Birth of a Tragedy Queen: Richard Robinson and the Repertory of the King’s Men, 1610–11

In his 2004 essay, ‘The Sharer and His Boy’, Scott McMillin hypothesized that what he called ‘restricted roles’ in early modern English drama, roles in which female characters take cue lines only from a small group of other characters, resulted from moments when new leading boy actors were being trained by their masters. This essay applies McMillin’s hypothesis to two new plays that entered the King’s Men’s repertory around 1610, Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale and Beaumont and Fletcher’s The Maid’s Tragedy, asking how they might have interacted with earlier plays within the company’s repertory to shape the training of Richard Robinson as a new leading tragic boy.

‘That Desdemona’?

In September 1610, Henry Jackson, a twenty-four-year-old fellow of Corpus Christi College, wrote a letter to a friend in which he described watching the King’s Men perform in Oxford. Only four excerpts from Jackson’s letter have survived, but they make clear that amongst the plays he saw were Jonson’s The Alchemist and Shakespeare’s Othello. He praised the actor who performed the role of Desdemona in the latter play, writing, ‘But that Desdemona, murdered by her husband in our presence, although she always pled her case excellently, yet when killed moved us more, while stretched out on the bed she begged the spectators’ pity with her very facial expression’. These lines have been much cited by later critics, amongst other reasons because Jackson never mentions that spectators would almost certainly have identified the actor he watched playing Desdemona as a boy. Writing in Latin, Jackson refers to the actor in the feminine, as if the performer had disappeared into the character altogether. Jackson’s commentary
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takes latter-day readers as close as they are ever likely to come to an early modern boy actor of female-identified roles. As Scott McMillin writes, however, we ‘do not know who the boy was, what roles he had played, [or] how long he had been with the company’.3

In this short essay, I hope to show that the practice of repertory playing may offer some possible answers not only to McMillin’s queries, but also to a wider set of questions about the plays written for the King’s Men around 1610–11. In the same 2004 essay in which he noted our ignorance of the name of Jackson’s Desdemona, McMillin hypothesized that what he called ‘restricted roles’ in early modern English drama, in which female-identified characters take cue lines only from a small group of other characters, featured in the repertory at moments when ‘a new generation of leading boy actors was being trained and rehearsed by their masters’.4 Citing Jackson’s letter, he argued that autumn 1610 was likely one such moment, since Othello and The Alchemist, two plays that feature restricted roles, were performed together in Oxford in that year. By considering McMillin’s argument alongside David Kathman’s groundbreaking work on the boys of the King’s Men, we can now guess that the boys who appeared in these two plays may have been Richard Robinson and George (sometimes also called Richard) Birche, both of whom make their first recorded appearances in the records of the King’s Men around this time and both of whom soon appeared in leading female-identified roles with the company. In order to explore this hypothesis, this essay will put McMillin’s theory about Desdemona’s restricted role in Othello into dialogue with roles in two new plays that entered the King’s Men’s repertory around 1610–11, Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale and Beaumont and Fletcher’s The Maid’s Tragedy. I will ask how these three plays might have interacted within the company’s repertory to shape the training of a leading boy tragedienne, a position I tentatively assign to Richard Robinson. By comparing the parts of Desdemona, Hermione, and Aspatia and casting Robinson in them, we can theorize about how the repertory playing of both old and new dramas might have contributed not only to the ‘enskillment’ of an early modern boy actress, but also to the making of his popular reputation.

The King’s Men and Their Boys, 1610

To begin this process of discovery, we must consider the situation in which the King’s Men found themselves when Jackson saw them perform in Oxford in the year 1610. As David Kathman’s painstaking research has underlined, this was a moment of considerable transition for the troupe. The records of the livery
companies in which they were bound show that its leading boy players of the peak Shakespearean years of 1603–10 — John Rice, William Ecclestone, and possibly John Underwood — were all ‘nearing the ends of their apprenticeship terms’. Rice in particular had clearly had an illustrious career as a boy actor with the King’s Men; the company had chosen to feature him in at least two well-documented, high-prestige performances for royal spectators. This prominence, Kathman argues, makes him a likely candidate for the creator of many great female-identified roles of the 1603–10 period. The summer of 1611 would see his departure from the King’s Men, along with that of his contemporary Ecclestone; on 29 August of that year, both actors signed a bond with Philip Henslowe as sharers in a new company, the Lady Elizabeth’s Men. Both rejoined the King’s Men around 1614 and stayed with the company for some years, suggesting that their enskillment as boys had helped to develop a set of talents that remained attractive to the company in their adulthood.

