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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is an attempt to describe the characteristics of Thomas Heywood's dramatic style. The study is divided into three parts. The first deals with the playwright's theatrical career and discusses how his practical experience as actor and sharer might have affected his technique as a dramatic writer. The second part defines the scope of the investigation and contains the bulk of the analysis of Heywood's plays. My approach to the mechanics of playwriting is both practical and theoretical. I have attempted to come to an understanding of the technicalities of Heywood's craftsmanship by studying the changes he made in *Sir Thomas Moore* and in the sources he used for his plays. At the same time, I have tried to comprehend the aesthetic framework within which he worked by referring to the critical ideas of the period and especially to opinions expressed by Heywood himself in *An Apology for Actors* and elsewhere. The third part of the thesis is an application of the findings of Part Two to the problems of authorship in *Fortune by Land and Sea*.

The thesis shows Heywood's emphasis on essentially theatrical qualities such as visual effects and effects which can be obtained by controlling the relationship of the actor to the audience. It also illustrates his rejection of "Aristotelian"
principles of dramatic construction in favour of "rules" derived from the native morality and romance traditions, and shaped by contemporary theatrical conditions. It concludes that Heywood is essentially a didactic artist but one interested in technical experimentation and audience response.
Our Play is new, but whether shaped well
In Act or Seane, Iudge you.

(Epilogue, A Mayden-
head Well lost.)
There are several practical difficulties confronting the student of Thomas Heywood. To begin with, the very length of his career (more than forty years), and the great variety of his writings make it awkward to confine any study to manageable proportions. Furthermore, there is still considerable disagreement about the canon of the playwright's work. Consequently it is impossible to establish a firm chronology for the plays. Only one of the dramas written between 1594 and 1613—*A Woman Killed with Kindness*—can be dated with absolute authority. About virtually every other play ascribed to Heywood during this period there is some uncertainty. Any comparison of the plays on the basis of a conjectural sequence of composition, therefore, rests on a shaky foundation. Closely related to the problem of date is the question of authorship. It is frequently difficult or impossible to know if a work is a collaboration or a revision involving another writer. I have included two plays (*Edward IV*, and *How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad*) in my discussion of dramaturgy although there is a real possibility that Heywood may have had no hand at all in the second and only "a main finger" in the first. Furthermore, *If You Know Not Me* and *1 Fair Maid of the West* have not survived in their original form and it is now almost impossible to reconstruct the author's intentions. Here again,
generalizations based on evidence including these plays are bound to be less reliable than one could wish.

I have taken several decisions in an attempt to minimize the difficulties just described. To begin with, I have limited the study to the years 1594-1613 during which time Heywood was most closely connected with an acting company. Secondly I have confined the rather detailed and technical discussion of chronology and authorship to a bulky appendix. This has enabled me to adopt a hypothetical sequence of composition without overcrowding the main discussion of dramaturgy with extended supporting arguments. Finally, I have chosen to use the 1874 Pearson edition of Heywood's plays to which edition I have referred consistently throughout. Since the plays are often not divided into acts and scenes, I have adopted a convention of citing the volume number in Roman and the page number in Arabic numerals (e.g. 2 Edward IV, I, 162).

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my supervisor, Professor W. A. Armstrong, who has been unfailingly helpful and encouraging.
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PART ONE

THEATRICAL CONDITIONS

The forthright telling of the play's story, the freedom with time and place which lets the dramatist rivet each consecutive link in it, the confidences of the soliloquy, the spell-binding rhetoric, the quick alternation of one interest and one group of figures with another--all this is adaptation to environment and the solving of practical problems.

(H. Granville-Barker, On Dramatic Method, p. 17)
I

COVENANTE SEARVANTE (1594-1599)

Two references to Thomas Heywood in the year 1598 illustrate the multi-faceted nature of his talent. On March 25, the theatrical financier, Philip Henslowe, made the following entry in his record of business transactions with the Admiral's men:

Thomas hawoode came & hiered hime seallfe wth me as a covenante searvante for ij yeares by the Receuenge of ij syngell pence acordinge to the statute of winshester & to beginne at the daye aboue written & not to playe any wher publicke a bowt london not whille thes ij yeares be exspired but in my howsse yf he do then he dothe forfett vnto me the Receuinge of thes ijd fortie powndes & wittnes to this Antony monday wm Borne gabrell spencer Thomas dowton Robart shawe Richard Jonnes Richard alleyn.1

1Henslowe's Diary, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (Cambridge, 1961), p. 241. The term "diary" is not quite accurate to describe Henslowe's account book but it has been so universally employed that I follow the customary usage. Subsequent references will be to the Foakes-Rickert edition but will cite the folio pages.

Sometime after September of that year there appeared a commonplace book by Francis Meres entitled Palladis Tamia. In it the author makes a comparison between the English poets and playwrights and those of the ancient world in which he lists Heywood as one of the best contemporary dramatists writing comedy.2 Together these references establish Heywood

2Palladis Tamia (1598), sig. 283v.
as one of those rare playwrights who combine with literary ability an intimate knowledge of the technical aspects of acting and stage production.

Just how Heywood managed to follow careers as both writer and performer is not clear. He probably arrived in London as early as 1593 after having left Cambridge without taking a degree.³ He may have been no more than twenty⁴ and undoubtedly had no great expectations.⁵


⁴C. J. Sisson ("The Red Bull Company and the Importunate Widow", Shakespeare Survey, 7 (1954), 58-59) cites the depositions taken in 1623 in the Chancery suit of Worth v. Baskerville. There Heywood is described as being "of the age of 49 or thereabouts" and "aged 50 yeares, or neare vpon." Putting, perhaps, too much faith in the accuracy of these documents, Sisson reckons that Heywood was born "soon after October 3, 1573."

⁵A. M. Clark (Thomas Heywood, p. 4) speculates that it was the death of the young scholar's father, Robert Heywood, in February, 1593, that caused him to give up his studies.

There is some evidence that the young man immediately sought to attract a patron. In his Funeral Elegy on James I (1625), Heywood alludes to a time when he was a servant to the Earl of Southampton. Clark conjectures that the reference is to Heywood's first years in London when he was an actor in a company under the Earl's patronage.⁶ Since there
is no record of Southampton ever having had a company of actors, however, it seems more likely to me that Heywood may have been attempting to attract the Earl's favour as a writer.

In 1594 there appeared in the bookshops a fashionably amorous poem entitled Oenone and Paris written by "T. H." As Joseph Quincy Adams points out, the work is a close imitation of Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis having the "same theme of unrequited love, approximately the same plot, the same setting, the same richly ornate style." The poem is without a dedication but contains an interesting epistle "To the Curteous Readers":

Here you haue the first fruits of my indeauors and the Maiden head of my Pen...Apelles haung framed any Worke of woorth, wold set it openlie to the view of all, hiding himself closely in a corner of his Workhouse, to the end, that if some curious and carping fellow came to finde any faulte, he might amend it against the next Market. In the publishing of this little Poem, I haue imitated the Painter.
Adams is certainly justified in identifying the modest T. H. with Thomas Heywood. And although Adams concludes that, like Shakespeare, Heywood may have written unpublished plays before his excursion into amatory verse, I think it equally possible that the young author's original ambition may not have been towards the stage at all.

Whatever the truth of the matter, the earliest positive evidence we have of Heywood's connection with the theatre is an undated entry in Henslowe's diary referring to a loan of thirty shillings to the Admiral's men for "hawodes bocke" (sig. 23). The book involved was almost certainly a play but whether original or complete we cannot say. The payment is one of four recorded in the diary about November or December, 1596, for what might be called "literary expenses."9

A sum paid to Henry Porter suggests that an established dramatist could expect to command at least £5 for a new play. Heywood's "bocke" may consequently have been no more than an act or so of a work on which he was collaborating. On the other hand, the payment of fifty shillings to "by a bocke" might be an additional instalment to Heywood, or it might indicate that the fee for new plays was not as uniform in 1596 as it was later to become. From the limited information available, it is impossible to reach any reliable conclusions about this first recorded dramatic work of the playwright. Both the precise nature of the piece and its title remain unknown.10
Efforts such as those of Clark (Thomas Heywood, p. 10) to identify Heywood's "bocke" as one of the new works produced in the autumn of 1596 do not seem convincing.

Heywood's activities as an actor during these early years are equally obscure. The period of the playwright's association with the Admiral's men from 1596 to the signing of his "contract" in 1598 coincides with a time of retrenchment and reorganization on the part of Edward Alleyn's company. The somewhat fragmentary evidence seems to suggest that several new actors joined the troupe late in 1596.\footnote{Foakes and Rickert argue (Henslowe's Diary, p. xxxvii) that Lawrence Fletcher, Thomas Hunt, and possibly Robert Browne were recruited late in 1596.}

At the same time, Alleyn and his father-in-law, Henslowe, seem to have worked out a new method of theatrical finance. The reason for such financial reorganization can no longer be determined. Nevertheless, the series of entries recorded on folios 22-23 of the diary almost certainly indicate new demands or financial pressures.

The measures Alleyn and Henslowe introduced to establish the company on a firmer footing were upset by a crisis precipitated by developments early in 1597. Sometime prior to July of that year, Francis Langley, owner of the newly-erected Swan theatre, managed to establish a company of actors under the patronage of the Earl of Pembroke in his premises on the South Bank. The sudden emergence of a rival
company just a few hundred yards from the Rose theatre had serious consequences for the Admiral's men. To begin with, at least two members of the latter troupe were lured away by the competing management.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12}The exact date of the departure of Jones and Downton to Pembroke's men is conjectural. Chambers (\textit{The Elizabethan Stage} (Oxford, 1923), II, 150-51) believes they left in February, 1597. Foakes and Rickert, however (\textit{Henslowe's Diary}, p. xxxvii), seem to think that the actors left at the beginning of the autumn season and that it was this defection, along with an unexplained absence of Singer and Towne, which occasioned the recruiting of new talent.

More alarming, the indiscretion of Pembroke's men in producing \textit{The Isle of Dogs} in July brought about the closing of all theatres.

It seemed at first that this closure might be permanent. In a letter of unprecedented vehemence, the Privy Council gave utterance to what appeared to be a final resolution to do away with plays in London altogether:

\begin{quote}
Her Majestie...hathe given direction that not onlie no plaies shalbe used within London or about the citty or in any publique place during this tyme of sommer, but that also those play houses that are erected and built only for suche purposes shalbe plucked downe, namelie the Curtayne and the Theatre nere to Shoreditch...[The Council accordingly commands the justices]to send for the owners of the Curtayne Theatre or anie other common playhouse and injoyne them...forthwith to plucke downe quite the stages, gallories and roomes that are made for people to stand in, and so to deface the same as they maie not be ymploied agayne to suche use.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13}Privy Council Minute, 28 July, 1597, reprinted in \textit{The Elizabethan Stage}, IV, 322-23.
An identical letter was sent to the Justices of Surrey requiring them "to take the like order for the playhouses in the Banckside, in Southwarke or elsewhere in the said county within iiij e miles of London."

On the face of it, this would seem to be the most serious crisis the theatre had yet faced and it may well be that it was about this time that Philip Henslowe was busily journeying to court "a bwt the changinge of ower comysion" (sig. 38). Whatever transpired during the summer months of 1597, the storm seems to have been averted—or at least prevented from falling on the heads of the Admiral's men. Playing resumed in October. The renegades, Jones and Downton, returned to their former fellows bringing with them several of the leading members of Pembroke's men. Furthermore, Francis Langley was unsuccessful in obtaining a licence for the Swan which meant that the Admiral's men were once again unchallenged on the South bank.

The questions of whether or not Heywood was acting with the Admiral's men in 1596-97 and, if so, whether he joined Downton and Jones in their ill-fated sojourn at the Swan, are not easily answered. Some clue to Heywood's role in the company and to his movements prior to March, 1598, may be provided by the series of contracts included in the diary. There are eleven of these agreements dated between 27 July, 1597, and 16 November, 1598. The earliest is an undertaking by Thomas Hearne to play for a salary of five shillings a week for the first year rising to six shillings and eight pence the second. Since the contract specifies wages and is sealed the day before the closing of the theatres, it seems likely that Hearne was employed as a hired man to replace an actor who had left the company (possibly Martin Slater who departed
about July 18.) In August, in spite of the Privy Council Order, Henslowe was confidently rebuilding his company. He hired John Helle on August 3 "to contenew" playing at the Rose which suggests that Helle had previously been a member of the troupe. Helle's contract was to run only "tylle Srafte tid next" or to early March, 1598. On August 6, Henslowe or Alleyn (perhaps in association with Richard Jones), succeeded in persuading Robert Shaw of Pembroke's men that his future was more secure with the Admiral's company than with Langley at the Swan. It is quite possible that the incentive they used was the promise of the position of leading actor and company manager in Alleyn's place since the latter seems to have retired from the stage at about this time. Four days later, another prominent member of Pembroke's, William Borne, signed on with Henslowe, and after he was released from prison on October 8, Gabriel Spenser, yet another leading Pembroke's actor, joined Shaw at the Rose although there is no evidence of a contract. Early in October, the Privy Council prohibition was relaxed and the Admiral's men and the Chamberlain's men were granted licences to resume playing. On October 6, Thomas Downton signed with Henslowe thereby rejoining the company which he and Jones had deserted for Pembroke's on 14 February, 1597.

Now an interesting feature of the contracts so far discussed is that they almost certainly all indicate the beginning or resumption of an association with the company. There are no contracts for members of the Admiral's men who remained with the company when Langley encouraged Pembroke's to move to his theatre. Thomas Towne, Edward Jube, John Singer, James Donstall, and Samuel Rowley, all of whom witnessed
one or more of the new contracts, did not themselves enter into new contractual arrangements with Henslowe prior to the resumption of playing after the Privy Council prohibition. The one possible exception to the above generalization is John Helle who agreed "to conteneu" at the Rose. Since the same words are used in Jones' contract, however, in spite of the fact that Jones had been playing at the Swan, the phrase may mean the very opposite from what it appears to.

On December 8, Alleyn witnessed a contract with William Kendall who was taken on, presumably as a hired man, to play for ten shillings a week in London and five in the country. Ten days later, Henslowe (or Alleyn) acquired James Bristow, probably as an apprentice. In March, John Helle's contract ran out and Henslowe recorded the hiring of Richard Alleyn and Thomas Heywood. The following November, Charles Massey and Samuel Rowley were hired as "covenant servants" completing the transactions recorded by this series of contracts.

The agreements with the last four actors differ significantly from the preceding ones. All of the actors mentioned were previously associated with the Admiral's men, and there is no external evidence that Rowley, Massey, or Alleyn ever left. The three last-named actors were in Frederick and Basilea produced by the Admiral's men as "ne" in June, 1597, when Jones and Downton were playing at the Swan. Furthermore, Rowley witnessed the agreement with John Helle in August, 1597.

A second characteristic of the last three contracts (Massey and Rowley are included in one agreement), is that each actor is referred to as a servant, a term used (or implied) elsewhere only in the contracts with Thomas Hearne and William Kendall who seem pretty clearly to be hired men. Two questions suggest themselves. Does the existence of contracts
for these four actors indicate that they had spent some time with another management as had Jones and Downton? What station did the agreements confer on the actors involved? My own conviction is that Heywood, Alleyn, Massey, and Rowley had all been with the company throughout the period of crisis in 1597, but that their status in the company was that of hired men rather than sharers. The present memoranda record the renewing of their contracts, not a change in status. The agreements were probably entered into on Henslowe's insistence to prevent the kind of defection which plagued the company in February, 1597. Nevertheless, they likely also represented welcome security to the actors in a period of considerable uncertainty.

The company in which Heywood reconfirmed his membership in March, 1598, was therefore the second in London. It was made up of William Bird (or Borne), Gabriel Spenser, Robert Shaw, Richard Jones, Thomas Downton, Edward Juby, Thomas Towne, John Singer, Humphrey Jeffes, Anthony Jeffes,*14 Charles Massey, Samuel Rowley, Thomas Heywood, Richard Alleyn, Thomas Hearne, James Bristow,15 and William Kendall16.

14. The first ten names are included in Henslowe's list of the Admiral's men made about December, 1597 (sig. 43V).

15. Listed in Henslowe's memoranda (sig. 233-31).

The relationship of these various actors to one another and to Henslowe has been lengthily but inconclusively debated. Attempts to draw distinctions between the actors solely on the basis of their financial involvement with the company have been generally unsuccessful.¹⁷ This is particularly true of that group of intermediate actors such as Samuel Rowley whose authority in the company seems to have exceeded their financial responsibility. At present, it would be rash to make more than rough distinctions between four classes of actors. The first, which I would call master actors, includes those who were invariably referred to as "Mr." in the plots and whose names most frequently appear in acknowledgements of indebtedness, or in entries authorizing payments. This group includes Singer, Jones, Towne, Borne, Juby, Downton and either Edward Alleyn or Gabriel Spenser. A second group of "journeymen actors" includes those who sometimes authorize payments or acknowledge a debt but who are never (or rarely) referred to as "Mr." in the plots. These are Richard Alleyn, Samuel Rowley, Charles

¹⁷These attempts have been concerned primarily with reconciling the use of the term "Mr." in the dramatic plots, and in the various contracts and lists of actors' names in Henslowe's diary. In his edition of the diary (1904-08), W. W. Greg concluded that the plots could not be used to distinguish between sharers and hired men (Diary, I, 103). Chambers seemed to agree with this assumption in his discussion of the company in The Elizabethan Stage (1923). By the time Greg came to write his commentary to Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses (1931), however, he had become convinced that the term "Mr." did, in fact, invariably indicate a sharer and had persuaded Chambers to his view. (I, 35, note 1). R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert recapitulate the argument in the introduction to their edition of Henslowe's Diary (1961) and suggest that there may have been an intermediate position between sharer and hired man which they call master actor (Diary, p. xxxix).
Massey, Thomas Hunt, Anthony Jeffes and Humphrey Jeffes. It is these actors who are most difficult to fit into any consistent theory dividing sharers from non-sharers. A third group of "adult actors" includes men who have no apparent responsibilities apart from acting, and who are never referred to by the term "Mr." Among these latter are Thomas Hearne, William Kendall, and Thomas Heywood. A fourth group would include most, if not all, of the boy actors and possibly also those gatherers, stage-hands, tailors, and wardrobe-keepers who were recruited from time to time to swell a scene. Although these different groups are not clearly distinct, they represent roughly the stages in an actor's career from a position of no responsibility, artistic or fiscal, through intermediate stages of responsibility to a position which includes both artistic and financial power. Heywood's status in the company at this time was almost certainly that of what I have called an "adult actor" without any administrative responsibilities.

The relationship of the company to Henslowe is more difficult to determine. Not a few commentators, including one of the most recent, allude to Henslowe in terms which imply that the artistic policies pursued by the Admiral's men were imposed on them by their financial backer. But this is surely a fundamental misconception. It is true, of course, that in the double capacity of landlord and banker, Henslowe would have been in a position to exert considerable influence on manage-
ment decisions. The contracts describe the actors as being bound to Henslowe personally rather than to the company as a whole, and it is quite likely that he had some say in the composition of the troupe. 19

19. The arrangement is comparable to the one between Langley and Pembroke's men at the Swan. (See Elizabethan Stage, II, 131-133 and I, 368, note 3). Langley apparently released some of the actors from their contractual obligations to him and then sued the others when they could not perform with a reduced company. There is no evidence that Henslowe ever interfered in this way with the Admiral's men. Nevertheless, after the death of Gabriel Spenser, he wrote to Alleyn asking for his son-in-law's "cownsell" which suggests that he was faced with the problem of replacing the actor and was contemplating taking Alleyn's advice instead of that of the sharers. But this is pure speculation.

On the other hand, company payments were almost always authorized by one of the actors which would seem to prove that artistic policy was in the hands of the sharers. 20 Furthermore, there is evidence that the actors deliberately sought to tighten their control over policy and expenditures. Of ninety-eight payments to authors recorded in the diary for the period October, 1597, to November, 1598, only twenty-eight are authorized by one of the men who would subsequently have to

20. There is slight evidence that Henslowe's influence may have extended into the area of literary management. On February 9, 1599/1600 William Birde acknowledged receipt of thirty shillings from Henslowe for "a new booke to will: Boyle cald Jurguth... if yoU dislike Ile repaye it back" (sig. 67v). This may have been a private purchase on Henslowe's part, but it is entered among the company's debts and suggests that Henslowe may have exercised some sort of veto power. On the whole, however, the evidence of the diary does not warrant the assumption, sometimes made, that the Admiral's men's policy during these years was dictated by a grasping businessman.
assume responsibility for the debt. Beginning in December, however, there is a dramatic change. Thereafter 75% of payments made to playwrights are authorized, usually by a sharer. Indeed this figure is low, since many of the advances made by Henslowe alone are instalments on plays that have been given prior approval. A similar change is observable in the entries recording payments for production expenses. The significance of this, surely, is that it was the company, represented by the sharing actors, not Henslowe, who determined artistic and financial policy.

Thomas Heywood's influence on the management of the Admiral's men at this time was undoubtedly slight. His name is nowhere recorded as authorizing payments for either literary or production expenses and the sums paid to him for his two plays written in these years (War Without Blows and Joan as Good as My Lady) had to be approved respectively by Robert Shaw and Thomas Downton. It is unlikely that he had any more control over the working conditions prevailing at the Rose theatre. All the evidence points towards a production schedule which must have imposed rigorous demands on all members of the company. Indeed, so strenuous was the life of the actor that is is more than likely that the writer had little time to develop. If Heywood's comparatively slight output during this time is a reflection of his involvement in the practical aspects of production, that involvement was to have important consequences in later years. For the playwright's understanding of pragmatic dramaturgy and his awareness of the importance of visual effects in the theatre were to be put to good use in his subsequent career.
A reasonably clear insight into Heywood's life at this time can be obtained from a study of Henslowe's diary and the extant dramatic plots of the period. Of these latter, Frederick and Basilea and The Battle of Alcazar are particularly instructive.\textsuperscript{21} The first almost certainly dates from June, 1597, and the second probably from the winter season of 1601-02. Although neither play was likely produced at the Rose during the term of Heywood's contract, they are nevertheless fairly reliable evidence of the practices of the time.

Perhaps the most interesting conclusion that can be drawn from the plots is that the distinctions we have made between various categories of actors seem not to be reflected in the actual casting of the plays. Evidence for this is provided by a comparison of the acting load of the master-sharers and other actors in the two plays. Of the four individuals who seem unquestionably to have been sharers in 1597-1600 (Edward Alleyn, John Singer, Thomas Towne, and Edward Juby), Alleyn and Towne had single leading roles in both productions, Singer appeared in neither and Edward Juby played a principal role in 'Frederick and Basilea' but doubled two

\textsuperscript{21}A full discussion of these plots is to be found in W. W. Greg's \textit{Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses} (Oxford, 1931). According to Greg, the plots were "prepared for the guidance of actors and others in the playhouse to remind those concerned when and in what characters they were to appear, what properties were required, and what noises were to be made behind the scenes" (p. 3). Frederick and Basilea was produced as "ne" on June 3, 1597, and there seems to be no reason to doubt that the extant plot was prepared for the first production. The Battle of Alcazar is much older, but the plot that has come down to us is of a revival produced some time between August, 1597 and November, 1601. These limits are set by the date of Robert Shaw's joining the company and that of Richard Alleyn's death.
smaller roles in *Alcazar*. Of the group which I have called journeymen actors (Richard Alleyn, Charles Massey, Samuel Rowley, and Thomas Hunt), Massey and Rowley had single roles in *Frederick and Basilea* and doubled two and five roles respectively in *Alcazar*. Alleyn and Hunt between them played nine roles in the first play and five in the second. The adult actors with the company included Edward Dutton, Robert Ledbetter and Black Dick. Dutton had a single role in *Frederick and Basilea* and the other two played ten roles between them.

What is significant about these facts is that they throw into doubt any theory which would suggest a rigid hierarchy in the company and a corresponding distribution of roles whether on the basis of "lines" or seniority. The evidence of the plots suggests a company of extremely versatile actors rather than one of narrow specialists.

A similar conclusion seems inescapable from a tentative casting of those extant plays produced at the Rose between 1598 and 1600.

---

22. The most extreme of such theories is that of T. W. Baldwin, advanced in *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (Princeton, 1927), p. 176-8. Baldwin argues that hired men never played major roles and that sharers were cast according to type or what he called "lines". These arguments have been very successfully refuted, in my opinion, by Bernard Beckerman in *Shakespeare at the Globe 1599-1609* (New York, 1962), pp. 134-7.

23. There is reasonable evidence to suggest that six extant plays (*Massacre at Paris, Two Angry Women of Abington, The Shoemakers' Holiday, I Sir John Oldcastle, Patient Grissell,* and *Old Fortunatus*) were produced at the Rose during Heywood's career as an actor and that another four (*The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon* and *The Death of*
Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, Englishmen for My Money and Look About You) may have been. Since no plots survive for any of these plays, casting must necessarily be conjectural. I have adopted two principles which seem to underlie the casting in the plots which have survived. The first is to double as extensively as possible in order to keep the company small. The second (not invariably followed in the plots) is to allow at least one scene for a costume change between two appearances of the same actor in different roles. My casting figures suggest that the Admiral's men consisted of about twenty active men and boy actors and another ten to twelve "extras" who may have been recruited from the ranks of the gatherers, stage hands, and young boy apprentices.

These plays reveal a change in the ratio of actors to speaking roles in the years under discussion. D. M. Bevington describes how a trend towards less doubling for the leading player and his chief associates together with more doubling of minor roles can be seen in the two or three decades before 1590.24 Something of the same tendency is evident in the Rose plays from 1587 to 1600. In the eighties the largest ratio is thirteen actors to twenty-three roles in Orlando. Between 1594 and 1597 it is eighteen to twenty-three (John a Kent and Humorous Day's Mirth) and between 1598 and 1600 it is fourteen to fourteen (Two Angry Women).25


25 The exceptions to this trend which include Fortunatus (19/30), Robin Hood (20/40), and Oldcastle (21/59) might be considered to be somewhat old fashioned.
The extent to which an actor such as Heywood might benefit from the slightly discernible trend we have been discussing would depend upon the opportunities available to him to play leading roles, and the length of time devoted to rehearsal. While there is nothing to suggest that Heywood often escaped the burden of doubling, the records may indicate that the company spent slightly more time in the preparation of their productions during the years 1598-1600. In that time, the Admiral's men presented three winter, and three spring seasons at the Rose interrupted only by the usual breaks at Lent and in the summer. In the absence of daily records of performances, it is impossible to be dogmatic about the length of seasons or the company's repertoire during these years. I have followed Greg in postulating seasons from October 11, 1597 to March 4, 1598; April 2 to July 8, 1598; July 29, 1598 to February 24, 1599; March 26 to June 3, 1599; October 6, 1599 to February 10, 1600; and March 9 to July 13, 1600 (Diary, II, 94). In Henslowe's diary enable us to identify some of the new productions staged between October, 1597, and July, 1600. This evidence suggests a somewhat less hectic production schedule than that in effect during the years 1595-97. In the earlier period, the company produced thirty-seven new productions in eighty-eight weeks or about one every two-and-a-half weeks. During the latter period (1597-1600), we have evidence for the production of only thirty-four plays in approximately one hundred and twelve weeks or a little better than one a month.
The figure would be more impressive if we could be certain that all of the new productions are traceable in the diary. But we cannot. Indeed there is independent evidence that four plays purchased during this time (The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon, A Woman Will Have Her Will, The Gentle Craft, and I Sir John Oldcastle) were almost certainly staged in spite of the fact that no production expenses are recorded for them.

There are also signs that the standard of production may have been rising at this time. In the years before 1598, the average number of performances of a play increased from two-and-a-half in the spring season of 1595 to six-and-one-third in the spring of 1597.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEASON</th>
<th>WEEKS</th>
<th>&quot;NE&quot;</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AV. PERF.</th>
<th>MOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1595</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1595-96</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1596-97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1597</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time plays tended to be kept in the repertoire slightly longer. The maximum number of performances in the spring of 1595 was five compared to twelve in the spring of 1597. Altogether these trends suggest that the company may have been trying to overcome some of the more glaring disadvantages of the repertory system. Whatever improvement may have been made in rehearsal conditions, however, these latter remained very far from ideal. The closely coordinated productions of the modern theatre which are the result of weeks of painstaking preparation would have been quite beyond the resources of the Admiral's men.
Rehearsal periods at the Rose theatre varied greatly. The longest time recorded was fifty-eight days and the shortest, five. It is possible that the extra-long rehearsals were caused by special circumstances. For example, the fifty-eight day period mentioned above stretched from December 14, 1594, to February 11, 1595, during which time the company gave three performances at court and were probably bending much of their energy to that end. A second protracted rehearsal period of forty-nine days occurs between November 15, 1595, and January 3, 1596, when the theatre seems to have been closed on thirteen playing days (although two of these may actually have been Sundays if Henslowe's dates are wrong). This interruption of playing may have been occasioned by trouble in the company or by plague. In this instance, at any rate, their obligations at court did not interfere with their service to the public since the new production, when it did open, had its premiere two days after one court performance and the day before another.

The shorter rehearsal periods are perhaps more significant in showing the company's remarkable resources. The troupe could, on occasion, mount two new productions in a single calendar week. Even more surprising, they could apparently revive old plays almost at any time. On July 11, 1596, the company gave what appears to have been a single Sunday performance of Bellendon which they had not played since

29Pethageros, presented as "ne" on January 16, 1596, was followed six days later by another new production entitled The 2 wecke (sig. 14-14v).
November 15, 1594. It was the tenth of eleven consecutive performances following the opening of Paradox on July 1 and came exactly one week before the first performance of the Tynker of Totnes. If extra rehearsals for this revival were required, it is difficult to see where they could have been squeezed in. This particular example is not conclusive because it appears in the middle of some puzzling alterations of Henslowe's usual method of making entries. But the same mysterious

30The entries run July 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 after which they begin again with July 4, 5, 7, 8, 9. As they stand, the figures show two performances on July 5, 7, and 8, which seems extremely unlikely although I cannot see how the dates can otherwise be explained (sig. 21v).

capacity to revive old productions seemingly without preparation is demonstrated frequently in the diary. For example, on November 29, 1595, the company gave a single performance of The Welche Man which is untraceable earlier. It is not improbable that these revivals were staged as a result of particular requests like that made to the Lord Chamberlain's men by the Essex conspirators. It is virtually certain that they reflect the company's desire to woo the public, possibly by capitalizing on current events.

However this extraordinary flexibility of programming was achieved, it can hardly have made the actor's life more tranquil. Indeed all the evidence in the diary points to a thoroughly exhausting production schedule. Not only were the performers called upon to revive old productions with very little notice, but they may also have had to begin rehearsals on unfinished scripts. Another requirement of the
Gownes, 'a gerken and payer of hosse' and 'divers things' were purchased for II 2 Angry Women of Abengton between January 31, and February 12, 1599 although the final payment to Porter was not made until the last date (sig. 53-53v).

repertory system which would have complicated Heywood's life as an actor was the need to keep a large number of plays in constant readiness. During the years between 1595 and 1597, the Admiral's men maintained the ratio of new plays to old at about one to two. In other words, an average bill would include one-third new productions and two-thirds revivals or repetitions of works from the past six months or so. In any particular season, an actor such as Heywood could expect to perform somewhere between seventeen and thirty plays of which six to ten would be new. Since a performer of Heywood's rank might have two or three roles in every production, the young dramatist would have had to have close to one hundred parts committed to memory at all times!

The duties imposed on Heywood at the Rose may or may not have been heavier than those borne by Shakespeare at the Theatre or the Curtain. On the whole, however, the evidence suggests to me that the aspiring dramatist may have found the necessity of performing regularly was preventing him from writing. It may be that after a year or so with the Admiral's men at the Rose, Heywood began to look about for ways in which he could exercise his writing talent more freely.
Heywood's contract bound him until March 24, 1600 to act "no wher publicke a bowt london...but in [the Rose theatre]". At that time, presumably, he would be free to continue his association with the Admiral's men or to follow his theatrical career elsewhere. There are indications, however, that the playwright may have left the Rose well before his agreement with Henslowe expired. The lack of any reference to Heywood in Henslowe's accounts from February 1599 to March 1600 strongly suggests a parting of the ways. That suggestion is practically confirmed by other events.

On August 28, 1599, two plays entitled "the ffirst and Second parte of Edward iiij" were entered in the Stationers' Register. The two-part play unquestionably contains work by Heywood and consequently establishes some kind of link between the dramatist and the Earl of Derby's men who, according to the title page of the published work, performed the play.¹ As A. M. Clark points out, there was nothing in Heywood's contract which explicitly prevented him from writing for other companies², but

¹For a full discussion of Heywood's connection with this play see Appendix 1.

²Thomas Heywood, p. 13.
logic would seem to dictate that a dramatist who is also a salaried actor would sell his work to the company that paid his wages.  

3Depositions by Roger Clarke and John King in the Chancery suit of Worth vs. Baskerville (P.R.O. C 24/500/9 and 103) show that the salary of a hired man in 1623 varied according to the weekly takings. King claimed that after thirty years in the theatre he had lost £100 in salary as a result of such reductions. If Heywood's salary was also subject to such fluctuations, he is unlikely to have contributed to the repertory of a rival company. See C. J. Sisson, "The Red Bull Company and the Importunate Widow", Shakespeare Survey, 7, 59.

It seems highly probable to me, therefore, that sometime early in 1599 (possibly during the cessation of playing in Lent), Heywood left the Admiral's company to seek his fortune elsewhere. 4 Whatever his precise movements were at this time, however, it is certain that he was caught up in the sequence of shifting alliances which profoundly affected the English theatre at the turn of the century.

(a) Derby's Men 1599-1601

In order to understand the choices open to an ambitious actor-playwright such as Thomas Heywood, it is necessary to review the highly volatile state of the theatre during the years just before and just after
1600. Glynne Wickham, in his immensely valuable study, *Early English Stages*, has described this period as one of crisis during which the shape of the English commercial theatre as we know it was determined.5

It was a time during which the interlocking rivalries of actors, financiers, theatre owners, City aldermen, and Privy Councilors reached such a pitch that they provoked physical violence and ultimately required the direct intervention of the Queen herself. The one thing which seems to emerge most clearly from the still-confused picture of the theatrical machinations of the time is that the drama was more than an idle pastime. To the successful, it offered immense rewards of wealth and prestige.6

It is not surprising, therefore, that the political, financial, and legal infighting that went on at the time was devious and savage.


6Students of this period of dramatic history are greatly indebted to the researches of Professor C. J. Sisson, whose discovery of several Chancery suits has cast much new light on the nature of the Boar's Head theatre and on the activities of actors who played there. Professor Sisson's work has been published posthumously (*The Boar's Head Theatre* (London, 1972), edited by Stanley Wells). Professor Herbert Berry ("The Playhouse in the Boar's Head Inn, Whitechapel", *The Elizabethan Theatre*, ed. David Galloway (London, 1969), pp. 45-73), has examined much of the material discovered by Sisson and in some cases arrived at different conclusions. The picture which emerges, while still not wholly clear, is certainly much brighter than existed when Chambers and Clark were writing.
The situation of the London theatres in 1599 was made extremely unstable by the sudden concatenation of several significant events. The most alarming of these, as Wickham suggests, was the apparent determination of the Privy Council to limit the number of approved adult companies in London to two and to confine those companies to a single theatre each.7

Although it is possible, as Wickham demonstrates, to doubt the sincerity of some of these orders (especially the sweeping condemnation of 1597), it is very likely that the Council itself was split on the issue. While the vacillation reflected in the various missives may have been Machiavellian, therefore, it may just as easily have been the result of prolonged and vigorous lobbying. One of the clearest indications of the subtlety of the Council debates on the subject of the theatres is provided by a marginal note by Thomas Smith in the Privy Council order of June 22, 1600. Smith records that 'the alteracion and interlyning of this order was by reason that the said order after the same was entred in the Booke came againe in question and debate and the said interlyninge and amendmentes were sett downe according to the laste determinacion of their Lordships.'8

One significant passage which was deleted as a result of this second debate reads, "[since] the said Companie of Plaiers being the Seruant of
the L. Chamberlen that are to plaie there haue made choise of the house called the Globe yt is ordered that the said house and none other shall be there allowed."9 It requires only a very limited familiarity with

9Ibid., pp. 82-83.

the ways of committees to recognize the import of this change. By making the order less specific the Council has provided a loophole through which the other Bankside theatre owners (Philip Henslowe and Francis Langley) could squeeze. In fact neither the Rose nor the Swan was pulled down as a result of this order although there were clearly members of the Privy Council who desired that they should have been.

If the political climate was uncomfortably warm for theatre owners, it was getting considerably hotter for actors as well. In the winter of 1599, the Paul's boys began performing after an absence of nearly 10 years from the theatrical scene. The following year they were joined by the Children of the Chapel who moved to a new private theatre in Blackfriars. The effect of this novel competition on the adult companies is attested to by Rosencrantz's familiar reference to the "little eyasses."10 As if to complicate the rivalry still further,

10Hamlet. Do they [ie. the city tragedians] hold the same estimation they did when I was in the city? Are they so followed? Ros. No, indeed they are not. Ham. How comes it? Do they grow rusty? Ros. Nay, their endeavour keeps in the wonted pace: but there is, sir, an aery of children, little eyases, that cry out on the top of question, and are most tyrannically clapped for't: these are now
the fashion, and so berattle the common stages, - so they call them, - that many wearing rapiers are afraid of goose quills, and dare scarce come thither. (Hamlet, II, ii)

the adult companies themselves began to engage in stiffer competition. Late in 1600, Edward Alleyn returned to the Admiral's men and brought with him to the Fortune a number of the plays in which he had triumphed in the mid-nineties. It is more than likely that Alleyn's return to the stage was occasioned in part by the success of Paul's and the encroachment of the Chamberlain's men on the Bankside territory formerly the more-or-less exclusive preserve of the Admiral's. The shifting of locations by the two leading adult companies (Chamberlain's from Middlesex to their new Globe in Surrey by September, 1599; Admiral's from the Rose to the new Fortune in Finsbury by the beginning of 1601) was probably followed by an attempt on the part of each company to appeal to a particular segment of the London audience possibly by featuring a distinctive repertory. This jockeying for advantage in

11 The number of revivals mounted by the Admiral's men after Alleyn's return suggests a deliberate decision to provide a certain kind of action-melodrama.

the rich entertainment business was made still more complicated by the appearance in February, 1598, of a mysterious "third company" of adult actors. There had long been more than two companies in London and at times there may have been as many as four or five. But during the 90's, the Chamberlain's and Admiral's men established their supremacy, and by 1598 their de facto dominance of the London theatrical world was given
official sanction. On 19 February of that year, the Privy Council noted that "licence hath bin graunted unto two companies of stage players retaind unto us, the Lord Admyral and Lord Chamberlain." But, the

12 Privy Council Minute, reprinted in The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 325.

minute goes on to say, "there is also a third company who of late (as wee are informed) have by waie of intrusion used likewise to play...Wee have therefore thought good to require you uppon receipt heereof to take order that the aforesaid third company may be suppressed and none suffered heereafter to plaie but those two formerlie named." What is

13 Ibid., p. 325.

significant about the minute is not only the express resolution of the Council but also the rather shadowy nature of the body of actors defying the government authority. It is with this third group--the actors,

14 The "third company" may have been the remnant of Pembroke's playing at the Swan without a licence (see Langley's deposition to the Court of Chancery 24 November, 1597, quoted by C. W. Wallace in "The Swan and the Earl of Pembroke's Servants," Englische Studien, XLIII (1911), 351). Or it may have been Derby's men playing somewhere under Robert Browne.
financiers, and property holders whom the Council was seeking to squeeze out of the lucrative London theatrical market—that Heywood now becomes associated.

The evidence of Heywood's hand in *Edward IV*, the performance of that play by Derby's men sometime in 1599, the connection of Robert Browne with the latter company as payee for court performances on 3 and 5 February, 1600, and the tangled relationship of Browne with Samwell at the Boar's Head in 1599 and later, all suggest to me that Heywood had severed his connections with Henslowe by about March, 1599. I think it likely that at approximately that time, Robert Browne was negotiating with Samwell to obtain a suitable theatre close to the city but some distance from the centres of rival activity on the Bankside and in Finsbury. Browne was undoubtedly attempting to emulate Alleyn as an actor-manager and to carve for himself a share of the potentially large London profits. To do that he needed a company, a theatre, a popular repertory, and a licence to play. The company he seems to have gathered and bound to him by the summer of 1599.¹⁵ His complicated financial investment in the Boar's Head had also begun by this time. I think he probably enticed Heywood to join him as a resident dramatist, possibly by offering him a share. All that remained by mid-1599 was to obtain approval from the Privy Council to operate a third adult company in the city.

The involved activities of the period between the summer of 1599 and 31 March, 1602, seem to me to be best explained in terms of an intense competition for the position of the "third company" in London. The opposition between the pro-theatre and anti-theatre factions at court and in the city was further muddled by the internecine rivalries between those who wanted two companies and those who were maneuvering for the licensing of a third.\textsuperscript{16} At least four noblemen (the Earls of Pembroke, Derby, Worcester and Oxford) seem to have been involved in the intriguing along with the financiers Langley, Browne, and, of course, the ever-resourceful Henslowe. In September, 1599, the Globe opened on the South bank. Thomas Platter reported seeing \textit{Julius Caesar} there on the twenty-first of that month and about the same time he attended a play at a theatre in Bishopsgate "not far from [his] inn" which must have been the Curtain.\textsuperscript{17} He makes no mention of the Rose, Swan, or

\textsuperscript{16}It seems to me an oversimplification of the question to suggest that all of the opponents of the stage were at the Guildhall and all of its supporters in the court. The Privy Council letter of 9 March, 1600 to Sir Drew Drewry (\textit{Elizabethan Stage}, IV, 326-27) quite specifically orders that "no theatre or plaiehowse be built." It is apparently only in response to a petition from the inhabitants of Finsbury sometime in March or early April, 1600, that the Council approves the building of the Fortune. (\textit{Ibid.}, 328-29)

\textsuperscript{17}Reprinted and translated by Chambers in \textit{The Elizabethan Stage}, II, 365.
Boar's Head, but comments that "every day at two o'clock in the afternoon in the city of London two and sometimes three comedies are performed, at separate places...and whichever does best gets the greatest audience." 18

18Ibid., p. 365. That Platter is referring exclusively to public theatres seems to be indicated by his description of the seating.

Platter's remarks are interesting because they confirm the existence of a third company and the highly competitive nature of the profession. They are also intriguing because they suggest that the Curtain was taken over by another company almost as soon as the Chamberlain's men left it for the Globe. 19

19It is possible, of course, that both performances were by the Chamberlain's men, one before their move and one after it. The passage seems to imply that the visit to Bishopsgate was later than that to the South bank, however, and consequently to a different company.

The identity of the Curtain company is a puzzle because evidence from the Chancery suits which Sisson has uncovered indicates that probably in the autumn and certainly by December, a company was acting at the Boar's Head with Robert Browne for which theatre they had a licence for that winter. Browne's company was almost certainly Derby's men who appeared at court on February 3 and 5, 1600. 20 All the evidence

20The case is complicated by the fact that Derby, Pembroke, and Worcester all seem to have had companies about this time. Sisson seems to make no distinction between the three and Berry thinks that
Derby's and Worcester's alternated at the Boar's Head, one travelling to the provinces while the other acted in London. The relationship between the actors, Robert Browne, and the various patrons is not at all clear.

would seem to suggest that Heywood was a member of Derby's at the Boar's Head and that two of the plays in the repertory (possibly the two presented at Court) were 1 and 2 Edward IV.

During 1600, several developments in the struggle for a place in the theatrical sun were to have their effect on Heywood. On 7 November, 1599, Francis Langley, financier of the Swan, had acquired the lease of the Boar's Head Theatre. Langley's shift of interest away from the South bank of the Thames suggests that he had abandoned the Swan as a viable theatre. This impression is reinforced by the fact that the theatre was licensed for the showing of various "feates of great activity" by a Peter Bromvill on 15 May, 1600, and that sometime after that date Langley sold the property. The legal ambiguities of Langley's title to a share in the proceeds of the Boar's Head theatre provoked him to a series of physical and legal assaults on Samwell, Browne, and Woodlif which were seriously to jeopardize the success of the theatre. Elsewhere, the Curtain was still being used in March, 1600, when William Hawkins was apprehended for purse snatching there.
On April 8 of that year, however, the Privy Council letter to the Justices of Middlesex implies that it may have acquired a new status. In allowing the erection of the Fortune, the Council gives as one reason that "an other howse is [to be] pulled downe in steade of yt." Two months later, it makes clear that the theatre that is to be "ruined and plucked down" is not the Rose, as we might expect, but the Curtain.

The statement is remarkable for the light it sheds on the strength of the Henslowe-Alleyn lobby. For not only have the Fortune-Rose partisans succeeded in preventing the Rose from being disallowed, they have apparently been able to arrange for the suppression of a rival house close to their new enterprise. Against this kind of influence, it

Another possible interpretation which I shall explore later is that Henslowe had by this time somehow acquired a financial interest in the Curtain.
would seem that the combined expenditures of Samwell for "suits at court to uphold playing in the said house [the Boar's Head] which came to much money"\textsuperscript{26} and the personal prestige of the Earle of Derby were of no avail.

\textsuperscript{26}Deposition of Robert Browne in Chancery dated July, 1603 (P.R.O. C24/304/27) quoted by C. J. Sisson, \textit{The Boar's Head Theatre}, p. 72.

The Council order is uncompromisingly explicit in its intention to limit London companies to two and to suppress "stage plaies...in any Common Inn...in or neare about the Cittie."\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Elizabethan Stage,} IV, 331.

It may be about this time that Lady Derby wrote to her uncle Robert Cecil as follows:

being importuned by [my husband] to intreat your favor that his man Browne, with his companye, may not be bared from the accustomed plaing, in maintenance wherof they have consumde the better part of ther substance...I could desier that your furderance might be a meane to uphold them, for that my Lord, taking delite in them, it will kepe him from more prodigall courses."\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{28}Hatfield MXX xiii, 609 quoted \textit{Elizabethan Stage,} II, 127.

One wonders whether the persuasive Lady Derby may have derived
her arguments from Cicero via Thomas Heywood who some years later in

*An Apology for Actors* cites the original:

> Content thee Cesar, there bee many heads busied & bewitched with these pastimes now in Rome, which otherwise would be inquisitive after thee and thy greatness. (sig. D).

The example may well have been a commonplace. But Heywood's subsequent comment in *An Apology* looks almost like a veiled allusion to the incident. "Such was likewise the opinion", he writes,

> of a great statesman of this land, about the time that certaine bookes were called in question. (sig. D)

Whether as a result of Cecil's intervention or not, Derby's men continued to play at the Boar's Head throughout 1600 and 1601. The precise nature of the Boar's Head company, however, becomes increasingly confusing. Sometime during the summer or early autumn of 1600 Robert Browne sued the sharers for breaking the bonds whereby they had agreed to play only at the Boar's Head. In the Michaelmas term (after September 29) Thomas Heywood and John Duke with four unnamed fellow sharers exhibited a Bill in Chancery against Browne stating their side of the case.29 The outcome of the disagreement is unknown since the case was

---

29 Information about this case is contained in a number of Chancery decrees (P.R.O. C33/101 ff. 573, 611, 643, 648, 735, 798 and C33/102 ff. 577v, 616, 648v, and 797v.) The entries were discovered by Sisson who refers to them without quoting from them in "The Red Bull Company and the Importunate Widow," *Shakespeare Survey*, 7 (1954), p. 67. Sisson states that Heywood and Duke are sharers in the Earl of Worcester's players but his failure at other times to distinguish carefully between the various companies using the Boar's Head theatre makes this identification suspect. Unfortunately there are no photocopies of the first six decrees among Professor Sisson's papers at the University of London and the original volume is so badly damaged that it cannot be examined at the Public Record Office. The four decrees which I have examined do not refer to the company by name.
dismissed on June 28, 1601, as being outside the jurisdiction of the court.

The personnel of the "third company" is difficult to determine. Only three actors, Browne, Heywood, and Duke are known by name. Heywood and Duke may well have joined Derby's together since Duke was with Chamberlaine's men until 1598.\(^{30}\) With the difficulties and inconveniences brought about by Langley's forcible invasions of the Boar's Head theatre in December, 1599, however, the two actors may have looked around for more secure employment. By June, 1600, the Privy Council order makes it apparent that the Earl of Derby may not be able to protect his actors. It may also be about this time that the Earl of Worcester forms a London company. By September, 1600, Heywood and Duke have broken with Browne and are being sued for breaking their agreement to play at the Boar's Head. It seems plausible to me that the two actors moved away to form the nucleus of a new company under the Earl of Worcester at the Curtain.

Of the two competing companies, Derby's appears to have been the strongest at this time, performing at Court on December 3 and 6, 1601, for the second year in a row. In contrast, Worcester's may have run into trouble with the Privy Council if, in fact, they are the "certain players" condemned in a letter of May 10, 1601, to the Justices of Middlesex. "We do understand," the letter reads,

that certaine players that do use to recyte their playes at the Curtaine in Moorefieldes do repre-
sent upon the stage in their interludes the persons of some gentlemen of good desert and quailty that are yet alive under obscure manner, but yet in such sorte as all the hearers may take notice both of the matter and the persons that are meant thereby. This beinge a thinge very unfitte,...wee do hereby require you that you do forthwith forbidd those players to whomsoever they appertaine.31

31Elizabethan Stage, IV, 332.

If the offending company was indeed the Earl of Worcester's men, it seems unlikely that the Council would have been ignorant of the fact. On the other hand, Heywood's reference to satire in An Apology for Actors, dedicated some years later to the Earl, could almost be a direct reference to the incident.

Now to speake of some abuse lately crept into the quality, as inveighing against the state, the court, the law, the citty, and their governments, with the particularizing of private men's humors (yet alive) noble-men, and others: I know it distastes many; neither do I any way approve it, nor dare I by any meanes excuse it.32

32An Apology for Actors, sig. G3v.

Is it conceivable that Heywood, as the playwright least guilty of satire, may have been offering an apology on behalf of the company for a past indiscretion?
During the second half of 1601, Worcester's men may have undergone some reorganization, for during the Christmas festivities of 1601-2 it is that company which appears at Court, and Heywood and Kempe are the payees. Kempe had returned from the continent by September, 1601, and he probably joined Worcester's at that time. Another administrative change may have been brought about by a final agreement on the part of the various parties contending for a share in the "third company". By March 31, 1602, we learn from a Privy Council letter to the Lord Mayor of London that the Queen herself had taken a hand in the controversy and personally approved another adult company (and by implication a third London theatre). The sequence of events described by the letter is interesting. A "tolleracion" was granted to the company as a result of a "suit of the Earle of Oxford" directly to the Queen. The successful company was not one or other of the troupes which had been contending for the honour but a combination of "the servants of our verey good L. the Earle of Oxford, and of...the Earle of Worcester, beinge ioyned by agrement togeather in on Companie." 33 There is no record of a company of Oxford's men performing either in London or the provinces after 1589-90. Far from being a resurrected company or a troupe brought in from the provinces as Chambers seems to think, 34 the

33 Elizabethan Stage, IV, 334.

34 Ibid., II, 102.
new "Oxford's" men are surely Robert Browne and his fellows from the Boar's Head formerly known as Derby's men. What probably happened was that Oxford (possibly at the urging of his daughter, Lady Derby) agreed to approach the Queen directly. It may have been Oxford who suggested the compromise of an amalgamation between Worcester's and Derby's as a condition of his support. Whatever the precise sequence of events, it seems clear that the third company which finally won a right to perform in London was made up of the leading actors of those companies which had been playing during the past one or two years at the Curtain and the Boar's Head theatres.

Thomas Heywood's activities in the years between 1599 and 1602, therefore, were probably somewhat as follows. It seems likely that he left the Admiral's men sometime in 1599 to join Robert Browne, probably at the Boar's Head theatre, although he may have travelled with the company into the provinces during the summer. He wrote 1 and 2 Edward IV for Derby's sometime before August, 1599, and may have completed The Four Prentices of London before he left the company.35 By the summer of 1600 he had fallen out with Browne and had become a sharer in Worcester's company. He probably wrote The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham and How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad for this company which was likely performing at the Curtain. Then in August, 1602, the troupe established a financial relationship with Philip Henslowe and the history of its activities becomes considerably clearer.

35See Appendix 1.
(b) Worcester's Men 1602-1603

The connection of the Earl of Oxford with the "third company" seems to have been only temporary for by August 17, 1602 the troupe is known simply as Worcester's men. On that date Philip Henslowe begins a new page in his diary with the words "Lent vnto my Lorde of worsters players" (sig. 115). There follow thirteen pages of accounts covering the period August, 1602, to March, 1603, during which Henslowe acted as banker for the company. It has, I believe, been universally assumed that these accounts relate to performances given at the Rose theatre which had been vacated by the Admiral's men when they moved to the Fortune late in 1600.36 I would like to consider the possibility that

36This assumption is based on the fact that the company was certainly at the Rose in May, 1603 when Chettle and Day acknowledged an advance of forty shillings which was approved by Heywood and Duke for "the Booke of Shoare now newly to be written for the Earle of Worcesters players at the Rose of m' Henchloes" (sig. 100v).

the accounts do not, in fact, point to a move across the river but simply indicate a financial connection between Henslowe and Worcester's which did not alter their place of playing.

