

ANDREW GURR

The Work of Elizabethan Plotters, and 2 *The Seven Deadly Sins*

It would, to put it mildly, be nice to know more about the backstage operations of a playing company like the Chamberlain's Men or the Admiral's in the later 1590s. About the company that Shakespeare joined in 1594 we are unlikely ever to know much more than the few hard facts now current can tell us. But given Henslowe's *Diary* with its intricate records of the day-by-day operations of Edward Alleyn and his company, there is better reason to hope for some clarification of the extraordinary processes that helped fifteen or more players to put six different plays on stage every week and to run a repertory consisting of more than thirty plays each year. Regrettably little about that uniquely high-speed process has come out so far, and this study of the backstage book-keeper and stage management will not take it very much further. But, as the chronic optimists say, every little helps.

The Admiral's company must have had several helpers for the staging of their plays besides the costumiers, to whom the Henslowe papers note payments, and the property men. The difficulties of reading the *Diary* start there. Were the backstage workers employed by Henslowe himself as owner of the playhouse the company rented, or were they members of the company, hired and paid by the sharers? None of the stage hands is named in the accounts, though there are some bonds signed by hired men who were players. Several backstage workers can be identified by function but none by name. Whether they worked for the playhouse or for the company, Henslowe's entries both as playhouse-owner and later as company banker appear to ignore them. The idea that he must have kept a separate account book for his non-company theatre finances, and that it has been lost is a chimera that has become a frequent refuge for scholars frustrated by the obvious gaps in the Henslowe records. It has its appeal here too.

We might expect that the work of the scribes who made copies of the authors' manuscript playbooks and especially of the 'plotter', as David Bradley¹

calls him, who helped to design the staging and the doubling of roles for each play, must have been a company activity, and that the names of the men and boys who did such work should appear somewhere in Henslowe's records. But the *Diary* is even more teasing in what it omits than in what it contains. I think we can safely assume that the work of 'plotting' a play's presentation on stage was one of the main functions of the company's book-keeper or scribe. He would make the copy that was to become the 'allowed book' with Tilney's authorizing signature, and then write out the 'parts', the hundreds of lines each sharer had to learn along with his cues, so that each sharer could learn them in the three weeks while a new play was being made ready for performance. Henslowe regularly set down the payments to the Master of the Revels for licensing the Admiral's company's playbooks, but he entered nothing about paying the scribes who made the transcripts and wrote out the players' 'parts'. It is time we set off in pursuit of the company book-keeper or scribe, and explored the function of the men who created those peculiar playhouse papers that survive from Henslowe's records, the 'plots' that were made up from some of the Admiral's and other companies' playscripts.

In one of its two distinct forms, plotting must have been an element in any experienced playwright's activities. A skilled professional writer like Shakespeare, for instance, in 'plotting' his play, would have made sure to leave ample time for costume changes between a speaking player's exit and his next entrance if he were doubling his parts or adopting a disguise. That was one pre-emptive requirement in designing a play. The other kind of 'plot' seems usually to have been needed when the author was absent or dead, as Peele was when the Admiral's Men revived *The Battle of Alcazar* in 1601. For that event, a skilled 'plotter' had to go through the playbook in a quite separate kind of exercise, if only to ensure that the allocation of the parts needing to be doubled when the play was re-staged would be practicable. This second kind of plotting became a particularly challenging task when a play demanded that a good proportion of the speaking roles were played by men in blackface, as David Bradley shows in his study of *The Battle of Alcazar's* 'plot' and his comparison of it with Peele's printed playtext of 1594.

The first aspect of writing a 'plot' came at the outset of composition, the other only after the lines were written. A 'plot', the sort of product that these days we call a scenario, was a vital prerequisite for any play written in collaboration, as Antony Munday's work on the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* illustrates. When Francis Meres wrote in 1598 that Munday was 'our best plotter', he was confirming the importance of the original designer of the

dramatised story. In 1613 when Henslowe was housing and financing the Lady Elizabeth's Men on Bankside the player Nathan Field wrote to him saying that 'Mr Dawborne [Daborne] and I, have spent a great deale of time in conference about this plott, w^{ch} will make as beneficiall a play as hath Come these seaven yeares.'² Often the 'plot' or storyline of a play rather than the completed playscript appears to have been the clinching factor in a company's decision to buy and perform it. *Henslowe's Diary* has references to 'plots' which the writers employed in order to sell their work to the Admiral's Men. Jonson received one pound (twenty shillings) for a playbook he was writing on 3 December 1597, 'upon a boocke w^{ch} he showed the plotte unto the company'.³ On 23 October 1598 another entry notes £4 paid to Chapman 'one his playe boocke' and along with it a payment to Jonson for 'ij ectes of a tragedies of bengemens plotte'.⁴ Such 'plots' were vital to the collaborators in writing the full script. In June 1601 John Day wrote a brief memo saying 'about the plot of the Indyes I have occasion to be absent therefore pray delyver it to will hauton'.⁵ Between April and September 1601 Day and Haughton were collaborating on a play called *The Conquest of the West Indies*, produced in October of that year. Their 'plot' or scenario was clearly the basis for them to complete the play. On 4 April a letter from the company's Samuel Rowley to Henslowe stated 'I have hard five sheets of a playe of the Conqueste of the Indes & I dow not doute but It wyll be a verye good playe'.⁶ Five sheets of manuscript would make a scene or two showing what the play was about, and the 'plot' would outline the rest. Rowley's assurance was the justification for Henslowe to make recurrent payments on the company's behalf to the two writers. Seeing such drafts and 'plots', and giving approval to what they offered, was part of the company's regular dealings with their teams of writers. They might have been the play's 'argument' which Hieronimo gives the king in prelude to the finale of the play in *The Spanish Tragedy's* finale, or the 'argument' that Claudius asks presenter-censor Hamlet to reassure him about. One of our many gaping gulfs is that no such writers' 'plots' exist in the Henslowe archives.

