having more of it to count and more elements to study, but they are difficult to build solid evidence from as this example shows.

**The Nature of Evidence**

The above is a survey of the broad types of evidence this thesis will encounter and the scope and limitations associated with each. By no means is it to be considered exhaustive, but it does tackle some of the major classes of evidence and how we might view them as 'meaningful parts of a past whole' (Ingram 2008, 5). By taking these pieces and applying them in unison this thesis will offer a new account of the theatre industry of Shakespeare's time,
based on fresh discoveries regarding collaborative working and the networks of individuals working in the professional theatre. Before any application occurs though, it serves to consider the notion of evidence itself. All evidence discussed above derives directly (as with company licences) or indirectly (as with doubling charts based on printed playbooks) from written documents. The discussion above weighed the reliability of each type, and any associated problems; what it did not do was consider the reliability of documents themselves as representatives of the class to which they belong. William Ingram summarised just what we can say for certain:

Two things, and only two, can be said unambiguously about surviving documents: one, that they have somehow survived where other similar documents often have not . . . and two, that they contain particularized information set down by a particular writer with greater or lesser coherence depending upon the writer's command of syntax. One cannot go further than this . . . Nor can one presume, even subliminally, that the documents that have not survived would, if found, strengthen the narratives we perceive to be implicit in the ones we already have. (2008, 6)

Indeed, to illustrate his point, Ingram questioned legal depositions and wills, two sources of information considered broadly reliable to the theatre historian. He noted that not only could depositions contain competing narratives – since by definition the parties involved are in dispute about facts – but that they also had no guarantee that they unambiguously represented 'what the deponents said or meant to say' (Ingram 2008, 6). This realization is perturbing to the theatre historian.

For those concerned with 'doing' history, exercising anything more than healthy scepticism when drawing on early modern documents is impractical. There is not enough evidence for historians to demand irreproachable sources, even if they existed, and we might never ascertain anything about the past, however tentative, if we did. My study proceeds from this point with the decidedly fluid nature of its evidence borne in mind. At various points,
each of these classes of evidence will be drawn upon to help better understand the social networks of early modern drama. For some, their use will be to display otherwise unknown links between writers and other theatre professionals. Others will be marshalled to provide facts about people's lives pertinent to, or on the boundaries of, their own network. Through these we are able to garner a sense of the world of early modern theatre via the connections of those who made it up. Biography is particularly important here. Full knowledge of a person's life, and not just an understanding of his professional endeavours, can yield more than knowledge of the professional life alone. Shakespeare studies has known this for some time.

'Shakespeare's only son Hamnet or Hamlet died in August 1596, and his father John was to die in September 1601' (A. Thompson and Taylor 2016, 37); it is difficult, therefore, to 'dismiss the relevance of these experiences to the writing of Hamlet (1600-1601), a play which begins with the death of a father and ends with the death of a son, both called Hamlet' (A. Thompson and Taylor 2016, 37). An appreciation of Hamlet would be poorer for not knowing those facts about Shakespeare's non-professional life. In the same way, David Kathman has outlined the influence of Warwickshire on Shakespeare: 'for one thing,' his 'works are peppered with dialect words from Warwickshire and the West Midlands'; the plays also hold references to people and places from Stratford and the surrounding area (Kathman 2013b, 129). Were we to not know of Shakespeare's Warwickshire origins, we might not spot local references or, worse, we might dismiss dialect words as errors or as marks of inelegance in the writing. Again, knowing Shakespeare's background helps our understanding of his works. This is, however, emphatically not a plea to begin reading biography in an author's works. Rather, it is a call to place each writer's work, wherever possible, in its proper biographical context.
Take one example: George Wilkins, the man whose wife was accused of being a bawd in a legal record covered earlier. He was a writer from around 1607 to around 1610. Because of his background as a brothel keeper, he is readily credited with authoring the Act Four bawdy-house scenes in *Pericles*. These 'feature an unnamed bawd and pandar, and the pandar’s servant, Boult . . . the brothel is evoked in a brisk, businesslike way, and one might think the expertise of Wilkins is a contributory factor in this' (Nicholl 2008c, 222). Stanley Wells is right to assert that 'how much, if any, of it [the depiction of brothel life] derives directly from Wilkins' personal and professional experience we cannot say' (2010, 223). In discussion of Wilkins' works, scholars show an awareness of part of his life away from the stage, and how it might have shaped his literary works. His proximity to Shakespeare has no doubt helped this. What scholars usually neglect to mention, however, is that just as Wilkins began writing, he became a father: he had a daughter, Mary, christened in December 1607, and a son, Thomas, christened in February 1610 (Eccles 1982, 131). Mary died in infancy, and was buried in September 1609 (Eccles 1982, 131). Were this Shakespeare, there would be books devoted to the process of fatherhood and the literary inspiration it brought forth. There would have been links, tenuous though they might be, between the naming of a child 'Mary' and a character called 'Marina' who appears in *Pericles*. Scholars would have agonized over the impact the loss of a child had on literary production, apparently ending it in Wilkins' case.

This thesis will ground its writings on various theatrical figures in an awareness of their non-theatrical or non-literary biographies as well as their professional careers. It might be the case, of course, that during a discussion of their theatrical life we dismiss part of that non-theatrical biography as irrelevant. Examination and dismissal is acceptable; what we must avoid is ignorance of biographical fact. Biographical data, then, are central to this study. In
working with the types of evidence outlined above this thesis is concerned with the microscopic and the macroscopic levels of attention. The minutiae of who was where when and with whom, the day-to-day interactions of people in the London theatre, and the various life-points we can plot for each person, might be discerned from the documents themselves. The large-scale considerations like how drama was co-authored, and how much of it was co-authored, what distinguishing traits marked the population of early modern playwrights, and where links between theatre professionals were most likely to occur, are to be extrapolated from employing the surviving records taken together.
Chapter 2. The 1590s: The Social Networks of the 1594 Duopoly and Beyond

How do we best organize the amassed facts of theatre history to tell as complete a narrative as possible? Scholars have covered the ground in numerous ways. 'For centrality' Scott McMillin declared in a review of Andrew Gurr's *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, 'there is nothing like the acting companies' (1999b, 383). Indeed, McMillin believed in his assertion because he published, along with Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and their Plays*, the first fully developed biographical study of an early modern acting company. There have been several company-based histories written since: Gurr gave us *The Shakespeare Company, 1594-1642* and *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company, 1594-1625*; the introduction mentioned Lucy Munro's *Children of the Queen's Revels: A Jacobean Theatre Repertory*; and, in 2014 Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean published *Lord Strange's Men and their Plays*. Clearly historians agree that studying the acting companies offers a useful way to organize the evidence and present the facts of early modern dramatic production.

There have been other approaches to presenting our knowledge of theatre history, however. Edwin Nungezer (1929), and, latterly, David Kathman (2005, 2015) focussed on the actors involved, the constituent parts of the companies. Kathman subdivided the category, publishing on boy actors and guild members in acting companies (2004a, 2005). Glynne Wickham separated the world of early theatre into playing spaces (1959-1981); Lukas Erne (2003, 2013) and Zachary Lesser (2004) have structured narratives around printing and the book trade; James Shapiro has sliced theatre history temporally with his *1599* and *1606* (2006, 2015). Bernard Beckerman (1971) and William Ingram (1978) made studies of theatre owners and managers Philip Henslowe and Francis Langley, respectively. Studies of
playwrights and their works, and William Shakespeare in particular, have been the most popular and outnumber all others in this field combined. Elsewhere, E. K. Chambers (Chambers 1923a, 1:vii–viii) and G. E. Bentley (1941a) collected the facts of early modern theatre history as they saw them.

Though useful methods for presentation, none of those listed here offers the best approach for interpreting the relationships of the early modern theatre, and analysing the impact these relationships had on the drama. Their problems are twofold. First, they prompt difficult questions of categorization. Where might we place Nathan Field, for instance? He began his career as an actor, before going on to write plays as well (R. F. Brinkley 1928). He first belonged to the Children of the Chapel (Astington 2010, 53) before joining, as two companies merged, the Lady Elizabeth's Men and later moved to the King's men (Williams 2004). Similarly, where might James Burbage belong: with actors or theatre owners and managers? He performed on stage for Leicester's men and the Queen's men, but he built the Theatre in Shoreditch too (Edmond 2004). Secondly, studies covering a stated facet of theatre history are bounded by it. A discussion of the men involved in financing the Whitefriars playhouse might be, necessarily, curtailed or omitted from a study pertaining to the Admiral's men.

In this chapter, and those that follow, I construct a narrative that necessarily sprawls across such boundaries. Indeed, the moments of intersection between groups within the theatre are often those most interesting when considering theatrical networks. In an attempt to show how people's relationships influenced the drama the age produced, this thesis will traverse connections between people, heading outside the theatrical world and back in, as necessary. This is not an effort to cover breadth at the expense of depth: some arguments will
demand tackling the minutiae of people's lives. By negotiating the connections between companies, playhouses, actors, patrons, playwrights, managers, financiers and any other figures who make incursions into the theatrical world this thesis will showcase the importance of the networks of theatre professionals involved in creating and staging drama in the early modern period. The Lord Admiral's and Lord Chamberlain's men, in this chapter, will sometimes serve as a foundation and sometimes as a pivot. They were, as has been shown by others and as will be detailed below, the dominant theatrical companies of the 1590s and therefore provide a good base from which to start a narrative. The theorized duopoly they held over the London stage from 1594 will be outlined and weighed in detail; dramatic activity outside the apparent duopoly will be considered too.

With a promise to allow my narrative to sprawl across boundaries, why then focus a chapter on the 1590s? As noted in the Introduction, a decade is used as a rough period with which to bound discussion, rather than a hard-edged container used to exclude data. There is, of course, a practical element at play too: this thesis cannot address all of theatre history. The 1590s specifically have long been a focus for theatre historians because of the apparent discord among theatres and theatre personnel. The decade also receives special attention because it was Shakespeare's first full decade in the industry. Two of the period's major companies formed in the middle of the decade, in 1594, and this too has caused a good deal of interest among theatre historians, most notably with Andrew Gurr's theory of an official duopoly for those two companies. Other times in the decade have been seen as characterised by rivalry and competition too. The completion of the Swan theatre, near the Rose on Bankside, for instance, meant greater competition for actors and audiences (Mateer 2009, 61). Below we meet further examples – discord, deaths, defections – that have led scholars to assume a fractious industry in this decade.
It is because of the apparent upheaval that this chapter focusses on the 1590s. As we shall see, the decade comprises a number of events against which to test my hypothesis (that a study of theatre people's social networks can show a cooperative industry rather than a combative one). Selecting a decade that is often thought of as fractious means a network-centred approach to theatre history receives a stern test. In taking such an approach, we can add further evidence to claims that theatre people got along well with one another in general (Knutson 2001b). Studying specific networks that span the decade, such as those of Anthony Munday and Richard Bradshaw, can show us the importance of social networks in the professional theatre. The case studies below, for example, show cooperation and trust between working members of apparently competing companies, amongst much else.

**The 1594 Duopoly**

Though the concept of a duopoly structure for theatre in 1590s London is synonymous with the 'master narrative' of Andrew Gurr (McMillin 1999b, 382), the term was originally applied by Richard Dutton (1991, 110–11). A 1598 Privy Council edict that declared 'licence hath bin graunted unto two companies of stage players retayned unto us, the Lord Admyral and Lord Chamberlain, to use and practise stage playes' (Chambers 1923b, 4:325) led Dutton to conclude that this had 'effectively created a duopoly of the acting profession in and around the capital' (1991, 111). Dutton made little of it as a defining moment in Elizabethan theatre, as his concern was with official attempts to supress playing more generally. Gurr took the Council's declaration as indicative of a previous ruling and rewound it to May 1594 when 'Henry Carey as Lord Chamberlain and Charles Howard, the Lord Admiral, first set up their two new companies' (2005, 52). This was the formation of an officially sanctioned two-
The Queen's men, according to McMillin and MacLean, had enjoyed a 'virtual London monopoly' but 'a major reorganization of the acting companies was occurring in 1594 and the result was that two other companies were established as the most powerful in the city' (1998, 49–50). It must be noted that McMillin and MacLean were writing in full knowledge of Gurr's duopoly theory and it is difficult to see them asserting such a 'major reorganization' of the theatre without it. The duopoly, Gurr's narrative runs, was a solution to the official petitioning of the Lord Mayor and city fathers to ban playing in the city of London. The arrangement contrived by Carey and Howard 'appeased the Lord Mayor by agreeing to ban all playing at the city inns where plays had been staged regularly in the past. Instead they allocated their companies to playhouses out in the suburbs, both of which belonged to people with whom the two Councillors already had long contact' (Gurr 2009, 3). Carey was not simply mollifying the Lord Mayor, however. As well as having an acting company stamped with his name, he was motivated by the 'recent deaths of some major patrons (Sussex on 14 December 1593 and . . . Ferdinando Strange, now Earl of Derby, on 16 April [1594]), and the trouble he had setting up the Queen’s Christmas entertainment through the previous season' (Gurr 2004b, 43).

The case for a theatrical duopoly is strengthened by Privy Council minutes from 1598 and 1600 that seem to iterate a two company system. The first is cited above; the second, dated June 22 1600, reads:
First, that there shall bee about the Cittie two howses and noe more allowed to serue for the vse of the Common Stage plaies, of the which howses one shalbe in Surrey in that place which is Commonlie called the banckside or there aboutes, and the other in Midlesex. And foras muche as there Lordshippes haue bin enformed by Edmond Tylney Esquire, hir Maiesties seruant and Master of the Reuellis, that the howse now in hand to be builte by the said Edward Allen is not intended to encrease the number of the Plaiehowses, but to be in steed of an other, namelie the Curtaine, Which is either to be ruined and plucked downe or to be putt to some other good vse . . . And especiallie yt is forbidden that anie stage plaies shalbe plaied (as sometimes they haue bin) in any Common Inn for publique assemblie in or neare about the Cittie. Secondlie, forasmuche as these stage plaies, by the multitude of houses and Companie of players, haue bin too frequent, not seruing for recreacion but inviting and Callinge the people daily from there trad and worke to mispend there t ime. It is likewise ordered that the two seuerall Companies of Plaiers assigned vnto the two howses allowed maie play each of them in there seuerall howse twice a weeke and noe oftener, and especially that they shall refraine to play on the Sabboth daie, vppon paine of imprisonment and further penaltie. (Chambers 1923b, 4:330–31)

Certainly, the tenor of the order is severe: officially two companies were allowed and they could perform no more than twice a week. And yet, as we saw in the previous chapter, an official decree does not guarantee adherence: the need to reissue guidance on the proposed two company policy, twice, (accepting for the moment Gurr's imagined record of 1594) suggests there was more theatrical activity than was officially desired.

Surviving data help us measure how seriously acting companies took this announcement with its threat of imprisonment and its ominous offer of 'further penaltie'. Philip Henslowe's accounts catalogue how much was taken each day at his playhouse. By checking receipts for the periods before and immediately after the Council's edict, we can assess whether companies did adhere to performing only twice a week. If the receipts remain broadly stable, that is Henslowe took roughly the same amounts of money before the order as after it, we can reasonably infer that there were not fewer performances; if, however, receipts drop it would be a clear signal that Henslowe had decreased the number of performances per week. Were companies to take one part of the ruling seriously by dropping performances, it
would be a good indicator that they might be willing to take the rest of it seriously too. Were the records to show that they did not cut performances, it might mean that they were less likely to follow the rest of the Council's mandate. In the first half of the 1590s Henslowe catalogued gate receipt by day. Because of this we know that when *Doctor Faustus* (1592) played on the 30 September 1594 it took £3 12s, and that the following day's offering, *The Ranger's Comedy* (1594), took a meagre 10 shillings (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 24). These represent two extremes, with average receipts running to some tens of shillings each day. Unfortunately, Henslowe's records run only through to July 1600, roughly a month after the Council's order. Additionally, by this time he had changed his record keeping to only register a total gate per week, rather than per day. Knowing an average day's take from the itemised records of the 1590s means a rough calculation can determine whether the company were performing twice each week, or more than twice. Henslowe's weekly records extend for three weeks beyond the 22 June announcement: in the week ending the 1 July 1600 Henslowe logged a take of £5 8s; in the week ending the 6 July 1600 Henslowe logged a take of £4 7s; and, in the week ending 13 July 1600 Henslowe logged a take of £4 7s (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 121). Thus, the weekly receipts in shillings were 108s, 87s and 87s. Immediately before the Council's decision to only allow two performances a week, Henslowe's receipts in June 1600 had been: 97s, 131s, 73s, and 142s. A look back further through Henslowe's accounts suggests this sort of fluctuation was fairly regular and that July's receipts were in line with those of previous months. As a result, it appears that the Admiral's men at least didn't initially drop to two performances a week.

This method of assessment is patently imperfect. Henslowe's records do not extend as far beyond the 1600 Council minute as one would like: it might simply be that the Admiral's men did fall in line, but they dragged their feet in doing so, meaning their receipts from, say
1601 indicate only two performances per week. It is also open to the charge of only assessing a group of actors inside the decreed duopoly; they might behave differently to those outside it. However, the second half of the order directly admonishes those who have the right to act, but have been encouraging people to 'mispend there time'. If those permitted to act are happy to disregard the Council's pronouncements then others, outside the duopoly, would likely do so too.

Where there does seem to have been adherence to the Council's order is at court. Perhaps this is unsurprising given that court performances would have been arranged by the Master of the Revels (deputy to the Lord Chamberlain) who might have had no option but to follow the Council's edict. Gurr showed how no company, beyond the Chamberlain's men and the Admiral's men, performed at court between 1594 and 1600: each company played three times in the court season of 1594-95; the Chamberlain's played four times and the Admiral's three the following year; in the 1596-97 season only the Chamberlain's men performed (six times); and, in the next year, the Chamberlain's men played four times and the Admiral's two (1993, 165). Here, at least, the duopoly appears to have held firm.

Gurr's theory is not without flaws, or detractors willing to highlight them. Holger Schott Syme traced the genesis of the hypothesis to Gurr's 1987 piece in *Shakespeare Quarterly* on 'Intertextuality at Windsor' and its 'first full treatment' to Gurr's 1993 article titled 'Three Reluctant Patrons and Early Shakespeare' in the same journal (2010, 493). The duopoly theory has since been restated in many of Gurr's publications. McMillin has sounded a note of caution when discussing Gurr's duopoly 'deal': the theory is, in *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, referenced so frequently that 'the hypothesis presents itself after a while as virtual fact' (McMillin 1999b, 383). Gurr, perhaps unsurprisingly, does not show such
caution. In his most recent retelling of the duopoly, in *Shakespeare's Opposites*, he conceded that it 'is only a hypothesis' before averring, in his own self-assessment, that 'it gives by far the best explanation of the available evidence' (Gurr 2009, 3).

Critique of the duopoly has come from several quarters. Syme was happy to concede the dominance of the two companies at court but, in a discussion of the Chamberlain's men, claimed that 'we have next to no knowledge of their commercial fortunes. They probably did well, but who their competition was in London and whether the situation at court mirrored the situation of the public stages is completely unclear' (2012, 280). He went on to make a particular objection to the theory, arguing that the number of viable playhouses around London 'throughout much of the 1590s' (the Theatre, the Curtain, the Rose; with a fourth, the Swan, built in 1595) outnumbered the supposedly allowed companies (Syme 2012, 280). Another obvious point against adopting Gurr's arguments wholesale is the total lack of documentary support: it is not until the Privy Council minute of 1598 that the suggestion of a two company model appears in the surviving historical record. Even in the years from 1598, when the duopoly arrangement has documentary support, some evidence appears to contradict it. Despite the closure of the Swan in 1598, its owner, Francis Langley, according to his biographer 'was not yet finished as an entrepreneur at the Swan' (Ingram 1978, 208). Indeed, the Swan remained open until 1628. This suggests that the theatrical world had room for more than the two officially recognized companies. More telling is that The Boar's Head playhouse was built inside the city walls in 1598, and expanded in 1599, where it initially housed Derby's men (H. Berry 1986, 29–37). Once more, edicts are no guarantee of observance. Roslyn L. Knutson has also grappled with Gurr's duopoly and found it wanting: 'the designation of 1594 as special necessarily labels routine behavior as risky, desperate, even commercially suicidal' (2010, 450). Where others have seen the duopoly as a steadying
influence, bringing the 'first, unstable phase of London-based playing companies' to an end, ushering in 'the second, much more stable phase' (Schoone-Jongen 2008, 84), Knutson found, and demonstrated, that there was no such instability. She showed that 'circumstances tagged as signs of trouble from 1588 to 1593 were in fact normal and continue beyond 1594 to characterize theatrical commerce' (Knutson 2010, 450).

Certainly the evidence is not entirely weighted in favour of a duopoly created in 1594. Clearly there was an officially mandated two company system from 1598, and a duopolistic sharing of court performances. However, there is also good evidence to suggest that the two company system was not readily adhered to, that there were more than the officially allowed number of playhouses operating, and that practices held to be irregular before 1594 carried on afterwards. Bart van Es offered a useful summary: 'Gurr's famous account of the establishment of a duopoly is a strong theory rather than a hard fact of history' (2013, 101). For what follows, the veracity of the duopoly narrative of 1594 is not central. It will be useful to consider the theatre historical facts around it, but without the aim of adding weight one way or another.

Whether occupying a duopoly or not, the two companies formed in 1594 are a helpful place to begin a discussion of the networks of the 1590s drama, not least because scholars have used the organization of one of the new companies to explain various important theatrical phenomena. Take, for instance, Es' assertion that 'from 1594 onwards Shakespeare was writing from inside a company of known acting talents' and that his inclusion in the Chamberlain's men made him 'remarkable not only for his exceptional talents, but also for his exceptional position within a larger whole' (2007). He discerned a change in Shakespeare's drama at roughly the time the Lord Chamberlain's men were formed. 'The distinctive feature
of Shakespeare's dramaturgy', from *Richard II* (1595) onwards, 'is the relationship within and between clusters of characters' (Es 2007). Perhaps more convincing are his counts of the size of major parts in plays written around or immediately after the company's creation (*Richard II, Romeo and Juliet* (1595), *The Merchant of Venice* (1596-1597)): 'the size of roles across the principal parts is remarkably equal: the largest differing from the second largest by no more than fifty lines' (Es 2007). These plays 'look very much like dramas composed with a company of mixed talents in mind' is van Es' conclusion (2007). If so, Es hits on a major impact of the creation of the Chamberlain's men: the professional binding of (an actor-sharer-) playwright to a company and its actors.

This is not however, a point for generalization. The 1590s did not signal a rise in playwrights becoming 'regular professionals, or attached professionals', the phrase of Gerald Eades Bentley we met in Chapter One (1971, 37). These were men who had a 'closer and more continuous association with the London theatres than the others' and who 'did not easily or frequently shift their company associations, but tended to work regularly for one troupe for long periods' (Bentley 1971, 30). Indeed, Es developed the idea of Shakespeare as being anomalous in this respect in *Shakespeare in Company*: he devoted a chapter to 'Shakespeare's Singularity' (2013, 125–46). Es' conception of Shakespeare's attachment to the Chamberlain's men from 1594 implies that his professional network was narrowed to those within his company. His plays were influenced by the internal politics of running an acting company and writing 'within a company of relative equals' (Es 2013, 146). In a powerful counterblast however, Knutson averred that Es 'isolates' Shakespeare 'from the business at the Rose and the newly built Swan... he and his company were looking out to these competitors as they readied for business in 1594' (Knutson 2007). This is important to remember in the following chapters: the high intensity with which some vertices are traversed in a network is not
necessarily at the total expense of lower intensity vertices. That is, just because Shakespeare was working more frequently with those in his new company – and, we meet an explicit example of this in the Conclusion – it does not mean he did so entirely at the expense of his pre-existing theatrical relationships.

Though he may well have been looking outward, Shakespeare began working more intensely with fewer theatre professionals in 1594: his professional network narrowed. His career had begun with a flurry of co-authored plays, written for several acting troupes. Parts two and three of Henry 6 (both 1591) were perhaps written with Christopher Marlowe; the prequel, 1 Henry 6 (1591-1592), was written with Thomas Nashe; and Titus Andronicus (1591-1592), was written with George Peele (Jackson 1996; Vickers 2007; Vincent 2001; Craig and Burrows 2012). He wrote Edward III (1592-1593) with Thomas Kyd, and Arden of Faversham (1588) with person or persons unknown (S. Wells et al. 1997; Jackson 2006). These early plays, according to their title pages, were staged by Pembroke's men, Derby's men and Sussex's men (Farmer and Lesser 2007). Before 1594 his network had to be broader: he wrote for more companies, had to write lines for more actors and perhaps engaged with more dramatic patrons. This provides a markedly different picture to Shakespeare's work after 1594: he switched to sole-authorship and wrote, to the best of our knowledge, for the Chamberlain's men alone. He would not co-author another play until the seventeenth century. This might not have been an artistic choice. Three of Shakespeare's four early collaborators died before or just after the Chamberlain's men's creation: Marlowe died in 1593 (Nicholl 2008a), Kyd died in the summer of 1594 (Mulryne 2004) and Peele held on only a little longer, dying in 1596 (Barbour 2004). Nashe made it to 1601 (Nicholl 2008b).
Consideration of Shakespeare as a co-author before his inclusion into the Chamberlain's men might simply be of a junior playwright learning his craft for a few years before casting off the shackles of the novice and striking out alone. The case is made by some scholars that this is how a dramatic career begins (Carson 1988, 60; Maguire and Smith 2013, 115) and such a case is restated and substantiated in Chapter Four. Shakespeare's dramatic apprenticeship is somewhat unconventional, however. His early collaborations were with writers only moderately more experienced than he was: Marlowe was the same age as Shakespeare and was the author of only four plays at the point of collaboration (Kuriyama 2010); Thomas Nashe was three years Shakespeare's junior and had written only one (possibly two) plays before they wrote 1 Henry 6 (Nicholl 2008b); and, George Peele had written only five plays before Titus Andronicus (Chambers 1923d, 3:458–64). Quite why Shakespeare began this way is difficult to ascertain. All his collaborators were university graduates with other literary forms of income, perhaps making them safe options to use as a springboard. Marlowe and Peele, like Shakespeare, wrote poetry, and Nashe was a pamphleteer and satirist (Kinney 2012b).

Shakespeare may not have been in a position to choose collaborators, of course: he might have had to take whatever offers he could get as the newcomer in the early 1590s or late 1580s. This is an important consideration given the history of Shakespeare's play-texts after 1594. We might also bear in mind that 'it was the acting company, which, under normal circumstances, controlled what we should call the copyright of his play' (Bentley 1971, 62). Copyright here related to performance as Lukas Erne has explained: 'unless a contract specifically forbade playwrights to have their plays published, what the acting company acquired from the author was the exclusive right to perform the play rather than a copyright in anything resembling its modern sense' (2002, 3). Consider the 1594 quarto of Titus
Andronicus. Its title page lists Derby's, Pembroke's and Sussex's men all as performing it, surely suggesting a more fluid sense of company ownership than supposed by Erne and Bentley above. This argument is not immediately concerned with its early company provenance (this gets fuller treatment elsewhere, see George 1981; McMillin 1991; Syme 2012). It is, however, concerned with its arrival in the hands of the Chamberlain's men as attested by the title page of the 1600 quarto (Farmer and Lesser 2007).

On the formation of the duopoly, Andrew Gurr decided, the Chamberlain's men 'acquired all of Shakespeare's earlier plays, including the first histories he had written or shared the writing of up to the hugely popular Richard III (1592-1593), along with his early comedies and his one tragedy Titus Andronicus' (Gurr 2009, 4). On the other side, the Admiral's men 'took all the Marlowe plays that Alleyn had made his name with' as well as 'a variety of plays that Alleyn had purchased over the years from Robert Peele [sic: George Peele] and other writers' (Gurr 2009, 4). Interestingly, in Gurr's apportioning of plays to companies, directly in line with their authors, he overlooked the co-authorship of Titus. Why should the play automatically pass to Shakespeare and the Chamberlain's men? If we presume that playwrights were somehow in control of their texts, as Gurr seemed to, might not Peele, as the more established writer, be closer to controlling the rights for Titus? Gurr asserted that in the formation of the duopoly 'each company took up players from a variety of former groups' and that the Chamberlain's took Richard Burbage as well as 'others who had been in the Earl of Pembroke's Men, almost certainly including Shakespeare' and 'several players from the recently deceased Lord Strange's, later the Earl of Derby's Men' (Gurr 2009, 4). Shakespeare's near certain attachment, in Gurr's estimation, to Pembroke's men, as well as other members of the newly formed Chamberlain's men, might better explain how Titus eventually made its way to them. And yet Syme has shown that neither of the 'two court-
favoured troupes . . . appears to have had an exclusive right to associate itself with the works' of Shakespeare or Marlowe (Syme 2012, 275).

The title pages of parts two and three *Henry 6* give Pembroke's as their company before they made the transition to the Chamberlain's men. As an additional problem, Pembroke's men were bankrupt by August 1593 (G. Taylor 1997, 113). This leaves a lacuna of nearly 10 months between the Pembroke's men's bankruptcy and the formation of the Chamberlain's men. It is difficult to imagine a company of actors not finding work elsewhere, or sitting on possibly lucrative playscripts in the hope that a new company might be formed and that they might make the cut. Alternatively, Holger Schott Syme, following William Ingram's lead, proposed that the 'play was performed by the same set of players acting as three different companies in succession' (Syme 2012, 281–82). The collapsing of company boundaries, or the free movement of members between acting companies encapsulates Shakespeare's dramatic network at the beginning of his career. He collaborated widely, and likely acted widely too; he would have met most of the London acting fraternity before becoming attached to the Chamberlain's men.

The figuring of Shakespeare, or his work, as somehow central to the events of 1594 rather than simply part of it is an impulse that might be checked. Just as a theatre historian might untangle which companies did what and when at one crux, a move through history presents another. Shakespeare's inclusion in one particular moment of assumed upheaval does not necessarily mark it as special. As Knutson has remarked, 'a Shakespeare-centric reading of theater history' means 'scholars have an investment in 1594 as a special year' (2010, 467). Syme echoed, and expanded, the same point thus: 'literary history has come to value Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare above all other Elizabethan playwrights, and
their centrality to the modern canon has been projected back into the 1590s. In hindsight, they appear just as indispensable to the repertories of the Admiral’s Men and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men as they are to the history of English literature’ (2010, 491). This might overstate the case somewhat. There is good evidence that the writing of these two men was successful (generally and in relation to their peers) in the 1590s. Marlowe's 1 and 2 Tamburlaine the Great (1587, 1588) went through five editions in the 15 years from 1590 to 1605 and there were dozens of editions of Shakespeare's plays by the same date (Farmer and Lesser 2007). Despite these facts, scholars like Knutson and Syme count Shakespeare's presence as not being pivotal to the events around 1594. They see the supremacy of Shakespeare in the modern imagination and figure other scholars as reflecting such supremacy back onto the 1590s, assuming that Shakespeare must have been central to the happenings of that decade, 1594 in particular. Scholars like Syme and Knutson, rightly, caution against this reverse engineering of history and encourage a broader view of theatrical society. With Shakespeare not by default at the centre of the theatrical milieu, we can broaden our gaze to the other people involved in the creation of Renaissance drama in 1590s London.

Rivalry in the Early Modern Theatre

The single largest group of people involved in the production of drama – playwrights, actors, managers, musicians – were actors. Their lives have been given some limited treatment by scholars. As cited above, works tend to focus on them in encyclopaedic fashion, merely cataloguing their existence. There is not a single book-length study of a Renaissance actor, unless, like Shakespeare or Nathan Field, they wrote as well as performed. Any biographical attention they do receive is considerably outweighed by that offered to
playwrights. Admittedly, dramatists typically created more data that could survive them, namely their writing. Even so, they occupy an outsized portion of early modern theatre biographies. And it cannot just be a question of surviving information: biographers have been moved to tackle other theatre personnel – like managers and financiers – without an oeuvre to draw on. Ingram wrote a monograph on Francis Langley (1978) and S. P. Cerasano, admittedly with the diary to draw on, is preparing a biography of Philip Henslowe. By point of example, the editors of the online *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)* give Shakespeare, undeniably somewhat of an aberration, an entry of 37,322 words compared to Richard Burbage's 3,187. Even in comparing those without Shakespeare's cultural status the disparity is stark. Christopher Marlowe's entry runs to 8,952 words, against Edward Alleyn's 3,111. The other best known actors of the period have modest entries: Will Kemp's entry has 3,240 words; Robert Armin's 1,240; Augustine Phillips' 1,075; Henry Condell's 1,299; and John Heminges' 1,306. Playwrights, almost ubiquitously, have more said about them. In addition to full biographies by scholars, the *ODNB*’s entries for Thomas Dekker (3,786 words), Philip Massinger (5,940), Francis Beaumont (3,329) and John Fletcher (5,777) far outstrip those of Renaissance actors. This survey is simply drawn from those I consider to be most frequently counted as among the 'biggest names' in both categories; it is my submission that a full survey of early modern playwrights and actors in the *ODNB* would mirror this trend. When the figures become more obscure, their treatment becomes starker still. Searches in the *ODNB* for the actors William Bird, or Richard Bradshaw, both discussed below, are fruitless, but queries for unfamiliar dramatists Gervase Markham and Thomas Nabbes yield entries (1,616 and 1,242 words respectively). And yet, despite this gap, there is plenty to be gleaned about the networks and practices of early theatre from a study of the lives of actors.
Earlier generations of theatre historians conceived the relationships between acting companies in the 1590s as fraught. Charles W. Wallace, in his study *The First London Theatre*, saw a feud between actors as suggestive of animosity between companies (Wallace 1913). Others followed (Greg 1931). And, on cursory examination, there's evidence to support the conjecture. First, it fits broadly into a parallel narrative: not only, so the argument runs, did actors not get along in the early modern theatre, they also had a strained relationship with the managers of their theatres. Philip Henslowe, while managing the Rose and its personnel, was, in at least one account, a 'driving taskmaster' who seemed 'chiefly to aim at binding his hacks more securely to him so that he would not be forced to face a competitive market on every play' (T. W. Baldwin 1961, 28). Elsewhere, Henslowe's practices, his 'hard dealings', provoked formal complaints from actors in the form of 'Articles of Grievance and Oppression against Philip Henslowe' (Carson 1988, 4, 31–33). It is perhaps easier to consider disharmony in one dimension (between actors) if it is apparent in a second (between actors and managers) and this may have been part of the reason scholars have perpetuated a belief in feuding companies. In Chapter Three we meet further evidence, in some minds, for prolonged rivalries between acting companies.

The second set of evidence making the notion of perpetual discord in the theatre plausible is incontestable moments of acrimony that survive in the historical record. Notably, universal harmony does not leave as much of a record in the legal system as conflict does. Charles W. Wallace based a significant portion of his reasoning on a legal dispute turned street brawl between James Burbage and Margaret Brayne and Robert Myles (Wallace 1913, 49). James Burbage had built the Theatre with John Brayne, Margaret's husband, in 1576 (H. Berry 2002, 93). They became embroiled in a legal dispute over how much more Brayne had contributed, financially, to the Theatre's building and how much subsequent expense Burbage
had incurred and hence how much each of the two men should be able to withdraw from the proceeds of performances (H. Berry 1993, 186). Burbage also entered into two bonds with Brayne, with one worth £200 that 'guaranteed that he would carry out the terms of the arbitrament' and one worth £400 that confirmed 'he would eventually give Brayne formal ownership of half the enterprise' (H. Berry 1993, 186). Following John Brayne's death his widow, along with her 'protector and, finally, heir', Robert Miles, sued 'Burbage in King's Bench on the bonds'; Burbage countersued in Chancery in 1588 (H. Berry 1993, 186). The records of the lawsuits contain 'colorful depositions' that 'conjure for us a sometimes comic picture of events at the Theatre', upon which a plank of Wallace's argument was based (Leinwand 2004, 65). Brayne and Miles (given below with the alternative spelling of Myles) confronted Burbage at the theatre:

Here was Burbage, according to John Alleyn (innholder, player, and brother of Edward), shouting "hang her hor . . . she getteth nothing here" . . . and defying the Court of Chancery, "saying/ that yf ther were xx contemptes/ and as many Injunctios he wold wtstand them all/ before he wold lose his possession" . . . . After Richard Burbage had turned away Brayne and Myles with a "Broome staff," the elder Burbage warned that "at ther next coming [he would] provyde charged Pistolles wt powder and hemspede/ to shoote them in the legges" . . . . The soapmaker Nicholas Bishop heard Burbage call Myles "Rascall & knave" . . . . "Burbage told the said Robert Myles/ that he had but A paper [the Chancery order]/ wch he might wype his tale wt/ and rather then he wold lose his possession/ he wold commit xx contemptes" . . . . Moments later young Richard Burbage was "playing wt" Bishop's nose and threatening to beat him. (Leinwand 2004, 65)

It was the perceived anger between John Alleyn and James Burbage that prompted Wallace to theorize a wider rivalry between the Admiral's and Chamberlain's men. At the end of the twentieth century, Mary Edmond questioned this figuring of the lawsuits exchanged by Burbage and the Brayne parties (Edmond 1996). Scott McMillin, too, questioned the generalized assumptions of previous scholars about James and Richard Burbage's relationship through the dispute. He entertained the possibility (though was explicit in not building any history on the assumption) that Richard Burbage, after the controversy, might have taken up
with the other side, and considered moving from the company playing at the Theatre to the company newly moved to the Rose (McMillin 1988, 57–58). Nevertheless, even if we were to be stripped of this example of theatrical discord, more present themselves that help add weight to the claim that actors did not get along.

While on tour with the Queen's men in June 1587, William Knell, one evening, drew his sword and attacked John Towne 'for reasons unknown' (P. Thompson 2004). In self-defence (according to the coroner's inquest) Towne pushed his sword through Knell's neck; Knell died later that evening (P. Thompson 2004). Ben Jonson, an actor as well as a playwright, at least in the early part of his career, was indicted for manslaughter in 1598; he had killed another actor, Gabriel Spencer, in a duel (Donaldson 2013). Spencer, interestingly, had, according to a coroner's report 'slain James Feake with a rapier in the house of Richard East' (Chambers 1923c, 2:341). Sometimes quarrels did not result in killings. On at least one occasion, in addition to that of Burbage versus Brayne cited above, actors brought their disagreements before the courts. By February 1597, noted David Mateer, Richard Jones and Thomas Downton had 'defected' from the Admiral's company at Henslowe's Rose to Francis Langley's newer theatre south of the river, the Swan (2009, 63). Though perhaps irksome to Henslowe, and unlikely to prompt affection, 'players could apparently move from one troupe to the next with relative ease' (Mateer 2009, 61). This alone, therefore, is not substantial enough to assume general discord between companies. However, Mateer's article detailed a third actor who made the same jump, an adolescent named Richard Perkins or Parkyns, but whose defection brought a lawsuit from Edward Alleyn (Mateer 2009). Perkins was retained as Alleyn's servant for three years from 26 November 1596 but he had left the company only five months into his term. Following a documented exchange, and with Perkins failing to make court appearances, the 'plea rolls fall silent on the matter' leading Mateer to conclude
that it was 'more than likely' he returned to the Rose, given the favourable legal weighting for employers in such matters (2009, 65–67).