One thing that suggests that the company did not leave Whitechapel is the fairly consistent association of the troupe with that area. The letter of toleration of March 31, 1602, specifies that unlike the other London companies, Oxford-Worcester's men "doe not tye them selfs to one certain place and house, but do change there place at there owne disposition."37 A Privy Council letter of April 9, 1604 approving the
resumption of playing after the plague lists the "Curtaine in Hollywell" as the usual house of the Queen's men (formerly Worcester's). The draft licence for the company, which must date from this time or a little earlier, also lists the Curtain theatre along with the Boar's Head. The licence goes on to say that the company is also permitted to play "in any other play house not used by others, by the said Thomas Greene [the new leader of the company], elected, or by him hereafter to be built." The patent of 15 April, 1609, gives authority to the company to play at the Red Bull and the Curtain. The significance of this series of documents has not been fully grasped, it seems to me. There are several interesting points. First, the Rose theatre is nowhere
mentioned as one of the houses connected with the company. Secondly, the Curtain seems to have been used regularly by the troupe at least from 1604 to 1609. Finally, this company habitually played at not one, but two theatres, a practice which they seem to have established prior to the Queen's allowance of March, 1602.

So consistent are the documents in their references to two theatres and to the company's custom of moving from one to the other, that they strongly suggest a philosophy of stage production different from that of the Admiral's and Chamberlain's men. It is possible that in the years 1600-1602 neither the Boar's Head nor the Curtain was thought ideal for playing and the actors attempted to capitalize on the advantages of both. If the policy of moving from theatre to theatre had been dictated by inadequate stage facilities, however, one would imagine that when the troupe built the Red Bull they would have installed all the amenities they considered necessary, and thereby avoided the inconvenience of moving productions from one stage to another. And yet, as we have seen, even as late as 1609 the company retained its connection with the Curtain. Some other explanation than inadequate playing facilities seems to be called for. I think that the peripatetic nature of this third company may have been determined by the audiences rather than by the actors. I suggest that the company alternated between the commodious Curtain in the early autumn and spring seasons and the smaller, but more comfortable, Inn yard theatres in the winter. The cheer obtainable in the parlours of the Boar's Head or the Red Bull might have provided an extra inducement to prospective spectators in the cold and dark months of December to February or March. This would seem
to be a logical way of adapting to the English climate and to a possible decline in attendance in mid-winter. It also anticipates the later pattern of alternating seasons in a public and private theatre by companies such as the King's at the Globe and Blackfriar's.\(^{41}\) All of this suggests that Worcester's men regarded the Curtain as their summer theatre from which they moved to the Boar's Head or the Red Bull in periods of bad weather.

A second fact that indicates that Worcester's men may not have moved into the Rose when they began dealing with Henslowe is evidence of earlier financial connections with the pawnbroker. On 21 September, 1601, for example, John Duke borrowed money from Henslowe although Worcester's men were then playing at the Boar's Head or the Curtain.\(^{42}\) On 28 February, 1602, Henslowe paid for the warrant for Worcester's to perform at Court which led Chambers to deduce that the "connexion with Henslowe probably began while they were still at the Boar's Head."\(^{43}\) These precedents would indicate that Henslowe was

\(^{41}\)It is interesting in this connection that John Mago's deposition in Chancery made in 1603 (P.R.O. Cl4/304/27, quoted The Boar's Head Theatre, p. 58) refers to the Boar's Head as a "winter house."

\(^{42}\)Diary, sig. 83\(^{v}\).
willing to enter into financial dealings with a company that was not resident in his own theatre.

Recently, however, it has been argued that Henslowe and Alleyn did, in fact, acquire an interest in the Curtain theatre. If this is

the case, then the "agreement" which Henslowe worked out with the Earl of Worcester's men at the Mermaid Inn on 21 August, 1602 may well have been for a season at this latter theatre rather than at the Rose. The advantages to Worcester's men of remaining north of the river would have been considerable. There they would not have had the direct competition of the Chamberlain's men in a new theatre a few hundred yards away. And they would have been playing to audiences to whom they were already well-known.

Wherever they performed, the activities of the company (and of its principal dramatist Thomas Heywood) emerge in much greater detail during the last seven months of Elizabeth's reign thanks to the evidence of Henslowe's diary. Our knowledge of the personnel of the company at this time comes from the authorizations for payments and the acknowledgments of loans included among the entries. Eleven names occur. They are John Duke, William Kempe, Thomas Heywood, Thomas Blackwood, John Thare, John Lowin, Christopher Beeston, Robert Pallant, Richard Perkins, and
two men known only by their last names, Cattanes and Underell. Of these, Duke and Heywood had been sharers in the company during the dispute with Browne in 1600-1601, Kempe had joined the troupe by 28 February, 1602 when he was joint payee with Heywood for a court performance. Robert Pallant had been with Strange's men along with Kempe and Duke in 1593, and may have been one of the unnamed sharers in the suit against Browne. Perkins, Blackwood, Lowin and Thare appear to be slightly younger than the previously mentioned actors.\(^{45}\) I have been unable to find evidence that any of these latter were connected with a theatrical troupe before they joined Worcester's. Another young actor in the group at this time was Christopher Beeston who may have been the Kit named in the plot of *The Second Part of the Seven Deadly Sins* (c. 1590).\(^{46}\) Along with John Duke he was a member of the Chamberlain's men in 1598 when he was apprenticed to Augustine Phillips.\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\)C. J. Sisson (in "Notes on Early Stuart Stage History", *Modern Language Review*, XXXVII (1942), 28) says that Perkins was born in 1579 which would make him 23.


\(^{47}\)Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors*, p. 36.
This group of actors carried on its day by day operations by methods that were very similar to those evolved by the Admiral's men in 1597-98. Responsibility for allowing both literary and production expenses seems to have been shouldered by John Duke. Of a total of some fifty-four entries related to production expenses, half were unauthorized or were acknowledged simply as expenses incurred on behalf of the company. Of the remaining payments, Duke approved more than any other single individual (eleven) and seems in many cases to have deputized one of the other actors. For example, on August 19, 1602, he received £9 with Thomas Blackwood to purchase dress fabrics, and two days later he and John Thare borrowed £12 to buy two costumes for Oldcastle (sig. 115). Thare seems to have been Duke's principal associate in the control of production expenses. His name appears six times among the entries, usually in connection with the purchase of properties. Duke was chiefly responsible for the purchase of costumes or costume materials. This proved to be an inconvenience on one occasion at least when John Willett, a Mercer with whom the company dealt, had Duke thrown into the Clink in order to collect an outstanding debt of £8 10s. (sig. 120v).

The management of literary expenses was more peaceful. In this area, too, Duke seems to have had final authority. About two-thirds of the payments to authors were approved by a member of the company. Duke personally authorized thirteen entries and it is quite likely that John Thare (who approved four) and John Lowin (who approved five), frequently acted on Duke's orders. This was certainly true in the case of Lowin on January 29, 1602, when he obtained £3 from Henslowe "vpon John duckes noote of his hande" (sig. 119v).
An interesting feature of the literary accounts is that three of the authors working for the company (Dekker, Chettle, and Heywood) apparently could authorize payments to themselves. Not surprisingly, perhaps, it is Heywood, a sharer in the company, who uses his authority most frequently (on ten occasions). All of the payments except one for which he gives authorization are for plays on which he himself is working. This is interesting, especially in view of the fact that the final payment is for the mysterious play "wherin shores wiffe is writen" for which Chettle and Day were given a payment "in earnest" of £2 about 9 May, 1603 (sig. 121). The appearance of Heywood's name in the entry may not, as some commentators have suggested, indicate that the playwright was responsible for launching dramatic projects to be carried out by others.48


On the contrary this particular entry may be confirmation that Heywood did write the Shore scenes of Edward IV and was about to collaborate with Chettle and Day on a reworking of the material.

Heywood's method of writing can at last be reconstructed in some detail from the Henslowe entries of 1602-03. Perhaps the most unexpected aspect of Heywood's career at this time is that he was in fact writing for both Worcester's and Admiral's men more or less simultaneously. This was common practice among Elizabethan playwrights we know. Of the nine professional writers working for the Henslowe-financed
companies in 1602-03, only Middleton, Munday and Smith seem to have had any kind of "loyalty" to one or the other troupe. We might expect this kind of mobility on the part of a free lance writer. Not even the "sealleynge of [a] band to writte for them" (sig. 105) on 25 March, 1602, was any guarantee that Henry Chettle would contribute only to the Admiral's repertory. The case would seem to be different with Heywood, however, since the playwright would derive some commercial advantage from his share in Worcester's profits. It may be that these were so large (or so small) at the time that he felt they would not be seriously affected by his contribution of a single play to a rival management. Whatever the explanation, Heywood collaborated with Chettle on The London Florentine which the Admiral's purchased in January, 1603.49

49Heywood's "moonlighting" for the Admiral's men does demonstrate that the dramatist could also have written for Derby's in 1599 without breaking his contract with Henslowe. Weighing all the evidence, I think that Heywood did leave the Rose, however, as I have argued above.

During the nearly seven months that Worcester's men were in association with Henslowe before the death of the Queen, Heywood wrote or contributed to six full-length plays and revised a seventh. Of these works, two (The Blind Eats Many a Fly and A Woman Killed With Kindness) were written alone, and the others (Albere Galles, Marshal Osric, Lady Jane, and Christmas Comes but once a Year) were produced in collaboration. What is remarkable is not only the speed of composition (better than a play a month), but the complexity of Heywood's interrelationships with his fellow writers. During the autumn, Heywood seems to have worked
most closely with Wentworth Smith. The two men first collaborated on Albere Galles for which they were paid on September 4 and which was almost certainly put into production immediately.\textsuperscript{50} The partners

\textsuperscript{50}"layd owt for the company the 3 of septmbz 1602 to bye iiij Lances for the comedy of thomas hewedes & mR smythes" (sig. 115\textsuperscript{v}).

probably began at once on their next play, Marshal Osric, which was completed three weeks later on September 30.\textsuperscript{51} During that time Heywood

\textsuperscript{51}For the possible identification of this play with The Royal King see Appendix 1.

had also managed to write some "new a dicyons" for Cutting Dick for which he was paid on September 20. During October, Heywood and Smith became involved in Lady Jane (almost certainly The Overthrow of Rebels which was in production early in November). This chronicle play may have been a project initiated by Dekker and Webster, both of whom, along with Chettle, received payment for contributions. A second part was finished in a brief six days by Dekker which suggests that he was probably the writer most familiar with the material.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{52}For the relationship of this play to Sir Thomas Wyatt and If You Know Not Me see Appendix 1.
About this time there seems to have been a realignment of the writers. Heywood (but not Smith) became associated with Chettle, Dekker, and Webster in what was probably a special extravaganza entitled *Christmas Comes But Once a Year*. The project was begun shortly after the completion of *Lady Jane* on October 21, and completed about a month later by November 26. Smith, meanwhile, began to collaborate with two writers new to Worcester's, John Day, and Richard Hathway. Hathway had been writing for Admiral's men as early as April, 1598. Relations may have been strained after his *Conquest of Spain* was returned to him in April, 1601, but he continued to write for the company until January, 1602. At that point he seems to have switched to Worcester's and to have written almost exclusively for them. Day also began writing for Admiral's in 1598 and contributed to their repertory from October of that year. His most intense activity was after the autumn of 1599 when, in collaboration with Haughton and later with Chettle and Dekker, he was a reliable and productive contributor. His last play for the Admiral's men was *As Merry as May Be* "for corte" which he completed on November 17, 1602.

Whatever occasioned the shift of Hathway and Day to Worcester's, these indefatigable collaborators now teamed up with Wentworth Smith. Between November, 1602, and February, 1603, the syndicate turned out four full-length plays (*Blacke Doge of Newgate*, *The Unfortunate Jenerell* and *II Blacke Doge* for Worcester's and *Bosse of Billengsgate* for Admiral's. This may have released Heywood to work on his own, for between the end of November and the beginning of March he wrote *Blinde eates many a Flye*, collaborated with Chettle on *London Florentyne* for Admiral's, and completed his undoubted masterpiece, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. 
Slight as it is, the evidence of the diary does give us some insight into Heywood's activities during the period September 1602-March 1603, and into his role in the company. It may be, as Grivelet says, that Heywood acted as what the Germans would call a "dramaturge", a sort of resident dramatic factotum. But the evidence is open to other interpretations. It is true that Heywood frequently approves payments, but only to plays he is working on. In no case does he authorize the purchase of a play by another dramatist. All new plays purchased by Worcester's men during this period (with the single exception of II Blacke Doge) were approved by Duke or one of his associates, Thare or Lowin.

Similarly, as we have seen, ideas for plays might just as easily be supplied by other dramatists such as Dekker. Far from relishing collaboration, Heywood seems to have preferred working alone. The evidence of the diary, along with what we know of his later literary aspirations, suggests that Heywood was a conscious artist interested in exercising as much control over his medium as possible. It seems to me, therefore, that he probably relieved himself as soon as possible of responsibility for the kind of
patching and coordinating suggested by Grivelet.

If Heywood may at this time have been freeing himself from the limitations imposed on his work by the working conditions in the company, he could not, of course, avoid facing the demands made by the physical shape of the stage for which he wrote. For this reason, it may be useful to consider briefly the nature of the theatres in which Heywood's plays were staged during the years under discussion. Thanks to the researches of Sisson, Berry, and Wickham, we know considerably more about the arrangement of the Boar's Head theatre than we did a few years ago. About one thing, at least, there is general agreement. The Boar's Head "theatre" was a playing area constructed in the yard of a Whitechapel inn with seating for the audience on all sides of the stage. The problem of providing adequate accommodation for the spectators seems to have been one of the main concerns of the owners from the very beginning. It was a desire for additional seating that led Woodlif in 1598 to suggest tearing down existing galleries to enlarge them by extending them into the yard.^^55


It is also conceivable that it was a shortage of seating accommodation which necessitated the use of the gallery behind the stage. Many of the features of the Boar's Head theatre revealed in the Chancery records suggest to me the kind of compromise necessitated by less-than-ideal circumstances. In this case, the need to find enough seating to make the theatre economically viable may have led to an encroachment on the stage area which somewhat hampered the players.
The admission of spectators to the gallery above the tiring house would necessarily have affected production techniques at the Boar's Head. Leslie Hotson argues that such seating arrangements made any use of an "inner stage" impossible and concludes that plays at that theatre were presented in the round. 56 While not subscribing to all of Hotson's theories, Herbert Berry does agree that a recessed acting area behind the main stage would have been impracticable as would any upper stage on the west side of the yard. 57 Berry does not venture to suggest how discovery or upper scenes would have been handled at the Boar's Head and Hotson's solution of separate "houses" seems to raise more problems than it solves. C. J. Sisson in his reconstruction of the theatre envisages some sort of inner stage and argues that the west gallery was available to the players for dramatic action when needed. 58


58 *The Boar's Head Theatre*, p. xix.
Glynne Wickham thinks that an upper acting area might have been provided by the roof over the tiring house in 1598, but presumably that area was eliminated in 1599 when the stage was moved back flush with the front of the gallery.\textsuperscript{59} Neither Wickham nor Berry had access to the deposition of John Mago, and both conclude that the theatre was without a "heavens". Sisson quotes Mago's reference to "the covering over the stage" as evidence that the Boar's Head had a "heavens" but the evidence is ambiguous to say the least.\textsuperscript{60} The truth is, therefore, that the information contained in the Chancery records is irritatingly fragmentary concerning the structure of the stage. We still do not know what facilities the theatre provided for discoveries, action above, or special effects involving the "heavens".

The situation is even more obscure regarding the stage at the Curtain. Thomas Platter describing a performance there in 1599 wrote,

\textit{I also saw after dinner a comedy, not far from our inn, in the suburb; if I remember right in Bishopsgate. Here they represented various nations, with whom on each occasion an Englishman fought for his daughter and overcame them all except the German, who won the daughter in fight... Meanwhile the Englishman went into the tent, [die Zelten] robbed the German of his gains, and thus he outwitted the German also.}\textsuperscript{61}
The reference to a "tent" is interesting in that it suggests either some kind of simultaneous setting or possibly a free-standing booth used as a discovery space. Where this "tent" was located with respect to the tiring house facade, and whether it could be entered from the backstage (or sub-stage) area, Platter does not tell us. Apart from this brief account, we know almost nothing about the stage arrangements at the Curtain. As Glynne Wickham remarks, this is bitterly disappointing since the Curtain was the one theatre in continuous use throughout the period. In spite of innovations introduced in the Rose, Swan, first

Globe, and Fortune, the Curtain (with or without alterations) was still considered adequate by the Queen's company who used it in conjunction first with the Boar's Head and then with the Red Bull until at least 1609.

If historical evidence is slight, the information provided by Heywood's plays is ambiguous. As I have argued in Appendix 1, Heywood probably wrote Edward IV, The Four Prentices of London, The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham, How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad, The Royal King and the Loyal Subject, and A Woman Killed with Kindness in the years between 1599 and 1603. Two things strike me about the staging requirements of these plays. The first is the weight of evidence
suggesting the existence of some kind of free-standing, curtained booth.

In Edward IV, such a structure could serve as the Goldsmith's shop in Part One and the "tent" in Part Two. It would provide the "dark hole" close to "the stairs" in which Aminadab hides in Chuse and from which his sword so obviously protrudes. The "hollow" in which the "tombe" of Mistress Arthur is discovered might also, conceivably, be represented by a booth although the words suggest some kind of alcove. A similar ambiguity exists in A Woman Killed where Anne enters "in her bed".

Hobson's "shop" in 2 Know seems to me almost certainly to have been a booth. The reference to the prentices peeping "like Italian pantelounes Behind an arras" (I, 257), conjures up a vision of a simple street stage with a curtained area for a tiring house. G. F. Reynolds thinks that a separate structure is indicated for the shop. All of these details would suggest that Heywood's plays if they were not actually written with the Curtain in mind, could certainly have been performed there using the "tent" which Platter described. Since similar booth structures were probably used in most of the Elizabethan theatres, however, this particular requirement is no help in fixing the theatre where the plays were produced.

Somewhat more indicative of differing stage conditions is the use of an upper acting area. Here there is a striking difference between The Four Prentices and Edward IV and all the other plays. Chuse, Royal

---

King, 2 Know, and Woman Killed could all be played on a bare platform with two entrances and a booth. The two "history" plays, however, make considerable use of walls and include several scenes which require interaction between actors on the main stage and others "above". In this respect, Four Prentices is the most demanding. At one point, the armies of the Christians and the pagans confront one another at different levels.

Enter upon the walls, Soldan, Sophy, Turnus, Morates. Souldiers. (II, 230).

A little later still others join those on the "walls." "Enter some bringing forth old Bullen, and others prisoners bound" (II, 232). At this point not less than ten actors are clustered together on an upper level together with the standards which they "set vp" (II, 233) in view of the opposing army. The actual battle seems to take place offstage as the stage direction reads, "Exeunt. Alarum. The Christians are repulst. Enter at two severall dores Guy and Eustace" (II, 234). Nevertheless, the upper acting area must have been accessible from the main stage since the same rubric continues,

Guy and Eustace climbe vp the walls, beate the Pagans, take away the Crownes on their heads, and in the stead hang vp the contrary Shields, and bring away the Ensignes, flourishing them, seuerall wayes (II, 234).

To satisfy the demands of this play a theatre would need an upper level of some kind, accessible from the main stage, large enough to hold a dozen or so actors, and with an exit leading into the backstage area.

The requirements for Edward IV are not so demanding. When the rebels approach the "city"

Spicing beats on the gates, and then enteres the Lord Maior and his associates with prentices. (I, 14)
That this entrance must have been on an upper level is indicated by the Maior's words, "We have no warrant, Thomas Falconbridge, to let your armed troops into our city" (I, 15). The Mayor's party includes, the Recorder, Shore, Josselin and at least two apprentices. The staging of the battle is not entirely clear. The stage direction reads, "Here is a very fierie assault on all sides, wherein the prentices doe great service" (II, 20) which suggests that the rebels on the main stage attack the city defenders above. The stage direction immediately following, however, reads "Enter Falconbridge" (II, 20) which would seem to indicate that the action may have been offstage. No matter how the battle was staged, it is evident that this play, too, requires a fairly large upper area which could accommodate several actors.

The evidence of the stage directions seems at first very difficult to reconcile with what we know from other sources about the theatres. It is not easy to imagine how the elaborate kind of action demanded by The Four Prentices could have been presented on a stage with spectators sitting in the gallery over the tiring house. And yet this is the situation that seems to have obtained at the Boar's Head and the Red Bull. At least one student has concluded that the Rose theatre was similarly restricted for acting space on an upper level. H. S. McMillin in an unpublished dissertation states that the Rose plays give no clear sign that the gallery was the kind of fully-developed playing area that such phrases as "upper stage" or "inner above" would suggest. Instead, it seems to have been only a shallow area, similar to the flat gallery of the Swan drawing...aside from the gallery, the Rose seems to have had no other playing areas at the upper levels of the tiring house facade.64
It is tempting to suggest that Heywood's abandoning of large-scale action in the balcony in his plays written from late 1600 to 1603 reflects a change in the facilities available to him (perhaps limitations imposed by the Boar's Head theatre). But our knowledge of the theatres of the period, of the movements of the companies and the printing of the plays, is not yet extensive enough to warrant any generalizations. All that can be said, perhaps, is that during his years with Worcester's men Heywood developed a fairly simple dramatic technique which made minimum use of elaborate effects or massed stage movement.

(c) Queen Anne's Men 1604-1613

With the death of Elizabeth and the subsequent inhibition of playing because of plague in May, 1603, Heywood found himself once again with an insecure future ahead of him. Although the influence of the Earl of Oxford had succeeded in winning approval for a third company in London, the appearance of a new monarch on the scene opened the whole question of the company's privileges once again. By May 19, 1603, James had conferred a Royal patent on the former Lord Chamberlain's men. But Heywood's company remained under the patronage of the Earl of Worcester at least until December when they were travelling in the provinces. By January 2, 1604, however, John Duke is referred to in the chamber accounts as one of "the Queenes mates players" so that the decision to extend Royal patronage
to the three adult companies must have been taken sometime late in the previous year.\(^{65}\) Evidence is lacking, but the last months of 1604 may have been a period of political manoeuvring very like that which preceded the Privy Council Order of March 31, 1602.\(^{66}\) If so, Heywood's patron would perhaps have needed to be particularly eloquent. It is this situation which I believe provided the need for Heywood's Apology for Actors. As I argue more fully in Appendix 1, the tract is not a belated reply to puritan critics but a "brief" presented by the actors as an almost desperate justification of their importance.

Not only was the patronage of the company in doubt in the summer of 1603, but the composition of the troupe itself changed once again. Perkins, Blackwood, and Lowin seem to have ridden into the country shortly after March 12, 1603, presumably to play with the company on tour (sig. 113v-114). But Nungezer points out that Blackwood and Thare were in fact with Robert Browne's players at the Frankfort Easter fair of 1603.\(^{67}\) The re-entrance of Robert Browne into this narrative

\(^{65}\)Elizabethan Stage, IV, 168.

\(^{66}\)Henslowe's presence at court in October, 1603 (p. 297) and his various petitions of 1603 (p. 303) may reflect the uncertainty of the time. Henslowe's Diary (1961).

\(^{67}\)Dictionary of Actors, pp. 50 and 373.
underlines the complexity of the relationship between that actor-landlord and Worcester's men. The prolonged series of court cases which had beset him since his tenancy at the Boar's Head came to an end in June, 1603, when he and Woodlif settled their differences. This might have led to a more calm existence for the beleaguered actor. But by October 11, he was dead and as Joan Alleyn reported with some awe, perhaps, he "dyed very pore". Poor or not, Browne left a complicated legacy which was to follow Heywood and his friends for about twenty years. The trail of that legacy has been traced with great patience through inheritances, marriages, and finally into the courts by C. J. Sisson. But the full implications of the story are still not entirely clear. The central figure in the drama, I believe, is the mysterious Thomas Greene who towards the end of 1603 suddenly appears from previous obscurity to become the leader of Worcester's men. For although John


70 This surely is the significance of the words in the draft licence to the Queen's men "as in any other play howse not vsed by others, by the said Thomas Greene, elected, or by him hereafter to be builte." (Malone Society Collections, I, 3, 266).
Duke continues to act as payee for the company's performances at court until 27 December, 1605, it is Greene, apparently, who had the authority to say where the company would play. Significantly too, at about the time that the company moves into its new Red Bull theatre, Greene's name begins to appear as payee in the Chambers accounts. The emergence of a complete unknown to a position of power in the company ahead of the long-time sharers Heywood, Duke, and possibly Pallant is, to say the least, surprising. Wickham says simply that "Browne died in 1603 and leadership of the company passed to Thomas Greene."71 C. J. Sisson assumes that Greene married Browne's young widow, Susan, within a few months of Browne's death, and through her inherited the lease to the Boar's Head theatre and his share in the company, "probably one seventh." He goes on to say that Greene presumably replaced Will Kempe who "appears to have left the company after 1602/3 or may have died."72

Both of these accounts ignore a central difficulty. There is nothing in Henslowe's accounts with Worcester's men from August 17, 1602 to 12 March, 1603 to indicate that Browne had any connection whatsoever with the troupe.

---

71 Early English Stages, II, 2, 107.

72 The Boar's Head Theatre, p. 75.
As I have argued above, all the circumstantial evidence (even the appearance of Blackwood and Thare with Browne in Germany at Easter, 1603), suggests that Browne did in fact retain a share in the combined Oxford's-Worcester's third company. What role he played, and whether the company continued to perform at his theatre while they were being financed by Henslowe, we cannot say for certain. Assuredly, however, his death had a significant effect on Heywood's troupe and indirectly did much to influence the course of development of that company over the next decade.

By the beginning of 1604, whatever real or imagined clouds had appeared on the horizon had gone. Heywood and his fellow actors had been granted the patronage of the Queen. They performed at court on January 2 and 13, 1604, and the following August spent eighteen days in attendance on the Countye Arrenbergh at Durham house for which Thomas Greene received an allowance of £19 16s. for apparelling charges.73

73 Elizabethan Stage, IV, 170.

The chambers accounts specify Thomas Greene and "tenne of his ffelowes grooms of the chamber and the Queen's Players." This may be a mistake since the draft patent, the Chamberlain's list of players granted cloth for the coronation, and the duplicate patent of 1609 all list only ten members altogether. These include Christopher Beeston, Thomas Heywood, Richard Perkins, Robert Pallant, and John Duke of the former Oxford's-Worcester's amalgamation and five new names. Greene's origin we have discussed. Robert Lee was with Admiral's men about 1590 and he is thus
a contemporary of Duke's and Pallant's. Nungezer thinks he may have
joined Worcester's men before the amalgamation but not as a sharer. 74

74 A Dictionary of Actors, p. 235.

James Hoult, Richard Beeston and Thomas Swynerton emerge into theatrical
history for the first time here. Swynerton's relationship with the
group may have been another case of mutual advantage. About this time,
the actor had gone into partnership with Aaron Holland in an enterprise
involving the conversion of the Red Bull Inn into a theatre. 75 The

75 Early English Stages, II, 2, 65.

reference in the draft patent of the Queen's men to the possible build-
ing of a theatre suggests that the company already had plans for replac-
ing the Boar's Head with more satisfactory quarters at the Red Bull.
Thomas Greene's role in all this is puzzling if, in fact, he had inherited
a financial interest in the former premises.

In the leisure enforced by the plague in late 1603 and early
1604, Heywood may have written The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth. This
play was so popular that it was pirated and published in 1605 under the
title If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody. A year later there appeared
in a slightly better text, Part Two of If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody
which was a revision of The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham. 76 Both
published plays undoubtedly reflect changes made in the originals to permit them to be played as a two-part drama about the great Queen. In 1607 *A Woman Killed with Kindness* appeared in print. It was the first published play to bear Heywood's name on the title page which probably indicates that the dramatist was by then sufficiently well-known to attract the book-buying public.

The publicity Heywood enjoyed in that year was not all favourable, however, for it was about 1607 that Beaumont and Fletcher so devastatingly parodied the romantic and bourgeois elements in Heywood's work in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Taste was rapidly changing in Jacobean London, and it may be this fact that led the publishers, and perhaps Heywood himself to withhold from print *1 Fair Maid of the West* which probably belongs to the years just after the death of the Queen.

Theatrical conditions, too, changed for Heywood and the Queen's men when, about 1605-6, they acquired their new Red Bull theatre in Clerkenwell. The evidence suggests that this move had been planned as early as 1604. It would be logical to assume that the motivation for such a move was a desire for better stage facilities and that consequently the new Red Bull theatre would compare in splendour with the Globe and the Fortune. There is some reason to doubt that such was the case. Glynne Wickham argues that the Red Bull "cannot have differed greatly in essentials from [other Inn yard theatres such as] the Boar's Head"
or even the Cross Keys." If Professor Wickham is right, then some other reason must be sought for the move, possibly a shift in the theatrical centre from the east to the west of the city.

It is not absolutely certain, however, that Wickham's description of the Red Bull as a "square with its tiring-house situated below the spectators' gallery on the west or south-west side of the yard and abutting directly on the stage" is absolutely accurate. Persuasive as his arguments are, Early English Stages, like Hotson's Shakespeare's Wooden O, is devoted to the exposition of a theory of staging. Where evidence is totally lacking, as in the case of the Red Bull theatre, it is not surprising that his conclusion confirms his preconceptions. If one principle emerges from a study of Elizabethan stage practices, however, it would seem to be that we cannot look for consistency. Consequently, the evidence of the plays produced at the Red Bull must also be weighed. Although Wickham accuses Reynolds of "dextrously [avoiding]

committing himself to any description of the physical appearance of his chosen playhouse inside or out\textsuperscript{80}, the charge is not altogether a fair one. Reynolds concludes from his study of the staging requirements of plays produced there that the Red Bull had a front stage, railings to protect it, three doors, an upper stage, a "heavens" or shadow over the stage, and an ascending-descending device. There were windows, at least two trap doors, with some means of getting up on the stage at the corners. There were posts on the stage, some of which were structural, and some which could be brought on. Reynolds thinks there was a curtain for the balcony or upper stage, and some space below which could also be concealed by a curtain. Some plays require two such spaces, and he suggests that there may not have been a permanent "rear stage" but rather removable structures.\textsuperscript{81} Many of the features mentioned by Reynolds (including the booths, traps, possibly even the doors and windows) are consistent with Wickham's picture of the theatre as a converted inn yard. But there are two questions on which they differ irreconcilably. The one is on the availability of an upper acting area and the other is the question of the heavens.

\textsuperscript{80}Early English Stages, II, 2, 107.

\textsuperscript{81}Reynolds, op. cit., p. 188.
It is difficult to understand how an inn yard stage such as Wickham describes could have provided facilities for an upper stage if the tiring house was situated below the spectators' gallery and abutting directly on the stage.\textsuperscript{82} And yet the evidence of the plays that some kind of upper acting area was needed seems to be incontrovertible. The question is of interest to a student of Heywood because of the prominence of his work in the Red Bull repertory. As we have seen above, The Four Prentices certainly requires a fairly substantial upper acting area. If it was indeed performed at the Red Bull, as Reynolds assumes, then the theatre must have had an upper stage of some variety.

A similar problem exists concerning the "heavens". Wickham is inclined to reject the idea of an elaborate cover over the stages of the inn yard theatres.\textsuperscript{83} His scepticism is based in part, however, on his ignorance of the source of Sisson's claims which has subsequently been identified as the deposition of John Mago. That document specifies a cover over the stage at the Boar's Head theatre and a similar cover may well have been provided at the Red Bull. Certainly if Heywood's Ages were presented at that theatre, the overhead machinery must have

\textsuperscript{82}Early English Stages, II, 2, 109.

\textsuperscript{83}Early English Stages, II, 2, 106.
been elaborate. Unfortunately there is no corroborating evidence from any of the other plays produced at the Red Bull for the existence of such machinery. So once again we are limited by our inability to date the *Ages* with absolute certainty. My own feeling is that the plays in their present form date from the period after 1607 and that the apparently new style which they and *The Rape of Lucrece* represent was inspired in part by the move to a new theatre.

The period between 1607 and 1613 may represent a time of growing disenchantment with the popular theatre on the part of Heywood. On the one hand he turns more and more to the composition of non-dramatic works. Between 1608-1613 he issued a translation of Sallust's histories of the Cataline conspiracy and of Jurgatha (1608), an epic poem entitled *Troia Britanica* (1609), *Three Elegies* upon the death of Prince Henry (of which Heywood contributed one) (1613), and *An Apology for Actors* (1612). In the same period he approved the publication of four plays, *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608), *The Golden Age* (1611), *The Silver Age* (1613), and *The Brazen Age* (1613). There are two things which strike the student. The first is the almost exclusively classical orientation of the works. Even *An Apology for Actors*, a treatise in a peculiarly English controversy, flaunts an ostentatious familiarity with Latin and Greek literature and history. The second surprising feature is the sudden decision of the dramatist to sponsor the publication of his plays by providing dedications and epistles to them. This is in marked contrast to his reluctance to acknowledge earlier plays. Yet here too, the plays he approves are without exception classical. He does not, during this time, sponsor the publication of *1 Fair Maid, The Wise Woman*
of Hogsdon or *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, all works which had been written before, and were quite likely performed during this period.

It may be that Heywood was beginning to disagree with the management of the company. Sometime between December, 1605, and December, 1608, John Duke was replaced as payee for court performances by Thomas Greene, which may reflect some kind of shake-up in the management, or it may indicate that Duke had died or left the troupe. If the absence from court for the three years 1605-8 is an indication of a slump in the company's ability or fortunes, those were presumably repaired sufficiently by 1608 as the Queen's men appear regularly in the chambers accounts from that Christmas until 1611. The following year Greene died and the company was again absent from court. During none of this period, however, could the contribution of the Queen's men to the annual Christmas revels be said to have been a distinguished one. In 1608-9 they performed five out of the twenty-seven plays presented. The following year they contributed one of twenty-three. In 1610-11 they contributed three plays, and in 1611-12 achieved their greatest eminence when they presented four plays, two of them apparently, in combination with the King's men. These latter works were Heywood's *Silver Age* and *The Rape of Lucrece* which were performed before the Queen and Prince Henry at Greenwich.  

84 Heywood speaks with understandable pride of the reception accorded his *Ages*, but it may be that he, like Webster, was beginning to despair of finding an "understanding auditory" among the

---

84 *Elizabethan Stage*, IV, 178.
regular patrons of the Red Bull theatre. If he was at this time looking more and more to the court for an appreciative audience he may have been disappointed there too. For as he himself reports, the taste was developing for "Satirica Dictaeria and Comica Scommata" rather than for the inspirational or moral epics which he favoured. Whatever the cause,

85See the epistle To the Reader, The Iron Age, Part Two, III, 351.

Heywood seems to have stopped writing for the Queen's men shortly after the death of Thomas Greene in 1612. It was to be almost ten years before he began to write for the stage again, and his last plays, in style and tone, reflect the influences of a later age.

Heywood's experiences as actor, dramatist, and sharer during the heyday of the Elizabethan drama exposed him to aspects of theatre and stagecraft about which many of his contemporaries knew nothing. He was brought into close daily contact with the performers who produced his works, and knew at first hand the problems of stage management and finance which affected the presentation of plays. Finally, he was intimately familiar with the stage facilities available at the Rose, the Curtain, the Boar's Head, and the Red Bull theatres. Heywood's technical expertise did not, of course, make him a better dramatist than poets such as Webster or Jonson whose knowledge of the theatre was less specialized. But there is evidence that it made him a different kind of playwright. His awareness of the non-verbal possibilities of drama, especially, led him to experiment in ways which were essentially
theatrical. In order to discuss these experiments meaningfully it is necessary to consider in greater detail those various forces which determined the final shape of an Elizabethan play.
Now it is evident that the dramatic incidents must be treated from the same points of view as the dramatic speeches, when the object is to evoke the sense of pity, fear, importance, or probability. The only difference is, that the incidents should speak for themselves without verbal exposition.

(Aristotle, Poetics, XIX.3)
Since the Elizabethans left no coherent body of dramatic theory such as that embodied in Aristotle's *Poetics*, any attempt to formulate the aesthetic principles underlying their dramaturgy must proceed inductively. It is not sufficient, to show as T. W. Baldwin does, that the Elizabethan playwrights would have been familiar with classical or Renaissance critical ideas.\(^1\) It is necessary to demonstrate that those ideas were, in fact, followed in practice. Nor is it safe to assume, as Mary Crappo Hyde does, that certain principles of dramatic structure are universal and unchanging.\(^2\) In order to distinguish between those features of Elizabethan drama which were consciously produced and those which were a result of limitations imposed by the physical conditions of the theatres or the practices of the companies, it is necessary to understand how the plays were actually written and how they were adapted to the stages on which they were performed.

\(^1\)*Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947).

\(^2\)*Playwriting for Elizabethans* (New York, 1949).
One of the most serious obstacles to a full discussion of these questions is the inadequacy of our critical vocabulary. To a very large extent, this inadequacy is the result of the predominantly literary bias of dramatic criticism. Such a bias was understandable during the Renaissance when all that survived of the great drama of the past were the texts. But today, when there is greater and greater emphasis among theatre practitioners on the non-verbal aspects of drama, it is more surprising that criticism should still be almost entirely concerned with the word. There have been few attempts that I know of to describe those features of a dramatic performance which are like music or dance or painting. We have no terms comparable to counterpoint, recapitulation, theme and variation, sonata, or movement, to describe the relationship between incident and incident in a dramatic plot. Nor can we express except by analogy, the effects of stage movement, or of the arrangement of costumes or properties. In the absence of any form of notation we can give only vague impressions of the impact of pauses, or of alterations of pace, pitch, or volume in stage speech. Nor can we adequately describe, let alone analyse, such things as the subtle relationship between the actor, the role he plays, and the audience. Before we can speak about dramaturgy in any comprehensive way, therefore, it will be necessary first to ascertain what, approximately, we mean by the term.

For the purposes of this study, I have taken the word "dramaturgy" to refer to the technicalities of the playwright's art. I have focussed attention on the "how" rather than the "what" of dramatic storytelling, on what is usually referred to as the form rather than the content. Just as an art historian might concentrate on such matters as
a particular artist's brush technique, or use of colour, or methods of pictorial composition, I have tried to analyse how Heywood exploits the technical resources of his medium. Those resources I take to include the physical properties of the stage and auditorium, the costumes and props available in the tiring house, and the bodies and voices of the actors. They would also include, but in a different way, the stock of traditional stories and fictional types upon which a dramatist might draw for his narrative ideas. The first would constitute roughly what Aristotle meant by the "medium" of imitation. The second would be approximately what he called the "objects" of imitation. 3 Whereas Aristotle fails to

3 Poetics in Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, trans. S. H. Butcher, Fourth Edition (reprinted New York, 1951), pp. 7-13. All subsequent references to the Poetics will be to Butcher's edition and will cite both the section and sub-section in the Greek as well as the page number of the translation.

make a consistent distinction between object and manner, however, (he says, for example, that the effect of a story is somehow not dependent upon its being presented on stage), 4 I would insist on such a distinction. For in

4 Poetics, VI, 19, p. 29 and XIV, 1, p. 49.

my view, it is precisely the artist's skill in organizing the sequence of impressions which an auditor or spectator receives which separates the great playwright from the minor hack. To put it another way, the
stories. Shakespeare used in his plays are not at all "the same" as the plots they inspired. And it is precisely the difference that is most important.

Heywood, therefore, had available to him a certain narrative tradition (which included common ideas about men in action), and certain technical facilities in the form of a particular theatre and acting company. Any analysis of his dramaturgy will have to consider both the way he handled his story material and the means he employed to present it. A particularly valuable insight into both these questions is provided by the dramatist's revisions. In the process of changing a script to make it more suitable for performance a playwright inevitably reveals something about the aesthetic principles motivating such alterations. In this respect, one of the most valuable documents to survive from the period is the manuscript known as The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. 5

5W. W. Greg, ed., The Book of Sir Thomas More (Oxford, 1911). All references to the play are to this edition. The title of the play is variously rendered. In order to make a distinction between the dramatic work and the individual about whom it is written, I have chosen to adhere to the spelling on the manuscript itself.

Sir Thomas Moore was probably originally written by Anthony Munday. 6 The surviving document comprises Munday's "foul papers" along

6See Appendix 1.
with the revisions of at least four other dramatists, some or all of whom may have collaborated on the original work. In its present condition it probably represents the copy from which the actors would have prepared their parts, plot, and prompt book had they been successful in obtaining a licence from the censor. There are thirteen original leaves and


several additions. These latter have been written in the margins, pasted over deleted material, and inserted on separate sheets to replace leaves removed from the original manuscript. The result is a sort of dramatic palimpsest in which can be discerned four distinct levels or stages of composition. The first is the original play in the handwriting of Anthony Munday (but probably including work by other dramatists) on thirteen sheets (folios three to five, ten to eleven, fourteen to fifteen, and seventeen to twenty-two). Some of the original material has been cancelled and a now indeterminable amount has been lost between folios five and ten, and eleven and fourteen. The second level consists of the additions of at least four authors who, for various reasons, revised certain speeches and scenes of the original play. These additions include contributions by four separate hands which Greg identifies as A, B, D, and E. A third
See the introduction to The Book of Sir Thomas More. These hands were subsequently identified as follows: E, Thomas Dekker (W. W. Greg, Malone Society Collections, II, 2 (1923), p. 139); A, Henry Chettle (S. A. Tannenbaum, The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore (New York, 1927) and accepted by Greg, Collections, II, 3 (London, 1931), 233 and Harold Jenkins, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (London, 1934), p. 64); D, Shakespeare (first suggested by R. Simpson, "Are there any extant MSS in Shakespeare's Handwriting?" Notes and Queries, VIII (1871), 1 and vigorously argued ever since); B, Heywood (See Appendix 1).

level consists of changes made by someone with a concern for the technical problems of production. These alterations involve such things as the modification of stage directions and speech headings or suggestions for casting. They are for the most part in a hand identified by Greg as C which is the same as that of the scribe who prepared the "plot" of The Second Part of the Seven Deadly Sins (c. 1590) and 2 Fortune's Tennis (c. 1600). Finally, there are the deletions and suggestions made by

Edmund Tilney, the Master of the Revels.

The play is of particular interest in the present study because of the plausible (although by no means certain) identification of Hand B with Thomas Heywood. Both A. M. Clark and Michel Grivelet accept the attribution and maintain that Sir Thomas Moore contains some of Heywood's earliest dramatic writing. If this is true then this play
The question of Heywood's authorship is discussed more fully below and in Appendix 1.

Hand B (which I shall henceforth assume to have been Heywood's) contributed one complete scene and incidental additions to three others. In order to understand the nature of these alterations and Heywood's role in the composition or revision of the play as a whole, it is
necessary to examine each addition in some detail.

The first is a rewriting, probably by Chettle, of Moore's reflections on his downfall and on the effect that downfall will have on his family and servants. Greg thinks that the revision is incomplete and altogether rather a puzzle.\footnote{The Book of Sir Thomas More, p. xi.} Mistakenly or not, I see no difficulty at all in explaining this passage. The original shows Moore in a rather petulant mood and introduces ideas about natural superiority and predestination which many of the spectators at the Rose theatre might have found offensive.

\begin{quote}
Here sits my wife, and deare esteemed issue, yonder stand/my loouing Seruaunts, now the difference/twixt those and these. Now you shall heare me speake, like Moore in melanchollie. I conceiue, that Nature/hath sundrie mettalles, out of which she frames/vs mortalles, eche in valuation/out prizing other. Of the finest stuffe, the finest features come, the rest of earth, receive base fortune even before their birth. Hence slues haue their creation and I thinke, Nature prouides content for the base minde, vnder the whip, the burden and the toyle, their lowe wrought bodies drudge in pacience.

\ldots
\end{quote}

But we beeing subject to the rack of hate, falling from happie life to bondage state hauing seene better dayes, now know the lack of glorie, that once rearde eche high fed back.

\footnote{Line references are to W. W. Greg's edition.}
Not only is this sentiment somewhat uncomplimentary to an audience made up largely of commoners, it is also illogical. Catesbie so reminds Moore by pointing out that he too had seen better days, an idea which Moore peremptorily dismisses.

I was the patrone of those dayes and knowe, those were but painted dayes, only for shewe, then greeue not you to fall with him that gaue them. (1503-5)

Moore then goes on to say that his servants are better off without their offices since they will not now be offered the bribes which (he implies) they have been in the habit of accepting and which would have damned their souls to hell. Altogether the picture of Moore here presented is unpleasant and inconsistent with that of the man we have seen in other parts of the play.

The revision seems quite clearly designed to remove the more glaring illogicalities and to present the character in a more favourable light. Chettle begins by touching on the cause of Moore's fall (the king's displeasure and a sycophantic court), but realizing, perhaps, that he is on dangerous ground he deletes these references. He then sounds the familiar stoic refrain about the blessedness of the quiet life

O happy banishment from worldly pride when soules by priuate life are sanctifide. (I, 30-31)

In this mood Moore can face the prospect of death and encourage his children to do the same. Finally he dismisses his servants, not with the implication that their sufferings are illusory, but with genuine consideration.
the best I can doo to prefer you all
with my meane store expect, for heauen can tell
that Moore loues all his followers more than well.
(I, 69-71)

Chettle's alterations effect a fairly fundamental change in the philosophy of the central character and a corresponding modification of his personality.

The second addition is much more complex, involving as it does several authors and a number of causes. Since there is little besides contiguity to identify this as a single unit, I will treat the different parts separately. The first sixty-four lines in Heywood's hand constitute a very slight revision of Scene Four which will be treated later. The second part of the addition consists of fifty-six lines in Hand C, and shows the Lord Mayor and Sir Thomas Moore receiving news of the riots and setting out to quell them. It replaces a street scene (of which a few speeches remain in the original). In eliminating a scene of apprentice violence, the writers may have been exhibiting the same awareness of the difference in effect between presented and reported action which underlies Tilney's much more sweeping objections demanding that the players,

Leaue out ye insur [rection] wholy & ye Cause ther off & [b]egin wt Sr Tho: Moore att ye mayors sessions wt a reportt afterwards off his good servic don being Shriue off Londö vppö a mutiny Agaynst ye Lübards only by A shortt reportt & nott otherwise att your own perrilles. (1-19 margin)

The substitution of a scene at the Guildhall for the street scene would avoid the risk of stirring up undesirable passions in the theatre and also achieve a variation of pace between this and the surrounding incidents. It is impossible to tell whether C had a hand in the
composition of the scene or whether he simply transcribed it.

The third section of Addition II is that portion of the play which has stimulated most discussion. It consists of 147 lines in Hand D which many commentators have claimed to be Shakespeare's. The addition is a revision of the first half of a scene in which Sir Thomas Moore persuades the rebels to surrender by promising that he will plead their cause with the king. The reason why such a partial revision was necessary is not easy to ascertain, since all but three lines of the material it replaces has been lost. Nevertheless, a study of the differences between the two halves of the scene (revised and original) does reveal some interesting facts.

The original conclusion of Moore's speech to the rebels (retained in the unrevised second half of the scene) is as follows:

To persist in it, is present[deat]h, but if you yee[ld yourselves], no doubt, what [punish]ment you (in simplicitie haue incurred, his highnesse in mercie will most [graciously] pardon. (473-5)

The revised version of the speech reads:

Submyt yo[u] to theise noble gentlemens entreate their mediation to the kinge gyve vp yo[r] sealf, to forme obay the maiestrate and thers no doubt, but mercy may be found. yf yo[u] so seek it. (II, 267-70)

The differences are slight but indicative. The first emphasizes the simplicity of the mob, the fact that they deserve punishment, and that submission will bring pardon. The second makes no slighting reference to the rebels' ignorance, stresses obedience rather than submission, and tactfully omits any mention of punishment. These minor differences
of emphasis might not by themselves be considered significant were it not for even more striking contrasts in tone between the revised and original halves of the scene. In the first version, Moore sees himself as an agent of God.

\begin{quote}
God hath made weake Moore his instrument, 
to thwart seditious violent intent. 
\end{quote}
(514-15)

But he does not seem to link this idea with his relationship to the king.

\begin{quote}
my service is my Kings, good reason why: 
since life or death hangs on our Soueraine's eye. 
\end{quote}
(543-4)

The source of the King's authority in these lines seems to be simply his power. After hearing of his appointment to the Privy Council, Moore reflects on the cares of state and finally concludes,

\begin{quote}
Life whirles bout fate, then to a graue it slydes. 
\end{quote}
(565)

The tone of the original scene, to the extent that it is philosophically consistent, tends to be more stoic than Christian.

The revised version is strikingly different in its detailed expression of the doctrine of civil obedience.

\begin{quote}
for to the king god hath his offyce lent 
of dread of Iustyce, power and Comaund 
hath bid him rule, and willd you\textsuperscript{u} to obey 
and to add ampler matie\textsuperscript{e} to this 
he hath not only lent the king his figure 
his throne \[his\textsuperscript{e} \text{sword}, but gyven him his owne name 
calls him a god on earth, what do yo\textsuperscript{u} then 
rysing against him that god himsealf enstalls 
but ryse against god; 
\end{quote}
(II, 221-29)

The contrast in tone suggests to me that the original scene contained sentiments like those replaced by Addition I which were uncongenial to the company. The revision may have been undertaken to bring the philosophical assumptions of the work into line with the prejudices and
convictions of the prospective audience or with the official doctrine of obedience which might be insisted upon by the censor. That the rather aristocratic tone of the original was in fact the real objection, however, is suggested by the fact that the lines stressing the "frailetie of the multitude" and their "outragious wrongs" in the penultimate speech of the following scene are also marked for deletion (726-30).

Philosophical or "doctrinal" issues seem to be the cause of revisions in Addition III as well. This latter consists of twenty-two lines of a soliloquy by Moore written by C and pasted into the book immediately preceding Scene Eight. The speech expresses Moore's sense of wonder at being elevated to the position of Lord Chancellor and his reflections on the power and responsibilities involved.

It is in heaven that I am thus and thus
And that wch we prophanlie terme orfortuns
Is the provision of the power aboue
fitted and shapte Iust to that strength of nature
wch we are borne good god good god
that I from such an humble bench of birth
should stepp as twere vp to my Countries head.

(III, 1-7)

Because the stage direction at the beginning of the revised Scene Eight ("Enter Sr Thomas moore and his man Atired like him") is unchanged, Greg argues that the soliloquy "was clearly an afterthought and has no very close connexion with what follows."13 Here again I find myself in disagreement. The speech seems to me to have a very direct connection with the rest of the play. It is Moore's first appearance after his

13 Ibid., p. xii.
elevation to the position of Lord Chancellor, and it is appropriate that the audience should learn from his own lips his attitude to his new responsibilities. This attitude seems to differ markedly from his reaction in the original to the news of his election to the Privy Council. There his mood was curiously detached.

My Lord, 'for to denye my Soueraigne's bountie were to drop precious stones into the heapes whence first they came. 

(538-40)

The effect of Addition III is therefore twofold. It stresses those themes of Providence and what we might call "Christian democracy" which we have noticed in other additions. But it also substantially alters the way in which we perceive the character of Moore. It shows him with a more serious respect for the office of Lord Chancellor than the immediately following scene without the addition would suggest. It also uses the device of the soliloquy to reveal to us thoughts which the character might not express in action.

Addition IV is another composite scene consisting of 211 lines of Hand C and 30 lines by E (Dekker). It is made up of two encounters of Sir Thomas Moore, the first with the scholar Erasmus, and the second with a ruffian by the name of Faulkner. Since there is a gap in the original manuscript, it is impossible to determine whether or not the two incidents always formed part of the same scene. Greg takes the presence of Surrey in both as evidence that they did. I am not convinced. It seems to me more probable that the episodes were originally dramatized separately. The two locations (study and court room) seem to be quite different, and the late hour of the first ("I know this night the famous Clarke of Roterdame will visite" (746-7) is inappropriate for the second incident.14
It is significant that the revised version changes the time of Erasmus' feast with Surrey from "this day" to "last night" and specifies that Moore "learnd today the famous clarke of Rotherdam will visett" (IV, 11-12).

The revision, therefore, seems an attempt to speed up the narrative and to give greater momentum to the story. The main way in which this has been achieved is by combining two separate scenes in one. Moore's sentencing and subsequent pardoning of Faulkner is divided into two halves which alternate with two portions of a scene in which Moore plays a practical joke on Erasmus by dressing his servant in the Chancellor's robe. The synthesis of these two episodes has involved the reviser in technical problems which he has not always solved satisfactorily.

To begin with, it was necessary to limit the action to one location. We have noted how the discrepancy of time was removed. It appears that a similar discrepancy in location was overcome by removing the properties which would have established the surroundings too strongly. The original scene begins with the stage direction "A table beeing couered with a greene Carpet, a state Cushion on it, and the Pursse and Mace lying thereon Enter Sir Thomas Moore and his man Randall with him, attyred like him" (735-37). In the revised version, the stage direction reads simply "Enter Sr Thomas moore and his man Atired like him." Later, where the original has Moore instruct Randall to "take my place furnishte with purse and Mace" (748-9), the revised version reads "therefore sir take my seate" (IV, 13).
Secondly, the sandwiching together of two scenes has created difficulties of movement which the reviser has not even attempted to overcome. In the original version, Moore leaves the stage while his man Randall impersonates him. After a brief interlude, Moore returns and unmasks his servant. The revision begins with the plan to deceive Erasmus, but the author cuts it short in order to introduce the Faulkner episode. The next seventy-one lines show Moore in his capacity as Chancellor passing sentence on Faulkner. During this incident, no provision is made to get Randall off stage; nor does anyone register surprise that he should be there dressed in his master’s robes of office. When Moore has completed his duties as a magistrate he leaves the stage in order that the proposed practical joke may proceed.

