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Abstract

This thesis explores the proposition that to comprehend William Shakespeare better in his social and creative contexts one has to understand both his and his family’s money - where it came from and where it went.

The Shakespearian mythos\(^1\) posits that John Shakespeare came penniless to Stratford where he did well in business before losing his wealth. Thereafter, his son William went to London, wrote plays which made him rich and then made a number of investments in Stratford. Among the various errors in this statement there is one that stands out - the “rich” part. It is not simply the fact that he made the investments - his house New Place, land, tithes etc. are well documented - it is when he made them that is of significance. The bulk of the Shakespeare family investments were made before William became part owner of the Globe or Blackfriars theatres.

This evaluation has focused on the tangible data from the period, chiefly legal and financial records.

Its conclusions challenge many pre-existing notions of how money flowed into the Early Modern Theatre and into William Shakespeare’s pockets.

The fable is that young Will Shakespeare, like the pantomime Dick Whittington, left his poverty-stricken family, walked to London and won his fortune. In neither case was this true. The Early Modern theatre in London was brutally commercial and the aim was the acquisition of wealth more than the pursuit of art. For William Shakespeare, Pope put it neatly

\[
\text{Shakespeare (whom you and every playhouse bill}\nonumber \\
\text{Style the divine! the matchless! what you will),}\nonumber \\
\text{For gain, not glory, wing’d his roving flight,}\nonumber \\
\text{And grew immortal in his own despite.}^2
\]

This thesis provides the evidence to dismiss many of the fantasies that surround William and John Shakespeare’s by replacing these with a clear financial picture of the sources and acquisition of their wealth.

---

\(^1\) **mythos**, A body of interconnected myths or stories, esp. those belonging to a … cultural tradition. OED.
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NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINED TERMS

“Stratford-upon-Avon” has frequently been abbreviated to “Stratford.”

The term “Early Modern”, though defined in The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms in Literature as the somewhat nebulous “period of European history broadly equivalent to that of the 16th and 17th centuries” is used in this thesis to specifically refer to the period 1530-1642. “Early Modern Theatre” refers to all types of playing in England between these dates.

References throughout to “John”, “William” and “Will” without surname refer to John Shakespeare (c.1530-1601) and William Shakespeare (1564-1616).

Where American authors have been quoted I have chosen to leave the spelling as it appeared in the original source material. Historical spelling has, for the most part, been left in its original form unless it would have been tedious to a modern reader.

The term “in Modern English” indicates that the translation into Standard Modern English is my own and is presented to aid a rapid introduction to the text. For experienced scholars of the prevailing grammar and wordage of the Early Modern Period this will not be required. It has been included as an aid to understanding and not as a substitute for the examination of the original text. Any renderings into colloquial modern language by other than myself have the translator’s name attached.

King James VI of Scotland who became James I in 1603 is referred to throughout as King James I rather than James VI & I. I have not followed the convention that a monarch who was the first of that name does not require the use of “I” in describing them.

Abbreviations used in this thesis:

CSP Calendar of State Papers
APC Acts of the Privy Council
CPH Papers of Robert Cecil at Hatfield
MD Miscellaneous Documents, borough records at the Birthplace Library, 16 vols.
SBTRO Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Roll/Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office
SPD State Papers Domestic
PRO Public Records Office, Kew
City City of London

Weights used during the Early Modern Period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tod</td>
<td>28 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>14 pounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross Referencing and Notations

Referencing in this thesis is in the “Chicago” style as defined in Microsoft Word 8. This word processing programme takes data through pre-determined entry categories and then produces these in the text as footnotes formatted in line with programme. At a mouse click, in theory, the presentation style can be changed without the need to manually reformat each footnote or reference. However, during the process of preparing this thesis a number of minor bugs have become apparent and while the software will eventually be an undoubted time saver it is not (as yet) perfected.

In the footnotes one manual change I have made is where a work is repeatedly referenced. I have avoided using “supra” and have instead have included a short abbreviated title for the original work. These are typically one to three words in length. I have done this as some of the chapters are long and often the same writer has various works referenced. For ease of reading these shortened titles have been introduced. If a particular work has not been referenced in full for some time in the thesis I have (in a few cases) repeated the full reference.

Cross References are shown in footnotes by the letters x ref. Unless otherwise noted, these refer to page numbers in the thesis. Occasionally they reference footnote numbers – these are marked x ref. footnote. If you are reading this thesis as a Word DOCX file on a computer then clicking on the number after x ref. will immediately take you to the first page of the chapter or section which contains the cross referenced material.

The Economist Style Book has been used concerning questions of grammatical style, usage and presentation in connection with financial analysis and data in this thesis.

Tables, Figures, Diagrams and Pictures are, for ease of reference, numbered sequentially throughout and are all labelled “Table”. Unless otherwise indicated, all numerical tables are my own using data drawn from the text or materials listed in the bibliography.

---

INTRODUCTION

Everyone lives by selling something, whatever be his right to it.
Robert Louis Stevenson, 1892

Over thirty years ago I trained as a corporate banker. Banks lend money, and at the heart of the lending process is the Credit Analysis, a document summarizing a borrower’s creditworthiness. At its core there is a numerical analysis that addresses the question “where does the cash come from to keep the company in business?” Two key terms describe the movement of money – “cash flow” and “liquidity”. As blood flow is to the body so cash flow is to commerce.

In Renaissance Florence, what truly made Lorenzo “the Magnificent” was not traditional reasons such as prowess in battle. It was money. The Medici were bankers. All great artists of the period were businessmen, running commercial enterprises with employees, cash flow, clients etc. A very few, such as Michelangelo and William Shakespeare, were financially successful and acquired big houses, titles and luxury.

This thesis explores the proposition that to better understand William Shakespeare in his social and creative contexts, one has to understand both his and his family’s money – where it came from and where it went. That the young John Shakespeare arrived penniless in Stratford and that his son William died rich, of gentlemanly status and respected is in no doubt. Equally, the London theatres thrived throughout the Early Modern Period despite a remarkably large number of compulsory closures. But what happened to make these financial results come about has not, as yet, been adequately examined.

The Shakespeare myth is that John initially did well in business then lost all his money. At this point, William went to London, wrote plays and later made a number of

---

investments in Stratford after he “got rich”⁷ Among the various errors in this story there is one that stands out - the “getting rich” part. It is not simply the fact that William made the investments - his house New Place, land, tithes etc. - all of these are documented - it is when he made them that is significant. The bulk of the family investments were made before William became part owner (housekeeper) of the Globe and later the much more profitable Blackfriars theatres. Nor does the notion that he simply borrowed the money make sense, as the compounding effect of interest would have simply made matters worse.⁸

This thesis questions the current economic understanding of the Shakespeare family from 1530 to 1616, as well as investigating the financing of Bankside and its theatres from 1590 to 1610. William Ingram, writing in 1993, said of lawsuits that they were “those best kinds of documents for the theatre historian”⁹ and that has certainly proved the case here.

The conclusions challenge many notions of where the money came from in William Shakespeare’s life and add to the understanding of the commercial and legal experiences of both father and son that William reflected in his work.

Despite its overuse, the observation of Bernard of Chartres¹⁰ that “we are like dwarfs on the shoulders of giants” remains valid. If my own efforts to establish the Shakespeares’ sources of funds are successful, then much of the credit will lie with the scholarly giants who have each pursued individual aspects of the Shakespeares’ lives and works, together with those of the Early Modern Theatre in London. Many of these researchers worked for literally decades, often in obscurity, on some small aspect of Shakespeare’s life or the London of his day. I salute them and their efforts.

**Quotations**

One technique occasionally used by scholars is to take a quotation from a literary work and then try to use this as a tool to hypothesize whether this had some special

---

⁷ x ref.153  
⁸ x ref.94  
¹⁰ Attributed to Bernard of Chartres see John of Salisbury, *The Metalogicon* (of 1159), trans. Daniel Mc Garry (Peter Smith Pub. Inc.,1985). Later Isaac Newton paraphrased it when he modestly wrote in a letter to Robert Hooke that “…if I have seen further it is by standing on the shoulders of giants”.
significance to the author’s own life. This thesis contains over sixty quotations from Shakespeare’s plays but the goal in including these was not to justify the arguments advanced in the work but rather the reverse - the quotations fall almost naturally out of the facts or circumstances being presented at that point in the text. If the quotations support anything at all it is the contention that “Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare”. Some of his most telling observations of the human condition reflect events that this thesis shows he was a part of, or which involve characters we verifiably know he interacted with. The proposals advanced in this thesis do not stand or fall based on material found in Shakespeare’s plays. On the contrary, William’s proven experiences in Stratford and London are the stuff from which the plays are made. Literary references in the thesis from other writers and scholars are used to summarize the spirit of the chapter or section that follows, and it often happens that these are paired with a quotation from Shakespeare’s dramatic work because together, they are the most apposite observations encountered during the course of this research.

The Middle Course

One other technique in drawing attention to an author’s work on Shakespeare has been the “exaggerated claim”. Based on a personal preference an author will endow a reference or series of quotations from Shakespeare’s plays with a significance that goes beyond rational observation. For example, The Times of London in 2000 carried a report that an Italian scholar had proposed that Shakespeare’s “real” name was Michelangelo Florio Crollalanza who had been born in Messina. Additionally in 2005 Clair Asquith published a book in which she proposed that Shakespeare: 1) was a secret practicing Roman Catholic, 2) trained at Oxford, 3) (perhaps) attended an English seminary abroad and 4) spent his career in embedding coded Catholic messages in his plays. Yet these two instances are mild compared to suggestions to be found in the more extreme recesses of the internet – for example, that Shakespeare was an extra-terrestrial.

---

11 Martino Iuvara, a retired teacher claimed William Shakespeare was born Michelangelo Florio Crollalanza who fled to England during the Inquisition. “Shakespeare” is a literal translation of “Crollalanza.” Reported by Richard Owen, “Shakespeare and Italy,” The Times, 8 April 2000. See also in Desmond O’Connor, “Florio, John,” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford, 2004). Here O’Connor refers to an “Italian Shakespeare” as the work of “the occasional dilettante researcher” before pointing out that if Shakespeare were “…Italian born, he should surely have known that Milan and Padua were not by the sea, as The Tempest and The Taming of the Shrew would have it”.

This thesis is not built on these types of proposals. In essence, it is an analysis of already proven material but ordered into a commercially credible explanation of the finances of the Shakespeare family. Further, in analyzing their financial history, new explanations of “problems” which have long been the cause for scholarly debate are revealed. The proposition here is not that we do not have enough information to answer certain questions, but that by arranging and understanding the legal and commercial realities applying to both the Shakespeare family and the Early Modern Theatre, a new appreciation of the playwright’s professional life could emerge.

Fiscal Historicism?

The “New Historicists”\(^{13}\) were unhappy with the exclusion of social and political circumstances from literary analyses. One prominent member of their group, Stephen Orgel, commented

…The playwright in the Renaissance theater was an employee of the Company, who wrote to order and was paid for piecework. Shakespeare may seem to be an exception, in the sense that he was, almost uniquely, his own boss, an actor and shareholder in the company as well as its leading playwright but this probably only means that he was in on more parts of the collaboration than other playwrights were.\(^{14}\)

The master of the New Historicists, Stephen Greenblatt, in advancing his theories and insights, defaults to the language of finance, when stating his view that the “work” of art is

…the product of negotiation between a creator or class of creators, equipped with a complex, communally shared repertoire of conventions, and the institutions and practice of society. In order to achieve the negotiation, artists need to create a currency that is valid for a meaningful, mutually profitable exchange.\(^{15}\)

Even when he considered the notion of “theatre” versus “book” in terms of Shakespeare’s artistic legacy, the terminology remained commercial

\(^{13}\) New Historicism is a school of literary theory that aims to understand literary works through their historical contexts. It developed in the 1980s, chiefly through the work of the American critic Stephen Greenblatt.


During Shakespeare's lifetime, the King's Men showed no interest in and may have actually resisted the publication of a one-volume collection of their famous playwright's work; the circulation of such a book was not in the interests of their company. But other collective enterprises, including the educational system in which this study is implicated, have focused more on the text than on the playhouse….

For if Shakespeare himself imagined Prospero's island as the great Globe Theater, succeeding generations found that island more compactly and portably figured in the bound volume. The passage from the stage to the book signals a larger shift from the joint-stock company, with its primary interest in protecting the common property, to the modern corporation, with its primary interest in the expansion and profitable exploitation of a network of relations. Unlike the Globe, which is tied to a particular place and time and community, unlike even the travelling theater company, with its constraints of personnel and stage properties and playing space, the book is supremely portable.  

While agreeing with Orgel and Greenblatt on using commercial language as a metaphor for artistic exchange I would add a third criterion to their “social” and “political” mantra, that is the truly “fiscal” - the analysis of how the theatre itself actually survived financially and how it fitted into the macroeconomic machinery of Early Modern London.

Jan Veenstra, writing in 1995 in an article that appears part critical, part supportive, of New Historicism, made the observation that

…Since Greenblatt explores this market [Early Modern Drama] basically through the examination of symbolic goods (texts that have to be interpreted) instead of material goods, the social energy he tries to articulate exists only in and as his interpretation and not as a verifiable historical "object."  

Veenstra also called on an earlier essay of Edward Pechter - a piece of work most definitely critical of Greenblatt. In a footnote, Veenstra noted

[Footnote] 58. Pechter draws attention to the fact that New Historicists, contrary to what they claim, are not very interested in the particulars of socioeconomic history. In his book on Shakespeare, for instance, Greenblatt does not make use of the available sources that can inform us about the actual staging of the plays. He does not go into the details of the ways in which theater companies acquired props, costumes, actors,

16 Ibid. p. 252 in “Martial Law in the Land of Cockaigne”
stories, and so on, though these particulars would certainly reveal interesting patterns of negotiation and exchange.\textsuperscript{19}

This thesis can be seen as addressing Veenstra’s concern – it is very much about the analysis of “the details of the ways in which theater companies acquired props, costumes, actors, stories” and it can certainly be said the intention is to “reveal interesting patterns of negotiation and exchange”, with the negotiations and exchanges being “real” i.e. showing how actual cash changed hands.

Admission charges alone, as we will see, could never explain how anyone, Shakespeare included, could have made a “theatrical fortune” - yet fortunes were made by those associated with the theatres of the time.

Greenblatt in \textit{Hamlet in Purgatory} defined his quest in that book thus

\[
\ldots \text{I believe that nothing comes of nothing, even in Shakespeare. I wanted to know where he got the matter he was working with and what he did with that matter...}\]

\textsuperscript{20}

I too believe in \textit{ex nihilo nihil fit}\textsuperscript{21} or as William had Lear put it “…nothing can come of nothing”\textsuperscript{22}. What I sought with this thesis can be summarized as

Nothing can come of nothing. I wanted to know how the Shakespeares got rich and how William’s life, working practices and personal circumstances were shaped by the business of getting and keeping those riches.

\textsuperscript{19} Veenstra, \textit{New Historicism} p.198
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{King Lear} I, i
The Structure of this Thesis

So children temporal fathers do appease…

*Cymbeline* V, v

This thesis rests on the premise that by bringing together facts from normally disparate areas of study - law, social and economic history, financial analysis and the records of theatrical performance in Early Modern England - a better understanding of how John and William Shakespeare succeeded both in business and in the theatre will be achieved. The disadvantage of this approach is that the reader may not have knowledge of some of these specialities. If this is the case, to assist in a better understanding of the thesis and its arguments, a number of papers which summarize background information, are appended to this thesis.

Three of these - Law, Money and the Wool and Cloth industries\(^{24}\) - were prepared as I could not find this type of condensed data required in other published work.

These are recommended to those not expert in

- the legal history of the Renaissance (specifically including the codification of English Common Law and the court system of the Early Modern Period),
- the origins and nature of banking in England and basic monetary theory,
- the wool business of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries including its importance in the overall English economy.

Throughout the thesis frequent reference is made to certain key Shakespeare family documents. For those readers not acquainted with the spelling and prose style of the age, I have added my own transliterations with explanatory footnotes where these assist understanding. These are not intended as a substitute for examination of the original documents as specified in the bibliography. However, they should assist in orienting the reader to the subjects under discussion.

*Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-Upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620* \(^{25}\) is a monumental work, the result of the sifting of the Borough’s records

---

\(^{23}\) The position of this quotation varies between various “complete” works.

\(^{24}\) *x ref.399*
by Richard Savage, to which Edgar Fripp wrote explanatory introductions. As far as I can determine, there was no previous attempt to condense the long introductions to an easily comprehensible form. Accordingly I have undertaken this task in The Abridged Introductions of Edgar I. Fripp to the Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620 as Originally Transcribed by Richard Savage.\textsuperscript{26} This is a digest of Fripp’s introductions with particular reference to items concerning the Shakespeare family.

The Body of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into three parts: the first, Chapters 1 and 2, reviews the work of scholars who have written on both Shakespeares, before analyzing the potential earnings of the Shakespeares from the London theatre. It goes beyond previous analyses in terms of appraising theatrical earnings and presents a provisional personal financial statement of William for the years 1597 to 1616.

The second part, Chapters 3, 4 and 5 examine the economic realities of both Stratford and London, as these would have impinged on the father and son. In John’s case - where there are many records of his life - it seeks to correct misinformation concerning both his civic and business careers. In William’s, the personal data is comparatively modest, but by analyzing the commercial environment in which he succeeded, most importantly the business biographies of representative figures within the theatrical milieu, it has been possible to create a picture of his London activities. As a result of this it has been possible to address and discard many of the fables surrounding his stay in London. However, where direct examination of William’s financial affairs has been possible - by examining the legal documents relating to his various investments or litigation in which he was involved - this has also contributed to the new, commercially realistic, picture of both the man and his career.

The third section, Chapters 6 and 7, scrutinize the Shakespeare family investments in detail before delivering the conclusion to all the foregoing research.