Clearly there were times when actors, or perhaps companies, because of the actions of their members, failed to get along. There are some immediate problems with drawing general conclusions here, however. The preceding chapter outlined why – given that Henslowe's company at the Rose can be shown in at least one case to not serve as an exemplar for practice across all companies – the practices of Philip Henslowe might not be representative of the management of every Renaissance theatre company. Thus, other actors might not have suffered the oppression that scholars have assumed marked those working with Henslowe. As also discussed in the preceding chapter, coroner's inquests and legal cases are designed to provide a formal record, and are likely to offer a skewed view to historians considering them as a complete sample. When considering actors' working relationships, we have no idea how many disputes never made it to some form of formal arbitration or how many disagreements escalated to violence but stopped short of official sanction. It seems reasonable to suspect there would have been significantly more than those that made official records.

Grappling with just this issue, Roslyn L. Knutson has made a strong case by presenting evidence leading to the opposite conclusion: that actors, for the most part, shared a fraternal bond, like that shared by members of a medieval guild (2001b, 10). Their networks, and their companies' commercial activity, were tied to a model of cooperation. She lists 14 actors, for a start, who were freeman of a guild; men who would have understood that the guild's design offered 'stability for the company when beset by misfortunes such as changes in membership, changes in patronage, playhouse closures, and personal quarrels' (Knutson 2001b, 22–23). Knutson went on to adduce further evidence for a collegial existence among
Renaissance players. Their wills, for she took Augustine Phillips as an exemplar, show the depth of bond felt in the theatrical community. Phillips included Christopher Beeston, the actor and theatre manager, 'among his legatees': Beeston had 'left the Chamberlain's Men to join Worcester's Men by 1602' and his inclusion in Phillips' will was sure evidence for Knutson that 'changes in affiliation' were not necessarily accompanied by 'hard feelings' (Knutson 2001b, 26). According to Knutson, 'the identities of legatees' in Phillips' Will 'illustrate a joining of professional and personal lives that was common among (but not exclusive to) members of guilds' (Knutson 2001b, 27–28).

She detailed a host of marriages between theatre personnel. These strongly indicated amiable relations between actors: Phillips' sister, Elizabeth had married Robert Gough; John Heminges married the widow of William Knell, the stabbed actor mentioned above; Thomas Greene, of Worcester's men, married Susan Browne the former wife of Robert Browne, 'most likely the leader of Derby's Men' (Knutson 2001b, 28). E. A. J. Honigmann and Susan Brock also noted that with actors remaining in 'the profession for life... Inevitably they married into each other's families' (1993, 5). Some acting families went further, and christened children after one another. Richard Cowley, of the Chamberlain's men, named a son 'Cuthbert' in May 1597; 'the fact that Cuthbert Burbage was one witness at Cowley's deathbed in 1618 makes reasonable the assumption that Cuthbert Cowley was Burbage's namesake and godchild' (Knutson 2001b, 29). There was also 'Burbage Underwood' son of John Underwood (Knutson 2001b, 29), Beaumont Ostler, named, assumedly, after Francis Beaumont, and Swanston Namecott, likely after Ellyard Swanston (Honigmann and Brock 1993, 6).

Players lived close to their playhouses, and, as a result, close to each other. This added to Knutson's arguments about neighbourly relations between players. Augustine Phillips lived...
in Southwark alongside Alexander Cooke, Will Kemp, Robert Gough and William Sly (Knutson 2001b, 30). Many of the Admiral's men lived in the parish of St Saviour's, Southwark in the 1590s: Edward Alleyn, Richard Alleyn, William Bird, Thomas Downton, Edward Dutton, Anthony Jeffes, Humphrey Jeaffes, Richard Jones, Edward Juby, Thomas Marbeck, Robert Shaa, John Singer, Martin Slater, and Thomas Towne; Robert Pallant and Henry Chettle, the publisher and playwright, made it to the parish after 1600 (Knutson 2001b, 30). In all, Knutson presented a compelling survey of actors' relationships. Rather than being marked by acrimony or ill will, their associations are typified by a fraternal bond. Her arguments do not explain away the killings and court cases, but perhaps they do not have to. It is difficult to imagine a world of animosity, punctuated with occasional fits of amity. A world, however, marked broadly by friendship but littered with spasms of hostility is far easier to picture. One difficulty in promoting a fraternal model for early modern actors is that the majority of Knutson's examples track intra-company relationships. Members of a single company getting on well together is not difficult to fathom, nor is it difficult to reconcile with the earlier conceptions of actors as belonging to rival factions: players in the Chamberlain's men, say, are friendly towards each other, but do not mix with those of the Admiral's men. What would be difficult to explain in a model set on rivalry or on intra-company friendships would be actors sharing similar patterns of association, across inter-company relationships. This, in fact, is what we see below laid out in the biography of Richard Bradshaw. First, though, we should consider the differences between the networks of Renaissance actors and Renaissance dramatists.

Players were far more strongly affiliated with a troupe at a given moment than most playwrights were. We've seen how this shaped actors' networks in the theatrical world: they lived cheek-by-jowl in the parishes nearest their theatres, and they worked closely with others
from the same troupe. We will also see, in the life of Richard Bradshaw, how they were able to ignore immediate economic pressures and co-operate with those in other companies. They could also move between companies with relative ease. These features of their professional lives spilled into their personal lives: players named children after other players close to them, they left items and money to each other on their deaths, and they married the daughters of other players. The networks of early modern playwrights did not operate in exactly the same way. While there were playwrights who operated as attached professionals, they were not the theatrical norm in the 1590s. Shakespeare and his association with the Chamberlain's men, discussed above, was a notable exception.

A significant difference between actors and playwrights in the 1590s was where they chose to live. The concentration of actors north of the river in the parish of St Leonard's – near the Theatre, and the Curtain – and south of the river in the parish of St Saviour's – near the Rose, and somewhat near the Swan – is not matched by playwrights. Actors, of course, had to be present at the playhouses every day to earn their living, and it seems safe to assume playwrights did not. Such a reading is supported by the facts we have available. Markedly few playwrights writing for the professional stage in the 1590s lived in the parishes of St Leonard's and St Saviour's. If we combine the resources of Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* (1940), Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser's *Database of Early English Playbooks* (2007), the Foakes and Rickert edition of *Henslowe's Diary* (1961) and Roslyn L. Knutson, Matthew Steggle, and David McInnis' *Lost Plays Database* (2016) we find that 31 dramatists wrote plays staged in the 1590s (including extant and lost work). Of these playwrights, 22 wrote for professional companies, rather than closet readers or amateur groups. This rises to 24 if we include those who wrote exclusively, in this decade, for the semi-professional boy companies at St Paul's and Blackfriars. Unfortunately, we do not
know, and may not ever know, the places of residence for some of these men. The assumed residences of others are built on plausible supposition. We can identify at least one residence for 19 of these 24 dramatists at some point in their careers. Where possible, this examination has used a known location from the 1590s; when this has not been possible another known location has been used at a date as near as possible to the 1590s.

Analysis of these playwrights' addresses shows a striking diversity across the city. They lived in 16 discrete parishes, wards or areas. Often, we know only the local parish where bureaucracy created records of a writer's life; sometimes, however, we learn exact streets. Two dramatists lived in St Saviour's: Thomas Heywood (Kathman 2004b) and Will Kemp (Butler 2011). Notably, Kemp appeared above in a list of actors present in the parish as he served as actor and playwright. Three playwrights also lived in the parish of St Giles Cripplegate: Anthony Munday (Bergeron 2007), whose biography is covered in some detail below, Robert Wilson (Bentley 1929, 825) and Richard Hathway (Cerasano 2004b). While St Saviour's is already associated with the Rose in the 1590s, St Giles Cripplegate would become associated with the Fortune theatre, built there in 1600 (Orrell 1993, 127). Robert Wilson's known residence there is derived from the record of his burial in 1600 (Bentley 1929, 825). Richard Hathway's known residence there is derived from the record of his children's christenings in 1601 and 1602 (Cerasano 2004b). The dates alone suggest that Hathway and Wilson might have moved there in response to the theatre's completion or near completion; Wilson, like Kemp, was an actor as well as a playwright (Kathman 2004c). It seems, therefore, that Wilson behaved, in this instance at least, like an actor rather than a playwright by moving to the new theatre. Munday, on the other hand, had been there well before the Fortune's erection. His daughter, Rose, was christened in the parish in October
1585 (Bentley 1929, 813–14). Records of Munday's family in the parish continue through the 1580s; the parish register also details the burial of his wife there in 1621 (Bentley 1929, 814).

Indeed, a case could be made for Hathway and Wilson making their way to Cripplegate because of the new theatre. The Fortune clearly prompted movement at the turn of the century. Bentley found records of 80 theatrical persons in the surviving parish registers (Bentley 1929, 790). The overwhelming majority of these are actors with records beginning after 1600. The implication then, is that the Fortune drove migration for theatre personnel to the parish. In addition, Hathway and Wilson enjoyed a fruitful collaborative relationship with Munday, a long-term resident of the parish. The three men had, along with Michael Drayton, collaborated on 1 *Sir John Oldcastle* (1599) for which they received payment in October 1599 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 125). Their writing syndicate proved successful and spawned further collaborations: 2 *Sir John Oldcastle*, at the end of 1599; 1 *Fair Constance of Rome*, in 1600 (with Thomas Dekker), and 1 *Owen Tudor* also in 1600 (Knutson, Steggle, and McInnis 2016).

It is thus seductive to imagine Munday encouraging Wilson and Hathway to relocate to Cripplegate in readiness for the new theatre and in the hope of penning further collaborations following a successful first co-authored play. The inclusion of Thomas Dekker in the team aids this argument. Dekker, as best we can tell, and our best is only a record of his burial in August 1632 (Smallwood and Wells 1999, 4), lived in the parish of St James's, Clerkenwell. The church of Dekker's parish was less than a mile away from Munday's in St Giles Cripplegate: as such, the collaborators may well have lived near one another. This might have considerably aided the speed at which they could work. The four collaborators could, when they needed to, meet somewhere close to home: one of their houses perhaps, or a local tavern,
to discuss plot devices, characterization or act and scene division. They might have penned key lines together. Certainly, they appear to have been able to complete plays quickly and hence efficiently. The team were paid: for the first part of *Sir John Oldcastle* in October 1599; for the second part of *Sir John Oldcastle* in December 1599; for *Owen Tudor* in January 1600; and for *Fair Constance of Rome*, a play that appears to have had two parts, in June 1600 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 125, 127, 267, 136). The influence of geography on Munday's professional network is discussed in his biography below. The importance of geography to other collaborative relationships can be seen in the life of William Rowley presented in Chapter Four.

Other playwrights appear to have lived, as the actors, close to theatres or the theatrical parishes. Ben Jonson was married in 1594 in the church of St Magnus the Martyr (Donaldson 2011, 102), in the parish adjacent to St Saviour's Southwark. Noting this, Mark Eccles made the case that Jonson was already acting on the Bankside by 1594 (Eccles 1936). As with Wilson and Kemp above, this may be another example of the necessities of an actor ensuring a residence close to a playhouse, despite us most readily associating Jonson with playwriting. Away from the adult professional stage, John Lyly lived close to his charges in the boy company at St Paul's in the parish of St Martin's Ludgate (Hunter 2008).

On the whole, however, playwrights do not show the patterns of residence that actors do. Playwrights were scattered across the city individually. William Bird or Bourne, another writer/actor, lived in St Leonard's; George Chapman lived in the parish of St Giles in the Fields (Chambers 1923d, 3:250); Robert Greene lived in Dowgate ward (Newcomb 2004); William Haughton resided in the parish of St Mary Abchurch (Kathman 2013a); the parish of St Mary Colechurch housed Thomas Kyd (Mulryne 2004); Christopher Marlowe lived in
Shoreditch (Nicholl 2008a); John Marston was at Middle Temple (Knowles 2009); Nashe lived in Conduit Lane in Holborn (Melnikoff 2015); George Peele resided in St Olave Jewry (Barbour 2004); Samuel Rowley, among those who appear in St Giles Cripplegate after 1600, lived in the parish of St Mary Matfellon (Gurr 2009, 285); and Shakespeare, as discussed in Chapter One, lived in the parish of St Helen's Bishopsgate (Chambers 1930a, 2:87–88).

These disparate residences help highlight the range of pursuits playwrights undertook in comparison to actors. Not only did playwrights not need to be ever-present at the playhouse, as suggested above, they often had other means of making a living which demanded their attention. Whereas actors might have been members of a livery company, as were some playwrights (Kathman 2004a), dramatists were far more able to generate alternative income. Of the 31 playwrights who we know wrote for the professional stage in the 1590s, we know that at least 18 made money away from playwriting. William Bird or Bourne acted, as did Ben Jonson, Will Kemp, Samuel Rowley, Robert Wilson and Shakespeare. Thomas Lodge was a physician (Halasz 2008), Henry Chettle was a stationer (E. Smith 2004a) and Kemp toured as a clown (Butler 2011). Chapman, Kyd, Lodge and Munday all translated and published work; Munday and Marlowe acted in some capacity as government agents (Bergeron 2007; Nicholl 2008a). Most frequently, playwrights doubled as poets or prose writers: Chapman, Chettle, Drayton, Greene, Hathway, Heywood, Jonson, Kemp, Marlowe, Marston, Munday, Peele and Shakespeare. Many of the writers co-authored works too; just how they collaborated and how it impacted their networks is given full treatment in Chapter Four.

Not being tied to a residence immediately next to a theatre and taking diverse employments widened playwrights' social networks. They came into contact with a broader
range of people professionally, had more reason to mix with the aristocracy – they had more written work to dedicate to them, for one thing – and were less constrained by their place of work than actors necessarily were. To illustrate this claim for the especially wide social connections enjoyed by writers, the biography of one, Anthony Munday, is focussed on below in an effort to highlight some typical, and some not so typical characteristics of a playwright's network. Munday's biography is turned to after that of Richard Bradshaw, a little known actor. Where Bradshaw's life in the profession showcases an enviably wide network – that he put to good use – Munday's network offers a depth most useful to those making their living via a range of employments.

**Case Study: Richard Bradshaw**

Studying the biography of a specific early modern actor can show us amiable inter-company relationships. One actor who had a long and seemingly varied career in the profession was Richard Bradshaw. It is worth affording some space for an exposition of the facts of his life, some of which are contested, to help us better understand the networks he cultivated and operated in. His name appears in a handful of historical records that, read appropriately, can help articulate a model of inter-company fraternity and mutual aid. Bradshaw's first appearance in the historical record is in 1595 as the member of a nobleman's provincial company. 'A warrant' was issued from Edward Sutton, 5th Baron Dudley 'to Francis Coffyn and Rich. Bradshaw his servants to travel in the quality of playing and to use musicke in All Cities, Towns and Corporations' (Murray 1910, 2:234). Bradshaw had a long career and the final mention we have of him is in 1633 as a member of a provincial playing company in Banbury with a dubious licence (Murray 1910, 2:106–7). From these two records, Gerald Eades Bentley made two deductions. First, given Dudley's warrant, Bentley
decided that in 1595 Bradshaw 'was probably at least thirty since he was a leader of the
troupe' (1941b, 2:388). This would place his birth some time in 1565. Bradshaw and Coffyn's
leadership of the troupe is not explicit, though it is implied by the wording of the warrant,
which calls them Dudley's 'servants' and refers later to 'their company' (E. Baldwin, Clopper,
and Mills 2007, 1:293). Second, Bentley thought that the Richard Bradshaw of the 1630s
'must have been a different actor, for it is unlikely that a man could have been acting for
twenty-five years in the provinces without leaving another record' (1941b, 2:387–88).
Bentley's assumptions led to another, more hopeful, conjecture: 'surely' Bradshaw 'would not
have been still dashing about the country at the age of sixty-eight' (1941b, 2:388).

There is good evidence to counter the first of Bentley's assertions and reconsider the
second. No record of Bradshaw's birth has ever been published, but a plausible one exists.
Records of St Gregory by St Paul held at the London Metropolitan Archive (and available in
digital facsimile via Ancestry.co.uk) contain an entry for one 'Richard Bradshawe' christened
on 26 December 1570 (‘St Gregory by St Paul, Composite Register: Baptisms 1559-1627,
Marriages 1559-1626/7, Burials 1559 -1627’, n.d.). There was also a Richard Bradshaw
christened at the same church in 1561: this cannot be the actor because this Richard
Bradshaw was buried on 24 February 1564. Though it is difficult to prove the man born in
1570 is the actor, there are indicators to help support that conclusion. First, he would be
twenty five in 1595 when he appeared on Dudley's warrant: an age not markedly different
from that supposed by Bentley, and one not unheard of for a senior member of a company.
Richard Burbage was an actor-sharer in the Chamberlain's men at twenty seven, Henry
Condell may have held the same position in the same company by the age of twenty one
(Gurr 2004c, 13). Bradshaw's seniority in Dudley's company might have been overstated by
Bentley too. In contrast to the passing reference to 'their company' above, a memorandum


from 1602, made on the back of the original warrant, omitted mention of Bradshaw but did name Francis Coffyn, the other player named in 1595. In November 1602 'francis Coffen & others within named who were licenced to play as the lord dudleys servants did repayre to this city [Chester] for that purpose' but Chester's mayor, Hugh Glaseour, had been 'Credbly enformed the lord dudly had long since discharged the sayd Coffen & licensed certain others' (E. Baldwin, Clopper, and Mills 2007, 1:293). Bradshaw's name might be omitted because he was lumped into the ' & others' of the memorandum. His position in the company, assuming he was still with Coffyn's now-allegedly-outlawed troupe, might not have been as senior as first assumed. If this were the case, and Bradshaw was a member of the company's rank and file, there would be no mismatch between the proposed record of Bradshaw's birth and his membership of the travelling company.

The second reason for supposing that the Richard Bradshaw christened at St Gregory by St Paul is the actor is that the actor had strong ties to London. On 10 October 1598 he was described as a yeoman of St Saviour's, Southwark (Nungezer 1929, 55). Not incidentally, this is the parish most readily associated with the Admiral's men, because their theatre, the Rose, was nearby and a host of their players were resident there. Bradshaw was involved with the Admiral's company for a time and makes several appearances in Henslowe's diary. Importantly, for the case made here, Henslowe's papers discuss payments on 'his Retorne a gayne to london' and 'at his next Retorne to london' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 165). It seems, therefore, that London was Bradshaw's base rather than a short-term lodging. In itself, this does not confirm that the christening record matches the Bradshaw of Dudley's troupe or Henslowe's diary; the man could have been a Richard Bradshaw who moved to London and then became an actor, settling in St Saviour's, wholly independent of the one born in 1570. This, however, appears unlikely given the alignment of dates and location presented here. In
what follows, Richard Bradshaw is assumed to be the man christened at St Gregory by St Paul in 1570.

Bentley's second assumption stressed that the Richard Bradshaw of the records from the 1590s must not have been the same Richard Bradshaw as mentioned in the records of the 1630s. At least one modern scholar has had no problem with recognizing both sets of records as pertaining to one man, however (A. Somerset 2008, 357). And new evidence, unavailable to Bentley writing in 1941, has emerged in the Records of Early English Drama (REED) series that bridges the twenty-five year gap between sightings of Bradshaw as put forward by Bentley. The household accounts of Thomas Walmesley note a payment of 20s 'given to Bradshewen the plaier & his Companie'; indeed, 'Richard Bradshaw's company visited Dunkenhalgh [Walmesley's home] seven times in all between 1625 and 1635' (George 1991, 193, 358). Additionally, the sixty-eight-year-old Bradshaw 'dashing about the country side' (1941b, 2:388) in Bentley's picture, would, given the baptism identified above, have actually been sixty three at the eldest sighting. This is not a trivial distinction: we know of at least one other actor tracing a similar trajectory at a similar age. Martin Slater, born around 1560 by David Kathman's reckoning (2012), was involved with the Admiral's men for a time (Gurr 2009, 286). Slater led touring companies as late as October 1625, when he appeared at Coventry (Eccles 1993, 172): he would have been sixty five.

It may have been that Bradshaw, at an admittedly advanced age, took a more managerial role with his later companies; John Heminges' position in the King's Men gives a useful model of a senior player taking on management responsibilities. Accounts from 1630 and 1633 seem to suggest at least seniority for Bradshaw in his companies, if not a differentiation between him and his actors: 'Richard Bradshawe hath licens and company' is
how a surviving note in the records of Reading puts it (Murray 1910, 2:386). Other
documents imply that Bradshaw was not a necessary part of his travelling company's acting
arm. 'At Banbury', in May 1633, 'the town authorities, becoming suspicious of the validity of
the company's license, arrested the players, and notified the Privy Council'; from the
subsequent examination of the players 'we learn that Bradshaw as their manager had gone a
few days before to London to renew the commission and would join them a few days later
with more players' (Nungezer 1929, 55). The players' testimonies, sent to the Privy Council
along with a letter outlining their possibly false patent, confirm that without Bradshaw they
were still able to act. Bradshaw had left the players in 'Keinton, co. Warwick, on Saturday
last towards London' and planned to meet them 'Monday next at Thame, co. Oxford' (Murray
1910, 2:164). Given they were at Banbury, in between parting with Bradshaw and his return,
it is clear they had intended to play without him. A picture with the old Richard Bradshaw as
company lead, concerned with company administration and player recruitment helps explain
how he was still prominent in the acting world some 38 years after his first documented
appearance in it. That Bradshaw's troupe had attempted to play under false papers, and the
Privy Council confirmed as much in their response dated 22 May 1633 (Murray 1910, 2:166),
is also revealing. Assuming Bradshaw was among the players who appeared in Chester in
1602, alongside Francis Coffyn, his one-time partner, this would be the second documented
occasion of Bradshaw trying to pull the same trick and attempting to play under an outdated
warrant. Combined, Bradshaw's plausible age, the increase in historical sightings, the
parallels in company practice in earlier and later records, and his managerial role make a
strong case for him being the same Richard Bradshaw as was involved with Admiral's men in
the 1590s. It is to that company that our attention now returns.
Bradshaw was a hired man with the Admiral's company from around 1598 to 1601 (Gurr 2009, 276). His tenure with Henslowe's troupe can showcase cooperation in the theatre across company boundaries. Bradshaw's first positive sighting within the company's milieu is in May 1598 when he appears in Henslowe's diary alongside another actor: 'Lent unto gabrell spencer the 19 of maye 1598 to bye a plume of feathers w\textsuperscript{th} his mane bradshawe feched of me' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 83). Quite what became of the plume is lost to history; otherwise, this is a fairly typical entry. Edwin Nungezer saw Bradshaw as Spencer's servant in this exchange, likely because of the appellation 'man' given to him (1929, 336). Henslowe repeatedly uses 'man' to signal a servant in his papers; it might fit with Bradshaw's relationship to Spencer in this transaction, but how formal Bradshaw's service was is unclear. There are numerous instances of adult actors taking boy actors as apprentices to learn their trade on the stage (Kathman 2005, 220), but that type of master-servant relationship between the pair is unlikely: Bradshaw was twenty-eight at this point (two years older than Spencer). Their relationship cannot have endured: Spencer was killed later the same year in a duel with Ben Jonson, as noted above (Donaldson 2013).

Other details of the diary show that Bradshaw became more involved with the company and its members in a broad sense. He handled two payments in October 1598 to playwrights Michael Drayton and Thomas Dekker for a play, now lost, called Conan Prince of Cornwall (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 100). In 1599 he had dealings with one Robert Archer and the mysterious figure or figures of Byrcot Bird or Byrcot and Bird. Whether these last two names denote one person or two depends on which source is consulted: Foakes and Rickert's Diary gives Byrcot Bird (1961, 287), Gurr's Opposites gives Byrcot and Bird (2009, 277). Bradshaw, Archer, and Byrcot [and?] Bird entered into a bond with William Bird to pay him
'ffyfte shillinges of good and lawfull money of England, upon the seconde daye of marche next comynge' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 287). We do not know what the money was for.

Thus far, records of Bradshaw's involvement with Henslowe's company have been characteristic of the business dealings actors were regularly part of. Three later records, however, are anomalous. The first two of these records come from Henslowe directly. On 15 December 1600 Henslowe sold Bradshaw 'j pownd & ij owences of coope lace' for fourteen shillings that was 'to be payde at to his Retorne a gayne to london next' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 165). Four and a half months later Henslowe noted a similar transaction with Bradshaw: 'lent more unto Richard Bradshawe player the 29 of ap rell 1601 in mony to be payd at his next Retorne to London the some of v s' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 165). As well as being suggestive of a London residence, as argued above, these transactions are significant for inter-company relations. That there were two occurrences, some months apart, suggests that neither was an aberration. Though he was a hired man of the Admiral's, clearly these records indicate that Bradshaw was to be leaving for somewhere other than London; knowing what we do about his background, we might reasonably assume he was heading out on tour and needed apparel for himself or his company. Thus, Henslowe is shown here not only to be trading with someone outside his company, but someone, once Bradshaw had left the troupe, with whom he would have been in direct competition.

One sceptical of this interpretation might observe that Henslowe's company were not competing for a share in the same market. Bradshaw was to be in the provinces, Henslowe in London. Superficially, this might be the case, but touring, even after the stability afforded by the theorized duopoly, was not far from Henslowe's mind. When, in August 1597, he resigned Richard Jones to the company on his return from the Pembroke's men, Henslowe was sure to put a clause in his contract that ensured Jones would play 'in my howsse only knowne
by the name of the Rosse & in no other howse a bowt london publicke & yf Restraynte be
granted then to go for the tyme into the contrey' (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 239–40). Clearly,
Henslowe considered the prospect of touring real. And, had his company gone on tour, he
would have been met with competition from other touring companies. Siobhan Keenan has
emphasised the competitive nature of touring too: 'London companies not only' contended
‘with each other, but with regionally based troupes for a share of the provincial theatre
market' (Keenan 2002, 9). The type of transaction is also significant: Henslowe sold apparel
to Bradshaw for his tour. In doing so, the theatre manager parted with an important
commodity because 'playbooks and apparel were a playing company's most valuable
possessions' (Gurr 1987, 176). Costumes for Admiral's productions could prompt sizeable
expenditure, over £17 for one production (Knutson 1991, 36–37), and we might imagine,
therefore, that Henslowe was not wont to part with it on a whim.

There appears to be an element of trust built into the transactions too. Henslowe assents
to collect payment on Bradshaw's return to London, in a world with little practical means of
enforcing collection when debtors absconded. Clearly he felt confident enough that Bradshaw
would not skip town and renege on his debt. Perhaps he was not aware of Bradshaw's less
than reputable practice of having his companies play under forged letters of patent as outlined
above. When the actor did return, a second entry from Henslowe noted that he 'lent more unto
Richard Bradshawe', signalling that he had either not settled his first account, or had another
one outstanding (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 165). Again, Bradshaw was trusted to disappear
indefinitely into the provinces. In a model of the acting world that allowed only for intra-
company fraternity, we would not expect to find these type of transactions where a theatre
manager – someone directly concerned with his company's place in the market – acts to
benefit someone about to become a direct rival. It is important to highlight that these records
of Bradshaw show inter-company networks working in spite of self-interest. Theatre managers in the style of Henslowe, with a direct financial interest in his company's success at the expense of others, would be the least likely candidates, we might posit, to engage in cross company assistance of this kind. Therefore, evidence that he did engage in such behaviour suggests that this form of assistance could be more widely practised.

If theatre managers, with, financially speaking, the most to lose, could act to help their direct opposition then we should expect the same behaviour of actors who stood to lose less. The third and final anomalous record of Richard Bradshaw in Henslowe's diary shows just this. Though the article is included in the diary, Henslowe is not involved in its creation. Rather, it details an outstanding debt of 10s owed by the actor William Bird to Edward Alleyn (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 287). It is recorded on the back of the manuscript used to record the previous bond made by Bradshaw and others that promised 50s to William Bird in 1598 (Ioppolo 2005); and, notably, it licenses Alleyn to recover from Bradshaw the 10s that Bird owed to Alleyn. The amendment to the bond is dated 8 January 1604. As well as showcasing Bradshaw's impressive ability to avoid paying a creditor – the original bond was due to be paid after five months, the later record comes after five years – it shows a leniency we would perhaps not expect on Bird's behalf. This leniency is heightened when we learn that during the time that Bradshaw was in Bird's debt, Bird's financial situation was so straitened that when he found himself imprisoned his wife had to borrow money from Henslowe so that he might make bail (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 83). Bird was also capable of entering into legal proceedings to solve his problems when he had to: in 1602 he sought 'sureties of the peace for fear of death against Thomas Boulton'; he might also have been the William Bird who 'sought sureties of the peace against Rowland Garland in 1602/3'; and the William "Byrd" who sought sureties in 1606 against Roger Corbett, Humphrey Jones, and Richard
Wilford' (Eccles 1991, 40). History presents a man in William Bird who was, at times, in dire need of money and a man who would use the law to achieve his aims. Both these facts should have encouraged Bradshaw to settle his account. And yet, because the records of Henslowe's diary show Bradshaw's outstanding five-year-old debt, we know he did not. One possible explanation for this non-payment is that Bird showed repeated leniency to a man in the same profession. Rather than sue Bradshaw he merely transferred his debt at a later date. At this point, Bradshaw was no longer a member of the same acting company: previous records tell us that he must have had at least two tours in the provinces before this return to London. But, despite this, Bird still made allowances, perhaps for an old friend from days in the Admiral's men or for an old neighbour from days in St Saviour's parish (Nungezer 1929, 49).

Actors then, on at least one occasion, were capable of exhibiting the type of fraternal bond with members of other companies that current models readily adduce for members of the same company. This vignette of Richard Bradshaw's life in the theatre typifies just this. His personal network was broad and it served him well. He knew Gabriel Spencer, William Bird, Robert Archer, Edward Alleyn, and, doubtless, the rest of the Admiral's men. He exchanged money with playwrights, Michael Drayton and Thomas Dekker, both of whom would live long enough to see Bradshaw tour into his late years, manage companies in the provinces, and perhaps suggest a well-spring of actors to tap for his next semi-authorised provincial venture. He had a useful relationship with Philip Henslowe who trusted him to pay his debts, eventually, and who helped him across company lines, despite being a member of competitor companies. Finally, Bradshaw's network was not without depth. He had acquaintances in the nobility: early in his career he was able to count himself a named servant to Lord Dudley and late in his career he was able to salvage an expired warrant by having an unknown nobleman renew it. Almost every record that has survived of Richard Bradshaw
shows him in cooperation with others in the profession; it seems only to have positively influenced his career.

**Case Study: Anthony Munday**

Biographers are reluctant to look warmly on Anthony Munday: 'many details' of his life 'are unattractive' was how Celeste Turner Wright framed her contribution (1958, 150); 'a shameless opportunist' was Ian W. Archer's judgement (2008, 406). He was seen as 'substituting plagiarism for talent' (Mann 1991, 29) on at least one occasion and was, in Tiffany Stern's estimation, 'undoubtedly known for "plotting" in every sense of the word' (2009, 27). At best, Munday is credited for his remarkable versatility (Wright 1963, 532). Modern chroniclers are, however, at odds with his early modern contemporaries tasked with capturing Munday's contribution to the world. The epitaph on his grave reads: 'to the memory of that ancient servant to the city, with his pen, in divers employments . . . Master Anthony Munday' (Graham 1821, 264).

Munday was born in 1560 and baptised on 13 October of that year (at the same church, incidentally, in which Richard Bradshaw was baptised 10 years later): St Gregory by St Paul's (Hotson 1959, 2). By January 1571 he was an orphan (Eccles 1959, 97). In 1576 he was apprenticed to John Allde, a stationer (Arber 1950, 2:69). Munday's mother left him £15 15s 2d and this was held by the Chamberlain of London, 'guardian of the rights of citizens' orphans', until Munday was able to claim his portion aged 21 (Eccles 1959, 98). He was able to receive the bequeathed money some 10 months early because he managed to convince the Court of Orphans that he was 21 in January 1581 (Kathman 2004a, 35). At this point, Munday was living in the Barbican, and records from St Giles without Cripplegate shed light
on a wider family (Eccles 1959, 98–99). He had married a woman called Elizabeth by 1582 and the marriage bore five children: Elizabeth, baptized on 28 June 1584; Rose, baptized 17 October 1585, and buried January 1586; Priscilla, baptized 9 January 1587; Richard, baptized 27 January 1588; and Anne, baptized 5 September 1589 (Bergeron 2007).

In the years before having children Munday left his apprenticeship with Allde, travelled to Europe, and entered the service of Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford. Munday 'spent some time at the English College in Rome' in 1578 (Pollard 2004, 62). The English college there was designed to prepare men for a life in Catholic holy orders. Munday left by May 1579. He had entered under a false name, 'Antonius Auleus', with a friend, Thomas Nowell (Eccles 1982, 98). Munday, according to one of his twentieth-century biographers, had gone to the college 'as a convert' to the outlawed Catholicism (Wright 1961a, 37). Munday, in his own words in The English Roman Life, told readers that he had visited Rome to experience other cultures and 'learne the languages' (1582, B1r). However, taking Munday's offering at face value is a risk, as we shall see. His later works, for one thing, suggest there was more to his trip to Rome: he enrolled 'probably as a government spy' in the words of some commentators (Maslen 2001, 306). His stay in Europe was brief: he sojourned in the English college at Reims in July 1579 before heading back to London (Eccles 1982, 98).

On his return to England, Munday worked for Edward de Vere alongside John Lyly (Wright 1928, 2(1):28–30). Some of his earliest works were dedicated to the Earl: The Mirror of Mutabilitie published in 1579 and Zelauto published in 1580 (Bergeron 2007). For those, like Wright, who view Munday's entry to the college at Rome as indicative of genuine Catholic sympathies, his attachment to the Earl of Oxford is important. Around this time
Oxford and several companions had 'flirted with Catholicism and sedition' (Nelson 2008). It might have been the ideal place for a young writer who harboured similar tendencies. At least one of Munday's biographers thought that 'a Catholic label of some sort may not be out of the question' (D. B. Hamilton 2005, xvi). Unfortunately, the position of Munday-as-Catholic-apologist is not supported by either his publication history or his later professional background. 'Munday launched a series of tracts that can only be categorized as virulently anti-Catholic' after his return to London: *A Brief Discourse of the Taking of Edmund Campion* in 1581 and *A Discovery of Edmund Campion and his Confederates* from 1582 (Bergeron 2007). In November 1581 Munday testified 'against priests whom he had met in Rome and even against Campion, whom he did not know' (Bergeron 2007). This is indicative of a wider career choice: put frankly he 'wrote anti-Catholic propaganda and informed against Catholics' (Maslen 2001, 306).

It is important to note for our purposes that Munday's professional network at this stage in his career must have already been deep. He would have encountered numerous people if he was indeed working for the state. It seems likely he would have encountered other aristocrats in the circle of Edward de Vere; he worked alongside another playwright, John Lyly, in these years too.

The anti-Catholic strain of his life continued well into the seventeenth century. Mark Eccles described legal records of recusants being indicted on Munday's testimony at least twice in 1612 (Eccles 1959, 103). Furthermore, he is possibly mentioned by a 'Scots Catholic, George Leslie' who warned a friend on 4 September 1594 'against one "Mundie" in Antwerp', a spy for Sir Thomas Heneage; Munday was also enlisted by the Bishop of London in 1606 to 'search for priests in Warwickshire after the Gunpowder Plot' (Eccles 1982, 99). His work
was also recognized by Elizabeth I. She 'granted to her servant "Anthony Mondaye," gentleman, on 19 July 1587, in consideration of his good and faithful service, leases in reversion of Crown property' and a reversion, as of 1611, of part of the fishery of the Tamar in Cornwall (Eccles 1982, 99). This is strong evidence in favour of Munday being an agent for the crown. This is compounded by Munday's own signature on his works from 1588 to 1596: 'Anthony Munday, Messenger of Her Majesties Chamber' (Bergeron 2007).

Away from recusant hunting, Munday was made a freeman of the Drapers' Company in 1585 (Braunmuller and Hattaway 2003, 407). The patrimony document lists Munday as 'a poet by Cripplegate' (Kathman 2004a, 35). He paid his quarterage dues for every year from 1605 (the first year records survive) to 1626 (Kathman 2004a, 35). Munday also began to forge a varied and prolific literary career. Andrew Hadfield confirmed his diverse trades, some of which are noted above: 'playwright, pamphleteer, poet, translator and author of civic pageants' (2013, 69). Though not a literary pursuit, actor must also be added to the list. 'This scholar new come out of Italy' a combative pamphlet declared, taking aim at Munday, 'first was a stage player' (Alfield 1582, E1r, D4v). This charge comes in a 1582 piece written in response to Munday's earlier writings on Campion. Seeking to defame Munday as a mere player was a predictable tactic according to Bart van Es. 'Such insults were to be expected when grammar-school-educated writers displayed ambition'; he cautioned the biographer, however, noting that these claims were 'not evidence of a professional commitment to a life on the stage' (Es 2013, 51). It is worth noting that there is no evidence that Munday actually attended a grammar school.

In another work, Es defended Munday by highlighting his pursuits beyond stage playing. Es added his own professions to Hadfield's list for Munday. 'He was a traveller,
writer, controversialist, spy, and much more' (Es 2010, 562). Controversialist is right: strangely, alongside his stage exposure, Munday 'was even (briefly) a polemicist against the stage' in a pamphlet written in 1580 and titled *A Second and Third Blast of Retreat from Plays and Theaters* (Es 2010, 562). Given Munday's clear links to the stage his polemic against it appears odd. One explanation for it might be simply economic: Munday was happy to sell his skills of rhetoric for any cause. Initially this claim appears tenuous: a man willing to enter a seminary under a false name in a foreign land to gather evidence is unlikely to sell his support for an issue in which he does not believe. Similarly, it is unconvincing to see the man who has dedicated himself to three decades of recusant hunting as a mercenary author. And yet, Donna B. Hamilton in her study of Munday noted that actually such apparent shifts typified Munday's personality, he 'was not rigid, but adjusted his ideological persona as the climate for religious difference shifted from decade to decade' (2005, xvi).

Despite his brief anti-theatrical tirade, Munday entered the documentary record as a translator-playwright with a play called *Fedele and Fortunio* (1585). It was acted at Elizabeth's court and had a 'prologue and epilogue explicitly written for this performance' (Bergeron 2007). Other stage playes followed. Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* 'survives in a manuscript fair copy in his hand, at the end of which is his signature' followed by the date of December 1595 (Ioppolo 2006, 90). The date of this manuscript and its identification with another play are contentious. Though dogmatic in her assertion, Ioppolo is on her own among modern scholars in reading the manuscript's date as 1595. Knutson followed I. A. Shapiro and gave the date as December 1590 (1984). MacDonald P. Jackson, most recently, has argued for a return to W. W. Greg's reading of December 1596 (2011, 8). The date of this manuscript matters because it bears on the date of the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More*, according to Jackson. Because, based on earlier palaeographic research, *John
a Kent predates More, a later date for John a Kent means a later date for More: arguing just this, Jackson sought to push the date of Sir Thomas More's first composition to around 1600 (2011, 25). The precise date is not central to our purposes here. The manuscript is used to show Munday's continued writing for the stage.

