

relationship to the fore, as well as in showing up its many complications, *Staging Women and the Soul-Body Dynamic* makes an important contribution to both religious and feminist studies.

Eva Griffith. *A Jacobean Company and Its Playhouse: The Queen's Servants at the Red Bull Theatre (c. 1605–1619)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp 305.

ELEANOR COLLINS

Early Theatre 18.1 (2015), 163–6

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12745/et.18.1.2576>

Eva Griffith's new repertory study presents a painstakingly detailed and illuminating account of the Queen's Servants and their operations at the Red Bull Theatre, an account that is engaging throughout while deeply grounded in rigorous scholarship and archival research. This hitherto-neglected company operated under the patronage of Queen Anna of Denmark and performed primarily in its Clerkenwell playhouse between 1605 and 1619, a date span which incorporates the vibrant period of Jacobean drama usually dominated by discussion of the King's Men. Here, Griffith makes a decisive and welcome attempt to redress the balance and correct the 'lopsided' picture of early modern drama that we have inherited from accounts that privilege Shakespeare's company and (implicitly) the genius of his authorship (26). The move away from Shakespeare-centric narratives has carried influence for some time now, but Griffith's study demonstrates the specific rewards of attention to lesser-studied companies and foregrounds the importance of such attention. In many ways, the Queen's Servants at the Red Bull provide a fascinating counterpoint to the King's Men, not least because critical accounts consistently invoke the former in opposition to the latter in a dichotomy which has affirmed and legitimized the importance of the dominant company. As Griffith articulates, it 'has, perhaps, been an important part of the development of Shakespeare studies to ensure that more marginal companies to that of Shakespeare were perceived as worse in order to privilege the material conditions of that centrally important author' (26).

This binary, and the extant narratives already attached to the Queen's Servants and the Red Bull, has traditionally made it hard for critics to talk about

the company and its venue in terms that are anything other than pejorative. As well as contending with the usual gaps and ambiguities in the evidence that threaten to muddle and tangle any work in theatre history, work on the Red Bull must also confront and accommodate sneering attitudes towards the venue which have worked to cement its place in historical narrative as a downmarket, inferior destination for rowdy citizens and poor apprentices. Griffith is right to argue that these perceptions — often anecdotal and retrospective — have become pervasive and generalized in theatre history. The received derogation of the company betrays a lack of critical examination and appropriate alertness to the history of the theatre and the particulars of its chronology, which has led to ‘unfortunate confusions’ and cast a long shadow over the company and indeed ‘on the effect of the entire group of individuals who first performed there’ (16). But one of the strengths of Griffith’s account is that it treats this potential difficulty not as a stumbling block but instead as a launch pad from which to further research. Griffith makes clear that she does not wish to ‘deface the “legend” of the Red Bull’ (16); this was a venue that will always remain ‘exciting’ (and, moreover, enjoyable) to study. Instead, she sets out to provide an understanding of the contexts required to treat the Queen’s Servants with the same level of attention and critical care enjoyed by Shakespeare’s company, and fills in the historical detail and interpretive work that transforms the flat stereotype of the Red Bull into a fuller, more nuanced, and contoured conception of the theatre as ‘a place of serious entertainment’ (4). At the same time, *A Jacobean Company and its Playhouse* affirms the importance of repertory study as a methodology, transferring attention away from specific playwrights to the company and its repertory to explore the material conditions which shaped early modern theatre. Griffith’s extended and in-depth engagement with the Queen’s Servants yields original conclusions that will change the critical landscape in which we experience not only this company, but many others.

It is impossible to catalogue or do justice to the wealth of information provided by the book here. One of the most interesting conclusions is the likelihood that the Queen’s Servants were operating from two theatre bases over the same period — not only the Red Bull, but also the Curtain, which is listed in one of the company’s patents and was partly owned by company members. As Griffith observes, although the King’s Men’s responsibility for two playhouses is commonplace knowledge, ‘contemplating similar conditions for the Queen’s Men’ has seemed ‘harder to admit’ (9). Another of the most fascinating of Griffith’s finds involves the use of pyrotechnics at the

Red Bull and the association of fireworks with the company's Danish patron. The Red Bull was famed for its spectacular drama, and Griffith links this characteristic feature of the venue to an identifiable tradition of sophisticated, large-scale firework displays put on at the Danish court, which made their way over to London in 1606 in a remarkable display designed to celebrate the visit of Queen Anne's brother. This revelation casts new light on a distinctive feature of the Red Bull repertory that has long been considered merely a concession to the crude tastes of spectacle-hungry citizens, and a recourse to dazzling pyrotechnics in the absence of anything more substantial or diverting within the plays; instead, as Griffith shows, the amphitheatre's fireworks had a distinctly courtly origin. It also gives the repertory and its staging a new and important context which links the company more firmly and with particular theatrical specificity to its royal patron, a theme which Griffith goes on to pursue in connection to the representation of women on the Red Bull stage. In other chapters of the book Griffith examines the individual lives of those who made up the company and provides a valuable sense of company dynamics which gets to grips with the difficult questions of who made decisions, who was responsible, what really makes a company, and who drives what, particularly in discussions of the leadership of Thomas Greene and of Christopher Beeston's role. She calls for a 'patient rethinking' of Beeston's role in company affairs (261), and draws attention to his involvement with the Red Bull into the 1630s, and his apparent (and hitherto unrecognized) interest in inn-yard venues.

The book does not have space or time to dwell at length on the full content of the repertory, though many of the plays are discussed or drawn on throughout, and Griffith incorporates short, close readings of some of the drama (notably three of Heywood's plays) into the chapters where such interpretation assists an understanding of the Red Bull, its workings, and its relation to other contemporary repertories. As Griffith states, her hope is that the present study will offer the history and context that will complement and support the continued study of the full repertory, study that will no doubt illuminate further the commercial strategies and political and aesthetic endeavours of the company. But the attempt made here to renegotiate the cultural status of amphitheatre fare is noteworthy in itself, and Griffith undertakes important work to help overturn long-held ideas and assumptions about the company and its *modus operandi*. This is an authoritative contribution to the literature on Jacobean drama, and should be the first port of call for students and researchers interested in the Queen's Servants,

the Red Bull, and its much-maligned repertoire of plays. More widely, Griffith's book offers an important commentary on (and corrective to) the ways in which theatre history has been conducted in the past and the priorities it has held, and offers a basis from which that history can be productively and positively reshaped.