\textsuperscript{25} Richard Savage, Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-Upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620, V vols. (Oxford: Oxford University for the Dugdale Society, 1921). A more detailed note concerning the publication of these volumes can be found at \textit{x ref.311}

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{x ref.311}
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Chapter 1 - AN IMPERTINENT QUESTION

...Ask an impertinent question and you're on your way to a pertinent answer...
Jacob Bronowski, 1973

...we mostly go about our business as if the contrary of what we profess to believe were the truth; somehow, from somewhere, a privilege, an authority descends upon our researches; and as long as we do things as they have generally been done – so long, that is, as the institution which guarantees our studies upholds the fictions that give them value – we shall continue to write historical narrative as if it were altogether different matter from making fictions or, a fortiori, from telling lies...
Frank Kermode, 1979

The impertinent question asked in this thesis is “where did the Shakespeare family money come from?” The steady stream of investments made in houses, land, titles, tithes etc. evidenced the availability of cash from the mid-1590’s onwards. However, no example of any systematic investigation into the sources of their wealth exists. Of John Shakespeare, the poet’s father, there are only two recent articles and though mentioned frequently in his son’s biographies there is no modern examination of his life or financial circumstances.

Certain trends or indicators concerning the most successful Shakespeare family researchers can be observed.

It appears that those who attempt to form conclusions based on evidence from original (primary) sources generally enjoy better results than those who limit themselves to secondary (derivative) opinions. Edmond Malone, James Halliwell-Phillipps and Edgar Fripp are in this “primary” category. All three derived much of their work from the examination of material in Stratford. A similar, though narrower, approach came

---

31 There are two commonly used spellings of Malone’s first name. To avoid confusion I have followed Peter Martin, “Malone, Edmond,” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: OUP). His father was “Edmund”.

from Samuel Schoenbaum in his two valuable examinations of the actual original documents themselves – his *William Shakespeare A Documentary Life*³² and *William Shakespeare - Records and Images*.

It is also noteworthy that Malone, Fripp and Schoenbaum established working relationships with individuals based in Stratford (James Davenport, Richard Savage and Robert Bearman) who had both close physical proximity to as well as an intimate knowledge of primary material. Following their example, I must acknowledge the assistance of Mairi Macdonald³³ of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust who, like Savage, Davenport and Bearman provided advice and suggestions of relevant documentary material used in the preparation of this thesis. Of particular value was her observation, after a lifetime career as a curator of Shakespeare related documentation, that the playwright was almost certainly involved in the commercial life of London outside of the theatre. At the time (2008) she expressed no idea about how this could possibly be demonstrated but remained firm in her conviction that this was the case. I hope she approves of my efforts in this regard.

The term “evidence”, with its legalistic basis, renders it unsurprising how many researchers are and were trained or practised as lawyers or had an interest in the law. Malone was a practising barrister - though his legal career was relatively short. Halliwell-Phillipps was admitted to the bar and writers such as J.M. Robertson studied the law in some depth. One observation is that the legally trained handle what constitutes evidence in a more systematic fashion than others, and though it may be unconscious on their part, they tend to present a more factual approach as if the material were actually being presented in court. The advantage of this lies in their greater focus on fact as the basis for their writing. With my own legal training I have consciously tried to follow this approach.

In the “further reading” section which surveys the literary sources used to support this thesis³⁴, careful reference has been made to the financial underpinnings for each group

---

³⁴ x ref. 311
of researchers. To assert that any researcher is oblivious to or has such high intellectual standards that they are immune from orientating their work towards their financial patrons - be they the buyers of books, educational institutions and foundations etc. - is, in my judgement, naïve. This is not to say that results are expressly fabricated, despite such causes célèbres as J. Payne Collier in the mid-nineteenth century and William Henry Ireland fifty years earlier.\textsuperscript{35} However, it is only a brave, foolhardy or independently wealthy individual who is truly divorced from thinking of where his next meal is coming from. Financial considerations are one potential temptation - academic fashion, that is to say the desire to accede to what whatever social or political movement or public concern is prevalent at the time of writing, is quite another. One commentator in 2007 observed that if a researcher wished to obtain funding for an academic project on “red squirrels in Sussex” then linking it to the highly fashionable interest in “climate change” was advisable.\textsuperscript{36} These influences matter because in evaluating each piece of work, the mindset and background of each researcher has to be recognized as shaping how the material under their review was presented.

Placing this Thesis, Placing this Research

Susan Cerasano in 2009 when describing “Theatrical Economics”\textsuperscript{37} in Early Modern England considered that

...developments within socio-economic history have sharpened our perceptions of theater as a business that was fully integrated into the economic climate of the time...not least of all in the shift in scholarly inquiry, away from obvious theatrical sources – particularly play texts – and towards manuscript sources that reveal more about the lives of playhouse owners and suggest many new contours for investigation... \textsuperscript{38}

This thesis fits squarely into this notion of exploring the socio-economic “contours” based on manuscript and other sources. However, whereas other recent attempts (such as those of Andrew Gurr\textsuperscript{39} and Melissa Aaron) have been pursued by scholars to whom financial and legal analysis represents, for the most part, new intellectual territory, this


\textsuperscript{36} Nigel Calder, \textit{The Great Global Warming Swindle}, television documentary film, directed by Martin Durkin, 2007. This is quoted here merely for illustration and not as an endorsement of Calder’s work or the accuracy of his assertions.


\textsuperscript{38} Ibid. p.380.

thesis has been formed with the accumulated knowledge of two decades of financial analysis and business experience, coupled to earlier formal training in both law and accounting.

Cerasano bravely forges ahead in her review with sub-chapters dedicated to “Trade, Commerce, Economics” and “Merchants, Merchandizing and Consumers.” These are highly relevant, but they represent areas where practical experience and specialist knowledge would have proved beneficial. Such observations as “…difficulties would seem to make it almost impossible to discuss the economics of the Early Modern Theatre [and by inference those who gained their fortunes through its operation] in any coherent manner…” could have been avoided with greater experience in these fields.

The methodology of this thesis was to build on both historical and on-going research and move towards achieving a credible and coherent picture based on facts drawn from, and supported by, primary material evidence - both explicit and circumstantial - which supports the case to be presented to the court of current scholarship.

The objective has been to prepare work free from as many of the political, faith or career biases that could have affected the thesis, to present conclusions based on sound financial footings. I hold that a multi-disciplinary approach to this problem, using specialist knowledge, has provided new solutions. If one were to attempt to encapsulate this initial point of departure, the term “fiscal historicism” might be applied or, put differently; it is an application of “Tanstafl.”

Tanstafl is an American term made up loosely from the initial letters of – “there ain’t no such thing as a free lunch” – meaning nothing is ever free, that everything is paid for in one way or another. This remains the doctrine behind this thesis, and scholarly detachment demanded that it was recognized as a potential bias that could lead away from a comprehensive consideration of writing on the subject. Accordingly, I have striven to maintain a “catholic” attitude in the range of materials that have been

---


41 i.e. meaning universal or all encompassing from the Greek καθολικός (katholikos).
reviewed and considered all of these in reaching my final conclusions. This thesis was intended to advance the understanding of how the Shakespeares made their money, while also providing an enhanced recognition of the fiscal limitations and economic realities of the Early Modern Theatre in England.

In the last few years, respected members of the academic community including Stephen Greenblatt, Jonathan Bate, James Shapiro, and René Weiss, have written biographies of Shakespeare. Television journalists and professional writers such as Michael Wood, Charles Nicholl and Peter Ackroyd have also been conspicuous in book production. While all of this has unquestionably given pleasure to many readers, its limitation is that there has been very little genuinely new material (i.e. factually based) or new approaches introduced into the study of the Shakespeare family or their close commercial environment.

However, there exist two other significant pools of documented information

- Financial - what the Shakespeare family invested in and,
- Legal - who and when the family sued or were sued by, together with the civic and tax records of both Stratford-upon-Avon and London.

Both are sources of data that have attracted sporadic attention.

As to the importance of money, E. K. Chambers writing in 1910 made, in my estimation, the wholly correct observation that

…The whole existence of plays in London depended on Elizabeth's economical desire to have companies for court entertainments without paying for their upkeep…

He then continued

…And in fact there can be little doubt that the expenses of the theatre were met out of the profits of the public performances...

---

Where Chambers’ view is more open to debate, remains with his implicit suggestion that ticket sales, with a sliver of Royal patronage at Christmas, could have rendered the theatres fully financially attractive to entrepreneurs and players alike. To put it another way – could seat revenue and court performance alone have attracted and held the attention of those in search of “much moneys”? ⁴⁵

The reviews of the cash streams generated by, and necessary for, the creation of the wealthy practitioners of the Early Modern Theatre such as Alleyn and Shakespeare have seen only modest investigation by those from the accounting, finance and legal professions. Indeed, even recent works such as Aaron’s Global Economics ⁴⁶ are, from a financial analysis standpoint, only an introduction to the problem. Their analytical style seems focused on “guesstimating” an average day’s takings for a theatre, and multiplying this by a probable range of average playing days to arrive at a number that in a real world setting is almost meaningless, ignoring as it does such factors as the value of money over time ⁴⁷ and the compounding effects of interest.

Collectively, all the literature previously listed, together with all the additional material in the bibliography, did not contain a credible answer to the simple question of “where did the Shakespeare family money come from?” Certainly it formed a platform for an analysis to begin - despite having the facts clouded by four hundred years of myth - and it would be churlish not to acknowledge that without the efforts of many of the authors listed in the attached bibliography the task would have been truly insurmountable.

George Steevens, an early promoter of the literary career of Edmond Malone, wrote

…All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning Shakespeare, is – that he was born at Stratford-upon-Avon, -- married and had children there, -- went to London, where he commenced actor, and wrote poems and plays, -- returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried, -- I must confess my readiness to combat every unfounded supposition respecting the particular occurrences of his life…. ⁴⁸

And here lies the reason why a full examination across all the history of research into the Shakespeare family is necessary. Such facts as exist have often been so obscured by

---

⁴⁵ Merchant of Venice I, iii
⁴⁶ Aaron, Global Economics See pages 54-55 and 66 as examples this.
⁴⁷ A concept explored later in this Chapter.
statements, fashionable and conjectural in their own respective period, that the actual ‘fact’ is partially or totally lost.

Progress can come about in two ways
- either by the rediscovery of verifiable facts through data contained in original records or,
- through a multi-disciplinary approach drawing the various factual lines of past and present research together – eliminating the speculative and focusing on the financially factual.

Both approaches have been used in the preparation of this thesis.

The Benefit and Challenge of a Multi-Disciplinary Approach

The potential benefit of using analysis techniques from two disciplines (in this case law and finance) outside the study of the Early Modern Theatre is that a different set of links can be observed. These links can aid the analysis of Shakespeare’s professional career and indeed provide new, credible answers to many long-standing questions.

Law

One piece of litigation that appears prominently in the thesis involves a legal technique used to harass an adversary by claiming that someone had threatened the complainant’s physical person. This put in motion a legal process that tied an adversary up in legal expense and inconvenience. William Shakespeare was named in just such a writ in 1596 along with theatrical impresario Francis Langley and others. The case was rediscovered in 1931 and has caused debate as to its possible importance, or indeed lack of any importance whatsoever. But if the legal structure of the period is carefully examined and the use of this type of litigation investigated, then by looking at other users of the technique, the commercial relationships between the parties can become clearer. In this case the technique had been previously employed by Langley against his own adversary only a month before. In other words, this was a retaliatory suit.

Equally interesting was the same technique’s use by John Shakespeare on an entirely different occasion. Then it was against the Bailiff and three other prominent members of the Stratford community. John Shakespeare initiated his case at the London (Court of Exchequer) level, undoubtedly incurring heavy legal costs\textsuperscript{50} at a time when many consider him to have been poverty-stricken.

By understanding how the law worked, who used it and when they employed it we can observe in the first case that Langley and Shakespeare were somehow linked at a significant business level – i.e. pursuing Shakespeare (named first in the suit) was a means of financially inconveniencing Langley.

Other questions flow from studying this technique - in the second situation, how did John Shakespeare pay for such an expensive piece of litigation? Does it not indicate that at the time of the litigation he was far from being a humble glover or a mere bankrupt?

These questions are answered in this thesis. The point I wish to make here is that by looking at the law in its commercial application, we learn the likely pattern of behaviour and the financial situation of the parties under examination.

Finance

An example of using modern financial techniques to aid research came in the analysis of why William Shakespeare bought the Blackfriars Gatehouse (the only London property he ever owned) in 1613. By 1613 he had effectively left London and was in retirement, so why buy a city house at this time in his life? Various theories have been advanced, but it has been through a detailed understanding of modern property markets and the financing of buildings, together with an investigation of the commercial environment surrounding the London theatres of the Early Modern Period that a new and satisfactory explanation of events has been uncovered.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{50} For a summary of the convoluted process and the amount of legal drafting involved see http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/records/research-guides/chancery-equity-from-1558.htm. Given that lawyers and judges were amongst the wealthiest members of society at this time the process - even in a straightforward proceeding - cannot have been anything but expensive.\textsuperscript{x ref.409}

\textsuperscript{51} x ref.272
The Challenge

One inherent danger in any cross-disciplinary approach is the temptation for a researcher to select only facts that support their “new” view of a historical situation or person. Moreover, this temptation can be exacerbated by consciously (or unconsciously) using technical jargon from one discipline to confuse scholars from another one. This is especially the case with the life and work of the Shakespeares, where wish-driven fantasies have been woven round the gaps in the historical records of both father and son.

I have aimed to avoid this by

1. Basing this thesis on fact – evidence found in primary documentation, or, where this is unavailable, from secondary sources with the highest academic reputation.
2. Ensuring that when technical terminology from a discipline outside theatrical research has been necessary, I have provided a definition of the term either in a footnote or in the glossary, as well as summarizing the underlying concept.
3. Using simple, non-technical language in considering legal and financial situations. In doing so I have aimed to emulate the literary style of The Economist and The Wall Street Journal. Both these publications excel in describing complex financial situations with a minimum amount of fuss. Their house styles ensure that key facts are explained to the non-technical reader before proceeding with the subject under consideration.
4. Tracing how certain theories in connection with the Shakespeares have evolved. In writing about Shakespeare, the law and finance, the various authors who are cited have been split into various stratified groups or believers in particular theories (see “Further Reading”). In doing so I am revealing the inner workings of how I have approached key questions. My hope is that including this will assist other scholars either seeking to replicate my conclusions (for replication is validation), or in taking the work into related fields.

---

52 See “Further Research” x ref.310
53 x ref.304
Investigating disciplines outside even Law, Finance and Theatre Studies to find different techniques to analyze my research. Principal among these has been Physics, where researchers have extrapolated data to produce working hypotheses which are then used to analyze problems, irrespective of whether the wider context is fully mapped or not. I refer to these approaches at various times in the thesis. The physicist’s approach might be summarized as, “if it works, use it”\textsuperscript{54} rather than “we haven’t found a document about this yet so let’s repeat the prevailing view till one turns up”. My goal was to connect well-established, documented facts and form these into credible solutions that answered long-standing questions about the Shakespeares and their financial success.

This is a thesis in search of knowledge through practical experience as well as the investigations of others. If the characters of John and William Shakespeare appear more or less attractive through its findings, then that is simply how the facts presented themselves to me.

When Leonardo da Vinci came to write his own treatise on painting he presented conclusions that, in part, ran contrary to certain long-held views. But he pressed on, recording that

…many will believe that they can reasonably reproach me, alleging that my proofs go against the authority of those men held in greatest reverence … [but] to distinguish the true from the false… enable[s]… men to strive towards what is possible with more discrimination…guesswork remains destroyed in eternal silence…\textsuperscript{55}

It is up to you, the reader, to weigh the evidence.

\textsuperscript{54} See x ref.\textsuperscript{105}

Chapter 2 – MONEY AND PERFORMANCE

...Some players, Tarlton and Robert Wilson among the earliest, even went home and wrote playscripts...the moral is that the offstage player cannot be ignored in considering the economics of the onstage player...*homo economicus*...was not a minor or negligible role played...by him and his fellows...

William Ingram, 1992

This chapter grapples with two questions. The first is a general one - could anyone have made a fortune solely from participating in the legitimate business of the Early Modern Theatre, the second is specific - did William Shakespeare’s participation in the theatre alone supply the wealth that he and his extended family enjoyed? To examine these, it proved necessary to compute just how much revenue was generated through performances by a successful company of players and, to quantify what other ancillary sources of legitimate (i.e. legal) income were available to them during the reigns of Elizabeth I and the early years of James I. Having examined the “gross” income of the industry, what follows is an analysis of Shakespeare’s personal (theatrical) income and his family’s expenditures.

“Patronage” or “touring” or other “intangibles” could be used as catch-alls to avoid an understanding of how the actual core “business” of playing was conducted and accordingly these are considered. But, as this chapter shows, there exists sufficient, albeit fragmented, factual evidence that these “intangibles” cannot explain the fortunes accumulated by a few of the theatre’s most successful luminaries.

THE LIMITATIONS OF CERTAIN APPROACHES TO THEATRE FINANCE

Aged six, I was deeply envious of the little girl who lived next door. Santa Claus had brought her a play shop complete with a foldout counter and wooden goods to stock the cardboard shelves. But the centrepiece was the cash register. Made of shiny red plastic it had real keys and if you pushed the levers down a bell rang. A yellow drawer popped out full of plastic coins that instantly made you feel rich. Though exciting for the first hour or so, the fun palled as, once you exchanged all your coins for the wooden pieces,

---

your only option was to change places and perform the whole game in reverse. It was a closed system. The amount of cash and goods you could buy was predetermined.

While much excellent research has been conducted on estimating the returns and financial viability of the Early Modern Theatre in England, I would propose that a realistic picture has remained elusive as many scholars seem wedded to the ‘red cash register’ or a simplistic ‘closed’ approach to finance. In the child’s game, the amount of money in circulation was confined to the actual currency in hand – the yellow plastic coins – but in the real world there is a host of factors that affect the constantly fluctuating availability of cash.

In trying to quantify the financial viability of the Early Modern Theatre in London – and therefore the potential earnings of William Shakespeare, various authors have approached the challenge by:

- estimating the average number of days available for playing and,
- multiplying the seating capacity by the likely admission charges before,
- deducting hypothetical expenses and concluding that,
- London players were, in financial terms, very successful.