The clumsy dramaturgy of this scene suggests that the union of the two episodes was accomplished by an almost mechanical reshuffling of speeches from what were originally separate scenes. But what was the nature of the two scenes that were so roughly interleaved? Was the patcher also a reviser? Or does the fusion of the two incidents represent a second alteration after earlier revision had failed to improve sufficiently this section of the play? These questions are more difficult to answer and require a comparison of the revised Addition IV with those portions of the original which have survived. Such a comparison reveals some striking differences. Although the original ending of the Erasmus scene has been lost, the close adherence of the reviser to his source where comparison is possible suggests that the ending of the scene as we have it is not very different from what it was at first. This is confirmed, to my mind, by an examination of the rather heavily underlined theme of
the incident. Summed up briefly, this theme is that learning sets a man apart from others in a very special way. It is like virtue in that it implies not simply an increase of knowledge but also a change of heart. It also implies a new relationship of the learned man to the universe and to those around him. All of this is made fairly explicit in Surrey's speech in the original:

nor dooth his greatnesse add
a feigned florishe to his woorthie meritt.
Hees great in studie, thats the statists grace,
that gaines more reverence then the outward place.

(770-73)

The use of such theologically significant words as "merit", "grace", and "reverence" emphasizes that learning bestows a sort of sanctity on its possessor. Erasmus is not being tested to see if he can penetrate a disguise, but to ascertain whether or not he can distinguish between "merit and outward ceremonie" (751). The test, as it turns out, is not a difficult one since the clownish Randall is not redeemed by a knowledge of Latin. This theme is carried over without any change into the revision. When Moore unmasks Randall he seems like a presenter after a dumb show:

thus you see
my loving learned frends how far respecte
waites often on the Cerimonious traine
of bace Illitterate welth whilst men of schooles
shrowded in povertie are cownted fooles.

(IV, 140-44)

The revision of the Faulkner episode, on the other hand, is far freer in treatment, and it weakens (where it does not altogether suppress) the theme of the original. In the play as first conceived, the Faulkner incident is a dramatic parallel to the play-within-the-play of Scene Nine. When Moore is confronted with the ruffian Faulkner who has refused to cut his hair on the pretence that he has made a vow, he sentences him to prison until such time as the offender will break his oath. In a matter of
minutes Faulkner has glimpsed the light, and returns a shaven and reformed man. Moore here plays Good Cownsele to Faulkner's Witt helping him to see the difference between Lady Vanity and Wisdom. Faulkner could scarcely be more edifying:

Sir, I confesse I haue bin much misgouernde, and led by ydle spleenes, which now I see, are like them selues, meere sottishe vanitie. when [in] the Iayle I better [ca]llde to minde the graue rebukes of my Lord Chauncell[or] and lookte into my selfe with more res[pect] then my rashe heate before would let m[e do] I caused a Barber presently be sent f[or] and moude your worship then [to sue] for me.

In the revision, the distinction between the frailty of the ignorant and the wisdom of the learned is retained but in somewhat less objectionable terms. The speeches differ considerably from the original and Faulkner is given the accents of life instead of the sentences of didactic art. The most significant difference, however, is the treatment of the end of the episode. The first revised version of the ending is simply an oath on the part of Faulkner to be revenged on his barber. That this was the original conclusion to the scene is suggested by the fact that it is followed by a stage direction "exit" (which has been subsequently deleted), and by a change of handwriting in the manuscript.

The next thirty lines in Hand E give an alternate ending. In it Morris discharges Faulkner, then repents and takes him back into his service. There is no reference to a reformation, nor is the contrast in appearance, symbolically so important in the original, used for anything but a source of humour:

hayles yf losse of hayre Cannot mad a man-- what Can? I am deposde: my Crowne is taken from mee Moore had bin better a Scowrd More ditch, than a notcht mee thus, does hee begin sheepe sharing wth Iack Faulkner?

(IV.213-16)
The impression conveyed by Addition IV is that two very different writers were working in some tenuous collaboration. One of the authors deviates very little from the source, retaining its heavily didactic tone, and (at least where comparison is possible) most of the original wording. The second writer is much more creative. He vitalizes the lines, giving them a colour and individuality they do not have in the original. Furthermore, he deliberately suppresses the thematic point of the scene. The relationship between these writers is puzzling because their work has been sandwiched together in a very clumsy and mechanical way. It seems to me that there are at least three principles underlying the revision. The first is related to the dynamic form of the play, and dictates those changes which were introduced to give forward momentum to scenes which originally existed with thematic connections only. This would account for the joining of two apparently separate scenes into one. A second, related, principle concerns the behaviour of individual characters. There is an obvious attempt to give Faulkner a more distinctive dramatic personality. Finally, there is a discernible tendency to play down certain thematic ideas. It seems to me that these various tendencies reflect the different interests of different writers.

The contrast between the additions so far discussed and those written by Heywood is striking. Most noticeable, perhaps, is the greater variety of tasks undertaken by Heywood. His contributions include a certain amount of comic material in Addition II and Scene Seven, a messenger speech in Addition V, and a short bridge scene (Addition VI). None of the other writers connected with the revision of Sir Thomas Moore
contributes so many different kinds of additions in so many different parts of the play. All of this suggests that Heywood's role was somehow different from that of his colleagues, and that along with C he had a larger or more important part in the revision of the work. Before considering what that role may have been I would like to look in more detail at the nature of the Heywood revisions.

The comic diversion in Addition II and Scene Seven is provided by a clown figure thrust rather crudely into two of the original mob scenes. In both cases the humour consists of no more than simple "gag" lines, and there is no apparent effort to give any distinctive personality to the new figure who is referred to simply as "Clown". To the extent that it is possible to judge such things, it would seem to me that the purpose of the additions was to lighten the tone, particularly of the anti-alien riot scene. The comedy serves to defuse the potentially explosive anger of the audience by providing an escape for the emotion through laughter. It is quite conceivable that the changes were undertaken to anticipate objections from the censor whose views on the presentation of civic disorder must have been well-known. The role of the clown in the second scene in which he appears is somewhat different. In that scene, the rioters are brought to justice so there is not the same need to divert a too-easily excitable audience. Here the use of comedy is closer to that suggested by the term "comic relief", since the clown's obvious fear of the gallows provides an emotional contrast to the fortitude of Williamson. The pathos of the moment between Doll and Williamson before the latter's death is increased by this contrast. Although the insertion of gags in this scene seems almost
mechanical, there is evidence that it reflects a coherent theory of the function of comedy in drama. For it is significant that no comparable comic intrusions are to be found in the last part of the play. Moore's martyrdom was considered too serious to be undercut. Heywood recognized that although comedy could heighten the poignancy of an incident, it interfered with the gradual intensification of emotion which is desirable at the conclusion of a serious play.

The next revision to which Heywood contributed was Addition V, (twenty-six lines in Hand C which serves as an introduction to Scene Nine). This addition consists of a brief messenger's speech announcing the arrival of the Lord Mayor, and Moore's rejoinder explaining that Erasmus has already dined and returned to Holland. The whole serves as a link between Addition IV (the combined Erasmus-Faulkner scene) and the following banquet scene with the Lord Mayor. Just why the transition was introduced, and how it was composed are questions of some complexity.

To begin with, it is impossible now to determine whether Heywood was the author of the entire twenty-six lines or only of those five which survive in his hand at the end of Addition VI. Secondly, the same obscurity surrounds the sequence of the composition. Was the whole addition conceived of at once, or does it represent two successive stages of revision? The need for the addition is fairly obvious. There is no foreshadowing of the Lord Mayor's banquet scene in the revised Faulkner episode. Furthermore, no account is given of Erasmus' departure, and it is possible that in the revision carried out in Addition IV some original material dealing with this incident was excluded. It was necessary, therefore, to provide some sort of transition between Addition IV and
Scene Nine to explain the sequence of events, and to establish the time. The resulting solution to the dramatic problem is surprisingly crude.  

\[15\]

W. W. Greg (The Book of Sir Thomas More, p. 89) says that the addition could not have been played in its present form following Scene Eight because it leaves no time for the dinner.

There is no effort to incorporate any of the necessary information in dramatic action. Furthermore, the time sequence and the offstage activities of Erasmus are left extremely vague. A reference to a "Banquet" (179) by Moore would suggest that the scholar's visit was to be a fairly extended one, and Moore's re-entry after the short exchange between Faulkner and Morris seems at first a continuation of the same scene. The news that at least a day has elapsed is surprising because the audience has not been prepared for it. Although the play as it stands could be made comprehensible in the theatre, this particular transition is especially clumsy.

The reason for this awkwardness may be that the composition of Addition IV took place in two stages. I believe that the Erasmus and Faulkner scenes were originally separate, and that the latter made no reference to time. The first stage of revision retained these as separate scenes, but introduced a certain amount of exposition to locate the Lord Mayor's banquet scene in the narrative sequence. The necessary information was conveyed in several lines given to Moore at the beginning of Scene Nine and now contained in the second half of Addition V. A subsequent decision to shorten the play led to the interweaving of the revised Erasmus
and Faulkner scenes, and an attempt to tack the Lord Mayor's banquet scene directly on to Addition IV. In order to accomplish this, Heywood wrote the messenger's speech which was recopied by C and inserted as a bridge between the first revised ending of the Faulkner scene and the added speech of Moore in Scene Nine. The original intention was to begin the banquet scene at IV.204 before Moore leaves the stage where a stage direction "Enter a messenger heere" is crossed out. Such an arrangement gave no time for Erasmus' departure, however, so it was decided to keep the banquet scene separate. Moore's immediate re-entrance seemed clumsy, and Dekker was evidently asked to write extra dialogue for Morris and Faulkner to provide a smoother transition.16

16For an argument that the extra dialogue was introduced to give an opportunity for those actors who had to double to change their costumes, however, see Scott McMillin, "The Book of Sir Thomas More: A Theatrical View", Modern Philology, 68 (August, 1970), 10-24.

Addition VI provides us with the clearest example we have of Heywood's work on this play. It consists of a short scene showing a second incident between Moore and the players in which the latter outwit a dishonest servant and are rewarded by the Chancellor on his way to a council meeting. The episode provides a neat transition between the surrounding scenes, and links the rather diffuse action of the middle of the play to the conflict which leads to the final catastrophe. In function, therefore, it is not unlike Addition V, but technically it is greatly superior. The exposition and foreshadowing needed to join the
banquet and council scenes are provided in a dramatic incident which is full of interest in its own right. Furthermore, the added scene not only serves as a transition, but it provides yet another illustration of Moore's character as a wise and just magistrate. This addition proves that Heywood was capable of far more competent work than that contained in his other brief contributions to the play. It is the mastery of dramatic technique revealed in this short scene which has persuaded some commentators that the playwright might have had a fairly responsible role in the revision of the original composition of *Sir Thomas Moore*.

W. W. Greg, in his edition of the play, concludes that "B is undoubtedly an original author...[and] probably [wrote]...a good deal of the additional matter which is not actually in his hand".17 E. H. C.

---


Oliphant argues that the original *Sir Thomas Moore* is a collaboration of three authors, Munday and the two dramatists whose handwriting Greg identifies as A and B.18 Accepting the usual identification of these hands, R. C. Bald agrees that the original play was written by Munday, Chettle, and Heywood19 in spite of the fact that Harold Jenkins finds...
Attractive as these theories are to a student of Heywood, there are several objections to them. The most forceful is that B does not exhibit the familiarity with the play which we would expect of an original author. For example, in transcribing Scene Four, Heywood makes two errors, writing "Lincoln" for "Williamson" (II.42), and misreading "vpon our Guarde" as "vpon or swords" (II.51). In Addition VI, he calls Moore "Lord" in the speech headings, and spells the name "more" when he uses it in the text. He also refers to Inclination as "Vice", and to the fourth player as "Clo[wn]". None of this suggests to me that Heywood was involved in the original composition of the play.

If Heywood was simply a reviser, how much authority did he have? Was he responsible for deciding what scenes needed to be altered, and for commissioning those revisions he did not write himself? To answer that question it is necessary to consider more carefully the relationship between Heywood and the writer of Hand C. There is a good deal of evidence to suggest that C was intimately concerned with the
technical aspects of production. For example, one of his tasks seems to have been to prepare the manuscript for use as a prompt book (or possibly as the final copy from which such a book would be transcribed). Certain of the author's stage directions have been rewritten in the left-hand margin and sometimes surrounded by a box to make them stand out more clearly.\footnote{Enter Lincolne Betts Williamson Doll (410); Enter Crofts (553); Waite's Play Here (954).} In other cases, stage directions have been inserted where none existed in the original.\footnote{Enter Moore wth Attendaunts wth Purse & Mace (VI.33)} The writer of Hand C also alters certain speech headings. The most interesting of these changes occurs at V.1 where the name "T. Goodal" has been added below the heading "Mess[enger]." This has been taken by Baldwin\footnote{The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company, p. 132.} and some others as proof that the play had been cast, and that the alterations were therefore made after approval by Tilney. I do not believe that such a conclusion is justified since, as Greg points out, the bulk of the additions clearly have nothing to do with the censor, and seem to have been undertaken solely for dramatic considerations.\footnote{Whether or not the}
appearance of an actor's name in the manuscript indicates that the play had reached the rehearsal stage, it does demonstrate that some consideration was being given to practical problems of production, and that C was somehow concerned with those problems.

Other alterations in the book point in the same direction. There are several instances where speeches have been assigned or reassigned by the writer of Hand C. The clearest example of this occurs in Addition II where the author D (Shakespeare?) has simply written "other" opposite several speeches. Four such have been given to specific characters by C. Here the intention is obvious. There are other cases, however, where C has reallocated lines already clearly ascribed by the original author. Two examples of such changes are to be found in the same scene where the prefix "Sher" is changed once to "Maior" and once to "Williamson". As Pollard suggests, this was almost certainly done to eliminate Sherwin from the revised scene since there is no entrance for the character, and the reviser is evidently confused about whether Sherwin was a rebel or member of the King's party.²⁵

²⁴ The Book of Sir Thomas More, p. xv.

²⁵ Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More, p. 208.
If C occasionally eliminates a character by reassigning speeches, there are other cases where he gives one greater prominence by the same means. In Addition II, two speeches (one assigned to "Betts" and one to "all") are given to Lincoln in order to give that character the importance he should have in the scene as leader of the mob. Finally, C occasionally seems to exercise an editorial function. This is sometimes very minor, as when he adds the word "hether" to give metrical regularity to one of B's lines (V.4). At other times, however, as when he repairs the incomprehensible verse of D (II, 237), he seems to wield greater authority.

The exact nature of C's authority may be indicated by two important stage directions. These directions reveal that in at least two cases C was responsible for fitting the additions into their appropriate places in the manuscript. But was he using his own judgment or simply acting on someone else's instructions? A marginal notation ordering the rewriting of a scene (735-36) would seem to hold the key to the mystery. Unfortunately the identity of the handwriting cannot be determined with certainty. Consequently the extent of C's authority remains something of a mystery.

W. W. Greg concludes from his study of the play that the writer of Hand B (whom he never accepted as Heywood) was a literary reviser,
while C undertook responsibility for what he called the "dramatic revision". This hypothesis does not seem entirely convincing.

As I have argued above, it is unlikely that B (Heywood) was in fact the author of much of the material now surviving in C's hand apart from the messenger speech for which we have concrete evidence. Greg's assumption that C was only a copyist is possibly justified, but I believe that he transcribed the work of several authors not just that of B. Furthermore, it seems to me that Greg's distinction between "literary" and "dramatic" revision is arbitrary or misleading. A division of authority along the lines Greg suggests (one concerned with text and another with stage directions) would be unworkable in practice since many of the revisions of Sir Thomas Moore are "dramatic" in the most comprehensive sense that they involve changes which are both linguistic and technical. I believe that final authority for revision would have to rest with one individual, and on the basis of the evidence I am inclined to think that that individual was C. This identification might help to explain the unevenness of the revision of the play. Where
authors are given freedom and scope, either within scenes or (as in Addition VI) between scenes, the results are usually successful. On the other hand, the awkward compressions of some parts of the play (Addition IV) and the clumsy transitions may reflect the fact that the supervision of the revision as a whole was in the hands of a technician rather than a dramatist. Whatever the true cause of the weaknesses in the surviving play, my reading of the evidence would suggest that Heywood's contributions to the revision were fairly minor and were coordinated (possibly even commissioned) by C.

It is now possible to reconstruct the process we have been examining with a view to assessing the aesthetic principles (if any) governing the changes introduced into the manuscript. The original play, as far as it can be reconstructed, might be described as a political morality in which events are seen as part of a strongly ethical and philosophical pattern. Like earlier and much more naive examples of the kind such as *King Johan* or *Gorboduc*, the play presents an historical figure as a moral type. The effect is a blend of history and allegory in which the universal significance of the characters is of more importance than their verisimilitude. Moore is a model or symbol rather than a person, and his actions are always more exemplary than fully credible. He is the Just Magistrate or the Martyr to Conscience. Even his frivolity has its philosophical point. When he playfully takes over the role of Good Cownsel in the interlude of *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* he is transformed quite literally into an allegorical figure, and the scene becomes a paradigm for the play as a whole.
The strong emphasis on theme in the play has tended to weaken the dynamic form. The action does not unfold in clearly realized space and time. There is very little foreshadowing to prepare the audience for the appearance of Erasmus, for example; nor is there any real sense of an environment enclosing the events on the stage. Messengers go to and come from distant places such as Newgate without seeming to move through real dimensions. Similarly, characters such as Lifter appear briefly and then sink into the surrounding darkness. On the other hand, within individual scenes there is a lively realism which makes maximum use of suspense, surprise, and reversal. The episodes with Lifter and Faulkner, the riot scenes, and the final moments of Moore with his family, all reveal a capacity on the part of the dramatist to create vivid and believable behaviour.

The alterations made to the play can be divided into three categories. There are those which alter the structure of the narrative by changing the sequence of the incidents or by giving further exposition or clearer foreshadowing. Secondly, there are the changes which alter the way in which character is presented. And finally, certain changes modify the nature of the stage spectacle. Among the first might be included Additions IV, V, and VI all of which are concerned, at least in part, with the sequential relationship of episodes. The second category includes a greater variety of changes. Some alter what might be called the verbal behaviour of a character and thereby present an individual more colourfully. The vitalization of Faulkner's speech is an example of this kind of character modification. Other changes affect the presentation of emotional or intellectual development. Moore's revised soliloquies are cases
that might be cited in this connection. Still other changes seem intended to modify the dynamics within a group as, for example, when certain speeches in the riot scene are reassigned. In the third category we might include the elimination of certain properties in the Erasmus scene, or the omission of one of the apprentice scenes from the original.

What is significant from our point of view is that almost alone among the revisers, Heywood is responsible for the relationship between incidents. Other revisers alter characterization, or modify the philosophical issues raised within a particular episode. But Heywood works from the viewpoint of the play as a whole, considering such things as the need for foreshadowing or dramatic transition. I think it is unlikely, as I have argued, that Heywood initiated the changes. It is interesting, however, that of all the writers, Heywood is the most concerned with the basic mechanics of dramatic storytelling.

In the end, it is perhaps not necessary to know what role Heywood had in the revision of Sir Thomas Moore or even if he was connected with the play at all. For what seems undeniable to me is that he would almost certainly have been involved in similar collaborative projects time and time again. It was from experiences such as these that he discovered what worked in the theatre and what did not. He learned how to tell his stories in such a way that they progressed easily from beginning to middle to end with change, suspense, and variety on the way. He learned how to present character through vivid individual speech as well as through appearance, and by resorting to the techniques of symbolism. He learned how to use the resources of the stage, the discovery space, trap, and upper level, as well as the properties stored or created in
the tiring house. Above all, he learned to involve the audience in an experience which was at once "real" enough to engage their attention but spectacular or moving enough to command their wonder. The way he put this knowledge to work in the composition of his own plays will be the subject of succeeding chapters.
IV

NARRATIVE

The process of dramatic composition we have observed in *Sir Thomas Moore* bears little resemblance to the notion of creative artistry usually associated (perhaps unconsciously) with the work of Shakespeare's contemporaries. Is it a reliable model of what actually occurred in the theatrical companies such as the Admiral's or Chamberlain's men? In order to put that question in its proper context I would like to make a brief digression into the subject of Elizabethan architecture. A comparison between the writing of plays and the building of houses is not altogether fanciful. To begin with, both activities were regarded more as crafts, possibly even trades, than as arts in the more exalted sense of that word. The popular playwright and the master builder learned their business in the most practical way possible. This meant that they worked with others who had more experience or, later on perhaps, complementary talents. As Sir John Summerson writes, "The plan of a house may have been conceived by one mind, its architectural treatment by another, and either of those minds, or some other, may have modified the original intentions while the building was going up. This fluidity is often apparent in Elizabethan architecture and sometimes results in those unexpected and original combinations in which much of its attraction lies."¹ One result of this form of education was that the apprentice
craftsman acquired a combination of theory and rules of thumb which was very different from the kind of "professional" training traditionally provided by more academic institutions. Theoretical ideas, when they were encountered, were frequently modified as they were absorbed into the practical tradition. In architecture, for example, "classical principles made their way in England not as a method of building but as a mode of decorative design... [Classicism] was applied to the old stock of building tradition [but] only to a limited extent did it get into the bones of that tradition."  

The interaction between "classicism" and "the old stock" of the English dramatic tradition is what produced Elizabethan dramatic form. Nowhere is this more evident, perhaps, than in the treatment of what Aristotle calls "the arrangement of the incidents."  

---


2 Ibid., p. 21.

3 Poetics, VI. 6, p. 25.
(a) Theory and Practice

The theoretical basis of dramatic classicism, in England as on the Continent, was the work of the commentators on the plays of Plautus and Terence. Professor T. W. Baldwin has shown in minute detail how the idea of a five-act structure embodying a tripartite action grew gradually out of the scholars' attempts to reconcile the practice of the Latin dramatists with the critical comments of Horace and Aristotle. 4

4Shakespere's Five Act Structure (Urbana, 1947).

By the middle of the sixteenth century, Baldwin argues, there had emerged a fairly coherent, and widely-held consensus about the "proper" way to construct a play. Although in retrospect it is clear that the theory of the commentators represented a narrow, and in some ways distorted, view of classical drama, at the time it seemed a genuine explication of the methods of the ancients.

Baldwin shows that the plays of Terence appear to be constructed according to clearly demarcated stages in a conflict between a chief intriguer and his opponents. 5 The struggle follows a pattern

5Ibid., p. 12.

which includes 1) necessary preparatory information, 2) the beginning of the first actual action with the preliminary moves and counter-moves
preceding the main battle, 3) the apparent victory of the forces of opposition, 4) the counterattack, and 5) the final success of the young intriguers.  

That Terence himself thought of these stages as

6 Ibid., pp. 9-10.

formal divisions of the structure is suggested by the fact that he referred to "the first act" of one of his plays.  

7 Ibid., p. 56.

Furthermore the fourth century commentator Donatus not only divided the plays into acts, but cited Terence's near-contemporary, Varro, as the authority for the division in five cases. It was Horace's dictum in Ars Poetica, however, that a play "should not be either shorter or longer than five acts".


that put the Roman seal of approval on the five-part dramatic structure. Renaissance critics assumed that all drama followed the same structural rules and Giraldi, in the 1540's, adopted a five-act division for his tragedies.
If there was widespread agreement that correct dramatic composition required a division of the plot into five acts, there was considerable difference of opinion about how those acts should be related to the structure of the action. The problem centred on the need to reconcile classical terminology with the fivefold division of plot. Aristotle and Horace speak of the beginning, middle, and end of the story, and Donatus mentions the prologue, protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe. To complicate things still further, Aristotle also refers to what he calls the "quantitative parts" of a tragedy which he designates prologue, episode, exode and choric song. How, the commentators wondered, did these correspond to one another and to the act sequence?

A clue to the solution of the problem seemed to be provided by Donatus. "The prologue", he wrote, "has extraneous material, the protasis is the first act and beginning of the drama, and the epitasis is the increase and progression of the turbations and the whole knot of the error, while the catastrophe is the conversion of affairs into a happy ending." By the sixteenth century it was generally understood

9 Ibid., p. 266.

10 Poetics, XII, 1, p. 43.
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that Donatus meant the prologue and *protasis* to be included in the first act, the *epitasis* in the second, third, and fourth (exactly or approximately), and the catastrophe in the fifth. The result was a structure in which the first, third, and final divisions were the crucial acts.

The Aristotelian terminology was somewhat more difficult to accommodate. Prior to the sixteenth century the *Poetics* exercised little direct influence on dramatic theory. Indeed, the Latin doctrine had become so dominant that when the first commentary on the *Poetics* appeared in 1548 it made Aristotle conform to Horace and Donatus. In it Robortellus equated Aristotle's "prologue" with the first act, his "exode" with the last act, and suggested that a play should normally contain three "episodes" separated by choric songs. From that time on, no major distinctions between Latin and Greek structure were made by the commentators. Furthermore, by one of those ironies of literary history, the
classical theory was not uncommonly referred to as "Aristotelian".

It is sometimes overlooked that the so-called Aristotelian tradition represents only a relatively narrow aspect of drama as practiced by the ancients themselves. It is misleading to suggest that "classicism" in its broadest sense is totally opposed to, or incompatible with, "medievalism". It is simply not true that the medieval mind was without logic, for example, or that Greek narrative could not be incoherent. Much of the Elizabethans' love of variety could be justified by classical example. The interweaving of two or more stories into a single play is a practice that goes back to the Romans who called it "contaminatio" and attributed its invention to Gnaeus Naevius. 14

Furthermore, the variety and sweep of classical epic served as a narrative model which even Aristotle acknowledged to have greater "mass and dignity" than tragedy. 15 Finally, we should recognize that popular drama, even in fourth century Athens, tended to be more formless, more appealing to a variety of emotions, than the ideal held up in the Poetics. Several of Aristotle's strictures anticipate Hamlet's. For example, he

14 Elder Olson, The Theory of Comedy (Bloomington, 1968), p. 60.

15 Poetics, XXIV.4, p. 93.
complains that episodic plots are written "to please the players" and to satisfy the requirements of the competition (IX, 10, p. 39). He condemns popular taste which prefers a double catastrophe (triumph for the good and retribution for the bad) to the "true tragic pleasure" (XIII, 7-8, pp. 47-49). He even seems to make allowance for looser construction than is generally acknowledged, by admitting that some facts are outside the scope of a play and consequently incidents may sometimes be presented without all of the causes leading up to them (XVII, 3, p. 63). He also says that extraneous incidents can be combined with the main action in the complication (XVIII, 1, p. 65). The conflict between the "Aristotelian" and non-Aristotelian traditions does not originate in the Renaissance, therefore, nor even in the Middle Ages. It is inherent in the very nature of storytelling and criticism, and is as old as both. For it reflects the basic differences between the creator and the critic, the practitioner and the theoretician.

Nevertheless, there is a way in which art and the methods of discussing art were profoundly altered in the Christian era. This alteration was caused in part by the shift from syllogistic to analogical reasoning, and partly by the increased emphasis on the moral purpose of fiction. Although Horace stressed that literature should instruct, it is unlikely that he had in mind the unrelieved didacticism characteristic of medieval allegory. The notion of a poet-preacher was foreign to the classical spirit. Equally foreign was the belief that the path to knowledge might be indirect. Classical narrative proceeds to a conclusion by logical steps. Medieval allegory sidles up to the truth. In the latter, narrative interest is secondary to the
larger symbolic framework. The "meaning" is not confined to the ending, but is coexistent with the whole structure.

The effect of the Christian preoccupation with the pedagogical nature of art can be seen in criticism as well. Prior to the sixteenth century, the interest in Terence was primarily textual, grammatical, or philological. Beginning with Melancthon's edition of the plays in 1528, however, there was a "new period of scholarly activity" which concerned itself less with dramatic structure than with the theme of the narrative.16 Terence began to be valued for his educational qualities, and


moral principles were applied to his work. Protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe, terms which Donatus applied to the intrigue, acquired slightly more ethical implications in Melancthon.

The theoretical assumptions according to which Thomas Heywood would fashion his plays were derived, then, from what I have called "Aristotelian" and non-Aristotelian sources. During his education at a grammar school and later at Cambridge he would have acquired a critical terminology and a more or less accurate understanding of the structure of Latin drama. But his experience in the theatre (as spectator or actor) and much of his non-dramatic reading would have introduced him to a very different narrative aesthetic. The sprawling medieval romances and the formless plays of the late eighties, as well as his beloved classical myths, all belonged to a tradition which,
at least in England, was far stronger than the attenuated classicism of the schools. Accordingly, as a dramatist, Heywood found himself torn between the claims of certain critics who cited classical theory, and the demands of audiences and actors who wanted plays to conform to popular narrative patterns and practical theatrical requirements.

Something of the way in which Heywood responded to these conflicting demands is evident in his adaptation of Plautus' Amphitryon for inclusion in The Silver Age. Latin drama had long been performed before academic spectators. But Heywood needed to present the story of Amphitryon in such a way that it would appeal to an audience accustomed to the fast-moving plays of the Fortune and Red Bull theatres.

To do this he makes several modifications of the original. To begin with, he compresses Plautus' somewhat diffuse action. For example, the confrontation between Amphitryon and Alcmena takes up some 350 lines in a modern English translation of the play. Heywood's treatment of the

same material is compressed into about 185 lines. In the original, Amphitryon is twice told of the visit of the mysterious stranger before he is upset by the possible consequences to his wife's chastity. Heywood eliminates the first reference to the bedchamber. The Elizabethan


\[\text{18 Cf. The Silver Age., III, 111-112 and Amphitryon, pp. 258-263.}\]
also makes much better use of the incident of the pilfered bowl. Whereas Plautus introduces it into the middle of the scene, Heywood reserves the discussion of the gift until after Amphitryon's outburst of jealousy. In this way Alcmena's mention of the bowl is made to seem a natural response to her husband's apparently irrational anger. The incident provides a neat double climax in which Amphitryon's confusion is compounded. One final change which is of some interest is Heywood's introduction of Juno as a supernatural opponent for Jupiter. This change has the effect of putting the human drama into a larger metaphysical context. In these various ways, Heywood gives a clearer indication of the forces acting in the play and causing one event to follow another.

The means a dramatist chooses to tell his story depend partly on the narrative tradition in which he writes, and partly on the physical resources he has at his disposal. Heywood's narrative technique is a product of the interaction of these two influences. The second could be said to determine the mechanics of structure - how the playwright conveys exposition, foreshadowing, and a sense of causality. The narrative tradition influences the way in which a writer conveys the overall shape of the story - how the beginning should relate to the middle and the end, and the various components to one another. The first might be called "dynamic form" as it refers to the way in which an audience apprehends a play moment by moment. The second could be called the play's "static form" because it describes how the work is thought of as a whole. Heywood's experiments with dynamic and static
form in his plays constitute two important aspects of his dramaturgy.

(b) Dynamic Form.

While the action of any story must necessarily proceed in one direction only, the dramatization of that action need not adhere to a strict temporal sequence. A play can "begin" at the beginning of the series of events it is relating or it can open very near the end. This beginning of the play (as opposed to the story) can be called the "point of attack".

(i) Point of Attack.

There are several means by which Heywood gets his stories under way. In the most informally structured of the plays (the first three Ages for example), he employs a chorus. The figure of Homer leads the audience into the play abruptly by methods that are more appropriate to the art of the storyteller than the dramatist. Much more inherently dramatic is the "narrative beginning" which establishes a potentially dramatic situation without presenting the initial crisis. Examples of such openings are to be found in the revelation of Young Arthur's dislike of his wife in the first scene of Chuse or the awakening of jealousy in Chester and Clinton in The Royal King. Narrative beginnings sometimes establish an atmosphere, as in the wedding scene in Woman Killed or the approach to the tavern in 1 Fair Maid. In such cases, the audience is given time to absorb the mood before the conflict is precipitated. Yet another type of narrative beginning intro-
duces a vow or statement of intent. The brothers' determination to set out on a crusade in *Four Prentices*, for example, Thomas Gresham's monopoly in sugar in *2 Know*, or the Trojans' resolve to go to war with Greece in *1 Iron Age*, all initiate courses of action which will later bring the protagonists into conflict with known or unknown adversaries.

A still more exciting opening can be achieved by initiating the central conflict in the first scene. It is interesting that Heywood very rarely begins his plays in this way. The closest he comes, to an opening scene of crisis is perhaps *1 Know* or *2 Edward IV* in which the audience is plunged into the middle of a conflict between central antagonists (Mary and Elizabeth, Edward and Lewis). In both these plays, however, the impact of the opening scene is diminished by keeping one of the opponents off stage. Similarly, the strong openings of *The Silver* and *Brazen Ages* are muted by the prior appearance of the chorus. Heywood rejects the strong dramatic beginning (such as the opening of *Othello* or *The Alchemist* for example) in favour of a slightly more leisurely opening which allows the audience to find its bearings before being plunged into the precipitating crisis.

(ii) Exposition.

Heywood's preference for an early point of attack eliminates the need for extensive exposition in the first scene. At the same time it presents him with the problem of achieving sequential coherence. The popular love of romantic stories ranging widely in space and time saddled the Elizabethan playwright with several technical difficulties in linking incident to incident. The need to locate a scene in a
We have noted the failure of the author of *Sir Thomas Moore* to provide adequate exposition and foreshadowing.

Coherent time sequence is particularly acute in plays involving gaps in the dramatic action. After each such gap the dramatist must introduce new characters and recount those events which have occurred off-stage in the interval. The most rudimentary means of providing such exposition is the employment of a presenter or chorus. Although Heywood relies infrequently on such devices, he does make use of them throughout his early and middle career. Narrative exposition of this elementary kind appears in *2 Edward IV* (I, 119), *Four Prentices* (II, 175), *2 Know* (I, 332), *1 Fair Maid* (II, 319), *Golden Age, Silver Age*, and *Brazen Age* (between acts). Far from seeking to eliminate such exposition from his plays as he develops his dramatic technique, Heywood actually makes more extensive use of the chorus in the *Ages* than in any of his earlier plays.

A related device for providing necessary exposition is the dumb show. Heywood explains the purpose of this convention in *Four Prentices*:

> Now to auoide all dilatory newes,  
> Which might with-hold you from the Stories pith,  
> And substance of the matter we entend:  
> I must entreate your patience to forbeare,  
> Whilst we do feast your eye, and starue your eare.  
> For in dumbe shews, which were they writ at large  
> Would aske a long and tedious circumstance:  
> Their infant fortunes I will soone expresse,  
> (II, 175)
This quotation shows that Heywood is conscious of the need to select only the "pith" of the story and to present the important incidents in a form that appeals to the eye as well as to the ear. But it exhibits little consciousness of the need to embody exposition in any "realistic" context. The avoidance of tedium is the first concern and any means to that end is welcome. Dumb shows have the advantage that they convey absolutely necessary "dilatory news" with considerably more colour and excitement than can be provided by a presenter. Accordingly Heywood often supplements his use of a chorus with what might be thought of as its dramatic equivalent.
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Dumb shows are, in fact, almost confined to those plays that also use a chorus; 1 Know (I, 216, 228, 239), 1 Fair Maid (II, 275), and the Golden, Silver and Brazen Ages.

In spite of his use of choruses and dumb shows, however, Heywood normally incorporates expository material into the dramatic action of his plays. He uses a number of techniques, some of them unquestionably naive by modern standards of realism. For example, characters frequently introduce themselves either by addressing the audience or by giving needlessly detailed information to others on stage. In a curious mixture of conventions in 1 Edward IV, John Crosby, Lord Mayor of London enters on a bare stage and begins speaking to himself. ("I marie, Crosbie this befits thee well.... But soft John Crosbie thou forgetst thyself" I, 57). Although these lines
are obviously intended to represent thought rather than direct address
to the audience, Crosby goes on to tell himself a great many things
that he already knows.

I do not shame to say the Hospital
Of London was my chiefest fostring place:
There did I learn that, near vnto the Crosse,
Commonly calld Cow Crosse neare Islington,
An honest citizen did chance to find me:
[And so on for another twenty-five lines.]
(I, 57)

The second Luce in *Wise Woman* introduces herself in a soliloquy directed
openly to the spectators.

Heigh hoe: have I disguis'd my selfe, and
stolne out of the Countrey thus farre, and can light of
no better newes to entertaine mee? ...you see
my welcome. (V, 290-291)

In other plays, introductions are thinly disguised as conversation.

For instance in *Brazen Age* Oeneus says,

Thus midst our brothers, daughter, Queene and sonne,
Sits Oeneus crown'd in fertill Calidon.
(III, 172)

In *Iron Age*, Heywood uses the technique of epic,

Faire Cresida by the honour of my birth,
As I am Hector's brother, Priams sonne,
And Troilus best belou'd of Hecuba. (III, 288)

Frequently individuals are described to the audience by other characters.
Sometimes such descriptions are directed to the audience. Chartley, in
*Wise Woman* explains, "There is a faire sweet modest rogue, her name is
Luce:" etc." (V, 283¼). More often, however, information about other
characters is imparted to the audience in the course of the dialogue.

Closely related to the problems of introducing new characters
is that of recounting incidents which have occurred offstage between scenes. The need in epic drama to convey such information throughout the plays (rather than only in the opening scene) led to the extensive use of a number of expository conventions. The most naive of these is "direct address" whereby a character performs the function of a chorus. In *The Four Prentices*, for example, Guy enters with a page and recounts his adventures:

> I am turn'd wilde man since I vsd these forrests:  
> And I haue wonne more weapons in these woods,  
> From Out-lawes, whom my sword hath vanquished,  
> Then I can carry on my backe with ease. (II, 222)

Here it is not a case of breaking the spell of the fiction by drawing the spectators' attention to the conventions of theatrical performance. On the contrary, the dramatist enlarges the world of illusion by, as it were, inviting the audience to participate directly in the story. The technique is a familiar one and there is no indication that Heywood grew dissatisfied with it during the period we are studying.²¹

²¹One... Luce I should have married in the Countrey, etc. (Wise Woman, V, 312); I crost the water in my gown and slippers, To see my rents and buildings of the Bankside (2 Know, I, 302); The Sailors call aboard, and I am forc'd To leave my friend now at the point of death, (1 Fair Maid, II, 288); The honest Merchant in whose ship I came, Hath by a cunning quiddit in the Law Both ship and goods made forfeit to the king (1 Fair Maid, II, 326); Jupiter and Alcmena are entred at the backe gate, whilst Amphitrio is beating his servants out at the foregate (Silver Age, III, 116).

A more complex method of conveying exposition is to incorporate it into the dramatic situation. Frequently this results in certain
characters making superfluous explanation as in *The Brazen Age* where Meleager announces, "The cause of this conuention (Lords of *Greece*) Needs no expression; and yet briefly thus:" etc. (III, 187). Examples of explanation of this kind are frequent in Heywood's plays throughout the period.  

22 Daughter, thou: seest how Fortune turnes her wheels. Wee that but late were mounted vp aloft, Lul'd in the skirt of that inconstant Dame, Are now throwne head-long by her ruthlesse hand (*Four Prentices*, II, 167); Thus from the Holy Warres are we return'd (*Royal King*, VI, 5); Sister you see we are driuen to hard shift, To keepe this poore house we haue left vnsold (*Woman Killed*, II, 113); Now are we strong, our giant Issue growne, Our sonnes in seuerall kingdomes we haue planted (*Golden Age*, III, 36).

Heywood's reliance on conventions of exposition is a necessary consequence of his submission to the demand for romantic adventure in the popular theatre. That copiousness of dramatic incident should be achieved at the expense of a certain literal realism seemed a self-evident artistic principle. As Homer remarks somewhat ungraciously in *The Brazen Age*, "He that expects fiue short Acts can containe Each circumstance of these things we present, Me thinkes should shew more barrennesse then braine:" (III, 255). We shall see later that Heywood did attempt where possible to incorporate exposition into fully credible dramatic action. But he did not consider the achievement of credibility an end in itself. On the contrary he rarely seems to have scrupled to use the most rudimentary methods of exposition if thereby he could plunge more directly into scenes of action and spectacle.
(iii) Foreshadowing.

Almost as important as filling in the dramatic past in epic drama is the problem of conveying a sense of expectation or foreboding. The creation of a dramatic future is usually called "foreshadowing" and Heywood employs a number of techniques to achieve this end in his plays. We saw in our study of the alterations of Sir Thomas Moore how Addition VI was introduced to clarify the transition from the play scene in Moore's house to the Council scene the following morning. Heywood frequently uses a similar technique whereby characters "set" a succeeding scene by reference to persons or place. This is a familiar practice of Elizabethan dramatists and usually involves a sequence such as that in 2 Edward IV in which Edward says, "Go herald, and to Lewis, the French king, Denounce stern war" (I, 94). When, a few lines later, the French King enters, the audience knows exactly where it is. Examples of this kind are so numerous that they scarcely need comment.

Foreshadowing of a different kind is provided by intriguers who confide their intentions to the audience. Here again soliloquies and asides are used to blur the distinction between the play world and the real world by inviting the spectators to participate as conspirators. For example, the Wise Woman in the play of that name lets the audience in on plans that she only later reveals to the characters in the drama. "But because there is a mistake, knowne onely to my Boy and my selfe; the Marriage shall be no sooner ended, but Ile disturbe them by some sudden out-cry" (V, 309). Once again it is possible to cite similar examples from plays throughout the period under discussion.
In some disguise I will pursue their steps (Four Prentices, II, 175); to morrow Ile pretend A reconcilement twixt my wife and me (Chuse, p. 44); To saue his body I his debts will pay To saue his life, I his appeals will stay (Woman Killed, II, 127); My purpose is to seeke to marry her. If she deny me, Ile conceale the Will (1 Fair Maid, II, 300).

Somewhat less frequently, Heywood provides hints of the future in purely dramatic terms. Often these hints are incorporated in the hopes, fears, or expectations of one of the characters. For example, Nick's dislike of Wendoll in Woman Killed foreshadows the latter's evil influence. In the same way, Mistress Arthur's faith in her husband reassures the audience that the play will end happily. "Admit my husband be inclin'd to vice, My virtues may in time recall him home" (Chuse, p. 46) she says and who could doubt that indeed they will? The Princess's wish that she wed someone like the Marshall (Royal King, VI, 22) is bound, by the nature of dramatic law, to be granted just as Venus' fear that Adonis will be killed by the boar in Brazen Age (III, 186) is certain to prove justified.

Exposition and foreshadowing are more than techniques for locating scenes spatially and temporally in a narrative sequence. They also reflect the dramatist's convictions about cause and effect, and help to create a sense of expectation or dread based on a view of a man's relationship to his destiny. In this respect, they are related to more fundamental causal connections between narrative incidents.
(iv) *Causality*

One of the most striking differences between the "Aristotelian" and non-Aristotelian narrative traditions is their attitude towards causality. For Aristotle, logical causation is very nearly all in all. "Of all plots," he writes, "the episodic are the worst. I call a plot episodic in which the episodes or acts succeed one another without probable or necessary sequence." *(Poetics, IX, 10, pp. 37-39).* A similar concern with causality is evident in the classical commentaries on rhetoric. Cicero says that "a cause requires the expectations of the audience should be met with all possible expedition; and if nothing to satisfy them be offered in the commencement, much more labour is necessary in the sequel."24 Elizabethan audiences, Cicero notwithstanding, seem to have placed a fairly low premium on necessary and probable connections in their stories. At least this is the conclusion suggested by the evidence of their plays. For as Bernard Beckerman says, "Very few Elizabethan or Jacobean plays can be found where closely linked causation produces the denouement."25 M.C. Bradbrook makes the obvious inference that "consecutive


25 *Shakespeare at the Globe*, p. 32.
or causal succession of events is not of the first importance to the playwrights.  


It would be wrong to say that popular dramatists such as Heywood had no interest in the casual connection of events. They did, after all believe in the reality of free will and in the influence of Providence in human affairs. But as Beckerman points out, the Elizabethan dramatist was not constrained to present causes and effects with equal emphasis.  

27 Another way of putting it is to say that the sequence of scenes in an Elizabethan play follows an aesthetic rather than a realistic logic. Whereas the classical plot is based on the syllogism, Heywood's dramatic narratives are closer in spirit to the analogy or to the tropes and embellishments beloved of the rhetoricians. There are a variety of possible relationships between scenes. Many transitions are "tight" in that references in one scene lead directly to incidents in a succeeding one. Others are "loose" in that there is what Aristotle would call a "probable" but not a necessary connection between events.  

27 Op. cit., p. 32. Beckerman argues that causes are frequently implied or only slightly dramatized and that the dramatists tended to focus on the effects instead.
Or there may be no direct connection whatsoever, with a new scene involving completely new characters and surroundings or relating to a preceding incident much earlier in the play. Scenes of headlong action in which the narrative is rapidly advanced can be interrupted by scenes which do little to propel the story forward, but which explore its psychological or metaphysical significance.

As for the actual forces at work in the events which Heywood dramatizes, these could be said to fall into three categories: human will or passion, supernatural forces such as Providence or Fate, and natural causes either in the form of human agents or chance. The role of passion will be discussed in the chapter on character. The supernatural is represented in the plays in two ways. In the Ages, the Gods appear directly. Supernatural agents are also seen at work in the ghost of Anselm in 2 Edward IV and in the angels in 1 Know. More frequently, however, the influence of the supernatural is shown to be indirect. The hand of Providence is discernible in a variety of mundane events from duelling (1 Fair Maid, II, 282), and business success (2 Know, I, 319), to the behaviour of an unfaithful wife (2 Edward IV, I, 125).

Most commonly, however, Heywood presents causality in realistic terms showing it to be related to human conflict. Whereas the "Aristotelian" plot puts a very heavy emphasis on such conflict, however, Heywood frequently plays down direct opposition with the result that the tension and suspense characteristic of a tightly-knit plot are absent. Certain plays such as 1 Know where the outcome of the story is already known are more like ritual celebrations than dramas of real
struggle. Others like 2 Know or Four Prentices are "miracle plays" about commercial or historical heroes. In still other plays, where the conflict between the protagonist and hostile forces might seem to be fatal, Heywood weakens the tension by introducing an early turning point so that the audience learns that tragedy has been averted.

Heywood's suppression of conflict as an element in the causal structure of his plays results in further changes in the nature of the principal crises. The "Aristotelian" plot is essentially a crisis plot in that the whole narrative thrust leads to a single moment. Furthermore, the meaning of the play inheres almost entirely in the focal event which is often a sudden reversal bringing new understanding. Heywood's plays do not always culminate in such a change of fortune. In extreme cases, such as those of Gresham and Hobson in 2 Know, the end is a vindication of the beginning. In others, like Woman Killed, or 2 Edward IV, the end constitutes a second reversal in which the tragic logic inherent in the events is upset by the death-bed repentances. Even in those plays which appear to be most "classical", The Wise Woman for example, Heywood, reveals his Elizabethan beliefs by centering the forces of reconciliation in a member of the older generation (albeit a social outcast) rather than in the young or in a tricky slave.

The typical Heywood crisis differs too in that the insight gained by the protagonist is rarely of the startling or shocking kind characteristic of the "Aristotelian" plot. Since Heywood's protagonists err through sin rather than ignorance, they are never blind to the true significance of what they do. Jane Shore and Anne Frankford fall as a result of a failure of will rather than from misunderstanding. Other
Heywood characters such as Bess Bridges, Mathew Shore, or Mistress Arthur know themselves completely throughout and never swerve from their purpose. The denouement of a Heywood play is consequently less intense than either the precipitous catastrophe of classical tragedy or the last-minute discoveries of Plautine or Terentian comedy.

Heywood's treatment of what I have called the "dynamic form" of his plays could be compared to a composer's handling of melody. In both drama and music the artist must seize the audience's attention and then hold it by alternately raising and satisfying certain expectations. The spectator or listener familiar with the conventions of the medium will follow the "narrative" through a series of developments, surprises, reversals or modulations, to a final resolution. The pleasure he takes in such an experience is not simply the enjoyment of the story or melody. It also derives from his awareness of the way in which the dramatic or musical story is told. This aesthetic pleasure, which consists of an appreciation of the artist's control over his medium, is both more sophisticated and more naive than the direct response to plot or tune. It is a reaction (conscious or unconscious) to many non-intellectual elements which affect temporal perception. The artist's ability to enhance that pleasure by the alternating of tension and relaxation, suspense and fulfillment, climax and resolution, within a conventional framework which seems emotionally coherent, is one of the surest indications of his talent.

If there is anything particularly characteristic about Heywood's handling of dynamic form, it would seem to be his predilection for "comic" rather than "tragic" development. This means that his plays tend to move
towards resolution rather than separation, towards cohesion and forgiveness rather than isolation and irreconcilability. It also means that causality in his plays tends to be "loose" and that conflict (and hence emotional tension) is subdued. In part, this can be explained as a consequence of the mode Heywood chose to write in. But his dramatic style may (in fact probably does) reflect an aspect of his own temperament.

(c) **Static Form**

If the unfolding of a dramatic narrative in time can be likened to melody, then the total interrelationship of the elements of "plot" is comparable to tonality. A complex musical work is only fully understood when the melodic components are put in their tonal context. Devices such as counterpoint, harmony, and key change, enable the composer to achieve effects which could be described as "lateral" rather than linear. Similarly, certain conventions like the use of a theme and variations, or rondo, or sonata form, establish a musical framework which, though it must be apprehended temporally, can only be comprehended in retrospect as a totality. This shape of the work as a whole, the shape that is permanently embodied in the score, could be called the "static form."

Similar "lateral" and "static" characteristics can be identified in the drama. But there is no generally accepted critical vocabulary with which to discuss or define these features. For example, the relationship between parallel story elements in a single "plot"
is practically ignored by Aristotle and the commentators on Plautus and Terence. Consequently, most writers discussing Elizabethan drama (in which a secondary story is often a prominent feature) must invent a terminology to explain how the plays seem to develop "sideways" as well as straight ahead.

Heywood experiments with several kinds of "lateral" connections. Frequently subordinate episodes seem to relate to the principal action by parallel or contrast. Sometimes they comment directly on the theme of the play. At other times, their purpose seems to be to alter the focus or to vary the mood of the narrative. The exact ways in which Heywood combines his raw materials will become more apparent when we examine the methods he uses to begin, develop, and end his plots.

Heywood follows classical theory when he divides a comedy into four parts:

- the Prologue, that is the preface; the Protasis, that is the proposition which includes the first Act and presents the Actors; the Epitasis, which is the business and body of the Comedy; the last the Catastrophe, and conclusion. (Apology, Fv)

Baldwin says that Heywood is here following the division taught in the Grammar Schools which was based in its essentials on Donatus. 28

---

28 Shakespere's Five-Act Structure, p. 320.

The playwright's explanation that the protasis "presents the actors" is the earliest example of this definition that Baldwin has discovered.
He suggests that the idea (which is subsequently expressed by Jonson and Dryden) may have originated with Heywood although he tends to think that it came from another source now lost.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., p. 331.

It is easier to show that Heywood was familiar with the classical terminology than to demonstrate that he organized his plays according to any theory of protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe. Certainly any threefold structure that the plays may reveal is not embodied in five acts. Only three of the plays published before 1615 contain act divisions, and of those only The Golden Age is divided throughout. The plays published between 1631-38 (but written in the first decade of the seventeenth century) have the conventional act divisions, but in most cases these bear little relationship to the actual structure of the works. 1 Fair Maid, for example, has an awkward break between the fourth and fifth acts\textsuperscript{30} and Parts One and Two of The Iron Age have all the appearance of having been arbitrarily divided by an editor. The second part especially (two consecutive stories dealing

\textsuperscript{30}It is quite possible that the present fifth act and Scene Three of the fourth act were written to provide a transition to the later sequel, in which case the present act division would not reflect the original structure.
with the sack of Troy and the murder of Agamemnon) gives no hint that
the author is following classical principles. On the other hand, The
Wise Woman and Royal King do fall into the traditional divisions. Yet
even these show interesting irregularities. In Royal King, for
instance, the act divisions are obscured by particularly tight sequential
connections. It almost appears in this case that Heywood cast his story
in the traditional mould and then did his best to smooth over the div-
isions by tightening the narrative connections between the acts.

If Heywood did not structure his plays according to classical
principles, how did he plan his dramatic narratives? Madeleine Doran
argues that Elizabethan dramatists were greatly influenced by their
source material which, she says, constitutes the greatest determinant
of whether or not a play is well organized.\textsuperscript{31} This is only partially

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Endeavors of Art}, p. 296.

true of Heywood. As we have seen in our study of The Silver Age, the
playwright did not scruple to alter his source substantially. He
reduced an entire play by Plautus to a single act, and considerably
modified the protasis of the Amphitryo story by introducing an earlier
point of attack. A comparison of the beginnings of Heywood's plays
shows that he did not follow a set of rules (of which none existed
for the popular Elizabethan plays), but evolved his own method of
launching the several stories he combined in his plots. The form he
developed shows evidence of a number of influences from both the Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian traditions.

(i) Beginnings.

For the purpose of this study I have found it useful to group the plays according to whether they contain simple, complex, or multiple narrative threads. By simple narrative I mean one that tells a single story focused on one individual such as Sir Thomas More or Queen Elizabeth. A complex narrative is one relating a sequence of different stories all connected to one individual (1 Fair Maid or Chuse) or various incidents in the story of a group (Golden Age, 1 Iron Age, Four Prentices, or Wise Woman). Multiple narratives include independent stories which are connected consecutively (2 Iron Age, Silver Age, Brazen Age, Rape, 2 Know, Edward IV) or laterally (2 Know, Edward IV, Royal King and Woman Killed). The problems presented by each of these narrative forms are slightly different and Heywood employs several methods of introducing and linking the narrative elements in his plots.

The most rudimentary form of narrative organization is the episodic plot in which a dominant character and historical chronology provide the only unity. Both Sir Thomas Moore and 1 Know are organized in this way. The first is little more than a series of tableaux showing Moore in different situations during his career. The second is more concentrated, focusing on the period immediately preceding Elizabeth's coronation and giving the story a certain amount of dynamic thrust by emphasizing the conflict between the princess and her Catholic
enemies. In both, the situation of conflict is presented before the principal character is introduced. Furthermore, both plays begin with considerable forward momentum and are interrupted by scenes which are more static. The effect is an alternation of incidents in a strong story line with others concerned with characterization or moral reflection.