Examples of the other kind of 'plot' do survive. One such was the paper that Bradley's 'plotter' made up for *The Battle of Alcazar*. Bradley's conclusion about the essential function of the man he calls the 'plotter' in drawing up such papers is thoroughly persuasive. Following a meticulous step-by-step analysis of the relations between Peel's 1594 quarto and the 'plot' made from it in 1601 for a revival of the play, he concluded

We have seen ... that the practice of plotting, various though its effects appear to be, had a well understood purpose and was based on principles that can be simply formulated. That purpose was not, as Greg supposed, to direct performances, but to count the actors, to construct a framework for the correct making-out of their acting scrolls, to create a mutual accommodation between the cast and the text, and to direct rehearsals in the absence of the Book.

For these uses the Plot of *Alcazar* is entirely adequate. Like *Tamar Cham*, it is spare and functional, couched uniformly in the imperative mood and lacking the seemingly 'literary' or descriptive embellishments that are to be found in others. The crisis of casting that forces the Plotter to omit a scene of the original, and to create the other apparent anomalies mentioned above, may be explained by his direct operation upon the Quarto text of 1594 according to the principles we have formulated, principles that were equally understood by the playwright and which we have seen – if through a glass darkly – to operate in all the Plots, just as they do in the prompt-books and in the great majority of printed texts.⁷

His analysis of the close links between Peele's text and *Alcazar's* 'plot' is remarkably thorough, based as it is on his own experiments with setting up a production using a similar cast to the one the Admiral's had available to them in 1601.⁸ Nothing quite matches first-hand experience.

The object in drawing up a 'plot' for *The Battle of Alcazar* was to pinpoint who in the company would play which parts, and how they could manage the consequent need for the doubling of individual parts, some of which had to be performed in blackface. Working this out was a major and responsible activity, the sort of work that might even have been done by a major player in the company. Alleyn took the major villain's role in blackface, and he needed a cohort of followers, whereas his Moorish, Portuguese, Spanish and English opponents all kept their own faces. That division of facial colour made doubling a special challenge.

Besides the seven surviving manuscript 'plots' for plays in production from this period, there is one other jotting which suggests how important such papers were to the companies. The Admiral's sharer Robert Shaa made notes on the reverse of one of his letters to Henslowe in 1599 that reads like the first draft of a 'plot'. It was a draft design for the play that his letter asked Henslowe to pay for, *2 Henry Richmond*, listing the characters and their entries scene by scene much as do the 'plots' for *The Battle of Alcazar*, *Frederick and Basilea*, and the five other story outlines noting who was to double which parts.⁹ The distinction between a 'plot' that tells the story scene by scene, which was the job of the writer initiating a collaborative project, of which

none survive, and the plotter's 'plot' developed from a given script to establish who would double which roles, and what props were needed for each scene as the 'plotter' of *Alcazar* did, is vital, but all too easily confused. The first was the initiation of the playbook itself, its story in summary, scene by scene and character by character. The second was a record of how the given playbook could be shaped into a form ready for staging. Robert Shaa was sketching out the second type of 'plot' for his play. The first 'plot' was an author's preliminary design, the other a stage manager's note of how to run a given text in performance. With the doubtful exception of Shaa's draft for *2 Henry Richmond*, all the surviving manuscripts known today as the 'plots' seem to be survivals from the second of these activities.

The many theatre-related papers originally held by Dulwich College include seven surviving papers that fairly evidently were put together backstage as company 'plots'.¹⁰ Their contents do seem to vary widely, to the extent that they seem to have been written for a disconcertingly different range of functions. Five of the seven were prepared for Admiral's Men's productions. Two of these list the names of as many as twenty-four players, whereas others name no more than five. From the known players listed we can tell that the Admiral's 'plot' for *Frederick and Basilea* was prepared for staging or re-staging in 1597, *Troilus and Cressida* in 1599, *Alcazar* in 1601, *2 Fortune's Tennis* in 1600 or 1602, and *1 Tamar Cham* also in 1602. This last play had been performed as 'ne' by Strange's Men in 1592 and the Admiral's first re-staged it in 1596. The Admiral's players named in the 'plot' narrow the date it was made for down to a revival in 1602. Of all the plays involved only the 1594 quarto of *Alcazar* has survived to be compared with the 'plot' made for it. Of the others, only the 'plots' survive to say what their playbooks contained. The two non-Admiral's 'plots' are *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and *The Dead Man's Fortune*. Both have Richard Burbage's name in them, and both, I believe, date from around 1591.¹¹

The chief purpose for most of the 'plots' seems to have been to identify the roles that specific players were to take, particularly where they entail some doubling. In *2 Seven Deadly Sins* two of the principal roles are given no player's name, as if the document's main need was to identify only who would play the parts to be doubled. It made sense to use the player's name rather than that of the changing characters in order to avoid confusion over who was doubling what. That seems to be the main reason for all the players' names appearing along with their parts. In *Frederick and Basilea* each scene identifies pretty well all the parts along with their players, as, rather more

spasmodically, do *Alcazar* and *1 Tamar Cham*. *Frederick and Basilea* even calls for 'gatherers' to be summoned on stage to swell its two biggest crowd scenes, scene 9 and the finale, scene 18. On the other hand the function of both the fragmentary *2 Fortune's Tennis* and the almost equally deficient *Troilus and Cressida* appears to be chiefly to identify only who was to play the walk-on parts. They name the principal players much less regularly.

Verbal practices in these seven manuscripts indicate that they were all intended for use backstage, since they never employ the standard terms such as '*within*' for noises in the tiring house. They mark entrances, but never exits, as if that was up to the player once he was onstage. The instructions in fact largely refer to matters that were only relevant '*within*'. The square holes visible in some of these 'plots' have been thought to indicate that they were written to be pasted on boards and hung backstage for consultation by the players.¹² Use as a notice board for the players, to remind them when they had to be ready to go on stage and what properties to take with them, is a possibility, but it seems more likely that it was put there for consultation by the book-keeper or stage manager to keep him in mind of the play's progress and what properties he would need to supply and when, for the characters about to go on stage. That was evidently one function of the *Alcazar* 'plot', with its specification of such properties as '3 violls of blood & a sheeps gather', and '*Dead mens heads & bones banquet blood*'. But the seven 'plots' vary so much in their contents and their condition that it seems dangerously speculative to make firm generalisations about their precise function backstage.