Andrew Gurr argued that John a Kent is another name for the otherwise-lost play The Wise Men of West Chester (1594); the play appears in Henslowe's diary and his records suggest it was incredibly popular (Gurr 2009, 106). Gurr's conjecture, that these are two titles for one play, is based around the rough alignment of the titles' dating and the West Chester location (2009, 106). Henslowe notes three performances by the Admiral's Men of this play in 1594, nineteen in 1595, six in 1596 and three in 1597 but, despite the play's popularity, Grace Ioppolo was reluctant to link the two (2006, 90). Her argument is based on a firm dating of the manuscript to late 1595 and the linked fact that Munday would have no need to re-copy an already working play one year after inception. There is however, 'no indisputable evidence' to suppose this is one play under two titles (Ioppolo 2006, 90). Paul Werstine has recently summarised the main issues surrounding the manuscript, outlining competing arguments (2013, 245–48). As with the play's date, whether or not it is The Wise Men of West Chester can be left open: it is not central to what follows.

Munday and his works, many of which are now lost, appear on numerous occasions in Henslowe's Diary between March 1598 and May 1603 (Jowett 2011, 11). Throughout this period, he appears largely to have co-authored plays: 'he was a chief collaborating dramatist' (Astington 2010, 206–7), writing 'mostly collaboratively, in the team of dramatists employed by Philip Henslowe' (Bate 2009, 168); he wrote '17 plays from 1594 to 1602, often in collaboration' (Braunmuller and Hattaway 2003, 407). Munday's most famous joint
enterprise, posthumously at least, was Sir Thomas More. The play was originally drafted by Munday in a now lost manuscript, and all that now survives is a copy made from this original draft (Jowett 2011, 5). Plenty about the play is contested, and it contains the hands of various writers, making revisions and excisions at a later date. Shakespeare's role in changes to the extant manuscript, as Hand D, is largely accepted but other aspects of the play's date and authorship are disputed (S. Wells et al. 1997, 124–25). The Oxford editors dated the initial manuscript to between autumn 1592 and mid-1595 (S. Wells et al. 1997, 124–25). MacDonald P. Jackson initially noted that the span has been accepted as probable (2007, 1), but has more recently suggested a later date as we saw above (2011). John Jowett's Arden3 edition similarly posited a later date 'most likely composed in or around 1600' (2011, 5). Dating it to the turn of the century, he argued, placed the work more appropriately in a vogue for English history plays focussed on non-royal figures, amongst much other evidence (Jowett 2011, 426–32). Jowett's claims have found support from Hugh Craig using computational stylometric analysis (2013).

Given what we might generously call Munday's anti-Catholic tendencies, it is surprising that within Sir Thomas More he should give 'such a sympathetic account' of the martyred scholar's life (Gurr 1996, 264). Gurr, who saw the play as being written for Strange's company, explained this oddity as having potentially been influenced 'by what he knew about the company patron's religious allegiance' (1996, 34–35). Munday was involved in at least one other play with a Catholic protagonist: Henslowe's diary records payments to him for the lost 1 Cardinal Wolsey in 1601 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 184). Though apparently plausible, not least because of Munday's ability to ink his pen for both sides of an issue, Gurr's explanation is incompatible with a date of composition around 1600: Strange's men had ceased to exist. Yet his argument might stand with a change of cast. Jowett signalled
the Worcester's/Queen Anne's men as likely commissioners of the revised manuscript. And, having established links to the playwrights involved, barring Munday, Jowett concluded 'the topic of Sir Thomas More might have been considered timely given the Catholic sympathies of the new patron, Queen Anne' (2011, 102–3).

Importantly, Munday's dramatic network and local geography helped him professionally while writing for Henslowe. As we saw above, he was living in St Giles Cripplegate, a parish that, around 1600, became home to two other dramatists, Robert Wilson and Richard Hathway. The three men became ready collaborators and worked together on several plays. The notion that geography influenced Munday's network is important and it pre-empt later arguments. We will revisit the usefulness of geographic proximity in professional networks in the biography of William Rowley in Chapter Four. Here we might imagine Munday enjoying a walk to or from the playhouse with Wilson and Hathway, perhaps sharing a boat over the river to the Rose. It is not difficult to see them back home in their local tavern in Cripplegate talking over their next play topic. Such considerations are particularly useful, and are afforded more space, in Chapter Four when discussion turns to the speed of dramatic collaboration, and the friendships of collaborating authors.

Munday achieved at least some level of fame in the playhouse. In 1598, in *Palladis Tamia*, Munday was listed as the best plotter (Meres 1598). This could have meant he was 'chief scenario-writer to the Admiral's Men' (Lawrence 1927, 351). The potential double meaning of 'plotter' is not lost on modern scholars (Bate 2009, 168; Stern 2009, 28). Such a double meaning might, however, be an attempt to retrospectively see meaning where there is none. In the late 1590s Munday was satirized in the staged machinations of the War of the Theatres, a series of disputes played out on the London stages at the beginning of the
seventeenth century. Such depictions may also have signalled a level of fame, or, perhaps, infamy, for Munday. Jonson began by incarnating him as 'Antonio Balladino' in *The Case is Altered* (1597) where he was depicted as 'obsessed with "plaine" plays' (Stern 2009, 28). Similar charges were levelled when Munday was portrayed as Posthaste in *Histriomastix* (1599) a year later (Mann 1991, 156; Braunmuller and Hattaway 2003, 408). Munday, as best we can tell, did not reply in kind; indeed, it seems he took no part in the War (the role of his fellow dramatists, however, is discussed in Chapter Three).

The breadth of Munday's network is demonstrated by the fact he wrote pageants and Lord Mayor's shows. Within the satirical lines of *The Case is Altered* this literary pursuit is mentioned, effectively giving a date prior to which he must have commenced the activity. He is 'first recorded as the author of the show in 1602 but he was guyed as "pageant poet to the city" in a scene added to the revised version' of the play 'implying that he had established himself as the new incumbent' by 1600 (Wiggins 2013, 3:406). Munday wrote a host of shows between 1602 and 1623, including two pageants for his own Drapers' company in 1614 and 1615 and one, in 1610, for the investiture festivities for Prince Henry (Bergeron 2007). Munday's son, Richard, by now a painter-stainer, contributed to several of the pageants (Kathman 2004a, 36). 'In the midst of pageant writing', and tackling yet another genre in the process, Munday 'turned formally to writing history' (Bergeron 2007). This included a *Brief Chronicle of the Success of Times, from the Creation* (1611) that attempts to recount 'the world's history from creation to the present moment' (Bergeron 2007). Perhaps Munday's magnum opus however, was saved until late on in his career. He finished and published a new edition of John Stow's *Survey of London* (Munday and Stow 1618). Stow, Munday claimed, 'had hoped to enlarge his *Survey* himself, "but prevented by infirmity, and
Sickness-bringing death," Stow had "imparted not only his Intention, but best Collections also unto me" (Knapp 2009, 133).

As Munday approached something like retirement, the city 'bethought itself of his thirty years' service "with his Pen, in divers imployments," and 'decreed that "in consideration of his age and present wants"' he should be entitled to nominate one person to be made free of the City per year for the rest of his life (Wright 1928, 2(1):169). Munday wrote his own will in 1629 'beinge very weake and ffeeble . . . but sound and secure both in minde and soule' before dying in 1633 (Eccles 1959, 104). On his death Munday's second wife, Gillian or Jillian, executed his will; his estate was worth £135 7s 10d (Bergeron 2007). His widow received gifts from a host of the City's guilds in exchange for copies of the *Survey* (Kathman 2004a, 35).

In showcasing Munday's versatility, Tracy Hill noted that Munday played a 'ubiquitous role in the culture of his day' (2009, 2), as a man capable and willing to turn his hand to a new pursuit. His outlook meshed perfectly with that required of a playwright in the 1590s. A range of employments and people in Munday's network served him well. His relationship with Henry Chettle, for instance, pre-dated his time with Henslowe. The pair were good friends by 1592: Chettle contributed a dedicatory epistle to at least two of Munday's works, as well as having various links with their printing (Wright 1961b, 129–30). This early relationship manifested itself when the pair teamed up in writing plays for the Admiral's men. Munday wrote with others too: Michael Drayton, Richard Hathway, Wentworth Smith, Richard Wilson, John Webster, Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton (Carson 1988). Indeed, David M. Bergeron has shown the flaws in scholarship that argues for animosity between Middleton and Munday (1996). Munday may have taken a senior role in writing for
Henslowe on occasion. More than once, formulations of the kind 'M' Mundaye & the Reste of the poets' or 'An: Munday & the rest' are mentioned (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 126, 135).

Munday's network with industry professionals stretched beyond the theatre too: despite Jonson parodying Munday on stage, the pair collaborated on the Lord Mayor's pageant in 1604. Munday earnt £2 for his 'paines' and Jonson £12 for his device and 'speech for the Children' (Bergeron 2007). Instances like this are worth remembering when we meet arguments about the bitter rivalries played out in the so-called War of the Theatres in Chapter Three. Munday's relationships seemed to endure, too. As well as a long-term friendship with Chettle, and repeated collaborations with his neighbours in Cripplegate, Munday remained friends with Edward Alleyn. On 30 April 1620, the Admiral's men's lesser-known diarist wrote in his journal: 'Mr Mondaye and his wife dinde with us' (Eccles 1982, 99).

Gifts from the City, a pension, crown property, dinners with old friends and his reversion of the fisheries in Cornwall speak to the depth of Munday's professional network by the end of Munday's career. Donna B. Hamilton has traced the political 'patronage networks' at play around Munday's earliest writings (2005, 2–6) and these could rightly be thought of as setting the tone for the rest of his working life. We saw throughout the early part of this chapter how the theatre industry was in a period of reorganization and how playwrights sought diverse professional portfolios possibly in response to the nature of the industry in the 1590s. Munday perfected such pursuits.

(Bentley 1941a, 1941b, 1956a, 1956b, 1956c, 1968a, 1968b)
Chapter Three. The 1600s: The Re-emergence of the Boy Companies into a Competitive Marketplace

As the seventeenth century began, a playgoer might, if so inclined, consume professional theatre at eight sites in London. Depending on one's social standing and profession, one might also attend performances by professional companies at court or amateur productions staged at the Inns of Court. A decade earlier, in 1590, one had a choice of nine theatres in which to see a play. There were, however, significant differences between those theatres available to professional companies. Five of those open in 1590 – indoor spaces like the chamber used at St Paul's and City inns called the Bel Savage, Bell Inn, Bull Inn and Cross Keys Inn – were not purpose-built for playing. The City inns, in particular, skew the count of early theatrical venues as we know they staged playing only sporadically (Bowsher 2012, 41). They were accompanied by the first wave of purpose-built professional theatres in or around London: the Rose, Newington Butts, the Curtain and the Theatre. By 1600, the number of structures built specifically for playing had increased to seven. The City inns that had been used occasionally for theatre a generation earlier (and in the 1590s) ceased hosting plays and the purpose-built amphitheatre-style playhouses took their place. The Fortune, Globe and Swan now hosted drama along with the Rose and the long-lasting Curtain. The Boar's Head had been transformed from an inn to a playhouse in the late 1590s (H. Berry 1986, 11) and St Paul's began staging drama again. A second Blackfriars theatre opened too, on a different site from the first, but still within the precinct (Stern 2014, 105).

These changes in the space used for drama can be read as a burgeoning theatre industry becoming more confident in the stability of its market. By 1600, theatrical entrepreneurs could see that staging dramatic performances for the public was a viable commercial enterprise. Not only was professional drama popular enough to draw an audience, but it had
proved resilient enough to survive attempts at official suppression, negotiate in-fighting and endure severe plague outbreaks. Clearly, 1600 does not delineate the start or end of a particular epoch in this respect: purpose-built theatres had been operating for 23 years by this point with more being added regularly, and they would go on being added well into the seventeenth century. But, by 1600 it was evident that theatres could be sustainable and lucrative. This increase in purpose-built playing spaces signalled an increased capacity for theatre professionals: more theatres meant more room for actors, more stages for playwrights to write for and more theatre managers and impresarios to help, or hinder, administration. An increase in the number of people working in the business likely signalled an increase in the size of a given person's professional social network.

An expanding theatre industry meant other things too. More supply (that is, a greater capacity, or more spaces, to stage plays) does not necessarily equal greater competition for audiences and for profits since diversity of provision can itself increase demand. It might be, for instance, that there were potential audience members not yet attending drama because their tastes and/or needs were not hitherto catered for. Only when there were enough playing spaces to hold all prospective audience members would competition inexorably rise: playing companies would then be competing for a finite demand. Despite this, however, an expanding market can feel competitive to those serving it. The arrival, for instance, of the Globe in Southwark, a hundred yards from the Rose is likely to have felt like extra competition for those at the Rose, regardless of the possibility of enough prospective audience members to fill both.

It is this extra competition that causes this chapter to focus on the 1600s. Few periods in the early modern theatre have spawned more debate than this decade and its events.
Historians have long imagined a War of the Theatres in the early 1600s prompted by the re-emergence of playing companies of boys in the City of London in apparent competition with the adult companies. The animosity this caused spilled onto the stage with an exchange of caricatures and insults, a number of which are outlined below. The aftermath of the War is imagined to have dragged on through the decade too, causing a particularly uneasy transition for those once-boy-actors who sought to act with the adult companies.

A decade that begins with extra competition in a proto-capitalist industry provides a good test-case, as did the 1590s, on which to examine a narrative of fraternal dealings in a cooperative industry. In approaching the period, and the War, with social networks in mind, we meet evidence that runs contra to traditional narratives of disharmony. For example, we see writers who are usually thought to be at odds with one another working together on a play, and one writing dedicatory verses for the other's publication. We also see boy actors, thought to be the scourge of the adult companies in this decade, silently joining adult companies themselves. Following the social networks of those involved therefore offers an ideal window through which to view the War and its seeming aftershocks in the theatre world. The case study of Nathan Field's life, in particular, is drawn on to do just this.

The Boy Companies

The extra competition in the early years of the seventeenth century was likely embodied by the re-emergence of two playing companies of boys occupying indoor spaces in the city. There had been companies of boy actors before. Indeed, there was a long tradition of boys playing to an audience: 'Throughout Western Europe in the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance, groups of grammar school students and choirboys performed plays in addition
to pursuing their studies or attending at religious devotions' (M. Shapiro 1977, 1). Attached to
the court were the Children of the Chapel, the young choristers who made up part of the
Chapel Royal. These children, of interest not least because of their proximity to the court and
London, are first recorded as performing at court in January 1516, alongside William
Cornysh, their master (Bowers 2008). During Elizabeth I's reign this company went on to
occupy the first (1576-1584) and second (1600-1608) Blackfriars theatres. The company
performed under different names at different times. They were the Children of the Chapel
until issued with a royal patent in 1603 when they became the Children of the Queen's
Revels. Politically controversial performances lost them their royal patent in 1606; henceforth
they were the Children of the Revels (Munro 2005, 2). Further indiscretion saw them leave
the Blackfriars in 1608, but 'a new "Children of the Queen's Revels" was in residence at the
Whitefriars theatre' by late 1609 (Munro 2005, 2). Another boy company performed at St
Paul's from 1575 to 1590 before being revived in 1599 and playing there until 1606. The first
Paul's company provoked censure: they became involved in the religious Marprelate
controversy and, in 1590, the government stopped them playing as a result (Gurr 1987, 136).

For the purposes of this thesis the boy companies are counted as professional
companies. This distinction is neither arbitrary nor convenient. In his book *Children of the
Revels* Michael Shapiro explained that the early boy troupes 'were regarded as amateurs, even
though their masters often received remuneration'. This tradition continued, lasting until 'the
boy companies of London achieved a quasi-professional status during Elizabeth's reign when
they began rehearsing for court performances in front of paying spectators at their own
private theatres' (M. Shapiro 1977, 1). In time, performances by boys in London became
'outright commercial' though the 'illusion of amateurism was accepted by many' (M. Shapiro
1977, 15). This commercialization is attested in extant records.
Edward Kirkham, who was associated with the management of the second boy troupe at the Blackfriars (Nungezer 1929, 227–28), was complainant in a lawsuit of 1612 the documents of which show the Blackfriars playhouse operating in 1600-1608 as a commercial enterprise. Richard Burbage and John Heminges, named as defendants in the suit, described in their answers to Kirkham's complaint how the theatre had been set up by one Henry Evans:

And this deft further answereth & saith that true yt is that this defendt, considering with himselfe that, except the said Evans could erect & keepe a companye of Playinge boyes or others to playe playes & interludes in the said Playhowse in such sort as before tyme had bene there vsed, that he was lykelye to be beh[ind with] the said rent of fortie pounds, for that the said howse was not otherwise worth soe much rent as therevpon was reserved. (Fleay 1890, 234)

In addition to the £40 annual rent, Evans and Alexander Hawkins, his son-in-law, had agreed to enter into a bond for the sum of £400 with Burbage, who owned the space used for the theatre. The theatre must have been planned to draw a commercial income else the rent would be too high for the space alone, as noted in the testimony above. The boys at Paul's were commercialised too. Andrew Gurr articulated the commercial motivations of Sebastian Westcott, one master of Paul's boys, thus: 'That the playhouse was built for boys to perform in shows how strongly the commercial incentive was growing' in the 1570s (1996, 221). Judging by Westcott's manoeuvres it must have been a powerful motive.

In 1596, with the lease on the Theatre coming to its end, James Burbage sought out a new theatre. He bought what would become the second Blackfriars theatre: the 'parliament chamber and allied places' of the Blackfriars precinct (Wickham, Berry, and Ingram 2000, 501). The move was scuppered, however, by a petition from local residents who did not want a playhouse and its associated vices in their well-heeled residential area (I. Smith 1966, 480–
James Burbage died in 1597 without seeing drama at the Blackfriars (Edmond 2004), but his sons, who inherited the space, did manage to see plays staged there. As mentioned above, rather than have the space stay empty Burbage rented it to Henry Evans who promptly established a company of boy actors there. It is worth highlighting this for the discussion that follows. The boy actors, cast as rivals to the adults, were afforded their playing space by one of the senior members of a rival adults company. Indeed, Burbage profited from their renting the space.

Though the boy companies in the latter half of the sixteenth century were meant to make money for their managers, the actors themselves were amateurs in the sense that they earned no money from performance. That is, though the playing companies were professional, operating in a competitive, commercial marketplace, the actors were amateurs. This distinction, though initially counter-intuitive, finds parallels elsewhere. The practice of having amateurs performing for a paying public while those in charge collect, and keep, the profits is largely analogous to college sports in the United States of America, which generate billions of dollars every year, giving some colleges revenues in excess of $150,000,000 (Berkowitz et al. 2016). And yet, the players are strictly amateurs.

Given that the boy companies were run by their managers as commercial enterprises it seems sensible to compare them with and consider them in relation to the commercial adult companies of the period. This chapter does just that. Its first portion is concerned with the theatre historical context of the boys' re-emergence at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the rivalry, or perceived rivalry, it created. Rendered as the 'poets' war', or 'poetomachia' (Hirschfeld 2009, 453), or labelled as 'the war of the theatres' (Egan 2001b, 516), this conflict informs much thinking about the drama of this brief period. Despite the
mixed nomenclature, I adopt 'War' as a shorthand throughout my discussion, for ease of reference. Plays by John Marston, Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker and William Shakespeare contributed to the supposed quarrel (Bednarz 2001, 2). The conflict is reappraised in light of the social networks of those involved, as well as those indirectly affected elsewhere in the dramatic world. This discussion feeds into the chapter's second part where, having established the historical context, the evidence for the specific social networks of those involved with early seventeenth century theatre is considered. As with other chapters a biographical case study illustrates specific arguments about the social networks of the early decades of the seventeenth century. For this, we turn to the life of the actor-dramatist Nathan Field. Throughout, this chapter considers the influence of the boy companies on existing and newly formed social networks.

Thus far, I have styled the re-emergence of boy companies in London in the years around 1600 as offering direct competition to the adult companies. This implies that the adult companies would have felt the competition: the boys were encroaching on their audience. Thirty years before, however, the picture was reversed. It had been the first incarnation of professional boy companies in London who had been dominant. 'Between 1564 and 1576 forty-two boy plays in all were presented at court compared to twenty-seven adult company plays' (Gurr 1996, 216). Over time, this dominance eroded; indeed, 'nineteen of the adult companies' twenty-seven' plays 'were staged in the last four of these seasons. The challenge to the boy companies from the adults was growing fast' (Gurr 1996, 216). Though 30 years separated the boys' court dominance and the re-emergence tackled here, it might have lived long in the theatrical memory; men involved with the adult companies might have known of a time when boy companies were dominant, even if not able to directly recall it. Thus, we might imagine the appearance of boy troupes being met with suspicion, or outright hostility.
One man involved with the first and second incarnations of the boy companies was Henry Evans. The man described in Burbage and Heminges' testimony above as holder of the Blackfriars theatre's lease in 1600 had also been lessee of the first Blackfriars playhouse in 1583 (Nungezer 1929, 132). Clearly, Evans saw commercial appeal in the prospect of housing a boy company; he will be returned to later. It is, however, worth asking just what he might have seen in the theatrical landscape of 1600 to make him want to reinvest in a boy company.

Closest in proximity and organization to the second Blackfriars theatre was the theatre at St Paul's. A five minute walk separated the two, with the theatre at St Paul's 'in the Almonry House, a small building behind Convocation House' (Armstrong 1959, 234). The theatre reopened in 1599 thanks to the boys' master, Edward Pearce (Foakes 2003, 24). The theatre itself was particularly small, and, according to one estimate, was shaped so as to appear round, holding roughly 100 people (Gair 1982, 66–67). The Blackfriars theatre was larger, and 'measured 66 by 46 feet; it had at least two galleries of seating for spectators and could accommodate perhaps as many as 500' (Foakes 2003, 24). The Blackfriars was built in the upper frater or refectory of what was once the Dominican friary that gave its name to the precinct; it had, by the time the boys occupied it, also served as a lawcourt and a parliament (Stern 2014, 98). The indoor theatres of the boys staged plays by George Chapman, Ben Jonson, John Marston, Thomas Middleton, John Lyly, and others (Foakes 2003, 25).

The stability and expansion of the theatrical marketplace sketched above did not necessarily mean continuity in playing venues for acting companies in the early 1600s. The three major companies – the Admiral's men, the Chamberlain's men, and Worcester's men –
all occupied multiple venues through these years. Worcester's men were under the patronage of Edward Somerset, a Privy Councillor who held the role of Master of the Horse after Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, was executed in 1601 (Croft 2007). Despite efforts from Somerset to ensure that Worcester's men competed with the Admiral's and Chamberlain's men on 'an equal footing' (Gurr 1996, 319), they moved playhouse several times in several years. 'The various shifts of the competing companies in 1601 and 1602 took Worcester's Men from the Rose to the Boar's Head and back again' before they moved, having merged with Oxford's men, to a 'third playhouse, the Red Bull'; there is a possibility they played at the Curtain too in 1601 (Gurr 1996, 319–20). Thus they played under three landlords: Philip Henslowe, Francis Langley and Robert Browne. They did however, despite their 'restless shifting' (Gurr 1996, 319), have 'a substantial group of players: Will Kemp, Christopher Beeston, John Duke – all formerly of the Chamberlain's men – as well as Robert Pallant, John Lowin and Richard Perkins' (Gurr 1996, 319–20). Thomas Heywood wrote plays for the company.

As we saw in the previous chapter, an official duopoly existed by 1598 and was restated in 1600 (as distinct from the one hypothesised by Gurr, beginning in 1594) that allowed for two companies to play in London. A Privy Council minute of 1598 asserted that 'licence hath bin graunted unto two companies of stage players retayned unto us, the Lord Admyral and Lord Chamberlain, to use and practise stage playes' (Chambers 1923b, 4:325). This was restated in 1600 in terms of playing spaces: 'First, that there shall bee about the Cittie two howses and noe more allowed to serue for the vse of the Common Stage plaies' (Chambers 1923b, 4:330–31). The Council order went on to stipulate the location of these houses – 'one shalbe in Surrey in that place which is Commonlie called the banckside or there aboutes, and the other in Midlesex' – and that it would be the Admiral's men and the
Chamberlain's men who occupied them (Chambers 1923b, 4:330–31). The order also took account of recent or planned moves by each company: it referred to Edward Alleyn's plans to build a new playhouse, the Fortune, for the Admiral's men, and that the Chamberlain's men 'haue made choise of the house called the Globe' (Chambers 1923b, 4:330–31). These new theatres were to replace older ones (the Rose and the Theatre, respectively), rather than coexist with them. The two boy companies seem not to have been considered by the Privy Council in the same way as the adult companies. The boy companies appear to have been more acceptable. A Privy Council minute from March 1601 reminded the Lord Mayor to 'not faile to take order the playes within the cyttie and the liberties, especially at Powles and in the Blackfriers, may be suppressed during this time of Lent' (Chambers 1923b, 4:332). The implication, therefore, is that, unlike the officially restricted adult companies, the boy companies were not limited by the duopoly system.

The two 'allowed' adult companies virtually swapped locations around 1600. The Chamberlain's men went from the Curtain, where they had played briefly, having vacated the Theatre in 1598, and moved to the Globe, opposite the Rose on Bankside. In turn, the Admiral's men went from the Rose on Bankside to the Fortune north of the river, about half a mile west of the Curtain. The change in location for the Admiral's men did not, however, prompt a change in landlord: the Fortune had been built at the behest of Edward Alleyn and Philip Henslowe (Orrell 1993, 127). The company's star, Edward Alleyn, had retired, from the stage at least, around 1597; in reality though he appeared to have deliberately taken time off the stage to 'manage theatrical and other investments' (Cerasano 2004a). Alleyn 'took up his place with the company again' in 1600, coming out of retirement (Cerasano 1998, 104). His return saw him back among fellow actors: Richard Allen (no relation to Edward),

While the Admiral's men were being guided by their impresario landlord and leading actor in the early years of the seventeenth century, the Chamberlain's men had an actor-sharer model. At their creation in 1594, eight members combined their capital to create the joint stock of the company. According to Gurr, in his biography of the Chamberlain's/King's men, the original company seemed 'to have been led by eight sharers, the standard number for the time, each holding (and paying for) one full share' (2004c, 13). The sharers, seven of whom we can be sure of, were: George Bryan, Richard Burbage, John Heminges, Will Kemp, Augustine Phillips, Thomas Pope, and William Shakespeare; the eighth sharer was 'almost certainly' Will Sly (Gurr 2004c, 13). These sharers made money from the profits of the theatre. The company paid rent to the theatre owner(s), who, whilst playing at the Theatre, had been James Burbage, father of Richard. For a brief period after James' death, the Theatre was rented from Cuthbert Burbage as his successor. Other costs – for properties, costumes, playbooks, additional hired actors – were also borne by the sharers. With the move south to the Globe the company's model altered slightly: the actor-sharers became 'housekeepers', that is, theatre owners, as well as company owners.

Cuthbert and Richard Burbage took the majority of shares in the Globe, but for the first time others outside their family were also part-owners of the company's venue. The Burbage brothers owned 25% of the theatre each (Gurr 1997, 45). And, initially, company sharers John Heminges, Will Kemp, Augustine Phillips, Alexander Pope and William Shakespeare paid £100 each in exchange for 10% of the theatre each (Gurr 1997, 45–46, 2004c, 112). Kemp soon left the company and sold his share to the other, non-Burbage, sharers, thus
increasing their share in the theatre to 12.5%. (Gurr 1997, 45–46). E. K. Chambers, making a
point about Shakespeare that may be applied to all the company's sharers with a stake in the
Globe, explained that each member was at 'once a "housekeeper", interested in a proportion
of takings assigned as quasi-rent to the owners of a theatre, and an actor-sharer receiving no
salary at all, but making his profit with his fellows, after outgoings had been paid, out of the
rest of the takings' (Chambers 1930a, 2:68).

The Globe's housekeepers were all sharers in the company, though not all sharers in the
company were housekeepers. In an arrangement 'substantially agreed before Christmas 1598'
and in a contract signed on 21 February 1599 the Burbages, Cuthbert and Richard, 'and their
associates' leased a piece of land in Southwark from one Nicholas Brend (H. Berry 1987, 86).
The lease cost the housekeepers £14 10s a year (H. Berry 1987, 86). The Globe was built on
this land in Southwark; famously, the company used the timbers of the old Theatre in
Shoreditch for its construction (Aaron 2000, 279). This method of organization had peculiar
implications. Typically, an acting company would pay rent to the owner of the theatre in
which they performed; the owner, in turn, would pay rent to the person from whom he leased
the land the theatre was built upon, assuming he did not own it outright. In the case of the
Globe, the eight sharers would pay the housekeepers rent for the use of the theatre; the
housekeepers would then pay whatever their lease demanded to the owner of the land and
keep the remainder as return on their investment in constructing the theatre. In practice this
meant that Richard Burbage, Heminges, Pope, Phillips and Shakespeare paid rent (along with
the other sharers) as tenants of the Globe theatre to themselves as housekeepers of the Globe
site (Beckerman 1967, 4).
This model of company finance coupled with the expansion of the theatrical marketplace, unsurprisingly, allowed sharers to amass significant wealth if the plays were reasonably successful. A core of the company membership was earning box office takings and rent. Philip Henslowe's records for performances at the Rose – a theatre smaller than the Chamberlain's men's Globe (Fitzpatrick 2011, 128) – show that even a poor day's takings would likely net at least £1 (20s) for a company, and a good day would see receipts of several pounds (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 20). What this meant in terms of an annual income, however, is difficult to say exactly. Working with numbers taken from Henslowe's accounts Gurr extrapolated an estimated income for Shakespeare at the Globe:

The Chamberlain's annual income [was] at least £1,500, less £480 rent. As a thumbnail sketch to show the profits that were likely to accrue after the 1599 reorganization to the Chamberlain's sharers who also bought into the Globe playhouse, for each year of full operation Shakespeare would have taken one-eighth of the housekeeper's £480 rent, less maintenance costs, an impressive annual income of more than £50, plus as much as £60 from his proportion of the profits as a sharer. (Gurr 2004c, 97)

The Chamberlain's men, who, as of 1603, became the King's men, would go on to be the most enduring company of the period. Their financial organization doubtless helped in this.

Despite the official duopoly, another company was also active around 1600. Derby's men were resident at the Boar's Head playhouse 'under the leadership of Robert Browne' (Manley and MacLean 2014, 326). Browne was a sharer in the Boar's Head itself which meant his company had control over their house, though there were other figures not attached to the company with an interest in the house and its site (H. Berry 1986, 36). Derby's men had other things in their favour too. Their playhouse was immediately next to the city boundary, so it was closer to the centre of town than all other outdoor playhouses at the time (H. Berry 1986, 11). Derby's men were esteemed enough to perform at court: once in February 1600
and twice in January 1601 (Astington 1999, 236). The company also appears to have toured regularly: they appear in provincial records in Woolaton on 7 October 1599 and Leicester on 16 October 1599 (Chambers 1923c, 2:127).

This was the milieu in which Henry Evans and Alexander Hawkins leased the space in the Blackfriars and Edward Pearce reopened the theatre at St Paul's to the public. They clearly saw a commercial opportunity. Their model of company organization looked different to those of the adults. First, the troupe was not comprised of sharers with a financial interest in the company, but boys too young to hold property. Similarly, there were no members of the company involved in owning or renting the theatre space and therefore no one with whom to share performance takings. These arrangements meant that the managers could effectively collect all of each troupe's profits. The company's costs, of course, had to be borne too: rent was owed; the theatres would doubtless have required some maintenance; there were playwrights to pay; and there would have been purchases of play scripts, properties and costumes. One other financial boon that marked the boy companies was that there was no need for theatre managers to pay their actors: the boys were officially being educated in return for their labour.

The War of the Theatres

As noted above, despite not necessarily increasing competition in economic terms, the re-emergence of the boy companies, like the building of the Globe next to the Rose, was likely to feel like an increase in competition for the adult companies. This perceived competition, so an accepted narrative runs, spawned rivalry between adult and boy companies and, in time, this rivalry was manifested in the drama. This so-called 'War of the Theatres' has
deep roots in the origins of theatre history, starting as far back as Nicholas Rowe's narrative in 1709 (Knutson 1995, 1). Roslyn L. Knutson tracks essentially the same narrative well into the twentieth century. In the late nineteenth century, two monographs were published – Josiah H. Penniman's *The War of the Theatres* (1897) and Roscoe Addison Small's *A Stage Quarrel* (1899) – on the topic, one of which drew the conclusion that because of the 'numerous and fierce rivalries among these men [early modern playwrights] and the companies represented by them, the introduction of personal satires upon the stage was inevitable. The great stage-querrel, in its deeper causes, was the outgrowth of the time' (Small 1899, 12). In the same decade F. G. Fleay's *Chronicle History of the London Stage* (1890) 'inferred commercial ramifications from personal conflict', linking, like Small and Penniman, the playwrights to the companies (Hume 2003, 246). Alfred Harbage, in *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (1952), helped the idea mutate further 'into a class war between the public and private playhouses' (Knutson 2001b, 6). To one reviewer's mind 'For readers educated in the 1960s . . . the "War of the Theatres" was simply a fact' (Hume 2003, 246).

This rivalry-manifested-in-drama is reverse engineered by critics from the surviving drama. That is, there are no documents stating that a War of the Theatres took place. Rather, commentators have theorised its existence from perceived references in a relatively small number of plays. It is from these 'personal satires' outlined by Small that the narrative is overlaid onto theatre history. Several instances in these satires, lines that serve as the core arguments about the war, are quoted below: the evidence they provide and the service to which they have been pressed are not always aligned, as we shall see. Once the notion that a war of the theatres took place is broadly accepted, however, it begets further arguments about rivalries and quarrels between dramatists and between companies. The evidence of the supposed war, now hardened into orthodoxy, is prevalent in twenty-first century scholarship.
In turn, the 'war' narrative has been used to support a range of ancillary arguments, each a step removed from what the drama can actually show us. For instance, Harbage's vision of a 'class war' stemmed from the evidence sketched above, as does the recent claim that the war exacerbated a 'competitive and dramatically combative atmosphere' (Sasser 2012, 11). David Farley Hills has gone further, claiming that without the changes in theatrical taste brought by John Marston's and Thomas Middleton's plays for the boys, and the competitive atmosphere of the time, 'Shakespeare's work in these years would be very different and in my view considerably less impressive' (1990, 4).

Given the reach of these claims, well beyond the matters of theatre history in which they are rooted, it is worth examining what supports them. Almost nothing of what follows is concrete: dating, authorship attribution and interpretation vary depending on the arguments of the critics making them. Nevertheless, a survey of the arguments and their sources helps ground what follows. James Bednarz, in the most recent book-length treatment of the subject, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War*, splits the topic into three periods spanning autumn 1599 to autumn 1601 (2001, 9). Autumn 1599 to autumn 1600 was phase 1, autumn 1600 to spring 1601 was phase 2, and spring 1601 to autumn 1601 was phase 3. The War involved four dramatists (Marston, Jonson, Dekker, and Shakespeare), three companies at three theatres (the children at St Paul's, the children at the Blackfriars, and the Chamberlain's men at the Globe), and some 13 plays, not counting different hypothesised versions of certain works (Bednarz 2001, 9). Conventionally, John Marston's *Histriomastix* (1600) has been marked as the War's beginning, shortly followed by *Every Man Out of his Humour* (1600) by Jonson in response (Kay 2002, 470). These are reversed in Bednarz's chronology, however. His runs thus: *Every Man Out of his Humour* (1599); *Histriomastix* (1599); *Every Man Out of his
**Humour** (1599), with the addition of certain episodes in response to *Histriomastix; As You Like It* (1600); *Jack Drum's Entertainment* (1600); *Cynthia's Revels* (1600); *Twelfth Night* (1601); *What You Will* (1601); *Poetaster* (1601); *Satiromastix* (1601); *Troilus and Cressida* (1601); 'Apologetical Dialogue of *Poetaster* (1601); *Hamlet* (1601), with the addition of 2.2.337-362 the 'little eyases' scene as discussed below (Bednarz 2001, 10–11). Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (1600) and *Antonio's Revenge* (1600-1601) are counted as 'peripheral' (Bednarz 2001, 9).

R. A. Small went further back in his account, dating a version of *Histriomastix* to 1596 (1899, 173). Though published in 1610 by Thomas Thorpe, the play is considered Elizabethan because of references to Astraea, a Greek Goddess associated with Queen Elizabeth (Yates 1947). Indeed, a particularly fawning final speech – 'Emperesse, whose praise for Peace shall mount, / Whose glory, which thy solid vertues wonne, / Shall honour Europe whil'st there shines a Sunne.' – is aimed at Astraea while she 'mounts vnto the Throne' (Marston 1610, H2v). Small's version of the play's history had the playwright Anthony Munday gull'd as the character Posthaste in an early version, not by Marston. A later version, adapted by Marston, included the satirical Chrisoganus who was considered to be a portrayal of Ben Jonson (Small 1899, 174, 67). Munday is also satirised in Ben Jonson's *The Case is Altered* (1597): Jonson styled him as 'Antonio Ballardino "Pageant Poet to the City of Milan"' in 'a thinly disguised portrait' (Donaldson 2011, 92). These characterizations, however, exist on the fringe of discussions about the war, mainly because Small found 'not the least allusion to the great stage-quarrel' (1899, 172). Though of course they may be deficient, extant records suggest no opening blast or counter from Munday to prompt, or respond to, these satires. The satirical pieces are worth noting, however: they signal further connections
between other playwrights often unremarked upon and they stop the narrowing of our timeframe, our material and our perpetrators.

*Histriomastix* is credited with the opening of the War because of the portrayal of Chrisoganus, the 'inane philosopher' in whom Jonson 'saw himself mocked' (Honan 1998, 277). The parody is highlighted in an exchange with Mauortius:

```
Mauo. Gallants let vs inuent some pleasing sportes,
To fit the Plentuous humor of the Time,

Chri. What better recreations can you find,
    Then sacred knowledge in diuinest thinges.

Phil. Your bookes are Adamants and you the Iron
    That cleaues to them till you confound your selfe

Mauor. Poore Scholler spend thy spirits so and dye.

Phil. Let them doe soe that list, so will not I.

Mauo. I cannot feed my appetite with Ayre,
    I must pursue my pleasures royally,
    That spung'd in sweat, I may returne from sport,
    Mount mee on horse-back, keepe the Hounds and Haukes,
    And leaue this Idle contemplation,
    To rugged Stoicall Morosophists.

Chri. O! did you but your owne true glories know,
    Your iudgements would not then decline so low. (Marston 1610, B4r)
```

Chrisoganus is presented as being at odds with the other characters, and out of touch with normal pursuits: Mauortius wants 'pleasing sports' whereas Jonson-as-Chrisoganus is to be left to 'idle contemplation' (Marston 1610, B4r). Naming Chrisoganus as among the 'Stoicall Morosophists' is an especially good line and pointedly satirical (Marston 1610, B4r). According to Bednarz, who takes a fairly typical view, Jonson, irked, replied in kind in *Every Man Out of His Humour*.

*Every Man Out* is a 'Comicall Satyre' performed, according to its title page in Jonson's 1616 folio, by the Lord Chamberlain's men in 1599 (1616, P4v). Its principal comedians were Richard Burbage, John Heminges, Augustine Phillips, Henry Condell, Will Sly and Thomas
Pope (Jonson 1616, P4v), five of whom were sharers in the Chamberlain's men. (This is accepting Gurr's assumption that Sly was the eighth sharer). Chambers saw no 'portraits in the strict sense of Marston or Dekker, although no doubt' there was 'some parody of Marston's "fustian" vocabulary . . . put into the mouth of Clove' (Chambers 1923d, 3:363). He did, however, recognize satirical elements in the characters of Carlo Buffone and Fastidious Briske that had 'analogies with' satirical characters in later works of the War 'who are undoubtedly Marston and Dekker' (Chambers 1923d, 3:363). Carlo Buffone's description in the play's prefatory matter reads like a character ripe for ridicule:

A Publike, scurrilous, and prophane Iester; that (more swift then Circe) with absurd simile's will transforme any person into deformi ty. A good Feast-hound, or Banket-beagell, that will sent you out a supper some three miles off, and sweare to his Patrons (Dam him) hee came in Oares, when hee was but wafted ouer in a Sculler. A slaue, that hath an extraordinary gift in pleasing his palat, and will swill vp more Sacke at a sitting, then would make all the Guard a posset. His religion is rayling, and his discourse ribaldry. They stand highest in his respect, whom he studies most to reproch (Jonson 1616, G3r–G3v).