Complex narratives require different beginnings. In the case of plays with a central character, there is a need to establish the dramatic situation and to introduce the various individuals who will become involved with the protagonist. 1 Fair Maid and Chuse are examples respectively of the acting and suffering romantic heroines. Both stories deal with separation, obstacles, and reconciliation, although in other respects the first is cast in the form of a romance while the second is a type of wooing comedy.

Fair Maid begins in a leisurely fashion with a scene to set the atmosphere but intensifies rapidly in the second scene with the duel and Spencer's flight. This precipitating crisis brings the lovers to their first major obstacle. Chuse opens with a laboured scene of exposition involving three pairs of characters. The basic situation is established by Scene Four after which the appearance of Aminadab introduces complications and parallel incidents.

Complex narratives involving many characters are still more difficult to organize successfully. Broadly speaking, the dramatist can introduce his principal figures successively (as in Golden Age, or 1 Iron Age) or collectively (as in Four Prentices or Wise Woman).
The first method is the more awkward and tends to allow the play to break into separate parts. In *The Golden Age*, for example, Act One presents the conflict between Titan and Saturn, and establishes the feud within which the other stories take place. Act Two introduces Jupiter and begins the first of the subsidiary escapades which enliven the main tale. The opening of *1 Iron Age* also takes place in two phases. The first act presents the precipitating cause of the Trojan war with a dramatization of the abduction of Hellen. Act Two introduces Troilus, Achilles, Hector and Ajax whose collective adventures make up the rest of the play. In both cases, the two opening "movements" comprise seven scenes.

A much more economical way to begin a complex group narrative is to introduce all the main characters at once. This is the method used in *Four Prentices* and *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*. In the first, the Earl and his sons set out separately towards Jerusalem. Bella Franca resolves to follow them in disguise but the family is completely dispersed by a storm at sea. The basic situation and the principal characters are introduced in the first three scenes. Similar economy is evident in *The Wise Woman* where the opening scene provides both exposition and characterization by means of a lively quarrel. By Scene Three the audience has met all the main characters and the three separate love stories are under way.

Multiple narratives involving independent stories require still more complicated beginnings. The simplest method is to link the various tales consecutively, completing one before the next is introduced. The second part of *The Iron Age*, for example, consists of two
almost completely separate dramas dealing with the sack of Troy and the murder of Agamemnon. No attempt is made to connect the stories except sequentially. The two parts of Edward IV also contain stories linked consecutively. In both, the opening episodes dealing with rebellion and foreign war have no causal connection with the conclusions of the plays concerned. The tales involving Bellerophon, Jupiter and Hercules in The Silver Age are also introduced and concluded separately. In only two of the plays organized on consecutive principles does Heywood attempt to achieve a stronger sense of sequential unity. The various stories in The Brazen Age are given some cohesion by the fact that the play begins and ends with the tale of Nessus' revenge on Hercules. In The Rape of Lucrece Heywood connects the central episodes dealing with the rape to the otherwise unrelated story of Tullia's ambition by linking the two avengers, Brutus and Collatine, in the final catastrophe.

The most familiar kind of multiple narrative is what is usually called the "double plot". The term is really unsatisfactory for two reasons. First, the word "plot" is more meaningful if it is used consistently to refer to the structure of a play as a whole rather than to certain episodes only. Secondly, there are often a great number of subordinate incidents in Elizabethan plays which do not belong to the main story but which hardly fit into an independent narrative either. In the subsequent discussion I try to distinguish between incidents, episodes, and stories, as "narratives" of differing lengths and complexities. The phrases "sub-plot" or "under-plot" are abandoned in favour of less familiar descriptions which I believe
are more exact.

The technique of interweaving different stories in such a way that they reflect or comment on one another is such a common feature of Elizabethan drama that I need hardly describe it in detail. Here I wish only to comment on Heywood's method of beginning those plays in which he combines more than one narrative thread. Five of the works under study (1 and 2 Edward IV, 2 Know, Royal King, and Woman Killed) are multiple narratives in the sense that they are made up of independent stories, each with its own beginning, middle, and end, which are told more or less simultaneously. The first two are irregular in that they begin with a story which is unrelated to the middle and end of the play as a whole. The third may well have suffered drastic changes when it was connected to a separate play about Queen Elizabeth. The last two, however, illustrate quite clearly two ways in which Heywood solved the problems of beginning separate stories in a single plot.

In Royal King, the playwright delays the introduction of the subordinate narrative until Scene Six. In this position, the second story could almost be said to be part of the epitasis, adding a new element after the establishment of the main dramatic situation. The opening of the play proper concentrates on the characters of the King and the Marshal and introduces the jealousy of Clinton and Chester which provides the sustaining conflict throughout the drama. Heywood's most successful multiple narrative plot is undoubtedly A Woman Killed with Kindness. In that play, the two stories begin together in the
opening wedding scene. There the relationship of Frankford and Anne is established along with the hot temper of Sir Charles. The scene itself is largely atmospheric, however, and it is not until the third scene that the play begins to move forward with the quarrel between Sir Charles and Sir Francis. It is interesting that Heywood here commences the secondary story first. It is only in the following scene when Frankford invites Wendoll to stay at his home that the precipitating crisis of the main story is set up.

The beginnings of Heywood's plays show the dramatist trying to solve the narrative problems presented by the technical limitations of his stage and by the popular taste for highly embellished stories. We have seen how the demands of simple, complex, and multiple narrative have suggested various ways of organizing the protasis. Three of Heywood's plays, *Fair Maid*, *Wise Woman*, and *Woman Killed*, represent fairly successful solutions to the structural problems. The first seems to owe something to the examples of romance or the morality plays in which the adventures of a single individual link beginning to middle and end. The last is undoubtedly influenced by the popular dramatic tradition which supplied a number of models of plays combining separate stories. Only *The Wise Woman* shows any convincing evidence of the influence of the classical tradition. And yet in each play, the "proposition" and the actors are presented in such a way that the action of the drama proceeds naturally towards what Heywood calls the "business and body of the Comedy". (Apology, FV)

On the other hand, it would be an exaggeration to say that
Heywood was consistently successful in his method of beginning his plays. It is true that the playwright almost invariably opens his action dramatically and reveals the essential strands of the plot as quickly as possible. But all too often the tension and interest aroused in the early scenes is allowed to sag and the forward motion of the play permitted to falter. Not infrequently the opening episode leads nowhere or terminates in the middle of the play as in 1 and 2 Edward IV. These weaknesses could possibly reflect an indifference to formal problems on the part of the playwright. More probably, however, they show just the opposite—a tendency to experiment continuously in his search for solutions to dramatic problems. Further evidence of Heywood's experimental predilections will be uncovered in an examination of the way in which he organized the middles of his plays.

(ii) Middles.

The classical epitasis as described by Baldwin begins in the second act after the preliminary moves and countermoves preceding the main battle between the protagonist and his enemies. It shows the forces of opposition apparently gaining victory followed by a
counter attack which serves as a transition to the final crisis.  

Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure, pp. 9-10.

Only in The Wise Woman of Hogsdon does Heywood follow the "Aристотelian" prescription for the epitasis exactly. In that play the act division corresponds to the plot division. In Act Two Scene One the first intrigue, (the staging of the false marriage by the Wise Woman) is initiated. The following scene begins the subordinate story of Sencer and Gratiana with the conflict between the young lover and the father. Act Three is a turning point, but not in the strict sense implied by Renaissance commentators. The first intrigue of the Wise Woman does not alter Chartley's true situation nor does it cause a change in the young man. His new infatuation with Gratiana which starts the second main intrigue, is only slenderly connected to events in the earlier part of the play. The central turning point is almost like a new beginning, although it is a probable development of Chartley's character, and certainly unites the opposition which finally brings about his fall. Act Four serves as a transition between the third act turning point and the catastrophe which is guaranteed by the appearance of Chartley's father at the beginning of Act Five.

The Wise Woman of Hogsdon demonstrates that Heywood was familiar with classical principles of plot construction and could employ them when he wished. His decision to follow other lines of
development in the majority of his plays is therefore a deliberate one. In an effort to understand the characteristics of the middles of Heywood's plays I have tried to distinguish between what I call a "romantic" and a "moral epitasis". The first is illustrated by plays such as The Four Prentices in which the loosely related adventures of the brothers in love and war are subordinated to the larger story of the campaign against the pagans. After a strong beginning, the story unfolds in a leisurely fashion in which cause and effect seem to play little part. There are two continuing actions which give some sense of forward momentum. The first is the love of the French Princess for Guy and her pursuit of him in the habit of a page. The second is the rivalry for Bella Franca's love. Both of these stories depend for their development on "errors", usually mistaken identities of the unlikeliest kind. The result is a series of more or less independent incidents caused by coincidence rather than by any sustained conflict. The hostility between Christian and pagan exists as a context in which individual fortunes are determined by chance and accident. Consequently, the play does not follow a clear line of development from opening crisis to central turning point to final catastrophe. Neither is the outcome the direct result of particular developments in the course of the action. The entire conflict hinges on the final battle, the outcome of which is merely a symbol of the dramatist's faith in a benevolent universe. The "romantic epitasis" of this play is characterized by elaboration, repetition, and digression. The story proceeds through a series of "miraculous" episodes
without any central turning point.

What I have called the "moral epitasis" is seen in its simplest form in Sir Thomas Moore. In this episodic chronicle play, events are not linked in a causally joined chain; nor do they progress because of any sustained conflict. The development of the story consists almost entirely of a series of "mirror" scenes, each reflecting different aspects of Moore's character. The incidents involving Moore and Erasmus, Faulkner, the Lord Mayor, and the players, are not linked causally but thematically. The middle of the play constitutes an interruption of the forward momentum of the story which enables the dramatist to illustrate the philosophical significance of his tale by a number of dramatic exempla.

Each of the forms of development described above differs very markedly from the standard classical epitasis. The latter, as we have seen, demands a conflict of steadily increasing intensity which reaches a climax of maximum tension which is usually also a turning point in the story. What I have called the "romantic epitasis" is un-classical in its emphasis on the irrational and the miraculous. Logic and causality give way to mystery. The turning point seems arbitrary rather than inevitable and occurs late in the drama. The "moral epitasis" departs from the classical norm in a different way. By its use of the techniques of allegory and symbolism, this form of development tends to be "sideways" rather than forward. The emphasis is less on change brought about by a neat turning point than on the enduring qualities of character or action embodied in the story. The
effect in both cases is to place less importance in the middle of the play on conflict, causality, and crisis. Heywood's use of elements from both the classical and the medieval traditions in his construction of the middles of his plays is one of the most revealing aspects of his narrative technique.

An interesting example of a play containing both "moral" and "Aristotelian" features is the first part of *If You Know Not Me*. The opening scenes of that play present a quickly-moving story of conflict which progresses fairly rapidly until Elizabeth's imprisonment in Scene Seven. At that point, the forward momentum is interrupted by two scenes which establish Elizabeth's popularity with her subjects (Scenes Ten and Eleven) and by a dumb show in Scene Fourteen which shows in allegorical form the defeat of the Catholic forces hostile to the princess. From a structural point of view, the latter is by far the most interesting. On the one hand, it is a symbolic representation of the relationship of the princess to the powers of good and evil and therefore a moral comment on the significance of the play as a whole. At the same time, however, the scene is a turning point in Elizabeth's fortunes. Consequently the incident functions as a crisis and provides a very clearly marked climax near the middle of the *epitasis*.

The Second Part of that play also contains an interesting illustration of the way in which Heywood combines "Aristotelian" and "moral" elements in the *epitasis* of a complicated multiple narrative. The original shape of this drama is obscured by the fact that it has
almost certainly been altered to serve as a sequel to an originally separate play about Queen Elizabeth. Since that alteration occurs principally in the last half of the drama, however, the middle portion is probably much as it was first conceived. The play is what might be called a "commercial morality". It is a collection of three inspirational stories illustrating the virtues of industry and fiscal probity. The main one concerns Sir Thomas Gresham, a prosperous Elizabethan merchant with philanthropic interests. Subsidiary stories deal in episodic fashion with the charitable actions of Hobson and the successful enterprise of the hardworking Tawnycoat. Two other cautionary tales tell of the narrowly averted downfalls of a dishonest Puritan and a prodigal factor. The play opens quickly and introduces the major characters with great economy in the first four scenes. The epitasis might be said to begin in Scene Six, a "mirror" scene illustrating the importance of civic charity, which establishes Gresham and Hobson as types of Christian businessmen. The development of the various stories is relatively innocent of conflict or necessary connection. Gresham's plan to build a Royal Exchange is carried out without any serious upset. Hobson's decision to stake Tawnycoat might be considered a turning point in the latter's story but we are never shown the successful outcome of the investment. Timothy's dishonesty brings him close to the gallows but he is saved at the last minute by Hobson. Even John Gresham's debts are redeemed by the kind-hearted, but romantically unsuspctible, Lady Ramsay.
The central section of the play is therefore practically devoid of conflict in the Aristotelian sense (although John Gresham's intrigues owe much to Terentian comedy.) Only one of the stories, Tawnycoat's, has a true turning point. Several of the scenes are simply illustrations of the characters of the central figures in the play, and demonstrate the virtues of magnificence which should characterize the Renaissance merchant prince. The rather diffuse nature of the centre of 2 Know is the result of the confusing combination of two methods of constructing the epitasis. The "Aristotelian" structure of the John Gresham and Tawnycoat stories with conflict and a change of fortune is obscured by the focus of the plot which relegates much of the important action to a position out of view of the audience. The suppression of a central climax is carried still further by the emphasis given to Gresham's triumphs in the middle of the play. Instead of being integrated into the narrative development as it was in I Know, the didacticism in this play is often at odds with the movement of the work as a whole. Heywood has seemingly tried to combine too many elements into his play with the result that the "moral" and "Aristotelian" characteristics tend to cancel one another out.

A much more successful solution to the problem of combining delight and instruction in the epitasis is to be found in How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad. The main story of a young man who tires of his wife and borrows poison from a friend to do away with her Heywood took from Cinthio, probably via Barnabe Riche. 34 But
"Of Gonsales and his Vertuous Wife Agatha" is the sixth history in Riche's *Farewell to Military Profession* (1581). It is a translation of story 5 in Book III of *Hecatommithi*.

The dramatist makes several significant changes in adapting it to the stage. To begin with, he casts it in a form that has many similarities to wooing comedy. (He introduces several stereotype characters such as the two fathers and Anselm's confidant, Fuller.) The basic story is thereby embroidered with scenes of conflict between the young prodigal and the older generation and by a number of wooing incidents involving Anselm as a rival lover. If the foundation is classical, however, much of the play's superstructure is decidedly Elizabethan. Heywood has added a number of subsidiary episodes to the story which considerably complicate the intrigue. These involve a comic pedant, Aminadab, who acts as a rival to Young Arthur. As with the Tawnycoat story in *2 Know*, however, the Aminadab narrative is allowed to disappear once it has served its purpose. Furthermore, the various incidents hardly make up a story at all and exist as more or less unconnected appendages to the main action. A second Elizabethan characteristic of the play is its heavily didactic tone. In *Chuse*, the moralizing is not concentrated in individual "mirror" scenes but is incorporated into the story as a whole. The predilection for allegory which we noticed in the dumb show in *1 Know*, for example, is here more subtly expressed in the metaphoric relationship
of the Aminadab episodes to the main story through images of teaching and education. The subsidiary material in Chuse is therefore related to the rest of the drama symbolically but it has not been integrated into an independent "sub-plot". Once its moral purpose in the epitasis has been fulfilled, it is allowed to drop out of the catastrophe.

A play which seems closely related to Chuse in structure and development is 1 Fair Maid. Here no single source comparable to Cinthio has been identified and it is possible to see Heywood organizing his story with complete freedom. The basic shape of the play is romantic in that the main story is essentially a quest narrative. Like Four Prentices, the play begins with separation, progresses through errors and misunderstandings related to love, and ends triumphantly in battle.\(^\text{34a}\) A comparison with that earlier play reveals some interesting differences however. For one thing, 1 Fair Maid moves forward much more directly as a result of Bess's resolve to find the body of her supposedly dead lover. Consequently the play has a far more clearly marked turning point in the middle of the epitasis when the audience learns that Spencer is alive. Another interesting difference in this play is the successful combination of narrative and didactic elements in the plot. Two subsidiary stories
concern the reformation respectively of Roughman and Goodlack. Both of these are symbolic in that they show virtue triumphing over wrath and greed. Furthermore, both are fully incorporated into the main action, the minor characters joining Bess in her adventures, so that the subordinate stories link up with the main one like the tributaries of a river. In this play Heywood solves the problem of giving moral significance to his action in two ways. The main tale of romance is implicitly moral, although the didacticism is far less direct than in Chuse. Secondly, the isolated "mirror" scenes of plays such as 1 Know have become "mirror stories", independent episodes with their own narrative development which are joined to the main action.

The integration of "Aristotelian" and non-Aristotelian components which we have been examining is most complete in Royal King and Woman Killed. The first of these is based on a story in Bandello retold by Painter about the dangers of a subject trying to exceed his prince in munificence. In Heywood's hands the tale becomes an allegory of obedience. The main story is supported in the play by an apparently original moral tale about a soldier who feigns impoverishment in order to test his friends. As in the other examples we have analysed, the subsidiary story is confined to the epitasis where it provides both variety and moral instruction. Here too, the episodes are woven into a continuous tale. Whereas Roughman and Goodlack interact directly

with the protagonist of *1 Fair Maid*, however, the Captain is the centre of a completely independent action. In this case, the integration of the subsidiary episodes is accomplished by a dove-tailing of certain minor characters who appear in both stories. Here the "sub-plot" has become a separate narrative component which is nevertheless strongly linked to the main story thematically in its exploration of questions of true virtue.

The most successful solution of the problems presented by the epitasis of a non-Aristotelian play in Heywood's work occurs in *Woman Killed*. There the complete independence of the narrative threads is evident from the fact that they were drawn from two separate Italian novellas. The most apparent effects of this double borrowing are that the "sub-plot" in *Woman Killed* is an independent narrative and its thematic relationship to the main story is less evident.

Heywood's reliance on separate sources has meant that the development of each story is predetermined. *Woman Killed*, therefore, has two very strong climaxes in the epitasis, one in Scene Nine when Sir Francis falls in love with Susan, and a second in Scene Thirteen where Frankford proves his wife's infidelity. The "sub-plot" is

---

36 The sub-plot is from a novella by Bernardo Ilicini which was available in English as the thirtieth novel of the second book of Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*. Ideas for the main story may have come from several of Painter's tales including the forty-third, fifty-eighth, fifty-seventh, and fifty-ninth novels of the first book.
structured with a central turning point and later reversal (like a classical comedy). The main plot resembles homiletic tragedy with a rather deliberate, long drawn out catastrophe.

Heywood's work reveals the effects of a variety of influences from different narrative traditions. What I have called the "non-Aristotelian" tradition probably exerted its influence through romances and stories on the one hand, and through sermons and moralities on the other. The "Aristotelian" tradition was transmitted primarily through the grammar schools and by classically influenced theoreticians. The conflicting claims of theory and practice presented the Elizabethan playwright with opposing ideals of dramatic structure which were not always reconciled in his work. In Heywood's plays, the confusion of aims is particularly noticeable in the way he develops his plots. On the one hand, there is usually a strong tendency to moralize, to sacrifice the forward momentum of the play to a leisurely exploration of theme either by explicit comment or by a mirroring of the theme symbolically in isolated scenes or continuous episodes. On the other hand, several plays reveal an awareness of the need to keep the story moving and to retain the audience's attention by suspense, surprise, and crisis. Heywood was certainly aware of classically derived theories of drama, and several of his plays reflect his efforts to organize his material according to "Aristotelian" notions of conflict, causality, and reversal. It would be true to say, however, that even those plays in which the *epitasis* is structured in a classical manner tend to contain what Bernard Beckerman has called
a "climactic plateau" rather than a sharply defined climax.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{37}Cf. the study of the Globe plays in his \textit{Shakespeare at the Globe}, pp. 41-42.

Several of the dramas written between 1607 and 1612 present a startling contrast in form to those we have so far examined. Whereas the early works reflect a search for a dramatic form which will combine the advantages of Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian development, the plays after \textit{The Rape of Lucrece} seem increasingly chaotic. The change in approach is shrilly announced in \textit{Rape} which, both in tone and structure, is a startling departure from previous practice. In the \textit{epitasis} of this play, Heywood concentrates entirely on the story of Lucrece. No effort is made to foreshadow the middle in the beginning of the play, and the catastrophe is only partially a consequence of the central scenes. As significant as the narrative independence of the \textit{epitasis} is its lack of relationship to the play's theme. Whereas we have seen Heywood using independent episodes in the \textit{epitasis} of early plays as "mirrors" of a dramatic theme, here the central scenes seem almost to constitute a separate play. That this represents a deliberate change of dramatic technique is suggested by an examination of the middle portions of the other \textit{Ages}. In those plays, we find a steady disintegration of form. The \textit{Golden Age} includes two separate escapades of \textit{Jupiter} in the \textit{epitasis} which are only tenuously related
to the main story of the conflict between Saturn and Titan. The Silver Age is completely episodic, treating almost totally unrelated incidents involving Bellerophon, Alcmena, Hercules, Prosperpine and Semele. The independent episodes in The Brazen Age are combined into some sort of unity by beginning and ending with the story of Hercules and Deianeira. The adventures of Venus with Adonis and Mars, of Meleager, and of Jason, are interwoven by overlapping characters but not otherwise. The two parts of The Iron Age are in some ways the most formless of the plays. In the first, Heywood begins his story even earlier than Homer by showing the Trojans setting out to avenge the abduction of Hesione. The second part is structurally two separate plays based respectively on the Aeneid and Agamemnon.

An examination of the middles of Heywood's plays reveals in particularly bold outline one of the main problems confronting the student of this playwright. That problem is the question of dates. As we have seen, there appears to be a very distinct line of development from The Four Prentices to A Woman Killed in Heywood's control over the central part of his dramatic narrative. But any theory of artistic development seems to be exploded by the evidence of the Ages. If these plays were indeed written between 1610-13 (even if they are only Jacobean revisions of Elizabethan originals) they reflect an indifference to problems of formal structure which is strangely at odds with the concern evident in Heywood's earlier plays. The same paradox is revealed by a study of the endings of the plays.
(iii) **Endings.**

"An end," according to Aristotle, "is that which naturally follows some other thing, either by necessity or as a rule, but has nothing following it." Classical theory tends to follow Aristotle in emphasizing the catastrophe as the most significant part of a drama. Here the conflict initiated at the beginning is resolved, and consequently the "laws" of necessity and probability governing human action become most apparent. To the extent that a story recounts the conflict of a protagonist with opposing forces, the "meaning" of the story will inhere in the outcome of that struggle. If the protagonist is successful, that success will seem a vindication of his conduct and of those laws which the playwright shows in operation in the drama. If the protagonist is defeated, it will seem to be because he has offended those powers. Since most conflicts can end in only one of these two possible ways, classical theory has tended to recognize only "comic" and "tragic" catastrophes. In the Christian world, however, there is a third possibility - that temporal defeat may lead to eternal victory. Few English dramatists of the seventeenth century were more sympathetic to what we might call the

---

38 Poetics, VII.3, p. 31.
"regenerative" catastrophe than Thomas Heywood.

Heywood's essentially optimistic nature seems to have found the truly tragic catastrophe uncongenial. The spectacle of defeat he considered neither edifying, nor, one suspects, altogether believable. Accordingly, there are few of Heywood's protagonists who suffer the pitiless fate reserved for the classical tragic hero. Those plays that do conclude with defeat normally embody that defeat in death. Sir Thomas Moore's exit accompanied by the executioner has some of the dignity, but none of the violence of Roman tragedy. A similar absence of violence characterizes the endings of Edward IV and Woman Killed where the deaths of the Shores and of Anne Frankford seem almost voluntary. In both cases the emphasis is less on physical mortality than on spiritual regeneration. The same avoidance of the effects of an implacable necessity is observable in The Golden Age where, instead of ending tragically, the conflict between Jupiter and Saturn is overshadowed by the reconciliation between Jupiter and Ganimede. To the extent that there are laws governing the sequential development of Heywood's plays, those laws are never shown to be hostile or indifferent towards the righteous.

Heywood's essentially Christian optimism also colours the endings of those plays which culminate in triumph. Classical comedy is fundamentally revolutionary in that it celebrates a change of the status quo, an overthrow of the parent "establishment" and the
setting up of a "new society" around the young lovers. As Northrop Frye points out, comedy is amoral in that "it finds the virtues ... as absurd as the vices."\textsuperscript{39} For all Heywood's paraphrasing of the definition of comedy (which Donatus attributed to Cicero) as "the imitation of life, the glasse of custome, and the image of truth",\textsuperscript{40} the playwright is very much a product of his own time. This is evident in the way he enlarges on the Horatian precept that comedy should teach as well as delight. The heavy emphasis on the didactic function of comedy in the Apology reflects his conviction that the universe is moral. Man's aspirations in Heywood are rarely presented as ridiculous, and even the most Plautine of the dramatist's juveniles such as Chartley or John Gresham move in a world in which ethical choice is important. The result is a form of comedy which is considerably more earnest than Plautus or Terence, a mixture of the comic and the moral which as Frye so aptly remarks is often closer to melodrama.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{40}Apology for Actors, FV. Clark points out that Heywood is here following Lodge (Thomas Heywood, p. 75.).

\textsuperscript{41}Anatomy, p. 167.
Heywood's comic endings rarely exhibit that combination of triumph and festivity which in different ways characterizes the conclusions of classic and Shakespearean comedies. The Four Prentices, 1 Fair Maid, and 1 and 2 If You Know Not Me all conclude in reasonably conventional comic fashion. But it is significant that in all cases, the hostile forces at work in the plays are shown to be external (or externally influenced.) The pagans and the Catholics were the two groups most closely associated with the Devil in the Elizabethan mind so that the victory of the four brothers, the reunion of Bess and Spencer, and the survival of Queen Elizabeth would all seem to be evidence of the power of Divine Providence. The obstacle to happiness in these plays is not a harsh or repressive law, or a social order dominated by conservative elders, but an outside threat to the whole fabric of society. The endings are not an overthrow, but a vindication, of the status quo. The identification of the interests of the establishment and the younger generation is implied by the Duke in Four Prentices who calls their collective joys "mere comical" (II, 253). This common cause between the young heroes and the guardians of the prevailing social order is nowhere more clearly marked than in the "commercial comedies". In 2 Know, for example, Gresham (never very much of a rebel at any time) is rewarded by fortune literally, and by the Queen symbolically. Tawnycoat in the same play is an analogous comic character whose blessing comes from even higher since it is made clear that his financial success is evidence of the approval of God (I, 319).
The essentially conservative nature of Heywood's comedy is even more apparent in those plays which seem superficially closest in form to Latin models. *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon* and *How a Man May Chuse* are both wooing comedies with the very important difference that in each case the *jeune premier* rather than the heavy father is outwitted. Whereas the conflict in Latin comedy is normally between sympathetic young lovers and unreasonable parents, in Heywood's plays these roles are reversed. It is the older generation that is sympathetic and rational - the catastrophes of the two plays in question are presided over by Wisdom and Reason - and the young lover who is the anti-social obstruction. The comic progress from "trouble" to "peace" is consequently away from rebellion against the social order towards an acceptance of its laws and conventions. The concluding festivities are not a celebration of life over death, growth over decay, youth over age as they usually are in Roman comedy (at least symbolically). In Heywood's comic endings the feast is more like that for the returning prodigal son. The social order in Heywood is not cyclical, it is permanent.

The belief in a divine order manifest in human life shapes Heywood's plays throughout. For reasons which we have discussed above, however, the author's philosophical convictions become most
apparent in the conclusions. Heywood's characteristic catastrophe is neither tragic nor comic in the classical sense, but moral. It lacks the pungency of the classical ending because it is always implicitly double. Either the triumph of the Godly is undermined by the awareness of the existence of evil, or the defeat of the righteous is ameliorated by a promise of salvation. The ending of Four Prentices is particularly interesting in that the temporal triumph of Christianity over paganism is balanced by two other contrasting endings.

The wedding of Bella-Franca is a celebration of the flesh and the delights of this world; Godfrey's religious vocation serves as a reminder of the Eternal which is present in all time. In a similar way, the marriage of Bess and Spencer is sullied by the ominous presence of Mullisbeg and the bawdry of Clem. The essentially paradoxical nature of Heywood's moral endings is still more vividly illustrated in other plays. Sir Thomas Moore, Jane Shore, and especially Anne Frankford, suffer fates which are "tragic" in outline but triumphant in substance. All are martyr plays in that the protagonist is vindicated by God and forgiven by his antagonist. Anne Frankford's curious contention that she cannot be forgiven by God unless first forgiven by her husband is a good example of the way in which Heywood deliberately attempts to give religious connotations to his endings. It is significant that many of the final moments of his plays are "judgement scenes" at which Wisdom, Reason, or Royalty preside. The same reassertion of order occurs at the end of
Shakespeare's plays. But frequently the authority figure in Shakespeare is one who has played no significant role in the conflict of the play. Theseus in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, the Duke of Verona in *Romeo and Juliet* or Fortinbras in *Hamlet* all step in to restore a harmony which has been shattered by the opposition of characters who were unable to settle their own differences. In Heywood's plays, however, the resolution tends to grow from within. Shore, Mistress Arthur, Frankford, Bess Bridges, the Wise Woman, the Marshal, even Bella-Franca to some extent, are agents of reconciliation which work at the very heart of the situation of conflict.

Many of Heywood's catastrophes draw together the various elements of the play in a conclusion which is related structurally to the middle and beginning. Occasionally, however, the playwright uses the devices we have discussed (battles, marriages, judgement scenes) to give a sense of conclusion to stories which he has otherwise failed to mould into a coherent shape. The final scenes of *1 and 2 Edward IV*, for example, show the playwright rather unsuccessfully trying to terminate his plays with devices that do not grow out of the dramas themselves. The first part of the story ends with the Shores separating and Edward releasing Hobs' son from prison. In the final moments of the play, however, Heywood introduces an entirely new character in the person of the Widow Norton whom the King tries, unsuccessfully, to marry to Hobs. The dramatist also begins the action which will open Part Two with mention of Edward's planned campaign in France. The catastrophe of *2 Edward IV* is
equally inconclusive. The Shores die in the penultimate scene bringing to a close the story which has been the main subject of the play. In the final episode, however, the playwright returns to the story of Richard III and crowds in the King's marriage to Anne and his rejection of Buckingham, thus once again combining a love interest with a new action. Both of these plays illustrate Heywood using a concluding convention (love or marriage) in such a way that it is little more than an artificial appendage.

Similar attempts to create a sense of an ending in stories which are completely episodic can be seen in some of the classical plays. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, for instance, the conventional battle is used to bring about the downfall of Tarquin and Sextus whose separate crimes had been unrelated in the body of the play. In the *Ages*, Heywood makes even less effort, for the most part, to convey a sense of moral consequence in the catastrophe. Saturn's defeat at the end of *The Golden Age* is not directly related to the prophecy which begins the play. *The Silver Age* ends with a judgement scene that has no moral significance for the drama as a whole. In the apotheosis of Hercules at the conclusion of *The Brazen Age*, Heywood creates a pagan equivalent of the Christian moral catastrophe. Hercules' death is related causally (though not morally) to the beginning but not at all to the middle. Only in *The Iron Age* does Heywood strive to convey the significance of the story in the ending. In the second part of that play he shows Hellen accepting responsibility for the sequence of events which was set in motion.
by her falling in love with Paris.

Heywood's tendency (if not his infallible practice) is to provide an ending for his stories which relates the conclusion of the play to the middle and the beginning in moral terms. The effect is to transform the conventional catastrophes of classical comedy and tragedy (marriages, battles, deaths by combat etc.) into judgement scenes in which ethical and religious criteria are implied or stated. These "catastrophes of judgement" often represent true conclusions only in a linear sense, and in several of his plays, Heywood must devise methods of bringing together several narrative threads. Only The Four Prentices and The Wise Woman of Hogsdon unite all of the subordinate narrative elements in one denouement. In several other plays, however, the dramatist gives an impression of unity at the conclusion by bringing together characters from the different stories although the final scene may, in fact, advance the action in one narrative only. For example, the presence of Aminadab at the end of How a Man May Chuse, or of the Captain at the conclusion of The Royal King, is required by the demands of lateral, not sequential coherence. In the same way, Sir Francis, Charles, and Susan, although they participate in the scene at Anne's deathbed in A Woman Killed, do not do so in any way that is essential to the conclusion of that story. Nevertheless, the presence of these characters illustrates the way in which Heywood seeks to join the various narrative elements of his better-organized plays into a single final scene.
(d) Conclusion

It is not entirely accurate to say, as Hazlitt does, that
"Heywood's plots have little of artifice or regularity of design."43


As we have seen, several of the plays show evidence of careful organization although the resulting structure is not one that an "Aristotelian" critic would recognize. Heywood's form seems to have evolved out of a fusion of elements from different narrative traditions. From the classical heritage, as it had been transmitted in the Grammar Schools, Heywood derived certain notions about conflict, causality, and crisis as the mainsprings of action. From the same source he inherited the conviction that meaning should be embodied in a final change of fortune. The native tradition which reached him by way of the popular literature of the age, and even more directly through the professional "shop talk" of his fellow actors and playwrights, supplied him with the bones upon which to hang the body of this dramatic theory. This latter tradition provided him with a mode of plot development based on répétition and analogy that was fundamentally different from the "Aristotelian"
epitasis of increasing complications. The native tradition also emphasized the moral implications of action, and stressed that Man was responsible for, and therefore capable of determining, his destiny. This too was at odds with the classical view which (at least in the plays if not always in the commentators) assumed Man's blindness. These conflicting traditions produced opposing tendencies – one which concentrated on plot in the sense of a fast-moving, tightly-knit story, and another which focused on meaning. One result of this conflict, as Bernard Beckerman has shown in his examination of the Globe plays, is a form in which the narrative and thematic lines do not always correspond. Another effect is a tension between the impulse to imitate and the impulse to explain which is even more evident in Heywood's treatment of character.
V

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

Character, like the wind, is invisible. Only its effects can be seen. In life it is natural to assume that the various acts of an individual (however apparently confused) reflect the emotions and thoughts of a coherent personality. But in fiction the case is different. There the connections between face and mind, gesture and emotion, word and thought, are imaginary. Behaviour in art is empty. It is a mask which suggests, but certainly does not hide, a human "character."

The implications of this necessary distinction between "behaviour" and "character" are far reaching. For the mimetic nature of drama prevents the playwright from describing the interior life of his personae with anything like the detail permitted the novelist. In order to convey an illusion of coherent psychic life, the dramatist must not only present feelings, he must also, in M.C. Bradbrook's phrase, "define them".¹ If he is successful in his use of those dramatic conventions available to him, he will convey to

¹Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy, p. 43.
his audience an impression of real inner life. If he is too clumsy, (or too subtle) or if he has unusual ideas about motivation, it is very likely that his personae will seem "unlifelike".

(a) Techniques of Characterization.

Elizabethan conventions of character are imperfectly understood. This is partly because commentators are usually more concerned with questions of psychology than with the means by which such psychology is revealed. As Madeleine Doran points out, however, "the creation of character in drama ... involves more than psychological theory and literary doctrine. It involves as well practical techniques of exhibiting character on stage. A full study of these techniques in the Elizabethan drama has yet to be made."2

2Endeavors of Art (Madison, 1954), p. 239.

One way to begin such a study is with an examination of dramatic revision. Such an examination should help us to understand the kinds of conventions used by the dramatist and possibly something of the aesthetic principles governing their use. A number of the alterations made to Sir Thomas Moore illustrate techniques of characterization and suggest ways in which Heywood learned to employ them.

In Chapter Three I suggested that several of the additions
made to Sir Thomas Moore were introduced to give greater depth and consistency to Moore's development, and to show his character in a more sympathetic light. Technically, two of those additions (I and III) are similar in that they reveal Moore's thoughts explicitly (in a speech to his family and in a soliloquy). More interesting than either is Addition IV where more complex dramatic techniques are used. In that scene, I suggested, the reviser was concerned with transforming Faulkner from a rather wooden symbol of Disorder into a more particularized individual. This was done by giving the persona a sense of humour and a colourful manner of speech. The effect of the changes, I argued, was to create a more vivid persona, but at the expense of the symbolic and thematic qualities of the original. Although Heywood himself was not likely involved in these particular alterations, it is virtually certain that the principles underlying such changes would have been discussed regularly by actors and writers working at the Rose between 1598-99.

An even more valuable insight into Heywood's own methods is provided by The Silver Age. That play shows Heywood adapting the Amphitryon of Plautus to conditions in the Elizabethan theatre. Plautus exhibits little subtlety in his revelation of character. For the most part, the dramatis personae tend to reveal themselves almost entirely through asides such as "I'm frightened, I'm frozen, I'm flabbergasted." Heywood takes greater pains to make his char-
acters express themselves less explicitly. A second way in which Heywood differs from Plautus is in his treatment of serious emotion. The Roman dramatist consistently presents his characters as simple stereotypes who do not engage the audience's emotions. Heywood, on the other hand, uses a variety of techniques to give his characters greater emotional complexity, and to make them appear more sympathetic to the spectators. One way he does this is by eliminating the ironic asides of Ganimede-Mercury during Alcmena's farewell to Jupiter thereby making the emotion in the scene more touching. Another is


by introducing new incidents such as the moment when Jupiter convinces everyone that he is the true Amphitryo. This has the effect of isolating the real husband and creating a situation of some poignancy.\[5\]

\[5\] Let all yon starry structure from his basses Shrinke to the earth, that the whole face of heavuen Forlorn Amphitrio Falling vpon/a marble monumentall stone, Lye on me in my graue. (Silver Age, III, 120)
But the most consistent and interesting of Heywood's changes concern the manipulation of the audience's response to the characters. Plautus makes little or no attempt to pretend that his characters are "real". On the contrary, he repeatedly emphasizes the conventional nature of the experience. Actors frequently play directly to the audience. At the opening of Amphitryon, for example, Mercury addresses the spectators in a speech which covers four pages in translation. This is followed by a further six pages of alternating asides by Sosia and Mercury before the first line of actual dialogue occurs. There are also repeated references to the fact that both actors and audience are participating in a theatrical performance.  

6 Closely related to 

6So to my prologue (228); Pay attention please (229); they do it in tragedies (229); Not to mention explaining the plot of this tragedy (230); He'd like to have some inspectors patrolling this theatre (230); Wasn't there a play last year, On this very stage (231); We're doing an old story in modern dress (232).

this emphasis on the artificiality of the stage-world is the meticulous, often laboured explanation of the story.  

7 The apparent need to be 

7Now I shall have to ask you To bear with me for a few moments longer, While I expound the Argument. The scene Is laid in Thebes. That is Amphitryon's house. He comes of an Argive family. His wife is Alcmena (231); This is what I'm going to do. I'm going to climb out on the roof up there; that'll be a good place from which to shout at him as soon as he arrives. (271)
certain that every member of the audience understood each turn in
the plot was likely imposed on the dramatist by the fact that his
plays were performed outdoors in a noisy fairground.

By contrast, Heywood uses several methods to make the world
of the play self-contained and reasonably "realistic". For example,
a number of soliloquies which in the original are spoken to the audi-
ence are represented in The Silver Age as private musings or reflec-
tions directed to an offstage character. Sometimes asides are

8Let mee a little determine with my selfe (III, 99); Alas
poore Amphitrio I pity thee (III, 102).

eliminated by introducing extra characters to whom the lines can be
addressed. Finally, a number of references to stage conventions


which might tend to "alienate" the audience are eliminated.

10Possible exceptions include: Ioue himselfe discends,
Cuts off my speech, and heere my Chorus ends (III, 98); I am too
long in the Prologue of this merry play we are to act (III, 99).

Act Two of The Silver Age provides invaluable insights into
Heywood's methods of characterization. The modifications he makes
to the Roman original are all in the direction of greater individuality, more complex and genuine emotion, and increased theatrical illusion. In part these reflect widespread tendencies in the Renaissance, an age in which "the intellectual urge was to particularize more and more." But they also reflect the influence of contemporary theatrical conditions. The smaller auditorium demanded a style of characterization more "realistic" than the one practiced by Plautus' actors. Furthermore, Renaissance audiences seem to have been more interested in the subtleties of human psychology than were their Roman counterparts.

From this study of changes introduced into Elizabethan plays it is possible to make a few preliminary generalizations about the techniques of characterization used by playwrights of the time. First it is evident that Heywood seems to seek a balance between what might be called the extremes of definition and presentation. The changes we observed in Sir Thomas Moore and The Silver Age tended by and large to be in the direction of more vivid, more individual, behaviour. As we saw in the first play, these alterations reduced the symbolic nature of a character such as Faulkner by presenting him as an individual rather than "defining" him as a

type. Closely related to this tendency towards more particularized characterization is an observable interest in character development. Moore's soliloquy in Addition III reveals the Chancellor's awareness of his new responsibilities, and conveys to the audience the impression of a growing, developing individual rather than of a static type such as is elsewhere implied by the identification of Moore with Good Cownsel. Finally, the various revisions in the two plays indicate the variety of techniques Heywood had available to him to communicate "character" through behaviour. At the simplest level are the methods of relying on appearance. Faulkner's unkempt hair is explicitly established as a symbol of his rebellious spirit. The ambiguous relationship between outward ceremony and inner nature is explored in the scene of Randall's disguise. The same relationship is exploited less seriously in the confusion between Jupiter and Amphitryo, Socia and Ganimede, in The Silver Age.

A second method of characterization closely related to the first is gesture. The humour of the Randall disguise would consist in large part of the inappropriateness of bearing which the servant exhibited in the role of the Lord Chancellor. The most powerful method of characterization, however, is speech, and most of the alterations discussed involve changes in the written dialogue. Here too, however, we noted a preference for techniques which could be called "presentational" rather than "definitive." In The Silver Age, for example, Heywood modifies Plautus' use of such naive devices as direct address to the audience, and the overt explanation of feelings.
Heywood's tendency seems to be towards establishing the world of the play as a more self-contained entity. A final way in which Heywood reveals character is through context. In *The Silver Age*, he introduces new *dramatis personae* so that characters reveal themselves to each other rather than directly to the audience. Once again these alterations help to create a more "realistic" stage world. The changes in *Sir Thomas Moore* and *The Silver Age* provide us with clues to the way in which Heywood approached the problem of representing character in drama. It now remains to see how far these clues help us in understanding his dramaturgy in the other plays.

(b) Appearance.

Heywood relies much more heavily than modern dramatists on techniques of communicating impressions about character through appearance. There are several reasons for this. To begin with, apparel played a more important role in everyday life in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries than it does today. Courtiers impoverished themselves in an effort to keep up with or to lead the fashion. Classes, professions, and offices were clearly distinguished by dress. Furthermore, as Hardin Craig points out, clothing was both more ornate and more symbolic than modern dress;\(^{12}\) a man's ancestry

\(^{12}\) *The Enchanted Glass*, p. 219.
was emblazoned on his coat of arms, his responsibilities in his symbols of office, his amatory adventures in the favour on his sleeve. Almost every mood had its appropriate attire. As Fuller remarks in *How a Man May Chuse*, he was once

A sigher, melancholy, humorist, Crosser of armes, a goer without garters, A hatband-hater, and a bush-point wearer, One that did vse much bracelets made of haire, Rings on my fingers, Jewels in mine eares. (B3v)

Public entertainments were much more spectacular, and occasions such as the Lord Mayor's show were elaborate visual allegories. The Elizabethan spectator could hardly fail to look at an actor's costume as more than mere clothing.

The habit of regarding appearance as an important clue to personality had a theoretical as well as an experiential justification. There was a strong belief throughout the period we are studying in the correspondence between the outer and the inner man.\(^{13}\) Such a belief underlines Cressida's description of Thersites in *2 Iron Age*:

> His visage swart, and earthy ore his shoulder
> Hangs lockes of hayre, blacke as the Rauens plumes:
> His eyes downe looking, you shall hardly see
> One in whose shape appeares more treachery.
> (III, 367)

Upon this theoretical foundation was built an elaborate superstructure of stage practice which provided the Renaissance dramatists with a long

\(^{13}\) See Bernard Beckerman, *Shakespeare at the Globe*, p. 141.
tradition of characterization by appearance. The Latin plays of Plautus, and Terence, supplied examples of stereotype character-
ization which probably depended as much on physical appearance as on gesture, catch-phrase, or conventional attitude.  

It is interesting, in this connection that in the Italian commedia dell' arte which evolved more or less directly from Latin comedy, it was the appearance of the characters which crystallized while the invented plots permitted change and evolution in the action of the plays.

The tendency of stereotype characters to be identified by traditional or conventional costumes was reinforced by the practical demands of Elizabethan stagecraft. In the absence of artificial lighting, actors were probably forced to rely on rather broad effects. To begin with, the dramatis personae had to be identifiable from three (or possibly four) sides of the auditorium. Secondly, the plays frequently called for the use of disguises, and the size of the companies necessitated doubling. All of these demands would encourage the use of bold, easily recognizable costumes and make-up. The clearest example of the way in which disguises were handled at the Rose theatre occurs in Look About You. In that play, characters are identified by a variety of combinations of costumes, props, and gestures. For example, Redcap stutters, is constantly running, and wears a cap and jerkin. Gloster wears a gown, and walks "like an Earle." John has a cloak, rapier, and hat; the Hermit wears a robe and beads as well as a wig and a false beard; the Falconer has a face
patch and a lure; Faukenbridge has characteristic hair and a beard. The fact that "disguising" in many cases simply involves donning or imitating one of these superficial characteristics, suggests that "character" in many of the plays was very little more than costume deep.

Doubling presented similar obstacles to complex character acting. Keeping in mind the difficulty of reconstructing the casting of Elizabethan plays, one may infer that Heywood's dramas require an average of about seven actors to play more than one role. This number is substantially reduced in "wooing" comedies such as Chuse or Wise Woman, but increased in spectacular plays such as 2 Edward IV and the first three Ages which require 14, 12, 18 and 15 actors respectively to double. The texts themselves give further evidence of this practice. In the cast list of 1 Fair Maid (1631) for example, Christopher Goad plays Forset and A Spanish Captain (II, 260). Even more interesting proof of doubling occurs in the stage directions and dialogue. In 1 Fair Maid there is the fascinating rubric, "Hoboyes long" (II, 312), which suggests to me an extra lengthy interval to cover a costume change by actors doubling as Mullisheg's attendants. A comparable direction "Act long" (II, 320), occurs between subsequent scenes, one involving Bess and the other the Moorish court. Even more suggestive evidence occurs in 1 Edward IV, where Hobs says of the Queen, "Mass, a good snug lasse, well like my daughter Nell" (I, 39-40). That the reference is intended to be noted by the audience is indicated by the fact that it is repeated later. "I saw a woman heere, that they said was the Queene. She's
as like my daughter .. " (I, 41). This is surely conclusive proof that the roles of the Queen and Nell in this play were doubled by the same boy actor.

Even more revealing, perhaps, of Heywood's interest in the appearance of dramatis personae on stage is his interpretation of the use of costume in the ancient theatre. "The ancient Comedians," he writes,

vsed to attire their actors thus; the old men in white, as the most ancient of all, the yong men in party-coloured garments, to note their diversity of thoughts, their slaues and servants in thin and bare vesture, either to note their pouerty, or that they might run the more lighter about their affaires: their Parasites wore robes that were turned in, and intricately wrapped about them; the fortunate in white, the discontented in decayed vesture, or garments, growne out of fashion; the rich in purple, the poore in crimson, souldiers wore purple iackets, hand-maids the habits of strange virgins, bawds, pide coates, and Curtezans, garments of the colour of mud, to denote their couetousnesse.15

15 An Apology for Actors, F2.

There are several features about this quotation which are worth noting. First, the character types are arranged according to a number of criteria including age or condition (old, young, fortunate, rich, poor), rank or occupation (slaves, servants, soldiers, hand maids, parasites, bawds, courtesans), and temperament or emotional state (discontented, covetous). Secondly, Heywood notes, without distinguishing, at least three methods of revealing "character" by
appearance. The first is a form of colour symbolism (the young men in parti-coloured garments to note their diversity of thoughts, courtesans in garments the colour of mud to denote their covetousness.) A second form of symbolism depends on the style, cut, or method of wearing a costume (robes that are turned in and intricately wrapped, garments out of fashion). Finally, a more "realistic" method suggests character by using costume as a sign (rather than a symbol) of a persona's condition of life (the discontented in decayed vesture, slaves in thin and bare clothes).

It is dangerous, no doubt, to draw any firm conclusions about Heywood's own practice from his rather imaginative reconstruction of the conventions of classical drama. But it is not unlikely that the playwright's interpretation of the past is coloured by his knowledge of the Elizabethan theatre. If this is so, then it is possible that different kinds of visual symbolism were more common in plays of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century than we sometimes imagine. Almost certainly, many of the costume effects employed by Elizabethan dramatists which we would consider "realistic" also had symbolic overtones which are now probably lost beyond any hope of recovery. Heywood's own practice suggests that he relied on both "realism" and symbolism to suggest "character" through appearance.

Evidence of the latter is to be found in Edward IV and A Woman Killed with Kindness. In the first play, Jane Shore's moral degeneration in becoming the King's mistress is symbolized by her
"lady-like attire" (I, 81) just as her repentance is made manifest by her final appearance in a white sheet. In *A Woman Killed*, Charles lives frugally after his first imprisonment scarcely able to recall "what a new fashion is" (II, 115). When he is arrested a second time, he is reduced still further so that his garments are "all ragged and torne" (II, 127). In his final bid to regain his sense of honour, he spends his last wealth so that he and his sister can appear "Gentleman-like" and "Gentlewoman-like" (II, 142). These changes in appearance not only reflect the characters' change of fortune, they also symbolize a transformation of attitude.

Another way in which Heywood conveys a generalized idea of character through appearance is by the use of costumes indicative of occupation or rank. Sometimes such costumes suggest national characteristics (Spaniard, 1 Know; Barbary Merchant, Florentine Ambassadors, 2 Know; Welch-man, Royal King; Spanish Captaine, 1 Fair Maid; Greekish habits, 2 Iron Age.) At other times, the costumes would be the traditional uniform of a particular office (Lord Maior, Sheriff, Edward IV; Cardinall, Constable, Sergeant Trumpeter, 1 Know; Martiall, Royal King). The rich variety of official uniforms which were part of Elizabethan life, especially at court, provided the playwright with a sort of visible shorthand for creating a quick impression of character. Almost the same abundance of visual imagery was available to be drawn on among the humbler classes where many labourers or craftsmen wore distinctive clothes. Heywood includes many such characters in his plays knowing that they will be immediately recognizable on stage by their clothes. It would be impossible
to describe the appearance of these minor **personae** without a study of contemporary documents and paintings which is beyond the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, I think it is self-evident that a variety of characters could be suggested on the Elizabethan stage by the use of what the audience would recognize as generic costumes. Examples of characters who are described only by rank or occupation in the stage directions of Heywood's plays are numerous. It is fairly certain that such individuals as "Countrey wenches, Huntsmen, seruingmen, Carters, (A Woman Killed), Prentices, plaine Citizen, Country Gentlewoman, Citizens wives, Serving-man, Chamber-mayd, and pedanticall Schoolmaster (Wise Woman)", would be defined visually in the theatre.

There are other times, however, when Heywood seems dissatisfied with symbolic or generic costume and wishes to create the illusion of a more particular environment in which appearance reflects individuality. In some cases, the playwright describes a use of make-up by which the actor can convey emotion or a state of mind. In 2 Edward IV, for example, Jane appears "with her haire about her eares" (I, 165), and Saturn in The Golden Age betrays his psychological distress by the fact that his "haire and beard [are all] ouer-grown" (III, 38). At other times, Heywood indicates ways in which costumes should be worn to suggest a particular time of day ("in his night-gown all vnready" 2 Iron Age, III, 381) or an emotional state ("garments all ragged and torn" Woman Killed, II, 127). These examples show Heywood's concern for a basic "realism" in his use of appearance
as a guide to character. Something of the same concern can be observed in his treatment of disguise conventions.

There seem to be two fundamental types of disguise on the Elizabethan stage. The first, and most naive, is what might be called "impenetrable disguise" by which a character literally dons a new persona with a new hat or cloak. Sencer, in *Wise Woman* for example, completely transforms himself by dressing as a servingman. Normally,

16 M. C. Bradbrook (Themes and Conventions, p. 67) implies that this is the only disguise convention used in Elizabethan tragedy.


according to this convention, a change of costume is sufficient to accomplish the transformation although we have seen above how modifications of voice and gait were also used. Heywood makes frequent use of impenetrable disguises. In most of the cases cited, the

18 Disguised like a Souldier (2 Edward IV, I, 110); like an Out-law (Four Prentices, II, 181); in the habit of a Page (Wise Woman, V, 289); vizarded ... mask't (Ibid., p. 308); disguised like a pedant (Ibid., p. 320); like a Serving-man (Ibid., p. 331); like a Mistresse ... like a Sea-captaine ... like a Page (1 Fair Maid, II, 276, 313, 284); like a Pedler (Golden Age, III, 60); shapt like Socia (Silver Age, III, 98); shapt like Amphitrio (Ibid., p. 100); in the shape of old Beroe (Ibid., p. 148); like a woodman (Ibid., p. 150); attired like a woman (Bronze Age, III, 241).
disguise is not penetrated by other characters on stage and the disguised individual becomes, to a certain extent, a new personality.