Drawing up such 'plots' with their information about who played what part and what they doubled was a responsible job, since it demanded early access to the company's decisions about who was to play which roles, and what properties would be required on stage. In the range of the five Admiral's 'plots' over five years, the variety of hands they were written in seems also to show that the company had at least two distinctive and deeply experienced plotters. Conceivably the company employed more than one scribe and stage manager, or, a possibility which Robert Shaa's tentative draft of a 'plot' for *2 Henry Richmond* makes plausible, one or more of the sharing players might have taken on the work of devising the plans for how to double the many roles that the history plays in particular required. Whoever did draw up the 'plots' must have been an intimate with the company, joining the players for their evening read-throughs of each play, helping to supply the props that were called for, and above all noting and advising the allocation of parts and the doubling. That was a particular challenge with plays such as *Alcazar*

which demanded opposing armies of different colours on stage, and spectacular dumbshows and battles. The simplest conclusion is that he must have been the man who is these days called the prompter, or the 'book-keeper', who was certainly a company employee, not a playhouse worker.

But if there was a single person responsible for looking after the playbooks and attending to the consequent staging requirements, why did so many different hands write the five Admiral's 'plot' manuscripts that survive from between 1597 and 1602? Or from a different viewpoint, how could the same scribe have put his hand to such a variety of manuscripts of different dates, functions and companies as *The booke of Sir Thomas More*, *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, *2 Seven Deadly Sins*, and *Fortune's Tennis*? His contribution to the *More* manuscript was a transcript of a substantial section of a play undergoing revision; to the second he added dates and other details to a complete play in manuscript; while the third and fourth were both 'plots'. We might well expect that if the company did have a single book-keeper or prompter, the same hand should appear in all the transcripts. But it does not. At least two hands were involved writing the five Admiral's 'plots' along with other company manuscripts.

Handwriting offers an awkward sort of clue. From the seven surviving 'plots', the one made for the re-staging of *1 Tamar Cham* in 1602 only survives in a transcription by George Steevens. Of the six others, two can hardly be Admiral's papers, since they include the name of Richard Burbage.¹³ One of those was *The Dead Man's Fortune*, which contains only four players' names. Besides Burbage's, two of the others it names, Darlowe and "b same", cannot be identified, unless "samme" was the young Samuel Rowley, later an Admiral's man. The fourth name, Robert Lee (or 'Leigh'), was a member of Queen Anne's company from 1604, and possibly earlier in Strange's or the pre-1594 Admiral's. In May 1593 he signed a bond to Edward Alleyn along with Edward's elder brother John and Thomas Goodale,¹⁴ whose name appears in the 'plots' of *The Dead Man's Fortune*, *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and also recurrently in the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More*.¹⁵ Around 1600 or 1602 the scribe who wrote *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and a lengthy section of *Sir Thomas More*, which gave him the only name he is known by, 'Hand C', also wrote the fragmentary 'plot' for *Fortune's Tennis*. At some point, probably in 1595, he inscribed the title and date and some stage directions in the manuscript of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* for the Admiral's.¹⁶ He certainly worked with Munday on both *John a Kent* and on *Sir Thomas More*, and very likely on the *More* manuscript in 1601–03, when it was rewritten in a fresh

attempt to ready it for the stage. Thus the scribe we know only as Hand C of *Sir Thomas More* seems to have been working for a company along with Alleyn in the early 1590s, and was with Alleyn's company, now the Admiral's, at the time they were working on *John a Kent, Fortune's Tennis* and perhaps *Sir Thomas More* in about 1602. Hand C did not, however, prepare the 'plot' of *Alcazar* in 1601. That work was done by an equally experienced plotter with a different handwriting.

Two uncertainties exist about this evidence. First, why should there have been two 'plotters' working for the same company, and second, if we adopt David Kathman's conjectural ascription of the 'plot' of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* not (as Greg did) to Strange's in 1591–93 but to the Chamberlain's in 1597–98, how and why did Hand C leave Alleyn's company for Burbage's, and later return to the Admiral's? Would the company role of 'plotter' have allowed such switches? Was plotting perhaps a player's job, not a scribe's? A player could have moved from one company to another as some experienced players did. Sharers of course had a financial commitment to their company, but not hired men. So easy switches of company loyalty would not make sense if a sharer was involved. Either way, the function of the plotter in any company in these years leaves us facing a major awkwardness in Kathman's theory that Hand C wrote the 'plot' of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* for the Chamberlain's.

First, it does seem strange that the Admiral's company of post-1594 at the Rose and the Fortune should have at least two men capable of doing such skilled work. Such a man clearly had enough authority within the company to allocate the doubled roles and write out a 'plot' to go with it. It was work easily done as a routine company activity by one man, possibly with an assistant to do the fetching and carrying. As a man whose chief work was scribal – copying out the allowed book, and the parts – he may have done much of his work outside the playhouse, though if so we would expect to see his name appear somewhere in Henslowe's notes, as that of Stephen Magett the tireman does. In the absence of any such name or reference from the *Diary*, it is conceivable that he was a playing sharer in the company doing the work as an extra task. But no scholar has been able to match Hand C from *Sir Thomas More* with the letters and signatures of any of the sharers found in the Henslowe documents. The Robert Yarrington who was the scribe employed to write a copy of Houghton and Day's *Two Lamentable Tragedies* for the press (his name appears at the end of the 1601 quarto), and who became 'free' of the Scriveners Guild in 1603, was certainly not a sharer but a professional scribe at the time he transcribed the play for the press in 1601. He seems to

have maintained contact with the company, since in 1612 Antony Jeffes, a company sharer, gave bail for a 'Yerrington' and two other men.¹⁷ But this fact need only mean that Yarrington was employed in 1601 just to copy the play for the printer, and may have continued to work as an occasional scribe for the company through the later years. He is an unlikely candidate to be the company's 'plotter'.