Melissa Aaron, writing in 2005 and using this technique, asserted that

the evidence suggests that the Chamberlain’s Men were succeeding [such that]...within two and a half years, they made back the investment [construction costs] on the Globe.

This model assumes that the world and the people in it operate on the “red cash register” financial basis – i.e. without any reference to the time value of money.

---

57 In most cases selectively using the actual takings from the nearby Rose Theatre as a guide - per Henslowe’s diary.
(TVM).\textsuperscript{59} It assumes that the total amount of cash in circulation is static and that such factors as interest, inflation, outstanding indebtedness of borrowers etc. are unquantifiable or simply do not exist.\textsuperscript{60} Yet to achieve a more accurate assessment of the real financial success or otherwise of the business of the theatre these factors cannot be ignored. Before starting to tabulate figures, it is necessary to note three key issues that affected the fact of funding a theatre in the Early Modern Period

1. the nature of money,
2. the effect of money in an economy without banks,
3. the cost of money

The Physical and True Nature of Money\textsuperscript{61}

While coins of the period, by virtue of their metallic composition, were credited with a tangible value, i.e. goods and services could be had in exchange for the metal they contained, they also had another property in common with modern paper money. Both rely on the assumption that the other party will accept these tokens as units of exchange. As soon as economic activity - the exchange of good and services - outstripped the physical availability of precious metals, then credit or notional value was described in legal documents. A modern banknote is a legal document, a promissory note that states (in the case of English notes) “I promise to pay the bearer on demand the sum of…”. What truly matters for the bulk of money, even in the Early Modern Period, is the common agreement that worth is attributed to it. It has a velocity of exchange as it passes from hand to hand and the availability of cash fluctuates widely from day-to-day. Real people do not come to a project or a purchase in a static state – they possess funds or they may be in someone’s debt – and as they spend money, by cash or through

\textsuperscript{59} Time Value of Money (TVM): where money can be invested to produce a return then it is better to have money now rather than later – leading on from this the inverse is also true if one borrows money then interest is, over time, a reductive cost. See Glossary – though this may seem to be an obvious statement of fact, its financial implications are profound on the success of any long term project – especially projects involving long term financing such as property development. See http://www.investopedia.com/articles/03/082703.asp for a brief introduction to the concept.

\textsuperscript{60} Like TVM, the Quantitative Theory of Money – a concept referred to by Nicolas Copernicus (1473-1543) has attracted considerable attention over the centuries since. Most notably restated by economist Milton Friedman (1987), see “quantity theory of money”, The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics, v. 4, p.15. In essence it states that the volume of money (money supply) has a profound affect on the price of goods and services. See Glossary for further detail.

promises to repay, it changes hands based on a variety of perceptions while inflation erodes its relative buying power.

In the Early Modern Period just what constituted the true nature of money was still hotly debated.\textsuperscript{62} In particular, people disagreed about whether money should demand economic rent, i.e. interest, from those who borrow it, hence requiring them to repay more than the simple principal upon maturity.\textsuperscript{63} At one step removed, we have the root of Antonio’s dilemma in \textit{The Merchant of Venice}\textsuperscript{64} - that if one lent credibility to help someone borrow, should this ‘intangible’ promise merit something in return to the lender (Shylock) beyond mere goodwill? Should an individual expect some form of financial gain for taking a risk on another’s behalf? Additionally, was this charging of “interest” morally compatible with religious beliefs which sought an harmonious God-fearing society? But regardless of religious scruples, Early Modern business practices - especially a huge increase in trade - quickly spawned a full range of lending practices and methodologies, legal and illegal, to permit charging for perceived risk, i.e. the more “insufficient” the borrower, the higher the rate charged.\textsuperscript{65}

The Nature and Function of Banks

Twenty-first century perceptions are inevitably clouded by inventions such as banks where the owners (shareholders) have capped their fiscal exposure through legal devices (companies limited by shares) that deliver limited liability to their shareholders. Early Modern Theatre had no access to banks – the Bank of England was still a hundred years in the future at the time of the Globe’s construction.\textsuperscript{66} The concept and existence of “central” banks controlling liquidity at a national level did not emerge until more than

\begin{flushleft}
\parbox{\textwidth}{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{62} The modern definition is expressed as: Money A medium of exchange that functions as a unit of account, a store of value, and a means for deferred payment. Originally money enhanced economic development by enabling goods to be bought and sold without the need for barter. However, throughout history money has been beset by the problem of its debasement as a store of value as a result of inflation. Now that the supply of money is a monopoly of the state, most governments are committed in principle to stable prices. Dictionary of Finance and Banking. Ed Jonathan Law and John Smullen. Oxford University Press, 2008.

\textsuperscript{63} See: Francis Bacon, ”Of Usury,” in Essays (London: Penguin Classics, 1985). This is a brilliant, perceptive and for its time, wholly remarkable piece of insight and economic thought.

\textsuperscript{64} “Try what my credit can in Venice do…” \textit{The Merchant of Venice} Act I, i.

\textsuperscript{65} “then, let me see; the rate” — Shylock, \textit{The Merchant of Venice} Act I, i., vocalizes the rate setting process, the balancing of risk vs. return. In this case (disingenuously) as he has already decided that he wants his “pound of flesh” but the process articulated in the play considers: a) the amount, b) the maturity (six months) and c) the likely creditworthiness or sufficiency of the obligor to repay – the key components of any lending decision.

\end{flushleft}
two hundred years after that. Certainly moneylenders existed, individuals who lent their own cash. By 1600 the term “goldsmith” had become synonymous with “moneylender” as the goldsmiths, with their stock of precious metals, were early entrants to the money lending business. There were also middlemen functioning somewhat in the manner of banks, i.e. matching the “cash rich” lender with the “cash poor” borrower. However, the lack of regulation made this prime hunting territory for the unscrupulous.

The Cost of Money

Theatres cost money to build and even after construction they require working capital - cash for both moveable assets - costumes etc. as well as running costs such as wages. Focusing only on the costs of the building, and assuming that there was enough cash available to build it at no incremental cost (i.e. interest) can lead to erroneous conclusions about profitability and therefore the return on the investment.

Simply estimating gross income and then notionally applying this to a limited number of fixed costs only makes financial sense if the promoters of a venture were cash rich at the start. In the Early Modern period this means holding ample bags of coins on the first day of the project to finance both the construction and on-going working capital needs of the endeavour. In the case of the Theatre and the Globe we know this was not the case. By the time of the Globe’s construction the prime movers behind the project, Richard and Cuthbert Burbage, were downright short of cash. Their decision to take additional partners (housekeepers) proves this to be the case.

---

67 OED Goldsmith: “down to the 18th c. these tradesmen acted as bankers”
68 x ref. 209
69 “the first permanent playhouse in London, the Theatre…opened in 1576” The Concise Oxford Companion to the Theatre. Ed. Phyllis Hartnoll and Peter Found. Oxford University Press, 1996. Other venues were used prior to this date in the 1520s in Finsbury Fields, the almshouse at Rounceval in 1531, the Boar’s Head at Aldgate and the Red Lion built by James Burbage’s brother-in-law. Hartnoll and Found appear to have considered “The Theatre” as the first truly purpose built structure meeting their definition of a theatre as opposed to a mere playing space. See also P.24 W.R. Streitberger, “Adult Playing Companies to 1583,” in The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre, ed. Richard Dutton (Oxford: OUP, 2009).
70 Frank Kermode, The Age of Shakespeare (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004). p.50 – Kermode also lists the other pressing macro financial considerations of the time.
71 Schoenbaum, Documentary Life (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.152-3. Schoenbaum neatly summarizes the failed and costly attempt by Burbage to convert part of the dissolved Blackfriars monastery having laid out £600 “for the frater [conservatory] and at the cost of several hundred pounds more refurbished the structure for theatrical use…”, hence their liquidity problems.
Nor can it be assumed that cash was always available. Nowadays Governments print money that they underwrite with their implicit ability to raise taxes in the future. Nobody was printing money in 1600, and coins needed precious metals to back their value. Liquidity ebbed and flowed without the control mechanisms a banking system would later provide. This situation was made all the more volatile as a significant slice of England’s money came from piracy\(^{72}\) - an activity whose cash flows were impossible to predict. Inevitably, wide day-to-day fluctuations in the amount of cash available to be borrowed, at any price, occurred.

R.H. Tawney,\(^{73}\) supported by documented examples across the period of Elizabeth’s reign, wrote that\(^{74}\)

\[\text{...the circumstances of borrower and lender varied so enormously from one place to another, that it is impossible to say what was the market rate of mortgages, or indeed whether there was a market rate at all.} \]

In 1635 Cuthbert Burbage testified that James Burbage

\[\text{...The father of us, Cuthbert and Richard Burbage, was the first builder of playhouses and was himself in his younger years a player. The theatre he built with many hundred pounds taken up at interest. ...He built this house upon the leased ground, by which means the landlord and he had a great suit at law and by his death, the like troubles fell on us, his sons; we then thought of moving from there and at like expense built the Globe with more sums of money taken up at interest.} \]

But as Ingram observed,\(^{76}\) [Cuthbert] Burbage’s testimony was likely to be self-seeking as it was part of his efforts to prevent a broader shareholding of the King’s Men when some members petitioned the Lord Chamberlain to permit them to become housekeepers. Cuthbert’s “rhetoric of despair”\(^{77}\) was his attempt to show that the Burbage family “suffer continually.”\(^{78}\) The Lord Chamberlain ruled against him. Ingram wrote that at this point, “...The ghost of the unscrupulous James


\(^{74}\) see Glossary “Tawney’s Examples”.

\(^{75}\) I have part modernized the spelling and grammar. The original document is PRO LC/5/133 and is also referenced in: Carson, Henslowe’s Diary p.15, See also Schoenbaum, Documentary Life (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.104

\(^{76}\) William Ingram, The Business of Playing (Ithaca: Cornell). p.43

\(^{77}\) Ibid. p.43

\(^{78}\) Ibid. p.43
Burbage…must have groaned in Senecan anguish at this posthumous rapine of his estate…”

C.C. Stopes, always theatrical in her choice of words, imagined James Burbage’s plight in 1580 when faced with an order forcing a curtailment of playing

…poor Burbage, five months’ forced “unemployment” with his rent, the interest of his loans running on, his creditors clamouring, his company worrying him for advances, and his housekeeper asking him for daily bread…

Hyperbole aside, it seems virtually certain that James Burbage built the Theatre on leased land and constructed it, at least in part, with borrowed money.

FACTORS AFFECTING THEATRICAL EARNINGS

It is appropriate here to examine three issues that influenced a playing company’s earnings:

1. **Theatre Closures** - when were the theatres actually open for business?
2. **Alternative Sources of Revenue** - what were the alternative and complementary sources of cash available to a company of players?
3. **The Expenses of Playing** - their range, nature and magnitude.

---

79 Ibid. p.43
80 A plague order, i.e. a mandatory instruction governing behaviour during times of contagion.
83 OED: balance-sheet, a tabular statement of assets and liabilities, showing the character and amount of the balance.
I. Theatre Closures

The successful history of the Chamberlain’s/King’s Men at the first Globe is also a history of small disasters smothered. Peter Thomson, 1983

It is a great stroke of good fortune that in those formative years of the Elizabethan Drama, from 1582 to 1602 the theatres (except for the plague-years of 1592 and 1593) suffered little or no interruption from the plague. If the City had been as unhealthy in these years as it was from 1603 to 1610, the result might have been disastrous. F.P. Wilson, 1929

Theatres in Early Modern London could be closed for a number of reasons, state occasions, such as coronations, or religious observance (Sundays, Lent etc.) were regular prohibitions. But the longest interruptions were from plague and other epidemics.

Church and City Corporation were no supporters of plays and playing in Early Modern London. One line of argument ran that if the plague arrived it was no time to permit playing and if no plague was present then the sins of players and plays would bring divine retribution and a fresh infection.

- One sermon at Paul’s Cross in 1577 had preached “the cause of plagues is a sin, if you look to it well: and the cause of sin are plays: therefore the cause of plagues are plays.”
- On the third of May 1583 the Court of Aldermen wrote to Secretary Walsingham on the danger of “the assembly of people to plays, bearbaiting, sensors and profane spectacles at the Theatre and Curtain... great multitudes of the basest sort of people and many infected with the sores running on them.”

---

86 Ibid. p.122 – other epidemic diseases included 1612 & 1622 for “two severe agues” and “an epidemic of smallpox was rife in December 1621”. Ague “A malarial fever, marked by successive fits or paroxysms, consisting of a cold, hot, and sweating stage. The name ague was apparently at first given to the burning or feverish stage” OED.
87 Ibid. 52 from T. White, Sermons (1578).
89 Ibid. p.51
• The City wrote to the Privy Council in 1584: “…to play in plague time is to increase the plague by infection: to play out of plague time is to draw the plague by offendings of God upon occasion of such plays…”

• Perhaps recognizing that some compromise was needed, “in 1584 or 1585 the Queen's players favoured the suggestion that theatres should only be closed when the deaths from the plague in London rose to fifty a week.”

While the impact of the plague on when the theatres were open has been debated, there has consistently been a failure to quantify how non-performance would have been financially crippling. Closure meant no London revenue, apart from Court performances, and so all the cash invested in a theatre and its fittings automatically became a drain on the housekeepers’ (i.e. the owners’) purses.

Wilson summarized the working of plague orders, those mandatory instructions governing behaviour, during times of contagion. Theatres were ordered closed when the plague deaths reached thirty a week though this was later raised to forty. However there are examples of theatres being closed when deaths were below that number notably in May 1603 when the official death rate only reached nineteen before prompting action. Indeed it becomes clear that the mortality rate at which playing would cease changed from time to time and that the authorities did not always adhere to any particular number. J. Leeds Barroll wrote that

…It is impossible therefore to tell from the bills of mortality alone for how many weeks in the year the theatres were closed. The Privy Council... supported by the city rulers... sometimes refused to take the risk of permitting them to be open until some weeks after the mortality had fallen below that number...

Wilson’s statement in the introductory quotation to this section, stated that “if the City had been as unhealthy [1582 -1602] as it was from 1603 to 1610, the result might have

90 Ibid. p.51 reference to Malone Society collections I 173 circa 1584
92 Ibid. p.111 and one ex gratia payment from James I “on eight February James gave Richard Burbidge £30 by way of his Majesty's free gift for the release and maintenance of him and his company seeing that they were prevented from playing publicly in or near London owing to the plague”. The quotation by Wilson comes from P. Cunningham, Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court (London: Shakespeare Society, 1842). See also x ref.57
93 Ibid. p.54
94 Ibid. p.124
95 Bills of Mortality “…were weekly official returns of the number of deaths that, from 1592 onwards, were published by the London Company of Parish Clerks for 109 districts in and around London. Although these statistics are inaccurate, they are of value in indicating broad epidemiological [trends]” The Oxford Companion to Medicine. Stephen Lock et al. Oxford University Press 2001.
been disastrous” for the theatres was, in my judgement, quite correct. However, this slice of plague-free time hardly justified Aaron’s claim that the “Chamberlain’s men were succeeding” in this period, nor the potentially misleading “Within two and a half years, they made back the investment in the Globe”. 97 A more accurate assessment would have been that they were marginally viable, in financial terms, and that the extensive closures from March 1603 onwards must have all but pushed them financially under. 98 99

Part of the confusion arises from the debate about just how extensive theatre closures were in the first years of James I’s reign. Of all the commentators on plague theatre closings, three stand out. Wilson’s already referenced, The Plague in Shakespeare’s London (1927),100 Gurr in The Shakespearean Playing Companies (1996)101 and Barroll’s, Politics, Plague and Shakespeare’s Theatre (1991).102

Of the three, Barroll was the most aggressive in estimating the extent of the closures, though, for reasons he does not share with us, Gurr stated: “for all Barroll’s doubts, I think Wilson’s book still offers a reliable trawl of earlier studies.” However, in the table Gurr provides immediately after this observation103 there seems no discrepancy between the three sources when they are placed side by side - at least for 1603 to 1609 where there seems to be agreement which is not surprising as this was one of the unhealthiest periods, and consequently one of the richest in statistical sources. Barroll used the following four sources to compute plague statistics.104

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Covering Period</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Annual Bills of Mortality</td>
<td>1/1603 to 12/1603</td>
<td>Summarized weekly by Parrish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Weekly Bills of Mortality</td>
<td>7/1603 to 6/1604 &amp; 1606-1610</td>
<td>No complete collection of bills survives A few from 7/1604 to 12/1605 exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Miscellaneous Documents</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td>Diaries and Letters of the period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 London Remembrancer</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97 x ref.29
98 There is also the matter of the return of the Boys Companies playing at the Blackfriars who were extremely popular at this time - competition that is referred to in Hamlet - see x ref.272
99 James H. Forse, Art Imitates Business (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993). Forse makes an even more optimistic analysis of profitability see p.27 et seq.
102 Barroll, Politics
103 Gurr, Playing Companies p.91
104 Barroll, Politics p.218 et seq. which sets out in detail the limitations on available data especially Bills of Mortality.
John Bell, Clerk to the Company of Parish Clerks, wrote the *London Remembrancer*\(^\text{105}\) in 1665. This document summarized weekly bills of mortality. Barroll and Gerald Eades Bentley\(^\text{106}\) appear to have accepted its accuracy, as does Wilson with some minor reservations.\(^\text{107}\)

Barroll observed

> Since John Bell renders the full set of figures I have used his... I conclude that Bell's plague death statistics are as accurate transcriptions of the relevant London records for the Shakespeare years as his own human errors and copying might allow.\(^\text{108}\)

As Table 2 (below) shows, in the eighty-four months from January 1603 to December 1609 according to Barroll the theatres were open for only eighteen full months and eleven partial ones.\(^\text{109}\) Both Gurr and Wilson comment on a more restricted timescale up to 1605. For more than two thirds of the period the theatres were closed and revenue from London public playing ceased, but any outstanding loans would have kept

\(^{105}\) John Bell, *London Remembrancer or A true Accompt of every particular Weeks etc.* (London: Coates, 1665).