The description of Clove, paired with Orange, also offers a character primed for mocking:

An inseparable case of Coxcombs, City-borne; The Gemini or Twins of foppery: that like a paire of woorden foyles, are fit for nothing, but to be practis'd vpon. Being well flatter'd, they'le lend money, and repent when they ha' done. Their glory is to inuite Plaiers, and make suppers. And in company of better ranke (to auoide the suspect of insufficiency) will inforce their ignorance, most desperately, to set vpon the vnderstanding of any thing. (Jonson 1616, G4v)

Chambers hit on a problem: seeing both characters (Buffone and Clove) in some way representing Marston. Assuming Jonson's goal was to satirise Marston to a theatre audience – a goal which is, admittedly, predicated on an acceptance of the broad narrative of the War as being between quarrelling playwrights and companies – it seems reasonable to assume he would have designed a single character to clearly serve as a butt. Creating more than one character with satirical elements to gull Marston, as Chambers detected, would appear to lessen any satirical impact. A clear satire would become harder to follow for an audience if
strung between several characters. Others, though, have found evidence for the same dual identification as Chambers (Small 1899, 202). Another scholar has read Marston in the characters of Clove and Orange (Donaldson 2011, 173). A lack of consensus signals a deeper problem here: the evidence held in the play is difficult to extract. This problem extends further too. Those commentators who do see a single character as representing Marston cannot decide which one it is: he is either Clove (Kernan 1958, 134; Barton 1984, 73; Bednarz 2001, 83), Orange (Donaldson 2011, 173), or Buffone (Penniman 1897, 44; Chambers 1923d, 3:363). *Every Man Out* showcases in microcosm the difficulties associated with drawing firm conclusions about who is satirising whom in the war. Characters in the play have been associated with various playwrights – Dekker, Michael Drayton, George Chapman – and other unexpected people, like Philip Henslowe and the wife of Anthony Munday (Small 1899, 202).

The target of the satire is not the only point at issue in scholarship surrounding the War. The chronology, and thus the order of provocation and response, is debated too, as is the authorship of some of the works. James Bednarz, for instance, argued that a version of *Every Man Out* pre-dates *Histriomastix*, meaning a reverse in the series of events as recounted above. To his mind, Jonson revised *Every Man Out* to take account of Marston's attack in *Histriomastix*, adding the characters of Clove and Orange (Bednarz 2001, 8). The matter is largely moot for the topic under discussion more broadly in this thesis. What matters is that, despite not agreeing on the circumstances, or the exact stage personages involved, there is a rough scholarly consensus that around 1600 Marston and Jonson satirised each other on stage. I say rough consensus, because some doubt Marston's authorship of *Histriomastix*. Knutson, for example, considered the author unknown (2001a). She argued that scholars, ever since Marston was credited with parts of the anonymously published play 1878 (R. Simpson
have been eager to attribute the play to him because of (1) its vocabulary, (2) its style, and (3) its importance in the War of the Theatres (Knutson 2001a, 360–61). She aimed to take apart each of these arguments, by comparing facets of Marston's known work with those present in Histriomastix: the vocabulary; the prosody and imagery; and, somewhat troublingly for the modern reader expecting authorship attribution based on computer software and statistics, the 'trendiness index' – a measure of 'a writer's exploitation of the latest fashion in topical allusions, literary fads, vulgar language, bawdry, and the like' (Knutson 2001a, 364–76).

The removal of Marston's name from Histriomastix would not remove his name from discussions of the War. Instead, it would mean a re-ordering of who called whom what first. Knutson had a particular interest in rendering Histriomastix anonymous: her narrative in Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time, of which her arguments about Histriomastix comprise a chapter, was concerned to refigure the oft-cited rivalries between dramatists and companies, and replace it with a more guild-like fraternal structure. Downplaying the War would strip a vital counter-argument from those who might disagree with such a narrative. Knutson also adduced evidence based on the play's doubling options. Knutson tried to show Histriomastix to be an outlier in this aspect because whereas Marston's plays typically call for somewhere around 20 actors, Knutson determined that Histriomastix would need 44 (Knutson 2001b, 94–95). From this, she concluded that no company would have been able to stage such a play and that scholars should align it with an amateur production of some sort, and, therefore, since it is hard to picture Marston working with amateurs at this point in his career, the play is not his (Knutson 2001b, 93–96).
The reconstructing of doubling options for an extant play is far from an exact science, not least because we do not know 'the rules of the game' (Greg 1922, 120). How long do characters need to effect a quick-change? Can actors playing boys cross gender to play girls and vice versa? How many extras are called for when a character enters with attendants? But, accepting these limitations, one can attempt to piece together the minimum required cast size for a play in its surviving form. Doing this for *Histriomastix* is especially fraught, not least because the play has over 100 speaking parts. Some rules must be applied consistently to produce a working doubling chart. Typically actors are not required to finish one scene in one role and immediately re-enter for the next scene as someone else. Actors have around a minimum of 20 lines for a quick-change. Actors do not share a role. Stage directions calling for attendants or soldiers are afforded two actors, unless otherwise specified. These rules roughly follow those of recent casting studies by Sally-Beth Maclean and Lawrence Manley (2014, 343). By following these guidelines, the play in its published state, can be performed by around 24 actors (see Appendix 1). The discrepancies with Knutson's study occur throughout but most markedly in the play's last scenes and epilogue where six hitherto unseen characters are called for. She calls on new actors to play them, rather than fitting them in with existing parts. Tellingly, the final scene of Act Five calls for the most actors on stage simultaneously, with a host of characters having just exited: all 24 cast members are used here. This includes two 'Peasants', two 'Citizens' and one 'Soldier'. It is difficult to imagine a playwright, even preparing a play for an amateur troupe, needing twice the number of actors that his largest scene required.

*Histriomastix*, therefore, does not represent a significant outlier with regards to the company size demanded to stage it. The fact it could have been staged with around 24 actors does not necessarily mean that it was, of course. Companies were not obliged to use the
minimum number of actors, although in general they had an incentive to do so since additionally hired men had to be paid by the sharers (a concern not as acute for boy companies where the actors were not paid). A smaller cast than she reckoned does not render Knutson's claim about the play's authorship incorrect, but it does remove a significant argument for her anonymous attribution. Knutson's argument has met significant counterblasts from elsewhere. Bednarz published an essay where he attempted to refute Knutson and reaffirm Marston as the author (2002). Charles Cathcart, most recently, found in favour of Marstonian authorship based on a 'gloriously disrespectful glance at Hamlet's deathless prose' in a case that was strengthened by 'an inception involving a writer known to echo Hamlet [as Marston was] and to engage with Jonson repeatedly [as Marston was], and located at a venue where such echoes and engagements took place [like St Paul's]' (2003, 429–30).

The relationship between Jonson and Marston is not just complicated by coded references to one another in print. Jonson, in his conversations with William Drummond, told how he 'had many quarrels with Marston, beat him, and took his pistol from him, wrote his Poetaster on him; the beginning of them were that Marston represented him in the stage' (Patterson 1923, 26–27). The fact he beat Marston and stole his pistol is mentioned earlier in the Conversations too (Patterson 1923, 15). Given this report alone, we would conclude that Jonson and Marston disliked each other; this assumption is further supported by evidence of repeated satirical barbs in their plays. And yet, there is also strong evidence to the contrary. In 1605 both men, along with George Chapman, co-authored a play called Eastward Ho! Though not necessarily a signal of friendship, working together on a play suggests that the men were able to maintain some sort of professional relationship during the collaboration. Suzanne Gossett, when discussing the play's uniformity, saw evidence for what she described
as possible 'close work by all three authors on the final draft' (2004b, 193). These three writers were experienced enough to not necessarily need the apprenticeship or the exposure that writing with more accomplished writers could provide and we might, therefore, see them choosing to work together as equals. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson saw Marston as originating the idea for *Eastward Ho!* (1944, 716). Conversely, C. G. Petter found it 'difficult to imagine the enterprise not taking shape under the direction of the most experienced and outspoken playwright of the three', meaning Jonson (1973, xix). One of the play's recent editors chose not to weigh in on who contrived to marshal the play and its collaborators (Fossen 1999). With Jonson or Marston initiating the work the other had to be brought into the team at some point. Sworn enemies, we may conclude, would hardly be likely to offer, or accept, the invitation to collaborate. Thus, Jonson and Marston's relationship cannot have existed in a permanent state of enmity.

*Eastward Ho!* proved controversial. It lampooned King James' practice of selling knighthoods and mocked the Scottish accent with lines like 'I ken the man weel, hees one of my thirty pound knights' (Chapman, Jonson, and Marston 1605, F1v) and 'Now this is he that stole his knighthood o' the gradday, for *foure pound* (Chapman, Jonson, and Marston 1605, F1v). Other offensive passages were removed from the play before it was printed (Burnett 2006). So seditious was the play that Jonson and Chapman were imprisoned (Burnett 2006). In a bid to be released, Jonson and Chapman wrote letters to members of the nobility and the King protesting their innocence. Ten surviving letters are 'almost certainly' related to this episode, though none mentions the play specifically (Donaldson 2013). In Chapter One, we looked briefly at the letters and the different tale told by each writer in a bid to absolve themselves. We meet them again here, and are concerned with what they tell us about the playwrights' relationships.
In one prison missive to the 'most nobly-vertuous and thrice-honor'd' Earl of Salisbury, Jonson declared:

I am here (my most honor'd Lord) vn-examined, or vnheard, committed to a vile prison, and (w'h mee) a Gentleman, (whose Name may perhaps haue come to yo' Lo:) one M' George Chapman, a learned, and honest Man; The Cause (would I could name some worthier) though I wish we had knowne none worthy o' Imprisonment) is, a (the work yrkes mee, that o' Fortune hath necessitated vs to so desipisd a Course) a Play, my Lord; wherof, we hope, there is no Man can iustly complayne. (Fossen 1999, 221)

He went on to 'beseech yo' most ho: Lordship, suffer not othermens Errors, or Falts past, to be made my Crimes' and pleaded to the Earl that 'if others haue transgressed, let not me bee entitled to they^e Follyes' (Fossen 1999, 221).

Jonson appears keen in his writings from prison to absolve himself by fingering another man for the 'Follyes' for which he stands accused. Chapman does likewise in his letters, often appealing to the same noblemen as Jonson. Since Jonson labels Chapman honest, it is unlikely he is attempting to lay the blame on him. Rather, it seems that Jonson is tacitly identifying Marston as the author of the offending passages. This might simply have been an act designed to save a desperate Jonson by deflecting blame towards Marston. But, equally, it could be seen as a marker of Jonson's continued dislike for his collaborator and additional reason for it.

Marston shared another publication with Jonson in 1605. He contributed a prefatory poem to Jonson's play _Sejanus_ (1604, published in Jonson 1605), which is an act not easily read as antagonistic. Marston's six-line verse asserted that 'neuer English shall, or hath before Spoake fuller grac'd' (Jonson 1605, A3r). It suggests that Jonson's play offered the most graceful use of the English language yet seen. Possibly this hints at knowledge of the
attention Jonson gave to readying a text for the press. Marston's lines pick up a theme noted in Jonson's address to the reader: namely, his attempts to provide an elegant text. His book 'is not the same with that which was acted on the publicke Stage, wherein a second Pen had good share: in place of which I haue rather chosen, to put weaker (and no doubt lesse pleasing) of mine own' (Jonson 1605, ¶2v). Certainly, this is not an act typically associated with a hostile relationship. Were we intent on wringing every drop of possible evidence from the prefatory remarks to *Sejanus*, we might find only a grudging respect in Marston's poem being the shortest (6 lines) of all the eight prefatory works. In contrast, George Chapman, the third collaborator on *Eastward Ho!*, provided the longest poem, spanning six pages, perhaps suggesting a warmer, closer relationship.

The assembled evidence suggests an oscillation in the relationship of Jonson and Marston: they satirised one another repeatedly on stage at the start of the seventeenth century; they collaborated on *Eastward Ho!* in 1605; Jonson all but named Marston to senior noblemen as the author of abusive passages in their collaborative play; Marston offered a poem to preface the publication of *Sejanus*; and, over a decade later, the memory of their relationship that Jonson chose to share with Drummond was that of acrimony, their quarrels.

Drummond's notes on Jonson's recollections are not necessarily the most accurate indicator of Marston and Jonson's relationship simply by dint of their being Jonson's last known recorded words on the matter. Elsewhere in the conversations, for instance, Jonson is recorded as claiming that 'Shakespeare wanted Arte' and logging Shakespeare's errors: 'Sheakspear, in a play, brought in a number of men saying they had suffered Shipwrack in Bohemia, wher ther is no sea neer by some 100 miles' (Patterson 1923, 5, 20). The second comment refers to Shakespeare endowing the land-locked Bohemia with a sea coast
(following his source, Robert Greene's *Pandosto*) in *The Winter's Tale* (Shakespeare 1623, Aa6v). Afforded only this, critics would assume jealousy from Jonson towards Shakespeare. But, when these criticisms are considered alongside Jonson's eulogy to Shakespeare in the First Folio of 1623 their impact is lessened and the dramatists' relationship is not so easily constructed in terms of rivalry and jealousy. Our conclusions about Jonson and Shakespeare's relationship change when we introduce more information than is included in Drummond's summary. The same is true of Marston and Jonson's relationship. Knowing more about the relationship of Jonson and Marston enables a more considered examination of their continued roles in the War of the Theatres. It is to that we now return, as other playwrights enter.

Following *Histriomastix* and *Every Man Out* were other plays by Jonson and Marston, and Thomas Dekker. Matthew Steggle conceived the war as a disagreement about the 'status of professional drama', with Jonson arguing, through his plays, that 'comic drama should be treated seriously' (1998, 40). On the other side of the war, for Steggle, were Dekker and Marston, arguing against Jonson and his claims about the status of comic drama. The character of Brabant Senior was used by Marston to represent Jonson in *Jack Drum's Entertainment* (1600) to achieve this (Wallace 1908, 8:171; Wickham, Berry, and Ingram 2000, 314; Donaldson 2011, 173). As the War went on, the 'personations' become 'more extensive, bitter, and biographically specific' (Steggle 1998, 23). Bednarz detected this trend in Brabant Senior: he is 'Marston's first wholly caustic parody of Jonson' (2001, 138). The character 'is a hypocrite who indulges in the very bombast he mocks' (Bednarz 2001, 142); Marston mocks Jonson's 'language of formal compliment' too by having Senior speak passages like this: 'I protest your abilities are infinite, your perfections matchlesse, your matchlesse perfection infinite in abilitie, and your infinite abilitie, matchlesse in perfection' (1601, E2r).
Keeping broadly to Bednarz’s chronology, his version of the War sees Jonson reply in *Cynthia’s Revels* (1600). This time, according to Bednarz, Jonson pointed an attack at Marston through the play's induction. According to Jonson, Marston: would 'derive his best grace' from the 'common stages' (that is, public playhouses); his work was derivative because he fed 'friends with nothing of their own, but what they have twice or thrice cook'd'; and his audience was uncultured, 'how many coaches came to carry away the broken meat, besides hobby-horses and foot-cloth rags' (Bednarz 2001, 158). In addition, Jonson parodies Marston as Hedon, satirises Dekker as Anaides and wrote himself into the role of Criticus (Bednarz 2001, 160). There are other scholars who are convinced that no such identification can be made, however: 'Jonson intended no individual poet in the type figure of the foppish courtier [Hedon], and there is nothing in the play which would have led a contemporary audience to suspect such an intention' (Berringer 1943, 1). Recognising the disagreements, Charles Cathcart found good evidence in Thomas Dekker's *Satiromastix* (1601) to reaffirm Hedon and Anaides as Marston and Dekker. Largely, this was 'clear from *Satiromastix*’s precise and extended quotation of the lines denigrating Hedon and Anaides that Dekker at least saw in them a direct criticism of Marston and himself' (Cathcart 2008, 153).

Thus far, discussion has followed a narrative driven by playwrights and their parts in the War. With *Cynthia's Revels*, however, we might briefly turn our attention to an acting company, because with this play, for the first time, the Children of the Chapel at the Blackfriars theatre became involved in the War. In September of 1600 Henry Evans agreed to rent the theatre owned by Richard Burbage in the Blackfriars precinct; the lease ran for 21 years from 29 September 1600 (Munro 2005, 15). The fact the company managed to stage a play at all in 1600 is remarkable. For most of the year the theatre had no tenant and no
company. In the court revels season of 1601 it is probable that the Blackfriars company played *Cynthia's Revels* on Twelfth Night, 6 January (Munro 2005, 188). Assuming that *Cynthia's Revels* was reviewed by the Master of the Revels or his officers before being performed at court (Dutton 2016), and that the play had therefore been staged by the company at the Blackfriars at least once, there was a remarkably short window between October 1600 and January 1601 for a wholly new company to spring into being.

In around three months, Evans had managed to complete any maintenance work needed on the theatre and find costumes, properties, playbooks and, most impressively, a full acting company. For this last feat, he had had help from Nathaniel Giles, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal at Windsor. As R. A. Foakes explained, 'in 1561, Queen Elizabeth had given the Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal power to "take" children from anywhere in the realm in order to maintain the choir, and the Master in 1600, Nathaniel Giles, abused his prerogative by impressing boys from various grammar schools in London to play in his company as actors' (2003, 42). The pressing of children into service as actors proved decidedly controversial. Nathan Field, whose life is covered in some detail below, was 'recruited' from St Paul's Grammar School in 1600 (Astington 2010, 53). Another of those pressed into acting was Thomas Clifton; his father brought a case to the Star Chamber to save Thomas from being 'abusively employed . . . in plays and interludes' and held there with 'violence, threats and terror' (Fleay 1890, 127–28). Thomas was subsequently released when the Star Chamber ruled in his favour. As the Blackfriars company scrambled into being, they became the apparent company of choice to fire Jonson's remaining shots in the War. Along with *Cynthia's Revels* in those first months, Evans' company also played his *Poetaster*, helping Jonson carve a niche away from the Chamberlain's men who had played *Every Man* and away from the other boy company as utilised by Marston. This split of Jonson from the
boys and from the Chamberlain's at once corrects and focusses two claims made surrounding
the War. First, it is difficult to reconcile for those who see a strict adult company versus boy
company binary, as we shall see below. And second, it allows for a distinction to be drawn
along company lines in addition to the discussion of the War as simply the preserve of
warring poets.

Marston responded to *Cynthia's Revels* with *What You Will*, performed by Paul's boys.
The play contains a scholar-poet named Lampatho Doria, described as 'a meere Scholler, that
is a meere sot' (Marston 1607, F4r). The character of Doria has been taken by critics to be a
portrayal of Jonson (Barton 1984, 63; Steggle 1998, 40–43; Moulton 2000, 205; McEvoy
2008, 19). Several lines before this description, Quadratus, one of the play's gallants, had
been making fun of Doria's over-wrought love poetry:

*Lamp.* Nay heare it, and rellish it iudiciously.
*Qua.* I do rellish it most iudicially.  
*Lamp.* Adored excellency, delicious sweet.
*Qua.* Delicious sweete good, very good.
*Lamp.* If thou canst taste the purer iuice of loue.
*Qua.* If thou canst taste the purer iuice, good still, good still.
*Qua.* I doe rellish it, it tastes sweete.
*Lamp.* If not the metaphor good, ist not well followed?
*Qua.* Passing good, very pleasing.
*Lamp.* Ist not sweete.
*Qua.* Let me see't Ile make it sweete,
Ile soake it in the iuice of *Helicon.*
Bir Lady, passing sweete, good, passing sweete.
*Lamp.* You wrong my Muse.
*Qua.* The Irish flux vpon thy Muse, thy whorish Muse,
Heere is no place for her loose brothelry,
We will not deale with her, goe, away, away.
*Lamp.* Ile be reueng'd. (Marston 1607, F3v-F4r)

Towards the end of the passage, Marston has Quadratus appear to take Doria's manuscript
and dip it in his wine, 'soake it in the iuice', in order to sweeten the verse, a telling moment of
physical comedy that ensures Doria remains the gull in the audience's memory. If accepted as
a parody of Jonson, the characterization could provide further evidence of Marston and Jonson's involvement in the dispute.

Predictably though, as with so much of the scholarship surrounding the war, there are those who draw the opposite conclusion: Lampatho Doria is meant to represent Marston, not Jonson, they argue (Halliwell 1856, 1:xi; Penniman 1897, 138; Farley-Hills 1990, 54). And, there are those who conveniently see the character aligned with both combatants: Doria is a 'teasing anamorphic double-portrait of the two rivals' (Jackson and Neill 1986, xiv).

Once more, and remaining with Bednarz's chronology, Jonson crafted a response; he wrote *Poetaster*, probably the best known play of the War. Like *Cynthia's Revels*, it was performed by the company of boys under Henry Evans at the Blackfriars. In the play, Jonson put himself on the stage: he 'pretty clearly represented himself as [the character] Horace' (Lopez 2014, 117). In *Poetaster* Marston and Dekker were 'transparently and viciously lampooned as intellectually feeble, craven and unscrupulous peddlers of sub-literary trash (Loxley 2005, 24). Marston was represented as Crispinus, 'a dilettante and impecunious poet who turns to writing for players'; Dekker was represented as Demetrius Fannius, 'a hack writer, "a dresser of plays about the town", one who will slander any man for money' (Twyning 2008). The ridicule between the writers escalates with *Poetaster*, as the mockery becomes markedly more personal. Typifying this is the pointed exchange where Horace, at the end of the play, makes Crispinus 'vomit up fanciful words drawn from Marston's satires and early plays' (Gieskes 2006, 84).
The purging of the 'fustian vocabulary that has contaminated' the 'minds and work' of Crispinus and Demetrius (Gieskes 2007, 110) is caused by Horace administering his 'Physicke' to Crispinus, his 'Patient', to cure the bad poetry (Jonson 1602, M2v):

Crisp. O, I am sicke,
Hor. A Bason, a Bason, quickly; our Physicke works. Faint not, man.
Crisp. O---Retrograde---Reciprocall---Incubus.
Caesar. What's that, Horace?
Hor. Retrograde, Reciprocall, and Incubus are come vp.
Gall. Thanks be to Jupiter.
Crisp. O---Glibbery---Lubricall---Defunct---O---
Hor. VVell said: here's some store.
Virg. VVhat are they?
Hor. Glibbery, Lubricall, and Defunct.
Gall. O, they came vp easie.
Crisp. O---O---
Tibull. VVhat's that?
Hor. Nothing, yet.
Crisp. Magnificate.
Mecoe. Magnificate? that came vp somewhat hard. (Jonson 1602, M3r)

Jonson ensures the point is made for his audience as this device plays out in much the same way for 65 lines. Drawing on words from Marston's earlier works ensures the personation is clear for at least these characters. Indeed, other barbs in the play maintain this personal vein: 'there are frequent references in The Poetaster to Marston's red hair and his little legs, as well as to his genteel origins which seem to have particularly upset Jonson' (Mann 1991, 110).

The mud-slinging continued in Thomas Dekker's reply, Satiromastix, or the Untrussing of the Humorous Poet (1601). It is, notably, Dekker's only play contributed to the War (despite being caricatured by Jonson in Poetaster). Dekker continues Jonson's story of Crispinus and Demetrius, who are vindicated as they 'correct the follies of the overweening Horace' (Cathcart 2012, 51). The play was staged between August and November 1601, a date recently challenged by Gabriele Bernard Jackson and convincingly, defended by
Bednarz (2015, 220–22). The play was registered for publication on 11 November 1601 under what we now consider its subtitle: 'A book called the untrussinge of the humourous poetes' (Bednarz 2015, 220). Its more familiar title deliberately echoes Marston's earlier play Histriomastix, with both plays utilising the vogue for the –mastix suffix, designating a 'person violently hostile to an idea, institution' (*OED* –mastix, *comb. form*).

In *Satiromastix*, Dekker responded to Jonson's personal slights in kind. He:

> drew explicit attention to the gap between Jonson’s Horatian pretensions and the realities of his social position, pointedly referring to Jonson’s killing of Gabriel Spencer (4.2.61), his subsequent escape from execution by reciting the "neck verse" (1.2.117), his past as a bricklayer (1.2.139), and his failed career as a histrionic actor (4.1.125–35). Dekker characterizes Jonson as "self-creating Horace" (5.2.138), who is punished for daring to speak harshly of his betters. (Moulton 2000, 205)

Likewise, where Jonson had attempted to turn Marston's words against him, by having Crispinus vomit them up, Dekker did the same with 'the incorporation of Jonson's own poetry (1.2.1-20, 2.2.57-9)' (Rutter 2008, 298). Though Bednarz cautions against reading the *Poetaster-Satiromastix* exchange as a synecdoche for the war, he does concede that this particular pair of plays constitutes one of the conflict's 'most acrimoniously contested engagements' (2001, 204). The rift between the poets can again be viewed along company lines. Dekker's work was performed, according to the title page of its 1602 quarto, by the Chamberlain's men and by the children of Paul's (Dekker 1602, A1r). Jonson's later contributions to the war were performed by the newly formed company of boys at the Blackfriars. This fact and its wider implications are considered below.

> As with Jonson and Marston, the relationship between Jonson and Dekker is not straightforward. We might presume they felt a certain dislike for one another, given the evidence of distinctly personal slurs in the plays discussed above; at least, we might assume a
strong difference of opinion about the function of drama. But Philip Henslowe's diary contains records of payments to the two writers apparently successfully collaborating on plays now lost. The pair were paid 40s 'in earneste' for the *Page of Plymouth* on 10 August 1599 and, along with Henry Chettle and another gentlemen, were paid for *Robert II* on 3 September 1599 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 123–24). As with Marston and Jonson's relationship, it seems unlikely that if Dekker and Jonson were enemies they would collaborate on a play and then, shortly after, work together on a second. We must conclude a normally functioning professional relationship, at least.

The timing of the pair's collaborations is also striking. Their works together, in August and September 1599 – *Page of Plymouth* was either ready, or virtually ready, for the stage by 12 September 1599 when Henslowe dispensed £10 for women's gowns (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 124) – immediately preceded the start of the War in the Autumn of 1599. It is even possible that the pair were still collaborating as the war began, suggesting that perhaps battle lines were not, initially, if ever, starkly drawn.

*Satiromastix* was the final play contributed to the War by the three writers so far discussed. Critics are keen to find Shakespeare engaged in the feud, perhaps operating on the periphery of these core exchanges, and there is evidence that suggests his involvement. Park Honan, however, decided that Shakespeare 'coolly kept out of the Poets' War' whilst allowing that he 'jokingly included a few of Jonson's traits in Ajax in *Troilus and Cressida* (1602)'; for all his reserve though, he was 'alert to it, and, indirectly at least' saw it affect 'the content and direction of his own writing' (1998, 278). David Bevington discerned a similarly marginal role in the War for Shakespeare. Though Jonson 'was at the centre of the hubbub', he wrote, 'Shakespeare steered away from outright satire' (Bevington 2008, 104). *Troilus and Cressida*
is offered by Honan as one site where Shakespeare engages with the satire, and, by extension, the War. Bevington, in his account of Shakespeare's ideas, offered *As You Like It* (1599-1600) as a play in which Shakespeare engages with satire, despite being 'reluctant to put himself on display as a literary theorist' (2008, 105).

**Shakespeare and the War of the Theatres**

In Bednarz's account, titled *Shakespeare and the Poets' War, As You Like It, Hamlet, Twelfth Night* and *Troilus and Cressida* all play a role. Contemporary evidence gives one positive sighting of Shakespeare in the War, though it offers no specifics. In *2 The Return from Parnassus*, an anonymous university play, we learn that Shakespeare had somehow attacked Jonson. Two of the play's characters, Studiosus and Philomusus, audition to become actors in the acting company of Richard Burbage and Will Kemp:

*Kempe...* I was once at a Comedie in Cambridge, and there I saw a parasite make faces and mouths of all sorts on this fashion.

*Bur.* A little teaching will mend these faults, and it may bee besides they will be able to pen a part.

*Kemp.* Few of the vniuersity pen plaies well, they smell too much of that writer Ouid, and that writer *Metamorphosis*, and talke too much of Proserpina & Iuppiter. Why heres our fellow *Shakespeare* puts them all downe, I and *Ben Ionson* too. O that *Ben Ionson* is a pestilent fellow, he brought vp *Horace* giuing the Poets a pill, but our fellow *Shakespeare* hath giuen him a purge that made him beray his credit.

(Anonymous 1606, G2v)

The lines of Kemp, as well as making an amusing nod towards Shakespeare and his frequent use of Ovid as a source, recall the action of *Poetaster* and Jonson's Horace dealing his patients a 'cure' for their bad poetry at the end of the play. Since that time, it suggests, Shakespeare had dealt a purge of his own to Jonson.
Scholarly opinion is divided on just what constituted the purge, largely because evidence of any direct Shakespearean involvement is thin. Bednarz found evidence in *Troilus and Cressida* and the character Ajax (with possible toilet puns arising from the pronunciation 'a jakes') as Shakespeare sought to 'stigmatize the new breed of formal satirists as unwholesomely noxious "anal" characters' (Bednarz 1993, 189, 2001, 33). Bednarz's view was also held by E. A. J. Honigmann (2002, 233). Jonathan Bate dismissed those who consider Shakespeare's purge to have come from *Troilus*, and also those who look for it in Malvolio from *Twelfth Night*, as pursuers of red herrings (2009, 380–81). The purge, suspected Bate, came through Shakespeare's acting in Dekker's *Satiromastix* when performed by the Chamberlain's men, thus purging Jonson with Dekker's lines and characters.

Given that conclusive evidence of Jonson's purge from Shakespeare is difficult to find, we might reconsider our source of the information, the student author of *2 Return from Parnassus*. The work is seemingly rich with theatrical knowledge. In the scene quoted above the author mentions the character Hieronimo from Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (1587), the opening lines of *Richard 3* (1592-1593) and the character Horace from *Poetaster*, as well as naming Jonson. It also shows a familiarity with the Chamberlain's men's personnel, naming Kemp, 'Dick' Burbage, and Shakespeare. And yet, the author shows himself to be out of touch with the professional theatre world. The earliest proposed date for *2 Return from Parnassus* is 1601, by which point Will Kemp was no longer with the company, having left in 1599 to pursue clowning (Butler 2011). We might ask, therefore, since the author is incorrect about the make-up of the company, what else could he be wrong about? Might he have received poor information about the professional theatre, thus perhaps incorrectly identifying Shakespeare's role in the War? As ever in this War, our evidence is decidedly unreliable.
Shakespeare is often considered to have contributed to the War elsewhere though. *Hamlet* contains lines that appear to bemoan the popularity of the boy companies. As Rosencrantz tells of a company of players come to entertain him, Hamlet enquires:

\[\text{Ham.} \ldots \text{what Players are they?} \]
\[\text{Rosin.} \text{Euen those you were wont to take delight in the Tragedians of the City.} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{How chances it they trauaile? their residence both in reputation and profit was better both wayes.} \]
\[\text{Rosin.} \text{I thinke their Inhibition comes by the meanes of the late Innouation?} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{Doe they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the City? Are they so follow'd?} \]
\[\text{Rosin.} \text{No indeed, they are not.} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{How comes it? doe they grow rusty?} \]
\[\text{Rosin.} \text{Nay, their indeauour keeps in the wonted pace; But there is Sir an ayrie of Children, little Yases, that crye out on the top of question; and are most tyrannically clap't for't: these are now the fashion, and so be-ratled the common Stages (so they call them) that many wearing Rapiers, are affraide of Goose-quils, and dare scarce come thither.} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{What are they Children? Who maintains 'em? How are they escoted? Will they pursue the Quality no longer then they can sing? Will they not say afterwards if they should grow themselues to common Players (as it is like most if their meanes are no better) their Writers do them wrong, to make them exclaim against their owne Succession. (Shakespeare 1623, OO3v–OO4r).} \]

These lines occur only in the First Folio of 1623, however. The complaint was notably softer in earlier printed editions of the play. The first quarto (Q1) of 1603 has Rosencrantz respond to the same question thus:

\[\text{Ross.} \text{My Lord, the Tragedians of the Citty,} \]
\[\text{Those that you tooke delight to see so often.} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{How comes it that they trauell? Do they grow re-} \]
\[\text{Gil.} \text{No my Lord, their reputation holds as it was wont.} \]
\[\text{Ham.} \text{How then?} \]
\[\text{Gil.} \text{Yfaith my Lord, noueltie carries it away,} \]
\[\text{For the principall publike audience that} \]
\[\text{Came to them, are turned to priuate playes,} \]
\[\text{And to the humour of children. (Shakespeare 1603, E3r)} \]

And the lament all but disappears in the second quarto (Q2) of 1604-1605:

\[\text{Ros.} \text{Euen those you were wont to take such delight in, the Tragedians of the Citty.} \]
Ham. How chances it they trauaile? their residence both in reputation, and profit was better both wayes.
Ros. I thinke their inhibition, comes by the meanes of the late innowasion.
Ham. Doe they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the Citty; are they so followed.
Ros. No indeede are they not. (Shakespeare 1604-1605, F2r–F2v)

In isolation, one would be tempted to read in this a hardening of Shakespeare's position towards the boy companies, with him becoming more satirical towards them over time, but this is not necessarily the case. The dating of *Hamlet's* composition, first performances, revisions and versions is complicated and contentious. In their revised Arden3 edition, Neil Taylor and Ann Thompson dedicated 17 pages to discussion of the play's date and could only conclude that the best external evidence – Q1's title page and an entry in the Stationers' Register – pointed to a latest 'completion' date of either 1602 or 1603 and that the best internal evidence pointed 'back to either the spring of 1601 or some time in 1600' (A. Thompson and Taylor 2016, 44–60). What happened to *Hamlet* in performance and print is not covered in any further detail here (see Honigmann 1956; G. Taylor 1997, 122, 396–422; Lesser 2015); the evolution of the above passage, though, is considered briefly.

Traditionally, the lines cited above have been dated around 1600-1601 to align with the War (Knutson 1995, 1). Gary Taylor, in the *Textual Companion* to the Oxford *Complete Works*, thought that the 'little eyases' passage was a later addition to the text, 'although "later" may mean days, rather than years', and that it was not written before Michaelmas 1600 (1997, 122). Where consensus falters however, is just how the differences between early editions occurred. Grace Ioppolo, for instance, saw the lines as an expansion of the reference to the war in Q1, the 'humour of children' pulling audiences to the 'private playes'. The 'humour of children' lines in Q1 may 'imperfectly represent Shakespeare's first attempt, after the play had originally been composed, to mock his private-theatre competition'; the passage was
expanded again, finding 'fuller and more satiric expression in the Folio text' (Ioppolo 1991, 145). Philip Edwards in his revised New Cambridge edition declared that 'it is my view that Shakespeare added this passage [the 'little eyases'] to his original draft as a kind of afterthought' (2003, 4). 'I think', Edwards reflected, 'that as he was finishing his play the success of the children and the plight of his own company suggested to Shakespeare an amplification of what he had already written' (2003, 5).

The supposed plight is in part evidenced by Histrio in *Poetaster* who says, of making Demetrius (as Dekker) a player, that 'O, it will get vs a huge deale of money (Captaine) and we haue need on't; for this Winter ha's made vs all poorer, then so many staru'd Snakes: No body comes at vs; not a Gentleman, nor a ------' (Jonson 1602, F3v). It is difficult, however, to give these lines a life of this sort outside their play. The opening section of this chapter outlined just where the theatre industry expanded at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and how this likely led to the perception, and possible reality, of increased competition. Given the limited size of their theatres though, the boy companies simply did not have the capacity to empty the adult companies' amphitheatres. The theatres at St Paul's and the Blackfriars held several hundred people, the open-air amphitheatres held several thousand. Moreover, those attending the indoor playhouses were wealthier: the cheapest seat cost 6d, six times the cost of the price of admission at the amphitheatres (Gurr 1997, 12). A significant number of those who sought theatre at the outdoor venues could not have been lured by the new offerings because they could not have afforded to pay the admission charge. Rather than the adults playing to empty theatres, what is more likely is that the performances of the boy companies perhaps felt more *au courant*, as the Folio lines record: 'these are now the fashion'. Edwards, therefore, is too stark in his painting of the situation. But something did prompt Shakespeare to write those lines found in the Folio.
In 1995, Knutson took a radically different view from other commentators, suggesting that the lines were a much later addition to the play. In her estimation, Q1's lines about the 'humour of children' existed in the play as performed 'at the Globe in 1600' (1995, 14). Those lines were cut after May 1603 and the 'little eyases' passage, she posited, was added between 1606 and 1608 in response to the wayward behaviour of the Blackfriars boys (Knutson 1995, 14). This wayward behaviour was the staging of offensive plays: 'Philotaes (1604), Eastward Ho! (1605), The Isle of Gulls (1606), the two-part Byron (1606), and a lost play about mines in Scotland (1608). . . . these plays angered influential noblemen who pressured the court of James I for reprisals' (Knutson 1995, 23). She figured Shakespeare and the King's men stepping into this dangerously disruptive situation and 'admonishing the children's company in public'; they 'spoke out publicly in an attempt to limit the damage to themselves and to the industry as a whole' (Knutson 1995, 27–28). In this view, the King's men were at once the mouthpiece for the socially and politically responsible theatre industry and its arbiter.

Viewing the King's men as speaking for the profession in rebuke of offensive plays through the 'little eyases' passage, and removing it away from the War of 1600-1, fits well with wider arguments that are typical of Knutson's account of the industry. She has made a strong case, largely corroborated in the previous chapter, for fraternal, guild-like but informal, arrangements structuring early modern theatre industry (Knutson 2001b, 10). The removal of an oft-cited passage as a piece of evidence used to suggest a feud between rival companies helps advance her cause in that regard. But the evidence does not run all her own way. The theatre industry, despite having elements of a medieval guild, was not a medieval guild. It did not have a court of assistants to regulate industry practices or to settle disputes and there is no clear evidence that the King's men might have claimed the authority to be
industry arbiters. Were we to accept the King's men did act in this way, bringing other parts of the industry into line, it would entail two further assumptions. First, we would need to read a Shakespeare-centric theatre history, with his company at the head of the quasi-guild willing to be pressed into service for the general good. And second, that having been pushed to their limit, the best counter-blast the company could muster was for Shakespeare to revise fewer than 10 lines in a six-year old play.