A different type of convention is the "penetrable disguise" which could be said to enrich, but not basically alter, the personality of the character. A good example of this device occurs in Edward IV where Edward disguises himself to woo Jane Shore. He informs the audience of his purposes in a soliloquy in which he explains that "the watermen that daily use the Court And see me often, know me not in this." (I, 64). His confidence seems justified when Jane does not recognize him until he "discovers himself" (I, 66). But her husband is more perceptive. As Edward leaves muffled in his cloak, "Shore looks earnestly and perceives it is the King; whereat he seemeth greatly discontented". (I, 67). The example is interesting because it illustrates how Heywood combines "realistic" and "symbolic" qualities in the projection of character. Here all the associations connected with royalty are only partially concealed by the disguise. Edward is temporarily both the King and the common wooer that Jane takes him for. In a similar way, the characters of the brothers in Four Prentices are compounded of the nobility of their "true" birth, and the energy and humanity of their disguised stations. The brothers are not simply princes or commoners, but both.

An intermediate disguise convention is the boy-girl-boy disguises whereby the young actor playing the heroine "disguises" himself as a boy. Here the terms "penetrable" and "impenetrable"
are less useful since the whole perception by the audience of the character of the "girl" is so complex that it probably defies analysis. It is virtually certain that no Elizabethan spectator was ever truly confused about the sex of the stage heroines in Heywood's plays. As the dramatist writes in An Apology for Actors,

to see our youths attired in the habit of women, who knows not what their intents be? who cannot distinguish them by their names, assuredly knowing, they are but to represent such a Lady, at such a time appoynted. (C3v)

Whatever the spectators may have known intellectually, however, there is little doubt that emotionally they accepted the boys' presentation of femininity. As J.L. Styan emphasizes, too, an important part of that presentation was the conveying of sexual attractiveness.¹⁹ The


The skill of the boy players consisted in making the audience forget the testimony of its eyes and see instead with its imagination. Occasionally, however, Heywood deliberately exploits the double awareness of the audience. In The Four Prentices, for example, Eustace asks Guy (referring to the French Lady disguised as a page), "Fye, are you not ashamed to kisse a boy?" (II, 252). It is clear that the "character" of a heroine is modified when "she" is disguised as a boy. But the layers if "illusion" and "reality" are so intermixed that it is probably impossible to extricate them for
the purpose of criticism.

Emphasis on the theatrical nature of illusion in the use of disguise is unusual for Heywood. Normally the playwright attempts to increase the credibility of the dramatic conventions. In *The Four Prentices*, for example, he carefully justifies the various mistakes of identity. To begin with, he draws attention in the text to the obvious facial resemblances which might be expected to be more noticeable than the change of costume.\(^{20}\) He then provides understand-

\[^{20}\text{Even such a one was Eustace (II, 107); How like is he to Charles (II, 190); The Captains father ... Resembles mine in gesture, face and look (II, 187); This French-man I should thinke my brother Guy (II, 198).}\]

able (if improbable) reasons why recognition does not take place. In some cases, a character is blinded by the conviction that a particular individual is dead or in a distant country.\(^{21}\) In others he suggests

\[^{21}\text{But his blest soule, by this doth Heauen inherit (II, 187); But the olde Earle my father is by this Within the wals of faire Ierusalem (II, 187); Had not yong Eustace in the seas been drown'd (II, 198).}\]

that sickness or misfortune has altered appearance to such an extent that recognition is difficult or impossible. This excuse provides a logical justification for mistaken identity in *1 Fair Maid*.\(^{23}\) In
If my discontinuance And change at Sea disguise me from her knowledge (1 Fair Maid, II, 300).

that play, too, Heywood goes to great lengths to lend credibility to the first confrontation between Spencer and Bess after the former is reported dead. Bess is disguised as a Sea Captain so recognition on Spencer's side is impossible. Nevertheless, Spencer says, "I have seene a face ere now like that yong Gentleman, But not remember where." Bess's initial recognition, which causes such a shock that she almost faints, is followed by disbelief based on her conviction that Spencer is dead. Still further justification for the mistake is provided by a chorus who explains, "had [Goodlack] not been wounded and seeen Spencer, [he] Had sure describe him" (II, 319). In all these ways, Heywood attempts to fit disguise conventions into a realistic dramatic context. The effect is to add to the superficial authority of realism the symbolic possibilities of disguise.
In his use of appearance as a means of conveying an impression of character, Heywood relies on both symbolic and realistic techniques. Although he seems perfectly willing to create stereotype personae by the use of conventional or generic costume, he reveals a dissatisfaction with methods that are too naive, or too close to allegory. By emphasizing particular details of dress, and by justifying the conventions of disguise, he shows his concern for surface realism. A similar concern is evident in his handling of gesture.

(c) Gesture

It is evident from several of his remarks that Heywood was particularly drawn to the stage because of his enchantment with live performances. On the one hand this is reflected in his admiration of the actor's ability to bewitch the audience by "liuely and well spirited action" and thereby "new-mold the harts of the spectators and fashion them to the shape of any noble and notable attempt."26

26 An Apology for Actors, B4.

On the other, it is implicit in his belief that drama as an art form is superior to both painting and literature. This superiority, he believes, consists precisely in drama's ability to "show action, passion, motion, [and] any other gesture to moue the spirits of the beholder to admiration" (Apology, B3v). Finally, it is evident in the attention
he pays in the writing of his plays to details of movement and "stage business."

Like many of his contemporaries, Heywood was keenly interested in the problem of creating characters who would seem to be individual without appearing eccentric. This was both a theoretical and a practical problem. The critics tended to think of character in very generalized terms. A doctrine of "decorum" taught by Renaissance theoreticians held that a character's actions should conform to fairly rigid patterns of behaviour. The idea is thought to have originated in Aristotle's remark that in representing a character a dramatist should aim at propriety and consistency.  

27 See Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art, p. 218, and Aristotle's Poetics, XV, 2-4, pp. 53-55.

Horace, too, recommended against the creation of original dramatic personae and warned, "If you ... are so bold as to invent a new character, be sure that it ... is entirely consistent." 28 But the Renaissance critics tended to be even more conservative than their classical mentors. George Whetstone's oft-quoted Prologue to Promos and Cassandra illustrates the relative inflexibility inherent in the
theory.

To work a comeddie kindly grave old men should instruct, young men should shew imperfections of youth, strumpets should be lascivious, Boyes unhappe and clowns should speak disorderlye.

Thomas Wilson in his *Arte of Rhetorique* is even more explicit in describing the kind of behaviour that should be exhibited by various "characters".

A Souldier is coumpted a great bragger, and a vaunter of himself: A Scholar simple: A Russet coat sad, and sometimes craftie: a Courtier, flattering: a Citizen, gentle.29


Characteristically, however, the grammarians' interpretation of the ancient critics tends to overemphasize one aspect of "classicism". For there is another side to Greek and Roman criticism which can be seen as a justification for rebelling against the rather narrow application of the doctrine of decorum so frequent in Renaissance theory. This is the concept of verisimilitude which holds that the artist must observe life. "The experienced poet," writes Horace, "as an imaginative artist, should look to human life and character ... Works written to give pleasure should be as true to life as possible."30
Aristotle is even more explicit in his insistence on the need for vividly realized behaviour. "To render a narrative pathetic," he says, "we must particularize the actions and gestures that naturally accompany each powerful emotion."  

The dramatic theory with which Heywood would be familiar was therefore somewhat ambiguous. One aspect of that theory, stressed by the commentators and apparently illustrated by the Latin drama, encouraged characterization by conventional, or stereotype gesture. But a second face of classicism prompted a search for particular, individual behaviour, and a rejection of received stereotypes. A similar ambiguity is evident in Elizabethan acting traditions.

Perhaps the strongest factor encouraging a conventional acting style was the repertory system within which the performers had to work. In the conditions I have described above, it would have been difficult for actors (especially given their inherent conservatism) to have been very creative or experimental in their
work. An impatience with the performers' reliance on conventional
tricks underlies much contemporary criticism of the stage. Hamlet's
strictures are well known. Heywood too deplored the practices of
the lazy or unimaginative actor. He regrets that

    in oueracting trickes, and toyling too much in
    the antick habit of humors, men of the ripest
desert, greatest opinions, and best reputations,
    may break into the most violent absurdities.

    (Apology, C4)

What he admired was grace and, what Hamlet would probably have called,
a "modest naturalism."

    Without a comely and elegant gesture, a
    gratious and bewitching kinde of action, a
    naturall and familiar motion of the head,
    the hand, the body, and a moderate and fit
countenance sutable to all the rest, I hold
all the rest as nothing.

    (Apology, C4)

It is legitimate to wonder what influence an individual
playwright could have exerted against the inherent conservatism of
the acting profession and the weight of critical theory. Did
Heywood participate in rehearsals of his plays and, if so, what
authority did he have over his colleagues? Could he influence the
shape of the production directly, or was he forced to rely entirely
on the stage directions he could squeeze into his manuscripts? One
passage in *An Apology for Actors* is interesting in this connection.
There Heywood states that actors need not be especially intelligent
("schollers") or even able to speak well so long as these imper-
fecions "may by instructios be helped & amended." (E3). Since
it is impossible to know what responsibility Heywood may himself
have had for teaching the actors, it will be useful to see what "instructiōns" he incorporated in his plays.

The question of the function of the stage directions in Elizabethan plays is extraordinarily vexed. The evidence of Sir Thomas Moore and some other prompt books suggests that at least some of the directions included in the playwright's manuscript were intended as suggestions for the actors. Sometimes these "instructiōns" are fairly specific indicating that the playwright has a clear idea of the gesture he wishes to accompany a particular line. At other times, the directions are vague, which suggests that the dramatist is relying on the actor to invent the appropriate movement.

32 For a still fuller discussion of the technicalities of the subject see Appendix 2.

33 shrugging gladly (p. 9); he kisses her on the ladder (p. 24); flinging vp cappes (p. 24); she offers to depart (p. 36); with great reuerence (p. 41); kinde salutations (p. 51); kneeling and weeping (p. 51); pondering to himself (p. 52). Sir Thomas Moore.

34 Lord Maior and Moore whisper (p. 6); action (p. 9). Sir Thomas Moore.
actor in this respect is obscure. The revision of Sir Thomas Moore, (no less than Peter Quince's wholesale introduction of explanation into Pyramus and Thisbe) would seem to indicate that the actors had little concern for the original author's intentions. The same conclusion seems inescapable from a study of Edward Alleyn's part in Orlando Furioso. 35 A comparison of the stage directions in the part and the quarto reveals that the former are far less detailed. In some cases, specific suggestions are ignored. For example, the quarto "He drawes him in by the leg" (p. 153), is recorded in the part as "dragges him in" (p. 152). Details of costume are omitted in the part where "solus" (154) is all that remains of the original direction "Enter Orlando attired like a mad-man" (155). Frequently the directions in the part seem little more than a kind of short hand. "They fight a good wile and then breath" (195) is rendered simply "pugnat" (194). Unfortunately, in those cases where the directions in the part are fullest, the corresponding text has disappeared from the quarto. 36 Where comparison is possible, how-


36 Here he harkens (154); he walketh vp & downe (156); singes (156); he whistles for him (156).
ever, the evidence seems to suggest that the actor, or the scribe responsible for transcribing the actors' parts, ignored most directions for gestures incorporated in the text of the prompt book. 37

37 It would, of course, be understandable if an actor of Alleyn's stature felt that there was little about movement or gesture that a mere playwright could teach him.

In spite of these indications of the actors' occasional disregard of the author's stage directions, I have argued elsewhere that there is also evidence to suggest that in most instances his wishes were followed. 38 The assumption that Heywood's directions constitute detailed instructions to actors and stage technicians seems particularly justified. First, he was himself an actor and sharer with an intimate knowledge of the resources of the theatre. Secondly, he seems more interested than some of his contemporaries in the purely visual aspects of drama. This interest is particularly evident in the care with which he provides for the revelation of "character" through gesture. 39

38 See Appendix 2.

39
M.C. Bradbrook's comment (Themes and Conventions, p. 43) that "the Elizabethans hardly used stage directions at all, because the action, though important, was not intended to define the feelings, but to reflect those defined in the verse" is clearly not applicable to Heywood.

Sometimes the playwright simply describes the emotions which the actors are to express. At other times, however,

Greatly discontented (1 Edward IV, I, 67); chafing (2 Edward IV, I, 110); melancholy (Woman Killed, II, 108); affrighted and amazed (Wise Woman, V, 309); humorously (Rape, V, 168); fearfully (Silver Age, III, 119);

Heywood's stage directions show the actor how he should give emphasis or heightened emotional effect to a certain speech.

Humbly on his knees offers it to the King (1 Edward IV, I, 61); Claps her on the shoulder (2 Edward IV, I, 123); Tiril pulls Catesby by the sleeve (Ibid., p. 147); He laies his hand on his brothers head (Ibid., p. 153); Clowne goes learing away, and shaking his head (Royal King, VI, 51); As it were brushing the Crummes from his clothes with a Napkin (Woman Killed II, 118); Stayes his hand, and claspes hold on him. He pauses for a while (Ibid., p. 138); Fals on her knees (Ibid., p. 141); Hee wipes his eyes (Wise Woman, V, 316); She flings from him (Rape, V, 226); Falling for haste (1 Fair Maid, II, 315); In his going out plucks her back (1 Iron Age, III, 271); He starts vp from his Chair and takes her by the hand (Ibid., p. 282).
Frequently Heywood describes bits of "business" which are quite eloquent in themselves. In 2 Edward IV, for example, the whole meaning of one encounter between the Queen and Jane is summed up in a moment of pantomime in which the Queen "making as though she meant to spoile her [Jane's] face, runs to her, and falling on her knees, embraces and kisses her, casting away the knife" (I, 129). At such moments, Heywood insists on interaction between his actors, deliberately overcoming any tendency they might have to play to the audience rather than to each other.\

42 They play still towards her, and Jockie often breaks bread and cheese, & gives her, till Jeffrey being called away, he then gives her all, and is apprehended (2 Edward IV, I, 173); She swounds, and he supports her in his armes (Ibid., p. 182); As she turnses back, he offers to shoote, but returning he withdrawes his hand (2 Know, I, 326); Paris turnes from them and kisseth Hellep, all way shee with her hand puts him backe (1 Iron Age, III, 277).

Sometimes Heywood describes the staging of purely physical movement. Duels, for example, are often presented very vividly. In The Rape of Lucrece, the concluding fight between Brutus and Sextus is prescribed exactly: "Fight with single swords, and being deadly wounded and painting [sic.] for breth, making a stroak at each together with their gantlets they fall" (V, 252). Through his stage directions, Heywood gives the kind of instruction to the actors which in the modern theatre would
be provided by the director or duelling coach: "In this combat both having lost their swords and Shields, Hector takes up a great piece of a Rocke, and casts at Ajax; who teares a young Tree vp by the rootes, and assailes Hector, at which they are parted by both armes" (1 Iron Age, III, 300). A similar interest in the "choreography" of his plays is evident in the care with which he describes elaborate bits of pantomime. One stage direction is

43 March two and two, discoursing, as being conducted by them into the Citty (1 Iron Age, III, 302); Enter Egistus with his sword drawne, hideth himselfe in the chamber behind the Bed-curtaines: all the Kings come next in, conducting the Generall and his Queene to their Lodging, and after some complement leave them, every one with torches vshered to their severall chambers (2 Iron Age, III, 411).

particularly interesting in this respect for it shows Heywood visualizing the relationship of the actors to the audience as well as to one another. In 1 Iron Age he shows the entrance into Troy by presenting both the outside and the inside of the city without an intervening scene. To do this, he brings Agamemnon and his soldiers on to the main stage "in a soft march, without noise" (III, 378) and Synon "with a torch aboue" (III, 379). Then, to indicate a change of location, Heywood requires that "They march softly in at one doore, and presently in at another. Enter Synon with a stealing pace, holding the key in his hand." (III, 379) A moment later,
In spite of the sequence given in the stage directions, it seems probable to me that Synon entered on to an empty main stage and pretended to unlock the other stage door to let in Agamemnon rather than that he came on later to release the warriors from the horse. In either case, the example illustrates the interest Heywood took in the effects which could be achieved by pantomime.

The stage directions provide eloquent testimony to Heywood's essentially theatrical approach to characterization. Because of his experience as an actor he is particularly conscious of the power of gesture and pantomime. Consequently, he does not prescribe gestures simply as a "general reinforcement of speech" as Beckerman suggests was the practice among Elizabethan dramatists. Heywood's exploitation of gesture is an important aspect of his method of characterization, and a means whereby he conveys an illusion of inner psychic life.

(d) Speech.

Effective as pantomime can be for communicating emotion, it is language which distinguishes man from other creatures and
the concept of character is almost meaningless apart from the
phenomenon of speech. So inseparable, indeed, are our notions
of the two that the study of characterization in drama is at times
indistinguishable from rhetorical analysis. The critics' tradition-
al preoccupation with language and with the principles underlying
its use in poetry is understandable. Nevertheless, it has greatly
impeded the development of a theoretical basis for the study of
purely dramatic speech, and especially for the ways in which such
speech is used to create an illusion of personality.

The close relationship between the arts of the actor and
the orator has long been acknowledged. The methods of moving or
persuading an audience employed by the one are obviously those
available to the other. Criticism of the drama has sometimes
failed, however, to take sufficient account of the slight, but
fundamental, difference between the two. For while the author as
orator can confront his audience in his own person and exert an
influence upon his hearers directly, the dramatist must rely on
the talent of others. In doing so, he is further limited by the
objective nature of the medium itself. Unlike the novelist or
epic poet, the dramatist cannot explain his meaning openly. Only
by convention can he reveal the significance of action or the
secret thoughts and feelings behind the public utterance of his
characters.

As we have seen, one way to ensure the widest possible
understanding of the "character" of individual dramatis personae
is to create figures who fit into the popularly accepted dramatic conventions. The effect of a theory of decorum, for example, is to confine the artist to certain general beliefs about character and behaviour. While such general beliefs may aid understanding, however, they are inadequate for the exploration of genius, eccentricity, or very pronounced individuality. An important aspect of Heywood's dramaturgy is his use of speech to create characters that are recognizable but unique.

Perhaps the simplest direct verbal clue to a character's personality is his name. In Edward IV several minor figures such as Hadland, or Grudgeon, have very little personality apart from that implied by their names. Characters such as Goodfellow (2 Know), Roughman, and Goodlack (1 Fair Maid), or Mistress Blague (2 Edward IV), clearly reveal their descent from the morality tradition.

Another clue to personality is description. The influence of the classical and humours plays can be seen in The Wise Woman of Hogsdon in which the four young gallants are described as: "young Chartley, a wild-headed Gentleman; Boyster, a blunt fellow; Sencer a conceited Gentleman; Harringfield, a Civill Gentleman" (V, 277). Some characters are identified by other individuals in the play with the same generalized descriptions. The Sultan in Four Prentices, is referred to as "the deuils Lieutenant" (II, 221), and Mrs. Arthur in Chuse is called a "mirror of virtue" (p. 22). Bess Bridges in 1 Fair Maid resolves, ambitiously perhaps, "To be a patterne to all Maldes hereafter Of constancy in love" (II, 305) while Robert com-
pares himself in *Four Prentices* to "an Errant and Adventurous Knight" (II, 220). It is clear from these examples that Heywood pictured many of his characters in very generalized terms, and that he not infrequently communicated these terms to the audience in the baldest possible way.

Ordinarily, however, Heywood works more indirectly, allowing his characters at least the semblance of individual life. Sometimes he does this by relying on techniques of stage caricature such as accents (the Welshman in *Royal King*); a certain exaggerated manner of speaking like Boyster's "blunt humour" in *Wise Woman* ("There is a thing call'd a Virgin...Court her I cannot, but Ile doe as I may; V, 283"); speech tags such as Timothy's "yea and nay" in *2 Know* or Old Lusam's "so say I" in *Chuse* or Josselin's "and so forth" in *Edward IV*; or class accents as in *Woman Killed* ("Nick...Speaks stately and scurvily, the rest after the Countrey fashion", II, 98). But Heywood continually tries to give his *dramatis personae* more "depth" and to suggest in his characters an inner life of greater complexity than that which can be projected by such rudimentary means.

The range of devices available to the poet-playwright for conveying an illusion of such complexity is wide. It includes many rhetorical techniques which have been frequently discussed, but also one or two which have not. One of the latter which I would like to try to analyse is the way in which the playwright places his *personae* in relation to the world of the play and the world of the
audience. It is a familiar feature of Elizabethan drama that characters frequently "step outside" the framework of the drama to address the spectators directly thus bridging the realms of illusion and reality. The gradations from "direct address" through various degrees of spoken thought and feeling to "realistic" conversation are slight, and the variety of actor-audience relationships possible immense. The manipulation of this relationship is one of the many subtle devices in the hands of the Elizabethan dramatist which, in the study (and even in the theatre), goes unnoticed by the mind even while it is affecting the emotions. It is particularly important in the revelation of the inner life of a dramatic character and in influencing the spectator's attitude towards that character.

(i) Direct Address

The most extreme violation of "realistic" dialogue is the use of that convention which I have called "direct address." By this phrase I mean those speeches in which the actor (either in his own person or that of the character he plays) acknowledges the presence of the audience and thus breaks the illusion of a separate and self-contained play world. Only very occasionally does Heywood draw attention to the realities behind the world of make-believe in this way. In Woman Killed, Jenkin says to the audience, "You may see my masters, though it be afternoone with you 'tis but early
dayes with vs, for wee have not din'd yet: stay but a little, Ile but go in and helpe to beare vp the first course, and come to you againe presently" (II, 106). By alluding to the difference between stage time and real time in this instance, Heywood emphasizes the conventional nature of the theatrical performance. Normally, however, the playwright uses direct address to extend, rather than to limit, the world of illusion. In such cases, the fictional character speaks to the audience and invites it to participate in the play world directly. Frequently, the contact between the dramatic character and the spectator has all the naivety of the morality plays as when the stage figure salutes the audience with a "Gentiles God saue you" (Chuse, p. 31) or "God night to you all" (Brazen Age. III, 228). Often, too, the figures in Heywood's plays function very much like the presenters in allegorical drama exhorting the audience ("Fair dames, behold! let my example proue, There is no loue like to a husband loue", 1 Edward IV, I, 175), or making homiletic observations ("Tis generall thorow the world, each state esteems A man not what he is but what he seemes," Royal King, VI, 46). In this respect, Heywood's practice differs markedly from that of Shakespeare in whose work at the Globe Bernard Beckerman can find no certain evidence that soliloquies were ever addressed directly to the audience.45

45Shakespeare at the Globe, p. 186.
Most of the examples quoted above leave the reader in no doubt that the actor is intended to acknowledge the presence of the audience. Frequently, however, it is far more difficult to be certain of the effect desired by the playwright. For most soliloquies and asides, and even much of the apparently "realistic" dialogue of Elizabethan plays, can be performed in a variety of ways. For example, Sir Laurence Olivier, in those scenes in the film version of *Henry V* which were shot in a reconstructed Elizabethan theatre, uses a very presentational style. Much of the dialogue, including lines intended for other characters on stage, is spoken directly to the audience. There is no attempt to pretend that the play world exists independently of the world of the galleries and the pit. On the contrary, there is constant by-play between the actor-characters and invididuals in the audience. I think Olivier's reconstruction of the style of a Curtain or Globe performance is very convincing. But it is quite possible that other actors and another director might quite legitimately disagree. In the absence of an actual Elizabethan stage and auditorium it is impossible to dogmatize about the way soliloquies, asides, or dialogue were delivered in the sixteenth century.

(ii) **Spoken Thought and Feeling.**

Most commentators on Elizabethan drama tend to distinguish between soliloquies and asides, sometimes with further divisions between the "solo aside" (addressed to the audience) and the "con-
versational aside" (spoken to another character). I have found it more convenient to group conversational asides with ordinary dialogue and to invent a category of "spoken thought and feeling" to describe those lines which seem to be addressed to no one in particular. The convention of "spoken thought" is less purely theatrical than direct address since it has a counterpart in real life in those (admittedly rare) occasions when people do actually talk to themselves. But its use in the theatre can hardly be called "realistic" since it is usually employed to reveal precisely those thoughts and feelings which in ordinary life would be concealed from the world.

In his treatment of spoken thought, Heywood's usual practice is to disguise the artificiality of the convention by providing a "naturalistic" excuse for it. In the case of soliloquies, for example, he sometimes indicates quite clearly in the text that the character is not addressing the audience but is speaking to himself. Occasionally this is done in the stage directions as in The Four Prentices where Guy speaks "private to himselfe" (II, 179). More frequently it is implied in the lines as when Wendoll exclaims, "As if, fond man Thy eyes could swim in laughter" (Woman Killed,
Another way of indicating that soliloquies are not to be spoken to the audience is to frame them as if they are addressed to objects. In _Four Prentices_, for example, Guy enters with his escutcheon and says, "Armes ye are full of hope." (II, 224). He goes on to extol the Goldsmiths' arms emblazoned on his shield but soon slips into the third person referring to them as "this shield" and "these Armes". The ambiguous nature of the middle portion of the soliloquy is indicated by the fact that Guy refers to his sleeping brother sometimes in the third person ("What obiect's that?", "the villaine") and sometimes in the second ("Arch-foe"). He also addresses himself as the "sonne vnto the Bullen Duke". The end of the soliloquy is once again delivered to various objects including his pen ("Be swift my pen"), his opponent's shield ("Then go with me"), and his prostrate brother Eustace ("base Knight"). It would be easy to interpret this confusion of focus as the bungling of an inexperienced dramatist not yet in control of his medium. But a

47 A surprising number of the soliloquies and asides in Heywood's plays are presented as an individual talking to himself: Thus must thou Richard (2 Edward IV, I, 185); But soft John Crosbie (1 Edward IV, I, 57); Take this aduantage, and be secret, Guy (Four Prentices, II, 179); But what would that availe thee foolish Girle? (Ibid., p. 179); Charles obscure thee (Ibid., p. 220); How now Ned? (1 Edward IV, I, 60); Roughman, thou art still the same (1 Fair Maid, II, 287); Pause Sextus (Rape, V, 221); Now Nessus, in thy death be aueng'd on him (Brazen Age, III, 181); What hast thou done Althea? (Ibid., p. 200); Jason bethinke thee (Ibid., p. 212).
study of Heywood's practice suggests that the shift from what I am calling "spoken thought" to direct address and back again is deliberate. The playwright begins and ends with a self-contained dramatic world from which the audience is excluded. In the middle of the speech, however, the dramatist provides the actor with an opportunity to establish contact with his audience. The frequency with which Heywood tries to eliminate this kind of contact in the soliloquies by providing another focus for the lines suggests a deliberate policy. 48 For not only are soliloquies addressed to objects, and

48 Alas, poor soule (2 Edward IV, I, 127); Stand to me bill, and head-piece sit thou close (Chuse, p. 33); But stay; my heart (Woman Killed, II, 116); What sayst thou mettle? (Ibid., p. 113); Sterne heart, relent (Ibid., p. 146).

parts of the body, they are directed towards characters who do not hear them 49 or who are not present on the stage. 50 Still another

49 Are ye so crafty Constable? (2 Edward IV, I, 99); Oh, thou has crack'd thy credit with a crowne (Ibid., p. 122); And in this gift thou dost thy bed betray (Rape, V, 215); Oh kisse mee if thou lou'st me once againe (1 Iron Age, III, 278).

50 And then, Jane Shore, thy credit will come downe (2 Edward IV, I, 142); To horse, to horse, Lucrece, we cannot rest (Rape, V, 214); Medea now if there be power in loue (Brazen Age, III, 217); Now father stile me a most worthy sonne (2 Iron Age, III, 414).
method Heywood employs is to treat such speeches as invocations. 51

Forgive me God (Woman Killed, II, 100); Oh! thou all-seeing heavens (1 Know, I, 215); Night be as secret as thou art close (Rape, V, 221); Cinthia maske thy cheeke (Ibid., p. 221); Ioue art thou just (Ibid., p. 174); Three-headed Hecate (Brazen Age, III, 215); Oh Ioue, how sweetly doth this Troian kiss (1 Iron Age, III, 227); Awake reuenge (2 Iron Age, III, 396).

In all these ways, Heywood seems to discourage the actor from what may have been an over-enthusiastic tendency to address his audience directly.

Bernard Beckerman concludes that solo asides in the Globe plays were spoken conventionally. 52 By this he means that the method of delivery would differ from that used for ordinary dialogue and would indicate to the audience that the words so delivered could not be overheard. 53 Heywood seems to favour a more realistic handling of the problem. One method he employs is to have the actor delivering an aside move away from the individual or group about whom he speaks. When Shore meets his wife in 2 Edward IV, he says to himself, "Oh torment worse than death to see her face" (I, 122).
It is clear from Jane's line, "I pity ... that same proper man That turnes his backe" exactly what staging is intended. Another solution he employs is to suggest that the aside is a pause in the stage conversation. In *Four Prentices*, for example, Guy's aside is represented as inaudible mumbling. The French Lady complains, "Fie niggard, can you spend such precious breath, Speake to your selfe so many words apart; And keepe their sound from my attentiue eare" *(II, 179)*. A similar technique is used in *A Woman Killed* where Wendoll's asides are sometimes shown to be "silences". Anne establishes this convention when she asks, "Are you not well sir that you seeme thus trobled?" *(II, III)*.54 In *The Rape of Lucrece* Heywood presents Lucrece's asides as "silent weeping" which the maid cannot interpret.55

54 Heywood is rarely wholly consistent in his practice and earlier in the same play Jenkin overhears Wendoll's soliloquy. *(II, 109)*

55 What ailes you Madam, truth you make me weep To see you shed salt teares *(V, 234)*.

Another way in which Heywood seems to have differed from Shakespeare and the other Globe dramatists is in his use of stage business to "cover" solo asides. Beckerman could find no indication
that the Globe dramatists disguised the solo aside with action.\footnote{Shakespeare at the Globe, p. 190.}

In contrast, Heywood frequently introduces stage business with his asides. For example, in \textit{1 Edward IV} the king's aside in which he expresses his infatuation with Jane Shore is "masked" by his pretending to read a letter (I, 61). At the end of his aside he suggests that it was news received in the letter that caused his upset. In \textit{A Woman Killed with Kindness}, Heywood introduces a game of cards to give a semblance of credibility to the asides in that scene. Another ingenious combination of action and spoken thought occurs in \textit{The Rape of Lucrece}. There Sextus gives utterance to his desire for Lucrece while eating a banquet in her presence. The unsuspecting Lucrece treats each of the asides as if it were a pause or a reaction to the food.\footnote{My Lord, I feare your health, your changing brow. (V, 219); Your highnesse cannot taste such homely cates? (V, 218).}

In all these ways Heywood seems to be searching for a method of conveying the hidden thoughts of a character as realistically as possible. In the examples I have discussed his efforts
have been directed towards eliminating or reducing direct address to the audience, and substituting a convention of "spoken thought" whereby the reflections of a dramatic figure are imagined to be audible. Although Heywood's practice is by no means consistent, what distinguishes it is his attempt throughout the period we are studying to present spoken thought in a fairly "realistic" context which confines the character to the circumscribed world of the play. Something of the same predilection for what might be called "illusionism" is apparent in his representation of spoken emotion.

The necessity to articulate feelings which in real life would remain hidden or be expressed in vague gestures led Elizabethan playwrights to adopt a number of speech conventions. One of the most naïve of these is the "self-description" practised by characters who expose their emotions in explicit terms. A good example is Guy's confession in *Four Prentices* that, "Fire, rage and fury, all my veins do swell" (II, 213). Technically this device differs very little from the practice of dramatists writing in the mid-sixteenth century. Although Heywood makes use of it throughout his early career, he seems to reserve it for moments of extreme passion. 58

| 58 Drops of cold sweate sit dangling on my haires ... And I am plung'd into strange agonies (Woman Killed, II, 119); Astonishment, Feare, and amazement beate vpon my heart (Ibid., p. 137); Amazement, warre the threatening Oracle, All muster strange perplexions 'bout my braine (Golden Age, III, 40); A stipticke poyson boyles within my veines (Brazen Age, III, 249). |
Closely related to self-description is self-analysis. By this convention, the character not only expresses his emotions but gives a fairly complete picture of his own development or psychological nature. Frequently such analysis follows the theory of faculty psychology according to which one passion drives out another. In Royal King, for instance, the King explains the emotional basis for his behaviour by saying, "All my love Is swallowed in the spleene I beare thy Father" (VI, 53). Once again the evidence suggests that Heywood continued to rely on such conventional self-awareness in both his early and middle periods.59

59But now intruding Loue dwels in my braine, And frantickly hath shouldered reason thence (Chuse, p. 3) My sorrowes turne to rage, my teares to fire, My praiers to curses, vowes into reuenge (Brazen.Age, III, 197).

If Heywood sometimes resorts to a rudimentary method of presenting a character's inner psychology, there are other times when he attempts to reveal feelings in more realistic ways. One device he uses is the juxtaposition of naturalistic dialogue with the rhetorical expression of asides. This has the effect of establishing a basically realistic dramatic context in which the heightened emotional speech can be imagined to be inaudible. Just as the spoken thought of Edward is covered by the pantomime of reading a letter, so the spoken feeling of a character such as Wendoll is "masked" by the
non-emotional words he utters in conversation. The highly rhetorical asides beginning "Give me a name you whose infectious tongues are tipt with gall" and "I will not speake to wrong a Gentleman" (II, 110-111) are deliberately contrasted with the low-key phrases which represent the words he speaks aloud, ("I thank him for his loue" and "I am bound unto your husband, and you to.") In a more successful example, Bess Bridges gives vent to her grief when she hears news of the death of Spencer. In the immediately following episode, however, she hides her emotion beneath a controlled exterior.  

alternating scenes in which passion is expressed explicitly with others in which it is only implied, Heywood achieves an effect very like modern realism. In Woman Killed, for example, the rhetorical passages such as "I would I had no tongue, no eares, no eyes, no apprehension, no capacity" (II, 139) make more effective the terse lines later in the scene, "I was", "0 no", "You did." (II, 140). A comparable use of understatement occurs in 1 Fair Maid where Spencer is too dumbstruck by his killing of Carroll to utter a single word (II, 270).

(iii) Conversation.

The least artificial method of revealing character through
speech is by expressing it as it would be in real life, in words that the individual might reasonably be expected to utter. The limitations of naturalistic dialogue are severe, and no Elizabethan dramatist would have shackled himself by adhering to them entirely. Nevertheless, there are indications that as early as The Four Prentices Heywood was experimenting with dialogue that presents emotion without explicitly defining it. The French Lady, reluctant to confess her love, resorts to circumlocution. ("Something I mean; which though my tongue deny, Look on me, you may reade it in mine eye", II, 179). Frankford taking leave of his wife in Woman Killed hides his inner turmoil behind conversational commonplaces. The actor would have ample opportunity to express the character's heartsickness by gesture, but he is given only one aside in which these feelings are made explicit. It is significant, too, that the words in which he confesses his true emotions, "Dissembling lips you sute not with my heart" (II, 134), are uttered just before the exit so that the actor would have an opportunity to move away and not be overheard. The projection of inner feelings is done entirely indirectly in 2 Iron Age where Synon deceives the Trojans without a single aside. In this case, the situation is made clear to the audience in an earlier scene, and in a final soliloquy (III, 378).

As Heywood learns to eliminate self-description and self-analysis, he develops greater mastery over the broken rhythms of speech which reveal emotion indirectly. Sextus' speech immediately following the rape scene in Lucrece is particularly "realistic". 
Nay, weepe not sweete, what's done is past recall,
... pull not on my head. The wrath of Rome; if
I have done thee wrong, Love was the cause ...
Nay sweet looke up, thou onely hast my heart,
I must be gone, Lucrece a kiss and part. (V, 226).

Here the indirect expression of emotion is reinforced by the integration of revealing gestures into the scene. Lucrece's posture is indicated by the lines, and the final words make quite unnecessary the ensuing stage-direction "she flings from him and Exit".

In our study of Heywood's use of speech to reveal character we have seen how he employs both direct and indirect means. Among the former are the use of generic or allegorical names, mechanical speech-tags, direct address, spoken thought, self-description, and self-analysis. On the whole, Heywood seems to have been dissatisfied with these techniques, and to have experimented with ways of making stage dialogue more "realistic". On the one hand, he has tried to do this by keeping the world of the play separate and distinct from the world of the audience. He has discouraged direct address by indicating in a variety of ways that soliloquies and asides are not to be spoken entirely to the audience. On the other hand, he has sought to minimize the artificialities of performance which would remind the spectators that they are in a theatre. Where feelings are expressed directly, he often tries to present the context of those feelings in a realistic way. Frequently, however, he expresses emotions indirectly by eliminating asides and reproducing the accents of true passion. It would be wrong to suggest that Heywood's technique reveals a steady progression from conventional
to realistic methods. Nevertheless, it does show the playwright experimenting with ways of making the conventions of Elizabethan drama fit more comfortably into a realistic framework. This is what we observed in his exploitation of the physical appearance of his *dramatis personae*. It is equally evident in his treatment of grouping.

(e) **Grouping**

In a very real sense, "character" cannot exist in isolation. Alone a man is not "himself". It is only in interaction with others, either in harmony or conflict, that an individual defines his identity. This accounts for Aristotle's ambiguous use of the words *praxis* (action), *ethos* (personal nature), and *dianoia* (thought), and for the inherent difficulty of discussing "personality" apart from behaviour. Because of this, it is necessary to include among the techniques of characterization the arrangement of *personae* in groups. For one of the playwright's most effective means of defining character is by context.

The effect of context is most plainly evident in the realm of dramatic stereotype. The world of Latin comedy, for example, consists of certain familiar characters who almost always appear in identical relationships to one another. The repressive fathers, wayward sons, nubile slave girls, and tricky servants of Terentian drama are not individuals so much as parts of a complete comic universe. Their value, as it were, depends upon that of other components in the equation.
This is also true in other highly conventional story patterns, from myth and romance to fairy tale and allegory, which have come to embody profound human experience in popular symbolic form. Thus the prodigal son cannot exist without a forgiving father, nor a patient Griselda without a tyrannous husband. It is not a great exaggeration to say that characters in drama do not come in single spies but in battalions.

The existence of these "character complexes" in any literary tradition is of great assistance to an author. It supplies him with a set of commonly-held assumptions about character which he can use in two ways. On the one hand, he can rely on the audience's conventional wisdom to fill in the motivation which he is unable or unwilling to supply. On the other, he can deliberately alter traditional relationships thereby giving an impression of novelty and "realism". Heywood's modification of character context is a particularly interesting feature of his dramatic technique.

Throughout his career Heywood uses traditional stereotypes to give shape and coherence to his personae. Christian types such as the Prodigal Son or Patient Griselda underlie a number of his early characters. The opening scenes of 1 Edward IV, for example, present Edward as a typical wastrel in conflict with his parents. Part of the incoherence of the character results from the fact that the prodigal type is inconsistent with the dignity which Heywood seems to think is appropriate to an English monarch. Consequently the playwright has felt obliged to shift the focus in the play away
from Edward's prodigality and towards that of Jane Shore. The result is that no consistent development of the King is represented, and his behaviour in various scenes hardly seems to belong to a single individual.

Certain aspects of the prodigal type underlie the character of Spencer in _Fair Maid_ especially in the scenes of exile and misery following the quarrel and fatal duel. But here too, Heywood is reluctant to explore the darker implications of the prodigal story and he concentrates instead on the romantic adventures of Bess. His predilection for what might be called the classical, rather than the Hebraic, elements of the prodigal type is evident in the comedies. Young Arthur in _Chuse_, Chartley in _Wise Woman_, and John Gresham in _Know_ are all chaste versions of the Plautine or Terentian juvenile. In these plays the Latin comic characters are given an aura of Christian morality by focusing more serious attention on the ethical questions involved, and by exculpating the hero by retaining for him a strictly technical purity.

Where Heywood is most innovative, perhaps, is in his adaptation of such models to novel conditions. By certain fairly simple changes of a few basic stereotypes Heywood creates an illusion of striking novelty. Two examples of such transformation of types (which also illustrate his alteration of context) are _Edward IV_ and _A Woman Killed with Kindness_. In those plays, Jane Shore and Anne Frankford are not so much real individuals as examples of a new type which might be called the "prodigal daughter." The stories are both
fairly traditional tales of sin, repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation. What is new is not the plot, behaviour, or spiritual development of the protagonist, but her sex. And yet even here, the true impression of novelty is conveyed less by the individual characters than by the relationship between them. By transforming son into wife and father into husband Heywood gives a superficial atmosphere of realism to a basically stereotype plot. I am not trying to deny that there is a certain emotional truth to the "characters" of Jane and Anne. But I am suggesting that the inspiration for them is less a new vision of life than an experimental approach to art.
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61 New Playes, are like new Fashions: if they take? Followed and worne: and happy's hee can make First into th Garbe: (Epilogue, A Maidenhead Well Lost, IV 165).

In this respect it is significant that of all the "domestic tragedies" A Woman Killed alone cannot be traced to a contemporary crime.

If Heywood sometimes alters the grouping of his characters by substituting new values in an old equation, he also changes dramatic context by combining stories in new ways. This is most easily demonstrated in two plays derived from Italian novellas, The Royal King and A Woman Killed with Kindness. The first is based quite closely on the story of Ariobarzanes recounted by Painter in Novel 2 of the Second Book of his Palace of Pleasure. The original tells of "the duty of a subject to his Prince; ... also the condition of
courting flatterers: and the poison of the monster Enuy.\textsuperscript{62}
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\bibitem{Heywood1}
Heywood introduces a subsidiary story involving an apparently impeccable Captain who tests the mettle of various courtiers, bawds, and hangers on, to find that gold is more powerful than virtue. The effect of juxtaposing the heavily moralistic sub-plot with the Italian story in the main action is to place a far greater emphasis on certain common themes. One of these is the frequent discrepancy between appearance and reality and the related tendency to mistake wealth for virtue. In this context, the Marshal seems like the Captain, an innocent man who suffers as a result of the King's (or others) inability to recognize his true worth. But this is a considerable distortion of the original. In the Italian story, it is made quite clear that much of the fault lay with Ariobarzanes who infringed the courtly code which prescribed that a subject ought not "to contende with his souerayne in matters of curtesy".\textsuperscript{63}

\bibitem{Heywood2}
Although Heywood has followed his source quite closely, he has modified the "character" of the Marshal by introducing a sub-plot

\end{thebibliography}


\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., p. 155)
with a particularly strong theme. The new personae involved in this story exert an influence on the way we see and respond to the characters in the original.

The same capacity to change character by changing the context around the character can be observed in A Woman Killed with Kindness. In this play, Heywood links one story found in Painter (Book Two, Novel 30) with another which seems to be constructed on ideas from Novels 57 and 58. In the sub-plot, Heywood follows his source quite closely. The Italian tale tells of "A Gentleman of Siena called Anselmo Salimbene, [who] curteously and gently deliu-ereth his enemy from death. The condemned party seeing the kinde parte of Salimbene, rendreth into his hands his sister Angelica, with whom he was in loue, which gratitude and curtesie, Salimbene well markinge, moued in Conscience, would not abuse hir, but for recompence tooke hir to wyfe."64 Heywood seems to have altered the main story to bring it more into line with the sub-plot. In all versions of the wife's infidelity in Painter, either the wife, or lover, or both are punished. Heywood's modification of the tale may have been suggested by a sentence in Novel 30 to the effect that a man can acquire no greater glory than "by vanquishing him-selfe, and chastising his affections and rage."65

---

64Ibid., p. 288.
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Whatever the inspiration for the forgiving husband, it is clear that the characters in both stories are affected by the presence of the others. Critics may disagree about the precise effect of the juxtaposition of the two tales. But few individuals who read or see the play can fail to be aware of the cross reflections between the two plots.

Heywood conveys at least part of the personality of his characters by arranging their "psychic surroundings." In some cases he uses archetypal relationships to reinforce his characterization. In others, he seems deliberately to alter traditional patterns in order to surprise the audience. Still other plays reveal him enlarging the context in which a character is defined by adding a subsidiary story.

(f) Development

It is not uncommon to refer to character in drama as though it had some kind of permanent existence apart from the gestures, words, and actions by which it is expressed. I have tried to avoid the philosophical difficulties posed by this assumption by concentrating on the details of behaviour instead of on the inferred abstractions which give rise to that behaviour. There is, however, one abstraction which
it is necessary to consider. That is the question of development. Nowhere is the necessity of dramatic compression more fatal to "realism" than in the matter of personality change. Drama is preeminently about those crises which constitute "turning points" in men's lives, and yet the very brevity of the art form makes it difficult or impossible to represent growth convincingly. As a result, one of the most complex aspects of the creation of dramatis personae is the communication of an illusion of development.

As I have suggested above, there were a great many influences from the ancient no less than the contemporary world which impeded the development of a theory of character evolution in the Renaissance. Classical theory and practice encouraged the creation of stereotypes which, almost by definition, did not alter. If character change was presented, it was shown to be almost instantaneous and often from one extreme to another.66 Whereas temperament

66 M.C. Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions, p. 62.

was thought to be reasonably constant, however, the emotions of man were regarded as notoriously unstable. Faculty psychology taught that any passion was alike in all men and that once a passion overcame reason, reason was powerless.67 Heywood was certainly familiar

with this theory and many of his characters reveal the kind of
instability described by Jove in Troia Britanica:

I want the power to gouerne mine owne will,
My head-strong appetite beares all the sway,
I know my wales losse, yet I wander still,
I see the path, and yet I turne astray:68

68 Thomas Heywood, Troia Britanica (1609), p. MIV.

There was an alternative theory of human behaviour,
however, which held that although man was weak, he was nevertheless
free and ultimately responsible for his own actions. This was the
fundamental Christian view shared by most sects with the possible
exception of the Calvinists. The matter of central concern to the
theologians (and of almost equal interest to the dramatist) was
the question of individual volition. As long as the individual
could affect his action by his will, then he was a responsible
agent, and (dramatically speaking) capable of growth, development,
and change. Heywood is primarily interested in characters of this
latter kind whose interactions reflect rational will and who have
a potential for education through suffering. Heywood's idea of
the drama as an image of ethical struggle is most succintly con-
veyed in England's Elizabeth:

... this earthly Globe, O Lord, is but a Theatre
on which thou hast placed vs, to get some provee
from hence of our sufficiencye, death will assaille
vs, the world will entice vs, the fleshe will seeke
to betray vs, and the Diuell ready to devoure
vs: but all this and much more shall never
defect my spirits; for thou, 0 King of Kings,
art my Spectator, and thy Son Christ, my Saviour
Jesus, hath already undergone these tryals for
my encouragement; 69


In some of Heywood's early plays his characters seem to
engage in the struggle at a serious disadvantage. Jane Shore is
shown in an interesting temptation scene in which Mistress Blague
so confuses her that she can scarcely distinguish right from wrong.
"Oh, that I knew which were the best of twain," she says, suggest-
ing that she has already, like Eve with the serpent, allowed her
reason to be clouded. But in the end, Jane is not allowed to
choose. The King commands her to the court reminding her that the
wishes of a lover who holds a royal sceptre "may not, must not,
shall not be withstood." (I, 76). In later plays (apart from
*The Rape of Lucrece*) characters are generally free to determine
their own actions. This fact is proclaimed in the title of *How a
Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad*, and those protagonists from
Anne Frankford to Hellen who change in the course of a play, do so
in consequence of acts they themselves have willed. This is empha-
sized particularly strongly in *The Iron Age*. There Heywood not
only introduces a scene in which Hellen must listen to the com-
peting claims of her husband, Menelaus, and her lover, Paris (III,
307), but he underlines Hellen's responsibility by bringing her on at the end of the play to survey the carnage after Orestes' revenge. She acknowledges then that she is "the cause of all these Princes' deaths" (III, 429).

In his emphasis on the freedom of the individual and on the knowledge or change that results from interaction with other characters, Heywood differs from some of his contemporaries. One method he uses is to foreshadow a character's change before that change actually occurs. I have mentioned Jane Shore's encounter with Mistress Blague in Edward IV where her weakening resolve is shown. Another interesting example in the same play is the moment after Edward first woos her when Jane lies to her husband by denying that her suitor was in fact the King (I, 68). This act would be interpreted by a theologically sensitive audience as the first step on a road which could lead to only one destination. Another means by which Heywood communicates an impression of change is by providing conflicting opinions about an individual. In Chuse, for example, the apparent prodigality of Young Arthur is shown to be a temporary abnormality by his wife's faith that "his soul is free from ... intents of ill."70 The contrary views about Young Arthur's character suggest a complexity not evident in his deeds. They also

70 How a Man May Chuse, p. 46.
justify the final "conversion" and show it to be more than an unmotivated reversal.

Yet another method Heywood uses to convey a sense of character development is to show a change taking place over a long period. One minor example of this occurs in *Iron Age* in which Hellen is immediately bewitched by Paris although she manages to dissemble the fact from the others for some time. The combination of asides and conflicting actions gives an impression of character complexity and of a more gradual yielding to the Trojan's charms. One final way in which Heywood shows the development of character is by revealing the internal struggle leading up to action. Whereas Bernard Beckerman claims that Shakespeare rarely shows "profound conflicts of the mind" in his soliloquies, Heywood is continually interested in the process of temptation. In some respects the capitulation of characters such as Anne Frankford seems to be precipitate and insufficiently motivated. Often, however, Heywood focuses quite sharply on the moment of choice before action. Sometimes this is presented in the form of a soliloquy as in *Royal King* or *The Brazen Age* where Medea exclaims "Oh! what distraction's this within me bred, Although he die I would not see him dead? The best I see, the worst I follow still." (III, 212). At others,
the choice is externalized, as when Hellen is forced to choose between Menaleus and Paris in *The Iron Age*. (III, 307)

The most usual form of character development in Heywood is some part of the process of temptation, sin, and repentance which is the basis of Christian psychology. That such development is often presented in a rather conventional manner is not in itself a denial of the existence of development as opposed to reversal. The existence of a concept of character change at the heart of drama as patently Christian as Heywood's is scarcely surprising.

For while the intrigues of classical comedy are predicated on the fact that everyone remains the same, Christian moral tales are quintessentially about character reformation. *Personae* such as the prodigal son are the very antithesis of fixed or unaltering characters. A central meaning of the story is that experience teaches, and that mistakes can be rectified.

(g) Conclusion.

In this discussion of characterization, I have examined some of the received theories about human behaviour, and suggested that they encouraged conflicting views of personality. On the one hand, there were efforts to classify individuals according to relatively fixed and unchanging types. On the other, theories about the emotions and about the necessity for moral choice tended to describe personality as variable and inconstant. Both views of character could be found in the drama and literature of the ancient world and the Christian Middle Ages. Elizabethan playwrights thus
inherited a complex tradition which encouraged characterization by stereotype, but which nevertheless provided the basis for dramatic portraiture of a more detailed and dynamic kind. Heywood's experiments in characterization draw on both aspects of the tradition. Sometimes he uses appearance, speech, and gesture in formal, symbolic ways to create personae which are deliberately conventional or "unrealistic". At other times, he uses the resources of his medium to give an impression of vivid and complex inner life. Perhaps the most striking feature of Heywood's method of presenting "character" however, is its essentially theatrical quality. The detailed attention he devotes to the non-verbal elements of his art (especially in matters of appearance, gesture, and grouping) reflects his interest in acting and his experience of the technical aspects of stage production. The one seems to lead him to explore ways in which he can present intense emotion in an accurately imitative way. The other tempts him to stretch the resources of the theatre to the utmost to dazzle the spectators with elaborate pageantry and gorgeous costumes. Both of these tendencies are even more clearly observable in Heywood's use of visual effects which I have called "spectacle".
Aristotle divides tragedy into six parts which he calls plot (μύθος), character (ἐθος), diction (λέξις), thought (δινοία), spectacle (opsis) and song (μελοποίια). Diction and song constitute the medium; plot, character, and thought the objects; and spectacle the manner of imitation. The distinction Aristotle draws between the objects, medium, and manner of imitating is not entirely clear, but he seems to imply by it a hierarchy of reality in which the triad of plot, character, and thought has an existence which is somehow independent of its expression. A parallel relationship might be that which exists between the subject, medium, and ground of a painting. The subject itself, presumably, is unaffected by decisions of the artist to use oils, tempera, or watercolours, or to paint on canvas, wood panel, or plaster.

Because of his epistemological bias, Aristotle regards spectacle as the least important element of the drama. "The Spectacle has," he admits, "an emotional attraction of its own, but, of all the parts, it is the least artistic, and connected least with the
art of poetry. For the power of Tragedy, we may be sure, is felt even apart from representation and actors. Besides, the production of spectacular effects depends more on the art of the stage machinist than on that of the poet." ²

Something of the same indifference to the theatrical qualities of drama is evident in Horace. The Roman poet recognizes that "the mind is less actively stimulated by what it takes in through the ear than by what is presented" to the eyes. Nevertheless, he feels that a sense of decorum will lead the poet to "keep out of sight many episodes that are to be described later by the eloquent tongue of a narrator." ³ In both the cases cited, the critics are merely presenting a theoretical justification of contemporary practices. For Greek and Roman plays are primarily rhetorical. The comparison between the actor and the orator, so often drawn in oratorical theory, was probably more apt in the classical than the Elizabethan theatre. Furthermore, the conditions of performance severely limited the kind

² Poetics, VI, 19, pp. 29 - 31.

³ On the Art of Poetry, p. 85.
of illusion a playwright could create.

(a) Stage Practice

The extent of the difference between illusion on the Roman and English stages can be estimated by comparing Plautus' *Amphitryon* and Heywood's *The Silver Age*. To begin with, Heywood dramatizes a number of incidents in *The Silver Age* which Plautus has simply reported. Equally interesting is the way in which the Elizabethan playwright consistently takes pains to establish a more detailed environment for his action. *Amphitryon* takes place in a vague location outside Amphitryon's house. There is little attempt to identify different areas of the stage and still less to convey an illusion of space extending into the "wings". The action in *The Silver Age*, by contrast, is vividly localized. Not only are the "gates" and "walls" of the palace referred to repeatedly, but there is even mention of the Porter's lodge (III, 104). The time of day is conjured up by Socia who expresses his relief that "out of this utter darkenes I am come to see lights in my Ladies Pallace" (III, 103). Even more striking, is the way in which the impression of an offstage environment is conveyed. Alcmena orders that the house be prepared for her husband's return.