As this generation of boy players grew up, the company took on a new cohort. Livery company documentation shows that Walter Haynes and George Birche were apprenticed to members of the King’s Men in March and July 1610, respectively. Little documentary evidence attests to Haynes’s repertoire, but Birche’s recorded female-identified roles include the comic parts of Doll Common in The Alchemist and Lady Politic Would-Be in Volpone. Kathman suggests that Richard Robinson, another boy known to have played female-identified roles with the company in the 1610s, was probably apprenticed in the company ‘at around the same time [as Haynes and Birche], probably to Richard Burbage’. Because no apprenticeship records have yet been found for Robinson (or indeed for any apprentices linked to Burbage), this dating of his entry into the King’s Men must be treated as tentative; possibly Robinson joined the company earlier than Haynes and Birche, in which case he would have been in training for longer than they had when the King’s Men played in Oxford in 1610. He was, however, unquestionably playing leading tragic roles with the King’s Men as early as 1611. Thanks to an annotator of the surviving manuscript of Middleton’s 1611 play The Second Maiden’s Tragedy, who has written ‘Enter Ladye Rich Robinson’ at a key point in the action, we know that Robinson almost certainly played the Lady in that play. In the same year, Robinson is listed as one of the ‘principal Tragoedians’ in Ben Jonson’s Catiline. This evidence is, of course, highly limited. As Lucy Munro stresses, ‘the leading boy players of the King’s Men were generally required to move between different kinds of roles and styles of performance’, and so Birche and Robinson are unlikely to have specialized solely in comic or tragic roles. What evidence we
have about the King’s Men’s repertory in the year 1611 nevertheless suggests that Robinson was featured pretty quickly in tragic parts, while the fact that Birche was remembered for his appearances in Jonson’s comedies hints that he may have had particular strengths in comic ones. If we accept McMillin’s hypothesis that *The Alchemist* and *Othello* might have appeared in the King’s Men’s repertory in Oxford in 1610 in part because the company was training one or more new leading boy actresses, and if we assume that these performers were different ones, Birche seems a reasonable candidate to have appeared in the role of Doll Common and Robinson as the likelier actor to have been Jackson’s admired Desdemona.\(^{17}\)

McMillin shows us how we can imagine these plays working together in the King’s Men’s Oxford repertory as training vehicles for young actors. He argues that ‘the leading boys’ roles in both plays are … “restricted” roles, largely rehearsable with one or two master actors, perhaps with a second boy’.\(^{18}\) In both, the boy playing the leading female-identified role receives cue lines from only a small group of other actors, most of whom play leading male-identified roles. McMillin indicates that one can thus plausibly theorize that as the company prepared for their Oxford gig, ‘the boy-actors in the two plays were rehearsing with the same combination of master-actors for both plays’.\(^{19}\) These masters would presumably have drilled them not only in their lines, but also in the skills they would need to succeed in further, more demanding female-identified roles in the company.