\(^{108}\) Barroll, *Politics* p.220

\(^{109}\) Partial months are given a given a half month’s value in Table 2
accruing interest. Even if we take these figures as merely indicative, they show the magnitude of the financial problem faced by theatres owners and players alike.

Table 2 - Months When Theatres Were Open in London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Barroll</th>
<th>Gurr</th>
<th>Wilson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Alternative Sources of Revenue

Researchers seeking to explain how the theatres in London were financially viable during the first decade of the seventeenth century have commented on various additional sources of revenue. The following four have direct links into playing and the creation of plays:

a) Touring
b) Patronage
c) Publishing
d) Court performance

The question under consideration in this section is - could these, singly or collectively, have supplied the amounts of cash required to balance the theatrical books during periods of compulsory closure?

Alternative Sources of Revenue – a) Touring

The frequently suggested alternative to playing in London was to play in the provinces – to go on tour. Barbara Palmer¹¹⁰ in 2005 painted a picture that

…In [the] entertainment economy, London’s role is central but not exclusive. Provincial touring clearly contributed to professional practices and to the maintenance of competitive professional standards. Great houses formed part of lucrative playing routes, which were travelled regularly on what look to have been predictable calendars. If the data and

---

analysis here are reliably representative, provincial audiences were sophisticated and proficient players were welcomed…

The provinces were therefore, according to Palmer, not cultural wastelands and there was significant cultural interaction and cultural mobility. She quoted Greenblatt

…The picture we have of people simply in their places, in cultures that weren’t in contact, is simply wrong.\(^{112}\)

Based on her REED\(^{113}\) work Palmer provided data showing the various payments made to touring companies in both towns and great houses. Even a cursory examination of these shows that while the amounts paid could have held off starvation for the players and their families, these set out a level of compensation that could never have led to fortunes ever being accumulated. Table 5 below\(^{114}\) shows typical levels of remuneration.

Moreover, with plague in London, if provincial touring companies were well established with seasonal touring routes and fixtures then, when London theatres closed and their premier companies went on tour, what did this do to the demand vs. supply balance on the touring circuit?

Barroll studied this question in detail with regard to Coventry

…In normal times Coventry accommodated the visits of some 6 to 9 provincial companies during the course of a year, but during this plague summer and fall of 1603 the number was augmented by visits from the three London companies -- Kings, as well as Nottingham's and Worcester's servants…\(^{115}\)

He continued that dates of entry into registers might not always accurately reflect dates of performance

\(^{111}\) Ibid. p.291

\(^{112}\) Ibid p.292.- The Greenblatt quote appears in Peter Monaghan, “Hot Type,” Chronicle of Higher Education, 18 October 2002, A18. This is an American publication in newspaper form, aimed at academics, the “Hot Type” column is a short newspaper article – one would have thought Palmer might have chosen a more direct first-hand quotation from Greenblatt given the onus being placed on this secondary one.

\(^{113}\) Records of Early English Drama (REED) - Centre for Research in Early English Drama - “REED is an international scholarly project that is establishing for the first time the broad context from which the great drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries grew”. See http://www.reed.utoronto.ca/index.html – Palmer’s contributions to REED include the compiling of the dramatic records of Derbyshire and the West Riding of Yorkshire as well as earlier work connected with Devon.

\(^{114}\) x ref.44

\(^{115}\) Barroll, Politics p.109
…in the Chamberlains and Wardens account book... all these companies cannot have played in Coventry between November 17 and November 27 so the entries must be retrospective and cumulative for the fiscal year... ١١٦

This touring alternative model also seems to be blind to the degree that those fleeing from a plague-infested London would be welcomed in the provinces. Wilson’s book contains numerous woodcut illustrations from pamphlets of the period showing those escaping the plague being cold-shouldered in the provinces for fear of contagion. ١١٧ The master or mistress of a great house may well have been more than a little irritated with a steward that reported favourably on a company of players who had unexpectedly arrived from plague-ridden London.

Table 3 - A Cool Reception ١١٨

Plague was by no means only a London phenomenon - Barroll wrote that

…Dramatic historians regularly assume that Jacobean acting companies in times of plague toured the provinces, but in many plague visitations, especially during this one of 1603, such travelling would have been more difficult than one might assume because the plague was not now confined to London. ١١٩

A Company fleeing London in search of lucrative playing venues could have seen their progress blocked by further plague outbreaks. For example, the tables were reversed in 1604 when the plague raged outside London, and the city, in contrast, became almost contagion-free for a time. As Wilson noted

١١٦ Ibid. p.106 and footnote.
١١٨ From the Huntington Library Copy of A Dialogue betwixt a Citizen, and a Poore Country-man and his wife, in the Country (1636). The figure on the right is holding his nose, presumably as a plague preventer.
١١٩ Barroll, Politics p.106
...[London] citizens with bitter memories of the treatment they had received in 1603, took pleasure in discouraging the approach of the “country Hobbinols”120

However, Wilson also provided some record of the venues the principal touring companies were able to perform at during the summer of 1603121

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King's Men</th>
<th>Worcester's Men (Later the Queen's Men)</th>
<th>Admiral's Men (Later the Prince's Men)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortlake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barroll repeated his concerns concerning the accuracy of records. Here he focused on those of Bath

... such records are more deceptive than is apparent from the statements of Chambers and of Schoenbaum... the records of the city of Bath are a pertinent case in point... of the three provincial documents tracing the King’s servants during 1603, this city offers the most specific information, but even this record is ambiguous...122

However, by 21 October 1603, Edward Alleyn’s wife, Joan, wrote to her husband that “all the companies be come home and well for ought we know.”123

Using 1600-1 an example, Palmer references the following data124

120 Ibid. p.116 – “Hobbinol - The name of a shepherd in Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar; hence, A countryman, rustic, boor”. OED
121 Ibid. p.111 – see footnote 1 - data attributed to J.T. Murray and also confirmed by Barroll.
122 Ibid. p.107 – uncharacteristically Barroll makes no specific reference to the exact passages of Chambers and Schoenbaum to which he refers.
124 Palmer, Mobility Palmer’s records cover several pages – this table is merely one of these and is presented as an example. The reader should examine the original article to confirm that the above figures are truly representative of her entire article. York to Londesborough is 21 miles.
### Table 5 - Touring Dates 1600-1601

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Patron</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/01/1600</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Lord Pembroke's Players</td>
<td>40s.</td>
<td>Common Hall next Monday afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/1/1600</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Pembroke's Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30/1/1600</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Wharton's Players /8</td>
<td>13s. 4d. s/d/s</td>
<td>3-4 Skipton neighbours &quot;came to see the play&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/1600</td>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Lord Pembroke's Players</td>
<td>5s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/1600</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Pembroke's Players</td>
<td>13s. 4d. s/d/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/1600</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Lord Sudder’s Men</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/1601</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Unnamed players</td>
<td>21s.4d.</td>
<td>Date account rendered: includes wine and sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1600</td>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Queen’s Players</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/1600</td>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Lord Thomas Howard's players</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&amp;8/12/1600</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Evers Players /12</td>
<td>d/s/b</td>
<td>Pantry account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&amp;8/12/1600</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Clinton’s Players /12</td>
<td>d/s/b</td>
<td>Pantry account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/1601</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Unnamed players /10</td>
<td>s/c/d</td>
<td>Pantry account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&amp;2/2/1601</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Wharton's Players /8</td>
<td>c/d/s</td>
<td>Pantry account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/4/1601</td>
<td>Londesborough</td>
<td>Lord Shrewsbury: Deshley the player and his co.</td>
<td>by 1619 Dudley was Dishley’s patron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/7/1602</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Queen’s Players</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>Common Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/1602</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Lord of Lincoln’s Players</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>&quot;which played not before my Lord maior&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in bold indicate the number of players in the Company – “Disley” is also spelt Dishley and Deshley depending on the source quoted see footnote.*

Drawing from the REED records for Coventry in 1603 the Chamberlain’s and Warden’s Account Book recorded the following payments to players:

---

125 Key for meals provided: s = supper, d = dinner, b = breakfast, c = undefined.
127 R.W. Ingram, *REED - Coventry* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981). p.366 from the Chamberlains and Wardens Account Book II x ref. O. A 7(b) N.B. I have modernized the spelling and converted the amounts from Roman numerals.
Table 6 - Payments to Players in Coventry 1603

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Payment In Shillings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Haywarde’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Players</td>
<td>40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Worcester’s Players</td>
<td>20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Dudleys Bearkeeper</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mounteagle’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s Players</td>
<td>10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord D’Arcy’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Derby’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Sussex’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Huntingdon’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Dudley’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Worcester’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Lincoln’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Chandos’s Players</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Nottingham’s Players</td>
<td>20s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing from the data in the above two tables, admittedly a very limited sample, the following are indicated

- The more provincial the company, and the less august their patron, the less pay – it can hardly be accidental that the Queen’s players get £3 (the highest single fee) while the lesser companies get a few shillings or merely their meals.

- Even £2 to £3 a night split among the sharers, hired men and boys (assuming a company of 10-12 players performed) is comparable to London (in terms of just the actors wages). However, the need to travel and shift playing locations suggests that across several weeks the probable returns could not match the regular London season in terms of income.

Susan Cerasano in 2009 wrote that Travelling players had very satisfactory careers. They earned a good living, were generally welcomed by spectators and patrons, were assured of a certain regularity of employment, and benefitted [sic] from a kind of financial freedom…so despite the fact that the characteristics shaping the success of the dominant acting companies …seem to be growing clearer with each successive generation of scholarship, it might well be the failed ventures – had we more knowledge of them – that would have much to

---

128 “Sharer - A member of a company of players, who paid the expenses, and received the profits, and employed the ‘journeymen’ members of the company” OED
teach us about the commercial environment of the public theatres in Shakespeare’s time.\textsuperscript{129}

There are two points here. First is the notion that a touring player could attain a measure of financial success. Though initially this may seem to be a rather naïve proposal - intuitively one knows that the highest potential earnings lay for a lucky few in London - yet it does stand some examination when the lot of the average hired man in a London playing company is set against an established touring player. Chambers quoted Gosson in 1579 who had stated an average compensation of 6s. a week. Chambers continued, “some of Henslowe’s agreements of 1579 provide for wages of 5s. 6s. and 8s.”\textsuperscript{131}

As Thomson noted “…a London artisan would earn 6 to 8 shillings for a seventy hour week (approximately £17 a year, if his health held).”\textsuperscript{132} In London then, wages were broadly equivalent for both player and artisan. The question is then, based on the REED figures, was it probable that a provincial player’s earnings could exceed an average of about 6s. per week.\textsuperscript{133}

Shapiro writing in 1994\textsuperscript{134} supported the work of Alan Somerset, calling his essay *How Chances It They Travel: Provincial Touring, Playing Places, and the King’s Men*  \textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{129}Throughout this thesis the terms “public” and “private” are used to describe theatres in Early Modern London. A full definition explaining these terms is supplied in the Glossary however, in essence, both the “First Blackfriars Playhouse” and “The Theatre” were established in 1576. The Blackfriars was the first to be called a “private” house, The Theatre was the first “public” one. The difference was not based upon anything the words “private” and “public” imply; both were “public” in the sense that any person could enter either after paying an admission fee. The term “private house” may have been to take advantage of a loophole in a 1574 Act of the Common Council, which, while seeking to restrict plays and acting, made an exception for “any plays…in the private house, dwelling or lodging of any nobleman, Citizen, or gentleman etc. . . – the foregoing an abbreviation of Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1964). p.130-132.


\textsuperscript{134}James Shapiro, “Recent Studies in Tudor and Stewart Drama,” *Studies in English Literature* (Rice University) 36, no. 2 (1996). Shapiro shows in this article the same enthusiasm for the speculative that would later be demonstrated in his book *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare:1599* (London: Faber & Faber, 2006).

“one of the most important essays published this past year, [it] overturns a number of myths about provincial touring.” In this article, Somerset had argued that the view of theatrical touring as a “sorry affair” with players being “poorly treated and forced into the countryside by the outbreak of plague in the metropolis” was inaccurate if not downright misleading.

A decade before, Bentley had asserted that there was

…no evidence that touring was ever very profitable... it was certainly uncomfortable in the mire and the rain… there is little evidence that the local authorities received the travellers with enthusiasm…

Somerset's position rested on the REED research and based on this he proposed that players were well received in the countryside.

As the REED data was assembled, Somerset, and later Palmer together with Cerasano, interpreted the records as suggesting that the more traditional view of writers such as Bentley was in error. However, when one takes a look at the actual figures paid to the performers, the physical distances between performances and the number of players involved then, the reality lies somewhere between these two camps. For 6s. a week per man in, for example, a ten man company, a company needed £150 p.a. gross – this is before other costs i.e. it is for wages alone. From even the single table prepared by Palmer a good payment might have been 30s. This calls for at least 100 performances a year - certainly well within the physical capacity of the players to stage.

But it is possible to identify in the 1603 to 1604 period even the King’s Men being paid less than this – as low as twenty shillings for a performance. However there remains the possibility of additional sources of compensation. In 2009 Peter Greenfield noted

…Since the players had other unrecorded sources of income in addition to amounts that appear in the civic and household accounts….the reward of [a] Lord might be supplemented by gifts from others who gathered there…

---

138 x ref.44
139 See http://link.library.utoronto.ca/reed/event.cfm?EventListID=1200 - part of REED.
He continued his analysis by investigating the nature of the “40s. the Queen’s men received at Coventry”. To his mind, this was a “mayor’s play”, i.e. 40s. would have represented the total compensation for that one play. However there may well have been – and there are some records suggesting this – subsequent performances that would or could have taken place where the audience were “presumably…charged at the door.”\textsuperscript{140}

Greenfield makes a reasonable point that there may well have been additional income, but this is conjectural. For the purposes of this thesis, I have used the generous thirty-shilling figure as an average, assuming there were other sources of cash.

But two questions remain -
How long did the players take travelling from venue to venue?
Were there enough great houses or towns to play?

Based on the above table\textsuperscript{141} anything 30 miles or more might need to be traversed to reach the next location. In some isolated houses there may well have been only a single performance as Barroll, somewhat at odds with Greenfield, pointed out in one particular case “Even if they lingered longer, they had earned only 30 shillings for the length of the stay.”\textsuperscript{142}

Reference has already been made to Alan Somerset’s workmanlike “How Chance it they travel: Provincial Touring, Playing Places and the King's Men.”\textsuperscript{143} In this he quoted from Marston’s \textit{Histriomastix},\textsuperscript{144} in particular from the song the mechanicals, the self-styled Sir Oliver Owlet’s Men, sing about the joys of touring

\begin{quote}
Besides that we travel, with pumps full of gravel,  
Made all of such running leather  
That once in a week new masters we seek
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{141} x ref.44


\textsuperscript{144} The exact authorship of the play remains under debate – Chambers in, \textit{The Elizabethan Stage}, 4 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1923). IV p.17 comments that Marston was merely reviewing an earlier play an opinion supported by George L. Geckle, \textit{John Marston's Drama: Themes, Images, Sources}, Rutherford, NJ, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1980; p.34. The full title is \textit{Histriomastix, or The Player Whipped} which foreshadows the anti-professional player tone of the piece. With its huge cast and themes I agree with Chambers that performance at one of the Inns of Court was the likeliest original venue.
And never can hold together…

Where Somerset stood on his firmest ground (based on REED) was in his analysis of the number of times players were welcomed – in sharp contrast to Bentley’s work of 1984. Bentley implied the performers were successful only about ten per cent of the time, Somerset estimated that they were welcomed on over ninety five per cent of occasions. One still has to question if every unsuccessful visit was chronicled as carefully - or indeed noted at all - as the successful ones.

J. R. Mulryne in 2007[145] building on the work of Somerset, Sally-Beth MacLean and Scott McMillin[146] produced a detailed analysis of the visits of professional players to Stratford between 1568 and 1597. Though generally supporting the themes of these other authors, he did point out the relative rarity of the visits even in the 1590s - “… the Queen’s Men came three times to Stratford in 1587, 1593 and 1594, the only professional company to do so in the latter two years…” and as happened in other places – notably Chester. There the council voted to ban playing altogether

…a meeting of the council held on 17 December 1602, at which a decision was taken to permit no further playing in... “the Chamber of the Guild hall nor in any part[e] of the howsse or Courte”…[147]

Ignoring the prohibition was subject to a ten-shilling fine. However, a further ban was made in 1612 and a more punitive fine of £10 was introduced. Again quoting Mulryne

…we can detect, perhaps, an earnest discussion of the ‘impropriety’ of plays…the whopping twenty-fold increase in the fine reads like a self-righteous gesture meant to impress…[148]

Somerset estimated the size of travelling companies at between 4 to 24 players and referenced Ingram’s calculation that a travelling company of six needed ten to fourteen shillings a day in takings “simply to survive.”[149]

---

[147] Mulryne, Professional p.4
[148] Ibid. p.4
Mulryne closed his article with an interesting, if speculative, observation that touring offered a company “a temporary relief from the onerous and continuing task of rehearsal of new plays…we might think of such a tour as a working holiday.”

Earning a living (6s. a week) as a touring player at the turn of the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries in England appears just possible. However it certainly was not the halcyon experience that Palmer and Cerasano propose. Had it been as easy as they suggest, the great London companies would have surely followed the cash and left the city far more than they did. Somerset’s “working holiday” for some professional companies remains an interesting, if entirely unsubstantiated, suggestion.

Cerasano’s second point, and the much more powerful observation, was that an understanding of “failed ventures” is needed to gain a fuller overall picture – failures such as the Swan⁵¹⁰ and the antics surrounding the Boar’s Head, both of which are considered in this thesis.⁵¹¹

That touring existed was never in doubt. That players were better received on tour than had been previously thought has been proved through the REED research. Palmer, clearly a devotee of Country and Western music, as recently as 2009⁵¹² suggested that there may have been provincial impresarios. Men who were, to her mind, “upwardly mobile”

...skilled professionals who knew when to hold 'em and knew when to fold 'em, knew when to walk away, knew when to run…⁵¹³

She continued

...because, in the myopic context of “London companies,” no one suspected their existence, let alone the value of tracking them or how to evaluate what they were doing...