Further, we might question the supposed ire provoked by the Blackfriars company at court. Whilst they certainly did stage plays that saw at least the writers get into trouble, as with *Eastward Ho!* covered above, the authorities do not seem to have flirted with suppression of them or the wider industry. If James I was under pressure from slighted nobles to censure the company, or the industry, we might expect the offending company to be absent from records of court performances, thus sparing the monarch embarrassing exchanges with smarting councillors. That is not the case with the Blackfriars company in the years Knutson highlights. During the court revels seasons between and including 1603-1604 and 1608-1609, the years in which the boys were daring rebuke, they performed at court nine times (Astington 1999, 237–42). Not only did they perform regularly, though the King's own company appeared somewhat more frequently, they were allocated particular important days in the calendar. Certain days were likely to involve especially long or rich festivities: Twelfth Night, the first night of the playing season, or Shrove Tuesday (Dutton 2016, 48–49). Particularly important was New Year's Day (Kernan 1995, 17), on which the Blackfriars company performed at court in 1605, 1607 and 1609. They also performed over Christmas 1608 as well as at other, less significant, times (Astington 1999, 237–42). Given the King's men's prevalence at court, we must imagine they knew that the Blackfriars company was still in good enough standing with the monarch to be performing regularly. This evidence makes
it difficult to accept a picture of the boy company on the verge of official denunciation and requiring reproach from the King's men.

It is best therefore, to remain sceptical about Knutson's claim to push the date of the 'little eyases' passage later than 1606. Whether we accept a later date, or hold to an earlier date in line with the War, the passage suggests discord between at least two companies and at most the adult companies and boy companies in general. It is this point about discord that remains relevant to the discussion that follows. Continuing with an examination of theatrical animosity, we may return to the conclusions drawn about the War and how they might inform our thinking about theatrical networks.

Commentators differ in their views about how the war played out. Was it an exchange on the nature of drama? Was it a manifestation of rivalry between acting companies (and if so, which ones)? Was it part of incessant backbiting between poets who disliked each other? Or, was it a publicity campaign to lure audiences? Each characterization is problematic and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. These conclusions dictate nomenclature, as was noted in this Chapter's introduction. For those finding here a conflict between companies, based on rivalry or repertory, it is the 'War of the Theatres'. The same term could be adopted by those seeing a debate about drama split along company lines. Conversely, those who see the playwrights as personal adversaries would identify this as a 'Poets' War' or, borrowing from Dekker, a 'Poetomachia'. Scholars arguing for a fabricated clash designed to draw in audiences would follow this second group. After a sketch of scholars' conclusions and the problems associated with them, I turn to the life of Nathan Field whose biography can throw light onto the topic of the War and the wider questions of perceived professional rivalry in the theatre industry at the start of the seventeenth century.
Some critics considered the war little more than a marketing ploy. Reavley Gair thought it a 'high probability' that the War was 'a purely contrived situation, a seventeenth-century version of a modern publicity campaign' (Gair 1982, 134). Others have reached the same conclusion: 'all this [the War] was no doubt good box-office, . . . so we must not take it too seriously' (Rowse 1988, 1726); it was 'trivial and trumped up . . . a publicity campaign' for the dramatists (Honan 1998, 278); it involved 'publicity seeking' (Gurr 1996, 243). This is ostensibly the simplest way to understand the exchange. It does not address, however, how the playwrights contrived the conflict expressly to lure audiences. A theory of publicity demands inter-company cooperation that goes beyond that proposed in the previous chapter. Also, for an orchestrated publicity campaign to work, plays needed to appeal to audiences across the social spectrum. Those able to only pay 1d at the Globe were effectively priced-out of seeing the parts of the War staged at the indoor theatres, meaning they were left with an incomplete view of the exchange. That is not to say the drama of the War staged at the Globe was wasted on its audience, but that claims imagining the 'good box-office' extending beyond the Globe might need tempering. You can only be drawn into watching a stage War if you know one is being staged.

'Modern criticism has trivialized the Poets' War by characterising it as either a series of personal vendettas or a publicity stunt designed to generate a profit' but in reality, according to Bednarz, 'the Poets' War involved much more serious issues' (2001, 103). It was, for him, a debate on the 'theory of literature' with the possibility of multiple motives: writers could argue over satire and self-publicize and wage personal vendettas all at the same time (Bednarz 2001, 103). It is entirely possible that Jonson really did think that Marston tortured poetry in his plays, as well as simply parodying him for it on stage for an audience's
enjoyment. Steggle too saw disagreements about the role of drama as the basis of the War. But he also saw rifts developing along company lines. Steggle described how Jonson 'divides good theatre from bad as the Thames divides Jonson's location, the Blackfriars, from the South Bank theatres such as the Globe' (Steggle 1998, 37). And Chambers too found 'hits at the Chamberlain's men' in *Poetaster* (Chambers 1930b, 1:71). After 400 years much of the original context is necessarily lost, and perhaps Michael Shapiro's succinct and multi-sided summary is best: the War was 'playful, vicious, promotional' (M. Shapiro 1977, 229).

**Case Study: Nathan Field**

A study of one actor-playwright's life and network can help us understand the apparently combative, rivalry-fuelled, self-advertising world of professional theatre at the opening of the seventeenth century. Nathan Field was baptized on 17 October 1587 in the parish of St Giles Cripplegate to parents John and Joan Field (Williams 2004). John Field was a preacher and 'castigator of the stage' (Chambers 1923c, 2:316). Following a collapse at the Paris Garden on Bankside, he had written a treatise against entertainments in 1583 attributing the event to 'divine displeasure' (Egan 2001a, 138). Nathan Field was the seventh of seven children; he had two sisters, Dorcas and Elizabeth, and four brothers, John, Theophilus, Jonathan, and Nathaniel (Williams 2004). A repeated lack of creativity on the Fields' part saw them endow two pairs of sons with almost identical names. Of the siblings, Theophilus became Bishop of Llandaff and Nathaniel was apprenticed as a stationer in 1596 (Williams 2004). Predictably, the similarity of Nathan's and Nathaniel's names has caused confusion for biographers. This might be because of the rough crossover between Nathaniel's career as a stationer and Nathan's as an actor-dramatist or because of the rendering of Nathan Field's name in the 1679 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher folio as 'Nathanael' on several

Nathan Field’s life is not documented by any standard biographical records: there is no evidence to suggest that he married, or fathered children. Field’s will supports the conclusion that he was a childless bachelor. It was proved, on 2 August 1620, by his sister Dorcas and made no mention of a wife or children (F. R. Brinkley 1927, 13; Honigmann and Brock 1993, 231). Field’s will also recorded that he was of the parish of St Giles in the Fields. The parish is in Westminster, outside London’s city walls, and, despite sharing an eponymous saint, is nearly two miles away from Field’s parish of birth, St Giles Cripplegate. Field was partially educated at St Paul’s grammar school. His schooling was left incomplete when in 1600, as reported above, he was stolen away by Nathaniel Giles to become a member of Henry Evans' troupe at the Blackfriars at the age of 13. Though Giles (the Master of the Queen's Chapel Children) was, in the words of Andrew Gurr, the 'vital enabler' for the enterprise, the impetus for the creation of the second Blackfriars boys' company, and thus Field's curtailed schooling, belonged to Evans (1996, 347–48).

There is no record – like the law suit brought by the father of Thomas Clifton (Forse 1990) another boy abducted by Giles – that suggests how the Fields reacted to Nathan's abduction to the Blackfriars. We might assume his anti-theatrical preacher father would have railed against the virtual kidnap and the ends to which his son was pressed. Unfortunately, his death prevented his protest: he died a year after Nathan's birth, and Nathan's move into the
boy company went without paternal challenge (Collinson 2008). With the absence of biographical check-points in Field's life, his biography must rely primarily on theatrical records. From 1600, 'Field's life [was] intricately inter-woven with the stories of the various Queen's Revels companies' and, despite the method of his recruitment, scholars have imagined his beginning positively: 'life at St Paul's or any other school is hardly likely to have been so exciting, to a boy under fifteen, as life at the Blackfriars must have been . . . before turning seventeen, Field had played principal roles before two monarchs' (Peery 1950, 7–8).

Field began on the stage as London's theatre world was expanding and writers began trading shots in the War. He, and the new company to which he belonged, could have been at once the subject of jealous glances from rivals in pre-existing companies and, more specifically, viewed as on-stage combatants in the War. Some of his earliest roles came in the plays discussed above: he is named in cast lists for Cynthia's Revels and Poetaster in Jonson's 1616 Workes (1616, Z3v, Gg3v). From these formative experiences, Field's theatrical network began growing. He acted in Cynthia's Revels with John Underwood, Salomon Pavy, Thomas Day, John Frost and Robert Baxter (Jonson 1616, Z3v). In Poetaster he appeared with Underwood, Pavy, Day, William Ostler and Thomas Marton (Jonson 1616, Gg3v). Jonson himself took an especial interest in Field, describing him to William Drummond as his 'scholar', the theatrical equivalent of a guilds-man's apprentice (Patterson 1923, 15). Jonson was known to honour 'boys apprenticed to him' and, during this period of scholarship, taught 'Field how to read Horace and Martial in Latin and perhaps playwriting' (Kinney 2003, 44).
In her 1928 biography, Brinkley claimed that Field, like Chapman and Jonson, served time in prison for acting in the unlicensed performance of *Eastward Ho!: 'since Field was the leading actor, we may safely assume that at the age of seventeen he was experiencing life in an Elizabethan prison' (1928, 26). Actually, it is unknown whether he served time in what would have been a Jacobean prison. Brinkley's source for the assertion is the deposition of Henry Evans in 1612, where he stated that the company was struggling to make a profit since 'some of the boyes being committed to prison by order from his highnes' (Fleay 1890, 245). Even if he were one of those boys, Field could just as easily have been imprisoned for his parts in other plays. A letter from Sir Edward Hoby, a diplomat and Member of Parliament (Knafla 2008), to Sir Thomas Edmonds, another diplomat (Greengrass 2015), dated 7 March 1606 told how 'sundry' of those who played in John Day's *Isle of Gulls* had been 'committed to Bridewell' (Birch 1848, 60–61). The boys at Blackfriars managed to upset the authorities again in 1608 with their performance of Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron*. It provoked the ire of the French ambassador because of its representation of the French court; three of the actors were rounded up and sent to prison (1928, 27). Field could have been incarcerated on any of these three occasions.

The Blackfriars company to which Field belonged faltered following official suppression and plague, and Henry Evans relinquished the lease at the theatre in August 1608 (Munro 2005, 22–23). A named company of children from the Blackfriars nevertheless performed at court during the revels season of 1608-1609, as noted above (Astington 1999, 242). A company under the name of 'Children of the Revels' and 'Children of the Chapel', as the Blackfriars company was variously known, received payments for performances outside London after Evans had given up the Blackfriars space. They were paid 20s in Leicester on 21 August 1609 and 10s in Maidstone in 1609-1610 (Gibson 2002, 2:724; Munro 2005, 192).
At this point Field would have been 22 or 23, considerably older than the average age of a boy player in the period. David Kathman found that 'at the peak of the boy company vogue around the turn of the seventeenth century, the evidence suggests that the members of these companies were between ten and fourteen years old' (2005, 222) and that 22 was the upper limit.

Around 1610, company personnel and location changed. Under the auspices of Robert Keysar, the boys' company moved to occupy the Whitefriars theatre (Munro 2005, 23). Field appears in the cast list for *Epicoene* (1609) alongside Giles Carey, William Barksted, William Penn, Hugh Attwell, Richard Allen, John Smith and John Blaney (Jonson 1616, Ddd1v). Notably, Field remained the only constant from the earlier phase of the company's existence. He continued with the company and performed in the *Entertainment at Britain's Burse* on 11 April 1609 with other actors from the newest crop of Queen's Revels children (McMillin 1968, 158). Field not only appeared in the entertainment but collaborated on it with his old tutor, Jonson, who wrote it (Lamb 2009, 129). For their parts in the production, William Ostler made £5, Field £4 and Giles Carey £2; Jonson as writer and Inigo Jones, as designer, made £13 6s 8d each (Ioppolo 2006, 143–44).

Records suggest that William Ostler, along with John Underwood, joined the King's men shortly after performing in Jonson's entertainment. In the sharers' papers from a lawsuit pertaining to the adult company from 1635 we learn that 'in processe of time the boyes growing up to bee men which were Underwood, Field, Ostler, & were taken to strengthen the service' of Shakespeare's company (Gurr 2004c, 278). The 'transfer' of the actors 'may reasonably be placed in the winter of 1609-10' according to Chambers; Field though, in Chambers' estimation, did not join the others at the King's men until 'some years later'
(1923c, 2:53). This would make sense: Gurr listed Ostler and Underwood as sharers at around this time but noted that Field did not join the company until 1615 (2004c, 235, 245, 227). The three actors' inclusion in the same sentence, though having moved to the King's men at different times, is plausibly explained by the sharer's papers dating from 1635, 20 years after the events to which they pertain. The writer appears to have simply, but deliberately, conflated events. His phrasing suggests as much: 'in the processe of time' seems to purposely capture an unspecified timespan.

Importantly, reading the biographical network of Field and his peers casts doubt on the rhetoric of rivalry in the early seventeenth century theatre. The transfer of players from a child to an adult company confounds an enduring divide between adult and boy companies. For Alfred Harbage the War of the Theatres was a conflict between the two types of company with 'deep-seated tensions, involving class antagonisms, rival moral philosophies' (Harbage 1952, 90). Several years after the height of the War, the King's men voluntarily brought in two actors who had been their adversaries. The words used in the description from the sharers' papers are illuminating too: the actors were 'taken to strengthen the service'. 'Taken' conveys a sense of choice on the part of the King's men: the boys were not foisted upon the company, nor did they, it seems, petition to join, the company chose to acquire them. Similarly, the sense that it occurred 'in process of time' suggests that it was a quiet evolution, with the boys naturally joining an adult company. Insurmountable rivalry is replaced with a natural progression. Either existential enmity between the troupes was short-lived or it did not exist and was manufactured by scholars constructing narratives hundreds of years after the fact.
Those convinced by Knutson's arguments over Q2 *Hamlet* and the 'little eyases' passage must also square her case with these facts. With her dating of the lines to 1606-1608 the gap for any ill-will to subside before the taking in of the boys is significantly shortened. In Knutson's conception, the boy company was rebuked by Shakespeare and his company because they could no longer stand by and see the stage's reputation tarnished by the incendiary plays performed at Blackfriars. But come the end of 1609, possibly less than two years after Shakespeare re-wrote the 'little eyases' section, those members of the King's men who were so harmed by the Queen's Revel's plays were happy to welcome to their company the men who had acted in them. And, in turn, those men who had been so scolded by Shakespeare's pen were content to join his company.

What all this actually shows is a continuation of amicable, even amiable, relations among theatre professionals into the 1600s, despite the background of perceived rivalry and animosity. As in the 1590s, companies and actors showed themselves to be capable of inter-company cooperation. Ostler and Underwood, and later, Field, became sharers in the King's men (Gurr 2004c, 235, 245). They were not brought in to be hired men, but allowed to buy a share in the company. They were evidently not there to make up numbers, or fill holes in a cast short of actors. A tangential and partially theatrical example serves to encapsulate this bridging of assumed rifts between the adults and the boys. Around 1611 William Ostler married the daughter of John Heminges, Thomasin (H. Berry 2008). She was 16, and John Heminges was the treasurer of the King's men (Berry 2008) and a senior member of the company: he was a sharer and a housekeeper at the Globe. In 1612, the pair had a son, and named him Beaumont, presumably after Francis Beaumont, the playwright (H. Berry 2008). Ostler most likely got to know Beaumont through his writing for the Queen's Revels, for whom he had written *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607), *Cupid's Revenge* (1608) and
The Scornful Lady (1610), before he moved across to the King's men – at roughly the same time as Ostler and Underwood – and wrote Philaster (1609) The Maid's Tragedy (1610), and A King and No King (1611). Through their marriage, and the naming of their son, the Ostlers seem to highlight a happy co-existence between the adults and the boys, just like those of the 1590s highlighted in the previous chapter.

Having moved to the Whitefriars, Field started writing plays. Initially he did this for his company, the Children of the Queen's Revels and, later, the Lady Elizabeth's men. Later in his career he co-authored plays performed by other companies. He sole-authored two plays that 'were written specifically for the Whitefriars' (Bly 2007, 70): A Woman is a Weathercock (1609) and Amends for Ladies (1611). The prefatory material to Weathercock, printed in 1612, contains a letter 'To the Reader' from Field, in which he declares that:

I haue beene vexed with vile playes my selfe, a great while, hearing many, nowe I thought to be euen with some, and they shoulde heare mine too. Fare thee well, if thou hast any thing to say to me, thou know'st where to heare of me for a yeare or two, and no more I assure thee. (1612, A3v)

Field's readers, according to his letter, knew where to find him: presumably this meant the Whitefriars precinct where his company's theatre was located. If not here, then at a location well-known enough by Field and his readers as to not need naming. More importantly, Field gives a limit, readers will know where to find him for a year or two.

The above lines suggest that Field was unsure about where he might be in two years' time. His assurance at the end of the letter, 'and no more', hints that he might have designs on a move from his current location. One possible explanation is a move to the King's men. We know that by 1615 Field was a sharer with the company at the Globe (Gurr 2004c, 227) and so it seems plausible that he might have been starting to think about leaving his company at
the Whitefriars. There is no smoking-gun evidence that ties his reference in the *Weathercock* letter to a move, but it does at least signal some uncertainty about Field's future situation.

Whatever the nature of Field's letter in *Weathercock*, it does seem to signal a person who is able to consider the future in some significant way. Simply talking in such terms suggests substantial autonomy in his professional life. Even if his note in the *Weathercock* quarto does not specifically speak to an agreement with the King's men, it confirms long term thinking on Field's part. Nathan Field's life could therefore serve as a corrective to those who see what we might call grudge-based, short-term decision making as prevalent in the theatrical world. Amidst the general instability in the industry caused by the threat of plague closures and political suppression, Nathan Field appeared able to take a longer view.

Unknown to Field when he was making his plans referred to in *Weathercock*, the Queen's Revels at the Whitefriars were to be short-lived. In March 1613, under the management of Philip Rosseter, they amalgamated with the 'Lady Elizabeth's men, under Philip Henslowe' (Nungezer 1929, 136–37). Field served as representative of the new company in an accord in which Jacob Meade and Henslowe agreed to provide a theatre, money for, or access to, apparel and properties, and playbooks (Greg 1907, 23–24). This particular agreement, though the document is undated, was probably completed around the end of June 1613 (Bentley 1971, 70). Once more, Field's network expanded. An incarnation of the Lady Elizabeth's men had signed a previous bond with Henslowe on 29 August 1611: though 'the articles of agreement themselves have not survived... the names on the bonds' are 'enough to constitute a full company' (Gurr 1996, 398). Assuming that these actors remained with the company until 1613, Field joined John Townsend, Joseph Moore, William Barksted, Thomas Basse, William Carpenter, Giles Carey, William Ecclestone, Alexander...
Foster, Robert Hamlen, Thomas Hunt, John Rice, Joseph Taylor, and Francis Wambus (Gurr 1996, 398). Barksted and Carey had previously been members of the Queen's Revels and appeared alongside Field in Jonson's *Epicoence*. Another list of actors associated with the Lady Elizabeth's men dates from 31 May 1613. Townsend and Moore appear on the list, but none of the others listed in 1611. They 'seem to have formed a touring branch of the company', no member of which, with the exception of William Perry, is 'known to have been previously connected with the London branch of Lady Elizabeth's Men' (Keenan 2014, 38).

Other records of this new company, the Lady Elizabeth's men, see Field actively involved until early 1615. Henslowe had almost immediate cause to regret his newest acquisition. Field managed to get incarcerated, possibly not for the first time, along with Philip Massinger and Robert Daborne. As Brian Vickers wondered, 'how they managed [to get locked up] is a mystery' (2002, 30). Field and the other imprisoned dramatists petitioned Henslowe for a £5 advance to make bail (Greg 1907, 65–66). In another letter, undated though speculatively attributed to 1613 by Greg, Field requested a further loan of £10 to settle a debt he had incurred elsewhere (1907, 67). At the end of June 1613 Field wrote to Henslowe again, requesting money for a dramatic plot he had been working on with Robert Daborne in an effort to stop Daborne allowing it to go to another company (Greg 1907, 84).

Despite Field's constant petitioning for funds, some evidence suggests he had a good working relationship with Henslowe. He 'wrote a number of affectionate letters to Henslowe', for example, 'addressing [him] as "Father Hinchlow" in one letter and signing another as his "loving and obedient Son"' (Keenan 2014, 44). This could, of course, be dismissed as a man seeking to flatter his way to a loan. It is somewhat corroborated, however, by a record of a Lady Elizabeth's men quarrel with Henslowe in February 1615. The company claimed 'that
Henslowe had cheated them of some £1,134' (Wickham, Berry, and Ingram 2000, 603). The grievance was related to the company giving over their theatre space (owned by Henslowe) once a fortnight for bear baiting, and Henslowe compensating them 50s each time. Field, it was alleged, had been allowing Henslowe to pay 40s a time in exchange for a bribe, effectively selling the company short for personal gain (Wickham, Berry, and Ingram 2000, 603).

During his time with the Lady Elizabeth's men, Field wrote more plays. He turned to collaborative authorship, writing *Four Plays in One* (1613) with Fletcher and *The Honest Man's Fortune* (1613) with Fletcher and Massinger. These were relationships that he carried with him to the King's men. If surviving records are representative, Field wrote only collaboratively once at the King's men. With Fletcher and Massinger he co-wrote the now-lost *Jeweller of Amsterdam* (1616) about a jeweller murdered in the Hague (Knutson, Steggle, and McInnis 2016), as well as *The Knight of Malta* (1616) and *The Queen of Corinth* (1617) with the same pair. *The Bloody Brother* (1619), sometimes known as *Rollo Duke of Normandy*, was by Fletcher and Massinger, with Field, along with Jonson and Chapman, as possible co-authors. Field's writing relationships seem to have remained consistent either side of his company move. Where he may have damaged his actor-based network by skimming from their earnings shortly before leaving the Lady Elizabeth's men, he maintained his writer-based network in his move to the King's men.

The puritan preacher at St Mary Overie (now Southwark Cathedral) attacked Field explicitly in 1616 (R. F. Brinkley 1928, 40). Field had moved to the parish – the same parish where Fletcher, Massinger, Henslowe, Ecclestone, Taylor, John Rice, and others were residents (R. F. Brinkley 1928, 40; Rendle 1884) – by 1616, probably around the time of his
move to the King's men. In response, Field wrote a defence of his profession. Eloquently, he resisted charges of damnation: 'in Gods whole volume,— which I have studied as my best parte,— I find not any trade of life except Conjurers, sorcerers, and witches (ipso facto) damned' (Field 1865, 11). Brinkley saw 'piety' in Field's response (1928, 40). Following biographically, though perhaps not religiously, there are hints of an affair between the Countess of Argyll and Field, 'for a gossipy letter of 1619 relates that the Earl of Argyll "was privy to the paiment of 15 or 16 poundes . . . for the noursing of a childe which the worlde sayes is daughter to My Lady and N. Feild the player"' (Nicholl 2008c, 241). Field died in the summer of 1620, and his will was proved in August of that year (Honigmann and Brock 1993, 231).

A study of Field's life yields a greater understanding of the transfer of personnel between acting companies, as well as relationships within them. His network was undeniably broad, spanning several incarnations of several troupes over a career of nearly twenty years. Beyond his acting in plays of the War, and aside from one notable accusation that he selfishly neglected the needs of his fellows to better himself financially, Field's life tells the story of acting companies co-existing amicably. A supposed atmosphere of rivalry, ruthless back-biting, grudges and parody is here, in the life history of Field, replaced by a career characterized by prolonged, fruitful collaborative relationships. This is all the more surprising when we reflect that an actor's transition from boyhood to adulthood could, in the light of all we know about early modern proto-capitalism, easily have been traumatic and precarious.

This chapter began by outlining an industry becoming more stable. The growth in full-time spaces for theatre meant an expansion of the industry. Stability was not universal, however. We have seen in the discussion above acting companies fail and venues close: a
settling industry did not guarantee success. And yet, with the life of Nathan Field we see a
good example of theatre professionals frequently working together to ameliorate the worst
personal dangers of a proto-capitalist industry. Field's life encompassed theatre changes,
company dissolutions and mergers, company moves and personal attacks. In a less stable
industry he and other professionals may not have survived. Good evidence suggests that the
strength of his network helped him throughout his career. He had opportunities to plan ahead
and make career-advancing moves. In so doing, Field helps us to dispel narratives of hard-felt
rivalry between acting companies and theatre professionals. Though there clearly were
moments of acrimony in the theatre world of the 1600s, claims for a fraternal industry are
strengthened by a study of Field's life.
Chapter Four. The Mechanics of Dramatic Collaboration

One concrete way to learn about the social networks of theatre professionals is by studying the plays they wrote together. The contents of the drama created by co-authorship and what we might now call the meta-data of co-authored drama are of particular interest. Dramatic content is worth examining to aid an understanding of the creative process, to draw comparisons with sole-authored drama, and see how co-authors might structure their work. The meta-data of collaborative drama – that is, how often the writers collaborated, how many collaborations occur in the period, what genre of plays they wrote, and how many authors contributed to each play – gives us quantitative knowledge of the social nature of creative acts that are still often pictured as essentially solitary. This chapter draws on the dramatic content and the meta-data.

The verb 'to collaborate' and its derivatives are not recorded in English before 1801, when they arrived, via 'collaborateur'. Whatever early modern theatre professionals considered themselves to be doing, they were not calling it collaboration. Nor were they calling it co-authorship a word whose first use is dated to 1886 (OED co-author, n). The Latin root of collaborate is illuminating for what follows: co, meaning together, laborare, meaning work. This could serve as a warning: discussing early modern phenomena with modern terminology and modern definitions is likely to mislead. This danger is particularly acute when discussing authorship because of stark difference in early modern and modern conceptions of the term.

Ideas about just what constituted joint labour in the early modern theatre are broad. Collaboration of some sort is inherent in dramatic production: 'the playhouse . . . requires
collaboration: audiences and playwrights and theatre management must to some extent agree or the institution will collapse economically' (Braunmuller 2003, 53). The fact that theatre is a collaborative endeavour has occasionally been overstated, stretched, and forced into a model of dramatic creation that suggests 'that plays were written extempore by the acting company as they rehearsed; that actors, with their minds steeped in poesy and pentameter, could contribute to and fill in the blanks of speeches and plays that Shakespeare initiated; that drama was somehow ushered into being by the very spirit of creativity of the age itself' (Sharpe 2014, 33). Will Sharpe, to illustrate such a point, cited a commenter on an article in The Guardian who thought that Shakespeare 'was in a room full of other actors . . . who were also speaking, and coming up with lines. In such a scenario, Shakespeare’s work would be down to a team effort, and of course those scribes, who might have had to ad-lib a garbled utterance more than once' (2014, 33). As a more formal example of this trend, Patrick Cheney claimed in a recent book that his work joined a field of criticism that 'acknowledges the revisionist principle of social collaboration in the production of Shakespeare's plays' though he did acknowledge Shakespeare's 'individuated literary authorship' (2008, 6). Though made by Will Sharpe in reference to the production of Shakespeare's plays, this description of the common misconception applies to the creation of other writers' plays too. Indeed, Sharpe concluded that those who see drama created in this way 'underestimate radically the labour and particular skill in the writing we recognize as Shakespeare's, or as Marlowe's, or Jonson's (2014, 33). This 'labour and particular skill' is the focus of this chapter. Whilst acknowledging play by theatrical collaboration, in what follows we take a narrower definition of writerly creativity.

Collaboration here is limited to instances where two or more people worked together on the composition of a play. There are problematic notions bundled into this definition,
however. What constitutes work? And, in the context of routine theatrical practices of copying and recopying, how much does a writer need to contribute, and when, in order to qualify as a collaborator? The definition needs nuance. One way to draw a distinction between the general collaboration of the theatre industry and the collaborative authorship discussed here is by considering their finances. A simple test might serve to split this general theatrical collaboration from authorial collaboration: could the person/group/institution being identified as the collaborator reasonably expect to be paid for their particular writerly contribution to the work? This distinction is not perfect, not least because notions of what constitutes content that should be paid for have changed; but it serves to distinguish mere copyists from authors. However, some early moderns may have benefitted financially from changes they made to a play, without considering themselves collaborators. For instance, the Master of the Revels was paid to censor and license plays for the public stage, as well as readying drama for the court (Chambers 1923b, 4:285–87; Dutton 2000, 1–2), but he would not, as far as we can tell, have considered himself a co-writer in any play he authorised. That is not to say that he did not influence the production of early modern drama.

A notable instance where one of the Masters of the period, Edmund Tilney, exercised extensively his control over a dramatic work. In the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* (first written in the early 1590s and revised around 1600), Tilney 'deleted almost all of the first scene' before instructing that the contributing dramatists 'Leave out the insurrection wholly and the cause thereof, and begin with Sir Thomas More at the Mayor's sessions, with a report afterwards of his good service done being Sheriff of London' (Jowett 2011, 5). For this as well as a host of marginal notes, John Jowett acknowledged Tilney on the title page of his Arden3 edition of the play. The title page also gives a sense of some of the difficulties surrounding collaboration, discussed below:
Modern credit aside, Tilney belongs in the category of general industry collaboration, rather than authorial collaboration. Splitting collaboration into those who would and those who would not expect to be paid directly for its creation, puts the influences upon writing of the actors, the audiences, the political zeitgeist, the document copyists, and those from whom source material is borrowed, all placed into the general collaboration column. They are not co-authors.

Broader instances of collaboration are excluded from the discussion here, in favour of more specific shared labour of writing for direct payment. This helps nuance my initial definition of collaboration as two or more people involved in creating a play. Eschewing wider collaboration usefully limits to us those persons involved writing the words of a play in acts of remunerated creativity; this is authorial collaboration.

Co-authorship, even when this closely defined, takes manifold forms. It includes playwrights revising the work of other playwrights, and, indeed, playwrights revising their own work. Jowett's title page above shows just this: Munday and Chettle wrote a play, and Chettle was involved with its revision post-censorship. Similarly, records extant in Philip Henslowe's diary show payments for writers to revise the work of others. Thomas Dekker, for
instance, was paid for additions to *Sir John Oldcastle* (1599) on 7 November 1602 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 216). Lois Potter termed this type of co-authorship as 'sequential' collaboration, cases where a writer 'took over a job' of another or 'revised it at a later stage' (2008, 5). A different, and perhaps more familiar, version of co-authorship is what Potter called 'concurrent' collaboration, where writers met a 'mutual agreement about the plot, followed by a division of labour' and worked roughly simultaneously on the play (2008, 5). This style of concurrent collaboration was, according to Suzanne Gossett, employed in the seditious *Eastward Ho!* discussed in the previous chapter: the play’s uniformity could have been 'achieved by close work by all three authors on the final draft' (2004b, 193).

Elsewhere, the distinction between sequential and concurrent collaboration has been observed with different nomenclature: indirect collaboration and direct collaboration (Llewellyn 2005, 4), or 'active', and by inference, 'passive', collaboration (G. Taylor 2016, 146). Gordon McMullan split passive/indirect/sequential collaboration further by identifying the revision of deceased writers' work as 'collaboration with the dead' (1994, 135). There are instances of this in Henslowe's diary, too. He paid William Byrd and Samuel Rowley for additions to *Doctor Faustus* (1592) on 22 November 1602 (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 206); its original author, Christopher Marlowe, had been dead for nine years (Nicholl 2008a). Collaboration with the dead has been recently taken to an extreme in the field of Shakespeare studies with Gary Taylor's 'unadaptation' of William Shakespeare and John Fletcher’ lost *Cardenio* (1612-1613). Attempting to strip away Lewis Theobald's eighteenth-century version of the play, and fill in the gaps by mirroring Shakespeare's and Fletcher's idiolects, Taylor saw himself as a posthumous collaborator (Bourus and Taylor 2013, 237). Indeed, in his edition he named himself as a co-author: *The History of Cardenio, 1612-2012, John Fletcher, William Shakespeare, and Gary Taylor* (Bourus and Taylor 2013, 241).
Active co-authorship has been subdivided too. Gary Taylor, co-opting a phrase from John Lennon, identified 'eyeball-to-eyeball' collaboration for 'writers in a room together hammering out a text line by line' and 'Lazy collaboration' (another borrowing, this time from psychologist James W. Pennebaker) for writing when the 'penning of speeches and scenes was done separately' (2016, 146). Applying Taylor's nomenclature, however, can produce oxymoronic terminology. Shakespeare and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1613) would have to be labelled an active-lazy collaboration: the writers wrote the play simultaneously but structured it 'to facilitate collaboration between two people who did not expect to have much opportunity to talk about the work in progress' (Potter 1997, 29). Instead, to avoid such confusing constructions, I will label plays produced in this way as discrete-active collaborations; for ease, those thought to be produced eyeball-to-eyeball will simply be termed active collaborations.

With these terms defined, this chapter will first demonstrate the prevalence of active collaboration in the theatre of the period. We will examine just how many plays were written collaboratively and how big a proportion of the total they represent. Secondly, we will review the process of collaboration, asking just how dramatists split the labour of co-authorship and why they choose to do so in that way. Thirdly, it asks why dramatists collaborated: what circumstances prompted writers to share their fees with other playwrights. The chapter concludes with a biographical case study of the life of William Rowley, an actor, playwright and prolific collaborator. As noted above, understanding dramatic collaboration throws light on the networks of the theatre in the period. In turn, this can help theatre historians better understand how the theatre industry operated to produce so many works that are still considered classics of the world's stage.
Shakespeare and Collaborative Authorship

Collaborative authorship in the field of Renaissance drama has at various times been ignored, dismissed or derogated. At least two related reasons have contributed to this. First, modern (essentially, Romantic) conceptions of the author as a single figure, alone in artistic creation, have served to devalue implicitly collaborative authorship. And secondly, the position Shakespeare holds in Renaissance literature and the longstanding belief that he was essentially a non-collaborative writer have seen assumptions about his practices overlaid onto other writers and the profession generally. Jack Stillinger, in *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of the Solitary Genius* explained that 'ideas of the sacredness of an individual author's text' are anachronistic: for, in the early modern theatre, 'nothing in either law or sentiment stood in the way of adapting, cutting, rearranging, and even massive rewriting in the interest of spectacle, story and entertainment' (1991, 164). This anachronistic attachment to the myth of the individual author made Jeffrey Masten write: 'traditionally, criticism has viewed collaboration as a subset or aberrant kind of authorship, the collusion of otherwise individuated authors' (1997a, 371). His terminology is illuminating. The idea that collaboration offers a subset of authorship, somehow beneath single authorship, aligns with Stillinger's articulation of the 'sacredness' of an author's text. Similarly, Masten's phrase 'the collusion of otherwise individuated authors', points to the same characterization. Collaborative authorship is, in the approach Masten analyses and rejects, a simple mixing of individual authors, rather than its own phenomenon. And it is caused by collusion, a word loaded with connotations of deceit, as though collaborative authorship was to be hidden.
Shakespeare's status in scholarship of the Renaissance theatre and traditional beliefs about him being a non-collaborative author have caused discussions of collaborative authorship in the period's theatre to be marginalised. Shakespeare's collaborative authorship has been historically difficult to prove conclusively. Stanley Wells, writing on the topic before the most recent round of discoveries, pointed out that John Fletcher is 'the only dramatist with whom, on the basis of evidence likely to be accepted in a court of law, it can confidently be said that Shakespeare collaborated' (2006, 194). The statistical analysis of large textual corpora has, in the twenty-first century, improved our understanding of Shakespeare's collaborations, and those of other writers. Historically however, Shakespeare has not been thought of as needing to work with others to produce plays. Richard Proudfoot encapsulated this when discussing Shakespeare's relationship with Fletcher, but the argument stands when considering any proposed co-author. There is a 'reluctance' to accept Shakespeare as a collaborator, apparently resulting 'from a tacit assumption that Shakespeare was too great a poet to condescend to collaborate with so manifestly inferior an artist as Fletcher' (Proudfoot 1966, 247). Editors have encountered similar thinking. In discussing the co-authorship of Pericles (1607) between George Wilkins and Shakespeare, F. D. Hoeniger conceded in his Arden2 edition that 'Not a few scholars have rejected Wilkins primarily because the very idea that Shakespeare should have collaborated with such a minor dramatist near the end of his career was repugnant to them' (1963, lix).

It is bardolatry that shackles scholars to thinking that Shakespeare was too good for collaboration. Wilkins, whom we met in Chapter One, was, as well as daring to write with Shakespeare, a particularly unpleasant character. This was largely unknown at the time of Proudfoot's and Hoeniger's writings, however. He was dismissed as a co-author because of the immutable fact that Shakespeare only collaborated occasionally and only with the very
best. Wilkins' adult life was marked by collisions with the law: he managed an impressive 21 encounters in the 16 years from 1608 (Prior 1972; Eccles 1975, 1982; Nicholl 2008c). Repeatedly, he was bound over, charged, or bailed for something, and just occasionally he was the plaintiff or was required to give evidence. His charges include grisly acts of violence: he assaulted numerous people including local constables, mugged a local tapster, kicked a pregnant woman in the stomach, and stamped on another so badly she could not walk (Hardy 1935, 1937a; Eccles 1975, 250; Nicholl 2008c, 403–4).

Slowly, Shakespeare is becoming viewed as a frequently collaborative author. In contrast to Hoeniger's descriptions of the reception of the notion of Shakespeare-as-collaborator when editing in the 1960s, Suzanne Gossett was able to treat the issue as relatively uncontroversial in her Arden3 edition of *Pericles*. Gossett noted that 'it was not particularly surprising for Shakespeare' to turn to collaboration 'at this point in his professional life' (2004a, 57). Nonetheless, in 2013 Laurie Maguire and Emma Smith still felt the need to address the question of Shakespeare's collaborations; in their *30 Great Myths about Shakespeare*, one of the myths debunked was that 'Shakespeare wrote alone' (Maguire and Smith 2013, 113–18). And, perhaps more troublingly, the New Cambridge editions of Shakespeare's plays ignore several of the firmer collaborative attributions in the canon, including *Pericles* (DelVecchio and Hammond 1998). This is despite there being compelling reasons, according to MacDonald P. Jackson, for accepting *Titus Andronicus*, *Timon of Athens*, *Pericles*, *Henry 8*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as collaborations (Jackson 2002, 1–14). It should be stated that not all commentators have traditionally thought of Shakespeare collaborating as unimaginable. Gary Taylor has noted that, at various points and for various plays, Nicholas Rowe, Samuel Coleridge, Alfred Lord Tennyson and Algernon Swinburne considered Shakespeare as a collaborative author (2014, 2). Modern authorship attribution
has proved them right: Rowe saw another at work hand in *Pericles*, Coleridge thought a collaborator was responsible for parts of *1 Henry 6*, (1592), Tennyson posited John Fletcher as co-author of *Henry 8* and Swinburne 'insisted' that *Arden of Faversham* (1591) was part Shakespearean (G. Taylor 2014, 2). Notably, in 1960 Kenneth Muir addressed the topic in *Shakespeare as Collaborator*. He studied evidence for Shakespeare's co-authorship and found his hand in *Edward 3* (1594), *Sir Thomas More, Pericles, Two Noble Kinsmen* and others (Muir 1960).