‘Possibly these boys were apprenticed to [these] master-actors, were living with them, being fed and clothed by them’, suggests McMillin, adding conscientiously, ‘but we do not know these things’.\(^{20}\) In fact, despite the lack of surviving apprenticeship documents for Robinson, we can be reasonably confident that he was apprenticed to the King’s Men’s leading actor, Richard Burbage. In 1619, he was one of the signatories to Burbage’s will, along with Burbage’s brother Cuthbert, Cuthbert’s wife Elizabeth, and Nicholas Tooley, an older actor who described Burbage as ‘my late master’ in his own will.\(^{21}\) The group around Burbage’s deathbed was clearly comprised of intimates, including at least one past apprentice. Robinson would go on to marry Burbage’s widow, Winifred, at St Mary Magdalene Church, Old Fish Street, on 31 October 1622.\(^{22}\) This act looks like the behaviour of a young man who had lived closely with Burbage and his family. Burbage certainly played Othello; at his death, an elegist mourned the passing of his greatest roles, including ‘young Hamlett, old Hieronimo / Kinge Leer, the greeu’d Moore’.\(^{23}\) At least some early modern documentation thus supports the hypothetical image of Burbage as the master training his apprentice, Robinson, in Desdemona’s role.
Whether or not Robinson was the actor Jackson saw in Oxford in 1610, he must certainly have worked with his master and other senior company members on the skills for which Jackson praised ‘that Desdemona’. Like any boy-actress-in-training, he would have needed to learn how to ‘plead [the character’s] case excellently’ with his speech and to ‘beg the spectators’ pity’ with his looks. Eloquence and pathos were, after all, two of the key skills of the apprentice tragedienne — and the role of Desdemona offered ample opportunity to practice them. Nevertheless, this role can scarcely have been the only one in which a boy like Robinson learned to exercise these skills and others vital to his new profession as a boy actress. By 31 October 1611, the date on which master of the revels George Buc licensed *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* for performance, Robinson was expert enough that the King’s Men willingly featured him in a new and very prominent tragic role. Does the company’s repertory from late 1610 or early 1611 offer any further evidence that might show us how it worked to train this budding tragedy queen — perhaps while also bidding farewell to an older, more experienced one?

**Training in Repertory**

To explore that question, I want to turn to two very successful King’s Men plays that many scholars believe to have been written in late 1610 or early 1611, and that might thus have entered the company’s repertory around the time that Jackson saw *The Alchemist* and *Othello* in Oxford. These are Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale* and Beaumont and Fletcher’s *The Maid’s Tragedy*.*

For neither of these plays does an early cast list survive, but a close look at the two largest female-identified roles in each suggests that they may have been written with a strong awareness of the boys who were working for the King’s Men in late 1610 and early 1611. Both look like plays that aim to give an experienced boy tragedienne an appropriate showcase while also offering a tragedy-queen-in-waiting a chance to hone his craft.

In both plays, the largest female-identified part seems designed for a mature and versatile player. In *The Winter’s Tale*, Paulina plays a dominant, plot-driving role throughout the entire play. She offers such blazing defiance to King Leontes when he unjustly condemns his wife Hermione for adultery that he dubs her a ‘mankind witch’; engineers the salvation of Leontes’s baby daughter Perdita; and — in the play’s final, magical sequence — transforms the lost Hermione from a statue back to life. In such scenes, the boy playing Paulina would have had to dominate all eyes, upstaging even the great Burbage, who likely played Leontes’s flashy part. In *The Maid’s Tragedy*, the role of Evadne offers an even more spectacular showcase
for a seasoned boy actress. A king’s mistress, married for convenience to Amintor, she mocks him on their wedding night and flaunts her sexual experience, laughing, ‘A maidenhead, Amintor, / At my years?’ Later, rebuked by her brother Meli-antius, she repents her sin, abases herself before her husband, and kills her seducer. Demure charm, brazen sexuality, love, penitence, and frenzied violence: Evadne’s part offers them all. We can easily imagine Beaumont and Fletcher designing this role as a valedictory tribute to a celebrated boy actress who might already have played such parts as Lady Macbeth or Cleopatra.

The second-largest female-identified roles in these two plays are very different. Hermione in *The Winter’s Tale* is a magnificent and memorable part but a relatively short one. She appears in only three scenes in the first three acts of the play, which depict her husband’s spiral into rabid jealousy, her arrest for adultery, and her subsequent trial and apparent death after the birth of Perdita. Throughout these scenes, Hermione behaves with steadfast dignity and poise, responding to Leontes’s frenzied accusations with sorrowful resignation:

Sir, spare your threats.
The bug which you would fright me with I seek.
To me can life be no commodity;
The crown and comfort of my life, your favour,
I do give lost, for I do feel it gone
But know not how it went. (3.2.89–94)

Hermione’s trial scene offers its actor a marvelous opportunity to showcase skill at embodying feminine grief, love, and constancy; but it does not require the boy player to move far out of the bounds of this limited (though powerful) range. These limitations remain in place even in the play’s final scene, in which Hermione returns to life from her statuary stasis. When she moves, it is to embrace her husband; when she speaks, it is to call down blessings on her daughter’s head. Hermione’s role thus allows the apprentice actor to practice the same skills for which Jackson praised his Desdemona — eloquence in self-defence and pathos in suffering — without stretching his capacities too far.