It is certainly an interesting conjecture, but her personal research ran contrary to this scenario. These show a business base too small to support the notion of a provincial Henslowe. Certainly there were a lot of counterfeit companies - multiple bands using or claiming to use one patron’s licence - hence more possible revenue than a single

⁵¹⁰ x ref.²¹¹, x ref.²¹⁹
⁵¹¹ x ref.²¹¹
⁵¹³ From Don Schlitz’s song “The Gambler” which was the title track to Kenny Roger’s 1978 album “The Gambler” - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kn481KcjvMo. Bobby Bare - singer of “Drop Kick Me Jesus Through The Goal posts Of Life” http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SO5Y1OuQIxo - described as “the world's only Christian-football waltz” also recorded the song earlier that same year to no acclaim whatsoever. Palmer, unusually for a retired Professor of English, omitted a full reference.
company name suggests. Moreover, Palmer was quite right to conclude that the business of touring was more complex than had been thought when Chambers was writing *The Elizabethan Stage*.\(^{154}\) But when one adds up the total possible venues, average playing days and customary fees, and deducts travelling times plus cost of wagon and other expenses (all beautifully detailed by Palmer) it is clear that there was no great fortune to be made from touring. Unfortunately for Palmer’s main argument, the few great fortunes in the English theatre were made in London - just as they are today - and London companies on national tour were at best only accessing a complementary source of income for their troupe.

**Alternative Sources of Revenue – b) Patronage**

A prince ought also to show himself a patron of ability, and to honour the proficient in every art. … Further, he ought to entertain the people with festivals and spectacles at convenient seasons of the year; … and show himself an example of courtesy and liberality. …

Niccolò Machiavelli, 1513\(^{155}\)

One explanation often used for the apparent wealth of certain players was patronage. Rowe did much to fan these flames with his reference to £1000 being given to Shakespeare by the Earl of Southampton.\(^{156}\) Not many believe the actual amount, but writers such as Katherine Duncan-Jones\(^ {157}\) continue to theorize on whether some lesser figure, might have been the “real” payment. One cannot prove that in a moment of madness a silly young courtier would not throw a fortune away, and for some scholars this is an attractive notion. It conjures up images of aristocrats - literally knights in shining armour - being of sufficient good taste and learning to part with huge sums in exchange for a little flattery. Unfortunately, reality does not support the proposition.

In 1909 Phoebe Sheavyn was writing, with considerable candour, about the largesse available from patrons to performers and writers at the turn of the sixteenth into the seventeenth centuries

…this was a period of economic transition, with painful consequences for both patrons and protégés. Neither side realized the drift of circumstances: the reigns of Elizabeth and James mark a gradual

---


\(^{155}\) Nicolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. 1908 Marriott (1513). Chapter XXI

\(^{156}\) See *x ref.360* for an analysis of Nicholas Rowe, *The Works of William Shakespear* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1709).

disintegration of the aristocratic system of private literary patronage...[though] efforts were often aimed at the conservation of a dying system...

Literary and artistic patronage certainly existed, but it found expression in lending credibility or protection far more frequently than hard cash. Sheavyn continued

...The old form of patronage as experienced by Chaucer...had been a substantial and satisfactory thing....the writer was given an organic place within the feudal community...

Later she noted

...those writers...fortunate to meet with lifelong patronage were rare indeed... Roger Ascham, Samuel Daniel, perhaps Ben Jonson as well – it is doubtful another could be found...

Largesse often came in non-financial forms such as non-literary jobs and positions that sometimes were transferrable and could be sold. Cash for everyone, from the monarch down, was in short supply. Great men died penniless but not through excessive patronage of the arts. The Earl of Leicester died £85,000 in debt. Walsingham also left in penury begging in his will to be

...buried without any extraordinary ceremonies as usually appertain to a man serving in my place, in respect of the greatness of my debts and the mean state I shall leave my wife and heirs in...

For all her clarity of thinking, it is interesting to note that even Sheavyn still repeats Rowe’s story of the £1000 without any comment or analysis. Such is the power of established myth.

In 1964, H.S. Bennett in considering writers and books, sought to redress the balance back in favour of the existence of patronage. He insisted that there were “no grounds for the belief that patronage was on the decline” as Sheavyn half a century before “had asserted.” Yet, when one examines Bennett’s evidence of his position, it largely appears to be based around the amount of grovelling on the authors’ part (i.e. in

159 Ibid. p.12
160 Ibid. p.12 Note: All three receiving royal patronage of one sort or another.
163 Sheavyn, Literary Profession p.12
prefaces, dedication etc.) with very little direct payment (hard cash) on the patrons’ side. Certainly there were contingent benefits

Much was dedicated to them (the Patrons) without any other reason other than the general belief that they provided “a buckler” of defence” or “a shelter against the stormes and tempests which their malicious enemies raise against the truth”.

He also noted that by the 1580’s

…the professional man of letters…introduced a more strident note in the dedicatory epistles…few were optimistic enough to think they would be rewarded with any large sums or annual pensions. A few pounds, perhaps, were all they hoped for in cash [or recommendation] …to some position in the service of the Crown, or of some influential lord or perhaps to give them a living or a tutorship.

Despite Bennett’s protestations to the contrary, an analysis of his writing on patronage shows that he actually agreed with Sheavyn when it comes to how much cash a patron was ever likely to hand over. Fortunes were not built on occasional small gifts.

Sheavyn is very direct on this point

…the usual fee paid for the dedication of a drama was forty shillings and occasionally other works earned three pounds…

Sheavyn also gives an example of a higher fee

…The Earl of Northumberland gave George Peel £3 in June 1593 upon the presentation of a congratulatory poem.

That scholars should have speculated about the influence of patronage on playwrights in general and Shakespeare in particular is inevitable. One of the most interesting combinations of opinion on this point comes from Alfred Harbage who observed

---

166 OED - a shield, see Glossary
167 H.S. Bennett, *English Books* II p.39
168 Ibid. p.45
169 Sheavyn, *Literary Profession* p.25 - she uses as her authority for this “Nathaniel Field, A Woman in Weathercock (1612) dedication”. The fee of forty shillings also appears in earlier reference sources in the sixth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica of 1823 Vol. XVI “the usual present from a patron in return for a dedication was forty shillings”.
Harbage’s summary of “the situation of his day” was essentially that seeking patronage as a playwright was wasted time. One interesting footnote to literary history was the evidence of how this point was taken up by A. L. Rowse\(^{172}\) who wrote in his own personal copy of Harbage’s book (above) the above notation “not need to” indicating his endorsement of Harbage’s and my own position.

Alternative Sources of Revenue – c) Publishing and Puffing

One might think that if traditional aristocratic patronage was in decline, then income from the burgeoning business of publishing could have been a substitute source of cash for hard-pressed writers and playwrights through book and pamphlet sales.

Sheavyn is again clear-cut in her assertions that

...it was practically impossible to dispose of a manuscript outside London...all printing by law was confined to London...the only exceptions were...Oxford and Cambridge...and one to a Dutch refugee [who] scarcely printed anything but Dutch, for his fellow refugees...\(^{173}\)

Theoretically a writer had a number of potential publishers but the “system of monopolies favoured by the Elizabethans”\(^ {174}\) had permeated the publishing business.

Describing the business practices of publishers of the time, Sheavyn quoted George Wither who, in 1624, described them as being

...like fleas but suck now and then a drop of the writers blood from him it was somewhat tolerable: but since they began to feed on him like the third plague of Aeigipt [Egypt] without removing...\(^ {175}\)

\(^{172}\) See: John Clarke, ‘Rowse, (Alfred) Leslie (1903–1997)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. I had the good fortune to acquire Rowse’s own copy - complete with his marginalia. Rowse, a prolific author might well have made this point in one of his own books, my expertise in his work is not sufficient to comment on this possibility.

\(^{173}\) Ibid. p.64/5

\(^{174}\) Ibid. p.64
Sheavyn’s choice of Wither as an authoritative source is interesting. However, one occasion where he does stand out was in his early assertion that an author should have rights in his own work. In the 1620s the Stationers’ Company’s focus was on its members’ enrichment, with scant regard for the authors.

Payments for literary and dramatic work were meagre at best, with more sensational and riskier works earning the highest remuneration for authors, coupled with the greatest chance of arrest if someone in power took offence - witness Wither’s own incarcerations. In short, a smart writer of the 1590’s and early 1600’s would, after discovering the economic realities of the Stationers’ Company’s monopolists, have stayed well away from publishing to generate cash unless in dire need.

Harbage, wrote of William Shakespeare that: “‘there seems no doubt that for whomever else he wrote…it certainly was not for the book trade.’"

176 See Glossary – Wither.
177 On a larger scale Lawrence Stone made the following observation about trade and monopolism, “In boom and slump alike, the motive force behind the Trading Companies was the desire to increase their profits by placing restrictions on their lesser competitors, and by making price-rigging agreements between themselves…” Lawrence Stone, "State Control in Sixteenth Century England," The Economic History Review, 1947: 103-120. p.117
179 I have not included here an analysis of the Shakespeare Quartos or the various published editions of Shakespeare’s poetry. While this is an interesting subject in its own right - especially the degree to which he did or did not benefit in each case - my own researches have led me to conclude that Harbage was entirely correct that Shakespeare was not writing for the book trade.
Puffing and Praising

Puffing, the extravagant praising of another’s work for either cash or favour, was almost mandatory in literary works of the Early Modern Period. Puffing was often expressed in the form of a congratulatory poem. As Franklin Williams noted in 1966 the years 1599 and 1609 were “outstanding” in the volume of “puffs”, and across the decade Williams referenced 151 books that contained no less than 533 poems. He made the important observation that

…Habitual writers of commendatory verse were… mainly literary professionals… with the curious exception of Sidney and Shakespeare, all the chief poets including Spenser and Milton wrote puffs. Jonson led the way with 30 contributions… [also] George Wither… in Stuart times, it is clear from scattered evidence the task of soliciting puffs was frequently, if not customarily, assumed by the publisher or stationer…

On the matter of Shakespeare’s puffing absence, Williams also noted that no work of Shakespeare’s printed in his lifetime ever contained a “commendatory poem as its bush.” However, as was demonstrated in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* Shakespeare did equate bushes with moonshine.

The conclusion is self-evident. Shakespeare did not publish or puff because financially he did not have to. The puffing Ben Jonson, despite his published works, output of plays, acting and Royal pension died almost penniless.

---

182 For another “curious exception” for Shakespeare see in *x ref.272*
183 Williams, *Commentatory Verses* p.6
184 Act III, i and Act V, i. also OED – Moonshine: “Appearance without substance” – the OED places its first use in this meaning to 1468
Alternative Sources of Revenue – d) Court Performance

...£10 which was standard for a court performance...

Andrew Gurr, 2004

Queen Elizabeth’s ability to “balance the books” through rigorous cost control was surely one of the highlights of her reign. Evidence of her penny-wise mindset abounds. Having her courtiers pay for her entertainment as she graciously dumped her entire court on their private residences is one example. However there are others, such as increasing the number of fish-days to boost fish consumption. In doing so, she ensured increased numbers of fishermen (needed to meet the rise in demand for fish) who were then available as trained sailors for her navy in time of crisis. Of course, there were many less complex economies, such as not keeping a company of players. As previously noted, Chambers remarked how the only reason the Early Modern Theatre existed at all was because of her thriftiness. The Corporation of London and the Puritan faction would otherwise have jointly killed off the theatres had they not been protected by the modest fig-leaf of amusing a monarch, who only paid on the days they played.

As Gurr noted (above) £10 was the going rate for a performance at court and that figure changed very little during the 1590’s and the early years of James I’s reign – despite inflation. Gurr estimated that income from court performances remained a static £50 per annum for the Lord Chamberlain’s (later the King’s) Men between 1594 and 1608. Chambers in 1906 had written of one earlier performance

...Feb. 11, 1578. Leicester's [Men] ‘for making their repaire to the Courte with their whole company and furniture to presente a playe before her matie...in consideracon of their chardgies for that purpose although the plaie by her ma the comaundement was supplyed by others.’ They got

\[\text{186} \quad \text{A Gurr, The Shakespeare Company 1594-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 2004). p.96}\]
\[\text{187} \quad \text{The OED definition: “A day on which fish is eaten, usually in obedience to an ecclesiastical ordinance; a fast-day” While this certainly describes the religious origin of the practice still observed by stricter followers of the Church of Rome. A more detailed reference might also add the words “or whenever the queen says so”... during the reign of Elizabeth I. See 1564 Act 5 Eliz. c. 5 “It shall not be lawfull..to eate any flesh vpon any dayes now usuallly obserued as fish dayes, or vpon any Wednesday now newly limited to be obserued as fish day.” [emphasis added]}\]
\[\text{188} \quad \text{x ref.21}\]
\[\text{189} \quad \text{E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1923). I. p.5-6}\]
\[\text{190} \quad \text{Gurr, Shakespeare Company p.108}\]
the ordinary “reward” of £6. 13s. 4d., but not the “more reward” of [an additional] £3. 6s. 8d.\textsuperscript{191}

This seems to indicate that if a company showed up but was not “preferred” then they got an “ordinary reward” and the balance to bring it up to £10 if they were. This is far short of Flute’s fantasy of a pension of “sixpence a day during his life” for “sweet bully Bottom” playing Pyramus in a single performance.\textsuperscript{192}

Court Performances are recorded in two ways.

Firstly, it was listed in the Accounts of the Revels Office which was

…charged with the oversight of all dramatic festivities within the royal household, and incurred expenditure in connection with the choice, rehearsal, staging, dresses, and properties of the plays performed by the accredited “Servants” of the Queen herself or of the great nobles, at Christmas, Candlemas, or Shrovetide, in the palaces of Whitehall, Windsor, Richmond, Hampton Court, Greenwich, or Nonsuch.\textsuperscript{193}

Secondly, records of “Rewards” paid out of royal funds to the companies still survive. Remarkable to modern eyes, a warrant was required from no less than the Privy Council for each payment, and details of these warrants remain sprinkled between what Chambers described as

…minutes of its [Privy Council] proceedings between accounts of important investigations into heresy and treason…\textsuperscript{194}

Even the method for claiming their fees was convoluted and showed tight fiscal control. After a performance, a company had to submit and address a warrant to the Treasurer of the Chamber. After he honoured it, it would be debited against funds specially assigned to him for this and other specified expenses, and only then would payment be made. Such payments are documented both in the Privy Council Register and in the Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber.

\textsuperscript{192} \textit{A Midsummer Night’s Dream} IV. II
\textsuperscript{193} Chambers, \textit{Court Performances} p.1 For more detail see P. Cunningham, \textit{Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court In the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James I} (London: Shakespeare Society, 1842). This book lists the names of the companies, times of performances and in some cases the names of the plays.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid.
George Chalmers in his *Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare Papers* of 1797 analyzed payments for plays during the reign of Elizabeth I and added a subsequent review in the third volume of the Boswell-Malone variorum *Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* of 1821. John Roche Dasent’s *Acts of the Privy Council of England* listed the surviving data up to 1601. Although the register itself is incomplete, enough survives to show that once established, the process of court performances changed remarkably little during the final decades of the reign.

While it is possible to examine these records in greater detail, for the purposes of this thesis, it is perhaps sufficient to endorse Aaron’s observation that

…if Elizabeth only hired the company for at most six plays at £10 a play, or £60 a year, then Royal income was never more than 7.5 percent of the company income and probably much less.

Aaron in support of this assertion referenced Bernard Beckerman, who in 1962 had put the figure at 5% or less of the Company’s income at the Globe.

As to later court performances after the first few years of James I’s reign, once the King’s profligate spending habits had become established, a gradual increase in Royal payments is evident. Gurr estimates court performances at £180 per annum from 1610 to 1615 though this still only reflects just over 7% of a greatly inflated total income.

In conclusion, court performing during the years of Shakespeare’s professional career brought prestige and protection to a Company, but precious little hard cash.

---

Alternative Sources of Revenue - Summary

It is inconceivable that any of the activities listed above: touring, patronage, publishing or court performance singly, or even collectively, played anything but a minor role in the accumulation of the Shakespeare family wealth.

The preceding data shows that from a playing company’s perspective, a marginal income could be wrung from touring. However patronage (in cash) has at times been greatly exaggerated, publishing was, at best, a modest contributor and court performance a minor source of revenue.

Given the foregoing analysis, none of these activities ever made a fortune for any artist in the London of the 1590s and early 1600s.

3. Certain Expenses of Playing

I speak through my clothes

Umberto Eco, 1973

…Rich garments, linens, stuffs and necessaries,
Which since have steaded much…
The Tempest, I, ii

F.J. Fisher commented on the rapid expansion of the capital in the Early Modern Period:
“that the growth of London was widely considered to be a morbid growth is incontestable.”

He included this observation in an article whose very title indicates that he considered the city was “a centre of conspicuous consumption”. Giovanni Botero had, in 1606, written about the rise and ensuing problems of the Renaissance cities. Botero pointed out that the “invariable characteristic of the gentleman come to town was his ostentatious display.” Ben Jonson had been more direct about the cost of one obvious element of this showing off - “…’twere good that you turned four or

201 For both company and playwright.
204 Giovanni Botero, A Treatise Concerning the Causes of the Magnificence and Greatness of Cities, 1606. A copy of the original is available on EEBO. Fisher in his article refers to the translator as “R. Pearson” whereas the original text refers to “Robert Peterson.” Botero also draws attention in Cap. 6 “Of Pleasure” to the “theatres…, rases for running horses, Fountaines, Images, Pictures, and such other excellent and wonderfull things, as delight and feede the eyes of the people with an admiration and wonder at them…”
five acres of your best land into two or three trunks of apparel…” On May 1, 1602, William Shakespeare bought land in Old Stratford – approximately 120 acres for £320. Though hardly a scientific means of establishing the cost of an outfit of clothes, five acres would equate to about £16.