An acceptance of Shakespeare as a collaborative author can lead scholars to other extremes, where they hunt for anything they might be able to call 'Shakespeare' seeking to trumpet an addition to, or a revision for, the canon. Shakespeare, to borrow from Will Sharpe (who was, in turn, borrowing a phrase more frequently applied to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart), is 'culturally supernatural' (2013, 641). This status can trigger an impulse to force every attribution or association. For instance, Sharpe was writing in a Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) collection entitled *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* in which works fairly well accepted as being at least partially Shakespearean (*Sir Thomas More*, for example) appeared alongside works where the likelihood of finding Shakespeare's writing are 'highly unlikely to almost impossible' (2013, 642). In the 'almost impossible' category are *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1605-1608), *The London Prodigal* (1603-1605), *Locrine* (1594), *Thomas Lord Cromwell* (1599-1602). Marketed on its dust-jacket as a companion to the RSC's *William Shakespeare: Complete Works*, the *Collaborative Plays* seeks unashamedly to cash in on the burgeoning acceptance of Shakespeare-as-collaborator and Shakespeare's cultural status.
'To a very real extent', Peter Kirwan has explained, "Shakespeare" is defined as what can be *sold* as Shakespearean' (2012, 247). He articulated the urge undoubtedly behind the inclusion of non-Shakespearean works in the *Collaborative Plays*. Interestingly, the same desire to claim these works for Shakespeare, not least because of the marketability of the name, was at play in their original printings. *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (printed 1608), *The London Prodigal* (printed 1605) appeared with William Shakespeare, and W. Shakespeare on their title pages, respectively. *Locrine* (printed 1595) and *Thomas Lord Cromwell* (printed 1602) were printed with Shakespeare's initials, W. S., on their title pages. The plays, collectively known as the Shakespeare apocrypha along with a handful of other spuriously attributed works (Kirwan 2011, 594), were presumably printed with Shakespeare's name to improve their sales. Lukas Erne has shown how these plays were deliberately misattributed to Shakespeare (2013, 68–82): the move was economic and the intention was deception.

Without the weight of Shakespeare attached to them, there have been less inhibited approaches to collaboration concerning other early modern dramatists. Rather, than considering collaborative work as shared labour, as joint artistic endeavour, scholarly attention has been largely concerned with apportioning just who wrote what. Philip C. McGuire summarised it thus: 'Twentieth-century scholarship on collaboratively written plays concentrated almost exclusively on matters of attribution' (2002, 547). This trend, with notable exceptions, has continued in the first decade and a half of the twenty-first century; the dominating force in scholarship surrounding collaborative plays is attribution studies. And rightly so: as methods of attribution are refined, they can be applied to large databases of digital texts and analysed with statistical rigour by attribution specialists. These methods were unavailable to scholars even a generation ago and even a mere understanding of their principles was rare. This is vital work, and it is from these attribution studies that we are able
to gain a greater understanding of the prevalence and circumstances of dramatic collaboration. And yet, they do not especially address the artistic outputs of co-authorship. Muir, when he addressed the topic, aimed to marry the two strands of study by considering plays 'both from the point of view of authorship, and from the point of view of dramatic value' (1960, 9).

Studies of co-authorship not primarily concerned with attribution often couple collaboration with another topic, such that titles are formed with a 'Collaboration and . . .' structure. Jeffrey Masten's seminal work on the topic *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (1997b) is an example of this. Similarly, Heather Anne Hirschfeld wrote 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship' (2001). Majorie Stone and Judith Thompson edited a collection called *Literary Couplings: Writing Couples, Collaborators, and the Construction of Authorship* (2006) that made the same pairing. David Nicol, more recently, authored *Middleton and Rowley: Forms of Collaboration in the Jacobean Playhouse* (2012). These titles suggest that our understanding of collaboration should serve as the means to understand something else beyond it. One notable exception to the trend is Heather Anne Hirschfeld's *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater* (2004) where collaborative authorship is afforded a fuller airing solely on its own terms. The standard reference work for early modern collaboration remains G. E. Bentley's chapter in *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* (1971). Predictably, as scholarly opinion has accepted Shakespeare as a collaborative author like so many of his contemporaries, he has nonetheless received special treatment: Brian Vickers wrote *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (2002) and volume 67 of *Shakespeare Survey* (Holland and Hoenselaars 2014) was dedicated to Shakespeare's collaborative works.
What, though, does all this mean? Because of the somewhat disorganised approaches to collaboration we still do not know the answers to several pertinent questions. How many plays were the product of more than one author in the early modern professional theatre? And, what percentage of all known plays were collaboratively written? Studying the empirical data can help us better understand the process of dramatic collaboration. For this thesis in particular it can assist with identifying new networks, and better recognizing the intensity of the links in known networks. What, for instance, can a wholesale study of collaborative authorship say about writers’ habits to return to collaboration with the same co-authors? Or for writers to return to collaboration but with different writers? Such a study is not without problems. There is probably more co-authored drama in surviving plays than we know because the publishers tended not to mention co-authorship on title pages, at least not as frequently as sole-authorship (Knapp 2005, 7). This means scholars often have to – and have had to – discern who wrote what without the help of title pages.

Collaboration by the Numbers

Scholars have made unequivocal claims about the volume of collaborative drama from the period, but never by having adduced much hard data. Jeffrey Masten has called collaboration 'the Renaissance English theatre's dominant mode of textual production' (1997b, 14). He did so, we should note, in discussion of collaboration as active co-authorship, not as the more nebulous theatre-as-collaborative-endeavour construct mooted by A. R. Braunmuller above. Hirschfeld expressed a similar thought: 'Over half of the plays of the English Renaissance were scripted by more than one dramatist' (2004, 1). Exhibiting some rudimentary calculation at least, Bentley, likewise, concluded that 'altogether the evidence
suggests that it would be reasonable to guess that as many as half of the plays by professional dramatists in the period incorporated the writing at some date of more than one man' (1971, 199).

Others make the same case. Lois Potter explained that 'collaboration was the commonest way of supplying the heavy demand for new plays at a time when a week was a long run' (2015, 27). Paying especial attention to the matter Gordon McMullan averred that 'it is thus essential to emphasize that active collaboration was the norm of Jacobean theater' (1994, 142). He used 'active collaboration' in the same sense as used here. McMullan drew on Bentley, and believed that a figure of 50% collaborative plays was 'conservative' (1994, 142). Philip C. McGuire discussed a 'disparity' between the significance collaborative plays 'had for the culture within which they came into being and the importance accorded them in recent and current work' (2002, 540). He too drew on Bentley, noting a discrepancy between the volume of collaborative work apparent in Philip Henslowe's diary and the volume of collaborative work to appear in a modern anthology of Renaissance drama. He saw collaborative plays as underrepresented, and that this 'prolongs the (mis)impression that collaboratively written plays are a relatively small subset of Renaissance drama' (McGuire 2002, 540).

It is, of course, the job of the writer to sell their topic to a reader. Masten, Hirschfeld, Bentley, Potter (in a section of her introduction to Henry 8 for the Arden3), and McGuire were writing explicitly about collaboration. All, at some level, make an empirical claim about the prevalence of collaborative drama in the early modern theatre. But where does the evidence for the strength of their claims come from? Invariably, one passage of Bentley is cited (in addition to those above, see: Braunmuller 1999, 255; Vickers 2002, 19–22;
McMullan 2007, 233). It is worth reproducing in full since it has formed the basis for the arguments already presented:

Since records of authorship are so sparse for the period as a whole, we can only guess at the precise amount of collaboration involved in the plays, but the evidence still extant shows that it must have been large. We know the titles (often no more) of about 1,500 plays from 1590 to 1642. For about 370 we know nothing at all about authorship. For the remaining 1,100 or so, we have evidence that between 1/5 and 1/6 contained the work of more than one man as either collaborator, reviser, or provider of additional matter. If we consider the professional dramatists only, this proportion is much too low, for the total includes over 200 amateur plays, which after 1590 were seldom collaborated, and it includes many plays about whose authorship we have only a title-page statement, which tended, as a number of known examples show, to simplify the actual circumstances of composition. Altogether the evidence suggests that it would be reasonable to guess that as many as half of the plays by professional dramatists in the period incorporated the writing at some date of more than one man. In the case of the 282 plays mentioned in Henslowe's diary (far and away the most detailed record of authorship that has come down to us) nearly two-thirds are the work of more than one man. (Bentley 1971, 199)

Another oft-quoted passage is from Neil Carson's Companion to Henslowe's Diary: 'figures show that collaborated plays accounted for 60 per cent of the plays completed in Fall-Winter 1598, and an astonishing 82 per cent in Spring-Summer 1598' (1988, 57). The examples from Bentley and Carson have served as the bedrock for the arguments about the prevalence of co-authored drama. As we shall see, they are not as firm a foundation as proponents have assumed.

Questions of collaborative authorship cannot help but get entangled in broader discussions of authorship. Jeffrey Masten's work, as well as addressing what he saw as the practicalities of collaboration, was steeped in theoretical work about the tensions between sole- and co-authorship. Jeffrey Knapp, like Masten, used a consideration of practical co-authorship as a springboard for his arguments. Knapp, rather than using the same evidence to chime with Masten, used it to critique Masten's position on the dominance of the co-author over the sole-author as theoretical constructs in Renaissance drama. Knapp, for instance,
asserted that 'Collective playwriting, as I've argued elsewhere, was never the practical or theoretical norm during the English Renaissance' (2008, 49). His claim to have debunked the myth of the dominance of practical co-authorship stemmed from his simple observation that, again using Bentley's figures, if half of the plays were collaborative, half the plays were not (Knapp 2005, 2–3, 2009, 12).

Actually, 24.6% of plays were collaborative. Of those plays written for performance in the professional theatre during the period from 1567-1642, the best estimate we can make is that a quarter of them were written by more than one man. The number is reached with some difficulty and some explanation of its derivation is warranted. The data behind my claim are drawn from the Database of Early English Playbooks (DEEP), edited by Zachary Lesser and Alan B. Farmer (2007) and The Lost Plays Database edited by Roslyn L. Knutson, David McInnis and Matthew Steggle (2016). Supplementary evidence comes from Alfred Harbage's Annals of Early English Drama, 975-1700 and its online derivative, Gabriel Egan's Non-Shakespearian Drama Database. The raw data has been limited to include titles from 1567-1642 (the opening of the Red Lion to the general pre-war closure) and filtered to remove dramatic works not written for the professional stage. Court masques and other entertainments, civic pageants, closet drama, university drama, Latin and translated plays, school plays and plays by unknown players outside of London are thus excluded. Where a play's auspices are unknown, the benefit of the doubt has been given to include plays in the list since the single largest group of known titles (for that is all some surviving records are) belong to the professional stage. However, where such works signal that they were not readied for the professional theatre, say the anonymous A Masque of Six Seaman (1583), they have been removed. Such striations leave 1,021 titles: 457 printed extant plays, 544 lost plays, and 20 additional manuscript plays.
Constructing a list of all professional drama and its authorship from 1567-1642 is fraught. Recent estimates put the number of works staged in commercial theatres in the period at around 3,000 plays (Steggle and McInnis 2014, 1). Assumptions have to be made, and sometimes assumptions are layered on to other assumptions. I have followed the educated guesswork of the database editors whose data I have drawn on. For example, the DEEP editors tentatively attribute George Wapull's *The Tide Tarrieth No Man* (1576) to an adult professional company (they do so by marking the assignation with a question mark) and I follow their lead. In this particular instance, the relative explosion of professional drama around 1576, especially in venues for adult players, seems to support their conclusion. Wherever possible I have updated attributions to account for the latest thinking. Shakespeare's *2 Henry 6* and *3 Henry 6* are considered collaborations because of evidence presented by Hugh Craig, John Burrows and others (Craig 2009b; Craig and Burrows 2012), as is *Arden of Faversham* (2014). I have not however, widened the net uncritically to allow in all proposed collaborations: John Day's *Law Tricks* (1604) has been considered as a collaboration with George Wilkins with various degrees of certainty: M. E. Borish (1937) found no evidence for the claim in an article lauded by Jackson (2003, 81–82); Anthony Parr, in his biography of Wilkins, saw it as a probable collaboration (2004); and, Vickers entertained the idea that Wilkins 'may have' contributed (2002, 317). Thus, *Law Tricks* remains listed as sole authored.

Dating is taken from my sources. Each provides, as best as possible, a date of earliest production. Though these may be disagreed upon, the following discussion will not generally be singling out particular works and particular years so exact dating of each work is not necessary. Plays categorised as collaborations include the active collaborations discussed so
far, and acts of reworking or revision. This means that Shakespeare's additions to Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* mark it as a collaboration, alongside something like the actively collaborated *Roaring Girl* (1611) by Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton. Where plays are known to have had two parts they are represented as two plays, despite sometimes being published in one collection, as with Thomas Heywood's *1 Edward 4 and 2 Edward 4*. These various assumptions cannot all be correct all of the time, so there will be errors. However, the data presented are as full as practically possible and present a large enough set that single inaccuracies will not skew the data unduly or invalidate the conclusions drawn from it.

Collaborative plays number 171 of the 1,022 known titles from the period. Sole authored plays make up 524, and plays of unknown authorship number 327. Computing collaboration with these numbers means that 16.7% of plays can be said to be collaborative (see Table 4.1 below). However, the 327 anonymous titles bring down the share of collaborations considerably. If we assume that the authorship of the 327 anonymous plays mirrors those of the 695 where authorship is known, a different picture emerges. Of the plays of known authorship 24.6% are collaborative, with the remaining 75.4% the work of a sole author. For later discussion, I make the same assumption about the authorship of anonymous plays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorship Type</th>
<th>Number of Plays</th>
<th>% of Play Total</th>
<th>% of Plays of Known Authorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole authored</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Rates of Collaborative Authorship
The message of the data is clear, one in four plays was created by co-authorship. Paulina Kewes made a brief study of sole and collaborative authorship in her book on authorship and appropriation between 1660 and 1710 (1998). In her calculations, however, she counted anonymous plays as a third category of authorship, rather than a set of data where the information about authorship was missing. This led her to significantly underrepresent the prevalence of collaborative authorship (Kewes 1998, 232–35). Jackson made an approximation not dissimilar to my answer, though with different limitations. Looking at surviving plays from Shakespeare's career (1590-1614) not by Shakespeare, he found that 'modern scholarship ascribes some 20 per cent to more than one playwright' (Jackson 2012, 32–33).

This new information allows us to adjust previous assumptions about collaboration. Though it effectively halves the collaborative output of the period, its meaning should not diminish accordingly. Collaborative plays account for a significant minority of early modern drama. The proportion of collaborative drama varies from one record type to another, however. 33.2% of plays that are now lost were of collaborative authorship, significantly above the 24.6% mean average. 19.2% of extant printed drama is collaborative. Of the manuscript plays from Harbage's Annals 26.7% are co-authored; there are, however, too few to be considered statistically representative (see Table 4.2). One reason that collaborative drama might be underrepresented in print was proposed by Lukas Erne. As part of a broader argument that dramatic texts underwent a 'process of legitimation' by printing which led 'to their establishment as a genre of printed texts in its own right rather than as a pale reflection of what properly belongs to the stage', Erne showed that the inclusion of an author's name on a play's title page helped this quest for respectability (2003, 33–43). Importantly, he argued that a single author's name lent respectability to the new printed play market: 'From the
1590s, title pages, in contrast, show the stationers' effort to tie playbooks to a playwright who authorizes the playtext much as a poet authorizes a book of poetry' (Erne 2003, 44). However, 'The fact that many of the plays were not only collaboratively staged and produced but also collaboratively written, complicated this process of authorization' and acknowledgement of 'the extent of collaboration on title pages would no doubt have failed to convey the impression of authorship publishers tried to foster' (Erne 2003, 43–44). Wendy Wall evoked a similar theme: playtexts are 'unruly bulks of language, whose collaborative process of creation complicated their states as marketable commodities' (1994, 89).

Between 1584 and 1623, according to Erne's figures, 111 plays name an author or authors on their title pages. Only 13 of these 111 (less than 12%) 'acknowledge multiple authorship' (Erne 2003, 44). An aversion on the part of publishers to acknowledge multiple authorship in print could have led to a selection bias toward printing sole authored plays more frequently. This reluctance to print co-authored drama could explain its relative underrepresentation in extant printed plays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>Sole Authored</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Plays</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Collaborative Plays by Data Source

These data can be brought to bear directly in a discussion of theatrical networks. We know, for instance, theatre professionals organized themselves as acting companies under the patronage of a member of the nobility. These companies had to work together to
stage plays; this intra-company cooperation, as discussed in Chapter Two, likely led to some standardised working practices. It seems safe to assume, however, that a company working together every day, separate from other companies, would develop its own ways of working. A company likely had a particular way of commissioning writers or accepting play proposals or scripts from them, a particular way they rehearsed and brought in hired men and a specific system they used to double parts.

There is nothing to say that all acting companies had to go about these things in the same way but there likely was a good deal of overlap in practices. We know that actors, playwrights, and managers frequently moved between companies. Chapter Two noted the moves in 1595 of Richard Jones and Thomas Downton from Philip Henslowe's Rose to Francis Langley's Swan; a year later, they were back with Henslowe at the Rose. Were there a particularly high entry cost to join a company, in terms of learning a company's way of working, such moves would be unlikely to take place. Jones' and Downton's moves were not isolated cases either. Also in Chapter Two we saw how Richard Bradshaw moved from one company to another. Similarly, Nathan Field, discussed in Chapter Three, moved from the Lady Elizabeth's men to the King's men. Merging of companies, as happened with the Lady Elizabeth's men and the Duke of York's men when they combined under the Duke's new title of Prince Henry in 1615 (Gurr 1996, 120–21), would also have been made easier where companies had normalized practices. Roslyn L. Knutson found overlapping practices in her work on the revision and revival of plays in a company's repertory. She found evidence that the 'Admiral's men and Worcester's men (and by association, all adult companies) operated their businesses as economically as possible' with regards to their practice of reworking plays for performance (Knutson 1985, 15). All companies would have had to behave identically in certain instances or on certain occasions too: all had to present a text to the official censor,
the Master of the Revels, for pre-performance approval, and all companies would have had to cease playing when ordered because of plague closure or a more general suppression (as when members of the royal family died).

Theatre historians are often keen to apply evidence about company practices found in one historical context to other contexts because it helps fill gaps in our knowledge. Unfortunately, sometimes this is demonstrably invalid. It has already been shown above that when considering rates of collaboration, data mined from Henslowe's diary are inadequate for extrapolation. Elsewhere we have seen how companies differed in their organizational structure, with some renting theatres from landlords and others acquiring their own venue and becoming housekeepers. Some companies also favoured employing what G. E. Bentley called an 'attached professional', a playwright who had a 'long-term exclusive attachment' to them (1971, 37). Bentley listed eight writers who fit these criteria – Heywood, Fletcher, Dekker, Shakespeare, Philip Massinger, James Shirley, William Rowley and Richard Brome – of the 22 he surveyed who 'profited from furnishing plays for the theatres' (1971, 37). But we cannot extrapolate this proportion as numerical data, not least because writers appear to have been attached to companies only for a time, not indefinitely. As Bentley conceded, George Chapman wrote solely for the Admiral's men for a year or two before going on to write for other companies (Bentley 1971, 33). Dekker too is a problematic candidate for the label attached professional: he wrote for numerous companies throughout his career (Bentley 1956a, 3:241–75; Chambers 1923d, 3:291–305). Bentley's main distinction, however, is that attached professionals wrote exclusively for a company during the period they were writing for that company. One troupe that seem to have persistently favoured an attached professional is the King's men. The well-known move from William Shakespeare to John Fletcher at Shakespeare's retirement was, in turn, followed by Philip Massinger after Fletcher. The
source of a company's plays – from an attached professional in some cases, or, effectively, from unattached writers in others – offers an instance where company practices fundamentally differ.

The point of sketching these examples is that although companies sometimes approached things in the same way company practices were not ubiquitously normalised. This is especially true of their practices in developing and refreshing repertory, the branch of a company's work most closely related to collaborative authorship. Though Knutson found analogues across companies in their handling of revivals of plays, the sources of that drama – through attached or unattached writers – differed by company. The same conclusion can be made about companies' use of collaboratively written plays. Some companies staged considerably more co-authored drama than others, as the following Table 4.3 shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>Sole Authored</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admiral's men</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester's men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Charles' men</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Elizabeth's men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby's/Strange's men</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>1022</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain's/King's men</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Paul's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of the Queen's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeston's boys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Henrietta Maria's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.3 Collaborative Drama by Company*
Of all those companies with enough known plays to generate something resembling meaningful statistics, Worcester's men and the Admiral's men had the largest proportion of collaboratively written drama: 50%. In fact, the four companies with the highest proportion of collaborative drama in their repertories were companies connected with Henslowe in some way. This may in some part be an evidential aberration produced by the chance survival of the detailed records of Henslowe's diary. Where he recorded authorship of plays for those companies he worked with – particularly those of the Admiral's and Worcester's men – we are left to decipher it ourselves for others. Data regarding those other companies' plays is hard to come by. One reason for this is the practice of publishers to not routinely signal authorship on title pages, at least in the earlier decades of our period (Farmer and Lesser 2000). When this is combined with their especial reluctance to highlight collaborative authorship, as well as not always providing a company attribution, assigning a play to a particular company or author can be all but impossible. These difficulties most likely skew the figures we use.

Despite such difficulties, the numbers present a relatively clear picture of different companies' reliance on collaboratively written plays. In addition to the Admiral's men and Worcester's men, Prince Charles' men, Lady Elizabeth's men and Derby's/Strange's men all track well above the average proportion of collaborative plays staged in the period. The King's men, perhaps considered unlikely to stage a high proportion of collaborative because of their dependence upon Shakespeare (who seems rarely to have collaborated for most of his career), track 3.7% below the industry average. Interestingly, the Children at Paul's and the Children of the Queen's Revels staged virtually the same proportion of collaborative drama: just over one in six of their plays. Christopher Beeston's boys only register one known collaboration in the figures. Remarkably, of the 60 plays attributed to Queen Henrietta's men
not a single one is collaborative. Of these, 24 were written by their attached professional James Shirley.

These figures reflect on a company's authorship network: the writers on whom they would draw to furnish them with plays. Where they used attached professionals, these networks had a static point that could serve as a direct bridge between an author and a company's repertory. Clearly, when in need of a new play, Queen Henrietta's men immediately turned to James Shirley, who, presumably, wrote one for them. Or perhaps vice versa: on writing a new play, Shirley offered it first to Queen Henrietta's men. In instances like this, attached professionals serve to keep a network small. They cultivate a relationship with their company, with an appealing symbiosis. The writer receives steady commissions or payments for his work and the company has a stream of new drama being prepared, or older drama being reworked, by a writer who understands their particular needs. Exactly this arrangement seems to have existed for Shakespeare in relation to the Chamberlain's men. Plays that predate 1594, the year in which the company was formed, bear a marked difference in composition to those that come after and the reason was a 'relative disconnection between playwright and playing company' (Es 2007, 14–15). As Shakespeare came to write exclusively for the company his style developed around their needs. Rather than writing plays with a 'thinness of characterization beyond the central protagonist' and 'with little consistency in the division of lesser roles', after 1594 Shakespeare made the 'distinctive feature' of his dramaturgy 'the relationship within and between clusters of characters' (Es 2007, 14–15).

A model of supplying plays to a company based on a familiar company-author vertex appears to have been useful. There were other ways drama reached the stage, however. It has long been observed that the Admiral's men favoured hiring authorship teams, writers who
would collaborate repeatedly on multiple plays. The data in Table 4.3 confirm the prevalence of co-authored drama in their repertory. This makes for a broader author-company network, as there are more sources to draw on for a company's plays. We must assume that, with a proportion so far above the average, it was an active policy of the Admiral's men, and likely Worcester's men, Prince Charles' men and Lady Elizabeth's men, to stage co-authored plays.

Regarding the prevalence of collaborative drama in these companies, the number of collaborators involved in the plays is striking. Combined, the table totals 91 collaborations for the four companies. 44.0% of those are the product of at least three men and 26.4% are the product of four men or more (3.3% have five writers). Even when the numbers have Henslowe's records removed to stop the diary skewing the data the figures remain roughly the same (37.5% three or more men, 29.2% four or more men, 8.3% five men). That is, those companies that seem to have actively sought collaborative writing regularly got it from writers working in groups of three or more. Just why this might have been the case is discussed below.

An interesting contrast is presented by the relative paucity of collaborative drama staged by the boy companies. The fact that the trend to stage lower than average rates of collaborative drama is consistent across all three boy companies is telling. It would seem that something about the organization or practices of the boy companies did not encourage the writing and staging of co-authored drama. Further support for the conclusion that the age-profiles of these companies mitigated against co-authored plays is given by the case of the Lady Elizabeth's men. As discussed in Chapter Three, the Children of the Queen's Revels amalgamated with the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1613 (Gurr 1996, 398–99). The boys company immediately adopted the Lady Elizabeth's men's practice of staging co-authored drama. In their first year as an amalgamated company they played *The Honest Man's Fortune*
(1613) by Field, Massinger and Fletcher and *The Arraignment of London* (1613) by Robert Daborne and Cyril Tourneur. Something about their nature as a boy company had been directly or indirectly stopping them from staging co-authored plays.
Why did Playwrights Collaborate?

Why, then, did authors collaborate at all? And why, with particular respect to the boy companies, did they not? Gary Taylor recently addressed this topic with regards to Shakespeare. 'Both prevailing answers' about why Shakespeare collaborated 'are economic':

The postmodernist answer celebrates collaboration because, it claims, proprietary individual authorship was a capitalist ideology not written into law until the Enlightenment, and therefore irrelevant to the cooperative mentalité of early modern playwrights. Shakespeare collaborated because he didn’t know any better. (2014, 2)

This thinking is roughly analogous with that drawn on by Sharpe, above, who described a tendency to overstate the collaborative nature of dramatic creation at the expense of an author's endeavours. Taylor dismissed the postmodernist explanation by noting that before Shakespeare it had 'never routinely required more than one playwright per play' (2014, 3). The 'collapse of this historically indefensible argument' led to a resurgence for the second economic answer for collaboration (though Taylor gives no dates for when this occurred), namely:

The neoclassical, formalist explanation, which denigrates collaboration as itself a capitalist intrusion upon the natural and desirable state of individual artistic autonomy. According to this theory, the economic dominance of actors and proprietors forced playwrights to collaborate. Shakespeare’s plays include material by other writers because the men who paid the piper fiddled with the tunes. (G. Taylor 2014, 3)

Claims about Henslowe keeping his stable of dramatists in thrall, perennially indebted, as discussed in Chapter Two, loosely align with this model of collaboration. This approach is also 'suspect' (G. Taylor 2014, 3). Taylor replaced an economic reason for collaboration with a social one: 'It's not about the numbers. It must be qualitative, and therefore phenomenological. Collaboration in some way improved the quality of the human experience' (2014, 4).
Taylor sought to rewrite much of earlier criticism regarding collaboration. For one thing, we must recast Brian Vickers' assertion that 'co-authors, having a smaller vested interest in a playscript than if they had been solely responsible, were less concerned to get collaborative work published' (2002, 17). Though it speaks to the previously discussed prevalence of stated co-authorship on title pages, Vickers' claim does not fit in Taylor's model of collaboration based on choice and friendship. Taylor, citing Carson's *Companion to Henslowe's Diary*, explained that the only statistical difference Carson found was that collaborative plays were more likely to get finished that sole-authored ones (G. Taylor 2014, 4; Carson 1988, 57–58). Rather than having a lesser interest in a collaborative project, writers appear to have been more likely to see a work to completion when working with others. Presumably, this is because no one likes to let other people down.

'Strands of credit and debt' were, according to Douglas Bruster, intertwined with daily life in the theatre: it was 'primarily a place of business' (1992, 26–27). Within that world, dramatists needed the money: 'one variable, but inevitably important function in the collaborative process was economic' (McMullan 1994, 142); 'the main reason for collaboration was probably commercial' (Llewellyn 2005, 11); 'playwrights were employees of the acting companies' and, theatrical records are concerned with 'the allocation of labor, and (co)laborers'; and, (with specific reference to Massinger) 'his work as a collaborator must have been understandably onerous; presumably he was driven to it by financial need' (Howard 1985, 79). But, Taylor maintained, if cash were the main determinant, completing a play alone would provide a larger payoff than completing one with others, where payment would be shared. This was enough for him to reject the idea that writers collaborated because of financial motives.
And yet, there is a slight paradox in Taylor's argument. He decided that 'the economic motive cannot have been paramount: playwrights apparently had greater or more effective incentives to finish plays for which they received smaller, divided payments' (2014, 3–4). But this sits awkwardly with his recognition of the fact that the surest way for a playwright to receive a completion payment was to finish a collaborative play. That is, if dramatists were aware of the phenomenon, those writers who most needed quick money from playwriting were best served (assuming Carson's discoveries about play completion rates were representative) by turning to collaboration. A share of a completed commission is better than nothing from an incomplete one. (Henslowe's practice of making advance payments muddies the water here, since presumably the writer's powers of persuasion were as important as their actual output in securing these). There are other factors relevant to the discussion of collaborative authorship too. Rather than seeing it as a convivial or fraternal pursuit, Scott McMillin thought 'the collaborative system forced writers to keep to one another's pace and reminded them that they could easily be replaced' (1999a, 228). It is plausible that dramatists kept an eye on the pace of their peers so as not to be left behind.

Moments of commercial freedom actually suggest a pairing of these impulses. Sometimes writers sought to cash-in on projects, sometimes they sought more agreeable projects. For instance, 'in the fall of 1602 Anthony Munday was writing similar work for two different bosses'; he was writing for Henslowe and preparing a Lord Mayor's show for the Merchant Taylors (Northway 2008, 405). He was also preparing the third part in a series of translations, the *Historie of Palmerin of England* in 1602 (Bergeron 2007). Clearly, Munday had enough autonomy and motive to work on numerous projects. He was not, evidently, so concerned with his being replaced at the Admiral's men that his work elsewhere was stifled.
Other playwrights in the period show a willingness to marry the commercial and the fraternal. Eleanor Collins saw Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome break their 'usual working pattern' to collaborate on *The Witches of Lancashire* (1634); this 'illuminates the entrepreneurship of professional dramatists, and the fact that they were at liberty to make the most of opportunities as they arose' (2007, 128). Brome had been writing for the Red Bull Company at the Red Bull and Heywood was with Queen Henrietta's men at the Cockpit, but the pair came together to write a play eventually staged by the King's men. Taylor's stress upon writers freely choosing to collaborate seems consistent with this example of two playwrights deliberately breaking off their standard working practices to work together. But there is yet another dimension to be considered.

*The Witches of Lancashire* was a play whose subject matter was 'urgently topical' (Rowland 2010, 301) to the point of 'dramatic journalism' (Clark 1931, 242). The collaborators sought to profit from writing a play about current events.

A young boy, Edmund Robinson, accused people of witchcraft in the autumn of 1633. Others soon laid further accusations against these people and accused yet more. The accusers and accused all came, it seems, from the region of the Pendle Forest in Lancashire. Young Robinson and his father (another Edmund) were formally interrogated as was at least one of the accused, the Robinsons on February 10 and the accused person, who admitted being a witch, on March 2, 1634. Twenty-one people were then tried before a jury at the Lancashire Assizes on March 24 for killing or injuring people by witchcraft, and all but one of them were found guilty. As the law stood, the circuit judges who presided over the trial had to sentence the twenty people to death, but the judges were not satisfied with the trial and refused to pronounce sentence. Leaving the convicted people in prison at Lancaster, they took the matter back to London and laid it before the King. (H. Berry 1984, 215)

The Privy Council, at the behest of the King, ordered several of the principal offenders to be brought to London to be examined by him. Before they did so, the convicted witches were brought before the Bishop of Chester, John Bridgeman for further examination. By July 1634, the so-called witches were examined by a veritable troupe of physicians and midwives (18 in
total) who found 'little amiss' (H. Berry 1984, 215–16). As this went on, and the convicted women languished in prison, Brome and Heywood wrote their play.

The dramatists hoped the play would be a success because of the topical content. In fact, they were so keen to ensure that theirs was the only play covering the case that the King's men petitioned the Lord Chamberlain's office to stop other companies 'intermingleing some passages of witches in old playes to ye p'judice of their designed Comedy of the Lancashire witches' (Bentley 1956a, 3:73). The playing company desired 'a prohibition of any other till theirs bee allowed & Acted' (Bentley 1956a, 3:73). The writers were helped in ensuring the play's topicality and judicial accuracy by having access to various depositions from the accusers and the accused; parts of these formed the basis for some scenes in the play (H. Berry 1984, 217–18).

As well as making a deliberate choice to write together, Brome and Heywood had a commercial end in mind: the exploitation of an ongoing scandal. It proved a success and the play was enormously popular. A contemporary account of the play that might loosely be considered a review is contained in a letter that was discovered by Herbert Berry and published in 1984. Nathaniel Tomkyns, the account's author, told how the play was 'acted by reason of ye great concourse of people 3 dayes togither' (H. Berry 1984, 212), rather than taking its place in a rotating repertory as was usual. (The greatest dramatic success of the 1620s, Thomas Middleton's A Game At Chess (1624), was likewise played on successive days to satisfy huge public demand). Brome and Heywood's play made it into print some 11 weeks later, under the title The Late Lancashire Witches (1634).
Evidence in the printed texts points to other commercial factors for the playwrights too. Not only did they cash in on audiences' thirst for scandal, but there are signs that they used parts of their text as a marketing opportunity. On no fewer than six occasions do the dramatists mention the Mitre Tavern in Fleet Street, far from the play's fictional setting in Lancashire but temptingly close for its audience members on Bankside. This is suggestive of a deliberate 'product placement' and goes beyond the referencing of a specific locale or metaphoric tavern for an audience. Indeed, though it was not uncommon to see references to a tavern or similar space on the early modern stage (Campton 2014, 276–77), it is far less common to see them referred to in the reverential terms employed by Brome and Heywood. Take the first mention of it in the play, which comes as Generous has been informed his cellar is dry and he has guests coming the following day. Generous instructs Robin to fill his bottles before lamenting:

<code>Gen. O Robin, it comes short of that pure liquor
We drunke last Terme in London at the Myter
In Fleet-street, thou remembrest it; me thought
It was the very spirit of the Grape,
Meere quintessence of Wine.
Rob. Yes sir, I so remember it, that most certaine it is I never shal forget it, my mouth waters ever since when I but think on't. (Heywood and Brome 1634, D2v–D3r)
</code>

Other mentions are in a similar tone: 'since hee was last at London and tasted the Divinitie of the Miter' and 'all this while, to glorifie the Myter in Fleet-street?' (Heywood and Brome 1634, E2r, F1v).

The numerous references are hardly central to the play's action, and are so frequently effusive as to suggest inclusion for some personal benefit to the dramatists. There might have been a simple cash transaction for their inclusion – the tavern's drawer, one Jack Paine, is mentioned by name – or their might have been especial treatment afforded to the writers.
Some form of sponsorship might have extended to the company: their theatre at the Blackfriars was 0.4 miles away, a 10 minute walk. Whatever the pay-off, the audience would have got the message.

Considered in isolation the case of *The Witches of Lancashire* does not explicitly show writers moved to collaboration for commercial gain: a writer of a sole-authored work could also include similar product placement. It does, however, attest a commercial impulse in the two dramatists, who clearly were alive to financial opportunities beyond simply being paid for writing a play. In light of this evidence, and that regarding Munday above, we might revise Taylor's assertion of the fraternal motives for collaboration as necessarily distinct from commercial ones. Here, dramatists' works are considered as commercial decisions.

Another received idea about co-authored plays that Taylor sought to overturn regarded the relative speed of production. Studies of collaboration almost ubiquitously describe it as a means of producing plays quickly. Kathleen McLuskie articulated a 'need for speed' where collaboration helped dramatists who were 'employees of a booming entertainment industry which demanded a steady output of actable material' (1981, 169). This sentiment is broadly mirrored elsewhere, as we saw with Lois Potter's reference to dramatists needing to meet 'a heavy demand' for new plays. Scott McMillin glanced at the same idea above: playwrights had to work fast to keep up with one another. Speed was a crucial factor in his conception of collaborative authorship. Brian Vickers too thought that collaboration allowed for the completion of a 'script more quickly' (2002, 27). Claims about speed are also made regarding specific plays. The scholarship surrounding our most recent example, *The Witches of Lancashire*, is couched in language of the topical; indeed, the review published by Berry was impressed with the 'newnesse of ye subject' (H. Berry 1984; Hirschfeld 2000). Likewise,
discussions of *Keep the Widow Waking* (1624), another co-authored (now lost) play entwined with a legal dispute, come with conclusions about the need of the dramatists to exploit the topical nature of the subject matter. 'Doubtless the need for rapid production dictated multiplicity of authorship' was C. J. Sisson's judgment (1936, 112); this has been echoed elsewhere (Vickers 2002, 33).

Taylor departed from previous scholarship by comparing the relative speed of production with sole authored works. He cited a litany of fast-produced, sole-authored plays to counter claims, like those above, about the speed of collaborative composition. While an individual play might get completed more quickly if more hands work on it, the overall throughput of a group of writers is the same whether or not they collaborate. And some sole-authored plays were rapidly produced. George Chapman's *The Old Joiner of Aldgate* (1603), Ben Jonson's *Volpone*, Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess*, and an unnamed play by Michael Drayton that he promised to write in a fortnight were all produced, at speeds similar to, or greater than, works cited by scholars as evidence for the speed of collaborative composition. 'Compositional velocity is not', Taylor concluded, 'a function of the number of playwrights involved' (2014, 4). That is, 'Seven playwright working alone on separate plays, should, theoretically, be able to produce as many plays as seven playwrights working together on collaborative plays' (G. Taylor 2014, 4).

Taken at face value, Taylor's conclusions seem sensible enough. And yet, evidence suggests that playwrights felt that collaboration could speed up their rate of production. Chapter One opened with a discussion of Robert Daborne's inability to deliver a script on time, and the series of letters that document this fact. In those letters, Daborne acknowledged that his work was late and promised that the completed version of his play would be with
Henslowe soon. Another letter in the same group, from June 1613, showed how Daborne employed collaboration to complete his play more quickly. He wrote:

J have not only labord my own play which shall be ready before they come over but given Cyrill Tourneur an act of ye Arreignment of London to write yt we may have yt likewise ready for them [the Admiral's men], J wish ye had spoken with them to know the ar resolution for they depend upon ye purpose, J hav sent ye 2 sheets more fayr written vpon my fflayth s't they shall not stay one hour for me. (Greg 1907, 72)

It is clear that Daborne is concerned with getting things done quickly. His letter is rife with concerns about timings: 'before they come over', 'we may have yt likewise ready for them', 'shall not stay one hour with me' (Greg 1907, 72). The impression is of a man pursued by time's winged chariot, desperately trying to meet some imagined deadline to complete his work and please the acting company. Farming out an act to Tourneur meant that he could have the play ready for when he met with the company. In contrast to Taylor, Daborne thought that co-authorship would help increase the speed at which his play was composed. His letter closed, as was customary for Daborne, with a petition for cash.

We might imagine another instance where Taylor's arguments about the speed of co-authorship could be more nuanced. His discussion assumed that writers composed all scenes at an average velocity. Jonson apparently wrote Volpone at 85 lines per day over five weeks. An average, though, as this is, might obscure more varied rates of composition within those five weeks. Jonson might have flown through scenes involving exchanges between Volpone and Mosca, writing far in excess of 85 lines a day, but stalled in writing the scenes containing Nano, Androgyno and Castrone, writing far fewer. Or vice versa. If, as seems likely, writers found it easier to write some scenes than others then collaboration certainly could help increase the speed of production. If collaborators apportioned the work in order that each wrote to his specialisms, their overall productively would be greater.
There is some evidence that dramatists did just this. William Rowley, as we shall see, specialised in writing comic (especially fat-character) parts (Gunby 2013). Middleton appears to have had a penchant for writing witches (White 1992, 85–88; Ichikawa 2002, 12–13). These specialisms need not have been limited to the type of scene a writer might excel at but could also pertain to a play's form. For instance, it may be that one collaborator was better, or faster at writing the opening of a play or the end. Taylor noted that in his collaborations Shakespeare tends not to write the opening scene. Shakespeare was, 'For most of his career', less 'interested, or less accomplished' at the exposition needed to get a play started but excelled at portraying the complications that ensue after the premises are established (G. Taylor 2014, 7). As we shall see below, considerations of writers' specialisms were important to the arrangement of co-authorship.