Clearly the 'plotters' did not work just as scribes. As is evident from the features of the more intricate 'plots' such as *Alcazar*, they must have been regular workers for the company, with enough authority to make adjustments to the scenes in the playbooks when difficulties arose over such practical matters as doubling. This theatre teamwork suggests far more immediacy and importance than mere work as a company scribe. Simply to copy out the 'allowed book' and the 'parts' for each of the speaking roles in a new play was a recurrent need that would have taken up a fair number of daylight hours each week, but since the men who drew up the 'plots' must at the least have sat in on company discussions about new plays and the allocation of the various parts, copying could not have been their sole employment. Munday's manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* indicates that the writer himself usually supplied a fair copy of his play.¹⁸ The most plausible likelihood must be that the work of allocating the parts, drawing up the 'plot' for a particular play with its doubling, transcribing the copy to be sent to Tilney for his licence, and writing the rolls of 'parts' for the leading players was an activity belonging to a specific company member or members. The work of making copies for the press and other less urgent scribal needs could be supplied by outsiders such as Yarrington. The company book-keeper, who held the 'allowed book' and who controlled the backstage activities sometimes called 'prompting', is the most likely company member to have drawn up the 'plots'. When two hands were involved, as seems to have happened between 1597 and 1603, he may have used an assistant writing under his direction.

To apply this idea about the role of a company's chief backstage worker to some of the 'hard' evidence from the time requires us to reconsider Kathman's theory about the 'plot' of *2 Seven Deadly Sins*, along with what it may say about the companies involved and company allegiances at distinct times. Hand C wrote the 'plots' for *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and *Fortune's Tennis*, and the inscriptions for Munday's manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. The first of these manuscripts in time I think was the 'plot' for the last three stories of *The Seven Deadly Sins*, a Strange's play of 1593 or earlier. The second was Munday's comedy about the magician John of Kent, which later became the

celebrated Admiral's play launched as 'ne' under the title *The Wise Man of West Chester* on 2 December 1594, and performed a uniquely long-running 31 times up to 18 July 1597.¹⁹ The third, *Fortune's Tennis*, was a Dekker play written for the Admiral's at the new Fortune in 1600. Henslowe bought Dekker's book on 6 September 1600, though the players' names in the 'plot' are similar to those for *Frederick and Basilea*, of July 1597 or earlier. Hand C worked with and for Alleyn on two of these plays, and very likely on all three. His was also the hand that copied out scene 8 of *Sir Thomas More*, and inscribed Thomas Goodale's name in both *More* and *2 Seven Deadly Sins*.²⁰ The date of his transcript for *More* is made difficult by the complexity of the debate over its nature. He could have written it either early or late, 1593 or 1602–03.

If we give any credence to Kathman's theory that the 'plot' of *Sins* was prepared not for Alleyn but for the Chamberlain's Men it is a puzzle how Hand C could have written it. On his reckoning its date falls somewhere between the other manuscripts, 1595 for *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, 1600 or 1602 for *Fortune's Tennis*, and either 1593 or 1602–03 for *Sir Thomas More*. Greg and Chambers accepted the most likely date of *Sins* 'plot' as 1591–93, on the assumption, based on the player names it cites, that it was prepared for Strange's company during the years when Alleyn was leading them at the Rose. Kathman argues against that view, chiefly on the evidence of the players' names. The *Sins* 'plot' not only contains the name of Richard Burbage but most of the other early Chamberlain's Men, making it more likely, he considers, to have been prepared for a Chamberlain's production of 1597–98.

This thesis requires us to believe that Hand C switched his loyalty from one company led by Alleyn, for whom he was working in 1595 and 1600, and perhaps previously with Alleyn in the Strange's of 1590–93, across to the Shakespeare company in 1597–98 and then back to the Admiral's again for *Fortune's Tennis* in 1600 or 1602 and probably the revision of *Sir Thomas More*. If he did not return to Alleyn's company until 1600, his absence might just explain why he did not prepare the 'plot' of *Alcazar* in 1601. But I find it difficult to believe in such switching, not least because the *Fortune's Tennis* 'plot' seems to have preceded Hand C's revising of the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript. Principally I doubt such shifts because Kathman's evidence about the players named in the *2 Seven Deadly Sins* 'plot' as Chamberlain's men in 1597–98 has its own weaknesses.

We have no text for the play that the *Sins* 'plot' was made from, though it does offer an outline or scenario for the stories it contained. Allegedly written

by Richard Tarlton, which would put its original composition back before 1588 when he died, it must like most of the other 'plots' have been an old play prepared for a new staging. The first of the three sins, envy, sloth and lechery, dramatised as a sequel to a lost play containing the first four sins, is the tale of Ferrex and Porrex. The fifth sin, Ferrex and Porrex's Envy, was long familiar from Sackville and Norton's *Gorboduc*, staged by the Inns of Court in 1561 and printed in 1565. Little else is known about the play. Its main interest is the large number of players it names, and their known attachments to a variety of playing companies.

Alleyn's long association with Lord Strange's Men from at least 1591, before he began to appear with them in Henslowe's records of playing at the Rose from 1592, is well known. So is his subsequent ownership of several of their plays, including *1 Tamar Cham*, which he gave to the new Admiral's set up in 1594. His memories of playing with Strange's are hinted at in 1599, when he was on the point of returning to the stage after his three-year retirement, Henslowe then paid William Haughton to write a new play which he called simply 'Ferrex & Porrex'. Conceivably this marked a wish for an elaboration of the older short account that Alleyn remembered playing with Strange's. Dekker, working in the Henslowe writing teams, picked the story out once again in *Satiromastix*, staged by Paul's Boys and the Chamberlain's in 1601, with its allusions to respectable old plays such as *Gorboduc* while he was mocking Jonson as *Tucca*.

Of the most likely dates for the *Sins* 'plot', we should not forget that several scholars, most notably Scott McMillin, the first author of the idea that the 'plot' might be later than the early 1590s, have set out the idea that from the late 1580s up to 1594 the chief London-based companies mounted plays calling for exceptionally large casts.²¹ By 1590 at least four of these 'large' companies were capable of doing so, the Queen's, Strange's, Admiral's and Pembroke's. Between them these four companies staged fourteen surviving plays, mostly histories, each of which demanded an exceptionally large cast. If *2 Seven Deadly Sins* was staged by the Chamberlain's Men in 1597–98 that dating would make it the only instance among the fourteen 'large' plays to come from the period after 1594. This anomaly also needs explaining if Kathman's theory has any validity.

