

integrates these smoothly with her own judicious commentary. Alan Armstrong's review of Thomas Cartelli's *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations* takes the form of an intellectually stimulating counter-argument that is more likely to prompt readers to seek out the book than a lame encomium would have done. Frances Teague not only comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the new Revels Student Edition of *Volpone* but supplies informative details about the textual history of the play and Jonson's career. Other books reviewed in the volume are *Malevolent Nurture: Witch-Hunting and Maternal Power in Early Modern England* by Deborah Willis (reviewed by Carole Levin); *Ben Jonson and Theatre: Performance, Practice and Theory*, a collection of essays edited by Richard Cave, Elizabeth Schafer, and Brian Woolland (Lesley Mickel); and *Introduction to English Renaissance Comedy* by Alexander Leggatt (Nicholas F. Radel).

JAMES HIRSH

Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry, and William Ingram (eds). *English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. Theatre in Europe: A Documentary History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp 714.

Let us begin by recognising that: 'Twenty-three professional theatres ... were built in and around London during the seventy-five years from 1567 to 1642. Probably nothing of the kind had happened in any other city on earth.'<sup>1</sup> Incontestable and still breath-taking, this claim, and others not quite so sweeping, help explain why the book in which they appear is significant. Even specialists might need to be reminded that 'the largest number of documents of control (after those governing performances in times of plague and on Sundays and other religious holidays) ... [are] those relating to the conduct of the playhouses and the acting companies who used them' (92). Similarly, we all should ponder the link Glynne Wickham suggests (135n1) between the decline of (local, English) provincial touring in the 1620s and the rise of the 'more profitable (and safer)' European tour, and William Ingram's observation that 'The number of identifiable persons of rank or standing who were patrons of playing companies in that century [the sixteenth] approached 100' (204).

This large book by three hands is, as all large books by any number of hands are likely to be, intermittently inconsistent. It is unquestionably capacious,

even within its declared limit: *Professional* means that the volume contains no 'comprehensive account of the many dramatic entertainments organised and executed by amateurs on an occasional basis. Nor ... any systematic coverage of the careers of the many outstanding play-makers ['playwrights' to you and me] or their plays during this period' (7). Through human frailty, the volume is inconsistent, and through that same frailty, which is also, any scholar must hope, a strength, the volume is also immensely valuable. This collection pays due acknowledgement to W. W. Greg, E. K. Chambers, G. E. Bentley above all, and to many others – editors of Malone Society volumes and the Malone Society *Collections*, J. R. Dasant, who edited the relevant *Acts* of the Privy Council, and J. T. Murray. Whatever posture we assume when we think of our forebears – eg, standing on the shoulders of giants – this volume will make us all stand up straighter because it has many excellencies, and it is also a splendid teaching tool.

Like Gaul, the book is divided into three parts. The parts are unequal – 'documents of control', the title repeats Chambers' from 1923, is Wickham's special charge (132 pages), 'players and playing' (Ingram's, 131 pages), 'playhouses, 1560–1660' (Berry's, 387 pages). The contents of each part are selected, sometimes edited or corrected, and introduced by the respective scholar. An attractive feature of Ingram's portion is 'A representative life: Augustine Phillips' (191–203), printing numerous hitherto unpublished documents; this 'life' is 'representative' because there is plainly insufficient space to present the surviving documents for the lives of *every* member of the acting profession, much less the lives and documents of all persons known to have been connected with the theatre. Here, E. A. J. Honigmann and Susan Brock's *Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642* (1993), not cited here, is an important supplement. It will be a relief to future students to have all (apparently) of *Rastell v Walton* in one place (229–33). Perhaps the most innovative section is the third, where Berry offers what certainly looks like a comprehensive round-up of documents, in large part legal, concerning each of the twenty-three theatres with which I began. The discussion of the documents related to, and the condensed history of, the first Globe (493–5) are especially good.

Just exactly how each early modern text appears here is not clear. The opening and general claim is that 'the documents selected for inclusion have been transcribed from the original manuscripts or, occasionally, from the first printed edition where this is the primary source ... References are also given in these headings to the principal secondary sources whenever the manuscript in question has already been reputedly transcribed, edited and printed. Spellings and punctuation, however, have been altered (with only a few exceptions

retained to preserve the authenticity of some original documents – most notably the word *Enterlude* and *Interlude* – between 1530 and 1570) to conform with modern usage' (9). This statement of editorial practice is unsatisfactory in many ways, and it ignores contemporary debate over how to edit and present early modern texts.

What, for instance, is 'authenticity'? Why do the editors select the word(s) *Enterlude* and *Inrterlude* for special treatment? What, precisely, is 'modern usage'? What is the purpose of citing 'the principal secondary sources whenever the manuscript in question has already been reputedly transcribed, edited and printed'? 'Modern usage' might explain the universal change here of *then* to *than* where the change conforms to 'modern usage'. Does the omission of 'Emanell' [ie, 'Emanuel', a signifying piety for Puritan-leaning writers] at the head of Edward Alleyn's letter (1593?) to his wife (193, 277)<sup>2</sup> qualify as a 'modernization', or is the word omitted because the editor did not recognise its meaning (unlikely) or decided not to add a footnote (puzzling)? In the same famous letter, how does the reader decide between the Dulwich College manuscript 'm<sup>r</sup> grigs his wif' as it is represented in R. A. Foakes's edition of *Henslowe's Diary*<sup>3</sup> and this volume's 'Mr Griggs, his wife'? No doubt the editors know or suppose that Griggs/ 'grigs' was not on tour with 'my lord stranges players'<sup>4</sup> and that Griggs/'grigs' and his wife were both in London while Alleyn was on tour, but it might be worthwhile to say so, or at least to let Alleyn's letter (now at Dulwich College) openly speak its ambiguity. Finally, what is the purpose of citing recent, twentieth-century, or nineteenth-century, editions of the relevant texts? If one makes a spot-check comparison between the texts here and in a few of 'the principal secondary sources whenever the manuscript in question has already been reputedly transcribed, edited and printed', one finds discrepancies: *was* becomes *were* and ellipses are omitted (25b, 53), a comma is omitted (26b, 55), 'as hapens' becomes 'as happen' (193, cited already). Some, or most, of these changes from the original texts to these edited ones are probably silent, editorial ones, some probably pardonable errors in either the earlier transcriptions or the present ones, but the reader deserves a more thorough explanation of how the original documents have been treated. It should also be stressed that some documents (eg, 46, 47(a), 121–122, 124–28, 169) have never before been transcribed and printed.