Let all the windowes
Glister with lights like starres, cast sweete perfumes
To breath to heauen their odoriferous aires,
And tell the Gods my husband's safe return'd....
Sweete waters, costly ointments, pretious bathes,
Let me haue all, for tast, touch, smell, and sight,
All his fiue senses wee will feast this night.

(III, 100)
The pronounced emphasis on the sensuous in *The Silver Age* is in marked contrast to *Amphitryon* and very characteristic of Heywood. For in common with many of his contemporaries, Heywood thought of the drama as pre-eminently spectacular. There were both philosophical and traditional reasons for this. The Elizabethans thought that sight was "the most soveraigne sence, the first of five, which directeth man to the studdy & search of knowledge & wisdome; the eyes are placed in the head as in a Citadel, to be watch-towers and Centinels for the safety, and guiders and conducters for the sollace of the body."4 The belief in the importance of the eyes as perceivers of


both bea[t]y and truth led to an emphasis on the physical representation of action. In *An Apology for Actors* Heywood makes a sharp distinction between the effects of oratory, painting, and drama. Rhetorical description, he says,

is only a shadow receiued by the eare but not perceived by the eye so luily portrature is meerely a forme seene by the eye, but can neither show action, passion, motion, or any other gesture, to mooue the spirits of the beholder to admiration:

(Apology B3v)

Consequently, in the many examples of dramatic influence which he cites in *An Apology*, he repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the visual. It is "sights" and not sounds which "make an Alexander."5 What is of greatest value is to see.
To see a Hector all besmered in blood, trampling upon the bulkes of Kings. A Troylus returning from the field in the sight of his father Priam, as if man and horse euen from the steeds rough fetlocks to the plume in the champions helmet had bene together plunged into a purple Ocean: To see a Pompey ride in triumph, then a Caesar conquer that Pompey: labouring Hanniball alieue, hewing his passage through the Alpes. To see as I haue seen etc. 

(Apology, B4, my italics.)

In its strong emphasis on the importance of performance, An Apology may represent special pleading. 

Nevertheless, it unquestionably reflects Heywood's own bias. We have seen this bias expressed in his fascination with the physical aspects of characterization. It is evident in other ways as well. A particularly interesting indication of what was an unconscious or temperamental preference is supplied by a translation from the Latin included in An Apology. There he "Englishes" the phrase "Comedia recta si mente legatur, Constabit nulli posse nocere" as "Playes are in vse as they are understood Spectators eyes may make them bad or good." Somewhat later in his career, Heywood seems almost to succumb
to the enchantment of spectacle altogether. In his "Epistle to the Reader" published with Love's Mistress (1636), he praises the settings of Inigo Jones who,

to every Act, nay almost to every Sceane, by his excellent Inuentions, gave such an extraordinary Luster; upon every occasion changing the stage, to the admiraion [sic] of all the Spectators; that, as I must Ingeniously confesse, It was above my apprehension to conceiue.

(V, 86)

It is, of course, much easier to demonstrate the importance Heywood attached to spectacle than to define precisely the visual characteristics of his own plays. For our conception of production techniques at the Rose' or Red Bull theatres is very largely dependent upon the stage directions included in published texts. I have discussed the problems attending the interpretation of such directions in Appendix 2. Not only is it often difficult to ascertain the origin of any particular stage direction, but it is questionable how closely these instructions were actually followed in performance. Quite apart from these fundamental questions of fact are equally complicated problems of interpretation. Just how did the Elizabethan equivalent of the modern stage designer represent the various properties, or the stage manager produce the special effects
called for in the texts? Were there any scenic conventions comparable to the various theatrical "isms" (naturalism, surrealism, expressionism) which have been identified in the modern theatre? These are questions it is necessary to consider before treating the subject of spectacle in detail.

Very helpful insight into the conventions of Elizabethan stagecraft is provided, in my opinion, by the mechanicals' scene in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. While it is undoubtedly true that Shakespeare is here satirizing the naive and ineffectual efforts of amateurs, it is not at all clear just how the practice of the professionals differed from that he was parodying. The dramatist does not seem to be patronizing what he considers to be a more primitive stagecraft lacking the technical resources necessary for convincing theatrical realism. Quite the contrary. His satire seems to be directed against the mechanicals' efforts to be too literal in their approach to illusion. It is their failure to recognize that stage images can never in themselves be anything more than shadows that Shakespeare finds amusing. But there is no indication that the fundamental technical problems confronted by Peter Quince and his fellows were any different from those faced by the Chamberlain's or Admiral's men.

The heart of the matter seems to be the ambiguous nature of dramatic images. Bottom fears, (misguidedly we know) that the illusion conveyed by Pyramus's suicide will be too powerful. In their discussion of the problem, the mechanicals allude to three methods of creat-
ing theatrical illusion. The first, which they reject as being too frightening, is a kind of literal realism by which Pyramus's death would be imitated using a real sword, convincing gestures, and perhaps even real blood. The second, and preferred method, is a type of semi-realism in which the spectator is forced to remain aware of the artificial nature of the performance. Several of the mechanicals' spectacular effects are of this kind. The lion deliberately, and the wall inadvertently, are represented in such a way that any illusion in naturalistic terms is impossible. Still a third method of scenic design is what might be called visual symbolism. In the case of the representation of moonlight by a lantern, dog, and bush, the relationship between the theatrical image and its referent is completely conventional. It cannot be deduced by the eye alone from visual clues bearing a resemblance (however slight) to the real world. The interpretation of the visual symbol depends entirely upon an agreed upon scenic convention or upon explanation provided in the context of the play.

The coexistence in the Elizabethan theatre of three scenic conventions which I am calling "realism", "semi-realism", and "symbolism" is generally understood. There is a real difficulty, however, in agreeing about distinctions between the last two, and in assessing the effects of the various conventions. A particularly helpful introduction to the problem is provided by the property list drawn up by or for Philip Henslowe in March, 1598. The items listed can be divided
without too much trouble into three categories corresponding to the conventions I have enumerated. Realistic properties include those articles which probably differed in no noticeable way from similar items which could be encountered outside the theatre. Such properties comprise a relatively small group of weapons, symbols of office, small pieces of furniture, tools, utensils, and so on. A second group of semi-realistic properties are similar to Bottom's wall in that they are clearly intended to represent an object in the real world but probably do so in such a way that they could never be mistaken for the original. Among these are a number of fairly "realistic" properties such as severed heads and limbs which might, depending on the skill of the maker, be classified in group one. There are also certain bulky items such as tombs, a wooden canopy, and siege or

torture machines, which may have been realistic, but more probably contained elements of stylization. More obviously theatrical, no doubt, were the animals (lyon, great horse, black dog) or natural objects (trees and mossy banks) which served as indications of exterior scenes. Most intriguing, in many ways, are those items which suggest bulky scenic units (Belendon's stable, two steeples, a beacon) or the entries which may indicate the use of painted scenery (rainbow, the city of Rome, the cloth of the sun and moon). The range of spectacular effects attempted at the Rose seems to have been very wide and there is no reason to suppose that the stage management's success in all cases was greatly superior to that of Peter Quince and his associates.

Particular interest attaches to the third group of properties which I have called symbolic. These are representations of "objects" which exist only in the world of the imagination. The majority of such properties in the Admiral's men's list are for plays on mythological subjects. In designing for these plays, the property maker
could exercise his ingenuity untrammeled by the demands of realism or semi-realism. The construction of such units as Hell mouth or Mercury's wings, or Phaeton's chariot, could be as fanciful as desired. In many cases the scenic conventions on the Rose stage must have been comparable to the mechanicals' efforts to "disfigure" moonshine. Phaeton's fall, for example, was represented by an actor descending a flight of stairs (possibly wearing the "crown with a sone".\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} j Hell mought, j payer of stayers for Fayeton, j gowlden flece, Faeton charets, Argosse heade, Nepun forcke & garland, Ierosses head & raynbowe, Tamberlyne brydell, Cupedes bowe & quiver, j Cadeseus, Mercures wings, j helmet with a dragon, j shelde with iiij lyones, j chayne of dragons, j gylte speare, j dragon, j gostes crown, j crown with a sone.

An assessment of the spectacular elements of the drama of the Elizabethan period is difficult because it is precisely those elements which have not been preserved on the page. Contemporary comment and the testimony of Henslowe's property list suggest that the visual aspect of production was considered to be highly important. Just how Heywood approached the problems of stage spectacle will be the subject of succeeding pages.

(b) \textbf{Realism}

Any attempt at realistic, as opposed to dramatic, illusion on the platform stage must begin with the physical presence of the actor. The existence of the performer is the one reality that cannot be
doubted. If the actor is skilful, he will be able to convince the spectators that the passion he expresses is also real. From these two "facts" all other "reality" on the open stage must derive. The means by which a playwright extends the aura of truth surrounding the actor outwards to include properties, other actors, and even parts of the stage itself, is an interesting aspect of his dramatic technique. It could be compared to the way in which a painter places his figures in apparently real space in postures which imitate the effects of gravity. Just as the Renaissance painters had to discover ways to convey an illusion of weight and extension on a flat surface, so the dramatists had to experiment with methods of using properties and pantomime to give a convincing impression of rooms, streets, or open fields.

1) Properties

The conviction that location on the Elizabethan stage requires some form of background has led, in my opinion, to considerable obfuscation of the problem. Sir E. K. Chambers in his discussion of staging compiles a dizzying list of road, meadow, grove, forest, desert, mountain, street, threshold, porch, hall, chamber, and other scenes which are to be found in the plays of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.12 As Harley Granville-Barker points out, however,

---

such a list has very little meaning in the theatre where the "scene" only exists as a mirage "suddenly appearing, imperceptibly fading."\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} "A Note Upon Chapters XX and XXI of 'The Elizabethan Stage', Review of English Studies, I (1925), 64.

This mirage, of course, exists only in the imagination of the spectator where it might be said to interact with his normal perception of the stage as a stage. What does not appear and fade is the actor and those properties used to suggest location. These remain palpably real and it is from these, I believe, not from the background or even so much from the dialogue that the audience builds up its idea of place.

The principle that place is identified by properties rather than background is clearly demonstrated by two "split scenes" in Heywood's plays. In \textit{Fair Maid} Spencer and Goodlack refer twice to a "house" (inn) whereupon two drawers enter and invite them into "the next roome". Spencer says that they do not wish to dine but only to drink and asks for Bess. She enters alone, then a little later returns with wine and is invited to sit. Still later when Caroll and two captains enter, Spencer calls for more stools. After the quarrel in which Caroll is killed the two captains remove the body and the Drawers enter briefly complaining that no one will now settle the reckoning (II, 265 - 270). Although stage directions are missing, it seems quite clear that the
drawers are intended to bring stools on to the stage (probably on their first entrance, certainly when they are specifically asked for them) and then to clear the platform during their short exchange of dialogue which was almost certainly inserted to cover their function as stage-hands. The scene demonstrates two things. First it shows how an interior location is established by properties (stools, wine, glasses, and possibly a table) rather than by the background which remains neutral as the scene shifts from outside to inside the inn. It also shows how Heywood has very carefully made provision in the dramatic action for the setting up and clearing of the stage.

The incorporation of scene changing into the action of the play itself is carried even further in *A Woman Killed*. In that play, a domestic environment is established by a combination of pantomime, dialogue, and the deployment of a number of familiar properties. The scene in question opens with the stage direction "Enter 3. or 4. seruingmen, one with a Voyder and a woodden Knife to take away all, another the salt and bread, another the Table-cloth and Napkins, another the Carpet, Ienkin with two Lights after them" (II, 117). The dialogue establishes that the servants have just cleared their master's table and are on their way to set their own meal in the hall. Presently Frankford enters "as it were brushing the Crummes from his clothes with a Napkin, as newly risen from supper" (II, 118). He asks Nicholas to be brief since his "guests attend [him] in the Par- lour" (II, 118). When Nicholas leaves he calls, "Lights and a Table
there" whereupon "Enter Mistris Frankford, Master Wendoll, master Cranwell, Nicke and Ienkin, with Cards, Carpet, stooles, and other necessaries" (II, 121). Jenkin takes charge saying "A paire of Cards Nichlas, and a Carpet to couer the Table: where's Sisly with her Counters and her box: Candles and Candlestickes there" and according to the stage directions the servants "spred a Carpet, set downe lights and Cards" (II, 121). There are several points of interest in the scene. The first is the number and variety of the properties used to convey an impression of realism in the action. The second is the rather vague localization which seems to shift from a room outside the parlour to the parlour itself with the entry of the guests. A third point of interest is the elaborate care with which Heywood has integrated the scene changing into the playworld by devising wholly believable stage "business".

(ii) Furniture

This scene in A Woman Killed provides a convenient point of departure for a discussion of those larger properties employed by Heywood in the establishment of environment. Bernard Beckerman suggests that "it was regular practice at the Globe playhouse to have stools distributed about the stage for the use of the actors."14

14 Shakespeare at the Globe 1599 - 1609, p. 78.
He makes four points. First, he says, "only occasionally is a chair ... named in the dialogue." Secondly, stools are sometimes referred to as being present when there is no apparent way for them to have been brought on in the scene. Thirdly, "when banquets are brought on stage no mention is made of accompanying seats."
And finally, the actors frequently sit in places which "in reality would be devoid of seats."\(^{15}\) It is possible that such a practice as Beckerman describes was in fact used by Shakespeare and his colleagues at the Globe. If it was, however, it differed radically from procedures adopted by Heywood at the Rose and Red Bull.

Chairs or their equivalents are mentioned specifically in the stage directions of eight\(^{16}\) of the seventeen plays under discussion and were almost certainly used in all but two of the others.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\) Ibid., pp. 77 - 78.

\(^{16}\) Sir Thomas Moore, 2 Edward IV, Royal King, 1 Fair Maid, Rape, Silver Age, 1 Iron Age, 1 Know.

\(^{17}\) Brazen Age and 2 Iron Age.
Furthermore, Heywood quite consistently makes specific references in the dialogue to chairs and to the rearranging of furniture. 18

18 A Table and some stooles (1 Fair Maid, II, 307); A Chair for Justice Reason sirra (Chuse, 47); More stooles & cushions for these gentlemen (Ibid., p. 48); A stoole, a stoole; where's Ienkin, and where's Nicke? (Woman Killed, II, 132); A Chaire, admit the Herald, let him in (Royal King, VI, 34); A chaire first, and another for our Queene (Ibid., 52); Bones a me, you knaues! Stooles for these gentlemen (2 Know, I, 260); A low stoole for the Gentlewoman (Wise Woman, V, 344); The chamber-keeper a chaire there (1 Know, I, 206); A chaire for my Lady, Mistres Mirable do you not here my Lady call? (Rape, V, 196); A chaire for the Prince (Ibid., p. 217).

The most interesting reference occurs in a stage direction in 1 Iron Age which reads, "Enter Thersites with Souldiers, bringing in a table, with chayres and stooles plac'd aboue it"(III, 334). Such expedient scene-shifting must have been common on the Elizabethan stage as it is in many modern productions of Shakespeare. What is interesting about Heywood's dramatic technique is that he frequently tries to make the introduction of furniture a part of the dramatic illusion. Indeed he turns practical necessity to his advantage and uses the moving of chairs as a means of strengthening the sense of environment.

Something of the same convention seems to have been used by the playwright for the introduction of tables. Tables or banquets are required in ten of the seventeen plays. 19 In the original version of

19 Sir Thomas Moore, Four Prentices, 1 Edward IV, How a Man May Chuse, Royal King, 1 Fair Maid, Woman Killed, Rape of Lucrece, Golden Age, Silver Age, and 1 Iron Age.
Sir Thomas Moore a stage direction reads "A table beeing covered with a greene Carpet, a state Cushion on it, and the Pursse and Mace lying thereon Enter Sir Thomas Moore." The wording is ambiguous but it suggests that the author had in mind a discovery similar to the one he proposed for the scene of the Justices.20 Whatever the original in-

20 An Arras is drawne, and behinde it (as in Sessions) sit the L Maior [and eight other characters] (p. 5).

... it appears that the table and cushion were eliminated in the revision as the new direction reads simply "Enter Sr Thomas moore and his man Atired like him" (IV, 1). Tables in the other plays are almost invariably carried on to the main stage and are frequently referred to in the dialogue.21 Here again, the practice seems to be to

21 Nell, lay the cloth, and clap supper o' th' boord ... What Nell, What Didgeon, where be these folkes? Enter Nell and Dudgeon, with a table covered. (1 Edward IV, I, 49 - 50); Away there, ho! rid this place (1 Edward IV, I, 63); A Table and some stooles (1 Fair Maid, II, 307); Come spread the Table (Chuse, 46); Lights and a Table there (Woman Killed, II, 121); Go bid them spred the cloth and serue in supper (Ibid., p. 131); Wheres Spiggot the Butler to giue vs our salt and Trenchers ... Enter Butler and Ienkin with a Table-cloth, Bread, Trenchers and salt. (Ibid., p. 132); Musicke, and a banquet served in (2 Know, I, 297); More lights and see a banquet straight provided (Rape, V, 217); A banquet is brought in (1 Iron Age, III, 250); Usher me in a costly banquet straight (Silver Age, III, 100); A banquet, lights, attendance (Silver Age, III, 101); Come, come, spread, spread, vp with the pulpets straight, Seates for the Iudges (1 Iron Age, III, 334):
incorporate the moving of heavy properties into the dramatic action to make it seem a part of the world of illusion.

The setting of beds is more troublesome. Since such articles of furniture are not normally carried about by the servants, it is impossible to pretend that the sudden appearance of a bed is "realistic." Consequently, Heywood had to devise more conventional methods of establishing bedroom scenes. There are two such scenes in the plays before 1607, one in A Woman Killed and the other in If You Know Not Me. In both, the stage directions are explicit: "Enter Mistris Frankford in her bed" (II, 154), and "Enter Elizabeth in her bed" (I, 200). On the face of it, these directions would suggest some kind of movement on to the stage. However, "enter" may in these cases mean "be discovered." G. F. Reynolds so interprets the directions and concludes that the beds in both cases were revealed by drawing a curtain concealing a rear alcove.\(^{22}\) If actual beds were used in these scenes, such a position for them would be logical. It seems to me, however, that Reynolds does not take sufficient account of the possibility that the "beds" may in fact have been something else altogether.\(^{23}\) Whatever the actual stage practice, the evidence

\(^{22}\) The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theatre (New York, 1940), pp. 66 and 113.
23 It was not uncommon to use chairs to represent beds on the Elizabethan stage. In 1 Iron Age, for example, Hellen says to Paris, "This Chayre serue as your bed, lye downe and sleepe." (III, 282). Similarly Elizabeth sleeps in a chair in 1 Know (I, 228) and Mathew Shore is carried on wounded in a chair where a bed might be expected (2 Edward IV, I, 155).

of the texts suggests that Heywood was sparing in his use of bed scenes in his early career.

The relatively infrequent appearance of beds in the early plays is in marked contrast to their proliferation in the plays after 1607. Of the five Ages and The Rape of Lucrece only 1 Iron Age does not require the presence of a bed. It is true that this difference may simply reflect the preoccupations of Ovid, but it seems also to indicate a change in Heywood's approach to staging.

The handling of the bed in The Rape of Lucrece may mark a transition. According to the stage direction, Lucrece is "discovered in her bed" (V, 222). Once again the staging suggested is a real bed in some kind of discovery space. But there are two difficulties with such a reconstruction. The first is the relatively mild ambiguity introduced by the phrase "beneath these curtains" (V, 222) which suggests something very different from an ordinary traverse. The second, more serious, is the movements of the characters. At the end of the scene, according to the stage direction, Sextus "beares [Lucrece] out" (V, 225) and after a short bridge scene, the two enter again, this
time "unready" (i.e., in disarray). The exit and reentrance of Sextus and Lucrece would seem to be totally unnecessary if there were a bed in a rear stage behind a curtain as Reynolds suggests.\textsuperscript{24} A more logical explanation would seem to be that the exit was necessitated by the fact that the rear stage (if it existed) was not used, and that the discovery was arranged in some sort of structure which was not large enough to conceal the two actors or was not sufficiently bed-like to permit the actual rape to take place on it.

That Heywood did not, in fact, envisage the use of a bed in \textit{Rape} is suggested by the very different staging of a comparable scene in \textit{The Golden Age}. In that play the introduction of the bed on to the stage is clearly described by the stage direction which reads, "Enter the foure old Beldams, drawing out Danae's bed: she in it. They place foure tapers at the foure corners" (III, 67). Jupiter enters "crown'd with his Imperiall Robes" and shortly after "Lyes vpon her bed". During Danae's feeble protestations, Jupiter "puts out the lights and makes vnready" whereupon Danae cautions him to "draw the curtains" before he comes to bed. At the critical moment "the bed is drawne in" (V, 70), and the scene changes. There are two interesting differences between this and the previous scene. The first is

\textsuperscript{24} Op. cit., p. 66.
that Heywood clearly intends the bed to be the focus of the action and for this purpose has it moved out onto the main stage. Secondly, the dramatist has made some concession to his sense of realism by having the scene change carried out by characters who might be imagined to be in Danae's "bedchamber".

Other bedroom scenes in the Ages indicate that Heywood placed most of such scenes in his later plays on the main stage. This is certainly the suggestion of two stage directions, "Enter Sibilla lying in child-bed, with her child lying by her" (Golden Age, III, 16), and "Enter Semele drawne out in her bed" (Silver Age, III, 154). It is also the most logical solution to the problem of the staging of the murder of Agamemnon in 2 Iron Age. The stage direction reads, "Enter Egistus with his sworde drawne, hideth himselfe in the chamber behind the Bed-curtaines: all the Kings come next in, conducting the Generall and his Queene to their Lodging, and after some complement leaue them, every one with torches ushered to their severall chambers" (2 Iron Age, III, 411). In the course of the scene, Agamemnon apparently sits on the bed for he comments on its hardness. After the murder the body is borne off "with a sad and funerall march".

The scene seems to call for a fairly elaborate bed with curtains to be placed on the main stage. Since the area would also be used for other scenes, the bed would either have to stand in full view throughout the play or be moved into position when needed by stagehands whose presence could only be justified on conventional and not on dramatic
grounds. In this case, it seems that Heywood has at last abandoned his attempts to present the moving of large properties as an integral part of the play's action.

(c) **Semi-Realism**

The handling of bed scenes is interesting because it shows Heywood dealing with large properties of a marginal kind. While such properties are small enough to be moved about the stage, they are nevertheless of such a nature that their disposition by the actors cannot be made to look as natural as that of tables or chairs. Consequently the moving of a bed cannot be presented within the same conventions of "realism" as the setting of a banquet or the preparation of a game of cards. On the other hand, bedroom scenes are considerably more "realistic" than a great many of the scenes in Elizabethan drama which depend on properties such as rocks, trees, tombs, arbors, and so on which would never be moved about a real landscape. Such properties belong more properly to a discussion of what I have called "semi-realism".

(1) **Scenic Units**

What I would call semi-realistic scenic units (that is bulky properties used to indicate some exterior location) are of two kinds in Heywood's plays. The first includes those items such as gibbets, scaffolds, and the like which are brought in and assembled before the audience. In *Sir Thomas Moore*, for example, there is a stage direction which reads, "ex. some seuerally, others set vp the Iibbit" (p. 20). There is an execution scene in *2 Edward IV*, and a threatened
one in Royal King for which the necessary preparations are probably carried out in much the same way. A court scene is set up in Royal King and coffins are brought on to the stage in Edward IV, Chuse.

25 A barre set out, the King and Chester, with Clinton, and the Prince, and Captaine take their seates, Audley and Bonvile bring him to the Barre as out of his bed, then take their seates (VI, 77).

and I Know. In general, however, the plays written before 1607 require relatively few bulky props of this kind and those that are called for are handled in a fairly realistic manner.

A second category of semi-realistic scenic units comprises those objects which probably remained on stage unmoved throughout the play. Among these might be included the throne in I Know and the Trojan horse in Iron Age. In the first play, Mary obviously refers to a throne when she says, "here we may sit secure" (I, 195). Later, in a scene which supposedly takes place in Tame's house, Beningfield asks Barwick "is this the 'chair of state'"? (I, 223). On being assured that it is, Beningfield gives the interesting order "Take it downe" which suggests either that the throne was stored somewhere up high out of the way or, perhaps, that it stood permanently on a dais. The disposition of the Trojan horse in Iron Age is even more puzzling. It is "discovered" at the beginning of Act Two (III, 372). Priam, after listening to Synon's explanation, commands "Downe with the wals then, each man lend a hand" (III, 377). That the horse was not, in fact, moved from its position on the main stage is
suggested by a subsequent stage direction which shows how the platform was established as first "outside" and then "inside" the walls. 26

---

26 Enter Agamemnon, Menelaus, Vlisses, with souldiers in a soft march, without noise (III, 378); Enter Synon with a torch aboue (379); They march softly in at one doore, and presently in at another. Enter Synon with a stealing pace, holding the key in his hand (379); Pyrhus, Diomed, and the rest leape from out the Horse. And as if groping in the darke, meete with Agamemmon and the rest: who after knowledge imbrace (380).

Furthermore, the horse must have remained in full view of the audience at least until the end of Act Three when Pyrhus refers to it as "yon horse" (III, 391). These two examples demonstrate quite clearly that throughout the period we are studying Heywood occasionally envisaged incongruous bulky properties on stage during scenes in which they had no realistic function. 27

---

27 That the popular theatres regularly employed some form of simultaneous staging was first extensively argued by G. F. Reynolds in his careful study, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theatre (New York, 1940).

---

(ii) Tiring House Facade

Closely related to the bulky scenic units we have been discussing are the various permanent features of the tiring house facade such as doors, upper level, and discovery space. Normally, such features might
be considered part of a neutral architectural background which, as I have argued above, does not contribute to the illusion of dramatic environment. But there are occasions when the dramatist uses these features to suggest an object or location. At such times, an upper level may be used semi-realistically (to represent a balcony for example) or symbolically (to indicate a hill or ship's look-out). Since the employment of such features usually entails at least a rudimentary attempt to duplicate an object in the real world, I have chosen to treat Heywood's use of the tiring house facade in the present section.

Perhaps the most frequently used element related to the stage wall is the "discovery space". Although there is still disagreement on the matter, commentators now tend to think of this space as a free-standing structure rather than as an "inner stage" of the kind generally accepted a few years ago.28 The kind of structure which


would be required is suggested by references in Heywood's plays. Several of the works require a "shop" which can be "prepared" or "opened" (1 Edward IV, Wise Woman, 2 Know). Others call for a "tent" (2 Edward IV, Rape, Iron Age), a "tomb" and "dark hole" (Chuse), an "arbor" (Golden Age) or a "little closet" (Wise Woman). References
in How a Man May Chuse and The Wise Woman of Hogsdon are most suggestive of a booth. In the latter play allusion is made to "a little closet close to the doore (V, 307). A similar structure might have served for the "tomb" in Chuse as well as for the "dark hole" beside some "stairs" that Aminadab uses for a hiding place (p. 40).

In his early plays, Heywood makes moderate, and fairly realistic, use of a discovery space. The booth functions in an "indicative" way suggesting a room or enclosure on the periphery of the action. Most of the scenes involve no more than two or three actors and normally require action on the main stage as well. This tendency of "interior" scenes to spill forward on to the platform is illustrated by the staging of two similar scenes in 2 Iron Age. In the first,

King Priam [is] discovered kneeling at the Altar, with him Hecuba, Polixena, Andromache, Astianas: to them enter Pyrhus, and all the greeks, Pyrhus killing Plytes Priams sonne before the Altar, (III, 390)

The direction itself is ambiguous, but it is almost certain that the entrance of Pyrhus and the Greeks is not into the discovery space but on to the main platform. This is indicated by the staging of a very similar scene later in that play where an altar again serves as the focal point. In this second case, however, the altar is "set forth" which suggests that the property is placed well forward in order for there to be sufficient space to accommodate the numerous actors involved in the action (III, 426).

The examples I have discussed, show Heywood using the discovery
space in such a way that it serves as an adjunct to the main stage. The booth provides a supplementary acting area but never, or only very rarely, itself becomes the focus of the action. At other times, however, Heywood employs the discovery space differently. In *1 Iron Age*, for example, "Achilles [is] discovered in his Tent, about him his bleeding Mermidons, himself wounded, and with him Ulisses" (III, 324). This scene consists of little more than three lengthy speeches by Ulysses. The *Ages* also contain scenes in which the discovery space is used to reveal tableaux or special effects. For example, the Trojan Horse is somehow "discovered" (*2 Iron Age*), as are "Two fiery Bulls, the Fleece hanging over them and the Dragon sleeping beneath them" (*Brazen Age*, III, 217). In the last instance, especially, Heywood is abandoning the conventions of semi-realism and using the discovery space in a frankly theatrical way. These latter uses might be compared to the techniques of the masque whereas the earlier examples can be seen to be a natural outgrowth of stage practices on a simple outdoor booth stage. In the one case, the booth is used as a piece of stage machinery; in the other, it is more like a supplementary entrance.

The feature of the stage which is used next most frequently by Heywood is the upper level.29 Here again it is difficult to interpret

---

29 Guy and Eustace climbe vp the wals (*Four Prentices*, II, 234); Josselin on the walls (*1 Edward IV*, I, 19); great shot from the towne (*2 Edward IV*, I, 101); Sailor aboue (*1 Fair Maid*, II, 316); Elizabeth Gage & Clarentia aboue (*1 Know*, I, 240); Enter in several places ...
above (Rape, V, 243); Jupiter appears in his glory under a Raine-bow (Silver Age, III, 122); Enter Iuno and Iris above in a cloud (Silver Age, III, 130); Telamon first mounts the walls (Brazen Age, III, 224); Hercules from a rock above (Brazen Age, III, 252); Jupiter above strikes him with a thunder-bolt (Brazen Age, III, 254); above upon the walls (1 Iron Age, III, 298); Synon ... above (2 Iron Age, III, 379).

the evidence. In several cases, especially in the Ages, it is impossible to know if "above" refers to an upper stage or to some kind of flying machine lowered from the heavens. At other times, more than two levels are suggested. In The Silver Age, Juno is presumably above the main stage since Hercules refers to her as being in "the high tribunall in the Spheares Where [she sits] crown'd in starres" (III, 131). Nevertheless, Juno herself speaks to Iris who is apparently still higher in a "cloud" where she has been placed to see the chase (III, 130). In the latter instance, the relative height of the characters would almost certainly have to be reproduced in some way on stage.

The first reference, however, may simply be poetic, alluding to Juno's normal abode and not to her position above Hercules on the stage. When allowance has been made for these difficulties, however, it is apparent that Heywood's use of an upper level is confined entirely to the romantic and historical plays.

In the early work, the upper stage is used infrequently. It serves as city walls, the rigging of a ship, and the balcony from which Elizabeth receives news of her sister's death. In the Ages, however, Heywood makes more extensive use of the higher reaches of
the stage up to and including the heavens. In many cases he calls for a simple ascent or descent by a single character. In others, the stage directions seem to require that more than one character rise or descend together. A few directions suggest an elaborate passage from the heavens to the stage. Finally, at least one direction implies that some form of remote control or automation was possible.

30 Jupiter ascends (Golden Age, III, 78); Iris descends (Ibid., p. 78); Jupiter descends in a cloude (Silver Age, III, 98); Jupiter descends (Ibid., p. 154); Jupiter ascends (Ibid., p. 155).

31 Juno and Iris descend from the heauens (Silver Age, III, 121); Jupiter, the Gods and Planets ascend to heauen (Silver Age, III, 164).

32 Mercury flies from aboue (Silver Age, III, 138); Medea hangs aboue in the Aire (Brazen Age, III, 217).

33 from the heauens descends a hand in a cloud, that from the place where Hercules was burnt, brings vp a starre, and fixeth it in the firmament (Brazen Age, III, 254).
As with all stage directions, it is difficult to know how accurately these reflect the practice actually employed in production. It is clear, however, that the playwright is here making quite different demands from those in his other plays. This is simply further evidence of the unique, and somewhat puzzling place of the Ages in the Heywood canon.

The uniqueness of that position is confirmed by a study of Heywood's use of other features of the stage. Virtually the only evidence for a trap is to be found in the Ages where it serves as another "discovery" space. Earth rises through the trap in Silver Age (III, 139), and in The Brazen Age, the trap is used to reveal a Fury, a Bulls head (III, '176), Gallus and a cocke (III, 231), and to lower Hercules' body (III, 254). Heywood's use of the stage doors also differs slightly in the Ages. In the early plays, the doors are not often the focus of action. Their normal function is to provide a neutral entrance through which a character appears into an environment which begins in front of the tiring house facade. In those cases where the environment is thought of as extending offstage (as for example in the banquet scene of Woman Killed discussed above, or

34 A corpse is "buried" in one of the dumb shows in Four Prentices of London but this effect may have been achieved by other means than opening a trap (II, 178).
in *Wisewoman* where reference is made to a withdrawing room, or in *Chuse* where Aminadab's reference to "stayres" probably refers to imaginary stairs off stage), the door is treated in a realistic manner. Even in those "outdoor" scenes in which the doors may have been referred to as "gates" (as for instance in *1 Edward IV*, I, 14) the scenic convention is fairly realistic. In the *Ages*, however, the doors occasionally become the focus of action which is highly conventional. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, Horatius goes out supposedly to leap into the Tiber, here the door and the stage facade are treated in a semi-realistic way. The technique is not essentially different from that employed in the battles of *Four Prentices*, *1 Edward IV*, or *1 Fair Maid*, but the fact that the action takes place at the door and is imagined to continue off stage, means that the focus of the audience's attention is more directly on the physical features of the stage than in the earlier plays where the action tends to come forward.

The discussion of semi-realistic spectacle involving bulky scenic units or the permanent features of the tiring house facade has illustrated how difficult it is frequently to distinguish between a "realistic" and a "symbolic" use of properties. In some ways, the plays we have been examining suggest a definite line of development. The early plays, almost without exception, can be played on a simple platform and require very little in the way of visual effects. The background is rarely used to suggest environment and when doors or the discovery space are employed, they are used in a fairly "realistic"
way. *The Rape of Lucrece* and the *Ages* illustrate a very different stage technique. There is a greater and more imaginative use of the tiring house facade. The discovery space is used to reveal tableaux or special effects in a manner reminiscent of a masque. Furthermore, numerous special effects draw attention to the back or upper parts of the stage. This emphasis on machinery rather than on actors is even more pronounced in Heywood's use of visual symbolism.

(d) **Symbolism**

I have discussed above how the playwright's desire to "body forth the forms of things unknown" results in symbolic properties of two kinds. The first kind attempt to represent imaginary things such as mythological deities in a concrete and recognizable way. The second type suggest objects by relying on conventional, rather than representational means.

Heywood's classical plays call for many properties of the first variety many of them startlingly exotic. In *The Golden Age*, for example, Heywood calls for models of ships and buildings (III, 11), a mace and burning crown (III, 79), a sea-horse and Eagle (III, 78). The demands in the *Silver* and *Bronze* Ages are, if anything, more extravagant, including as they do a club of fire and burning weapons (III, 159), a cloude (III, 98), a rainbow (III, 122), two snakes (III, 126), a hand and a star (III, 254), a bull (III, 176), a sea monster (III, 206), a rock and trees (III, 252) and a dragon (III,
Spectacular effects in the last two Ages are more modest. An Amazonian head and bleeding arm are required in 2 Iron Age (III, 368) and in the same play the author calls for a Trojan horse which will hide several of the actors.

An even more reckless extravagance is evident in Heywood's specifications for special effects. So extreme, indeed, do these demands appear to some critics that it has been suggested that the Ages were never intended to be staged.\(^{35}\) In view of Heywood's specific claim that they were "Publickely Acted by two Companies, vppon one Stage at once, and haue at sundry times thronged three seuerall Theatres" this seems unlikely.\(^{36}\) How the stage manager can have accomplished the effects that Heywood envisaged, however, is difficult today to imagine. Among the spectacular requirements were Jupiter descending

\(^{35}\) J. Q. Adams ("Four Pictorial Representations of the Elizabethan Stage", JEGP, X (1911), 330) comments that the stage directions in the Ages do not reflect actual conditions of performance, a contention which Reynolds energetically refutes in Staging, p. 10. Adams had presumably changed his mind by 1919 when he suggested that the Ages were presented at the Red Bull, Globe and Blackfriars. ("Shakespeare, Heywood, and the Classics", Modern Language Notes, 34 (1919), 339).

\(^{36}\) Epistle "To the Reader", 1 Iron Age, III, 264.
in a cloud (Silver Age, III, 98), Jupiter in Glory under a rainbow (Ibid., p. 122), Juno in a cloud (Ibid., p. 130), fireworks all over the house (Ibid., p. 159), a thunderbolt burning (Ibid., p. 154), a bed that burns and "flyes vp" (Ibid., p. 155), a shower of rain (Ibid., p. 183), a fire in which Hercules is burned and a hand which descends from the heavens, takes a star from the place where Hercules was burnt, and fixes it in the firmament (III, 254).

Heywood's use of properties and special effects in the Ages is strikingly different from his practice in the "realistic" plays of 1599 - 1603. Not only are individual objects and scenic units much more elaborate than those normally called for in the earlier plays, but there is no effort in the Ages to incorporate scene changes or special effects into a stage world that in any way mirrors the actual one. The purpose of the spectacle is to dazzle the spectators and to invite them to collaborate in a much more active way in the creation of theatrical illusion. Even greater imaginative cooperation is required in those plays where Heywood abandons all attempt at verisimilitude.

The existence of a few undoubted examples of symbolism in the plays raises fundamental questions about the interpretation of the stage directions and texts. In The Silver Age, for example, Juno says, "Pull me from heavent (faire Iris) a black cloud, From which I le fashion me a beldams shape" (III, 121). The "cloud", as is clear from the stage direction, is to be represented by a cloak and
the metamorphosis of the goddess into an old woman is accomplished by the actor putting on a garment which is itself symbolic of a mist. The use of a symbolic property in this scene suggests that many more of the objects on stage, especially those described in the text, may have been represented in a similar way.

The same suspicion attaches to backgrounds. A continuing problem in reconstructing the staging of Elizabethan plays is that of deciding when the playwright's flourishes of rhetorical scene painting indicate an actual alteration of the stage or stage facade. For example, when Mistress Arthur gives instructions in *How a Man May Chuse* to "spread the table," and asks "is the hall well rubb'd? The cushions in the windows neatly laid? The cupboard of plate set out? the casements stuck With rosemary and flowers? the carpets brush'd?" (p. 54) how many of these details were represented or symbolized in a performance? G. F. Reynolds concludes that the popular dramatist "did not usually solve [his scenic] problems by using passages of extended description. Instead, he resorted to pantomime, noises, and other stage effects." 37 I think that this was usually the case. On the other hand, Heywood's plays contain some evidence that it was not always so. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, the maid asks Lucrece "Why is your

---

chamber hung with mourning blacke?" (V, 234). The stage direction, however, reads "A Table and A Chaire couered with blacke" (V, 234). Here the "hangings" are not fastened to the walls as would be suggested by the text. But neither are they altogether imaginary. By the use of visual symbolism Heywood adds to the stage spectacle but not in the way we might suppose if the stage direction had not survived.

Similar difficulties attend the interpretation of directions describing gestures or pantomime. Again The Rape of Lucrece gives us a clue to the scope of the problem. In that play, Brutus refers to a time earlier in the drama when Tullia "[made] her unwilling Chariotter [sic] drive on, And with his shod wheeles crush her Fathers bones" (V, 174). The action in question takes place on stage but it is described much differently in the direction which reads simply "Tullia treads on her Father & staies" (V, 173).

These examples show that on occasion Heywood resorted to a kind of symbolic spectacle which was at the very opposite extreme from his attempts to create a realistic stage illusion. The most striking instances of spectacular symbolism occur in the Ages but there is some evidence that similar practices may not have been entirely absent from the plays of 1600 - 1607. Part of this evidence consists of Heywood's sympathy for visual allegory. In 2 Edward IV, Jane Shore provides the allegorical interpretation of her actions. She says that she,

... in derision bore
This burning taper to expresse my folly,
That hauing light of reason to direct me
Delighted yet in by-ways of darke error.

(I, 165)
Allegorical conventions underlie the plot and some of the pageantry of Royal King and the use of such names as Goodlack and Roughman in 1 Fair Maid. Finally, it is quite likely that the Ages themselves are actually a series of allegories, what Heywood elsewhere calls "golden Truth[s] contained in ... leaden fable[s]".\(^{38}\)

\(^{38}\) To the Reader, Love's Mistress, V, p. 85.

Even clearer evidence of Heywood's use of symbolism is to be found in the dumb shows in the plays. At its simplest, the Elizabethan dumb show seems to have been a form of rapid storytelling intended to convey essential plot information in a quick and painless way. Homer indicates as much in The Brazen Age when he says, "Our last Act comes, which lest it tedious grow, What is to long in word, accept in show." (III, 239). Heywood's audiences apparently did accept such shows without demur for the playwright's use of the device in The Four Prentices and the Ages is essentially narrative. In 1 If You Know Not Me, however, Heywood experiments in a most interesting way with the convention. The particular pantomime is described as follows:

Enter Winchester, Constable, Barwick, and Fryers: At the other door, two Angels. The Fryers step to her, offering to kill her: the Angels drive them back. Exeunt. The Angel opens the Bible, and puts it in her hand as she sleeps. Exeunt Angels. She wakes.

(I, 228)
What is significant about this scene is that it illustrates the way in which Heywood could think in realistic and symbolic terms simultaneously. On the realistic level, the action could be interpreted as a dream. Heywood goes to considerable pains to put the incident into a logical and rational context. He gives a reason for Elizabeth's fatigue ("I am weary of writing"), and has her question her waiting woman when she wakes about the reality of her vision ("Clarentia, sawst thou nothing?"). Whether or not Clarentia actually left the stage when requested to do so by her mistress, she apparently also slept during the dumb show and so is unable to establish the objective reality of the vision one way or the other. The same ambiguity surrounds the placing of the Bible in the Princess's lap. Elizabeth is told that Clarentia did not bring the book into the room but her conclusion is that "Then, twas by inspiration." The suggestion here may be that the Bible is in fact only a symbol of a mental event. In the same way, the material presence of the angels and the Princess's enemies may also be thought of as the symbolic representation respectively of the dangers threatening her life and the effective protection of her faith. Although Heywood was never again to repeat this kind of scene exactly, it is an excellent illustration of the tensions in his work that we have been discussing in this chapter.

(e) Conclusion

In his handling of the purely visual aspects of drama, Heywood reveals something of the same alternation between apparently opposed
styles which we have noted in other facets of his dramaturgy. In
certain scenes and plays the dramatist seems to strive to create a
believable, self-contained stage world which is a literal "mirror"
of the world outside the theatre. In other places, he is apparently
interested in exploiting the spectacular resources of the stage and
tiring house for their own sake. We have seen that the first tend-
ency is strongest in the "domestic" plays of 1599 - 1603 and the
second most pronounced in the classical plays, especially the Ages.
Although there is some evidence to suggest that these facts demon-
strate a definite change of style in the middle of his career, there
are conflicting signs that the differences simply reflect Heywood
working in different modes. While it is probably not safe to pro-
nounce finally on this question, it is possible to make certain
broad generalizations about Heywood's plays and about the way the
dramatist habitually uses his medium.

We have seen that in his dramaturgy Heywood seems to vacillate
between two opposing aesthetics. The one I have sometimes called
"Aristotelian" although it only indirectly derives from the criti-
cism of the Greek philosopher. The "Aristotelian" aesthetic is
characterized by a strongly motivated, tightly organized narrative
line with an emphasis on causality, crisis, reversal, and recogni-
tion. It features characters who tend to be highly conventional
in their appearance, and whose behaviour conforms to traditional and
fixed stereotypes. The staging emphasizes rhetoric rather than
spectacle and tends to acknowledge, or even draw attention to, the artificial nature of theatrical conventions. The opposed aesthetic has been described occasionally above as "non-Aristotelian". It might more accurately be called "popular" in that it seems to express certain enduring theatrical ideals which are not peculiar to any particular period. It is characterized by a loose, meandering narrative line propelled by accidents, chance, and surprising coincidences, and frequently resolved by a last minute battle or change of heart. The characters are either surprising variations of basic stereotypes, or personae with a marked capacity for moral change. The staging places great stress on the visual and sometimes tries to convey an illusion of a self-contained world.

Heywood's dramaturgy is quite obviously much closer to the second than to the first aesthetic. In order to define more precisely just what features are peculiar to Heywood, however, and what are common to the Elizabethan drama in general, it would be necessary to extend the above technical analysis to cover all the plays written in the period under discussion. Since such a study is obviously beyond the scope of a single work, it will perhaps suffice to concentrate attention on one play in which Heywood's dramaturgy can be compared with that of a collaborator.
PART THREE

PAGEANTS TO INSTRUCT

... So bewitching a thing is lively and well-spirited action, that it hath power to new-mold the harts of the spectators, and fashion them to the shape of any noble and notable attempt.

(An Apology for Actors, B4)
VII

FORTUNE BY LAND AND SEA

The study of Heywood's relationship to various theatrical
managements, and the analysis of the technical features of his
dramaturgy are interesting in themselves. But they would undoubt-
edly acquire an added significance if they could be shown to have
a practical value as well. It is worth while enquiring, then,
whether or not the approach I have adopted throws any new light on
the problems of Heywood scholarship. To do this I would like to
conclude this study with a detailed examination of a play which
has so far been excluded from my analysis.

On June 20, 1655, some fourteen years after Heywood's death,
there was entered in the Stationers' Register a play entitled
Fortune by Land and Sea by "Tho: Heywood & Wm. Rowley." 1

1 G. E. B. Eyre, ed., A Transcript of the Registers of the-
Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708 (London, 1913-14), I,
486. For a fuller discussion of the play see Appendix I.

later the same year a quarto edition of the play printed for John
Sweeting proclaimed the same joint authorship on its title page.
In spite of the authority of these statements, however, there is
a surprising amount of disagreement about the nature of the play,
and about whether or not a second hand is discernible in it. E. H. C. Oliphant thinks that the piece is really a collaboration between Heywood and Shirley. Fleay and Clark agree that Rowley had no part in the composition of the play while Charles Wharton Stork thinks that Rowley contributed only an occasional short scene or touch.


3 Drama, I, 294; Thomas Heywood, pp. 179-182. Clark's rejection of Rowley's claim to the play is based on his conviction that Heywood is the author of an anonymous pamphlet entitled A True Relation, of the Lives and Deaths of the two most Famous English Pirates, Purser and Clinton (1639). The pamphlet contains a close paraphrase of the Pursuivant-scene in Fortune by Land and Sea and would seem to establish Heywood as the author of that particular incident. I have been unable to consult a copy of the pamphlet in question, but I do not find Clark's argument that Heywood must therefore have written the other pirate scenes particularly convincing.


Otelia Cromwell speculates that Rowley was responsible for the closely knit plot and some lines in the final revision, while Michel Grivelet
simply admits that "il n'est guère possible de dire ce qui, dans l'oeuvre, revient a Heywood." 6

The inability of critics to agree on this matter is some indication of our need for an adequate vocabulary to describe the technical aspects of English Renaissance drama. As Baldwin Maxwell said almost twenty years ago, "a convincing identification of ... authors ... must await our clearer knowledge of what were the peculiar characteristics of the various Jacobean dramatists." 7 The present study

is an attempt to define precisely those "peculiar characteristics" in the work of a single such dramatist. From our analysis we would expect that a play in which Heywood had a hand would exhibit certain stylistic traits in the treatment of narrative, dramatic character-

5 Thomas Heywood, p. 173.

6 Thomas Heywood, p. 380.

7 Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha (New York, 1956), p. 196. Maxwell was discussing the authorship of A Yorkshire Tragedy, but his comment seems relevant to the subject in hand.
ization, and spectacle. We would also hope that at least some of those traits would prove to be much more pronounced in that author's work than in the plays of his contemporaries. In such a case, a collaborated play like Fortune by Land and Sea might reflect its double origin in a perceptible mixture of styles.

In its static form, Fortune is a multiple narrative consisting of three carefully inter-locked stories. The first two of these are introduced fairly rapidly in the protasis. Scenes One and Two of Act One deal with the prodigality of Frank Forrest, his defiance of his father under the influence of the gallant, Rainsforth, and the resulting tavern brawl in which Frank is killed. This story is continued in I.iv and II.ii where the eldest Forrest son avenges the death of his brother. The killing of Rainsforth is the main crisis of the first story since it is the event which turns Forrest into a fugitive and determines his subsequent actions. The second story is introduced in I.iii and brought to a crisis in II.i. Old Harding, who has just himself married a younger and much poorer wife, hears that his eldest son, Philip, has promised to wed Susan Forrest. He forbids the match and threatens to disinherit his son. In a following scene (II.i), we hear that the wedding has taken place in spite of Old Harding's threats. When Philip learns that his father will not relent, he becomes a servant in the house.

The beginning of Fortune is thus very similar to a number of Heywood plays especially A Woman Killed and Royal King which also
introduce two separate stories in the **protasis**. When we compare the first work with the second two, however, we notice some interesting differences. To begin with, each of the stories in *Fortune* gets off to a false start. More accurately, perhaps, we should say that the dramatist devotes a disproportionate amount of time to incidents which are not central to the main action. Frank Forrest's death, for example, serves only as the motive for revenge and might better have been reported than dramatized. The very strong opening scenes, and especially the prolonged and melodramatic mourning over the body of Frank Forrest, create an atmosphere of almost tragic intensity which is rare in Heywood and especially so in his openings. In this respect, it is particularly interesting to compare the total lack of rhetoric following Spencer's duel with Carroll in *1 Fair Maid* and the equally restrained moments following Sir Charles' killing of two of Sir Francis' servants in *A Woman Killed*. A similar false start is evident in the subordinate story in which Harding's opposition to Philip's marriage is stretched over two scenes instead of being confined to one. We need only compare this leisurely and rather repetitive exposition of the main conflict with the compression of a dramatist such as Shakespeare to be aware of just how loosely organized this opening material is. We have noted that a leisurely **protasis** is typical of Heywood. What seems unusual in this play is the dramatization of essentially extraneous narrative material and the creation of great emotional intensity.
The epitasis of Fortune by Land and Sea illustrates with almost text-book simplicity both what I have called the "romantic" and the "moral" methods of development. Young Forrest, after fleeing from his pursuers, is hidden by Anne Harding, later discovered by his sister Susan, and helped to escape by being hidden in a trunk. At sea, Forrest becomes captain of the vessel on which he had booked passage, captures the pirates Purser and Clinton, and by way of reward is pardoned. The middle portion of this story is thus very much like those of Four Prentices or 1 Fair Maid and is characterized, like them, by astounding coincidences, surprise developments, vigorous action, and a final outcome determined in battle. It differs from typical Heywood plays in not having a love interest and in being essentially a flight rather than a quest. It also lacks the sense of purpose which gives the other plays an impression of direction. This aimlessness in the plot is compensated for by the introduction of Purser and Clinton in an almost independent narrative. The pattern of hubris and defeat which characterizes the story of the pirates gives a sense of momentum to the second part of the epitasis which the Forrest story alone could not impart.

The development of the Philip Harding story takes the form of a "moral epitasis" and consists of a series of tableaux illustrating a simple homily. Like the Captain in Royal King or Susan in A Woman Killed, Philip finds that a man's friends desert him in time of need.
The occurrence of the names Anne and Susan in both *Fortune* and *Woman Killed* is yet another example of similarities between the two plays.

The young lovers are unable to escape from their servitude to Old Harding when Philip is unsuccessful in his attempt to borrow money to stock a farm. However, the discovery of his helplessness is not a moment of insight or reversal. It is rather a confirmation of his situation which has remained more or less static throughout the middle part of the play.

In outline, therefore, the epitasis of *Fortune by Land and Sea* is very characteristic of Heywood. It combines in one play the two methods of development which that playwright frequently employs in place of an Aristotelian pattern of climax and reversal. Young Forrest has a change of fortune in IV.ii when he suddenly becomes a sea captain. But this development does not follow inevitably from anything preceding it. Nor does it in itself lead to the comic resolution. The central part of the play does not build steadily to one moment of crisis but rather meanders on a fairly level course.

The comic catastrophe of *Fortune by Land and Sea* is also very typical of the dramatist. One particularly interesting feature is the way in which the final scene of betrothal and judgement constitutes a "codas" after the conclusion of the individual stories. The various narrative components are ended successively in IV.v (Young
Forrest's capture of Clinton and Purser), IV. vi (the death of Old Harding), and V. i (the execution of the two pirates). The final scene (V. ii) adds very little to the sequential development of the plot. (Young Forrest's pardon is confirmed and Anne learns that her brother is safe). Nor does it serve any necessary function in relating the two major stories which have been tightly interconnected throughout. Its principal purpose seems to be to convey a sense of ending which, as so often with Heywood, means a heavily emphasized restoration of the moral order. It is significant, therefore, that the romantic attachment between Young Forrest and Anne is little more than a concession to popular convention while the real import of the scene is contained in the last moral pageant.

We have noted Heywood's predilection for "double" endings in which temporal and religious considerations are combined. These are frequently embodied in a final judgement scene which places the story's love interest in a larger context. The emphasis in Royal King, for example, is not on love (either between the King and Isabella, or the Marshall and the Princess) but on duty. In Woman Killed, love is reawakened at the end but in the larger context of death and salvation. Similarly, the lovers in Chuse and Wise Woman are not the innocents of a romantic comedy. In both cases the conclusion is less an occasion of festivity than one of chastisement.