The same description can be justly offered of Aspatia’s role in *The Maid’s Tragedy*. Considerably smaller than Evadne’s — like Hermione, she appears in only four scenes — Aspatia’s part plays for much of the tragedy on a single, poignant note of despair over her abandonment by her fiancé Amintor. She addresses him in strains that are strikingly similar to Hermione’s reproachful ones to Leontes while also recalling the plangent notes of Desdemona’s willow song:
You’ll come, my lord, and see the virgins weep
When I am laid in earth, though you yourself
Can know no pity? Thus I wind myself
Into this willow garland, and am prouder
That I was once your love, though now refused,
Than to have had another true to me. (2.1.117–22)

At such moments, Aspatia’s role fits neatly into Carol Rutter’s vision of the training of early modern boy actors as dependent in large part upon their mastery of the highly gendered, conventionalized rhetorical tropes taught in grammar schools. Aspatia’s words, tones, and gestures mimic those of the forsaken-yet-constant classical heroines whose Ovidian speeches such boys might have memorized, a point Aspatia herself underlines when she compares herself to Oenone, Dido, and Ariadne (2.2.30–65). If the same apprentice who created Aspatia also played Desdemona in Othello and/or Hermione in The Winter’s Tale about the same time, then his ability to ‘beg the spectators’ pity’ must have gotten a very thorough workout.

A return to McMillin’s concept of restricted roles in this context confirms the impression that The Winter’s Tale and The Maid’s Tragedy could have worked in repertory with Othello to aid in the training of a rising boy actress. In their relatively limited number of scenes, Hermione and Aspatia interact with a relatively limited number of other characters. In the first half of The Winter’s Tale, Hermione only exchanges lines with Leontes, Polixenes, her son Mamillius, and a small group of female attendants; at the play’s climax, she shares the stage with Leontes, Polixenes, Florizel, Perdita, and Camillo, but only addresses Perdita and embraces Leontes. The majority of her lines are addressed to, and answered by, Leontes. This restricted circle stands in stark contrast to that of Paulina, who exchanges lines directly with most of the play’s leading characters, both male and female, and also with a number of minor lords and ladies. In The Maid’s Tragedy, similarly, almost all Aspatia’s lines are delivered either to other female-identified characters, including Evadne and other court ladies, or to Amintor. Again, this limited number of scene partners contrasts sharply with Evadne’s role, which features major scenes with Amintor, Melantius, the King, the ladies of the court, and numerous other minor characters.

These patterns may be read as traces left behind in the early modern literary canon by the personal and professional relationships that governed the King’s Men. The experienced apprentice — perhaps Rice or Ecclestone — who played Paulina and Evadne could be trusted to hold his own against most of the
company’s leading players (and perhaps also to run lines with them by turns, backstage, at home, or in the tavern). His roles seem written with that assumption in mind. The newer boy — perhaps Richard Robinson — is being much more carefully monitored. Some of his key scenes pair him with other apprentices playing smaller female-identified roles — sometimes in the presence of a major female-identified character like Paulina or Evadne, sometimes not. These may be the kinds of scenes in which a group of boy actresses — say, Haynes, Birche, and Robinson — could be rehearsed together under the supervision of an adult or a senior apprentice. But most crucial to Hermione’s role and Aspatia’s are the scenes in which they are one-on-one with Leontes and Amintor — that is, with the characters in *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Maid’s Tragedy* that theatre historians have often connected with Richard Burbage.

Hermione’s first lines in *The Winter’s Tale* respond to cues from Leontes, and throughout her great trial scene she responds to only three cue lines that do not come from him. This Shakespearean romance thus may offer one of the first records in the early modern archive of the personal and professional relationship that finds its final monument in Robinson’s signature on Burbage’s will. An even more powerful testimony to that relationship may be present in Aspatia’s final scene in *The Maid’s Tragedy*, which offers the boy actress far more technical challenges than anything else in either this play or *The Winter’s Tale*. Aspatia enters this scene ‘in man’s apparel’ (5.3.1 sd), assuming the role of her own brother, and goads the guilt-wracked Amintor into a duel. She reverts to her characteristic attitude of mournful pathos only once she is wounded: ‘I have got enough, / And my desire’, she sighs, ‘there is no place so fit / For me to die as here’ (103–5). This hairpin turn from aggressive to pathetic affect, with a swordfight as the transition point, might have proved difficult for a relatively inexperienced player. Strikingly, at this very moment the authors choose to have Amintor describe Aspatia’s actions back to her in detailed terms. As they fight, he cries,