The cast-list in the 'plot' of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* is as lengthy as any of the surviving play manuscripts, with in all forty-five or more parts for twenty players. Only two major roles, Henry VI and the poet Lydgate, have no players named for them, probably because they were the only players who had

to do no doubling. Three of the named players were distinguished by the title 'Mr': George Bryan, Augustine Phillips, and Thomas Pope. All three uniquely were named 'Mr' every time they were named in the 'plot'. This apparent hierarchy of naming players that Greg found in *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and extended to other cases is clear-cut. Greg argued that Bryan, Phillips and Pope, the three men consistently named 'Mr', can most plausibly be seen as sharers along with the two unnamed players who took King Henry and Lydgate. The three 'Misters' or 'Masters' all had ample experience, and probably the financial resources, to take a paid share in the company. Most of the other players in the 'plot' were given no title, just an initial and a surname. In the order they appear on the manuscript, they are '(scene 1) *R Cowly Jo Duke J Holland R Pallant* (2) *J Sincler . T Belt* . (3) *R Burbadg m^r Brian . Th Goodale . saunder w sly Harry J Duke . Kitt . Ro Pallant J Holland* (4) *Harry . Kitt . R Cowly . John duke . W sly . R Pallant . John Sincler . J Holland* . (5) *m^r Brian Tho Goodale* . (6) *m^r Bry T Good* . (8) *R P . w sly Nick saunder R Cowly m^r Brian* . (10) *R Cowly Th Goodale . R Go . Ned . Nick* . (11) *m^r Phillipps m^r Pope R Pa Kit J sincler . J Holland* (12) *Kitt* (13) *R Pall . J sincler . Kitt . J Holland . R Cowly . Mr Pope . will foole . J Duke . Ned . mr Pope J sincler . Vincent R Cowly R P . Kitt* (14) *Th Goodale . will foole* (16) *m^r Pope . R Pa . Kitt J Holl R Cow . J Sinc* (18) *R Burbadg . Ro R Pall . J si...* (19) *saunder will J Duke w sly Hary* (21) *saunder T Belt will w sly Hary Th Goodale R Burbadg . J Duk R Cowly* (23) *Th Goodale Hary w sly* . (24) *R Cowly J Duke . J Holland Joh sincler . m^r Brian*'. The first entry for John Holland, in Sc.1, was deleted either because he was not needed, or because his reappearance in Sc. 3 made it impractical to double his part with the one he had in the first scene. The 'foole' who comes on with 'will' in scenes 13 and 14 was the company clown. In my view, for reasons we will come to, he was the sixth sharer.

Ten of the players in the cast assembled for the *Sins* revival certainly entered the Chamberlain's in or after 1594. Besides the three misters, Bryan, Phillips, and Pope, other players in the *Sins* list who became Chamberlain's Men at some time were Burbage, Cowley, Duke, Holland, Pallant, Sincler, and Sly. 'R Go' and perhaps T. Bent, both of whom seem to have been young, may also have joined the Chamberlain's in or after 1594. Harry, though given only a first name as if he were a boy, did take adult parts, and has been thought to be Henry Condell. John Holland's name appears in *Sins* and elsewhere in what was probably the post-Pembroke's version of *2 Henry VI* in 1593, a play that became a Chamberlain's Men's text in 1594.²² It is easy to believe that

so many names from the *Sins* 'plot' must have moved into the Chamberlain's company after its foundation in May 1594.

But we also know from a Privy Council letter of 6 May 1593 who the Strange's sharers were. They provide all three misters from the *Sins* list, plus the two unidentified parts and the fool. The letter was quite specific: 'the bearers hereof, Edward Allen, servaunt to the right honorable the Lorde Highe Admiral, William Kemp, Thomas Pope, John Heminges, Augustine Phillipps, and Georg Brian, being al one companie, servauntes to our verie good the Lord the Lord Strainge'.²³ It makes obvious sense to see those six names as the three identified as '*mr*' in *2 Seven Deadly Sins* along with Alleyne, probably playing Lydgate, Heminges playing King Henry, and Will Kemp playing the script-free clown, whose presence was registered only as '*foole*' in scenes 13 and 14.

The other players taking adult parts in the 'plot', Burbage, Cowley, Duke, Pallant, Sincler, Sly, Goodale, and Holland, along with the only two young players who were given surnames, T. Belt and Robert Gough ('R Go', and 'Ro'), are consistently identified in the same way, by a surname or an abbreviation and one initial. The rest of the cast, seemingly the boys since they mostly take the women's parts, are identified as 'saunder' (playing Queen Videna and Procne), 'Nick' (playing the queen's lady), 'R Go' (playing Aspatia), 'Ned' (playing Rodope), 'Ro' (probably also R. Gough, playing Philomele), and 'will' (Procne's lady). Two of the players identified only by first names do play men, 'Kitt' and 'Harry', while one without a first name, 'T Belt', plays both a man and a woman (a servant to King Henry, and Panthea). Of those with only first names 'Kit' or 'Kitt' has exclusively adult parts, playing a captain accompanying first Aspatia and the ladies and then with Arbactus in his triumph. Another player identified only by his first name, 'Vincent', accompanies Arbactus (Pope) as one of three musicians, the two other musicians being John Sincler and Richard Cowley.

What can we conclude from this fairly consistent set of status distinctions? As senior players Bryan, Phillips and Pope as likely sharers go with the nameless two who played King Henry and Lydgate, plus Will Kemp. There is complete consistency in this pattern, since the '*foole*', if he were the sixth sharer, did no doubling and so is as nameless as the players of Lydgate and Henry. The only status anomalies in the full list are 'T Belt' and 'R Go'. Their roles make both seem to have been boy players. Conceivably they have surnames because they were newcomers whose first names were unfamiliar to the plotter. Many attempts have been made to identify the various other boys in

the *Sins* 'plot', finding familiar surnames such as Kit Beeston, Harry Condell, Alexander Cooke, and the Robert Gough who later became a King's Man and married Phillips's sister. He was a legatee in Pope's will (1603), and a witness to Phillips's (1605). But none of these identifications is any more secure than finding the 'samme' of *Dead Man's Fortune* to be the young Samuel Rowley.