A comparably earnest tone is evident at the end of Fortune. Young Forrest visits Anne out of "necessary duty" (VI, 431) and
when he learns of her husband's death proposes to her from a convoluted sense of obligation. "On whom better," he says,

Or justlier can I confer my self,
    Then to be hers by whom I have my being,
And live to her that freely gave me life?
There is a providence that prompts too't
And I will give it motion.
(VI, 432 - 433)

Anne is hardly more ardent:

Sir, I should much mistake my own fair ends,
Should I alone withstand so many friends' [advice].
(VI, 433)

Anne's recent bereavement, of course, explains her circumspect behaviour. But it is apparent that the playwright is not at all interested in celebrating those instincts which are the traditional subject of comedy. This is confirmed by the second half of the concluding scene. This short episode, which is little more than the "mask" the Clown calls it (VI, 433), constitutes a warning against those who "distrust heaven and put their faith in riches" (VI, 434). It is dramatically naive, and has only a tenuous relationship to the foregoing narrative. Particularly interesting is the introduction of Goodwin and Foster who throughout the play have served as all-purpose ciphers rather than characters. In the early part of the drama the two men are companions to Rainsforth who pursue Young Forrest after the fatal duel. Next they appear as the "false friends" unwilling to lend Philip the money he needs to stock a farm. Finally, they turn up in the last scene where they recount their well-merited ill-fortune. Here they function as a dumb-show to teach the audience
by example.

What is significant, I think, is the tone of this concluding scene. Superficially it is the "double catastrophe" (success for the good, failure for the evil) which Aristotle deplores but which, in a modified form, is a standard comic ending. But the balance

9 A good example of such an ending is the final scene of Every Man in his Humor where there is a rigid separation of the characters at the end of the play according to the moral standards implied in the work.

between delight and dole in Fortune by Land and Sea is very different from that in a more conventional romantic comedy such as Much Ado. In the former, the focus is more directly on the sinners than on the lovers and the atmosphere of the concluding festivities is more appropriate to Vesta than to Hymen. The effect of wholesome exaltation is so characteristic of Heywood that it is difficult to imagine the scene coming from any other hand.

The static form of the play, therefore, reveals certain characteristics that are typical of Heywood together with others that are not. The same inconsistency is evident in the treatment of causality. Throughout much of the piece, the predominant force at work is Providence acting through conscience. Young Forrest is assailed almost at once upon killing Rainsforth, by an overwhelming sense of guilt:
Had I but known the terror of this deed,
I would have left it done imperfectly,
Rather than in this guilt of conscience,
Laboured so far.

(VI, 386)

His actions thereafter are directed towards escaping from the temporal Law which is shown to be susceptible to the corrupting influence of Rainsforth's powerful friends. But his final triumph is more than an outwitting of the secular judiciary. His father reminds the audience of the Providential powers at work in the world. "Oh heavens," he says,

Now that you after all these miseries
Have still reserv'd my son safe and unscom'n'd.

(VI, 431)

The agency of heaven is shown to be equally active in the fortune of Philip Harding. After the death of Old Harding Anne concludes,

Heaven being just could not deal longer roughly
With one so virtuous and compleatly honest.

(VI, 426)

The fates of the unfortunate William, John, Goodwin, and Foster at the end of the play are presented even more explicitly as evidence of Divine Providence.

In these heavens justice
In these a most remarkable president
To teach within our height to know our selves;

You that distrusted Heaven's providence ...
no more deride.

(VI, 435)

The confident assertion of Christian justice in the Forrest and
Harding stories, is in striking contrast to the presentation of causality in the Purser and Clinton narrative. Here the power at work in the universe is a seemingly impersonal Fortune. The ocean is shown as an area in which the ordinary laws of conscience and Providence do not operate. Purser explains,

We left our consciences upon the land
When we began to rob upon the sea.

(VI, 411)

In that world, the individual's fate seems to be beyond his control and unrelated to his desert. As Clinton says,

For he that's born to be a beggar know
How e'r he toyles and trafficks must dye so.

(VI, 411)

Even Young Forrest is more concerned in his piratical pursuits with "justice, [his] countries honour and the reputation Of [his] name" (VI, 414) than with any higher moral duties. He blames his exile on an inscrutable destiny.

But I that have been born to misery
Can never be so happy; oh my fate
When shall I pass away this tedious night,
Or when my stars will you burn out more bright.

(VI, 415)

After the battle in which Young Forrest overcomes the pirates, the hero pays lip service to heaven but Purser and Clinton seem more convincing when they attribute their downfall to Fortune.

Pur[ser]. We now are captives that made others thrall
Thus ebbs may flow and highest tydes may fall.

Clin[ton]. The latest day must come to have his date;
Stars govern all, and none can change his fate.

(VI, 418)
Forrest at the end of the scene seems to be persuaded to Clinton's view of things as he applauds "that fortune he defies" (VI, 420).

Even more revealing of the author's view of causality is the way in which the pirates meet their deaths. For instead of taking from their experience the kind of edifying moral lesson frequently on the lips of Heywood's characters, Purser and Clinton remain blind to the ethical implications of their acts.

Fortune I spit defiance in thy face:  
Thy best we have tasted, and thy worst we know,  
We can but pay what we to nature owe.  
(VI, 418)

What redeems their lives at the end is not any religious insight but sheer physical courage.

let us burn out bravely, not behind us  
Leave a black noysom snuf of cowardice.  
(VI, 427)

I have quoted at length to show what I think are fundamental differences in the treatment of narrative in different parts of the play. On the one hand, the general structure of the plot, the relationship of the various narrative elements, and the moral catastrophe are very typical of Heywood. But the intensity of the protasis, and the emphasis on Fortune seem less characteristic of the playwright we have been studying.

Similar differences of style can be observed in the treatment of the dramatis personae. Several of the techniques which we saw to be characteristic of Heywood's work are vividly illustrated in Fortune by Land and Sea. For example, certain scenes reveal that
emphasis on appearance which we noticed in such plays as Edward IV and Woman Killed. The altered status of Philip and Susan in II.1 is indicated visually by their change of costume. Philip offers to become a servant in his father's house and to wear his "Livery" (VI, 381). His father promises to "suit them as their fortunes are" and dresses them in "russets and sheepskins" taken from the "clown's wardrobe" (VI, 382 - 384). The visual impact of this change of attire is underlined by the Clown. Expecting to find "the Bride in her tiffety taffeties most sumptious, and the Bridegroom as wel in brancht Sattin" (VI, 383), he does a comic "double take" when he meets Philip and Susan in rags. There follow some fifty lines of recapitulation in which the transformation is further commented on and explained. At the end of the play, when the fortunes of the two young people are reversed, so too are their appearances and they enter in IV.vi "wel habited" (VI, 424).

A similar emphasis on appearance as an indication of situation (and a reflection of character) occurs in the final scene of the play. There John, William, Goodwin and Foster enter in costumes appropriate to the state to which their profligacy and crime have brought them. The apparel is not described, but the extent of the physical transformation is indicated by Philip's incredulity when he asks, "Are these my brothers?" (VI, 434). The appearance of the four personae is of paramount importance in this incident in which they serve merely as characters in a "mask" or "muming" and are
referred to by Philip as "the object Offered before our eyes:" (VI, 435).

The exploitation of purely visual effects in some scenes of the play is curiously at odds with the apparent neglect of such effects in others. A particularly good example of the contrasting treatment of gesture is provided by the handling of the two duels involving Rainsforth. The first of these encounters in I.ii is filled with physical action implied by the lines. For example, Rainsforth obviously gives the drawer some kind of a blow during the following exchange:

Rayns[forth]. ... what's this?
Draw[er]. Good Sherry Sack Sir.
Rayns. I meant Canary Sir, what hast no brains?
Draw. Pox a your brains, are your fingers so light.

(VI, 366)

When Frank Forrest enters, he presumably shakes hands with his friends:

Wherefore hath nature lent me two hands but to use them both at once (my cloak) I am for you here and here.

(VI, 366)

Later, to provoke Forrest, Rainsforth "Flings wine in's face" (VI, 368) and then fatally wounds him in a pause between two of Frank's exclamations:

I was not born to brook this, oh I am slain.

(VI, 368)

What is noteworthy about this scene is the amount of movement demanded and the comparative neglect of the means of describing that
movement. The single stage direction follows a particularly ambiguous line ("I boy, then take you that") which might easily be misinterpreted. Other lines, clearly demanding action of some kind, are not accompanied by similar stage directions. Consequently it is sometimes difficult to visualize the precise movement envisaged. This is especially true of the duel itself. A subsequent reference to the fight suggests that some sort of cowardly action was involved. At least this is the implication of Young Forrest's charge in I.iv where he says,

I'll kill thee be it ... as thou tookest my brother With thy back towards me basely:

(VI, 377)

If Frank Forrest was indeed killed while he had his back turned to his opponent, there is nothing else in the text to suggest it.10

10 Such vagueness, although not typical of Heywood, is of course quite common in Elizabethan plays. A good example is the final scene of Hamlet where no indication is given by means of stage directions as to how the duel between Laertes and Hamlet is to be staged.

In the light of the imprecision of I.ii it is somewhat surprising to find very explicit instructions about how the duel is to be staged in II.ii. A series of stage directions describes the encounter in detail:
Fight and pause. Fight, Forrest looseth his weapon. He guards himself, and puts by with his hat, slips, the other running falls over him, and Forrest kils him.
(VI, 386)

These directions are interesting in their own right as an example of an author giving precise instructions to the actor. But they

11 The possibility that the stage directions were inserted by the stage manager or even the editor cannot, of course, be altogether discounted.

also demonstrate an interest in physical movement which we noted as one of the characteristics of Heywood's dramaturgy. For the manner in which Forrest kills Rainsforth affects the attitude of the audience to the two combatants. Forrest's guilt in shedding blood is reduced since he is so obviously at a disadvantage. The technique of making this point through action rather than dialogue is typical of a dramatist who is mindful of the importance of gesture.

Comparable differences between various parts of the play are evident in the treatment of speech conventions, especially direct address. Comments intended to define the action of the play and to explain the larger significance of the events are of two kinds. Perhaps the most common are those quotations of moral "tags" by individuals speaking "in character". Such comments are plentiful in Elizabethan drama and usually imply no more than an interpretation of events from the point of view of one of the dramatis
There are other speeches, however, which seem to have greater authority than the opinion of one character and to represent the view of the dramatist himself. In such cases, a particular persona seems little more than a mouthpiece for the playwright (or alternatively, to speak with an insight unnatural in the dramatic context). At such times the individual character ceases to function as a personality in his own right and becomes little more than a surrogate chorus.

It is difficult in practice to make an absolute distinction between these different forms of direct address. Conventional comments such as "Murderers once being in Wade further till they drown" (VI, 378), "But now the course of fortunes wheele is turned" (VI, 399), or "Stars govern all, and none can change his fate" (VI, 418) sometimes add little or nothing to our knowledge of the personality of the speaker. To that extent they are psychologically neutral and could be assigned to any speaker without seriously altering the scene. At other times, however, even the most conventional sentiment can throw some light on the character who expresses it. While it would be foolhardy, therefore, to stress the difference unduly, it does seem to me that there is far greater use made of direct choricić comment in the scenes relating the stories of
Philip Harding and Young Forrest than in the rest of the play.

In those scenes, the figure who emerges most obviously as a thinly disguised "presenter" is Anne. Sometimes her comments explain her own actions as in II.iii where she justifies her concealing of Forrest:

If this should be some bloody murderer,
Great were my guilt to shroud him from the Law;
But if a gentleman by fortune crost; st,
'Tis pitty one so vallient and so young
Should be given up into his enemies hands,
Whilst greatness may perhaps weigh down his cause
And ballance him to death, who thus escaping
May when he hath, by means obtain his peace,
Redeem his desperate fortunes, and make good
Th' forétit made unto th' offended Law
Prove as Heaven shall direct, Ile do my best,
'Tis charity to succor the distrest.

(VI, 391)

At other times her comments are more general, relating to the plot as a whole. For example, in III.i she draws attention to the close thematic relationship between the two main stories.

Shal I compare his [Philip's] present misery
With the misfortunes of this Gentleman [Young Forrest]?

(VI, 394)

Or in IV.vi she points out the reason for Old Harding's death.

Heaven being just could not deal longer roughly
With one so virtuous and compleatly honest.

(VI, 426)

At the end of the play this choral function is taken over by Philip Harding who underlines yet again the moral significance of the dramatic action.

Phil[ip]. In these heavens justice,
In these a most remarkable president
To teach within our height to know our selves;

(VI, 435)
This tendency to define the meaning of the action by allowing the characters to address the audience directly is a very striking characteristic of certain scenes of the play and noticeably at odds with the dramatic technique employed elsewhere.

The use of spectacle in Fortune by Land and Sea is relatively restrained by comparison with many of Heywood's plays. We have noted above the scarcity of the kind of detailed stage directions which are common in many of his works. In this respect, Fortune seems not particularly characteristic of the playwright's oeuvre. In I.ii, for example, it is quite likely that chairs and tables were brought on to the stage to establish an environment but there is no mention of them in the rubrics nor any unequivocal indication of their presence in the text. Those directions which do mention properties are comparatively general. The same reticence is noticeable in the

12 Enter Mrs. Anne with Bread and a Bottle (VI, 393); Enter Susan with something in her Apron (394); Enter the Merchant reading a Letter (401); Purser and Clinton with their Mariners, all furnisht with Sea devices fitting for a fight (416); Enter ... Philip and Susan setting forth a Table (420).

use of the stage equipment. An upper level is necessary to represent the loft in which Young Forrest hides in II.iii and from which he "leaps down" (VI, 395) in III.i. An upper level is also called for in IV.ii. There a boy "Climb[s] to the main top" (VI, 414) and later
speaks from "above". Several off stage effects are required\(^{13}\) but

\[^{13}\text{A cry within (VI, 389); A peece goes off (416); A great Alarum and Flourish (418).}\]

there are no elaborate staging demands such as those in the Ages. Indeed, it is in the employment of the physical resources of the stage that this play is perhaps least characteristic of Heywood's later style.

In my study of the dramaturgy of Fortune by Land and Sea I have noted several apparent differences in technique. Among those characteristics of the play which are typical of Heywood I listed the handling of the epitasis and catastrophe, the emphasis on Providence as a causal agent, the dramatic use of appearance and gesture, and the employment of direct address for "choral" effect. Characteristics which seem to me less typical of the playwright are the vigorous and highly rhetorical protasis and the emphasis on Fortune in the Purser and Clinton story.

What light, if any, do the stylistic peculiarities I have described throw on the question of authorship? To begin with, the discrepancies convince me that Fortune by Land and Sea does, indeed, contain the work of two dramatists with slightly, but obviously, different dramatic techniques. Furthermore, the fairly extensive portions of the play which reveal technical features uncharacteristic
of Heywood indicate that the collaborator contributed more than an occasional scene. If the evidence points to a more or less equal sharing, how was the task of writing the play divided? Here the stylistic evidence is supplemented by clues drawn from other peculiarities of the piece.

One such peculiarity is the amount of redundant exposition included in the first scene of the second act. In that scene, William carefully establishes the identities of himself, Anne, and his brother Jack, in spite of the fact that they had all already appeared in I.iii. It is true that the names of the two younger brothers had not been given earlier. Nevertheless, this scene has many of the earmarks of an introductory episode which suggests to me that it is the work of a different author from the one who wrote the first act. Improbable as such a theory may seem, it is strongly supported by other features of the two acts. We have noted above the different handling of the fight scenes in I.ii and II.ii. Another difference is the characterization of the Clown. In I.ii, the comic figure is a timeserver who has not aligned himself with Philip Harding:

Now which of these parties shall I cleave to and follow: well now I remember my self Ile shew my self a true Citizen and stick to the stronger side.

(VI, 375)

The line is uncharacteristic both of the Clown's later behaviour and of Heywood's usually generous attitude towards citizens. In II.ii
the question of loyalty is never raised since the Clown's sympathies are immediately engaged by Philip's plight:

Well since 'tis so, no more young Master, but fellow servant; no more Master Philip but Phil; here's my hand I'll do two men's labours in one to save you a labour.

(VI, 384)

The combined evidence convinces me that the first and second acts of *Fortune* are from different pens.

Clumsy as the method may seem to us today, there is ample evidence that Elizabethan dramatists frequently shared the writing of a play by acts rather than by story content. If the discrepancies between the first and second acts of *Fortune* by Land and Sea point to such a division of the work between Heywood and his collaborator, then we might expect to find a similar line of demarcation between subsequent acts. Such a line does indeed occur at the end of Act Three. Once again, the evidence of discontinuity provided by a study of dramaturgy is supplemented by peculiarities in the text. As we have seen above, the handling of the Purser-Clinton scenes in Act Four shows many characteristics that differ from the treatment of the epitasis of the Harding and Forrest stories in Acts Two and Three.

---

It is undoubtedly these differences which led A. M. Clark to his "a priori" judgement that the pirate scenes were by Rowley.\textsuperscript{15}

Later, when that critic became convinced that Heywood had written the Pursuivant episode in III. iv he took this as proof that the playwright must also have been the author of the rest of the Purser-Clinton story in Acts Four and Five.\textsuperscript{16} It seems to me, however,

\textsuperscript{15} Thomas Heywood, p. 182.

\textsuperscript{16} See note 4 above.

that Clark's original instinct was right. Some corroboration for the view that Act Four and Five are by different hands is provided by the rhetorical characteristics of the short Pursuivant incident. The moment involves a piece of traditional clowning in which the comic repeats the lines of a proclamation giving each a humourous misreading in the process. One interesting feature of the episode is that it follows what appears to be a natural ending to the action:

\begin{verbatim}
Goodw[in]. Heaven may do much, that's all the beggers saying.
Let me hourd wealth, you seek for wealth by praying. Exit.
Phil[ip]. The time may come ere long, so I divine
To punish those that at their power repine.
\end{verbatim}

(VI, 409)
Furthermore the incident itself ends rather weakly. All of these features suggest to me that the Pursuivant scene was not part of the original draft of the play.

If this incident is, in fact, a later interpolation, why was it added and what made it necessary? My own belief is that it was introduced to give the audience information it needed to understand the pirate story. In Act Four there is only the briefest reference to the reward offered for the capture of Purser and Clinton:

Young Forrest. Besides a thousand pounds reward proposed To that adventurer can bring them in, My peace and pardon though a man condemned, Is by the proclamation ratified.

(VI, 414)

After his victory, Young Forrest alludes only to "Having my pardon purchast" (VI, 420) without further elaboration. As in I.iii (the scene in which the names of William and John Harding are not mentioned although they are on stage), we seem here to have work by a dramatist who is relatively unconcerned about the technicalities of exposition and foreshadowing. I think it not unlikely that the Pursuivant episode is a later attempt to patch up a join between the work of the two dramatists collaborating on this play.

If the first four acts of Fortune were shared more or less
equally between the two collaborators, who took responsibility for the final section of the play? It is in the catastrophe that the differences in dramatic technique are perhaps most pronounced and most suggestive. The scenes dealing with the pirates' defeat and death (IV. vi and V. i) put a heavy emphasis on the effect of Fortune and make relatively little use of choral comment in the form of direct address. On the other hand, the scenes dealing with the catastrophes of the Harding and Forrest stories show the working of Providence through a very extensive use of direct comment to the audience. These differences suggest to me that the last part of the play was divided according to content rather than by the rather arbitrary method of sharing out acts. The very decidedly Heywoodian characteristics of the final scene would indicate that the Harding-Forrest catastrophes were that playwright's work. The alternating scenes showing the defeat and execution of the pirates were, I believe, written by his collaborator.

The foregoing study of *Fortune by Land and Sea* would indicate that the play is indeed a collaboration and that about one half of it is the work of a dramatist other than Heywood. In view of the evidence of the Stationers' Register and the title page there seems no reason to doubt that that dramatist was William Rowley. The work was divided in two ways. The first half of the play was shared according to the division of the acts. Rowley wrote Act One; Heywood contributed Two and Three. The second half was constructed
differently. Rowley completed the story of the pirates (IV.v and V.i) and Heywood wrote the conclusion to the Harding and Forrest narratives (IV.vi and V.ii). Heywood was almost certainly responsible for the final shape of the drama and probably inserted the Clown-Pursuivant episode after the rest of the play had been written in order to provide a smoother transition between Acts Three and Four.
VIII

CONCLUSION

This study of Thomas Heywood has attempted to coordinate historical, bibliographical, and textual evidence in an effort to define the characteristics of the playwright's dramaturgy. In my reconstruction of Heywood's theatrical career I have emphasized the very practical form of his training and the preeminently pragmatic and collaborative nature of dramatic writing in the companies with which he was connected. I have used the manuscript of Sir Thomas Moore as a model of the way in which a play in the popular theatre of the sixteenth century would be modified by a variety of hands with different interests. I have suggested that Heywood may have had a relatively minor role in the Admiral's company and that his reputation as reported by Meres may have been earned by a smaller output than some commentators have imagined. The significance of all this for an assessment of Heywood's dramaturgy is that it suggests that the playwright was probably more concerned with the way his plays would work in a theatre than how they would appear in print.

My review of bibliographical evidence and critical opinion relating to the chronology of the plays has been inconclusive. Not even the supplementary data concerning the staging requirements of the plays has made possible a wholly satisfactory dating of the
works. Largely on the basis of striking similarities between the
dramas about Elizabethan subjects, I have tended to date some of
the plays (If You Know Not Me, and 1 Fair Maid) earlier than is
customary. But I realize that my arguments are often subjective.
It seems impossible in the present state of our knowledge about the
plays to say whether the pronounced differences in The Rape of
Lucrece and the Ages reflect a sudden change of style in the middle
of Heywood's career or simply point to the vestigial remains of
juvenile crudities.

Finally my study of the texts of Heywood's plays has revealed
certain stylistic features which the playwright exhibits to a par-
ticularly marked degree. One of the most striking of these is the
essentially visual quality of much of his dramaturgy. Whether he
is creating spectacular stage effects, revealing character by means
of dress or gesture, or simply setting the scene by the use of prop-
erties, Heywood constantly strives for effects which are essentially
theatrical. His substitution of what Cocteau calls "poetry of the
theatre" for poetry in the theatre may reflect an attempt to compen-
sate for his limited rhetorical powers. But it may equally well
indicate the hand of a professional craftsman who knew the resources
of his medium and was determined to exploit them all.

When it comes to defining the principles Heywood followed, the
critic is limited by his inadequate vocabulary. I have noted several
characteristics such as subdued conflict, an emphasis on the visual,
thinly disguised character stereotypes, and a heavily didactic tone which are typical of Heywood's plays. If these can be said to reflect any single governing idea, I would say that that idea is Heywood's concept of moral catharsis.

A continuing preoccupation of this dramatist is the immense power of mimesis, or what he often calls "lively and well-spirited action." It is Heywood's conviction that the physical representation of action works on a spectator in a particularly powerful and even mysterious fashion. Live drama has the capacity to "bewitch" an audience, bypassing reason and confounding duplicity. It attacks the consciences of the guilty thereby bringing to light crimes that the perpetrators had tried to keep secret, or shaming the foolish into rectitude. Simultaneously it exhorts the virtuous, inspiring them to still greater efforts. Drama, therefore, is an instrument of

1 An Apology for Actors gives the most explicit account of Heywood's theory of catharsis. One quotation will perhaps be sufficient to illustrate his argument: "We present Alexander, killing his friend in his rage, to reprooue rashnesse: ... with infinite others, by sundry instances, either animating men to noble attempts, or attacking the consciences of the spectators, finding themselves toucht in presenting the vices of others."(F3v)

great potential influence and it is incumbent upon the playwright to exert that influence for good. The dramatist is a moral teacher who communicates through action. As Heywood recounts in An Apology for
Actors:

These wise men of Greece ... could by their industry, finde out no neerer or directer course to plant humanity and manners in the hearts of the multitude then to instruct them by moralized mysteries, what vices to avoyd, what vertues to embrace ...
These Magi ... thought ... that Action was the neerest way to plant understanding in the hearts of the ignorant.

(Apology, C3)

It is hardly an exaggeration, I think, to view all of Heywood's experiments with dramatic form as efforts to create comparable "moralized mysteries" for his Christian contemporaries. His works are less like plays in the Aristotelian sense than like moral pageants. They are intended to affect the spectator as the arrest of Jane Shore did her husband in 2 Edward IV. In that play Mathew probably voices Heywood's own belief in the power of drama when he says:

Were I as young.
As when I came to London to be prentice
This pageant were sufficient to instruct
And teach me ever after to be wise.

(2 Edward IV, I, 162)
APPENDICES

1. A Conjectural Chronology

In the following pages I have tried to consolidate the present speculation concerning the composition and performance of Heywood's plays during his association with the Admiral's, Derby's, and Worcester's-Queen Anne's companies. Where characteristics of the dramaturgy have seemed to cast light on the question of date I have noted the fact. While this has helped me to arrive at a number of conclusions which differ from those held by prominent commentators, I cannot pretend that the results are as conclusive as I could wish.

In the present state of our knowledge, and bearing in mind the pragmatic methods of revision and production which were employed in the theatres, we can scarcely hope for certainty in the matter of chronology.

Jerusalem (1592)

Henslowe records that a play called Jerusalem was performed by Strange's men (probably at the Rose) on March 22 and April 25, 1592 (sig. 7-7v). Grivelet (Thomas Heywood, p. 357) thinks this play may have been an early version of The Four Prentices of London. Greg (Henslowe's Diary, II, 155, 166) suggests a connection but thinks that Jerusalem is too early to be Heywood's play. It may be this work which was entered in the Stationers' Register on June 19, 1594, as an "enterlude entitled Godfrey of Bulloigne with the Conquest of Jerusalem."
In the absence of any concrete evidence, I would be reluctant to connect Jerusalem with Heywood.

**Second Part of Godfrey of Bulloigne (1594)**

On July 19, 1594, Henslowe recorded the first performance of a new play entitled *2 pte of godfrey of bullen* (sig. 9v). The play was reasonably successful and was kept in the repertory for more than a year until Sept. 16, 1595, during which period it was performed a dozen times. The relationship between this play, Jerusalem, and the "enterlude" mentioned in the Stationers' Register on June 19, 1594, is obscure. Greg (*Henslowe's Diary*, II, 166) suggests that the designation "2 pte" may simply be Henslowe's method of distinguishing it from Jerusalem, an earlier play on a similar subject, and may not indicate that it is a sequel. Fleay (*Drama*, I, 282), Ward (*C.H.E.L.*, VI, 89) and Cromwell (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 7) identify *2 godfrey of bullen* with Heywood's *Four Prentices of London*. Since there seems to be no objective evidence upon which to base an hypothesis, it is best to regard the attribution of this play to Heywood as unproved.

**The Siege of London (1594)**

The sege of london appears to have been an old play when it was revived by the Admiral's men on Dec. 26, 1594 (sig. 11). During the following year and a half until July 6, 1596, it was presented twelve times and it may still have been in the repertory in March, 1598, when a "whell and frame in the Sege of London" were listed among the Admiral's properties (*Henslowe's Diary* (1961), p. 320). Fleay
(Drama, I, 288), Greg (Henslowe's Diary, II, 173), Ward (C.H.E.L., VI, 90), Cromwell (Thomas Heywood, p. 155), Grivelet (Thomas Heywood, p. 43) and Ribner (The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957), p. 274) all suggest a relationship between this play and the Falconbridge scenes in 1 Edward IV.

Seleo and Olimpo (1595)

A new play called seleo & olempo was recorded by Henslowe on March 5, 1595 (sig. 11v). The play was presented by the Admiral's men on several occasions until Feb. 18 the following year. The precise number of performances given is difficult to ascertain because of the irregularity of the spelling (selyo & olympo, seleo & olempa, olimpo, olimpio, olempeo & heugenyo) but presumably ten entries refer to the same production. Fleay (Drama, I, 283) suggests that this play may be an early version of The Golden Age. His theory seems to rest entirely on a conviction that the Ages were written in the 90's and that the "sewette for Nepton" listed in the inventory of playing apparel (Henslowe's Diary (1961) p. 317) belongs to the present play. There seems to be no possible way of deciding the matter either way.

I and II Hercules (1595)

A two-part play depicting the adventures of Hercules was opened by the Admiral's men on May 7 and May 23, 1595 (sig. 11v and 12v). The parts were performed eleven and eight times respectively during the next eight months, and then allowed to drop from the repertory. Martin Slater seems somehow to have acquired possession of the prompt-books,
and to have taken them with him when he left the Admiral's company in July, 1597. This, at least, seems the readiest explanation of the payment of seven pounds on May 16, 1598, "to bye v boockes of martine slather" including "ij ptes of herculos" (sig. 45v). The company apparently decided the classical play was still commercially viable for in. July, 1598, Thomas Downton authorized the purchase of "A robe to playe herOalas" (sig. 47v) presumably in a revival of the play just reacquired from Slater. Still another revival of the old piece seems to have been presented by the company shortly after their move to the new Fortune Theatre. In December, 1601, the "littell tayller" was authorized to spend twenty-five shillings "to bye divers things for the playe of hercolas" (sig. 95). The enduring popularity of the work is also attested to by the large number of properties in the Admiral's stock which can with reasonable certainty be linked with this play. "Hercolles lymes" certainly, and the "gowlden flece, the lyons skin, Ierosses head, Serberosse, Cadeseus, Mercures wings, and Junoes cotte" probably, were required for the various adventures of the eponymous hero (Henslowe's Diary (1961), pp. 318-21).

Fleay's suggestion (Drama, I, 284) that these plays underlie Heywood's Silver and Brazen Ages has been somewhat more favourably received than many of his identifications. Greg (Henslowe, II, 175), Ward (C.H.E.L., VI, 92-3), and Cromwell (Thomas Heywood, p. 14), all accept that Heywood was probably involved in some way with the early Hercules plays between 1595 and 1597. Allan Holaday ("Heywood's 'Troia Britannica' and 'The Ages'", J.E.G.P., XLV (1946), pp. 430-39)
argues on the basis of a comparison of the plays with *Troia Britanica* and the similarity of properties required by *The Silver* and *Brazen Ages* and those listed in the Admiral's inventory, that the Hercules plays are early versions of Heywood's work. The relatively naive structure of the *Ages* may also be evidence of their early origin. The fact that it would be simpler to revise juvenile verse than to recast the structure of the drama completely might account for the discrepancy which some commentators have detected between the naive dramaturgy and the more sophisticated poetry (Cf. Clark, *Thomas Heywood*, p. 222).

*Troy* (1596)

*Troye* is recorded as a new play by Henslowe on June 22, 1596 (sig. 21v). The work was performed only four times until July 16 of that year before it disappears from the Diary. That the play was not as unsuccessful as this rather miserable performance record would indicate is suggested by the presence of the "great horse with his leages" in the Admiral's property list of March 10, 1598 (*Diary* (1961), p. 320). The probability that this latter is for some version of the Trojan War is very high. Speculation about the relationship of this play to Heywood's work is, if anything, even more complicated than that concerning the Hercules dramas. Fleay (*Drama*, I, 285), argues that an early play underlies *I* and *II Iron Age* but thinks that the original work was performed by the Admiral's and Pembroke's men when they were acting together at the Rose in October, 1597. Greg (*Diary*, II, 180) disagrees with the identification of the companies, and thinks that *Troye* may be an early work by Heywood which the playwright later
J. S. P. Tatlock ("The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, especially in Shakespeare and in Thomas Heywood", P.M.L.A., XXX (1915), 708-18) believes that Troye is Thomas Heywood's earliest work, written between 1594-96, and antedating the other Ages.

Once again, internal evidence is contradictory and will be considered more carefully later on. Here, perhaps, it is appropriate to say that several structural characteristics of The Iron Age would seem to indicate an early date of composition. As Joseph Quincy Adams points out (Oenone and Paris, p. xxxvii), the first act of I Iron Age uses much of two early translations of Ovid's epistles (Paris to Oenone, and Oenone to Paris) from the Heroides. This might conceivably link the play in time to Oenone and Paris (1594) written by T.H. whom Adams identifies fairly confidently as Heywood. The play may also be related in some way to Heywood's youthful translations of Ovid's De Arte Amandi and Remedie Amoris made in the mid-nineties. (See the epistle "To the Reader" prefacing The Brazen Age, III, 167). The naive, episodic form of the narrative would also suggest early work which was, however, almost certainly revised later on.

**Heywood's Book (1596)**

Sometime late in 1596, probably after December 13, Henslowe made one of his periodic reckonings of the company's indebtedness to him. Among several items included in "A note of Suche money" as he had loaned to Edward Alleyn, Martin Slater, James Donstall and Edward Juby since October 14, 1596, was one entry of thirty shillings for "hawodes bocke" (sig. 23). The sum is unusual and may indicate one of
several things. If the book was a new play (for which Heywood would presumably be paid four or five pounds), then the record of an earlier instalment may be lost, or the entry for fifty shillings four lines lower "to by a booke" may also refer to Heywood's work. There is a possibility, however, that the thirty shillings represents the total paid to Heywood in which case the "bocke" may perhaps be a revision (possibly of Jerusalem, Godfrey, or The Siege of London.) If this were the case, we would expect to find one of these plays, or a title suggestive of one of them, listed in the following pages and we do not. Efforts to identify the "bocke" as one of the new plays produced in December have been half-hearted and both stewley (sig. 25v) and that wilbe shalbe (Ibid.) have been suggested as possibilities.¹ Here

¹ A. M. Clark, Thomas Heywood, p. 10.

again, however, the evidence is insufficient to warrant much speculation.

Five Plays in One (1597)

A new piece entitled v playes in one was produced by the Admiral's men on April 7, 1597 (sig. 27). Fleay (Drama, I, 286) identifies this play with Heywood's Deorom Judicium, Jupiter and Io, Apollo and Daphne, Amphrisa and possibly Timon published in Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas (1637). Both Greg (Diary, II, 183) and Cromwell (Thomas Heywood, p. 15) find the theory attractive. It seems to me, however, that conjecture is here pushed beyond useful bounds.
Sir Thomas Moore (1598)

Unquestionably one of the most interesting stage documents to survive from the Elizabethan period is the Harleian manuscript now in the British Museum bearing the title The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. The play is bound in a vellum wrapper, part of which was used to cover a similar manuscript copy of John a Kent and John a Cumber, and is largely in the hand of the playwright Anthony Munday. Munday was probably the author of the original play, but he was assisted by a number of other dramatists who functioned either as collaborators or revisers or both. Although the question is still being debated, there is a strong possibility that Thomas Heywood participated in the revision of the play towards the end of the last decade of the sixteenth century.

The history of the discussion touching Heywood's involvement in the play is succinctly summarized by Karl P. Wentersdorff in a recent article.

The identification of Hand B with Heywood was proposed by S. A. Tannenbaum, The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore (New York, 1927), pp. 56-68; questioned by Greg, who (in a review of Tannenbaum's book, 4 Library, IX [1928], 209-10), does not deny the possibility but remains unconvinced; dismissed by Nosworthy ["Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More," R.E.S., n.s. 6 (1955)] p. 13, footnote 1, as "quite unfounded" but accepted by other critics. A. M. Clark (Thomas Heywood, Oxford, 1931), p. 9 writes: "One of his very first jobs appears to have been a share in the revision of Munday's Sir Thomas Moore, probably for Shakespeare's company. The evidence is entirely palaeographical; but so striking is the resemblance between the crabbed hand B of the manuscript and Heywood's undoubted autograph dramas that, since Dr. Greg pointed this out without, however, committing himself, palaeographers have more or less cautiously accepted the proposition." Clark draws attention in


Not much need be added to Wentersdorff's summary. It should be pointed out, perhaps, that by 1931, Greg (Malone Society Collections, II, 3, 233) had definitely rejected the identification of Hand B with Heywood. In Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses (Oxford, 1931), p. 244, he writes, "B in some way resembles Thomas Heywood's [handwriting] but cannot be identified as his." A year after having "dismissed" Heywood's claim, J. M. Nosworthy ("Hand B in 'Sir Thomas More'", Library, 5th series, 11 (1956), 47-50) concluded that "nothing very positive seems to emerge. If B is not Heywood's hand, neither is it that of any other Elizabethan dramatist whose handwriting is known to us." Irving Ribner (The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, 1957), p. 210) says that of all the hands in the play, "the case for Heywood's is the most difficult to establish." The modern critical consensus is fairly accurately reflected in one of the most recent studies of the play by Scott McMillin ("'The Book of Sir Thomas More': A Theatrical View", Modern Philology, 68 (Aug.,
1970) p. 11 note 5) who says that he "prefers to leave [Hand B] anonymous."

The date of the play has been the subject of prolonged controversy. Palaeographic evidence, on the whole, seems to point to around 1593. I. A. Shapiro ("The Significance of a Date", Shakespeare Survey, 8 (Cambridge, 1955), 100-105) shows that John a Kent was almost certainly written before 1590, and argues that Munday's handwriting in The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore is only a little later.³ An early dating is also supported by a number of other considerations as well. If Hand D is indeed Shakespeare's then it seems much more probable that he would have been collaborating with Chettle, Dekker and Heywood towards the beginning of the decade than at the end. The association of Strange's and Admiral's men at the Theatre or Curtain, or the joint tenancy of Newington Butts by the Chamberlaine's and Admiral's would seem to provide the best possible occasions for cooperation between Shakespeare and dramatists later associated with the Admiral's men. Certain critics believe that the subject matter also indicates an early date of composition. Pollard argues convincingly (op. cit., pp. 24-31) that no play on the theme of the May day rising could have

obtained a license after 1595 when the Queen ordered the execution of several apprentices involved in a similar incident.

Stylistic evidence, on the other hand, seems to point to a much later date. G. B. Harrison ("The Date of 'Sir Thomas More'"), R.E.S., I (1925), 337-39) points out that the style of the so-called Shakespearean addition is closer to the mature poetry of the playwright, and on that basis he dates the play about 1600. R. C. Bald, in his review of the evidence in 1949 ("The Booke of Sir Thomas More and its Problems", Shakespeare Survey, 2 (1949), 53-54), concludes that the play was written about 1600 for Chamberlain's men when the Admiral's dramatists were not able to sell to Henslowe owing to the delayed opening of the Fortune theatre late in that year.

The case is complicated by the fact that virtually all the external evidence is inconclusive. Thomas Goodal, the actor whose name appears in the manuscript, was acting with Admiral's or Strange's about 1590, but was still living near St. Botolph's in 1599. The scribe who wrote the additions identified as Hand C prepared the plot of The Seven Deadly Sins about 1590, and that for 2 Fortune's Tennis about 1602. A theatrical supplier called "father ogell" was paid by

---


---

Thomas Downton in February, 1599, and it may be the same individual who is referred to as a wigmaker in the play.

What seems to me one of the most remarkable features of the play
has rarely been commented on. That is that Anthony Munday, notorious for his activities against the Jesuits, should have been involved in any way with a play on the subject of the life of a Catholic martyr. The play of Sir Thomas Moore is almost unique in its period for its vindication of disobedience of Royal authority. So profound is the criticism of the Queen implied in the play that it suggests to me an external influence of some kind. Could it be that the Earl of Derby was somehow involved in the origin of this work, possibly as one of the first authors? The somewhat aristocratic bias of the original, the potentially explosive subject matter, even the Catholic sympathy seem more appropriate to William Stanley than they do to Anthony Munday. Shakespeare's connection with the play is also more understandable if Derby was part author. Shakespeare may at one time have been a member of Lord Strange's men and have consequently retained some sense of obligation to his former patron's brother. He might also have been more willing to write for the new Lord Derby's company than for the more formidable Admiral's men. Whether or not Derby himself was connected with the play, the work seems to me to fit most comfortably into the context of a growing sense of disaffection for Elizabeth on the part of certain members of the aristocracy which led to the futile Essex rebellion. Consequently I would suggest a date between 1597-1599.

War Without Blows (January, 1599)

We are on firmer ground with the play which Henslowe describes variously as ware wth out blowes & love wth out sewte and ware wth
owt blowes & louve wth owt stryfe ascribed in two entries in the diary dated December 6, and January 26, 1598/9 to "Thomas hawode" (sig. 52v-53). The payment of five pounds indicates a new play but, unfortunately, the work has disappeared. Fleay's attempt (Drama, I, 287) to identify the work with The Thracian Wonder on the basis of the quotations "You shall never again renew your suit" (I, ii) and "Here was a happy war finished without blows" (III, ii) seems to me to demonstrate fairly aptly the dangers inherent in his method.

Joan as Good as My Lady (February, 1599)

Henslowe paid "mr hewode" a total of five pounds for a play entitled Jonne as good as my Ladey (sig. 53v) in two instalments dated February 10, and 12, 1598/9. The play is almost certainly lost.

1 and 2 Edward IV (1599)

On August 28, 1599 there appeared an entry in the Stationers' Register which reads, "Twoo playes beinge the ffirrst and Second parte of EDWARD the IIIIyth and the Tanner of Tamworth With the history of the life and deathe of master SHORE and JANE SHORE his Wyfe as yt was lately acted by the Right honourable and Erle of DERBYE his servantes" (Arber, III, 147). Later that year, the two plays were printed by I[ohn] W[indet] for John Oxenbridge and bound together without dedication, epistle to the reader, prologue, or epilogue, and with no indication of authorship. The combined play must have been highly successful on the stage for it went through six editions (1597, 1600, 1605, 1613, 1619, and 1626) before the closing of the theatres. It
may also have provided either the stimulus or the basis for a play on
the same theme by Chettle and Day which was either commissioned by, or
proposed to Worcester's men in May, 1603.\(^5\)

\(^{5}\)"In the name of god Amen/ Beginninge to playe Agayne by the
kynges licence & Layd owt sence for my lord of worsters men/ as
folowethe 1603 9 of maye/ Lent at the apoyntment of Thomas hewode/
& John ducke unto harey chettle & John/ daye in earnest of A playe
wherein shores/ wiffe is writen the some of ... xxx\(^{3}\)th (sig. 121).
An undated receipt, possibly (although not certainly) in Chettle's
hand, also seems to refer to the same play. It reads, "Receiued of
mr Philip Hinchloes in earnest of the Booke of Shoare,/ now newly to/
be written for the Earle of worcesters players at the Rose" (sig. 100).

The problem of the authorship of this play is particularly
vexed. On the one hand, there is overwhelming support for Heywood's
claim to the work. Kirkman in 1661 first attributed the play to the
dramatist. Greg (Diary, II, 173) calls it "unquestionably Heywood's"
and many critics including the five who have written book-length
studies of the dramatist (Velte, p. 20; Cromwell, p. 14; Clark, p. 15;
Boas, p. 17; and Grivelet, p. 365) agree that Heywood had more than
"a main finger" in the work. And yet, as other critics persistently
point out, "Heywood's claim is anything but strong."\(^6\) E. K. Chambers

\(^{6}\)E. H. C. Oliphant, "Problems of Authorship in Elizabethan

(Elizabethan Stage, IV, 10) lists the play as anonymous and points out
that there is "no external evidence for Heywood's authorship or for
any connection between him and Derby's men." Indeed what external evidence there is would all seem to point away from Heywood. To begin with, the playwright was under contract to Henslowe from March 1598 to March 1600. Furthermore, Heywood's authorization of a payment to Chettle and Day to write a play on the same subject seems, to say the least, a curious action for a dramatist with any proprietary interest in his own work. Even the internal evidence is open to a variety of interpretations. Fleay (Drama, I, 288) points out quite rightly, that much of the play seems to be "far better than [Heywood's] other early work." On the other hand, Heywood's writing of The London Florentine for the Admiral's men when he was a sharer with Worcester's demonstrates that dramatists were rarely tied to one company. Similarly, as I have argued elsewhere, Heywood's authorization of a payment to Chettle and Day, far from proving that the work was not his, may indeed indicate that it was.

The two parts of Edward IV could be performed by a company of thirteen men and four boys with the assistance of three or four tiremen or gatherers as mute supernumeraries. They require an upper stage and a discovery space, quite likely in the form of a free-standing booth, which could be used as the goldsmith's shop in Part One (I, 63) and the "tent" in Part Two (I, 113). In structure the two halves of the drama are similar in that they both employ consecutive and lateral methods of linking the various narrative elements. Where more than one story is interwoven in alternating scenes, however, there is very little evidence of attempts to exploit the effects of such
juxtaposition. The adventures of the Shores and the Tanner of Tamworth, or of Jane and Richard III do not reflect or comment on one another in a significant way. Furthermore, the various narrative strands seem to differ in style as well as in subject. The Falconbridge scenes in Part One, for example, are vivid and racy and seem closely related to similar scenes in Sir Thomas Moore, and Shakespeare's history plays. The dramatization of the degeneration of rebellion into anarchy is especially reminiscent of Shakespeare. In contrast, the Hobs scenes are strikingly unphilosophical. Here the high spirits, subtle characterization, and total lack of moral seriousness seem quite at odds with the Shore scenes of the play. A similar, although less pronounced, difference is observable in the different episodes of Part Two.

It seems to me that the apparently contradictory features of the play can best be explained by a theory of collaboration. Greg pointed out as long ago as 1908 (Diary, II, 173) that the Jane Shore scenes were not originally designed to follow the story of Falconbridge's rebellion or "the Lord Mayor would not introduce himself in an elaborate speech to an audience who already knew all about him" (Edward IV, I, 57). Furthermore, the attempts to link the two stories earlier by giving Shore a role in the defence of London are without historical authority, and are rather mechanically accomplished. The evolution

of the play, I believe, took place something as follows. Sometime in
February or March of 1599 Heywood joined Derby’s men in some capacity,
and immediately began collaborating on Edward IV. The play, no
doubt, was intended to capitalize on the success of Shakespeare’s
Henry IV and V. ⁸ Heywood’s task was to contribute scenes dealing with

⁸ See Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of

the story of Jane Shore which could be fitted together with work by
other dramatists to “bumbast out a play.”⁹ The principal source for the

⁹ It is just possible that the Earl of Derby himself may have
had a hand in Edward IV. George Fanner in a letter dated 30 June,
1599 states that the Earl was then “busy penning comedies for the
common players” (Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, II, 127).

Jane Shore episodes was probably Holished’s Chronicle,¹⁰ but Heywood


took a number of details from the ballad "Jane Shore."¹¹ The play as

¹¹ Percy’s Reliques, ed. H. B. Wheatley (London, 1891), Book 2,
a whole is clearly inspired by the contemporary fashion for chronicle plays. Although it is possible that earlier works such as The Siege of London may have served as a basis for certain parts of Edward IV, Shakespearean echoes in the drama suggest that most of the work was recent.

The Four Prentices of London (1600)

In 1615 there appeared in print The Foure Prentises of London With the Conquest of Ierusalem. As it hath bene diverse times Acted, at the Red Bull, by the Queenes Maiesties Servants. Written by Thomas Heywood. No entry is traceable in the Stationers' Register, and it is possible that the publication was unauthorized. The author includes a signed epistle "To the Honest and High-Spirited Prentises, the Readers" in which he explains that the work had come to the press "in such a forwardnesse ere it came to my knowledge that it was past prevention" (II, 161-62) implying that Heywood might have stopped the printing of the work if he had been able to. He also apologizes for the naivete of the work. The play, he says,

was written many yeares since, in my Infancy of Judgment in this kinde of Poetry, and my first practise. (II, 161)

He goes on to justify its form saying that it accorded with the fashion "fifteene or sixteene yeares agoe", and to suggest that its patriotic and heroic spirit might not be altogether inappropriate to the later date when "the practice of long forgotten Armes" was being revived. In addition to these fairly numerous internal clues to the date of composition, there is also an allusion to the play in The Knight of
the Burning Pestle where the Citizen says "Read the play of "The Four Prentices of London," where they tosse their pikes so" (IV, i).

Working from this evidence, a number of commentators have tried to identify this play as one of Heywood's earliest dramatic productions. Ward (C.H.E.L., VI, 89) calls the play "primitive to the last degree" and Velte (Thomas Heywood, p. 67) agrees that it is "unquestionably [Heywood's] least mature" work. R. B. Sharpe (The Real War of the Theatres (London, 1935), p. 25) cannot believe that the dramatist was serious, and thinks that the play is "almost a better burlesque of itself than Beaumont could do upon it." The conviction that The Four Prentices is apprentice work has led a number of writers, as we have seen above, to identify this play with godfrey of bullen performed at the Rose in 1594. Fleay (Drama, I, 282) argues for this identification on the basis that the revival of the exercise of arms in the Artillery Garden took place in 1610 and that "fifteene or sixteene" years prior to that would be 1594/5. He supports his claim with the argument that an earlier edition of the play (now lost) must have been in existence when The Knight of the Burning Pestle was first performed which he also dates 1610. Although Fleay's arguments have won many supporters, there are difficulties. A dating for The Knight of about 1607 is now more widely accepted (see Clark, Thomas Heywood, p. 25), and this has led a few commentators to identify Prentices with the Jerusalem mentioned in Henslowe as being on the boards in 1592. An early dating of the play would accord with its naive heroics and "high astounding terms" which might well have been
inspired by Marlowe. It would also seem to be what is implied in Heywood's reference to his "infancy of judgment ... and first practise." But there are other characteristics of the play as we have it which are almost certainly of a later date. Several echoes of Shakespeare, notably perhaps the relationship between the Old Soldan and the young Sophy, so reminiscent of King Charles and the Dauphin in Henry V, suggest composition about 1600. Acknowledging these discrepancies, several commentators suggest that the play was revised. Dating the revival of arms about 1614, Clark (Thomas Heywood, pp. 24-25) argues that The Four Prentices as we now have it is a revision carried out in 1602 for Worcester's which is recorded in Henslowe as the "comedy of thomas hepedes & m² smythes". (See below.)

In spite of the naivety of the play, it is not dramatically incompetent. Although individual episodes are poorly connected, the play has a strong narrative line and a theatrically effective ending. The tone of pious imperialism is not very different from that of Henry V albeit its expression is greatly inferior. The manipulation of disguise seems awkward, but no more so, perhaps, than in a number of Rose plays of about 1599-1600 such as Look About You or The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green. The piece could be performed by a company of fourteen men and two boys although they would need to be augmented by a suitable number of mute soldiers, bandits, and attendants. An interesting characteristic of the play is the relatively large number of non-doubling roles provided. Of the sixteen actors with speaking roles, only five are required to play more than one character.
This contrasts markedly with the practice of the early nineties in a play such as Tamburlaine, for example, and is another argument for a late dating of the former work. Four Prentices requires an upper level, and possibly a trap for the burial of the corpse in the dumb show, but no discovery space. The "three dores" mentioned in the prologue may indicate a particular stage. G. F. Reynolds (Staging, p. 109) thinks that the theatre referred to is the one mentioned on the title page and accepts this reference as proof of the existence of three doors in the Red Bull Theatre. These technical characteristics are by no means conclusive, but they do indicate a dramatist of some experience who is writing with a knowledge of theatrical conditions. My own conclusion is that The Four Prentices of London as we have it dates from about 1600 and that Heywood wrote it for Derby's or Worcester's after Edward IV, possibly as a counter attraction to Henry V.

The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham (1601)

On July 15, 1599, the Admiral's men purchased The Gentle Craft (The Shoemakers' Holiday) from Thomas Dekker. Although there is no record in Henslowe of production expenses for the play, it was undoubtedly mounted during the 1599 winter season and probably

\[12\text{Diary, sig. } 63^v.\]
performed at court on January 1, 1600. The similarities between

Elizabethan Stage, IV, 112.

Dekker's rollicking play about Simon Eyre the shoemaker and Heywood's celebration of Hobson the haberdasher are so striking that they almost certainly indicate an influence one way or the other. Here Heywood's predilection for including references to contemporary plays may help us. In Part Two of If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody there occur allusions to Mother Redcap, Englishmen for My Money (May, 1598), Joan as Good as My Lady (Feb., 1599) and The Battle of Alcazar. For our purposes the last is most interesting because it suggests that 2 Know did not appear until after the revival of Alcazar at the Fortune which almost certainly took place after Alleyn's return to the company in December 1600. Here the external evidence corroborates the impression gained from reading the play that Shoemaker is the original and 2 Know the imitation. It is fairly safe on this basis to assume that the original version of 2 Know, probably under the title of The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham first appeared sometime early in 1601.

The play was probably a great success, which would account for the slighting reference to it in The Knight of the Burning Pestle (Induction), and for the publication of the work without Heywood's permission. In an address "To the Reader" appended to the 1608 edition of The Rape of Lucrece, Heywood complains that "some of my
Playes have (unknowne to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the Printers hands, and therefore so corrupt and mangled, copied onely by the eare) that I have beene as unable to know them as ashamed to challenge them" (V, 163). This criticism might, of course, apply to all of Heywood's plays which appeared before that date, but it is generally taken to refer specifically to the editions of 1 and 2 If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody which appeared in 1605 and 1606. Certainly Part One of that double play has all of the signs of a pirated text. However, both G. N. Giordano-Orsini ("Thomas Heywood's Play on 'The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth'", The Library, XIV (Dec., 1933), p. 315, note 2) and Madeleine Doran (If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, Part II, ed. Madeleine Doran (London, 1935), p. xi) conclude that Part Two is a reasonably good quarto.

Since the play as we have it undoubtedly represents an altered version of the original, it will be more appropriate to discuss the details of its printing later on. Here I wish only to try to reconstruct the circumstances of its first composition. The work requires a relatively small company (ten adults and four boys plus three or four supers), and can be performed without trap or upper level. A discovery space is required for Hobson's shop and the reference to "curtains" may suggest a free-standing booth. A similar hiding place for John Gresham and his "Curtezan" to "withdrawe" into may be indicated, although the couple could as easily go off the stage in spite of the absence of stage directions to that effect. The original play was probably based on a lost source from which The Pleasant Conceites of
Old Hobson the merry Londoner (1607) also derived. Heywood has given the tale a somewhat more moral tone and interwoven it fairly skilfully with the story of Sir Thomas Gresham. As I suggested above, the integration of the various narrative threads is not complete, but the author has evidently sought to make the different stories complement one another as he did not in Edward IV.