Clad in his new raiment the new-formed gentleman headed for the entertainments and, as Fisher put it, “above all, there was the theatre.” Even in the plays themselves the acknowledged importance of smart clothing was given its place. In The Tempest when Prospero begins to list to Miranda the items the old lord Gonzalo “out of his kindness” gave them when they were cast adrift, the very first item on list was “rich garments.”

The notion of the latter half of Elizabeth’s reign being a time of general prosperity, a truly “golden age”, is largely a Victorian fiction. Hubert Hall writing in 1875 when describing the city burgesses wrote

…it was enough for them to store up golden honey, the capital which was to feed the growing labour resources of the country...

though even Hall acknowledged that not all the honey went on noble ventures, as he continued that it also was consumed by

…the lazy playmates of royalty, who swarmed about the court…

By 1949 Lawrence Stone took a less emotive and more analytical view of a time where any fiscal progress through industrialization, elementary mechanization or trade was being sopped up in luxuries for a few

…one of the chief objectives of official policy…had been the crying need to reduce imports of luxuries and particularly the only two items of real importance - wines and luxury cloths… but the Government was fighting against the irresistible demand of a recklessly wasteful society…and its efforts were a total failure...

There was also a second dimension to this waste as was set out in a report of 1600 which detailed the extent of smuggling, an activity which, according to Stone, “continued on a very large scale.”

---

205 Ibid. p.47
207 Lawrence Stone, "Elizabethan Overseas Trade," The Economic History Review (EHS (Blackwell)) 2, no. 1 (1949): 30-58. p.49
208 BM. Harleian. MSS 1878/56
209 Stone, Overseas p.49
In 1558 imports of exotic weaves were estimated at a total value of £180,000 to £190,000 - “by the turn of the century, imports of luxury cloths had increased about six times and were by far the most important group of imports.”

Wines were not far behind with imports soaring from £50-70,000 to £110,000 over the last few years of the century. Meanwhile the overall economy during this period remained in steep decline with an “almost complete crop failure in 1596.”

Cerasano in 2009 described the 1590’s as a time when the nation…

…laboured under a dire combination of overwhelming debt, severe inflation, a major grain shortage and a shortage of coinage; and some of these factors remained largely unchanged in the early part of the new century…

Expenses of Playing - Sumptuary Justice

Sumptuary Laws - attempts to control and moderate personal consumption through legislation - are almost as old as civilization itself, yet their effectiveness has always been at best transitory. In an attempt to relieve the economic stresses referred to above, a statute - 16 Elizabeth I - was issued at Greenwich on 15 June 1574. It included the following...

…The excess of apparel and the superfluity of unnecessary foreign wares thereto belonging now of late years is grown by sufferance to such an extremity that the manifest decay of the whole realm generally is like to follow (by bringing into the realm such superfluities of silks, cloths of gold, silver, and other most vain devices of so great cost for the quantity thereof as of necessity the moneys and treasure of the realm is and must be yearly conveyed out of the same to answer the said excess) but also particularly the wasting and undoing of a great number of young gentlemen, otherwise serviceable, and others seeking by show of apparel to be esteemed as gentlemen, who, allured by the vain show of those things, do not only consume themselves, their goods, and lands which their parents left unto them, but also run into such debts and shifts as they cannot live out of danger of laws without attempting unlawful acts, whereby they are not any ways serviceable to their country as otherwise they might be…

The purpose of this section is not to attempt to analyze the scope and range of sumptuary legislation in detail, but to better understand the economic effect that this

210 Stone, Overseas p.49
211 Ibid. p.49 See also S.P.Dom. Eliz. 273/99.
212 Cerasano, Theatrical Entrepreneurs p.386
213 The term is Roman in origin - sumptuariae leges.
demand for ostentatious clothing created on the theatre of the day. The requirement for
the newly made man-about-town to be seen at the theatre has already been referred to,
but there were two other groups that “needed” to be seen and “needed” to look lavishly
dressed - the powerful and the players.

Whether they were habitually, or even only occasionally used as the “Lords Rooms” -
the Gallery above the stage of the Globe\(^2\) - their purpose was surely twofold: firstly to
give prestigious, distinct and secure seating to the powerful elite and secondly, to put
that elite on display, reinforcing their status and establishing who constituted this group.
In 1613 the building contract for the Hope Theatre called for

\[
\ldots \text{two Boxes in the lowermost storie fitt and decent for gentlemen to sit}
\text{and shall make the ptisions betwne the Rommes as they are at the said}
\text{Plaie house called the Swan.}\(^3\)
\]

This position, facing the audience goes further than later, though similar, creation of the
Royal box in proscenium arch theatres of the Victorian era, as there is no possibility of
privacy for the occupants.\(^4\) In contrast to later periods, when men were standardized
into “white tie” and only the women were “decorated” in striking clothes and jewels, the
Early Modern male courtier when on display had to outshine every other lesser person
in the theatre. The greater the courtier the more lavish the required ensemble. Even the
puritanical Malvolio of \textit{Twelfth Night}, when he daydreamed, combined the fantasy of
rich clothing, lackeys, and a slaked sexual desire

\[
\ldots \text{Calling my officers about me, in my branched velvet}
\text{gown; having come from a day-bed, where I have left}
\text{Olivia sleeping…}\(^5\)
\]

And the theme continued as he demonstrated his authority, played with expensive toys
and had his enemy grovelling at his feet

\[
\ldots \text{Seven of my people, with an obedient start, make}
\text{out for him: I frown the while; and perchance wind}
\text{up watch, or play with my - some rich jewel. Toby}
\text{approaches; courtesies there to me…}\(^6\)
\]

\(^{2}\) Jon Greenfield, “Timber Framing the Two Bays and After,” in \textit{Shakespeare's Globe Rebuilt}
(Cambridge: Cambridge, 1997). p.119
p.25
\(^{4}\) With the Victorian “Royal Box” the physical positioning may be to the side or at the back of the
auditorium stalls or even in a higher gallery however the space itself is prominent and “frames” the
occupants for the ordinary theatre goers. The Royal Box of the London Coliseum is illustrative, see
http://www.arthurlloyd.co.uk/LondonColiseum.htm.
\(^{5}\) \textit{Twelfth Night} II, v
\(^{6}\) Ibid.
In the Globe, there would have been a real life play outside the stage performance with the fulfilment of various elements of Malvolio’s fantasy visible in selected members of the audience, literally framing the fiction on stage.

One source for players’ aristocratic costumes was the second hand market. In reality they were performing in hand-me-downs from the class who made up the most prestigious segment of their audience. This notion, when wrapped in a twenty-first century idea of the value of second hand clothing, leads, I would propose, to some erroneous assumptions about the costs of staging productions.

Modern day clothing, machine made and mass-produced is seen by many to be readily disposable. Only the makers of haute couture, state and academic ceremonial robes and a very few theatrical costumiers could today have an accurate sense of the cost of hand made, custom garments created in rare and exclusive fabrics. Even the idea of middle class children wearing the outgrown garments of older siblings, still prevalent in the mid twentieth century, is now largely considered passé.\(^\text{219}\) Second-hand clothing in the Early Modern Period had a cash value even if the newness had rubbed off. An analogy of a second hand Rolls Royce might be more appropriate in cash value than a suit of clothes, and like many second-hand cars, these second-hand clothes would be refitted to freshen up the appearance. Henslowe’s notebook records tailors’ bills for remodelling garments, and loans for such items as expensive lace to refurbish a jerkin. These amounts are not trivial either in terms of their cash value against total earnings, nor compared against other categories of theatrical expense such as wages for the hired men.

Thomson considered that

…a close reading of Henslowe leaves no doubt of the importance of costume in the theatre… Entries vary from the quaintly informative to the frankly astonishing … Of the latter kind is the listed cost of £9 for taffeta to make two women’s gowns for the Two Angry Women of Abingdon\(^\text{220}\), and the preparedness of the actor Richard Jones to pay £3 for “a man’s gown of Peachcolour in grain.”\(^\text{221}\)

\(^{219}\) See a BBC article on the issue from 2002 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/2500637.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/2500637.stm) - there is a niche market in so-called “vintage” or recycled clothing but for most the stigma of buying second-hand still remains.

\(^{220}\) A play by Henry Porter (1598).

Carson related how “…Henslowe made an advance of £12-10-00 to get two cloaks out of pawn…” about the annual wages of an average skilled worker.

Costumes, at the Company level, represented significant investments in themselves. For example, in the legal falling-out between Langley, builder of the Swan Theatre, and his would-be company of players, Langley asserted “…he was owed some £300 for costumes.”222 However one should be wary of Langley’s truthfulness on any point. But the players concerned only challenged the amount in a circuitous manner. C. C. Stopes in her *Burbage and Shakespeare’s Stage* of 1913 gives a detailed account of the legal tussle between the parties.223 In brief, the players argued that Langley had no claim on them because he had already been repaid from a garnishee on the portion of the players’ gallery receipts. Wallace in 1910 had previously quoted the relevant section of the court documents

…Of the said defendant were at charges for the providing of apparel…for a portion of the gains for the several standings in the galleries224

The actors, almost as an afterthought, included the words, “they deny the defendant hath disbursed the full sum of £300.”

What is noteworthy, beyond the method of repayment, is that the amount under discussion, correct or not, would have been about one third of the actual building costs of the Swan itself.

It is incontrovertible that Henslowe

- Lent money to the players, after the debacle of several members of his company leaving to join Francis Langley’s company at the Swan.
- Made them sign performance contracts on their return, as Langley had done.
- Knew precisely what he was doing in continuing to lend to the players, even when repayment was late.

Carson asked

---

222 Carson, *Henslowe’s Diary* p.25
...why would Henslowe continue to lend money to an organization which seemed unwilling or unable to repay him? 225

His explanation is in two parts: first the simple one that Henslowe was “satisfied to lend money to the players in order to keep them at his theatre” 226 which appears reasonable. But he continued “where he earned a more than satisfactory income from rent.” 227 Here it is interesting to review the rise of the Company’s indebtedness to Henslowe

Table 8 - Indebtedness of the Admiral’s Men to Henslowe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance in £.s.d.</th>
<th>Per Carson</th>
<th>Per Henslowe’s Notebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/2/1599</td>
<td>233-17-17</td>
<td>233-17-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/1600</td>
<td>271-13-00</td>
<td>271-13-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??/2/1602</td>
<td>604-10-04</td>
<td>604-10-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/12/1602</td>
<td>774-00-00</td>
<td>226-16-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/1603</td>
<td>400-00-06</td>
<td>400-00-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??/03/1604</td>
<td>24-00-00</td>
<td>24-00-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking aspect of these figures is their magnitude. According to the notebook, the Admiral’s Men were borrowing well over a hundred pounds a year, and total loans by the end of 1602 were almost enough to have paid for the building of a new theatre. Moreover, this debt accumulation occurred during a plague free period when (according to authors such as Forse 229 and Aaron 230) players in a London company should have been solvent. 231

...How the players can have reduced their financial obligations to Henslowe so rapidly, and in a period when playing was severely curtailed because of the plague, is a mystery which we cannot solve with information from the diary... 232

---

225 Carson, Companion p.27
226 Ibid. p.27
227 Ibid. p.27
228 £233/17/17 is how it appears in f48 of Henslowe’s Notebook – there is either a poorly fashioned “1” in the pence column i.e. it is eleven pence, or it was merely a mistake.
231 x ref.272 Though, as will be shown, there was competitive pressure at this time from the Children at the Blackfriars.
232 Carson, Companion p.29. See x ref.36 for dates when theatres were closed relating to plague.
Carson asks this obvious question and goes on to list some possibilities – the players either

a) had the cash in reserve, and/or
b) sold their costumes to raise cash, and/or
c) gave Henslowe stock in their company.

There is a suggestion in f. 110 of the notebook: “All Recoynges conserynyng the company in stocke generall descarged” which I interpret as – “all reckonings concerning the company in stock generally discharged” i.e. repayment was made or the sum written off.

Another alternative that has to be raised but can be quickly disregarded, was that Henslowe simply forgave the debt.

In examining the above schedule, it appears that the debt drops by a single repayment of £550 – see the line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance in £s.d.</th>
<th>Per Carson</th>
<th>Per Notebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/12/1602</td>
<td>774-00-00</td>
<td>226-16-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elsewhere in the Notebook a £50 advance to Robert Shaa is noted and if one assumes the fifty pound repayment refers to this then £500 would have been a “good round sum”233 in exchange for costumes, playbooks and/or company stock.

However the debt was reduced, it still leaves the all-important question of profitability from the Company’s perspective. Accumulating this kind of debt during plague free playing time suggests either profligacy on the part of the players, or the fact that the costs of production were high, or competition greatly increased, or they simply did not want to pay him. Perhaps the most likely scenario was a combination of some or all of these.

233 Three thousand ducats; ’tis a good round sum.
Three months from twelve; then, let me see; the rate —
The Merchant of Venice I, iii
Carson also speculates on this issue see Companion p. 29
There is an ironic parallel between Bassanio borrowing from Shylock to fund “rare new liveries” and the Admiral’s men getting deep in debt to Henslowe for items such as copperlace and tailor’s bills. Henslowe, like some present day credit card company, offered interest-free transfer loans when the Admiral’s Men reconstituted after the Swan episode. But, just as the credit card provider increases its costs of borrowing over time, Henslowe got his pound of flesh only a few years later. By acquiring shares in the company (i.e. reducing the players’ future earnings), he was both economically and literally taking their “means of production” - the playbooks and costumes. As Carson noted of the later Lady Elizabeth’s Men in 1613-15, Henslowe agreed as part of his responsibilities in this new venture to supply the actors with costumes and properties “from Henslowe’s private stock.” It is conjectural, but one can only wonder how and when these had been acquired and if the Admiral’s Men had anything to do with them. Another conjecture might be that the records in the Notebook ended for a good reason – that Henslowe had achieved his original purpose of securing the players - body and costumes - for what he refers to in the Notebook as “my theatre.”

Expenses of Playing -The Rose Theatre

The business and character of Philip Henslowe are examined later in this thesis, however, suffice to note here that he was an early entrepreneur whose interests included the business of playing, initially with his investment in building the Rose theatre.

When Henslowe initially considered building the Rose, his plan was to take a partner to, as Carson puts it, “share expenses in the building.” The would-be partner - John Cholmley - was to have the exclusive right to sell bread and drink to the Rose’s patrons. Carson concluded that the purpose of the partnership had been, from Henslowe’s standpoint, to hedge against fluctuations in the rate of investment return by selling an uncertain gain for a smaller but guaranteed income. Cholmley, according to Carson, was to pay an annuity of £816 in quarterly instalments of £27 10s. over a period of 8 years.

---

234 *The Merchant of Venice* II, ii
235 A technique for making lace using copper wire – see http://web.me.com/lievejerger/copper/Sculptures.html for a modern use of the technique.
236 *OED* - means of production: the aggregate resources (capital, land, workforce, etc.) of any country or society; (spec. in Marxist theory) the total productive capacity of these resources.
237 Carson, *Companion* p.31
238 X ref. 224
and three months.” However, an examination of the document itself shows that the actual amount was capped at £816 and that instalments were to be £25 10s. Additionally, Henslowe was to repair the bridges and wharves belonging to the property.

The partnership never materialized for unrecorded reasons. However a number of observations can be made

- Any realistic assessment of how theatres were financed has to recognize the cost of borrowing incurred.
- Even if we do not call them “loans” but “investments”, any prudent investor, such as Henslowe in the case of the Rose, would be mindful of what the rate of return and payback period would be - Henslowe as an investor would want to see a return on his capital.
- Payment was to be by annuity, in fixed instalments – i.e. the interest component was included in the fixed payments. Accordingly, if the cost of borrowing increased (interest rates went up) then Henslowe would have received no additional amounts. This suggests that Henslowe, in contrast to the Burbages, was cash rich and could take the risk of fluctuating interest out of the equation. Julian Bowsher and S.P. Cerasano writing in 2010 are in no doubt that “Henslowe had enough ready money to finance the bulk of construction costs himself.” It is also possible that he had enough financial credibility to borrow from other lenders. It appears that some time value of money was being factored into the implicit loan to Cholmley, and in effect he would have been guarantor for half the project. If Henslowe had needed to borrow the money, then he would have been passing on either all or part of his interest costs. Of course, he could also be charging a premium rate - i.e. more than his costs - but this could still be a relative bargain for Cholmley if his own (marginal) cost of

---

240 Ibid. p.14 – Carson’s £27 10s. there appears to be some confusion here - £25 10s. only works with 32 payments and not the 33 he indicates.
241 Chillington-Rutter, Documents of The Rose Playhouse, Revised Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999). p.38 “twentie five Poundes and Tenne shillinges…until all the saide somme of Eighte hundreth and Sixteen Poundes be so truly contented and payde”
242 The Act of 1545 permitted interest up to a limit of 10%, but was replaced by a new statute in 1552 that prohibited “…usury, a vice most odious and detestable” See x ref.72. In practice by rolling interest into principal or by only advancing part of the sum documented this 10% was often circumvented see:
borrowing were so much higher than Henslowe’s (and the implied interest rate therefore lay between the two).\textsuperscript{244}

- If Henslowe had been able to persuade Cholmley on these proposed terms, he would have pulled off a coup. However, after the partnership fell through, he took the role of the project’s banker - as is evidenced extensively in his “diary.”\textsuperscript{245} He supplied not only the capital to construct and maintain the fabric of the facilities (the long term, project related, debt) but also the funds to support the theatre’s working capital (short term liquidity) especially by lending on a short term basis, to the players, seemingly interest free. Some scholars have suggested that this demonstrates that there was an amiable side to his business character. Murray Bromberg was one defender of the notion that Henslowe was not a complete villain. But even he concluded that

\ldots we cannot say Philip Henslowe was an innocent babe whom scholars have vilified\ldots he seems to have been a hard-headed businessman, who was not above stooping to unscrupulous tactics\textsuperscript{246} \ldots

As the proposed partnership with Cholmley shows, Henslowe was indeed perfectly capable of rolling an interest component of a loan into a reduction in the amount advanced and thereby hiding the underlying component of interest. £816 would have paid for the entire construction unless Henslowe was either a) simply cheating Cholmley or b) recognizing the time value of money i.e. some heavy implicit interest costs.