Like his presence in the 'plot' of *The Dead Man's Fortune*, Richard Burbage's name in the *Sins* 'plot' raises the question of which companies he might have belonged to before he joined the Chamberlain's Men in 1594. The *Sins* 'plot' casts him to play Gorboduc and Tereus, one an elderly king, the other a rampant ruler, husband of Procne and rapist of Philomela. The absence with his name of the title '*mr*' given to Bryan, Phillips and Pope is a prop for Greg's theory that the prefaced title was given in Henslowe's papers only to the company sharers, the honorific distinguishing them from the hired men and boys. The general validity of Greg's view is not fully supported by the evidence of the 'plots', and has provoked a lot of debate about its use, or at least the consistency with which Henslowe and others might have used the honorific. It was not Henslowe, of course, who wrote the 'plots'. It is certainly true that apart from the two unnamed players who took single roles and whose designation is a blank the *Sins* 'plot' gives the title only to the three names who we know were Strange's sharers, Bryan, Pope and Phillips, but not to Burbage or any of the other adult players. The six names in the Council's letter of 6 May make it easy to fill the blanks with Alleyn and Heminges, and Kemp, though other possibilities obviously exist. This does give a substantial basis for concluding that Burbage was a hired man in Strange's but not a sharer. Personally I think it likely that he left Strange's for Pembroke's when it was formed in 1591 after the Theatre became available, not long after the preparation of the *Sins* 'plot', and after the Alleyns quarrelled with James Burbage at the Theatre in May of that year. Such a quarrel may have led to the departure of Alleyn and Strange's from the Theatre, their eventual establishment at the Rose in February 1592, and the establishment of a new Pembroke's starring Richard Burbage that opened at the Theatre, and played at Court on St. Stephen's Day and Twelfth Night 1592–3.²⁴

A rather more substantial issue over whether the *Sins* 'plot' was composed in 1591 for Strange's or in 1597 for the Chamberlain's is raised with the name of Thomas Goodale. He is recorded as a Berkeley's man as early as 1581, and Hand C inscribed him as a player in *Sir Thomas More* in 1592 or in 1601–02, or whenever that notorious transcript was made, at which time he must have been either a Strange's or an Admiral's man, and certainly in company with

Alleyn. His name also appears as a signatory on a bond dated 18 May 1593 to Alleyn, who, the Privy Council letter of the same month says, was then a sharer in Strange's.²⁵ Goodale signed this bond to Edward along with the elder Alleyn brother John. He clearly owed allegiance to Alleyn or at the least had financial and theatrical dealings with him through 1593. His name, however, never reappears in any other record, and he is certainly not named as a Chamberlain's player in the list that Heminges and Condell laid down in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio. The F1 list of the company's 26 names is 'William Shakespeare. Richard Burbadge. John Hemmings, Augustine Phillips. William Kempt. Thomas Poope. George Bryan. Henry Condell. William Slye. Richard Cowly. John Lowine. Samuel Crosse. Alexander Cooke. / Samuel Gilburne. Robert Armin. William Ostler. Nathan Field. John Underwood. Nicholas Tooley. William Ecclestone. Joseph Taylor. Robert Benfield. Robert Goughe. Richard Robinson. John Shancke. John Rice.' This hardly supports the idea that Goodale accompanied the seven other surnamed players from the *Sins* 'plot' to become a Chamberlain's man in 1594.

John Holland and John Sincler are others from the *Sins* list besides Burbadge who probably moved from Strange's to become Chamberlain's players, probably in late 1591 via Pembroke's. Holland's name appears in the manuscript of the early *John of Bordeaux*. Of the two hands identifiable as its scribes, Hand A inserted the name of John Holland three times, at TLN 466, 678–9, and 1159. In his Malone Society edition of *John of Bordeaux: Or the Second Part of Friar Bacon* (1936), W.L. Renwick says that of its two annotators Hand B has 'some resemblance with that of the Plot of *The Seven Deadly Sins* and more with that of *The Battle of Alcazar*' (p. vii); in other words one of the scribes might have been Hand C of *Sir Thomas More* and the Admiral's. Perhaps Holland was working for the same company as Hand C when the *Sins* 'plot' was created. Like John Sincler's, his name appeared in several plays published as Pembroke's in 1594–95. In *2 Henry VI*, the F text marks an entry at 4.2 for 'Bevis, and John Holland'. Sincler, too, was named in the Folio text of *3 Henry VI* at 3.1.1, and in the Induction to the quarto of Pembroke's *The Taming of the Shrew* in 1594. The grouping of *2* and *3 Henry VI* in their quarto versions with *The Taming of the Shrew* and also *Edward II* as Pembroke's plays of before 1594 creates one of several uncertainties about company membership at this time. Henslowe reported to Alleyn in August 1593 while he was on tour that Pembroke's had broken, after which there is nothing to say where Burbadge and others went, unless they joined Sussex's at the Rose in early 1594. Holland was named as Thomas Pope's tenant in his will of 1603, so it is at

least possible that both Sincler and Holland went with Burbage and perhaps Will Sly from Strange's to Pembroke's late in 1591.²⁶ All of this detail seems to support and be supported by the case for the *Sins* 'plot' being prepared for Strange's Men with Alleyn early in 1591.

Some larger issues over the younger players named in the *Sins* 'plot' remain. The apparent distinction between boys and men creates a problem with no clear solution. 'R Go' was clearly a boy, and most likely was the 'Ro' playing Philomele.²⁷ If so, then 'T Belt' was the only boy player that the *Sins* scribe never recorded with his first name. He played King Henry's servant, conceivably as an adult, although his other role as Panthea in *Lechery* indicates that he was young. However, the records of boys' ages and their naming in the various 'plots' is not very even or very consistent. In the 'plot' of *The Battle of Alcazar* (1601) George Somerset appears cited as 'George', and just once as 'Georg Somersett', in company with the full names of Tom Parsons and Robert Tailor, his regular companions in that play. Somerset also appeared in *1 Tamar Cham* (1602), where again he was named simply 'George'. There is also a 'George' in the 'plot' of *2 Fortune's Tennis* (1600 or 1602). The plotter's use of only his first name led Greg and Chambers to assume that Somerset must have been a boy player, the same boy in *Sins* as in *Alcazar* and *Tamar Cham*, even though in *Alcazar* George Somerset played the adult roles of a janissary, a Fury, County Vinioso, an attendant, and a guard. We now know that by 1601 Somerset had a wife, since she consulted Simon Forman on 10 February that year over the theft of a doublet (it turned out that Somerset's fellow player Thomas Towne had taken it). Why Somerset should have been labelled only by his first name in the two late 'plots' is an apparent anomaly that explains but does not excuse Greg's easy assumption. First names were not invariably used for boys. It does seem that the titular '*mr*' for a sharer was a much stricter designation than were those of the non-sharers and boys.