Sections and sub-sections are eruditely introduced. In each of the three major divisions (themselves divided into chapters and sub-headed sub-chapters) a continuing narrative and explanatory matrix recounts the nature and origins of the evidence and the evidence's possible relevance to theatrical, cultural, and social history. Kudos to Herbert Berry, who acknowledges what

many of us have felt, the burden of ‘fatiguing legal prose’ (289), excellently explains legal terms (eg., 341), and offers real help with law French (294n2). Here we find, for example, everything from explanations of relatively arcane early modern common law to just who’s who in a law suit, a satiric conflict (eg, Martin Marprelate), or precisely and undemonstratively, where recent scholarship has gone wrong (eg, over the ‘liberties’, at 79). To my ear and eye, commentary in the first two sections is a trifle more helpful than in the third, though the third has outstanding headnotes on each theatre. At times, the editors usefully debate one another (eg, 308n5 or 365n1), and there is generally a scrupulous attempt to inform readers of alternative explanations for the evidence (see, eg, 389n1). The editors have deliberately avoided repeating visual material reproduced in R. A. Foakes’s *Illustrations of the English Stage, 1580–1642* (1985), rightly opting for ‘pictures which can be regarded as documents in their own right because they supplement those printed within the text with additional, visual information or because they add evidence not previously published’ (13).

The volume’s internal reference system – numbers, letters, **bold face**, *italics* – sufficiently complex when it works, is maddening when it does not or when there are errors. For example, 95, 161, advises us to ‘see below’ which is true enough, but we ought, rather, to ‘see’ 97 ‘below’, according to the volume’s conventions; again, under 444, ‘see chapter 36’ (580) is correctly, ‘see chapter XXXVI’. (Roman, **bold**, and *italic* are sometimes inconsistent *passim*.) In the volume’s third section, *C* and *D* followed by italic numbers appear as shorthand in citations of documents transcribed in C. W. Wallace’s *The First London Theatre* (1913); the only explanation of this system appears in the final sentence on 332. Similarly, the reference to ‘when George Gerrard wrote to Lord Wentworth’ (525) will only make sense (and one may only check the reference) if one knows that Gerrard is writing to the Lord Wentworth known to moderns and in the edition of letters here alluded to as the earl of Stafford (see Bibliography, 683, ‘Stafford, the Earl of (Thomas Wentworth)'). ‘Abbreviations’ (xlv–xlvi) includes the howler ‘Huntingdon’ for the magnificent library in San Marino, California, not the county in England; the former is correctly cited, ‘Huntington’, elsewhere (eg, 181 and, happily, in the Index). And there are some unfortunate errors in the naming (and apostrophes) of City companies. By and large, these slips are slips, not serious flaws, and they are probably inescapable in a work of such complexity, as they have proved in mine of much less. A little more distressing is the omission from the Bibliography of some important, or at least relevant, works; given the editors’ erudition and

that at least one of the omitted works is my own, one must assume that the omissions are deliberate and that to name them would be odorous.

At the beginning of this review, I mentioned this volume's value as a teaching tool. A (post-) graduate seminar and I spent three months with this volume in 2002, and we were quite entranced. The histories of individual theatres and the biography-in-documents of Phillips are rich in incidental social history; the legal documents – be they governmental regulations or the remnants of a lawsuit – bring life and nuance to hoary scholarly clichés, and throughout the messy *business* of the theatre is everywhere apparent, a strong corrective to any innocently aesthetic approach to early modern drama and the spaces in which it played. The volume is an excellent source of speculation, learning, and reflection; the volume, were it only less expensive (it is *very* expensive) would be a wonderful teaching device. As it and the market are, it remains a remarkable resource in the library.

A possibly amusing final observation: the index sports this heading, 'Note: search under "London and Environs"; "Playing Companies" ... for individual entries appropriate to those categories.' 'Search' is a web-term; for a Gutenberg-junkie the appropriate word would surely be 'Look'.

A. R. BRAUNMULLER

### Notes

---

- 1 Herbert Berry in Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry, and William Ingram (eds), *English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. Theatre in Europe: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, 2000), 288. Later references to this volume are cited parenthetically.
- 2 Each document or cluster of linked documents is given a **bold face** numeral.
- 3 See R. A. Foakes (ed), *Henslowe's Diary*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, 2002), 276. The first edition of this essential volume is rather cavalierly referred to in the work reviewed as '*Henslowe's Diary* Edited by Foakes and Rickert' (xlv), but the full, correct, reference is in the Bibliography.
- 4 *Henslowe's Diary*, 276.