Carson’s analysis of Henslowe’s “diary” leads the reader to the recognition of a mild mannered individual

\ldots An examination of Henslowe's activities as theatrical landlord and banker shows that the popular conception of the man as a crass and illiterate promoter hardly fits the facts \ldots the diary and papers reveal glimpses of a man conscientious in his family responsibilities, and undemanding in his business dealings\textsuperscript{247}

But there are limitations to this analysis, for example

\textsuperscript{244} See Glossary: Marginal Cost
\textsuperscript{246} Murray Bromberg, “The Reputation of Philip Henslowe,” \textit{Shakespeare Quarterly} (Folger Shakespeare Library) 1, no. 3 (1950): 135-139. p.139
Henslowe personally wrote the notebook. No sharp businessman in history has ever written of his business dealings without being mindful that this could constitute evidence of his activities. This is especially true in the case of a notebook that was from time to time being initialled or signed by other parties – as was the situation here.

The notion that Henslowe could have amassed a fortune by being “undemanding in his business dealings” in any age is, from a financial standpoint, naïve.

When Carson analyses the litigation concerning “Henslowe’s activity over the players derived from documents linked to the Lady Elizabeth’s men” he makes no reference to the fact that the technique of trying to bind players to specific theatres was actually introduced by the unscrupulous Francis Langley. The explanation of this inconsistency may lie in the dates of Carson’s work and that of Ingram - though Ingram is listed by Carson as a “supporter and encourager” of Carson’s efforts.

On balance, a rational analysis of the cash flows suggests that Henslowe, far from being a genial lender, positively wanted the players to be in his debt, binding them closely to his theatre and thus avoiding the possibility of key players being lured away by competitors. The notebook shows repeatedly that he took their costumes and plays as collateral and it is not an idle conjecture that he always expected them to default when times were hard (as in 1604) so as to, again in the words of Antonio in The Merchant of Venice “exact the penalty.”

Expenses of Playing - Summary

Both Henslowe and Langley, the former with considerable success, the latter less so, sought to control absolutely the resident companies of their respective theatres. Some of the effects of this, for example the “performance contract”, are still in evidence today.

An examination of the costs of costume and hence the cost of staging productions suggests that considering the building costs of a theatre as the only major expense in

---

248 x ref.209
249 x ref.211
250 “But lend it rather to thine enemy, Who, if he break, thou mayst with better face Exact the penalty.” The Merchant of Venice I, 3
staging performances in the Early Modern period in London can lead to an overly optimistic view of profitability.

Usury

If thou wilt lend this money, lend it not As to thy friends; for when did friendship take A breed for barren metal of his friend? But lend it rather to thine enemy, Who, if he break, thou mayst with better face Exact the penalty. The Merchant of Venice I, iii

Those who swallow down usury cannot arise except as one whom Shaitan [Satan] has prostrated by (his) touch does rise...trading is only like usury; and Allah has allowed trading and forbidden usury. The Qur'an (Koran) 2.275

In the twenty-first century the necessity, nature and ground rules for what constitutes “money” are generally accepted. Concepts such as “interest” are hardly questioned in the Western world though in other cultures, most notably the Arab or Moslem sphere of influence, interest is still frowned upon (unless disguised as some other form of fee) for largely similar reasons to those in sixteenth century England i.e. religious doctrine. “Usury” as a term still continues to have negative connotations almost regardless of geography, with the suggestion of unscrupulous or immoral advantage still hanging over it.

Kate Aughterson introduced Thomas Wilson’s discourse upon usury with the following

…Usury was increasingly seen as an evil necessity during the 16th century, given the expanding mercantile economy… Here Wilson voices the theological objections.252

Aughterson’s selection of this section of Wilson’s essay gave the reader a good sense of what was to come

…And therefore as Lucifer for pride fell down from heaven, so usurers for covetousness will fall down from earth to the dark dungeon of hell.253


What follows can be described as a rant, steeped in terms such as fornication, evil, wicked etc. Merchants are reminded that they are merely God’s stewards and are warned not to make bargains that are merely disguised loans. If there is any reasoned argument, it surrounded the notion that if merchants were allowed to make money by charging interest, they would be discouraged from risking their capital in true trading activities or “adventures at sea…so the Queen shall lose her gain and right of inheritance and the state shall be undone”. Wilson also listed a number of beneficial practices that would come to an end if usury were permitted – the ploughman would not turn up the ground, the artificer would leave work, the clothier would cease making clothes, gentlemen will “no more profess arms but sell their land” and live off the interest and the nobleman would cease to defend the widow and fatherless and lose both dignity and estimation.

Table 10 - Usury “Ship of Fools”

A more rational analysis 50 years later came from Francis Bacon who commenced his 1625 work Of Usury with

…Many have made witty invectives against usury. They say that it is a pity the devil should have God’s part, which is the tithe. That the usurer is the greatest Sabbath-breaker, because his plough goeth every Sunday. 254

253 Ibid. p.505
He then enumerated the other anti-usury arguments of the time. He quoted scripture - “in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread - not in the sweat of another’s face”. He complained that usurers judaize, they behave like Jews. In summary, he agreed with Wilson that usury was un-Christian and could generally be lumped together with the devil and all his works. Furthermore, it was against nature for money to beget money.

In a few lines he had summarized the medieval consensus of what, for most in the early seventeenth century, remained a pernicious practice.

However, Bacon then demolished centuries of dogma with one shining line of common sense that

…Since there must be borrowing and lending, and men are so hard of heart as they will not lend freely, usury must be permitted…

He listed the pros and cons as he understood them

Cons

• Money held in savings (as a reserve) was not working, therefore it reduced commerce and “makes fewer merchants” - very close to the “New Labour” notion that capital tied up in (say) property needs to be freed up to supply more capital-hungry projects.

• Merchants cannot “drive trade so well” if they are paying heavy interest, or to use Bacon’s term “sit at great usury.”

• The State itself can “decay” with the “ebb or flow” of commerce.

• The “treasure of a realm” can end up concentrated in a few hands while spreading wealth causes a state to flourish.

• When money is “merchandizing or purchasing” it is not being spent on land. Therefore land prices can become depressed.

• Usury can dampen economic activity by reducing the degree to which cash can “stir” hence it can “dull and damp all industries” causing “public poverty”.

---

255 Genesis 3:19 (King James Version)
256 Bacon, Usury
Pros

• “trade is driven by young [capital deficient] merchants” who have to borrow “at interest.” Reduce usury and trade will stagnate.
• Borrowing can support business through temporary downturns and prevent rapacious “cruel moneyed” men from aggressive foreclosures i.e. “forfeitures of mortgages and bonds”.
• “It is a vanity to conceive…[of] borrowing without profit…impossible to conceive the number of inconveniences … if borrowing be cramped”.

Bacon noted that “to speak of the abolishing of usury is idle…all states have ever had it…”.

He proposed to reform usury by having a two-tier system. What we would now call consumer lending was to be capped at 5% and heavily regulated. Commercial borrowing would have been largely unregulated with interest rates governed by demand. The state would charge a minimal licensing fee to potential lenders who would have been restricted to operating in “principal cities and towns”.

He concluded “It is better to mitigate usury by declaration, than to suffer it to rage by connivance.”

Capitalists, Bankers or Usurers?

Tawney was in no doubt about the state of capitalism in the Early Modern Period

...By the latter part of the 16th century, agriculture, industry and foreign trade were largely dependent on credit…

As one example he noted of foreign exchange – the swapping of one currency for another

...the truth is that the practice of the 16th century was greatly in advance of its theory - to change one currency into another was permissible enough provided that “value was given for a value” ... it was an aggravation of the offence if its motive was to realize a gain which was

forbidden by the law, both of the church and of the state - [this presented a] terrifying picture of the money changers ... unalloyed by any tincture of public spirit or private charity…

It was “realizing a gain” through the manipulation of money, today the business of bankers, that constituted the “sin” here, and the habitual practice of this sin made one a usurer.

Anne and Edwin DeWindt wrote in great detail concerning the history of Ramsay, a small Fenland town, which during Shakespeare’s lifetime, closely resembled Stratford in size and range of commercial activity.²⁵⁹ With the dissolution of the monasteries, Stratford was to achieve Borough status but Ramsay did not and by the seventeenth century had fallen back to being a mere village. On the subject of money lending the DeWindts made some valuable observations

...as early as the 1290’s the taxpayers of Ramsey had taxable incomes not only from land, selling, and labour, but also from the borrowing and lending of money, crops, tools, livestock, even boats…

...the surviving Ramsey court rolls cite just under 400 debt cases between 1280 and 1465, involving more than 500 individuals as debtors and creditors - usually the Ramsey court scribe did not record the amount of the disputed debt, but in 177 cases there were cited descriptions of either goods, wages, rent, or money amounts …in the 108 cases where a specific sum of money was mentioned, the sums ranged from three pennies to £5, with most debts falling at the lower end…

...it is clear that the town's men and women were not afraid to lend money and to seek profit from so doing…

However, the question of being in the business of lending - of being a usurer or banker - went beyond the occasional loan, though it could be difficult to identify who the real moneylenders were.

As Tawney noted

The word “banker” was coming into use in England in the first half the 16th century ... the vast majority of lenders were… in the towns, merchants, shopkeepers, tailors, drapers, haberdashers, grocers and similar tradesmen; and, except when summarily damned with the opprobrious epithet of usurer or extortioner, they were described by the craft which was still the chief characteristic…

Richard Porder in a sermon\textsuperscript{260} of 1570 railed against both “money men” and the “merchantmen, citizens, graziers, farmers, ploughmen, artificers and even the clergy” who made loans.

Legality aside, the records show examples of how “usurers by occupation” got rich. One indignant correspondent from Norfolk wrote to the government of “three miserable usurers” of whom two were worth £100,000 each and one £40,000. Even in the little moorland town of Leek, far from centres of trade and industry, lurked a moneylender who “could accumulate what was then the considerable fortune of £1000.”\textsuperscript{261}

Table 11 - The Original 1570 Text of Porder’s Sermon

Not only were there moral arguments against money lending but, in the Government’s eyes,

…even in rural districts, we see growing up in Elizabethan England a new money power, which competes with the authority of the squire and the Justice and which in the absence of express intervention by the government, is sometimes strong enough to set the law at defiance…\textsuperscript{262}

\textsuperscript{260}Richard Porder, “A Sermon of God's Fearful Threatenings for Idolatrye - 1570” (London: Henry Denham, 1570). Note: Tawney refers to this work p.87 but does not include the full title which is: A sermon of gods fearefull threatnings for idolatrye mixing of religion, retayning of idolatrous remnaunts, and other wickednesse: with a treatise against usurie. Preached in Paules Churche the. xv. daye of Maye. 1570.


\textsuperscript{262}R.H. Tawney and Thomas Wilson, A Discourse Upon Usury by Thomas Wilson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1925). p.89
Perhaps even more worrying to the authorities was the notion that this new power was exercising “an extensive, if secret, influence in the countrysides.”

One place in which the moneylender could be seen in action was in the courts of law.

…In the opening years of Elizabeth’s reign, one moneylender had thirty [outstanding] suits arising from usurious dealings with his neighbours. [he also kept]…a gang of bullies who intimidated witnesses, forcibly kidnapped and imprisoned an opponent with whom he had a quarrel, threatened to drive the parson out of the village, and set at defiance a Royal commission appointed to investigate the disorders.

Tawney related how local juries suffered intimidation through fear of physical violence and could not be relied upon to “give a verdict, order local justices to take proceedings, for both yeomen and gentry were apt to be their clients.”

Two commissioners were appointed by the Crown in 1578 to investigate breaches of the 1571 Act (13 Eliz, c.8) legislation aimed at setting limits rather than a total ban. The commissioners

…were obliged to write to Burghley begging that [certain] offenders might be pardoned, “so that we may quietly travel without molestation within the counties specified in the commission”…

One Webbe, a prominent Dorsetshire moneylender, was even able to bring pressure to bear in the Privy Council to ensure the legal case against him was not transferred to London. The Government agent involved reported to his masters

…no good or direct preceding can ever be hoped for, in as much Webbe and his mother, being greatly moneyed and dealing very much in the trade of usury, have many or most of the better sort indebted to them…

In this last case it is interesting to note the reference to Webbe’s mother, a widow. The DeWindts drew attention to the fact that in the England of the late 16th century widows were

---

263 Ibid. p.89
264 See also S.P.D Elizabeth, volume 155, number 65
265 Tawney and Wilson, Discourse p.90
266 13 Eliz, c.8. also “…The law of 1571. It was called Against Usury but usury was actually permitted provided that it did not exceed ten per cent. But the law included a word of defiance to the New Plutocracy, for: “all usury, being forbidden by the Law of God, is sin detestable.”” Henry Swabey, Usury and the Church of England, Online - still in draft, ed. Peter Etherden (Buckfastleigh: CESC, 2008) p.41
267 Tawney and Wilson, Discourse p.160
268 MSS of Marquis of Salisbury, part four page 277 – see also Tawney and Wilson, Discourse p.90
…counted as full citizens … they appear as sureties in some village courts and often took control of village tenements or urban businesses previously directed by their husbands… widows became moneylenders, and one historian has even suggested that this was a widow's primary economic function in early modern England…

It would be dangerous to conclude that all moneylenders and, by the legal definitions of the time, all usurers, were criminal kingpins sitting on bags of cash directing their bully-boys and undermining the social fabric. But equally there were individuals who were doing all these things and like most quasi-criminal activity in many ages it was a business in which fortunes were made.

As noted above, that the tiny village of Leek could be rumoured to have a usurer who had accumulated a thousand pounds, suggests that the provincial money lending business was well established by the 1590s.

Kerridge quoted George Wither

To make of griping usury their trade
Among the rich, no scruple now is made
In any place. For every country village
Hath now some usury, as well as tillage

TAX

…the king could have no want as long as his subjects had the means to pay taxation

E.O. Smith, 1964

…it’s good to be the king

Mel Brookes, 1981

Background to Early Modern Taxation in England

During the medieval period taxes were raised by the monarchy almost exclusively to fund wars or other emergency situations. They were, to put it simply, extraordinary events. J.D. Allsop noted in 1984 that with the rise of mercantilism, the sixteenth century

---

269 DeWindt and DeWindt, Ramsay p.251.
270 x ref. footnote 176 and Glossary concerning George Wither.
...did not merely witness a repeat of earlier debates and activities of little or no ultimate consequence. Tudor tax innovations developed within the context of late medieval doctrine and as a part of the alteration of conventional finance under the pressure of political and economic circumstances.\textsuperscript{274}

Later in the same article Allsop continued

...Indeed, the combination of old and new was a prominent feature of this transitional phase. In a sense the greatest significance of the mid-Tudor acts lay not in the inclusion of occasional regular expenses as part of the arguments for supply or in the failure to identify certain costs as clearly extraordinary; it was the transformation of the traditional appeal to military necessity into an un-restricted association of all government with taxable defence.\textsuperscript{275}

**Table 12 - Bishop Latimer's Death**

Bishop Hugh Latimer,\textsuperscript{276} burnt at the stake by Queen Mary I, had earlier preached on a subject’s Christian duty as being

...to satisfy all and every royal necessity. Taxation... was essential for war, peacetime defence, and the general maintenance of the state.\textsuperscript{277}

It is the inclusion of “general maintenance of the state” that is perhaps most significant here, the notion of on-going expenses being met through taxation.

Another early Protestant theologian, Thomas Becon (1512-1567) also commented that “tribute” to monarchs was justified

...either for the provision and maintenance of their prince-like estate, or else for the safeguard of the commonweal...\textsuperscript{278}


\textsuperscript{275} Ibid. p.87

\textsuperscript{276} c.1487 – 1555


Again, the use of the word “maintenance” appears, indicating a profound change in thinking.

Allsop, in another paper of 1982, examined how the pretence of taxation for military purposes continued to be used long after it had ceased to have any real relevance. However, grudgingly, and only after many ebbs and flows, it did become tacitly accepted that the only solution to a burgeoning state bureaucracy and increased peacetime spending was the creation of parliamentary taxation “for the undifferentiated needs of the state.”

**Tax and Geese**

The art of taxation consists in so plucking the goose as to get the largest possible amount of feathers with the smallest amount of hissing.

Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683)

If the Early Modern legal system was in Francis Bacon’s term “a labyrinth” then the period’s tax system could be said to have been an equivalently large maze. One recent reference work, in a mastery of understatement, noted that “much ingenuity has gone into the devising of taxation systems.” I have assembled the following table to show the main building blocks of Early Modern taxation in England as they impact this thesis.

**Table 12 - Taxation in Early Modern England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (National) Taxation</th>
<th>Taxation imposed at the Local Level</th>
<th>Church Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Taxes</td>
<td>Parliamentary Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Duties</td>
<td>Prerogative Taxes</td>
<td>Lay Subsidy “Fifteenths” “Tenths”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Loans, Benevolences, Free &amp; Loving Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


280 Allsop, *Innovation* p.93

281 Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619-83) Chief Minister to Louis XIV *attrib.*

282 "from vastness of volume and a labyrinth of uncertainties unto that course of the Civil Law which is now in use.” Francis Bacon, "To The King: of a digest to be made of the Lawes of England (1629)." in *Certaine Miscellany Works* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1855).

Royal Taxes – Paid Direct to the Crown

Customs Duties The right to charge customs duties on imports and exports was granted by Parliament to each monarch for his or her life.

Prerogative Taxes are various categories of forced lending to the Crown. Under Henry VIII, forced loans appeared in the early 1520’s, thereafter 1542 and 1544 saw additional loans later converted into “grants”. In 1545, a “benevolence” and a “free and loving contribution” (both highly euphemistic terms) were demanded. Both Mary I and Elizabeth I required forced loans (in 1557, 1563, 1569/70, 1585/9, 1590/1, and 1597). The Queens repaid most of these and the last forced loan demanded was in 1626 by the newly crowned Charles I.