It is a mistake to dismiss economic factors or speed in a discussion of the reasons for collaborative authorship. In his model, Taylor replaced economics and speed with the 'social relationship of one Elizabethan playwright to his fellows' (2014, 5), what we might broadly term 'friendship', as driving collaborative authorship. This should come as no surprise, given the frequent conviviality of relationships that we have seen in preceding chapters and the exceptionality of those cases where it broke down. We know that writers often got on well enough to share their personal lives. Thomas Kyd and Christopher Marlowe lived together and wrote in the same chamber (S. Wells 2006, 96). Their relationship, however, only extended so far and might not outlive state persecution. When Kyd was imprisoned following the authorities finding heretical papers at the pair's lodgings, he wrote two letters to Sir John Puckering explaining his innocence and implicating his housemate (Mulryne 2004). For what it is worth, the pair are also tied together in the same line in Jonson's elegy to Shakespeare in
the First Folio: 'tell, how farre thou didst our Lily out-shine, / Or sporting Kid, or Marlowes mighty line' (1623, πA4r). Other pairs shared a personal and professional relationship. A 'gossipy few sentences' from the notoriously unreliable John Aubrey described how the frequent collaborators Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher 'were the closest of friends, soulmates as well as professional colleagues' (S. Wells 2006, 194).

We have seen Heywood and Brome departing from their regular arrangements to work together on The Witches of Lancashire, which was a choice that we might assume was based on an active desire to work together. Likewise, there was a 'particular deliberateness' in the pairing of Middleton and Rowley, who 'ignored the boundaries of company affiliations to work together' (Hirschfeld 2004, 101–3). As with Heywood and Brome, instances where dramatists broke their regular pattern to collaborate, rather than simply falling-in with a company's existing writers, are strong indicators of friendship between the co-authors. Pairings of this kind are important for considering the professional networks of dramatists, and for assessing just how important a factor company membership was in defining the boundaries of writers' relationship. As noted in the Introduction, 'most of the dramatists enjoyed personal acquaintance' with the other dramatists such that the 'drama of the period may be described as the product of a circle of friends' (H. W. Wells 1975, 4).

A significant reason for dramatists to collaborate was to learn, or teach their craft. A master-apprentice relationship best explains why some dramatists co-wrote some plays. Neil Carson observed just this in Henslowe's diary, where 'a number of playwrights mentioned appear first as protégés or associates of more established authors' (1988, 60). This seems sensible: a new writer learnt his trade from a more experienced writer by working with him in collaboration. The model afforded benefits that cannot be achieved from attempting to learn
by imitation, such as, presumably, some discussion of each author's strengths and how they might to employ them on a project, as well as the opportunity for the tutee to benefit from the inspiring ideas and perhaps the working practices of the tutor.

Scholars regularly refer to a period of writerly apprenticeship for each playwright. 'The business of playwrighting', Gary Taylor has written, 'often resembled the apprentice-master relationship that structured London trades' (2002, 3). This is unsurprising in light of the arguments that we should consider the theatre industry as being structured like a quasi-guild, as we saw in Chapter Two. One particular aspect of the guild structure that was reproduced in the theatre industry was adult actors taking on teenage boys as apprentices; the boys would learn their craft attached to the established actor (Kathman 2005). Not infrequently those actors who took apprentices were free of a London livery company (Kathman 2004a). Ostensibly, actors took apprentices in their official company professions rather than the acting profession but they provided them, in reality, with training for the stage (Kathman 2004a, 11). This mirroring of guild practices seems sensible as they were the long-established and successful institutions that specialised in the organization and continued provision of labour.

Carson noted writers first appearing as protégés in Henslowe's records, and Taylor saw the same relationship for Shakespeare at the start of his career: 'early in his career Shakespeare apparently collaborated with Thomas Nashe and others in writing The First Part of Henry the Sixth, and with George Peele in writing Titus Andronicus; Edward the Third may also be an early collaboration' (2002, 2). To this list we might now add 2 and 3 Henry 6 and Arden of Faversham (G. Taylor 2014, 1). Unwittingly, others making a case for a more general writing apprenticeship for Shakespeare employ the same evidence to different ends.
'Even some of Shakespeare's early plays – particularly *Titus Andronicus* and the first history tetralogy – reproduce sounds of Marlovian and Kydian verse; clearly the apprentice dramatist carefully listened to and mimicked the successes of his contemporaries' (Pangallo 2012, 104). Importantly, both critics see early modern writers, Shakespeare in this case, as apprentices in their profession. Others do the same. E. A. J. Honigmann in his book on Shakespeare's so-called lost years, imagined him serving an apprenticeship with Lord Strange's men (1985, 69). Conversely, in a narrative history of the Queen's men, Shakespeare spent his early career with that company (McMillin and MacLean 1998, 168). The point, though, is that despite us not knowing 'where Shakespeare was during this time or what he was doing . . . most sensible hypotheses are those that link him with some theatrical company or other, as apprentice writer and actor, learning his trades' (M. Taylor 2008, 9).

Those Shakespeareans intent on keeping Shakespeare exclusively as a timeless artist, detached from the commercial practicalities of his time, do not see Shakespeare as an apprentice at all. Consider the actor Brian Cox's declaration:

I describe the play [*Titus Andronicus*] as an 'apprentice masterpiece' in this respect: just as an apprentice carpenter of the period would prepare and create for himself a test piece . . . so in much the same way *Titus Andronicus* was Shakespeare's test piece, a test piece and template for all the great tragedies that were to follow – *Lear*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, and *Macbeth*. . . . The apprentice carpenter serves his master, but Shakespeare is his own apprentice and his own master. (Cox 2004, 338)

His discussion began with his view that *Titus* is 'most assuredly written by William Shakespeare and by William Shakespeare alone' (Cox 2004, 338). We have already seen this impulse to deny collaborative authorship in commentators elsewhere in this chapter, as well as the privileging of Shakespeare's singularity above all else. At odds with the observable evidence is the notion of Shakespeare not requiring a tutor. He arrived in the theatre having
already mapped out his own career and threw Titus at an audience at the beginning of an inevitable arc towards Hamlet and Lear.

Cox, despite not being a historian is not included here as a straw man. The essay quoted from appeared first in a book from Cambridge University Press edited by two Shakespeare scholars, and was reprinted a decade later by Emma Smith in her guide to criticism on Shakespeare's tragedies (2004b). Cox’s contortion – Shakespeare as his own master and apprentice – is not only impossible but hides a more telling fact: before Shakespeare was 'Shakespeare' he was the apprentice, he had a tutor. Following the chronology proposed in the Oxford Complete Works, five of Shakespeare's first eight plays were collaborative. If Arden of Faversham were included, that would push the number up to six from eight, 75% of his work up to that point. Understanding Shakespeare as apprentice collaborator helps us draw a second conclusion: that he might not have been the driving force behind his early collaborations. As the junior dramatist on a play, it would have been unlikely for him to be able to pick and choose his projects or collaborators. Other writers clearly started in the same way. A turn to collaboration in an effort to get established in the theatre industry is present in the careers of many well-known dramatists of the period, as we shall see.

Remaining briefly with Shakespeare, by the end of his career he had become the master in the collaborative dynamic. By those intent on squaring Shakespeare's co-authorship with his solitary, unmatched genius his late collaborations have been described thus:

The Shakespearean parts of Henry VIII, The Two Noble Kinsmen, and Cardenio were presumably written in retirement to help his fellows and John Fletcher to keep up with the demand for new plays. In the two plays that survive intact, there are no passages that throw any fresh light on Shakespeare. (Muir and O’Loughlin 1937, 221)
Despite the implied lack of artistic effort on Shakespeare's part – the quoted authors here also contend that Queen Katherine's trial in *Henry 8* is less powerful than that of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale* – he is at least credited with helping Fletcher take over as the King's men's resident dramatist. Gordon McMullan paraphrased familiar arguments about Shakespeare's need to collaborate with 'his nominated successor, John Fletcher' who suffered from 'inexperience' (2007, 91). With Shakespeare as the master at this stage of his career, Fletcher is figured as the apprentice. This fits with our records of Fletcher's plays. Of those up to and including his collaborations with Shakespeare, he collaborated 16 times in 19 plays (a rate of 84.2%). In his 33 plays produced after his work with Shakespeare he collaborated 20 times (a rate of 60.1%). Evidently, even for a distinctly collaborative author, Fletcher's early career is marked by apprenticeship in collaboration.

A focus on Shakespeare and collaboration-as-apprenticeship in his career could simply be a study of an outlier (though not for the reasons presumed by Brian Cox). But data across the early modern canon traces a similar curve. Master-apprentice relationships can explain the theatrical start of many familiar names. Indeed, a cursory study of the numbers reveals just that, although we must bear in mind the uncertainty of some of the dating of the period's plays, and that our first record does not necessarily indicate someone's first play. Francis Beaumont, Richard Brome, Robert Daborne, John Day, Thomas Dekker, John Ford, Richard Hathway, William Haughton, Gervase Markham, Christopher Marlowe, Philip Massinger, Thomas Middleton, William Rowley, William Sampson, James Shirley, Wentworth Smith, John Webster, and Richard Wilson all appear first in our records in collaborations.

Ben Jonson, in his prologue to *Volpone*, now oft-cited in studies of collaborative authorship, articulated a similar range of roles for collaborators: 'From his owne hand,
without a Co-adiutor, Novice, Iorney-man, or Tutor' (Jonson 1607, A4v). Stanley Wells glossed each of Jonson's roles thus: 'A coadjutor would be an equal collaborator, a novice a kind of apprentice, a journeyman a hack brought in perhaps to supply a comic subplot, and a tutor a master craftsman guiding a novice' (2006, 26). Grace Ioppolo, in elucidating a hierarchy of collaborators, defined the roles in much the same way: 'For Jonson, the main author reigned above co-adjutors (helpers or assistant writers), novices (inexperienced or probationary writers) and journeymen (writers who were newly qualified, having finished their apprenticeships)' (2006, 29). As we have seen, contemporary evidence aligns with Jonson's categories, as well as establishing new ones. Several reasons prompted collaboration. Dramatists may have chosen it because of the friendship it afforded, its ability to improve, in Taylor's expression, the human experience. Collaboration might have helped produce a play more quickly, or hastened a much-needed pay-off, as well as generally helping guarantee – because of the increased likelihood of the play's completion – a playwright's payment. Additionally, collaboration might have been prompted a master-apprentice dynamic where an inexperienced writer learnt from the more experienced professional. In some instances playwrights had a mixture of these motives moving them to collaborate.

**Collaboration: Division of Labour**

Having examined why writers collaborated, we may also consider just how they shared the labour of dramatic co-authorship. Evidence can be drawn from contemporary references to collaboration, as well as studies of authorship attribution.
Surviving records that suggest that playwrights mainly split plays by act. We saw above the ever penurious Robert Daborne, on 5 June 1613, telling Henslowe that he had 'given Cyrill Tourneur an act of ye Arreignment of london to write' in an effort to speed up his delivery (Greg 1907, 72). Clearly, Daborne thought an act would be a sufficient amount to outsource to ease the pressure on his rate of production. Presumably, it was also not such a large section of the play that he had to spend too long briefing Tourneur about the project that it undid the economies of time afforded by having him co-author the play. Tiffany Stern concluded that 'Daborne ha[d] transferred to Tourneur enough information for the writing of a single act out of context from the rest of the play' (2009, 23). Interestingly, though this example offers a solid case for the division of collaborative labour being split by act, it is not an instance of planned co-authorship, but rather shows collaboration as an afterthought. Given that Daborne gave the act to Tourneur to increase the speed with which the play was completed, we might assume that splitting a play into acts was a common practice. After all, there would be no benefit for Daborne in attempting to enter into an entirely new or unfamiliar way of working with Tourneur, one that might require lengthy explanation or supervision, if the goal is to complete a play quickly.

Another well-known example of such a share of collaborative playwriting comes from the lawsuit regarding a play with the full title The Late Murder in Whitechapel, or Keep the Widow Waking. Though lost, a good deal of information about the play's topics and creation survive. The play 'recounted the true story of how an unscrupulous suitor kept a rich old widow in a state of drunkenness and sleeplessness until she went through a marriage ceremony with him . . . at which point he robbed her of everything he could'; a second narrative 'told how a young boy killed his mother, confessed the crime, and was hanged' (Vickers 2007, 314). The widow's son-in-law brought the suit, which required that Thomas
Dekker, one of the play's authors, depose in the Star Chamber. His testimony recalled that he had written 'some parte of the . . . play himself', that his share consisted of 'two sheetes of paper conteyning the first Act' and 'a speech in the last Scene of the last Act of the Boy who had killed his mother' (Sisson 1936, 110). 'This would', according to C. J. Sisson, 'seem to indicate that the play was jobbed out to the four authors in detached acts with one important passage at least reserved for special treatment' (1936, 112). Once more, we see active collaboration split by act; in addition here though, a speech is used as a unit of collaborative playwriting. Dekker, on top of his full act, contributed a single speech too.

Without the text of the play it is impossible to ascertain the nature of Dekker's additional speech, but we might conclude it would have been of significant length and belonged to one character. It would be particularly tedious to organise collaboration at the level of the speech unless the speech was long enough to warrant it; farming out a small one would have been more trouble than it was worth. It may have been, though, that Dekker's additional speech was added as part of a final completion process, rather than in an initial sharing out of work. With his reference to contributing 'two sheetes of paper conteyning the first Act', it is probable that the collaborators worked on their shares separately before somehow stitching them together. Were the writers working together in the same room, such a discrete parcelling of paper would have been unlikely since this material was expensive and Dekker had personal experience of incarceration for debt (Parr 2002, vii). We may suppose that if they worked in the same room, collaborators shared paper wherever possible.

Speed mattered to the dramatists working on *Keep the Widow Waking* because of the desire to dramatize current events. Though Taylor took issue with generalised claims about the speed advantage that co-authorship had over solo writing, we have seen instances where it
could hasten a play's completion. Scott McMillin thought that when a 'dramatist was working, he was working very hard. . . . He was not the lonely artist in his garret. In most cases, he was collaborating with two, three or even four other writers, each of them taking an act or two of an outline plot and working fast' (1999a, 228). The arguments here largely fit with those outlined already about the speed of production (in some instances, though not generally) and about the division of labour (splitting plays by act). In addition, McMillin is also correct regarding the number of collaborators on a particular play. He suggested that most collaborations involved three or more writers. This is the case, as Table 4.4 below shows, but only by the slimmest of margins (50.3% of known cases) and we may say that about half of collaborative plays were the work of two playwrights, and half the work of more than two. The evidence for this conclusion is given above but because it includes revised plays as well as active collaborations, the prevalence of dual-authored works is slightly over-represented. But a table including only active collaborations would still likely show dual-authored works as the single largest group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborators</th>
<th>Number of Collaborative Plays</th>
<th>% of Collaborative Plays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Collaborators</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaborators</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Collaborators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaborators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Number of Collaborators Involved in Collaborative Plays

These data make a clear point about writing networks: authors most frequently collaborated in pairs. Despite the general friendliness that existed in the theatrical profession, writing plays was evidently not used as an opportunity to work with as many professional
companions as possible. When deciding to collaborate, dramatists preferred teams of two over teams of three, teams of three over teams of four, and teams of four over teams of five. Something about dramatic creativity was felt to be better served by the involvement of fewer writers.

A particular collaboration involving two dramatists provides more contemporary evidence for the splitting the writing of a play by act. When Thomas Nashe and Ben Jonson wrote *The Isle of Dogs* (1597) it proved so seditious the Privy Council imprisoned Jonson, and called for the arrest of Nashe (Wickham, Berry, and Ingram 2000, 102). Nashe avoided capture and, in a later prose work, described his role in the play:

> An imperfit Embrion I may well call it, for I hauing begun but the induction and first act of it, the other four acts without my consent, or the least guesse of my drift or scope, by the players were supplied, which bred their trouble and mine to. (McKerrow 1905, 3:153–54)

Nashe thus claimed that the collaboration was divided into acts: he wrote the first, with no real knowledge of what followed. As with Dekker's penning of an act and a speech in *Keep the Widow Waking*, Nashe's unit of contribution is the act along with an induction. Whether Nashe was being truthful with his recollections is difficult to know – at least one other writer in a similar position, discussed below, lied about about writing a seditious play – and one might remark on his willingness to absolve himself and implicate his co-authors. If Nashe was telling the truth, he dealt with a single act of the play; if he was not telling the truth, he seemingly felt that describing his share in acts was plausible enough that readers might believe his assertion. Either way, it serves as further evidence of the division of writing labour by act.
Alongside those specific references to act-based co-authorship, Henslowe's Diary holds at least one other record that hints at distribution of co-authorship by act. Robert Shaa noted that he:

```
Receaued of Mr Henshlowe th[ey]s 3th of June 1600
in behalfe of the Company to An: Munday &
the rest in pte of payment for a booke Called    iijli vs
the fayre Constance of Roome the some of
```

(Foakes and Rickert 1961, 135)

Following this, Robert Shaa wrote to Henslowe on behalf of the collaborators requesting the remaining payment for the play *Fair Constance of Rome* (1600):

```
I praye you Mr Henshlowe deliuer vnto the bringer hereof the some
of fyue & fifty shillinges to make the 3h –fyue shilling wch they
receaued before, full six pounde in full payment of their booke
Called the fayre Constance of Roome. Whereof I pray you
Reserue for me M' Wilsons whole share wyth is xjs. wch
I to supply his neede deliuered hime yesternight.
yo' Lovinge ffrend Robt Shaa (Foakes and Rickert 1961, 294)
```


*Fair Constance of Rome* had, if Henslowe's records are accurate, five authors, who shared the pay equally. For the second payment, the team were given 55 shillings. Robert Wilson's share, which he had taken early, Shaa tells us, was 11 shillings. That left four collaborators and 44 shillings; it seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that each of the others took an equal share, 11 shillings. Accepting an equal distribution of funds from the second payment, the same logic would suggest that the playwrights split their first payment in the same way to maintain the balance (each taking a neat 13 shillings). Had the first payment been distributed unequally for some reason, we would expect to see Wilson's share be either
more or less to fall in line with the agreed rates. At this moment it is worth noting that each of the dramatists working on *Fair Constance* was experienced: there were no novices being trained by perhaps taking a lesser share of the work and learning the ropes. Additionally, all of the playwrights had worked with each of the others before and would go on to do so again (apart from Dekker and Hathway, this is their one known collaboration with each another). Four of the five, excluding Dekker, had written *1 Sir John Oldcastle* for Henslowe in 1599. These writers had good professional relationships with one another. What the record appears to show, then, is five writers being equally compensated for a play. Based on the assumption that *Fair Constance* was a five-act play, and each co-author wrote an equal share, as suggested by the payments, it seems reasonable to assume that each author wrote one act.

Contemporary references to the organization of co-authorship largely signal playwriting distributed by act. Other references concerned with the division of dramatic labour in collaborations are not so explicit, however. When imprisoned for his part in writing *Eastward Ho!*, George Chapman, as we have seen, protested his innocence by letter to the Earl of Suffolk (the Lord Chamberlain), and to the King. Though he had a hand in the play, he declared that the offending matter was 'but two Clawses, and both of them not our owne' (Chapman, Jonson, and Marston 1999, 218). Champan's petition is not like the other examples cited above: there is no clear suggestion that the active collaboration on *Eastward Ho!* was arranged by acts. But there is an acknowledgment that the authors wrote allotted sections. If the scenes at issue did not belong to Chapman (or to Jonson, for he was imprisoned too and Chapman wrote on his behalf) then they had to have been written by John Marston, the play's third collaborator. Not incidentally, modern attribution studies do, in fact, credit Chapman with one of the most volatile scenes, despite his letters professing innocence. David Lake attributed the first act to Marston, 2.1-4.1 to Chapman, and 4.2-5.3 to Jonson
(Lake 1981). As such, Chapman is credited with lines poking fun at James I's 'traffic in knighthoods' (Fossen 1999, 157). More important for our purpose than who wrote the offensive scenes is how they shared the work. With the exception of a little overlap in the fourth act, we have another example of writers sharing their work by act.

The above example takes us from the documentary record to the findings of modern attribution scholarship regarding the organization of active collaboration. Rather than survey the findings of attribution studies for every extant collaborative play, I draw on several examples below that show collaborators sharing the labour of playwriting in different ways. A full survey of every extant collaboration's authorship mechanics is impossible because for many cases, no reliable attribution studies exist, particularly with lesser known plays. Studies of collaboration have been dominated by studies of authorship attribution, and studies of authorship attribution have been dominated by the plays of Shakespeare. Partly this is because what we consider 'Shakespeare' has been expanding: 'Modern scholarship gives us a larger Shakespeare canon, but also a larger proportion of collaborative work'; some 13 out of 43 plays he worked on are the product of co-authorship in some way (G. Taylor 2014, 1). And partly Shakespeare's dominance of this field of scholarship is reflective of his dominance of scholarship about the Renaissance theatre as a whole.

Pericles was identified as a collaboration with George Wilkins as early as 1868; critics detected an "evident disparity" of styles in the play' (Vickers 2002, 291). Wilkins's authorship has since been confirmed (Jackson 2003): he wrote Acts One and Two, and Shakespeare wrote Acts Three to Five (Gossett 2004a, 66). Once more, a co-authored play is divided by acts. This time though, the evidence stems from attribution scholarship focussed on internal evidence. Cyrus Hoy, in his work on the Beaumont and Fletcher canon found
similar divisions on the *Queen of Corinth*: that the play 'is the work of three dramatists is evident from the three distinct linguistic patterns which emerge (Hoy 1959, 98–99). He gave Philip Massinger acts 1 and 5, John Fletcher act 2, and Nathan Field acts 3 and 4. Clearly there is good evidence available – from contemporary records to attribution studies – that shows a division of writing by act.

We cannot say, however, that co-authored plays were only ever divided into discrete acts for dramatists to write. Playwrights split work in other ways too. Take Rowley and Middleton's *The Changeling* (1622). The first two acts follow the familiar pattern: Rowley wrote the first and Middleton wrote the second. But, acts three to five include scenes from both authors (Bawcutt 1998, 2–3). This shows a different kind of authorship split. For *The Changeling*, Rowley supplied the comic sub-plot, while Middleton provided the tragic main plot (O’Callaghan 2009, 133–34). Suzanne Gossett saw a similar division of labour in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* where Fletcher 'wrote primarily the subplot, while Shakespeare handled the main plot' (Gossett 2009, 16).

Elsewhere, dramatists split the work in other ways too. Sometimes one dramatist would write the opening and closing scenes of a play, with other collaborators writing the sections in between. A strand of this phenomenon was highlighted by Taylor regarding Shakespeare's apparent disinclination to write the opening scenes of collaborations (G. Taylor 2014, 7). Preferences for and against exposition and conclusion are found in numerous co-authored plays. In Field, Fletcher and Massinger's *The Queen of Corinth* (1617), Field wrote the opening and the closing scenes (Hoy 1959, 97). When the same trio wrote *The Knight of Malta* (1618), it was Massinger who opened and closed the work (Hoy 1959, 98). Clearly something kept Massinger in the role: he did it for *The Double Marriage* (1620) and *The
Elder Brother (1625), when collaborating with Fletcher (Hoy 1957, 147–48). When working with Fletcher on Philaster (1609), The Maid's Tragedy (1610), A King and no King (1611), and on Love's Pilgrimage (1616), Beaumont took on the role (Hoy 1958). There is plenty of evidence of authors dividing work in such a way that whoever started it finished it. Importantly, there is further evidence that suggests that these are examples of a deliberate practice, rather than random phenomena that we are attributing meaning to.

Rather than the author who bookended the play writing a significant portion of the play's beginning, they provide a small part of the text, before another author takes over. This suggests a deliberate choice on behalf of an author to take responsibility for a work's exposition and conclusion. Philaster exhibits just this pattern. Written by Beaumont and Fletcher, the pair split the first act, and shared the final scene of the final act, with Fletcher writing the opening and closing lines (Hoy 1958, 95–96). The same pattern of a pair of writers sharing an opening scene or act can be seen elsewhere. It happened in: Beaumont and Fletcher's The Maid's Tragedy (1610); Fletcher and Massinger's Little French Lawyer (1619); Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger's Thierry and Theodoret (1617); Fletcher and Massinger's The Double Marriage (1620); and, Fletcher and Massinger's The Prophetess (1622) (Hoy 1957, 1958).

There is, of course, nothing that precludes playwrights who use this opening-and-closing model from writing in acts as well. The Queen of Corinth, for instance, is written in just this way. There is also nothing to say that a collaboration need conform to any of the outlined methods of working described here. Take the distribution of writing in Wit at Several Weapons (1613) by Rowley and Middleton. It is not separated entirely into acts, not
separated by plot, and not started and finished by the same author. Writers had no obligation to fit their work onto the Procrustean bed of any particular model of collaboration.

**Case Study: William Rowley**

Thus far, this chapter has considered collaboration holistically across the Renaissance theatre and dealt with datasets as large as extant records will afford. To better examine the impact this had on the networks of those making their livelihoods in the theatre a more focused view is needed. And, as with other chapters, we now consider the evidence presented above in the light of a biographical case study of a theatre professional, the actor-playwright William Rowley.

Biographical study of William Rowley is prefaced with caveats: though 'an important presence in the theatrical life of Jacobean London...his place and date of birth are unknown...of his parentage and background we know nothing' (Pursglove 2006). His birth is conjectured to be around 1585, but no evidence – indeed, no reasoning – is offered to support the assertion by biographers (Fleay 1891, 2:89; Howard-Hill 1987, 241; Pursglove 2006; Gunby 2013). The parish register of St Andrew by the Wardrobe, held and digitized by the London Metropolitan Archive, and hitherto unexamined, holds a record of a christening for a 'Willm Rowley' on 12 July 1577 (‘St Andrew by the Wardrobe, Register of Baptisms, 1558-1812’, n.d.). This is probably the playwright. If so, he would have been 30 when he was first associated with the professional theatre, and 33 when he first appeared in a surviving record of a minor legal action (Eccles 1982, 116). As we shall see, there are good reasons to suppose Rowley belonged to a London family, which helps cement conclusions about his baptism record. Another possible candidate exists, though his claim is far weaker. This other
William Rowley was baptised at the church of St in the West on 8 December 1589 (‘St Dunstan in the West, Composite Register: Baptisms 1558-1631/2, Marriages 1559/60-1631/2, Burials 1558-1631/2’, n.d.). If this were the playwright he would have written his first play aged 17 and made his first legal appearance before the age of maturity at 20. This is unlikely.

Even with the new information adduced above regarding Rowley's date of birth, his family biography is difficult to piece together. His baptism record notes his presence only, with no parental information; this makes the tracking of siblings all but impossible without the help of documents about those siblings. William had two brothers, one named Samuel and one Thomas, both of whom appear in Samuel's will, proved in 1624 (J. A. Somerset 1966, 293–96). Samuel left money to his brother Thomas, and all his books to William (J. A. Somerset 1966, 293–96). Both were involved in the theatre industry (Chambers 1923c, 2:337). This helps, indirectly, to support the case made for the above revision of Rowley's birth date from circa 1585 to 1577. There is nothing to say that because a person ended up working in the early modern theatre in London, they had to have been born in London. They could, as with William Shakespeare (Holland 2013), Christopher Marlowe (Nicholl 2008a), and John Fletcher (McMullan 2006), have been born in the provinces and moved to London later. And there is nothing to say that more than one sibling appearing in records in London confirms that they are from a London family: witness Shakespeare and his actor brother Edmund (Eccles 1963, 107). With records tying three Rowley brothers to living and working in the city, however, even with only one documented at birth, it seems probable they were Londoners. Records of the brothers' lives involving weddings, baptisms, professional activities, legal wrangles and deaths suggest a full engagement with the city as their home. By contrast, records of Shakespeare show him split between Stratford and London throughout his life.
We can also expand Rowley's immediate family a little further. He married a woman named Grace, for on 26 June 1614 Rowley, then living in the parish of St Leonard's, Shoreditch, gave surety for her after she had been bound over for a breach of the peace (Eccles 1982, 117). An incident had occurred involving Grace at the 'Norton Folgate tavern of Robert Woodhouse' (Eccles 1982, 117). Information in another unpublished record tells us the couple had a daughter, also named Grace. She was baptised on 18 September 1614 at St Botolph Aldgate (‘St Botolph Aldgate, Composite Register, 1593 - 1599’, n.d.). The parish register of St Leonard's Shoreditch, digitized by Alan H. Nelson, contains a possible record of this daughter Grace Rowley marrying Thomas Ratcliffe on 21 February 1635 (2005). Rowley and his family appear to have moved on several occasions, though always within a small area of London. His residences play an important role in his dramatic network and his theatrical output as we shall see. Rowley's wife proved a handful: 'On 14 September 1618 John Williams and Thomas Butler, tailors, gave bond for Grace, wife of William Rowley of St. Botolph's without Bishopsgate, to keep the peace' (Eccles 1982, 117).

On 11 January 1616 'William Rowley of "Hollowellstreete vitler" was licensed as a tippler to sell ale' (Eccles 1982, 117). As part of his accreditation he had sureties provided by 'William Glover of Shoreditch and John Watson of Aldersgate street' (Hardy 1937b). Though the record throws up another new location for Rowley – he was working in Holywell Street – the residences of his sureties speak to the relatively small size of London at the time. Glover and Watson span the area within which we have seen records of the Rowleys thus far: Aldersgate marks the western boundary in which records occur, and is due north of St Andrew in the Wardrobe where Rowley was baptised; St Leonard's roughly marks the eastern most edge of Rowley's life records. The locations are roughly a mile apart, point to point.
Rowley finally lived in Clerkenwell, where he died February 1626 (Gunby 2013). He was listed as 'housekeeper' in the records; he was survived by Grace who 'renounced the administration of his estate' because, presumably, he died in debt (Gunby 2013).

Unlike other theatre professionals we have encountered, Rowley's professional network was partially formed by having his brothers in the field. The first theatrical record of Rowley is also one that immediately broadened his network: he collaborated on The Travels of the Three English Brothers (1607), with John Day and George Wilkins. This rather set the tone for Rowley's writing career. Modern scholarship gives him an oeuvre of 21 plays, seven of which are lost to us, and 12 of which are collaborative. He co-authored drama at a rate far above the average: 57% of his canon is the product of more than one author. This practice provides rich information about the make-up of his theatrical network. Importantly, a study of Rowley's professional relationships can also be used to help understand the basis of some collaborative authorship.

Take his work on The Travels of the Three English Brothers, where Rowley appears to have been the junior writer. Wilkins, though not overly experienced, had by then written several literary works: a translation of The History of Justine (1606); a pamphlet titled Three Miseries of Barbary (1607); and a sole-authored play The Miseries of Enforced Marriage (1607). Wilkins wrote roughly two-thirds of Travels (Jackson 2003, 128). John Day was the experienced hand in the collective. He had more than twenty plays to his name before taking on the project. That left Rowley as the apprentice on the work, contributing a small part. The genesis for the work is likely to have been Wilkins: the Travels was a Mediterranean history, in which genre he had a 'special interest' (Schrickx 1976, 25). Travels fits a familiar model: a seasoned hand guiding apprentice writers, letting them do most of the work.
There is an alluring possibility, and slight evidence, for a geographical connection between the two dramatists. Rowley and Wilkins both lived in the parish of St Leonard's Shoreditch in the earlier part of their lives: they could well have known each other there. As we saw above, Rowley was resident there before 1614, when he gave surety for his wife. Wilkins likely grew up in the same parish too. His father, George Wilkins senior, lived on Holywell Street in Shoreditch, and was buried on 9 August 1603 at the church that gave the parish its name: St Leonard's, Shoreditch, the actors' church. Wilkins senior was identified as a poet (Nicholl 2008c, 389–99). Notably, he was resident on the same street with which Rowley would later be identified when applying for his victualling licence. It is tantalising to consider the possibility of the pair knowing each other, living next door to the Theatre and the Curtain, seeing plays and contemplating a life in the profession.

Duncan Salkeld has posited a similar tangential relationship between Wilkins and William Jaggard, the publisher. Jaggard 'lived in Holywell Street' where 'he was neighbour not only to the Burbages' – the parish was a popular residence for actors and their families – 'but also (until mid-1603) to Wilkins's father' (Salkeld 2015, 295). Salkeld tied geography to literary culture by postulating that Wilkins 'enjoyed the favour of printers and publishers'; Jaggard printed three of Wilkins' early works and seems to have been 'a supporter' (Salkeld 2015, 295). In the same way, the nexus of topography and theatre adds meaning to our understanding of collaborative drama. Wilkins, flush with recent publications, having a publisher on his side and with a new project in mind, may well have provided a start in the industry for his old friend Rowley. Equally, Rowley may have petitioned Wilkins for an invitation to collaborate. On this point, David Nicol has recently chided commentators for supposing that Rowley was a hack and for categorizing him as a weaker author when
compared with Middleton: scholars, wrongly, in the mind of Nicol, imagine the 'more powerful writer, "invites" or "accepts" Rowley . . . into his dramatic project' (Nicol 2012, 21). I choose my words knowingly here: Rowley is, in this particular instance, 'subservient to his collaborators' (Nicol 2012, 21).

The secondary professions of the collaborators provide another link that might account for an amiable relationship between them. Rowley became a licensed tippler, allowed to sell ale, while based in Holywell Street. Wilkins too, as we saw in Chapter One, worked in the alcohol business. In time, he came to operate a tavern that doubled as a brothel. So keen was Wilkins to get into the industry that in 1610 he had been enjoined not to 'victell without lycense' (Eccles 1975, 25). We saw in the references to the Mitre Tavern from *The Late Witches of Lancashire* how entwined the tavern and the stage could be. Indeed, the relationship has recently been afforded a full-length treatment (Campton 2014). The bawdier side of life is more than apparent in the records pertaining to Rowley. As we saw above, his wife was reprimanded for a breach of the peace in a local tavern and needed Rowley to provide assurances that she would keep the peace in future. For Rowley, this interest in taverns may have crossed into his professional life. He was a large man who specialised in clown roles (Steggle 2015, 130) and so we might imagine his skills as a convivial host being employed on the stage.

Wilkins too, as we have seen in previous chapters, was acquainted with the seamier side of the life that spilled over from a professional, and personal, engagement with ale houses. Like Rowley, Wilkins made legal appearances on account of his wife's behaviour at a tavern (Prior 1972, 147). And, also like Rowley, once Wilkins' literary career stalled, he made a career in taverns. Given these parallel experiences and shared geography it might not
be too much to imagine a bond forged between the two writers that prompted their co-
authorship. Geography played a part in later collaborative relationships involving Rowley 
too, as we shall see.

In 1608, 'a company under the patronage of Prince Charles, then Duke of York, first 
makes its appearance'; their patent, dated 30 March 1610, stated 'that wee of our espeyall 
grace, certen knowledge, and mere mocion haue lycensed and aucthorized' Rowley and a host 
of others to perform (Chambers 1923c, 2:242). In that first patent, we see how Rowley's 
theatrical network expanded to encompass a full playing company: John Garland, Thomas 
Hobbes, Robert Dawes, Joseph Taylor, John Newton and Gilbert Reason (Bentley 1941a, 
1:198). Rowley’s name appears second in the patent, implying relative seniority. Chambers 
deduced from the fact that he was the payee for court rewards between 1610-1614 that 'their 
leader seems to have been Rowley' (1923c, 2:24). Rowley was clearly involved in the 
running of Prince Charles' company. His prominence within the company is attested by his 
participation in its various economic dealings. An agreement dated 15 March 1610 for 'the 
continuance of fellowship during three years and the forfeiture of the interest in common 
stock of "apparel goodes money and other thinges"' should anyone leave the company 
without consent required that Joseph Taylor, Rowley, Robert Dawes and Thomas Hobbes pay 
John Garland £200 as security (Chambers 1923c, 2:243). The same men involved in that 
bond paid John Heminges £11 'and gave a bond of £20 for payment' for 'some "olde clothes 
or apparel"' on 8 May 1610 (Chambers 1923c, 2:243). A letter in Rowley’s hand – dated 
c.1613 by W. W. Greg but 1615 by Chambers because of a known court performance – 
details a purchase of clothes for 'five and fiftye pounde' and records that the buyers 'desire 
that the clothes may bee here to morrow morning' (Greg 1907, 126). The letter is signed, in 
autograph, by Rowley, Joseph Taylor and Robert Pallant, though Greg noted part of Pallant’s
name is missing as the sheet is torn – suggesting there may have been other signatories (1907, 126).

Rowley’s economic involvement with his company also documents debts accrued and repayments defaulted on. A debt of £400 to the deceased Henslowe was, on 20 March 1616, halved to £200 by Edward Alleyn and Jacob Meade, after petition by Rowley and nine others. The articles of agreement drawn up state that Alleyn would 'accept in full discharge of the said debt, the sum of £200'; this would be taken from the 'gayne and profit of the fowerth pte of the said galleryes [the Hope, and wherever else they played]' until the £200 was paid off (Collier 1841, 126–30). When, on another occasion, the company fell into financial trouble, they again requested assistance from Alleyn with a document – also possibly in Rowley’s hand – asking for £40, half the amount they were due from a court performance (Greg 1907, 93). By this point Prince Charles' company had amalgamated with the Lady Elizabeth's men. Bentley speculated that this was prompted, in part, by two of the Prince Charles' company's founding members – Robert Dawes and Joseph Taylor, in 1611 and 1614 respectively – moving to the Lady Elizabeth's men. As a result, the rest of Prince Charles' company followed and the companies performed together for a while.

Predictably, an amalgamation saw Rowley's theatrical network expand again; some of those in his enlarged network are names already familiar to us. He was now working with: Robert Hamlen, William Barksted, Hugh Attwell, William Penn and Anthony Smith in addition to Newton, Hobbes, Taylor and Pallant (Bentley 1941a, 1:199). We saw Taylor, Hamlen, Attwell and Barksted in Nathan Field's network in the previous chapter. This gives us a sense of the interconnected nature of the London theatre industry at the time. Direct contemporaries were almost inevitably never more than one degree of separation apart.
Indeed, Rowley traced the same route as Field in his career, and that of Joseph Taylor too, eventually moving to the King's men around 1623 (Braunmuller and Hattaway 2003, 341).

Rowley's theatrical life was not without occasional misdemeanour either. On 29 March 1615, Rowley and John Newton were called, 'with representatives of other companies before the Privy Council to answer for playing in Lent' (Chambers 1923c, 2:244). Once with the King's men Rowley erred again by performing a play without licence from the Master of the Revels, Henry Herbert. A seemingly contrite letter, from Rowley and 10 others, apologised for playing *The Spanishe Viceroy* (1624) without licence from 'your worships hande', stating that they 'doe confess and herby acknowledge that wee have offended'; ominously, Herbert added a marginal note: 'tis entered here for a rememberance against their disorders' (Bawcutt 2003, 183). His move to the King's men broadened Rowley's network further as he forged new links and reignited old ones. The letter apologising for the unlicensed performance of *The Spanish Viceroy* was signed by Rowley and his company fellows Josphe Taylor, John Lowin, Richard Robinson, John Shank, Elyard Swanston, John Rice, Thomas Pollard, Robert Benfield, Richard Sharp and George Burght (Bawcutt 2003, 183).