How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad (1601)

In 1602 Mathew Lawe published A pleasant conceited Comedie wherein is shewed, how a man may chuse a good Wife from a bad. The quarto was advertised as having been "sundry times Acted by the Earle of Worcesters Servants." No entry for the work can be found in the Stationers' Register. The play was evidently popular with the reading public for it went through seven editions in the seventeenth century (1602, 1603, 1608, 1614, 1621, 1630, 1634). No author's name is mentioned on any of the title pages although the British Museum copy of the 1602 edition bears the handwritten note, "Written by Ioshua Cooke". Fleay (Drama, I, 289-90) first attributed the play to Heywood on the basis of verbal parallels with The Wise Woman of Hogsdon. Since that time an impressive number of students of the play have come to agree with Fleay's attribution. But it would be misleading to imply

that the question is settled. Felix Schelling (*Elizabethan Drama*, I, 331) and Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage*, IV, 19-20) along with Oetelia Cromwell (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 199) reject Heywood's claim to the play.

The drama is based on the sixth history of Barnabe Riche's *Farewell to Military Profession* (1581) "Of Gonzales and his Vertuous Wife Agatha" which in turn is derived from Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*, Book III, Novel 5. The playwright introduces a number of extra characters and subordinate episodes to enliven and diversify the main action, but these could hardly be said to constitute a separate story.

It must be admitted that virtually the only external evidence for Heywood's authorship is the ascription of the play to Worcester's men for whom Heywood was almost certainly writing before 1602. The internal evidence, as usual, is ambiguous. The extensive use of Latin misquotations is not unlike *Wise Woman*, but then that latter play is not at all characteristic of Heywood. The drama requires only a small cast but an unusually large number of boy actors (more than any Heywood play except the *Ages* which may have been written for a double company). The action demands a hiding place for Aminadab, almost certainly a free-standing booth. A particularly interesting feature of the text is a double allusion to the absence of posts\(^{15}\) which

\[^{15}\text{Swaen edition, I1. 1058 and 1262.}\]

suggests that the play was written for a theatre without a "heavens".
The Royal King and the Loyal Subject (1602)

The publication of *The Royall King and the Loyall Subject* in 1637 followed by more than thirty years its original production on stage. This belated issuing of the play in printed form may indicate its continued popularity, but more likely suggests a Caroline revival or revision. Fleay (*Drama*, I, 300) thinks the published play is an altered version of Marshal Osric recorded by Henslowe in 1602 (see below) which was brought out in consequence of the success of Fletcher's Loyal Subject. Grivelet (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 383) thinks the work is a late play, but almost all other commentators tend to date the drama in its present form shortly after the turn of the century.  16 The reasons for ascribing this play to an early period in the dramatist's career are partly internal and partly external. In an "Epilogue to the Reader" Heywood admits "That this Play's old" (VI, 84) and says that it was fitted to a season when "Doublets with stuft bellies and bigge sleeves And those Trunke-hose ... were all in fashion." This clearly suggests an Elizabethan rather than a Jacobean, date as does a further reference to the popularity of rhyme (VI, 84). Chambers (*Stage*, III, 341) calls Fleay's identification of this play with Marshal Osric "not one of the worst of his guesses", but neither is it

---

particularly convincing. To begin with, the Marshal in *Royal King* is never named. Furthermore, as Clark (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 30) points out, there is a Marshal Osric in *Knack to Know a Knave* and the Admiral's had an old play called *oserycke* in their repertory in February, 1597.

Internal evidence, though not conclusive, suggests a date around the turn of the century. The plain-speaking Captain is reminiscent of characters such as Downright in *Every Man In His Humour* (1598) or Malevole in *The Malcontent* (1604). A satiric reference to *The Battle of Alcazar* possibly points to a date of composition after the revival of that play at the Fortune early in 1601.\(^\text{17}\) The play calls for about twenty actors capable of carrying speaking roles, and could be played on a bare stage without upper level, trap, or discovery space. The story is taken from Novel 4, Book II, of Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, and in theme and origin is very similar to *A Woman Killed With Kindness*. I believe the evidence is most easily explained by an hypothesis which dates the play early in 1602.

The Comedy of Thomas Heywood (September, 1602)

On September 3, 1602 Henslowe advanced Worcester's men eight shillings to "bye iiij Lances for the comedy of thomas heweds & Mr Smythes" (sig. 115\(^\text{v}\)). Although A. M. Clark (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 24) identifies this with *The Four Prentices* (see above), Greg's assertion

\(^{17}\) Cap[tain] Here doe I meane to cranch, to munch, to eate, To feed, and be fat my fine Cullapolis (*Royal King*, VI, 30).
(Diary, II, 230) that it is the work subsequently referred to as *albere galles* seems more reasonable.

**Albere Galles** (September, 1602)

Heywood and Smith were paid £6 as full payment for a play called *albere galles* on September 4, 1602 (sig. 115v). Fleay (Drama, I, 294) and Greg (Diary, II, 230) suggest that the title may be a corruption of Archigallo, a character in *Nobody* and *Somebody*, and on that basis identify the Heywood-Smith play with the latter. Few subsequent students of Heywood agree. It seems to me that the original is probably lost.

**Marshal Osric** (September, 1602)

Between September 20 and 30, 1602, Heywood and Smith were paid £6 in full payment for a play called *marshalle oserecke* (sig. 116-116v). The total fee suggests a new play rather than a revision. For this reason, it seems unlikely to me that Otelia Cromwell (Thomas Heywood, p. 15) can be right when she identifies this play with *oseryke* performed by the Admiral's men in February, 1597 (sig. 26). I find the identification of *marshalle oserecke* with *Royal King* (see above) equally questionable although the evidence available hardly warrants dogmatism.

**Cutting Dick** (September, 1602)

On Sept. 20, 1602, Heywood was paid £1 for "the new a dicyons of cvttyng dicke" (sig. 116). Fleay's identification of this play (Drama, II, 319) with *Trial of Chivalry* is, as usual, extremely
hypothetical. The possibility that the Dick Bowyer episodes are a later interpolation in the last-named play is not, in my opinion, inconsistent with the evidence. The possibility that Trial might have found its way to Worcester's men, possibly with Robert Browne, and that Heywood might have added a few scenes in order that it might be passed off as a new play is an intriguing, if unverifiable, theory.

**Lady Jane or The Overthrow of Rebels (October, 1602)**

Thomas Heywood was one of four playwrights paid a total of £7 between October 15 and 21, 1602, for "A playe called Ladey Jane" (sig. 117). It has been plausibly argued by Fleay (Drama, II, 269) and Greg (Diary, II, 232) that portions of this play by Dekker and Webster survive in Sir Thomas Wyatt. It is generally agreed that Heywood's part in the latter play is very small.\(^\text{18}\) Some commentators suggest

\(^{18}\text{Cf. Mowbray Velte, Thomas Heywood, p. 16.}\)

that Heywood's contribution to Lady Jane may survive in Part One of **If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody**.

**Christmas Comes but Once a Year (November, 1602)**

Heywood, Chettle, Webster, and Dekker collaborated on a play by this title for which they were paid a total of £7 between November 2-26, 1602. Nothing is known of the piece.
The Blind Eats Many a Fly (January, 1603)

Heywood received £6 between November 24, 1602, and early January, 1603, for the curiously titled the blinde eates many a flye (sig. 118-118v). Fleay's suggestion that this work may be The English Traveller (Drama, I, 291) seems characteristically arbitrary.

The London Florentine (January, 1603)

In spite of his position as a sharer with Worcester's men, Heywood appears to have been free to contribute to the repertory of rival companies, for between December 17, 1602, and January 7, 1603, he collaborated with Henry Chettle on a play for the Admiral's men entitled the london florenten (sig. 108v-109). The two men collected a fee of £6 10s.

A Play (January, 1603)

Following their work on The London Florentine for the Admiral's men, Heywood and Chettle got an advance from Worcester's men for another collaboration. The play seems never to have been completed.

A Woman Killed With Kindness (March, 1603)

The only play of Thomas Heywood's written during his early career which we can date with any certainty is A Woman Killed With Kindness. Between February 5 and March 6, 1603, Henslowe records three payments related to this piece. Somewhat surprisingly, the first is a sum of £6 13s. "for A womanes gowne of black velluet" (sig. 119v) which seems to have been ordered while the play was still in the process of composition. Two instalments of £3 each were paid to Heywood on
February 12 and March 6, and it is possible (in view of the haste with which the costumes were ordered) that the play was on the boards before the theatres were closed by the Queen's final illness on March 19. Whenever it opened, the play seems to have been an immediate success. There is an early reference to it in T.M.'s The Black Book of London (1604), (sig. E3) and of all Heywood's plays it is the one which has maintained the greatest popularity.

The earliest extant edition of the work is a single copy dated 1607. Since the only other surviving volumes from the seventeenth century are of a third edition published in 1617, and since no entry is traceable in the Stationers' Register, it is at least possible that the play appeared in print closer to the date of its first performance on stage. A noteworthy feature of the published copies of A Woman Killed is that they are the first printed plays to bear Heywood's name on the title page. This may indicate that the playwright had at last approved the publishing of one of his dramatic works. On the other hand, the absence of a dedicatory epistle, and his complaint a year later about the "corrupt and mangled" condition of his plays "published in such savage and ragged ornaments" (see below under Rape of Lucrece) would suggest that even this reasonably good quarto was printed "without any of [his] direction" (Rape, V, 163).

Because of the absolute certainty with which we can date A Woman Killed, this play must serve as the anchor to which all theories about the chronology of Heywood's plays must be secured. Since the drama is also generally acknowledged to be the playwright's masterpiece,
it becomes necessary, too, to relate subsequent technical developments to the formal achievement of A Woman Killed. Deviations from the pattern and the mastery demonstrated in this work in plays which can be confidently dated later in Heywood's career, must be considered to reflect deliberate aesthetic choice.

The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth (1603)

Sometime before 1637, Heywood wrote a prologue for "A Play of Queene Elizabeth, as it was last revived at the Cock-pit" theatre. In the prologue, the dramatist claims that the play is more than twenty-one years old, and that it was so popular when first produced that it was pirated and printed in a corrupt text. The allusion is generally taken to refer to If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, Part One which appeared in an obviously mangled version in 1605. The inclusion of the prologue in the 1639 reprint of the play would seem to authenticate this identification.

Two problems confront the student attempting to reconstruct Heywood's connection with this work. How reliably does the text of 1 If You Know reflect the play that Heywood wrote, and when was that play first performed? The answer to the first question would seem to be supplied by the author himself who claims that the published version was so lame that he had to "teach it to walke" and that it contained "scarce one word `true" (I Know (1639), I, 191). Together these criticisms would seem to imply that, not only was the diction altered, but the very structure of the play was maimed. This would certainly seem to be borne out by some critics' assessment of the work.
Collier (I Know (1851), p. vi) says that "it can only be considered the fragment of a play", and Symonds (The Best Plays of Thomas Heywood (1888), p. xii) considers it "almost valueless as a work of art."

Against these opinions must be weighed the probability that Heywood may have exaggerated the extent of corruption in the play.\(^{19}\) It is at least possible that, however inaccurate the text may be, the basic structure of the work is intact.\(^{20}\) Since the necessary evidence upon which to form an opinion is lacking, however, the question will have to remain open.

The problem of the date of composition is equally thorny. Several commentators think that the revival at the Cockpit was given in 1623 just before Thomas Drue's Duchess of Suffolk which Clark (Thomas Heywood, p. 33, note 3) says "very obviously imitates Heywood's

\(^{19}\) For example Madeleine Doran argues that the play was not printed from a theatrical transcript but from a memorial reconstruction. (See below).

\(^{20}\) Giordano-Orsini ("Thomas Heywood's Play on 'The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth'", The Library, XIV (1933), 317) argues that "the progress of the action [and] the presentation of character are not obscured."
play.\textsuperscript{21} If that date is valid, and if the play is more than 21 years old, then it was written before the end of Elizabeth's reign. If, on the other hand, as other critics suppose, the revival was not until 1631 or 1632, shortly before the seventh edition of the play which it probably prompted, then we have no reliable guide to the date of the original composition.\textsuperscript{22} The difficulty is to reconcile the apparently primitive dramaturgy with a date when the play could actually have been performed. This latter hinges on whether or not a drama in which the Queen appeared would have been presented in public while she was still alive. Most commentators tend to think not, and consequently date the play very soon after the monarch's death.\textsuperscript{23} A Jacobean dating for the first performance would certainly be suggested by contemporary
comments. Ben Jonson remarked of the original ending of *Every Man Out of His Humour* that he had intended to impersonate the Queen in the play but that "many seem'd not to relish it; and therefore 'twas altered." 24 Heywood himself seems to imply that he would never be guilty of the lese-majesty of representing royalty on the stage. In the Epilogue to *The Late Lancashire Witches* he says he "dare not hold it fit That we for Justices and Judges sit, And personate their grave wisdomes on the Stage" (IV, 262). Against this evidence of circumspection on the part of the dramatist and the companies we can oppose only internal characteristics of the play which, because of the nature of the text, can carry but little weight. The play requires an "arras" behind which Philip can hide and an upper level. The fact that Philip must deliver lines from his hiding place suggests a free-standing booth but the evidence is not conclusive. In one scene (I, 224) the chair of state is taken "down", which might indicate a pulley from the heavens, but more likely refers to a dais on which the throne sits permanently throughout the performance. In view of the similarities between this play and *Sir Thomas Moore* and *Edward IV*, I would be inclined to date it immediately after Elizabeth's death.

An Apology for Actors (1603)

Heywood's most comprehensive exposition of his dramatic aims

is undoubtedly *An Apology for Actors* which appeared without entry in the Stationers' Register in 1612. The work is dedicated to the Earl of Worcester and contains an address to the "iudiciaill reader" as well as to "the Citty-Actors". Commendatory verses by several of these latter are prefaced to the work. Heywood even includes a poem of his own entitled "The Author to his Booke" in which he concludes "He that denyes then Theaters should be, He may as well deny a world to me" (sig. A4).

The unusual amount of prefatory material this volume carries is only one of numerous puzzling features. Certainly the most striking of these is the date of publication. For as most commentators have pointed out, by the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century the stage was secure, the playwrights more prosperous than they had ever been, and the actors protected by Royal patronage. It is rather surprising, therefore, as A. M. Clark expresses it (Thomas Heywood, p. 70) "to find Heywood at the very flourishing of the drama in England open his treatise with a melancholy vision of Melpomene." The fact is that *An Apology* seems to be a defence mounted against assailants that have already been routed. Several explanations for this apparent paradox have been advanced. Dover Wilson ("The Puritan Attack Upon the Stage", *C.H.E.L.*, VI, 401) suggests that Heywood was defending his calling from some attack on the part of the authorities of which we have no knowledge. A. M. Clark (Thomas Heywood, p. 69) thinks the *Apology* may well have been written in anticipation of, and not in retaliation for, some new attack on the actors. Hoyt E. Bowen
"Thomas Heywood: Teacher of Tradition", Renaissance Papers (1956), p. 13) suggests that the purpose of the Apology was to "cement relations in general with the court and in particular with the Earl of Worcester." F. S. Boas (Thomas Heywood, p. 77) says simply, "Why exactly ... Heywood took up the cudgels on behalf of his 'quality' ... is not known."

The inappropriateness of An Apology to conditions in 1612 has led most commentators beginning with Chambers (Elizabethan Stage, IV, 250) to date the work earlier, usually about 1607/8. Chambers gives three main arguments for this dating: a) the series of actors named as dead ends with Sly, who died in August 1608; b) the Revels Office is located at St. John's which it lost about February 1608; the frustrated Spanish landing in "Perin" in Cornwall "some 12 yeares ago" probably refers to attacks in 1595. The cumulative weight of these arguments is such that no commentator that I know of has since seriously questioned Chambers' dating.25

25 F. S. Boas (Thomas Heywood, p. 77) says An Apology was "probably first taken in hand about 1608" and Michel Grivelet (Thomas Heywood, p. 49) lists it with Troia Britanica and the Translation of Sallust as one of the works "dont la composition est due aux loisirs forcés du dramatiste" as a result of plague in 1607/8.

Persuasive as Chambers' views are, it is perhaps time to ask whether or not certain internal evidence pointing to a still earlier date of composition is not even more compelling. Specific references such as those Chambers cites may well have been altered at the time
of publication. Much more difficult to change (and therefore possibly a truer indication of the time of composition) is the whole tone and conception of the argument. The most striking characteristic of the work, of course, is that it is an apologia not for the drama, not even for poets, but for actors. It is the actual performance of plays that Heywood is interested in protecting. He is quite explicit on this point.

Oratory is a kind of speaking picture, therefore may some say, is it not sufficient to discourse to the eares of princes the fame of these conquerors: Painting likewise is a dumbe oratory, therefore may we not as well by some curious Pigmalion, drawe their conquests to worke the like loue in Princes towards these Worthyes by shewing them their pictures drawne to the life .... A Description is only a shadow receiued by the eare but not perceiued by the eye: so lively portrature is meereely a forme seene by the eye, but can neither show action, passion, motion, or any other gesture to mooue the spirits of the beholder to admiration.  

(B3v. My italics)

It is the actor, rather than the poet who deserves praise because of his educative ability to "new-mold the harts of the spectators, and fashion them to the shape of any noble and notable attempt." (B4)

Now at only one time in Heywood's career that we know of were the actors very seriously threatened and that, as Glynn Wickham points out (Early English Stages, II, 2, p. 25) was the period between 1597-1603 when the very survival of the theatre seemed to be in doubt. Is it possible that An Apology was originally written during the prolonged crisis following the Privy Council's attempt to limit the number of theatres in London?

The internal evidence suggesting a connection between An
Apology and the political manoeuvring involving the Privy Council, the Lord Mayor of London, the various theatre owners, and the patrons of the companies, during the last years of Elizabeth's reign is very strong. To begin with, Heywood says specifically,

> Amongst many other thinges tollerated in this peaceable & florishing State, it hath pleased the high and mighty Princes of this Land to limit the vse of certaine publicke Theatres, which since many of these over-curious heads haue lauishly & violently slandered, I hold it not a misse to lay open some few Antiquities to approve the true vse of them. (B)

It is possible to relate An Apology (as Clark does, Thomas Heywood, p. 69) to the surrender of the Blackfriars theatre by the Children of the Queen's Revels in August, 1608. But the reference quoted is to "publicke Theatres" and seems, in my opinion, to apply more aptly to the various Privy Council orders issued 1598-1601 expressing an intention to limit the theatres around London to one in Surrey and one in Middlesex.

The relationship of An Apology to this earlier period of crisis is confirmed, to my mind, by a number of incidental details. First of all, Heywood refers to himself in the dedication to Worcester as his "servant" which, except in a complimentary sense, he ceased to be sometime early in 1604 when Worcester's men were turned over to the Queen. Secondly, the playwright refers to himself as "the youngest and weakest of the Nest wherein I was hatcht" (Bv). The allusion is almost certainly to his seniority in the profession, and suggests a man in his twenties rather than one in his thirties as he would have been in 1608. Thirdly, most of the references to theatrical and literary
events are traceable to the last years of the sixteenth century. For example, the only plays mentioned are *The Spanish Tragedy* (1589), Legge's *Richardus Terius* (1580), *Friar Francis* (1593) and *The Four Sons of Aymon* (1602). The last two works are especially interesting. *Friar Francis* (which Heywood calls the "old History" (G^{V}) was played by the Earl of Sussex's men on January 7, 14, and 20, 1593, probably at Henslowe's Rose theatre (*Diary*, sig. 8^{V}). Sussex's men disappear from the records as a London troupe after 1594, but they probably continued in the provinces since a company of that patron is recorded at Coventry 1602/3, Dover 1606/7, Canterbury 1607/8, and Bristol, Norwich and Dunwich in 1608/9. Chambers says that the performance at Lin

26 *Elizabethan Stage*, II, 96.

(King's Lynn) referred to in *An Apology* is undated but in accordance with his theory he supposes it (*Stage*, II, 95) to have been in 1608/9. But the scanty records would also support a date of 1602/3. A similar early date may be indicated by the allusion to *The Four Sons of Aymon* presented by the "English Comedians at Amsterdam" (G^{2}). The Four

27 However see A. M. Clark, *Thomas Heywood*, p. 73) who identifies these players as being in the pay of the Cardinal and Archduke Albert, Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, about 1608-12.

*Sons of Aymon* was an old play in 1602 when Robert Shaw sold it to the
Another persuasive reason for thinking that *An Apology* was written towards the beginning rather than towards the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century is the fact that Heywood had apparently only recently read Francis Mere's *Palladis Tamia* (1598). He comments that "it was my chance to happen on ... a booke called Wits Commonwealth" (E3v). That the playwright should not have "happened on" a book which named him among the best dramatists in England until ten years after it had been published is possible but highly unlikely.

Finally, Heywood's references to the abuses

*lately crept into the quality, as an inueighing against the State, the Court, the Law, the City, and their gouernments; with particularizing of private mens humors (yet alioye) ... committing their bitternesse, and liberall inuectiues against all estates, to the mouthes of Children* (G3v)

seems to belong to the years just following the scandal of *The Isle of Dogs* (1597) and the revival of the boys companies in 1599 and 1600.

If an earlier date of composition is to be considered, just when would Heywood likely have penned *An Apology* and under what conditions? My own guess is that it was first prepared as a "brief" for the Earl of Worcester to provide him with arguments to use in the Privy Council and with King James to support the granting of Royal patronage to the combined Worcester's–Oxford's company. The evidence suggests that the argument about the need for a third company in London may have broken out again after the death of the Queen. The Worcester's–Oxford's company had won a place in the City as a result of Oxford's
direct appeal to the Queen and the sovereign's overruling of the Privy Council's expressed intention to limit the troupes. After the Queen's death, the Chamberlain's men were granted a patent on May 19, 1603. In December of that year, however, Heywood's company was still under the patronage of the Earl of Worcester and travelling in the provinces. The last half of 1603 may well have been a time of considerable apprehension among the players who once again faced the prospect of being exposed to the hostility of the Lord Mayor and the London Aldermen. It was during these months, I believe, that Heywood first jotted down his justification of the living theatre. 28

28 The specific reference to James "our most royall, and ever renouned soueraigne, [who] hath licensed vs in London" (G3) and those allusions mentioned by Chambers are not easily explained away. Nevertheless, I think that they may well be revisions made by Heywood at the time of publication to eliminate some of the most glaring anachronisms in a piece long out of date.

The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (1604)

"The Wise Woman of Hogsdon by Thomas Heywood" was entered in the Stationers' Register on March 12, 1638 and published the same year. A reference in the play to A Woman Killed With Kindness has led most commentators to date it about 1604. Fleay (Drama, I, 292) identifies this work with How to learn of a woman to woo a play by Heywood which was acted before the King by Queen Anne's men on December 30, 1604 and this identification has been widely accepted. Structurally, the
piece is generally regarded as Heywood's highest achievement but

in its adherence to "Aristotelian" principles of construction it is not at all typical of the dramatist. The staging requires a discovery space to serve as a "shop" and a "little closet close to the door." The latter description, particularly, suggests a free-standing booth. There is also an indication (V, 308) that three entrances may have been required as in The Four Prentices.

1 Fair Maid of the West (1604)

The Fair Maid of the West was registered with the Stationers' Company on June 16, 1631 (Arber, IV, 254) and published as a two-part play in the same year. In an epistle "To the Reader" Heywood speaks of "these Comedies" and for many years commentators assumed that the parts had been written together. As a result, estimates of the dates of composition tended to range from about 1606/7 when verbal echoes of Macbeth in Part Two might best be explained to sometime after 1616.

---


---

See Otelia Cromwell, Thomas Heywood, pp. 62-63.

Chambers omits the play altogether from The Elizabethan Stage which includes works written up until the death of Shakespeare.
A. M. Clark concludes that Part One was written about 1609/10 (Thomas Heywood, p. 110) and Alfred Harbage (Annals of the English Drama, rev. Samuel Schoenbaum (London, 1964), pp. 96-97) suggests 1610. Recently, however, there has been a tendency to believe that the Elizabethan atmosphere of the play is more than nostalgia, and that J. P. Collier may have been right more than a century ago when he argued (English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage, Vol. I (London, 1831), pp. 402-4) that the play was written before the death of the Queen. Reviewing the evidence in the most recent edition of the play, R. K. Turner (The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II (London, 1968), p. xiii) says that the consensus is for an early date, and that "all the apparent allusions now recognized are at least not inconsistent with a date somewhat earlier than 1604."

Structurally and thematically the play seems very closely related to The Four Prentices and How a Man May Chuse. The atmosphere of romance and action in the one, and the church vestry wholesomeness of the second, seem almost perfectly combined in the adventures of Bess Bridges. Furthermore, there are striking parallels between Chuse and Fair Maid in the narrative structure, especially the handling of the protasis and epitasis in each case. The catastrophe of 1 Fair Maid is almost certainly distorted by later changes made to introduce the action of the sequel. The play requires an upper level but no discovery space or other stage machinery. It seems likely to me that the Moroccan episode is an addition substituted for an original ending which has been lost. On the basis of an analysis of structure,
I would be inclined to date the play shortly after the turn of the century. However, it is unlikely that the references to Essex would have been politic at that time or at any time up until about 1604.

**If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody (1605)**

Early in July, 1605, Nathaniel Butter registered his intention to publish "A booke called, yf you knowe not me you knowe no body." The promised volume, which turned out to be a badly corrupt quarto, appeared later the same year with the sub-title *The troubles of Queene Elizabeth*. By September 14, Butter had determined to issue a second part of the play "with the building of the exchange" (Arber, III, 301), but this edition did not, in fact, come out until 1606. The title page described the play as *The Second Part of If you know not me you know no bodie With the building of the Royall Exchange: And the famous Victorie of Queene Elizabeth, in the Yeare 1588*. Neither play was attributed to Heywood, nor did either contain the prefatory remarks usually appended by the playwright to his acknowledged works.

The relationship of these plays to each other and to Heywood is obscure. That the dramatist was almost certainly the author of the play which underlies Part One is established by his "Prologue to the Play of Queene Elizabeth ... in which the Author taxeth the most corrupted copy now imprinted, which was published without his consent."^32

---

In this prologue, written for a Caroline revival of the play at the Cockpit, Heywood makes two points. First, the original play was written more than twenty-one years ago at which time it was so popular that audiences thronged "the Seates, the Boxes, and the Stage" (I, 191). Secondly, the success of the play was such that it led "some by Stenography [to draw] the plot: [and] put it in print: (scarce one word trew)" (Ibid.). Most commentators agree that the final statement must refer to the Butter edition of Part One of If You Know Not Me and that consequently Heywood is the author of that play. 33

---


Heywood's claim to Part Two is less secure. The 1606 edition shows no signs of "stenography", and is generally regarded as a good text which was probably printed from reliable copy. Furthermore, the "second part" of the play differs so greatly in style and subject from Part One that most students agree that it was originally conceived as a separate work, possibly The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham with the Building of the Royal Exchange mentioned in The Knight of the Burning Pestle. (See above.) The process by which it became linked with The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth in a two-part play is, perhaps, no longer discoverable. Several possibilities have been suggested. The simplest is that the whole play was written shortly after the death of
the Queen as a dramatic obituary, and that its awkward form can best be explained as a combination of textual corruption and haste. For reasons which I have given above, I find this theory unsatisfactory. A second hypothesis is that either Heywood, or the company, patched together a two-part epic on the Queen out of material they had on hand. This possibility is convincingly argued by A. M. Clark (Thomas Heywood, pp. 31-34) who claims that Part One consists of Heywood's share of Lady Jane and Part Two is Sir Thomas Gresham deprived of the merchant's death and augmented by the scenes recounting Dr. Parry's treason and the defeat of the Armada. I am inclined to agree with Madeleine Doran (If You Know Not Me, Part II (London, 1935), p. xvii) who believes that Part One was written after Elizabeth's death, and that Part Two is an earlier play which was amalgamated with the new work "in the early summer of 1605."

The textual history of the two plays is quite as obscure as their origins. It is generally accepted that only Part One is referred to in Heywood's allegations of piracy in the prologues to The Rape of Lucrece and the Cockpit revival of Know. However, as Miss Doran argues, (1 Know, p. xvii), the allusions to "Stenography" and to the
text being "copied onely by the eare" may well be misleading. Following G. N. Giordano-Orsini (The Library, XIV (1933), 317), she is inclined to accept that the text of Part One may be based on a memorial reconstruction of the actors who played Gage, Philip, Dodds and the Clown. Nevertheless, these qualifications do not alter the status of the text as a "bad quarto." The case of Part Two is very different. B. A. E. Van Dam and Stoffel ("The Fifth Act of Thomas Heywood's Queen Elizabeth: Second Part", Shakespeare, Jarbuch, XXXVIII (1902), p. 178) state that 2 Know is too accurate to be a stenographic transcription of a performance, and Doran agrees. The situation is complicated by the existence in the 1633 edition of the play, of a considerably enlarged version of the armada scenes. Do these represent a revision undertaken by Heywood for the Cockpit revival, or do they derive from the original play? Van Dam and Stoffel (op. cit., p. 179) argue that both versions were printed from Heywood's manuscript, and that the differences can be accounted for as cuts for performance in the 1606 version, and printer's changes in 1633. Doran works out a textual theory which she herself admits is more ingenious than credible (2 Know, p. xix). In the present state of our knowledge the truth must remain hidden.

For reasons that I have recorded above, I believe that a theory of independent composition best explains the confusing features of this play. Although both parts were written for performance on a platform stage requiring a discovery space with curtains, Part One demands an upper stage whereas Part Two does not. More important, the two parts require different-sized companies. Part One needs a total
troupe of about twenty-seven with perhaps eight supers, while Part Two could be played by a company of twenty. These differences may be attributable to the different modes of the two plays (history and comedy), but they also suggest composition at separate times. The two plays were probably combined early in 1605.

The Rape of Lucrece (1607)

The Rape of Lucrece, printed in 1608, is the first of Heywood's plays to be published with his approval. The playwright's attitude towards the publication of works written to be performed rather than to be read is expressed in an address "To the Reader" and deserves to be quoted at length. He writes,

It hath been no custome in me ... to commit my Playes to the Presse ... some have used a double sale of their labours, first to the Stage, and after to the Presse: For my owne part, I here proclaime my selue ever faithfull in the first, and never guilty of the last; yet since some of my Playes have (unknowne to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the Printers hands, and therefore so corrupt and mangled, copied onely by the eare) that I have beene as unable to know them, as ashamed to challenge them. This therefore I was willinger to furnish out in his native habit: first being by consent, next because the rest have been so wronged, in being publisht in such savage and ragged ornaments. (V, 163)

The epistle is puzzling for a number of reasons. On the face of it, Heywood's criticisms seem to apply to all of his plays published before 1608.36 Are his comments to be understood as overstatement, or

36 Edward IV (1599), How a Man May Chuse (1602), 1 Know (1605), 2 Know (1606), and A Woman Killed With Kindness (1607).
is Heywood here disowning the earlier anonymous plays? The

37 It is conceivable that Heywood had not seen the edition of
A Woman Killed when he wrote the epistle for The Rape of Lucrece.

reasonably good texts of Edward IV and Chuse might seem to exclude them
from among the plays Heywood refers to as having come "accidentally ... into the Printers hands." On the other hand, the words are too
ambiguous to allow absolute certainty on the point. A second curious
feature about the epistle is that it seems to represent a change of
policy on Heywood's part, and most of the plays published after 1608
contain some kind of indication of the author's approval in the form of
a dedication or address to the reader. 38 It is almost as if, with the

38 One exception to this generalization, perhaps significantly,
is The Wise Woman of Hogsdon.

publishing of The Rape of Lucrece, Heywood set out to emphasize the
literary and classical aspects of his work, and to ignore, if not to
repudiate, those bourgeois and realistic qualities which have become so
closely associated with his name.

The possibility that 1608 may represent a turning point in
Heywood's career is complicated by the difficulty of dating his classical
plays. As we have seen, there is considerable evidence to suggest
that the Ages were originally written in the mid 1590's. (See above).
Allan Holaday has argued very strongly that *The Rape of Lucrece* also belongs to the sixteenth century. Holaday rests his case primarily on a number of allusions to Lucrece plays in England and the Continent which he tries to identify as Heywood's original work. The theory seems over-ingenious, however, since there is no reason why the plays referred to could not have been by other dramatists.

A more common dating for *The Rape of Lucrece* is about 1607 on the grounds that the Tullia-Tarquin relationship is almost certainly an echo of *Macbeth*. As F. S. Boas points out too (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 47 and Michel Grivelet, *Thomas Heywood*, p. 369.)
p. 52), the imitation of Shakespeare's *Lucrece*, which Holaday thinks points to a date of composition shortly after the original appearance of that poem in 1594, might as easily have been occasioned by the 1607 reprint. The unevenness of the play might well point to a later revision, as Holaday (*Rape of Lucrece*, p. 5) suggests, but the power of the characterization in the Lucrece episodes represents a considerable advance on *A Woman Killed* and indicates to me, later composition.

Structurally the play is awkward and the staging is highly conventional. The fairly elaborate use of the upper stage, of reported off-stage action, and of pantomime, point to a deliberate rejection of the simple, realistic techniques worked out in *A Woman Killed*. Although the play has many puzzling features, I think it was probably written (possibly using an earlier play as a basis) about 1607.

**Fortune by Land and Sea** (1608)

*Fortune by Land and Sea* was not printed until 1655 but most commentators agree that it was likely written sometime between 1607-09.\(^\text{42}\) The title page and the entry in the Stationers' Register (June


20, 1655) both attribute the work to Heywood and William Rowley but the accuracy of this attribution has been questioned by several critics
who dispute Rowley's share in the play. The problem is complicated somewhat by the condition of the text which Clark (Thomas Heywood, p. 50) calls the "most slovenly" of the canon. It would appear from certain features of the quarto that the compositors were more interested in conserving paper than in producing a faithful transcription of their copy. Verse is printed as prose, short lines are doubled up (with speech headings frequently appearing in the middle of a line), and stage directions are often crowded to the right margin. On the other hand, the prose format preserves the very high proportion of rhyme in the play (148 couplets) which may indicate that the typesetting is more accurate than the appearance of the volume would suggest.

The play consists of three inter-woven stories for only one of which (the adventures of Purser and Clinton) is there an identifiable source. The exploits and deaths of the Elizabethan privateers, Tom Walton (alias Purser) and Clinton, were recounted in the chronicles of Stowe and Holinshed as well as in popular ballads and poems. No
latter consists of three poems, presumably by the same hand, purporting
to be the scaffold exhortations of the notorious pirates. It was
probably published about 1583 although I have been unable to locate a
copy of the original to verify Collier's comments.

comparable basis in fact or fiction has been located for the other two
stories told in Fortune by Land and Sea. Both of these bear a very
close resemblance to other plays of Thomas Heywood such as Edward IV
(1599), Woman Killed (1603), Four Prentices, Royal King, and 1 Fair
Maid. This suggests that the work belongs to the playwright's early
career. On the other hand, as I have argued elsewhere, the likelihood
that the play also contains work by William Rowley is very great.
Since the most probable period of collaboration is when the two
dramatists were associated with the Queen's men between 1607-09, I
would accept a date of about 1608.

The Golden Age (1609)

It is not altogether clear whether or not Heywood sponsored
the publication of The Golden Age which appeared with his name on the
title page in 1611. In an address to the reader he protests that,

This Play comming accidentally to the Presse, and at
length hauing notice thereof, I was loath (finding it
mine owne) to see it thrust naked into the world ... 
without either Title for acknowledgement, or the
formality of an Epistle for ornament. (III, 3)

That this seeming modesty may not have been altogether ingenuous,
however, is suggested by the conclusion to that epistle.

This is the Golden Age, the eldest brother of three
Ages, that haue adventured the Stage, but the onely
yet, that hath beeuen judged to the Presse. As this
is receiued, so you shall find the rest: either
fearefull further to proceede, or encouraged boldly
to follow. (Ibid.)
If the original publication was "accidental" presumably subsequent ones would not be. 42

42 There is an interesting similarity between this epistle and coy address by the anonymous T.H. to the readers of Oenone and Paris.

Perhaps no other works by Heywood have caused such contradictory comments by students than the five-play series of dramas which begins with The Golden Age. So unlike his other work is the cycle of pagan miracle-plays that they are sometimes practically omitted from discussions of Heywood which focus on his "realism" or his depictions of "everyday life." And yet the evidence suggests that these works are not only an important part of Heywood's dramatic output, but one of which the playwright himself was particularly proud. It is, I suggest, no accident that none of the "domestic" plays of these early years with which Heywood's name is now most closely associated (Edward IV, Woman Killed, How a Man May Chuse) were acknowledged in print by the author during his lifetime. The Ages, on the other hand, were considered worthy of being collected into "an handsome Volume". 43

43 See the "Address to the Reader", 2 Iron Age, III, 351.

Whether or not modern critics think the Ages are important seems to depend largely on their approach. Those interested in Heywood as a poet point out, with some justice, that these plays contain "some
of his truest poetry." 44 Other commentators, more concerned with the

44A. M. Clark, Thomas Heywood, p. 222.

dramaturgy, find the "literary" quality of these plays a weakness.
"De toutes les productions de Heywood, l'homme de théâtre," writes
Michel Grivelet (Thomas Heywood, p. 373), "c'est celle qui porte les
traces les plus visibles des défauts de Heywood, l'homme de lettres."
The normal difficulty of forming a fair assessment of these unusual
plays is compounded by the problem of their chronology. Were they
written early in the playwright's career, in which case they might be
dismissed as dramatic apprentice work? Or do they represent a conscious
change of direction after the "maturity" of A Woman Killed With Kindness?
Because our own ideas of artistic creation are so bound up with the
concept of development, it is virtually impossible to think about
these plays without, consciously or unconsciously, relating them to
Heywood's career. For this reason, it is particularly important to
form an estimate of when and how they were written.

Unfortunately, as with almost all of Heywood's plays, the
evidence is so fragmentary that absolute certainty is all but impossible.
There are three main theories: a) the Ages were written in the mid-
nineties and are identifiable with plays recorded in Henslowe's diary;
b) the Ages are a dramatization of Heywood's own Troia Britannica and
were consequently all written after 1609; c) the Ages as we have
them are Jacobean revisions of Elizabethan plays and consequently
exhibit characteristics of both periods. The identification of the Ages with plays in Henslowe's diary has been discussed above.


The alternative view, that the plays are entirely the product of the period 1608-13 is not popular. This opinion has been expressed most forcibly by A. M. Clark (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 63) who says that "the Ages are, beyond the shadow of a doubt, dramatizations of Heywood's own *Troia Britanica*." As Allan Holaday points out, however ("Heywood's 'Troia Britannica' and the 'Ages'", *J.E.G.P.*, XLV, (1946), 430-39), the departures from this supposed source, especially in *The Silver and Brazen Ages*, would suggest that Heywood drew on other material as well. Working from Henslowe's property list of 1598, Holaday infers that the early Admiral's plays contained incidents found in the Ages but not in *Troia*. 46 From this he concludes that Heywood must have used these works


as an alternate source. The consensus seems to be, therefore, that the Ages represent a revision of earlier material, some of it perhaps by Heywood himself, possibly undertaken to mark the re-opening of the
Red Bull theatre after the attack of the plague in 1609.\textsuperscript{47} Certainly


some kind of theory of revision best explains the discrepancies in the plays. Structurally The Golden Age is poorly organized, and more closely resembles the work of a journeyman playwright than that of a self-conscious artist. While it is not impossible that Heywood might have produced the loose epic form of the Ages after the formal experiments of 1600-1603, it seems to me unlikely. From a purely technical point of view, the chaotic structure of the Ages is more understandably explained as a primitive skeleton underlying an extensive revision.

It is more difficult to interpret the radically different approach to stage spectacle represented by these plays. J. Q. Adams ("Four Pictorial Representations of the Elizabethan Stage", J.E.C.P., X (1911), 330) suggests that the stage directions are so extreme they may be nothing more than literary descriptions. G. F. Reynolds (The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 10) on the other hand, takes the various references to performance in the epistles as an indication that the printed stage directions do, in fact, reflect production practices. It is certainly true that Henslowe's property list would suggest that stage effects not entirely unlike those in the Ages must have been employed at the Rose about 1598. But the Ages make far
heavier demands on stage machinery than plays of the nineties or indeed, for that matter, than most of the Jacobean period. It would seem that in these plays Heywood was deliberately exploiting new resources of the theatre, resources that may have become available as a result of experiments with moveable scenery for the court masques. This theory would also point to a date of about 1609 for the revision of *The Golden Age*.

**The Silver Age** (1610)

Whether or not it was public response which encouraged it to follow, *The Silver Age* cannot be said to have done so "boldly". It appeared in print in 1613 with an address to the reader signed T. H. in which Heywood comments that he "begunne with *Gold*, follow[s] with *Silver*, proceed[s] with *Brasse*, and purpose[s] by Gods grace, to end with *Iron*." (III, 83) These remarks have led to speculation about the relationship of the various *Ages* to one another, and about the relative dates of composition. The wording of the epistle in the 1611 edition of *The Golden Age* ("the eldest brother of three Ages") is normally taken to indicate that only the first trilogy had been written by that time. The reference to *Iron* in 1613 would seem to indicate

---

48 J. Q. Adams' attempt to interpret these words to include the final two plays by suggesting that the "Ages" referred to are three other Ages (i.e., Silver, Brazen and Iron) does not seem to me at all convincing. (See below.)
that the composition of the last two plays in the cycle was an afterthought, a theory which many features of the plays would support. The Silver Age was performed at Court on January 12, 1612 by the combined King's and Queen's companies.\textsuperscript{49} It is not unlikely that

\textsuperscript{49}Chambers, \textit{Elizabethan Stage}, IV, 126.

this performance, rather than any demand on the part of the reading public, stimulated the publication of the text. Allan Holaday's argument that this play and The Brazen Age were based on the two-part Hercules play listed in Henslowe, is not inconsistent with the structural characteristics of the play. The work is episodic and disjointed with little evidence of any unifying vision that might give it coherence. It is not impossible that the Hercules episodes may have come from a separate source just as the Jupiter-Alcmena story was taken over from Plautus.

The Brazen Age (1610)

The final part of the first trilogy appeared in print in 1613. It seems likely that the textual history of this play is closely related to the previous one and that for the purposes of establishing chronology the two can be considered together.

The Iron Age (1613)

In spite of Heywood's expressed intentions, it was not until 1632 that The Iron Age appeared in two separate volumes printed by
Nicholas Okes. In an epistle to the reader in Part One, Heywood says with some pride that

these were the Playes often (and not with the least applause,) Publickly Acted by two Companies, vppon one Stage at once, and have at sundry times thronged three seuerall Theatres, with numerous and mighty Auditories. (III, 264)

In Part Two, he comments that "These Ages haue beene long since Writ and suited with the time then" (III, 351). As usual with Heywood, the meaning of these remarks is not wholly clear. Fleay thinks (Drama, I, 285) the two companies referred to are: the Pembroke's and Admiral's men and that the performances took place at the Rose, the Curtain, and the Red Bull. J. Quincy Adams, on the other hand ("Shakespeare, Heywood, and the Classics", M.L.N., XXXIV, (1919), 336) believes the collaborative performances were given by the King's and Queen's men between 1610-1612 at Red Bull, the Curtain, and the Globe or Blackfriars. E. K. Chambers (Elizabethan Stage, III, 345) followed by F. S. Boas (Thomas Heywood, p. 84) takes the reference to two companies to refer to performances of the Iron Ages only. These scholars identify the three theatres as the Curtain, the Red Bull, and perhaps the Cockpit. The point is hardly important, but Heywood's reference to "This Iron Age" (III, 263) and "these Playes" (III, 264) suggests to me that the whole cycle was included in his allusion to performances by two companies.

The chronological relationship of the Iron Ages to the other trilogy is equally obscure. Tatlock ("The Siege", P.M.L.A., XX (1915), 708-718) thinks that 1 and 2 Iron Age are "Heywood's earliest works"
written before the other Ages about 1594-96. Some support for this theory, as least as far as the date is concerned, is provided by Adams (Oenone and Paris, ed. J. Q. Adams (Washington, 1943), p. xxxvii) who points out that 1 Iron Age contains portions of a translation of Ovid's epistles the Heroides which the young Heywood may have written when he was influenced by Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis.

R. G. Martin ("A New Specimen of the Revenge Play", Modern Philology, XVI (1918), 10) finds Tatlock's arguments convincing and thinks that 2 Iron Age, at least, was probably written in the nineties using Caxton's Recuyell as a source. He can find no evidence of revision.

Most commentators, however, believe that The Iron Age is of later date. R. B. Sharpe (The Real War of the Theatres, p. 199) takes the "cynical spirit" of the plays as evidence that they were written about 1602. Some students identify echoes of Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, and think the plays were composed following the publication of the quarto of the former work in 1609. 50 Others interpret the reference to "these Playes" in the epistle of 1 Iron Age as an indication that all five Ages had been performed by "two Companies" probably about 1612. Still others take the epistle to The Silver Age in which Heywood says that it is his "purpose by Gods grace, to end with Iron" as proof that the last two plays had not been completed.

---

when *The Silver Age* appeared in print in 1613. I would be inclined to follow the last group in accepting a date towards the end of 1613.

**Plays attributed to Heywood**

Mention should be made in conclusion of those plays sometimes attributed to Heywood about which there is disagreement. These include *Nobody and Somebody* (identified with Albere Galles), *Trial of Chivalry* (*Cutting Dick*), *The Thracian Wonder* (*War Without Blows*), *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, and *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*. Only the last two, in my opinion, warrant serious discussion on the basis of evidence available at this time.

The case for Heywood's authorship of *Captain Thomas Stukeley* has been most forcefully advanced by Professor Joseph Quincy Adams Jr. ("The Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XV (1916), 107-29) who argued on the basis of verbal echoes that the dramatist was responsible for "at least a share of the play." Adams' arguments appeared compelling enough to persuade Otelia Cromwell (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 205), and Mowbray Velte (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 17), but Clark remained unconvinced (*Thomas Heywood*, p. 328). Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage*, IV, 47) listed the play as anonymous. On balance, there seem to be insufficient grounds for including this doubtful play in a study designed to analyse technical characteristics.

The case of *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* is more complicated. Heywood's name has been linked with the work since Kirkman first attributed the play to him in 1671. Since that time, several commentators
have concurred with this attribution. Baron Field edited the play for the Shakespeare Society in 1846 as part of the projected complete works of Heywood, and R. H. Shepherd included it in the edition of Heywood's plays published by Pearson in 1874. Laura A. Hibbard argued Heywood's case ("The Authorship and Date of the Fair Maid of the Exchange", Modern Philology, VII (1910), 383-94) and Dugdale Sykes went so far as to say that Heywood's claim to the play was "unimpeachable" ("Thomas Heywood and 'The Fair Maid of the Exchange'", Notes and Queries, 136 (Twelfth Series, Vol. IV, 1918), 261-63). Such confidence notwithstanding, the weight of critical opinion in recent years has come down against Heywood. Both Ward and Clark have recorded a change of heart. The first followed Lamb in accepting Heywood (A History of English Dramatic Literature, II (London, 1899), 572) but subsequently (C.H.E.L., VI, 100) stated that he could not "persuade himself that Heywood was its author." Clark assumed the play to be Heywood's in 1922 ("Thomas Heywood as a Critic", Modern Language Notes, XXXVII (1922), 222) but later concluded that "only a small part at most" was by the dramatist (Thomas Heywood, p. 244). The most recent editor of the play (Peter H. Davison, ed., The Fair Maid of the Exchange (Oxford, 1963), p. vi) is surely right when he says that the question of authorship "can hardly be settled on the basis of the evidence at present available which is flimsy in the extreme."

In view of the inconclusive nature of the debate, I have felt it wise to omit The Fair Maid of the Exchange from the present study.
2. Heywood's Stage Directions

Because of their importance for a study of Heywood's dramaturgy, it is necessary to formulate an hypothesis concerning the nature of the stage directions in the printed editions of his plays. There are several problems. To begin with, too little evidence survives from the period to permit confident generalization about either the writing or the printing of stage directions. Secondly, the publishing history of all of the dramatist's early plays is obscure. Neither of these facts encourages the student to place great reliance on the directions from printed texts. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that these directions may adhere more closely to Heywood's intentions than would at first seem likely.

A study of Heywood's practice must begin with an examination of three manuscripts which are related to different times in his career. The first is Sir Thomas Moore which, whether or not the playwright was actually involved in its revision, gives a fairly clear picture of some theatrical conventions at the beginning of his career. The second is a manuscript entitled Callisto or The Escapes of Jupiter which consists of scenes from The Golden and Silver Ages differing from the published texts, and probably transcribed sometime after 1610. Finally, there is what is now generally believed to be an autograph manuscript of an untitled play thought to be The Captives, licensed as Heywood's in 1624.51

From these three sources, several interesting facts emerge.

The first is that manuscripts prepared for the theatre contain directions by both author and book-keeper. Those contributed by the playwright are more extensive and detailed. They describe properties, costumes, action, and effects, but frequently in vague or imprecise terms. Secondly, they generally (although not invariably) are to be found either in the centre or in the right margin of the manuscript. The stage directions of the book-keeper are usually precise, terse, primarily concerned with properties and effects, and located in the left-hand margin. These characteristics are furthermore not peculiar to the Heywood manuscripts.

52 Enter three or foure Prentises (S.T.M., p. 16); ex. some seuerally others set vp the Tibbit (Ibid., p. 20); ex. Sherife and the rest (Ibid., p. 20); so many Aldermen as may (Ibid., p. 32); A songe Iff you will (Escapes, f. 77); Enter the Lord de Averne, with som ffollowers (Captives, Malone Society, p. 53); Eather strykes him wth a staffe or Casts a stone (Ibid., 97).

53 This practice which well may have been a playhouse convention, is most clearly evident in the Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. There the scribe has consistently placed stage directions at the opening of scenes in the centre, and mid-scene directions in the right-hand margin. The only exceptions occur in places where the text is in prose which itself covers the margin. In such cases, the directions are put in the left margin along with the speech-headings. (This strongly suggests that stage directions, like speech-prefixes, may have been added after the dialogue had been written).
but are common to all prompt-books surviving from the period.\footnote{See W. W. Greg, \textit{Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses} (Oxford, 1931), pp. 207-214.}

What is suggested by the evidence is that there was a clearly recognized division of responsibility for the final production. In the matter of action on stage it is the author who seems to have final authority.\footnote{Cf. Greg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 213.} There is no instance in the manuscripts of the book-keeper altering an authorial stage direction in which suggestions for the actors are to be found. Only in rare cases does the prompter himself add directions specifying action.\footnote{Fry: strangled (\textit{Captives}, p. 71); carry him up (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 98); Fryer sett vp and left (\textit{Ibid.}, 100).} Furthermore, apart from the questionable Faulkner scene, there are no examples of the book-keeper altering requirements for costumes or properties. On the other hand, the playwright's authority is secondary in the area of special effects. In \textit{The Captives}, a direction by the dramatist (Musicke and voyses), is deleted by the book-keeper who inserts several directions regarding off-stage noises, or the use of the upper stage or arras, and who also
makes notes about casting. In *Sir Thomas Moore*, Hand C shows the same concern with casting, and off-stage effects. The very important significance of this is that it establishes that most of the details concerning gesture, appearance, and properties originate with the author. The book-keeper may have modified some of the author's requests for special effects, but here too there seems to be a tendency to respect the wishes of the author if the resources of the company permit it. It is reasonably safe to conclude, therefore, that the stage directions in Elizabethan manuscript prompt-books do very largely reflect the playwright's intentions.

The question remaining to consider is whether or not the printed texts contain "editorial directions" inserted for the benefit of the reader. In Heywood's case the problem is complicated by the publishing history of the early quartos. Of the six plays now attributed to Heywood which appeared in print before 1608, none was authorized by the dramatist, and only one bore his name on the title page.57 Quite

57 1 and 2 Edward IV (1599); *How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad* (1602); 1 and 2 *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1605, 1606); and *A Woman Killed With Kindness* (1607) the latter attributed to Thomas Heywood.

apart from the problem of authorship there is the question of the copy from which they were printed. Heywood himself says that they were
pirated.\textsuperscript{58} If this is the case then we should expect that the stage

\begin{center}
\begin{quotation}
Some of my Playes have (unknowne to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the Printers hand, and therefore so corrupt and mangled, copied onely by the eare) that I have beene as unable to know them as ashamed to challenge them. (To the Reader, Rape of Lucrece, V, 163).
\end{quotation}
\end{center}

directions in the early plays would differ in significant ways from those of the later texts all of which were authorized to the extent that Heywood included an epistle to a patron or to the reader. But no such differences are apparent. Authorized and unauthorized texts alike contain both lengthy "literary" directions and concise technical ones. Furthermore there are in both periods a number of stage directions printed towards the right side of the page which suggests that the compositors were imitating the playhouse convention we have noticed in the prompt books. This might indicate that the copy from which they were working had all the characteristics of a playhouse manuscript, or it may simply show that the pirates used the same conventions.\textsuperscript{59}

\begin{center}
\begin{quotation}
See Madeleine Doran's Introduction to her edition for the Malone Society of If You Know Not Me (London, 1934) in which she argues that the text is the result of memorial construction. (p. vii)
\end{quotation}
\end{center}

The evidence available, therefore, seems insufficient to warrant any firm conclusions. Perhaps all we can say is that the stage directions in the early published texts are not inconsistent with
Heywood's practice as illustrated by the autograph manuscripts and authorized quartos. Consequently I propose to accept them as evidence for his dramatic technique.
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