What dost thou mean?  
Thou canst not fight; the blows thou mak’st at me  
Are quite besides, and those I offer at thee  
Thou spreadst thine arms and tak’st upon thy breast,  
Alas, defenceless!  

(99–103)

So precise is this description that it sounds weirdly like one actor feeding another his business. If Burbage played Amintor to Robinson’s Aspatia, that may be precisely what happened. Perhaps, in an example of the dramaturgical ‘scaffolding’ so well analyzed by Evelyn Tribble, the authors here give the master a chance to
coach his apprentice through the most demanding sequence of his role. If so, then this slice of the King’s Men’s repertory may offer a direct glimpse of the training of an early modern boy actress.\(^{32}\)

**Triumph of a Tragedy Queen**

Other kinds of evidence, meanwhile, may vouchsafe a hint of that training’s success. In October 1611, Buc dubbed Thomas Middleton’s new play *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy*, apparently because he viewed it as a kind of sequel to the popular *Maid’s Tragedy*.\(^{33}\) As I have already noted, Robinson almost certainly played the eponymous heroine of ‘The Maid, Part Two’. Perhaps by now his presence in the Maid’s part was a draw — or even the inspiration for Buc’s titling of the later play. As Andrea Ria Stevens notes, the Lady’s posthumous appearance in *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* also offers a showpiece for some of the statuesque skills Robinson might have developed in *The Winter’s Tale*.\(^{34}\) Just possibly, the repertory of the King’s Men was beginning to be shaped by Robinson’s maturing talents, rather than by the need to discover and hone his gifts.

In 1612–3, *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Maid’s Tragedy* were among fourteen plays selected from the full repertory of the King’s Men for performance at court during the festivities for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine.\(^{35}\) Apparently prestigious audiences wanted to see these plays, even after the likely departure of the virtuoso boy actor (or actors) who had originated the roles of Paulina and Evadne. Perhaps by this point it was Burbage and Robinson, the master tragedian and his apprentice tragedienne, that the public was keenest to see. If so, the first stages of the boy’s training had paid off. A new star had been born.
Notes


2 Jackson, ‘Letter of 1610’.


6 I borrow the term boy actress from Harley Granville Barker, Prefaces to Shakespeare, vol. 1 (Princeton, 1946), 14. Unlike boy player, Barker’s term serves to distinguish the art of female impersonation from the other métiers of boy actors in the early modern theatre, such as those of singing and of playing children and youths. By troubling the gender binary, Barker’s locution also emphasizes the boundary-crossing nature of the boys’ art, which made them controversial amongst moralists in their own time and has rendered them a popular topic of debate amongst scholars of early modern gender and sexuality in ours.


8 Ibid, 258.

9 Ibid, 249.

10 For the departure of and return of these actors to the company, and for the development of apprentices into sharers in the King’s Men, see Holger Schott Syme, ‘The Jacobean King’s Men: A Reconsideration’, Review of English Studies, 70.294 (2019), 231–51, 246–7, https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgy131.


Another possibility, of course, is that one of the company’s more senior boy actresses, such as John Rice or William Ecclestone, was still playing Desdemona in 1610; see Kathman, ‘John Rice’, 259.


Ibid, 237.

Ibid.

Will of Richard Burbage, The National Archives (TNA), PRO PROB1/32; Will of Nicholas Tooley, aka Wilkinson, The National Archives (TNA), PRO PROB 11/143.

St Mary Magdalene Church, Old Fish Street Baptisms and Marriages Register, 1539–1645 (London Metropolitan Archives, London, UK, P69/MRY10/A/001/MS011529).


In scene 3.2, the Officer gives cue lines at line 20, a Lord at 116, and a chorus of Lords at 124.


See Wiggins with Richardson, *British Drama, 1533–1642*, vol. 6, 180.