As mentioned above, as an actor Rowley specialised in clown roles. Nicol saw that Rowley's seniority in Prince Charles' company allowed him to exercise a degree of control over his stage personas, through his own writing (2012, 71). This may have lessened slightly with a move to the King's men, where he was not quite so important, but 'understanding Rowley's stage persona is vital to understanding his collaborations with Middleton' (Nicol 2012, 71). One might consider this statement reflexive, that not only did his appeal as a clown matter to his collaborative work – and not just with Middleton – but that his collaborative work mattered to his role as a clown. I made the case above that writers could
produce collaborative work more quickly if they wrote to their particular strengths. Rowley seems to have played to those strengths with the parts of clowns. Nicol noted that 'at least fourteen roles in extant plays can be shown to have been written for Rowley' (2012, 71). Of these roles, Nicol determined that Rowley's self-written parts subtly differed from his clown parts written by others; in general, Rowley's self-written clowns were plain speaking and designed to draw audience approval while in those roles written for him the clown was deserving of punishment (2012, 71). Here again we see an actor-writer's professional career being shaped, in both its modes, by those around him in his theatrical network.

When considering Rowley's acting roles, commentators tend to consider Rowley performing the clown parts in new drama but there is also good reason to suppose that his arrival with the King's men allowed them to revive old plays with a clown's part. Though perhaps his transfer to the King's men did not have the star appeal of Nathan Field's that we saw in the previous chapter, or even of Joseph Taylor, Burbage's replacement who moved several years before, Rowley's move brought fresh options. Notably, the King's men were able to reprise *1 Henry 4* at court in 1625 with, we may responsibly speculate, Rowley playing Falstaff. Rowley's talents matched the role as 'Falstaff is structurally the clown's part' (Wiles 1987, 116). In fact, Rowley's talents – if we might label his appearance such – might have been ideally suited to playing the old, fat knight (Wiggins 2013, 3:362) because of his experience and his age. He would have been 48 at the time of performance. Again, we can see a specific instance of how the change in Rowley's professional network – his move to the King's men – influenced their drama, by allowing them to revive old works that might otherwise have gone unperformed.
Rowley's move to the King's men would seem a break from Prince Charles' men with whom he had played and written for a decade (Gurr 2004c, 239). But in fact his network expanded with the move rather than shifted, since in May 1625 he was listed along with members of Prince Charles' men for James I's funeral (Gurr 1996, 406). The list included William Carpenter, Robert Hamlen, Thomas Hobbes, John Newton, William Penn, Rowley, Anthony Smith and Gilbert Reason (Gurr 1996, 406). Some of those listed Rowley had acted with throughout his career. They had been the men, along with several others, for whom Rowley had written *Hymen's Holiday* (1612) and *All's Lost by Lust* (1619). He had co-written plays for the company too: *A Fair Quarrel* (1616) and *The World Tossed at Tennis* (1620) with Middleton, and *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621) with Dekker and John Ford. These plays were pre-dated by *Travels*, discussed above, *A Shoemaker a Gentlemen* (1608) and *Fortune by Land and Sea* (1609) written with Thomas Heywood, all prepared for Queen Anne's men. Others came later for the Lady Elizabeth's men: *The Changeling*, with Middleton and *The Spanish Gypsy* (1623) with Dekker and Ford again. These achievements are worth outlining in this way because their chronology is telling. Despite a sprinkling of plays with unknown auspices, Rowley – true to Bentley's model of an attached professional – generally wrote for the company with which he acted.

Rowley's attachment to Prince Charles' men in 1625 was ceremonial, because since August 1623 he had effectively been a member of the King's men (Gunby 2013). For his new company he wrote *The Maid in the Mill* (1623) – with the King's men's new attached dramatist, John Fletcher – *The Bee* (1624), and possibly *The Four Honourable Loves* (1623), *The Nonesuch* (1623) and *The Fool Without Book* (1623). His rate of collaborative authorship slowed in his time with the King's men. By the end of his career, Rowley had worked with a
great many writers, including some of the theatre's biggest names: Day, Dekker, Ford, Fletcher, Heywood, Massinger, Middleton, Webster and Wilkins.

We saw above the impact that geography probably had on Rowley's earliest collaborative works, and the same may well be true of his later collaborations. Rowley's life ended in St James's Clerkenwell in early 1626. We do not know for how long he had been resident in the parish, only that he must have moved there after 1618 when the documentary record places him in the parish of St Botolph's without Bishopsgate. A move of this sort does make sense – we saw theatre-driven migration in Chapter Two – because Rowley's company were playing at the Red Bull in Clerkenwell from 1617 to 1619. We know also that Thomas Dekker died in the same parish in August 1632 (Smallwood and Wells 1999, 4). Dekker likely lived there for some years, since his wife was buried there in July 1616 (Twyning 2008). Though both men had been active in the theatre profession for some years, both writing for numerous companies and with numerous collaborators, it was not until the pair began living in the same parish that they started writing together.

Dekker had been writing since the 1590s, working on Sir Thomas More and on various plays for the Admiral's men under Henslowe. Importantly, Rowley's professional network and Dekker's professional network shared considerable overlap for the time they were working in the theatre together. The shared nodes of their networks could have provided an introduction at any point, and it is likely that the pair would have known of each other and of each other's work. Colloquially termed friends of friends, these shared links, people who knew Dekker and Rowley, are numerous. Thomas Heywood collaborated with them both long before Dekker and Rowley wrote together. Thomas Middleton too, wrote with both men before they worked together, as did George Wilkins. He wrote Jests to Make you Merry
(1608) with Dekker, immediately after writing *Travels* with Rowley. Both men had dealings with Henslowe, who might have facilitated an introduction, as might Rowley's brother, Samuel, who worked closely with Henslowe at the Admiral's men (Cerasano 2010).

Crucially, it was not a shared personal network that brought the playwrights together but a shared geographical one. Only once both writers were living in Clerkenwell did they begin to work together. Presumably, the pair became acquainted there through sharing the same social space. They likely worshipped at the same local church, drank in the same taverns and alehouses and saw the same shows at their local theatre. And something in this experience prompted them to work together. The relationship must have been professionally satisfying too because they worked on three projects together, including the ill-fated *Keep the Widow Waking* which saw Rowley break from his usual practice of writing for the company to which he belonged. He joined Ford and Dekker (as well as Webster) to reprise the same team who wrote *The Witch of Edmonton*. With this in mind, and the similar arguments presented above regarding Wilkins and Rowley in Shoreditch, we might consider another motive for collaborative authorship: sheer geographical accident.

This chapter has outlined the reasons dramatists took to co-authorship: friendship, speed of composition, economics, and to learn or impart their professional skills as apprentices or masters. Following a study of Rowley's life and network in the theatre we might add geography to the list of historical considerations that help us make sense of their period's drama. Any study of Rowley's work that hit on the question 'what prompted him to collaborate with Dekker on *The Witch of Edmonton*?' would, without a consideration of geography, find such a question unanswerable.
Conclusion: The Impact of Social Networks on Drama

Throughout, this thesis has made the case that understanding the lives and relationships of theatre professionals can help us better understand the narratives of theatre history we construct. Specifically, it has argued that viewing the theatre profession through the networks and lives of theatre people can show a world of amicable cooperation in the stead of previous narratives of ruthlessness and enmity. I am not the first to suggest that theatre professionals got along, but evidence adduced in this thesis strengthens the claim considerably. The original contribution of this thesis occurs in the demonstration of that cooperation co-existing in a burgeoning theatrical marketplace that was necessarily competitive. Where other scholars, notably Roslyn L. Knutson (2001b), contested narratives of capitalistic rivalry and replaced them with models of theatre structured like a medieval guild, this thesis has articulated amiable relationships within a proto-capitalist industry.

The biographical case studies that close each of the major chapters have highlighted these agreeable relationships at different moments in the early modern theatre. In Chapter Two the life of Richard Bradshaw showed good-natured working practices between different companies, rather than just within them. Where previously there had been narratives of zero-sum rivalry amongst acting companies, a study of Bradshaw's life, and his dealings with Philip Henslowe and the Admiral's men, helped contest that narrative of theatre history. Importantly, Bradshaw's life showed dealings with Hensowe's company in the theatrical marketplace. Extant records do not speak of Bradshaw marrying daughters of players in the Admirals' company or naming his first son Philip (the kinds of evidence adduced by Knutson) but of him entering into debts with William Bird, being lent money by Henslowe, and buying apparel for his travelling company. Bradshaw's biography shows companies in a
proto-capitalist industry willing to work together, and clearly not considering themselves locked in a constant battle for survival at the cost of all others.

Professional activity in the theatrical marketplace was also the centrepiece of Nathan Field's biography at the end of Chapter Three. A generation after Bradshaw started his theatrical career, Field's professional network existed in a more stable market in which participants were able to have an eye on the future. Again, we saw inter-company cooperation as Field was involved in a pre-planned move between supposedly rival companies. Existing narratives of the War of the Theatres found, to a greater or lesser extent, inter-company conflict evidenced by pointed exchanges in extant plays. For some – like Alfred Harbage (1952) – this represented the theatrical world in microcosm: a world riven by animosity. For others – like Matthew Steggle (1998) and James Bednarz (2001) – the War was a more satirical entity, nonetheless punctuated with highly personal barbs. With a study of the life of Field, I find in favour of those who perceive neither an 'ancient grudge' nor 'new mutiny' in the historical record. His transfer from boy player to adult player and from the Children of the Queen's Revels (amalgamated with the Lady Elizabeth's men) to the King's men provided good evidence to strike down claims of a perpetual divide between companies generally and between boy and adult players specifically.

The practice of dramatists writing plays together was the backdrop for the life of William Rowley in Chapter Four. A Jacobean author who often wrote in collaboration, Rowley was at the centre of several adult companies. Studying his theatrical network – which included two brothers also in the industry – showed just how the particular skills of actors and playwrights mattered to the drama a company created. Performing clown roles for a large part of his career, Rowley wrote clown parts for himself, and had similar parts consistently
written for him. Having access to his skills enabled the King's men to revive older plays, like William Shakespeare's *1 Henry 4* with Rowley likely in the role of Falstaff. We also saw geography play a part in the development of theatrical networks and collaborative writing. At the beginning of Rowley's life, and the start of his writing career, his spatial proximity to George Wilkins may have prompted their collaboration on *The Travels of Three English Brothers*. At the end of Rowley's career, he lived in the same parish as Thomas Dekker and their proximity prompted a number of collaborations. This pairing is particularly significant because although the pair had ample opportunity to work together before, and would have known of each other's work, it was not until they occupied the same part of London that they struck up a collaborative relationship.

The findings of each of these preceding chapters are explored further in this conclusion. Specifically, attention is paid to the drama of the period and how it was influenced by the social networks of its creators. Once again, several case studies are used to highlight such instances. Moments in theatre history can be recast to be read as moments of professionals' networks having an impact on the drama. Broadly, this is the case made in each of the major chapters of this thesis. The purpose of this concluding chapter is at once to reflect on those examples and to briefly highlight others that might be familiar to some scholars, but that have not been previously considered in relation to the social networks surrounding them. Some well-known cases are appraised in such a way and, somewhat paradoxically, oft-ignored instances can also be read in such a way that they foreground the importance of understanding social networks.
Case Study: Will Kemp

One well-known example concerns Shakespeare and actors in his company. From 1594 until 1599 Will Kemp was the Chamberlain's men's specialist clown (R. Berry 2016, 8). Kemp had been in the theatre for nearly a decade – early records put Kemp with Leicester's men around 1585 (T. W. Baldwin 1961, 74–75) – before joining the Chamberlain's men at their formation in 1594. It would seem that Kemp brought with him considerable acting capital: he was clearly a clowning specialist before becoming a member of the Chamberlain's men. In 1590, for example, Thomas Nashe addressed his *Almond for a Parrot* to Kemp, referencing his comedic abilities: 'TO THAT MOST Comicall and conceited Caualeire Monsieur de Kempe, Iestmonger' (1590, A2r). In much the same vein, Kemp was also famed for his jigs, which is a skill tied to comedic turns: he was 'a jigging clown' (Clegg and Skeaping 2014, 20). Additionally, jigs were recorded in the Stationers' Register with his name in their titles. 'The Thirde and last parte of Kempe's Jigge' is one such example, entered on 28 December 1591.

Kemp's network in his early career shows links that would be prominent in his time with the Chamberlain's men. In the records of the 1580s, Kemp is shown to have travelled abroad with the Earl of Leicester's men. He performed at Elsinore – the setting of *Hamlet* – in 1586 and is named alongside Thomas King, Thomas Stevenes, George Bryan, Thomas Pope and Robert Persey. It was Pope and Bryan with whom he would later reconnect in his work for the Chamberlain's men (T. W. Baldwin 1961, 74). Before the Chamberlain's men's formation, however, Kemp was involved with another company: Lord Strange's men. He was with them by 1592, when he contributed a 'merriment' to the anonymous play *A Knack to Know a Knave* (Palmer and Palmer 1999, 139). Once again, Kemp was among men who were
to be his future colleagues in another company. Pope and Bryan had tracked the same path and were also playing with Strange's men. Alongside them were other future Chamberlain's men: Augustine Phillips, John Heminges and Richard Cowley (Manley and MacLean 2014, 281).

In joining the Chamberlain's men, Kemp's network would have expanded to include Shakespeare. E. A. J. Honigmann has speculated that Shakespeare could have been with Strange's men (as the majority of the founding members of the Chamberlain's men were) before 1594 (1985, 59–60). Were this the case, Kemp could well have known Shakespeare by 1594, at the establishment of the Chamberlain's men; it is impossible to know without fresh evidence. The most recent treatment of Shakespeare and Strange's men conceded that there is no 'definitive evidence' for a connection between the man and the company (Manley and MacLean 2014, 280). Nevertheless, Kemp's and Shakespeare's lives intersected at the Chamberlain's men, and Shakespeare began writing roles that would be played by Kemp.

Kemp's roles in Shakespeare's plays have been afforded plenty of attention, though they warrant some brief rehearsing here to allow for a later comparison. 'When Kemp and Shakespeare became fellows', David Wiles wrote in his study of Shakespeare's clown, 'one of Shakespeare's first acts was to take an old play and to construct a part in it for Kemp based on Kemp's routines or "merriments"' (1987, 73). Wiles' claim for revision in Two Gentlemen of Verona (1589-1591) is endorsed elsewhere. Marco Mincoff found Lance, the play's clown, scarcely integrated into the narrative (1976, 180), reasserting a view that Clifford Leech sought to prove in his Arden2 edition (1969). William C. Carroll in his edition of Two Gentlemen for the Arden3 found the claims about Lance being a later addition the most persuasive of all Leech's arguments regarding the play's composition (2009, 126–27).
A speech of Lance's in Act Two serves as an example of an addition built for Kemp. Lance is resolved to follow Proteus from Verona to Milan and describes his family's distress at his departure:

*Launce.* I thinke *Crab* my dog, be the sowrest natured dogge that liues: My Mother weeping: my Father wayling: my Sister crying: our Maid howling: our Catte wringing her hands, and all our house in a great perplexitie, yet did not this cruell-hearted Curre shedde one teare . . . Ile shew you the manner of it. This shooe is my father: no, this left shooe is my father; no, no, this left shooe is my mother: nay, that cannot bee so neyther: yes; it is so, it is so: it hath the worser sole: this shooe with the hole in it, is my mother: and this my father: a veng'ance on't, there 'tis: Now sir, this staffe is my sister: for, looke you, she is as white as a lilly, and as small as a wand: this hat is *Nan* our maid: I am the dogge: no, the dogge is himselfe, and I am the dogge: oh, the dogge is me, and I am my selfe. (Shakespeare 1623, C1r)

The soliloquy is ideal for a comedian who specialises in improvisational, physical comedy. These features align with Kemp's skills noted above: he was adept at jigs and merriments. Here, as Lance, alone on stage (but for his dog, Crab), Kemp could show off his abilities. The speech allows a good deal of scope for physical comedy. The character employs two shoes to act as his mother and father, and a staff to play his sister, all the while engaging as needed with the dog, Crab. As far as a written text might, it also highlights the possibility for improvisation, or apparent improvisation, for the actor.

There are frequent shifts in the speech, all for the cause of comedy. 'This shooe is my father: no, this left shooe is my father' says Lance feigning indecision; 'no, no' he continues in the same spirit, 'this left shooe is my mother: nay, that cannot bee so neyther: yes; it is so, it is so: it hath the worser sole' (Shakespeare 1623, C1r). Lance changes tack six times in this brief section all while interacting with physical properties. It allows the actor to showcase his skill in staged improvisation and to deliver a pun spun from his apparently impromptu choice
to use his shoes to represent his parents. The section generally, and Lance broadly, looks purpose-built for Kemp.

Here then, we see a network directly impact the drama created by members of that network. Shakespeare reworked a play because of whom he knew. Other plays in Shakespeare's canon underwent revision as best we can tell – 2 Henry 6, 3 Henry 6, Hamlet, for example – but the case of Two Gentlemen gives a good example of a playwright apparently revising work because of those he was working with every day. This adds a useful note to considerations of dramatic revision, and Shakespearean revision in particular. Where one might be tempted to see an older dramatist returning to his immature work and excising perceived infelicities in an exclusively artistic endeavour, to see a writer's social network at play shows more pragmatic considerations. Dramatists may well have revised earlier work in a simple effort to improve their theatrical offering, but revision could take practical forms too. Grace Ioppolo helpfully suggested three categories for this latter type of revision: additions, 'mending' and 'altering' (2012, 89). She was somewhat vague on the difference between mending and altering, but the notion of additions is clear enough: dramatists added 'one or more new speeches, passages or scenes, or simply a new prologue or epilogue' (Ioppolo 2012, 89). Just as a commissioned performance at court might demand a new prologue, new personnel in a writer's network might demand new scenes, particularly if the new person was an actor with a specialism.

In plays written after the formation of the Chamberlain's men, Shakespeare wrote comedic parts especially for Kemp, forming 'A litany of famous roles' in the words of one biographer (Butler 2011). These roles included, according to Martin Butler's biography, Costard in Love's Labour's Lost (1594-1595), Peter in Romeo and Juliet (1595), Bottom in A
Midsummer Night's Dream (1595), Lancelot in The Merchant of Venice (1596-1597), Dogberry in Much Ado About Nothing (1598-1599). Robert Hornback marked Kemp as 'almost undoubtedly' playing Jack Cade in 2 Henry 6 (2009, 135). Across all Kemp's roles, Butler saw, to a greater or lesser extent, 'verbal mistaking', 'upside-down epiphany', 'direct audience address, puzzled soliloquy, and scope for improvisation' (2011). 'Without Kemp in his company' Butler concluded, 'Shakespeare's output in the 1590s – though not unimaginable – would clearly have been significantly different' (2011). Just as with revisions in Two Gentlemen, Shakespeare's network shaped the drama he created.

Indeed, it is argued by some that there is good evidence not only for the roles occupied by Kemp, but also for how close Kemp was to Shakespeare's thoughts while writing. For some, Shakespeare's relationship with Kemp – and other actors, for that matter – literally changed what got written in to his drama. In the second quarto (Q2) of Romeo and Juliet, printed in 1599, there is a stage direction 'Enter Will Kemp' (Shakespeare 1599, K3v) in the place of the more expected direction 'enter Peter' (the character who enters). This is often taken as evidence for Shakespeare having Kemp in mind while writing. Bart van Es claimed this much: Shakespeare 'occasionally slipped into the use of performers' names as he worked' writing Kemp's name into 'the working papers that are the source' for Q2 Romeo and Juliet (2013, 83). Such a conclusion finds numerous and powerful supporters. To John Russell Brown the actor 'seems to have dominated Shakespeare's creating mind' (1966, 106). The same is true of James Mardock and Eric Rasmussen as they use the direction to assert that Shakespeare 'often seems to have had specific members of his company in mind' (2013, 115). Likewise, James Shapiro found that 'Shakespeare occasionally forgot to distinguish between actor and role' (2006, 46). Stanley Wells also cited this stage direction as evidence of
Shakespeare writing with Kemp in mind, noting that the play, importantly, was 'almost certainly printed from Shakespeare's own manuscript' (2006, 30).

The question of authority for the stage direction's inclusion is important in this instance, so Wells' thoughts on the subject, as general editor of the Oxford Shakespeare, are insightful and judicious. It is useful, though far from vital, for my argument here to consider the stage direction as authorial, but not all commentators count it as such. Refuting Wells – and, implicitly, the others cited above – Paul Werstine saw the direction as a key datum in a case for claiming the source for Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* as printer's copy (2013, 231). His argument was rooted in that of W. W. Greg who had found that 'in every instance in which an actor's name appears in a manuscript play it is written in a different hand from the text' (1931, 1:216). Though published in the 1930s, to the best of my knowledge Greg's pronouncement still holds true. Gabriel Egan criticized Werstine (2010, 215) for holding Greg to this argument without acknowledging a later position held by Greg that an actors' name might appear in an authors' papers when a part was 'written with a particular performer in view' (1955, 142). John Jowett, however, another editor of the Oxford Shakespeare, was alive to the possibility of actors' names being of theatrical, rather than authorial, origin in Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* (2007, 33–34).

Conflicting evidence creates an impasse. That Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* was printed from the author's papers, the view held by Wells and Jowett, suggests the stage direction was written by Shakespeare and hence that Kemp was in his mind as he constructed the role of Peter. In evaluating the claim that that every surviving instance of an actor's name on a manuscript occurs in a different hand to that of the text we are hampered by the extreme paucity of the direct evidence: around 20 playbook manuscripts survive from the 3,000 or so
plays of this period (Werstine 2013, 4). Even if the use of Kemp's name for Peter's in a lost manuscript of *Romeo and Juliet* reflects only a casting decision and not the working of Shakespeare's mind as he composed, it was a decision that can hardly have been made without Shakespeare's consent as a company sharer. Either way, Shakespeare's network, his relationship with Kemp, in this case, influenced the drama he wrote.

The same phenomenon was documented in Chapter Three in discussion of the War of the Theatres. There, like here, playwrights' writing was, in part, a direct result of whom they were in proximity to. Consider the trading of barbed caricatures between Jonson and Marston. Had the pair not known each other, Marston would not have created Chrisoganus and we would be without such pompous ruminations as 'What better recreations can you find / Then sacred knowledge in diuinest thinges' (1610, B4r). Throughout, we have seen the intersection of professionals' lives around the theatre. Their geography was shaped by their professional pursuits and relationships and vice versa. Importantly, in this instance with Kemp, as in Chapter Three, that intersection spilled onto the page as writers included members of their networks in their drama.

**Case Study: Joseph Taylor**

In Chapter Two we saw an industry in flux, in expansion. As the industry developed, its artists remained flexible. The biographies presented reflected this. Richard Bradshaw's life was punctuated with regular touring and Anthony Munday's life was marked by especially diverse pursuits. Others writing for the stage occupied diverse spaces geographically and professionally. Playwrights' residences were scattered across London and they made money in other professions or from other types of writing while the industry settled. The 1590s was a
good time to have a broad or deep network, or both. Later in the period, stability and, importantly, continuity began to matter more. In Chapter Four, this constancy was found in collaborating playwrights: William Shakespeare training John Fletcher to write for the King's men, John Fletcher, in turn, preparing Philip Massinger. But it happened with acting personnel as well. A shift in the social network of a company could, as with the case of Kemp addressed above, mean a change in a company's drama but it could just as well ensure that its drama remain the same.

This is well shown in the life of the actor Joseph Taylor. Where the introduction of Kemp into Shakespeare's network reshaped the drama he had written, features of Taylor's career allowed for the King's men to continue on their course without significant restructuring. Taylor joined the King's men in 1619, after the death of Richard Burbage (Weis 2008, 375). He inherited a number of Burbage's roles: Hamlet in *Hamlet*, Othello in *Othello* (1603-1604), Truewit in *Epiceone*, Mosca in *Volpone*, Face in *The Alchemist* (1610), 'and many parts in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher' (McNeir 1941, 581). Andrew Gurr made amendments to this list, marking Taylor as Iago in *Othello* and Subtle in *The Alchemist* (2004a). The corrections are important, since it shows that although Taylor replaced Burbage, he did not occupy all his roles. With that being said, the substitution of Taylor for Burbage allowed the King's men to continue staging the same drama, more or less. The network of the company and its members had replaced a node and remained stable.

The extent to which Taylor's inclusion in the King's men's network can be seen as a move for continuity can be seen in the first printed edition of *The Duchess of Malfi* (1612-1614) printed in 1623. In a list headed 'The Actors Names' – a list that is dated after the death of Burbage (Bentley 1956c, 5:1252) – the character of Ferdinand is given as first being acted
by Richard Burbage and second by Joseph Taylor (Webster 1623, A2v). The cast list, unique to my knowledge in presenting the names of two actors for some characters, clearly signals Taylor as having replaced Burbage. Edwin Nungezer provided a host of references to Taylor in his roles, on stage and off, with the King's men that included references to him playing Hamlet 'incomparably well' (1929, 369). John Downes spoke to the same impulse for stasis in his history of the stage at the start of the eighteenth century:

Hamlet being Perform'd by Mr. Betterton, Sir William [Davenant] (having seen Mr. Taylor of the Black-Fryars Company Act it, who being Instructed by the Author Mr. Shaksepear) taught Mr. Betterton in everyParticle of it which by his exact Performance of it, gain'd him Esteem and Reputation, Superlative to all other Plays. (1708, 21)

As it stands, Downes garbles his theatrical genealogy: Shakespeare had been dead for three years when Taylor joined the King's men. They were not in each other's networks. We might imagine Downes missing a step, with Burbage being instructed by the author about his performance before passing his knowledge on to Taylor, before he went on to teach Thomas Betterton. With or without correction, there is a sense of a company keen for continuity in their drama.

In noting instances like the replacement of Burbage with Taylor, Keith Sturgess described the 'astonishing continuity' of the King's men in the first four decades of the seventeenth century (1987, 60). He posited the effect of such continuity and, by implication, the motive for it. 'Continuity' he found 'would lead... to a very strong sense of ensemble playing' (Sturgess 1987, 60). Such an organization of personnel would not inspire competition – a trait he identified as often occurring in the theatre – but engender 'a sense of cooperative endeavour' (Sturgess 1987, 60). If we assume, plausibly, that this is the case, then not only do we see Taylor's move allowing the King's men to keep their output much the
same, but we see a direct substitution in their network as helping to foster the kind of inter-
company cooperation we have encountered in each of the major chapters of this thesis.

Burbage's death left a hole at the head of the company. It was a scenario ripe for in-
fighting, artistic posturing and unchecked egos. The company had not long acquired the focus of Chapter Four's biography, Nathan Field as a second star-in-residence. Presumably, he would have been keen for a chance to lead the company. John Lowin might also have staked a claim: he had been with the company for 16 years, was capable of performing leading roles (Butler 2004), and later shared the business responsibilities with Taylor (Nungezer 1929, 368). And yet, the company recruited externally. At a time when the company was mourning the loss of its artistic figurehead, a companion to the company membership, they thought the cooperative nature of the theatrical community was strong enough, and their social networks wide enough, to bring in a new actor able to lead the company. On top of Burbage's death, the company may still have been feeling the loss of Shakespeare, their main writer: he had died three years earlier in 1616 (though he had retired from the stage two or three years before). There were other losses too. Richard Cowley died in the same month as Burbage, and, though no longer with the King's men, Humphrey Jeffes had died only a year earlier in 1618 (Gurr 2004c, 217–46). Nathan Field lasted barely more than another year, dying in 1620.

The decision to bring in Joseph Taylor proved sage. He remained with the company until the closing of the theatres in 1642, and signed his name as a King's man to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio in 1647 (Gurr 2004a). With John Lowin, as noted above, he handled court payments and business affairs for the company. In time, his business dealings on behalf of the company paid off personally. He was, in 1639, appointed to 'the post of Yeoman of the Revels' probably, as E. K. Chambers noted, 'through the influence of Sir
Henry Herbert, with whom he had been in frequent contact as representative of his company' (1923c, 2:346).

Just how Taylor ended up with the King's men bears examination. Most facets of his life point in a theatrical direction. He is thought to be the man of the same name born in St Andrew's by the Wardrobe in Blackfriars in February 1586 (Chambers 1923c, 2:345). He appears, however, to have spent much of his adult life in St Saviour's, Southwark. He married Elizabeth Ingle in May 1610. From records in the token-books of St Saviour's, Taylor moved around, but within, the area. He was, notably, resident in one of the rents belonging to the theatre manager Francis Langley in Paris Garden. At other times he was listed as living 'on the Bankside' or in Mr 'Langley's new rents near the playhouse' (Chambers 1923c, 2:345). This is important because a good number of the King's men lived in the same area as their Globe theatre and were bound to have crossed paths with Taylor at some point in their careers. Taylor had numerous children baptised, and buried, at St Saviour's and their records attest his continued presence in the parish. Chapter Four showed us how geographic proximity could play a part in fostering a collaborative relationship, as with that of William Rowley and George Wilkins, and we might imagine it to be much the same here: living close together from 1610 allowed Taylor to meet and interact with King's men before he joined the company. Taylor was not static, however. He had several addresses through his career: after the Bankside, he was 'of Austen's Rents in 1611 and 1615', was listed 'as "gone" in 1617, as "near the playhouse" in 1623 and 1629, "on the Bankside" in 1631, and of Gravel Lane in 1633' (Nungezer 1929, 366). Mark Eccles listed him as living in St Giles in the Fields in 1617, nicely aligning with the period in which he was 'gone' from St Saviour's (Eccles 1993, 173).
Taylor certainly interacted with one member of the King's men before his arrival at the company in 1619. John Heminges brought a lawsuit against him in 1611. When a member of the Duke of York's company, Taylor had advised that company on, and been party to, the purchase of costumes from Heminges in a deal that went bad (Chambers 1923c, 2:345). Taylor's career, as best we can tell, started with the Duke of York's company in 1610. He moved to the Lady Elizabeth's men with their formation in 1611 (Gurr 2004a). It may well have been this move away from the Duke of York's that prompted the lawsuit: the bill for the costumes was unpaid and the suit landed on Taylor. It seems an unlikely coincidence that the one man who left the company is levelled with the legal action; Taylor alleged that the other men involved in the purchase had 'contrived to lay the blame on him' (Gurr 2004a). In the biographies presented in Chapters Three and Four Taylor appeared as a peripheral figure, named in actor lists, patents and theatrical agreements with shareholders. Here though, considered differently, it is his network than can be brought to bear as evidence for the King's men's continued quality through stability.

Clearly, Taylor was an important member of the companies to which he belonged. As well as being an accomplished actor he served as court payee (Nungezer 1929, 367) and was involved in an aborted project for his company, now the Prince Charles' men, to occupy an indoor theatre: the Porter's Hall in the Blackfriars precinct (Gurr 2004a). Along with Nathan Field, Gurr marked a man with no lack of ambition. Despite playing for the Prince Charles' men in early 1619, Taylor had made his way to the King's men by May, two months after Burbage's death (Edmond 2008). We discussed above the genesis for Taylor's move, but not perhaps its mechanics. By 1619, his dispute with Heminges was clearly settled enough that the pair could work together for the same company. Indeed, a prior relationship there might have helped lure Taylor back to Southwark. Alternatively, it might have been a longer
relationship with Nathan Field, and a chance to work together again that brought Taylor across in Burbage's stead. Chapter Three showed how readily the lives of the two men crossed; perhaps Burbage's death gave Taylor an opportunity to reconnect with his most talented early colleague having outgrown his existing company. Finally, it may have been a simpler question of geography. We have already seen how Taylor lived, and returned, to the right parish: he may have been an ideal all-round fit to replace Burbage.

Taylor's move was successful and he led the company until the closure of the theatres. At least one other talented colleague of Field's and Taylor's was brought to the Bankside in their early years with the company: William Rowley, Chapter Four's biographical subject. There is something illustrative in closing thus. Where the thesis's first major chapter opened with the formation of the Chamberlain's men and its personnel, this conclusion closes with the personnel who saw the King's men disbanded by the Civil War, some fifty years later.

In this conclusion we have seen the social network as an agent for change and for stasis in a company's drama. Will Kemp's arrival at the company allowed a shake-up, a rewriting of old work as well as inspiration for new plays. Joseph Taylor's arrival was a different story. A replacement for the company's leading man, Taylor probably exploited pre-existing links to the company, as well as his professional background of leading other companies, to ensure continuity on his arrival at the King's men. He and John Lowin became the company's playing leaders (Gurr 2004c, 26) where we might have otherwise expected a promotion from within.

Such examples from theatre history show how valuable this type of biographical study can be. Certainly there is more to be mined from the lives of the period's theatre personnel.
This thesis has argued that biography done in this way is a valuable tool in discovering the theatrical past. In so doing, it claims to have shown a cooperative proto-capitalist industry where competition mattered but not at the expense of all else. The King's men were happy enough to adopt an outsider as their leading man, rather than isolating themselves from others in the industry. This impulse was seen elsewhere too, in everything from Richard Bradshaw's loans of money and apparel to the constant movement of personnel across company boundaries.

A significant part of this industry was its collaborative playwriting. Though at half the rate usually cited, dramatists had ample opportunity to expand and consolidate their professional networks by writing together. Indeed, just as actors could have an apprenticeship within the industry – yet more evidence against a ruthless insularity – writers had that opportunity with collaboration too. Beyond this however, a study of writers' social networks shows more than a master-apprentice relationship in collaborative work: writers chose to write together long after they needed a tutor. Friendships encouraged collaboration as often as practical necessity did.

There is more to be done in the study of social networks and biography, but this thesis showcases a range of options for worthwhile pursuits. Repeatedly, study of someone's life at the microscopic level can produce knowledge about the theatre industry on the macroscopic level. Using only one example, we might be left with a faulty extrapolation; but, done repeatedly, across a number of lives in the same network, evidence can emerge that is difficult to ignore. Such a pursuit is particularly valuable in a field bereft of rich data for primary study. Though even the facts of people's lives are frustratingly thin, there is evidence enough to work with. Biographical study in this way, heeding the warnings outlined in
Chapter One, can help create the 'master narratives' of theatre history. This work contributes in a small way to that style of industry-wide approach. Of course, even without such a larger purpose, the deep study of subjects' lives can throw light on a single issue of the period. All historiography is the construction of narratives about the deeds of human beings, and the stories we tell may focus on any arbitrarily chosen level of abstraction from the single individual to the largest collectives such as nation states and international alliances. Between these extremes are various human collectives such as clans, guilds, city-states, corporations, geographical regions, and of course theatre companies. At the moment, theatre companies are the level of abstraction favoured by many historians of the drama of Shakespeare's time. It has been the purpose of this thesis to show that attending to other kinds of human association, and in particular attending to individuals' social networks, can help us tell more accurate and nuanced stories about the extraordinary flourishing of drama in London in the decades either side of the year 1600.
## Appendix 1: Histriomastix Doubling Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor/Scene</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor 1</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 2</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 3</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Server</td>
<td>Hypocrisy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 4</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 5</td>
<td>Arithmetic Bougle</td>
<td>Plutus</td>
<td>Plutus</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td>Gulch/Prologue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 6</td>
<td>Grammar Belch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td>Belch/Troilus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 7</td>
<td>Logic Gut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>Gut/Vice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 8</td>
<td>Geometry Clowt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 9</td>
<td>Music Fourcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td>2 Noble</td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 10</td>
<td>Astronomy Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>1 Noble</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor/Scene</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 1</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td>Mauortius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 2</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td>Philarchus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 3</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td>Chrisoganus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 4</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 5</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 6</td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 7</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 8</td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 9</td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td>Fourcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 10</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 11</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td>Velure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 12</td>
<td>Lyon-rash</td>
<td>Lyon-rash</td>
<td>Lyon-rash</td>
<td>Lyon-rash</td>
<td>Lyon-rash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 13</td>
<td>Ingle</td>
<td>Larius</td>
<td>1 Soldier</td>
<td>1 Soldier</td>
<td>1 Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 14</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Hiletus</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 15</td>
<td>Mask</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>4 Mechanical</td>
<td>1 Peasant</td>
<td>1 Peasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 16</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>2 Soldier</td>
<td>2 Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 17</td>
<td>1 Other</td>
<td>Fury</td>
<td>1 (Fury)</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 18</td>
<td>2 Other</td>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>2 Mechanical</td>
<td>Famine</td>
<td>Famine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 19</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>Ruin</td>
<td>3 Mechanical</td>
<td>Bondage</td>
<td>Bondage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 20</td>
<td>Perpetuana</td>
<td>Perpetuana</td>
<td>Perpetuana</td>
<td>Perpetuana</td>
<td>Perpetuana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 21</td>
<td>Fillisella</td>
<td>2 Peasant</td>
<td>Fillisella</td>
<td>Fillisella</td>
<td>Fillisella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 22</td>
<td>Bellula</td>
<td>Bellula</td>
<td>Bellula</td>
<td>Bellula</td>
<td>Bellula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 23</td>
<td>Calamancha</td>
<td>2 Citizen</td>
<td>Sluttishness</td>
<td>Sluttishness</td>
<td>Sluttishness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 24</td>
<td>Champerty</td>
<td>Champerty</td>
<td>Champerty</td>
<td>Champerty</td>
<td>Champerty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor/Scene</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Epilogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-haste</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sickness]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clowt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Sailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bacchus</td>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 17</td>
<td>1 Serving man</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 18</td>
<td>2 Serving man</td>
<td>Famine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bondage</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plenty</td>
<td>Plenty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceres</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostess</td>
<td>Sluttishness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Astrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curved brackets denote a character not named in a stage direction who is subsequently named in a speech prefix. Square brackets denote a character required to re-enter as a different character with fewer than 20 lines since their exit (see Sickness in 6.7).
Appendix 2: Amended Attributions

This appendix gives an itemised list of plays whose authorship has been amended, primarily for analysis in Chapter Four, from the records given in the *Database of Early English Playbooks (DEEP)* based on recent authorial attribution scholarship. Each entry lists the play's title, the play's estimated date of first production as given by *DEEP*, the play's author(s) as given by *DEEP*, the play's amended author(s) in light of the attribution studies, and a citation for the evidence that led to the change in attribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Title</th>
<th>Estimated date of first performance</th>
<th>DEEP Author(s)</th>
<th>Amended Authors</th>
<th>Evidence for amended attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Spanish Tragedy, The</em></td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Thomas Kyd</td>
<td>Thomas Kyd, William Shakespeare</td>
<td>(Craig 2009a; Bruster 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Edward 3</em></td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Other(s)</td>
<td>(Watt 2009; Elliott and Valenza 2010a, 2010b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>2 Henry 6</em></td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe</td>
<td>(Craig 2009b; Segarra et al. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>3 Henry 6</em></td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe</td>
<td>(Craig 2009b; Craig and Burrows 2012; Segarra et al. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden of Faversham</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Other(s)</td>
<td>(Jackson 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1 Henry 6</em></td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Thomas Nashe</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Thomas Nashe, Christopher Marlowe</td>
<td>(Craig 2009b; Segarra et al. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>All's Well That Ends Well</em></td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, Thomas Middleton</td>
<td>(Maguire and Smith 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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