Kathman's note that John Heminges enrolled 'T Belt' as his apprentice in the Grocers on 12 November 1595 is a remarkably useful discovery, but not, I think, as proof that he became a boy player under the Chamberlain's. The relationship between livery company apprenticeships and the boys who were taken on, often by players 'free' of the city through their inherited membership of a livery company, as their apprentices, was a complex and in many ways a devious one. The terms of handicraft apprenticeships in particular did not suit players' need for boys with unbroken voices to play boy pages and women. The various Statutes of Apprentices were all quite specific in declaring that in London such trades as carpentry and printing required an age

range for apprentices of between seventeen and twenty-four.²⁸ Much more work needs to be done on the question of whether or how the boys employed by the adult companies could have taken on any sort of formal apprenticeship registered with the livery companies., and if so how they might have evaded the laws about apprentice ages.

In particular the laws determining apprenticeship for London, where the players took on their boys, generally only admitted youths who were three or more years older than those in the rest of the country. The official starting age for London apprentices in the livery companies was seventeen, compared with fourteen for the rest of the country. It is easy to see how rare (and how valuable) boys with unbroken voices would be at that age. An apprentice enlisting at an earlier age could not have used the Grocer's as his ostensible employment except as a disguise for other work. No doubt John Heminges, free of the Grocer's in 1587, was beginning to think about that once he became a sharer in the Chamberlain's, as he was by November 1595 when he took on T. Belt as his 'apprentice'. Possibly the young Belt – unfamiliar to the *Sins* plotter, unlike the other boys whose first names he used – started playing as a boy with Heminges in *Strange's Men*, and was not formally enrolled in the Chamberlain's until 1595 when he was old enough to become an apprentice in the Grocer's.

Apart from the existence of Burbage in the cast as a player, Kathman's chief argument for ascribing the *Sins* 'plot' to the Chamberlain's is the names of the seven other players from the 'plot' who were known to have been in that company through 1597–98, chiefly Goodale and 'T Belt'. He does not consider Hand C, nor Alleyn's link with Goodale in 1593. His discovery that the 'T Belt' who played boy's parts was the first boy Heminges engaged as his apprentice on 5 November 1595 is fascinating but far from conclusive, and indeed helps to open up large questions about the function of the players who enlisted boys as their 'apprentices' that Kathman himself has done so much to identify. The age of the boy players is certainly an issue here, but the link between Heminges and the young Belt seems to me only to strengthen the likelihood that Heminges might, having been a sharer in *Strange's* before 1593, have taken young Belt on as an apprentice once he became a Chamberlain's Men's sharer in 1594, some time after playing alongside him in *Sins*.

The age of the boys who played the women's parts has been widely debated, though scholars have taken far too little notice of how that very issue must have flouted the rules for engaging apprentices at specific ages in the twelve livery companies.²⁹ Since the minimum age for an apprentice in London was

seventeen, whereas boys are said to have been routinely engaged for playing in the boy companies at ten or eleven, there is no reason why Heminges, playing either King Henry or the poet Lydgate, could not have taken 'T Belt' on unofficially in 1591, but not formally as his apprentice in the Chamberlain's until he was old enough, several years after the boy had first proved his worth with Strange's in *Sins*. Thomas Marbeck, in the Admiral's in 1602, was given eight walk-on parts in the plot' of *1 Tamar Cham*, 1602, one of them a child. He was born in 1577, so was twenty-five at the time. In the year of *Tamar Cham* he married Agnes, widow of Richard Alleyn. His sister married Thomas Middleton.

My own view, unprovable like so much of this grey matter, is that Richard Burbage worked as a hired man with Strange's up to May 1591, and so appeared with the others in the *Sins* 'plot'. That was when the Alleyns had a major quarrel with Burbage's father James over his financial control of the Theatre, and Edward Alleyn took Strange's away from the Burbage playhouse. Richard then helped his father form the Pembroke's Men which began playing at the Theatre in that year and performed at court on 26 December 1592 and Twelfth Night 1593. By then they were well established with good plays, including two of the *Henry VI* plays and very likely *Richard III*, not to mention *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Edward II*. That is why I think the 'plot' for the revival of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* must have been prepared for Strange's in the early part of 1591. However far astray they went over the functions of that anonymous but vital worker, the company plotter, Greg and Chambers were not so comprehensively wrong over the Henslowe papers as has been thought in recent years.

Notes

- 1 David Bradley, *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage* (Cambridge, 1992).
- 2 W.W. Greg (ed.), *Henslowe Papers* (London, 1907), 84.
- 3 R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert (eds), *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1961), 73, 85.
- 4 Foakes and Rickert, 100.
- 5 Foakes and Rickert, 295.
- 6 Foakes and Rickert, 294.
- 7 Bradley, *From Text to Performance*, 126.

- 8 W.W. Greg concluded in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, for the Malone Society (Oxford, 1922), that Peele's 1594 quarto was a poor text drastically trimmed for performance in the provinces, and that the 'plot' was prepared for a longer and more authoritative text. Bradley spends most of his book disproving Greg's theory.
- 9 Foakes and Rickert, *Henslowe's Diary*, 287–8.
- 10 They are reproduced and transcribed in W.W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1931). At least three of the seven 'plots' were prepared for revivals of plays by writers who had died.
- 11 David Kathman, 'Reconsidering *The Seven Deadly Sins*', *Early Theatre* 7 (2004), 13–44, has recently revived an idea broached in 1989 in separate papers by Scott McMillin and Gary Taylor arguing that the play might date not from 1590–91 but 1598, when it may have been prepared for the Chamberlain's Men. That theory sets up a real puzzle as to how a plotter could be working with Alleyn in the early 1590s and in 1601–2, and in between shift his loyalties to work for the Chamberlain's in 1597–98. This question is considered in the conclusion to this article.
- 12 Michela Calore has analysed the linguistic codes in 'Elizabethan Plots: A Shared Code of Theatrical and Fictional Language', *Theatre Survey* 44 (2003), 249–61.
- 13 This should lead us to ask, since Kathman has argued quite persuasively that the 'plot' of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* may have come to the Dulwich library through the Cartwrights rather than through Alleyn himself, how they got there too, unless those two 'plots' were retained by Alleyn after Strange's Men disappeared. Alleyn did possess at least ten playbooks, including at least two of Peele's plays.
- 14 The document, *Dulwich Ms.4.29*, is dated 18 May 1593. It is a bond entered on by Goodale, John Alleyn and Lee to Edward Alleyn. It calls Goodale a 'mercer'.
- 15 In the essays collected by T. H. Howard-Hill (ed.), *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More. Essays on the play and its Shakespearian interest* (Cambridge, 1989), William B. Long, Giorgio Melchiori and Gary Taylor all agree on Hand C's contributions to the play and the 'plots'. See also *Sir Thomas More*, Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori (eds), *Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1990, 23: 'Hand C is that of a copyist, or more precisely a professional bookkeeper responsible also for transcribing the 'plot' of the second part of Tarlton's *The Seven Deadly Sins* for a revival in the very early nineties by a company that included several members of the Strange's Men, for writing the titles on the vellum wrappings not only of *Sir Thomas More* but also of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (c. 1590), and for adding typical bookkeeper's directions to the latter.' See also W.W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 1.240: '[In the manuscript of *John a Kent*] there are a few playhouse directions added in the margin by another hand, which is apparently identical with that of the stage reviser in *Sir Thomas More* and if so with the hand that inscribed the ornamental

- title on the wrapper'. Nobody has yet challenged the identification of Hand C in the other manuscripts.
- 16 Grace Ioppolo and Peter Beale contend that the date on *John a Kent* which I.A. Shapiro read as altered from 1596 to 1590 is really 1595. See Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood: Authorship, Authority and the Playhouse* (London, 2006), 101. If it is of that date, the manuscript must have belonged to the Admiral's Men, or perhaps to its leader Alleyn, for whom Hand C also worked.
 - 17 Bernard M. Wagner, "Robert Yarrington", *Modern Language Notes* 45 (1930), 147–8.
 - 18 This view is affirmed by Ioppolo, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts*, with regard to Robert Daborne's dealings with Henslowe in 1614 (34–43).
 - 19 For the hand which added the lengthy new scene 8 of *More* and marked the vellum wrappers of both *More* and *John a Kent*, see T.H. Howard-Hill (ed.), *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More. Essays on the play and its Shakespearian interest* (Cambridge, 1989). William B. Long identified Hand C as the annotator who wrote the date at the end of *John a Kent*, and inscribed Thomas Goodale's name in both *Sir Thomas More* and *2 Seven Deadly Sins*, both of which he saw as linked to Strange's at the Curtain in 1590–93 (48). If on the other hand Beale and Ioppolo are right that the date was 1595, the *John a Kent* manuscript must be an Admiral's play belonging to the period after 1594. See Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood: Authorship, Authority and the Playhouse* (London, 2006), 101.
 - 20 The theories that prompted Kathman's relocation of the 'plot' had different bases. Scott McMillin used the question of doubtful dates to revise his earlier idea about the identity and date(s) of the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript that he set down in *The Elizabethan Theatre and the Book of Sir Thomas More*, where he had argued that both *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and *Sir Thomas More* were played by Strange's Men in 1592–93. Gary Taylor's argument was based on his own re-dating of the *More* additions, and the links between Hand C and Thomas Goodale, whose name never appears in Henslowe's *Diary*.
 - 21 See Gurr, 'The Chimera of Amalgamation', *Theatre Research International* 18 (1993), 85–93, especially 85–6, and *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1996), 59–60, which gives the different calculations by Scott McMillin, David Bradley, and T. J. King for the size of company casts at this time. See McMillin, *The Elizabethan Theatre and the Book of Sir Thomas More* (Ithaca, 1987); Bradley, *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage* (Cambridge, 1992);

- King, *Casting Shakespeare's Plays. London Actors and their Roles, 1590–1642* (Cambridge, 1992).
- 22 His name was recorded three times in the manuscript of *John of Bordeaux*, a sequel to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, in 1590.
 - 23 Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), 2.123.
 - 24 See Gurr, 'The Chimera of Amalgamation', 89.
 - 25 That the bond was made out to affirm the connection between Goodale and Alleyn in 1593 reinforces the likelihood that the early dating for *Sins* and its link with Strange's is the correct one. The Privy Council letter is cited in note 23.
 - 26 For some further discussion of the issue in 1591 that took Alleyn and Strange's to the Rose early in 1592 and set up Pembroke's as a new company, see Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies*, 71–5.
 - 27 He was certainly a King's player in 1603. He was named in Pope's will, and witnessed the will of Phillips, whose sister he married.
 - 28 Steve Rappaport's study of the apprentice ages and regulations, especially in the Carpenter's Guild, in *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge, 1989), 295–324, along with Don McKenzie's detailed lists of printers' apprentices together make an irrefutable argument for apprentices having to be close to seventeen at the youngest before they could be enrolled formally in London. Printing being almost exclusively a London concern, the evidence about the relatively mature starting age of such handicraft apprentices makes the idea of players officially apprenticing their boys in their Livery companies a major anomaly which needs much more careful scrutiny.
 - 29 Steve Rappaport has shown that in London the normal minimum age for entry to an apprenticeship was seventeen, with for instance the majority of entrants to the Carpenters' Guild between 1572 and 1594 starting at between eighteen and twenty years of age (p.295). The Statute of Artifiers, 1563, specified a minimum age of 24 for completion of an apprenticeship (p.324). In an article forthcoming in *Notes and Queries*, Laurence Manley has identified Belt as coming from Norwich and aged sixteen and a half when Heminges took him on as his apprentice. That information fits quite well with Rappaport's evidence.