Parliamentary Taxes – Levied by Parliament

The Lay Subsidy began as a tax for a specific purpose, for example

…to subsidize a foreign war, which was distinguished from taxes levied on the clergy. The lay subsidy rolls of 1290 - 1334 are a major medieval source. The tax was commonly known as the Tenth and Fifteenth because it was levied on one-tenth of movable property in a town and one-fifteenth of similar property in the countryside. The collectors arranged the returns by hundred orwapentake and then by vill or borough... amount of evasion is unknown. The lay subsidy was revived by Henry VIII. …occasional assessments were made until 1623.

The Lay Subsidy was levied on those with a minimum amount of goods or land (the penniless poor being exempt) and calculated against all their property, regardless of location and made payable at their normal place of residence. To maximize the return to the Crown it could be imposed against lands or goods according to whichever brought the highest tax charge.

The “fifteenths and tenths” referenced above were effectively a fixed yield tax, levied by quotas on communities, apportioned and assessed by those communities on their

---

284 A subdivision of certain English shires - OED
285 A territorial unit or division under the feudal system, consisting of a number of houses or buildings with their adjacent lands, more or less contiguous and having a common organization - OED
constituent members. Being a historical anachronism by the middle of the sixteenth century it no longer reflected the rapidly changing picture of where national wealth, and hence the capacity to be taxed, actually lay. London at the start of the sixteenth century, benefitting from this archaic system, was only paying 2% of the nation’s tax bill. The Lay Subsidy reintroduced in 1510 was the first attempt at modernization. By its operation tax payers

… were to be assessed individually on oath before local officials under the supervision of nationally appointed commissioners who were authorized to examine and revise assessments. Each tax-payer was to be assessed on both the value of his annual income (lands and fees) and on the capital value of his moveable goods...

But, as already referenced, tax was payable on the category which produced the highest tax charge.

Taxes Imposed at the Local Level

Poor Rates

Nowadays simply referred to as the “Rates” these originated with

…Various Acts in the 16th century provided for a poor rate for the relief of the sick and destitute, but in England “the rates” date back formally to the Poor Relief Act of 1601, which made the parish the administrative unit for rating.

The taxes were levied on householders “the occupiers of land and buildings” and it was rare for anyone, ever, to avoid paying these. John Shakespeare was, as will be shown, such a rare example.

Taxes on Office Holders

In Early Modern England status came with a corresponding cost. Officeholders were expected and required to contribute to the needs (usual or extraordinary) of their locale in proportion to their net worth. This thesis will detail the lengths some individuals were prepared to go to in order to avoid this form of taxation, but at this point it is sufficient

---

288 Ibid. p.605
290 x ref.153
to note that the costs of office could be enormous.\textsuperscript{291} Being appointed Sheriff of the City of London is a perfect example and we will see the lengths one individual went to in avoiding the “honour”.\textsuperscript{292} In 1990, R.M. Wunderli set out the history of tax dodging in London through the refusal of public office. His general conclusion was that in times of relative peace and prosperity offices broadly could be expected to bring the recipient reasonable income relative to the charges placed upon the “honour”. But in times of war, civil unrest or public health issues, then the costs were heightened and for many individuals office dodging became an attractive alternative.\textsuperscript{293} Declining a position usually resulted in fines payable on non-attendance, or court proceedings were initiated. Yet again, John Shakespeare was the rare case of an individual who absented himself - in his case from the Borough Council - and had these charges waived. Shakespeare’s son in law, John Hall, was less fortunate for as Joan Lane noted, “he was fined £10 rather than be knighted by Charles I in 1626.”\textsuperscript{294}

**Musters**

A 1523 statute required commissioners to return nominal listings of all those taxed to the Exchequer. This followed a joint muster and fiscal assessment of the previous year. This was an initiative to calculate national wealth, military capability and to determine who actually controlled the military. One practical application of this was the allocation of the subsequent forced loans.

This exercise tied into the regular “Musters” when all able-bodied men aged 16 to 60, who were automatically liable for military service had to present themselves equipped with their own weapons and armour according to their income and social position.\textsuperscript{295}

The lists of names created at these were known as muster rolls. In March 1570 Musters “of men, horses, armour and weapons” took place in Stratford. These mandatory assemblies were often used as a technique to signal public authority to the citizenry in times of potential political unrest. The costs of these exercises, plus the replacement of any war materials, were distributed according to perceived wealth. The higher position

\textsuperscript{291} x ref.209
\textsuperscript{292} x ref.222
\textsuperscript{294} Joan Lane, *John Hall and his Patients*, 1st Edition (Stratford: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1996). p.XXV
\textsuperscript{295} A large number of the surviving Muster rolls are kept at the Public Record Office, mostly in the State Papers Domestic. See the Public Record Office Records Information leaflet no. 46, ‘Militia Muster Rolls, 1522–1640’
on the “list” of the “well-to-do” then the greater one’s potential liability. It was, in effect, a wealth tax to pay for the militia. John Shakespeare’s name appeared near the top of “Gentlemen and Freeholders” in Stratford drawn up at the time of the 1570 Musters i.e. he was identified as someone who would be required to contribute in relation to this position.

**Church Taxes**

Tithes

“In England [tithing] was legally enforced by King Athelstan's Ordinance c.930. Tithes were at one time subject to canonical division between the bishop, the clergy, the fabric of the church, and the relief of the poor, but eventually their disposal was left to the clergy who received them. At first the owner of the land could pay the tithe to what clergy he liked, but as the parochial system developed the tithes of each parish were allotted to its own ‘parson’.”

Tithes appeared in the Old Testament - Leviticus 27:30-32

… and concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, euen of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shalbe holy unto the Lord.”


Tithes did not disappear with the Reformation and the tithe-rights that belonged to certain religious institutions were confiscated by the Crown and given or sold to various owners known as lay impropriators. About a third of all tithes became owned by these lay people and significantly for the Shakespeares, a part of one block of the tithes around Stratford was purchased by William Shakespeare.

---

297 King James Version (1611)
298 Ibid.
300 The largest single known cash investment made by the Shakespeare family “In 1605, Shakespeare paid £440 for a half-interest in the lease of certain tithes in the Stratford-upon-Avon area” see "tithes" Stanley Wells, *A Dictionary of Shakespeare* (Oxford: OUP, 1998). See also x ref. 266.
Consistory (Bawdy Court) Court Fines

Though the local Church Courts levied fines for moral lapses, these were generally of a minor nature and tied to specific penances or the cash applied to poor relief. Various members of the Shakespeare family were censured and/or fined by the Stratford Court.

Recusancy Fines

If Bawdy Court Fines were trivial, then Recusancy fines were the exact opposite. What began as an attempt to coerce catholics into the Government preferred version of Protestantism, soon became an instrument of state taxation – albeit in a religious guise. In 1603 when James I fleetingly relented on fining non-church-attending individuals, the related annual fines (taxes) fell alarmingly by £7000 to £1400. But with the advent of Whitgift as Bishop of Worcester in 1577 a new drive for money was aimed also at non-conforming Protestants in an effort to mine a new vein of tax income. Clearly his “religious” zeal was well received for in 1583 he became Archbishop of Canterbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts In £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>5745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>8478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>6873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>9787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>7627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>6529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1938 Brian Magee computed total Exchequer receipts from recusants as shown above. Though his work must be seen as potentially biased towards a Catholic viewpoint - the publisher is self-described as “printer to the Holy See” - the figures themselves do appear to be accurate. John Shakespeare was fined for recusancy and indeed appeared on a list of recusants.

301 The figure for 1592 is an estimate, the actual figure is lost.
Tax in London

The effect in London of these changes in taxation is very apparent in the following table\textsuperscript{303}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Parliamentary Fifteenths</th>
<th>Parliamentary Subsidies</th>
<th>Military Exactions</th>
<th>Loans &amp; Benevolences not Repaid</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1510-19</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>10,218</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>13,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520-9</td>
<td>16,907</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>47,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-9</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540-9</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>105,643</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>169,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-9</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>77,883</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>21,332</td>
<td>109,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-9</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>33,417</td>
<td>7,815</td>
<td>43,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570-9</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>27,821</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>37,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580-9</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>38,607</td>
<td>44,285</td>
<td>87,176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590-9</td>
<td>7,956</td>
<td>57,383</td>
<td>44,068</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>129,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,223</td>
<td>357,642</td>
<td>149,911</td>
<td>94,432</td>
<td>645,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures exclude sums “incapable” of being levied (i.e. theoretically due but practically impossible to collect) though sheriffs were still required to pursue these payments. There are indications that as little as 2% of these were actually recovered.\textsuperscript{304} By the 1590’s attempts to obtain the “incapable” had “to all intents and purposes been abandoned.”

Another issue was the exclusion of sums due from claimants in London producing certificates that they were already paying somewhere else, usually based on property owned elsewhere. As the century progressed, “certificates” unsurprisingly grew in popularity. Archer estimated that by 1559 the absence of certificates would have increased the city’s taxes by about 6% rising to 14% by 1596. County assessments were perennially lower than London ones with only the wealth immediately visible to the local assessors being taken into account. Archer was of the opinion that “the figures represent [only] what the crown was able to extract of London-based wealth.”

Depressing one’s assessment became common practice in London with the wealthiest benefitting most from reduced assessments. The lowest level of taxable net worth

\textsuperscript{303} Archer, Burden I have prepared this table from statistics that appear across p.603-605.

\textsuperscript{304} R. Schofield, Parliamentary lay taxation, 1485-1547 (Unpublished). Quoted in Archer, Burden
started with individuals who owned £3 worth of goods. By the turn of the century according to Archer the Privy Council had reluctantly been forced to conclude

...assessments should not be according to men’s “just and true” valuations but according to some mediocrity in their callings.\textsuperscript{305}

Therefore, immediately before and after 1600 in London, anyone seeking to reduce their apparent tax liability would have a “calling” that appeared humble in the extreme and/or have multiple sources of income but declare only the lowest of these. He would seek not to be a property owner or even a householder (another taxation point). He would live as a lodger in the city but have a country property where a friendly tax assessment and certificate might be obtained if, \textit{in extremis}, one were ever needed i.e. if the collectors ever caught up with him. Other features that would help to confuse the authorities would be moving between addresses and criss-crossing from city to suburbs. Final touches would be, in the case of a married man, not to have family members living with him, have no personal servants and only have a limited number of possessions i.e. to look as poor as possible.

In short, he would behave in a manner exactly like William Shakespeare, a man assessed at goods “to the [humble] value of £5”, a man who consciously met all of the above tax avoidance criteria. A man who was just a “poor player.”\textsuperscript{306}

\textbf{ANALYZING THE TAKINGS}

Figures are plentiful, but they prove tantalisingly evasive. When we have receipts for individual sections of a theatre, we lack the receipts for the whole; or when we have the receipts for the whole, we lack the receipts for individual sections. When we know what a housekeeper’s share was worth, or an actor’s share, we are in doubt about the total number of shares, or deductions for expenses, or prices of admission. The surviving figures simply fail to cooperate…

Alfred Harbage, 1941\textsuperscript{307}

Harbage (above) was summarizing how incomplete the financial records are of the Early Modern Theatre in London. Yet, to intelligently comment on the earnings of William Shakespeare, it is necessary to quantify theatrical earnings in general before

\textsuperscript{305} Archer, \textit{Burden} p.612
\textsuperscript{306} Macbeth V, v
examining the potential personal earnings of the man who was playwright, actor, sharer, and housekeeper.

Just as figures are plentiful, so attempts to piece together a coherent picture of the net profitability of the theatres have been many, contradictory and often tainted with a phenomenon Gabriel Egan called “scholarly wish fulfilment.” Each of these efforts has understandably been made from the single point of view, and more importantly the academic or professional training, of the person analysing the puzzle. Writers, principally trained in literary analysis, have produced summaries that often include a blend of past stories rather than numerical evaluations. But economists seek to place the activity within the overall financial scene and therefore concentrate more on macro-economic issues rather than the day-to-day cash flows as the following table, prepared by two American economists, shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Theatrical Costs 1600 vs. 1960</th>
<th>Estimated % of Total Budget Broadway Theatre, 1960-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical Rental</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playwright’s Fees</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists &amp; Managerial Costs</td>
<td>30-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Itemized Costs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005 Andrew Gurr took a significant step, and a courageous one, for an established literary scholar, by acknowledging that a detailed financial understanding of “Shakespeare’s” Company could only be had if modern accounting methods were used to summarise its financial standing. In his chapter “Will money buy ’em?” he produced, with assistance, a series of tables that represent truncated financial summaries for the various guises of the Chamberlain’s/ King’s Men across their existence. However, one suspects that he hindered his own efforts by starting with “this offer of the facts and figures has to be based largely on guesswork.”

308 Gabriel Egan, “Reconstructions of the Globe: a Retrospective,” Shakespeare Survey (Cambridge), no. 52 (1999): 1-16. p.8 - though Egan is not referring to this particular problem, I would suggest his term is applicable to this situation.


310 Ibid. p.159


312 Ibid. p.85
A tourist from Utrecht, Johannes de Witt, in 1596 describing the Swan theatre used the words: “tres mille homines in sedilibus admittat.” i.e. “…it accommodates in its seats three thousand persons.”

A more systematic calculation of theatre capacity came from Harbage in 1941. He took the measurements of the Fortune Theatre - the only theatre of the period for which exact dimensions are documented - and proceeded to calculate its audience capacity. Harbage put the Fortune at 1,842 ft.² of standing space in the yard and 5,725 ft.² of useable seating space in the galleries. At 2.25 ft.² per standee and 3.75 ft.² per person seated this would permit 818 standing in the yard and 1,526 seated. Forty years later A. J. Cook revisited these calculations and noted

I follow here Harbage's allotment of 2.25 ft.² of space to each groundling. I question, however his figure of 7,156.65 ft.² of gallery space holding 1,526 people. Not only does his footage fail to conform to the dimensions of the Fortune ... But he assumes a wholly seated audience in the Galleries despite the wealth of evidence to people standing there too... His estimate of 2,344 person capacity for Fortune diverges considerably from the 3000 figure reported by contemporaries.

The apparent discrepancy between the 5,725 ft.² figure of Harbage and Cook’s 7,156 ft.² was explained by Harbage having deducted 20% for stairs, passageways etc..

In summary, while Cook thought Harbage’s calculations understated the maximum capacity, there was agreement that the galleries were much more important financially than the yard. In Cook’s words

Harbage still comes out with a preponderance of gallery places over pit places by a margin of two to one… this is a staggeringly favourable [sic] allotment of space to gallery places over yard places.

Having some sense of theatre capacity, the next logical question concerns the financial mix of the patrons. Another tourist, this time Thomas Platter of Basle, in 1599 wrote

…there are different galleries and places, however, where the seating is better and more comfortable and are therefore more expensive. For whoever cares to stand below only pays one English penny, but if he

---

314 The building contract is dated January 8, 1600. As Chambers notes – “…the Hope itself was modelled structurally on the Swan”. Chambers *Elizabethan Stage* p.414
315 Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audience* p.22-3
317 Ibid. p.187
wishes to sit he enters by another door and pays another penny, while if he desires to sit in the most comfortable seats which are cushioned, where he not only sees everything well, but can also be seen, then he pays another English penny at another door…

This price scale only applied to the public theatres. As Harbage noted

…a greatly advanced and evidently more variable scale came in with the “private” theatres after 1599, and these in turn modified the price system elsewhere, certainly at the later Globe…

Cook made similar observations

…with the reopening of private houses [private theatres] after 1599, prices seem to have begun at sixpence and ranged upward. Prince Otto of Hesse - Cassel claimed that “it cost half a shilling to enter, but for other places at least half a crown …a shilling was a common charge, but some paid up to eighteen pence, two shillings or even more…

[with]…the reappearance of the boys troupes [after 1599], charging higher prices… the public playhouses seem to have begun charging higher prices too. Though there were still plenty of references to the two penny places right up to the end of the period

In calculating gross returns for the public theatres, the key question is what is the ratio of the cheapest “one penny” yard patrons to the more expensive, and exclusive, seating areas? The most complete financial records of daily theatre earnings come from Henslowe’s notebook, as it provides the daily receipts from the Rose from February 19, 1592 to November 5, 1597 – apart from closings due to Lent and other prohibitions on performance. In the notebook plays marked with “NE” represent new plays that attracted better audiences. Cook commented on the

…sheer number of new plays given each year… Henslowe averaged one a fortnight at the Rose…

Harbage noted that the maximum and minimum earnings recorded in the notebook were as follows

---

319 Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audience* p.24
320 Cook, *Privileged Playgoers* p.183
321 Ibid. p.193
Table 16 - Gallery Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Gallery Receipts</th>
<th>Low Record</th>
<th>High Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Plays</td>
<td>72d.</td>
<td>1,728d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plays</td>
<td>720d.</td>
<td>1,840d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, writing as he was in 1941, Harbage then unfortunately spent, as he put it, “many hours on the electric calculating machine” for at this point in his computations he lost all sight of a coherent business model of the theatres. He took the approach of taking small samples of the highest figures from Henslowe’s notebook and coupled these to a very literal interpretation of de Witt’s sketch and notes. He then grossed these up arithmetically and proceeded to drive the financial picture of the theatres to suit his computations. Harbage has not been alone in this approach – Forse did much the same and also arrived at hugely inflated earnings for both players and owners.322

Thomson in 1992, looked at takings on a more average or “typical” basis, as opposed to looking to extremes. He considered the audience and its paying power before piecing numbers together

...an Elizabethan artisan could have afforded the penny admission...the merchant would have certainly preferred to sit unless the type has changed, he would have believed that his enterprise and effort had earned him the reward of comfort, and paid his extra penny as of right.323

Though not dismissing the notion of a three tier pricing system (as proposed by Harbage) he commented “a likelier area [for expensive seating] is the gallery over the stage.”324

Cook also commented on exclusive seating

...six penny rooms were noted by both Beaumont and Middleton… besides the standings in the pit band of the seats or standings in the Galleries, there were also "the priuate roomes of greater prise" (in particular the Lords room)325

322 James H. Forse, Art Imitates Business (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993). p.58 – Forse appears to base everything on a comment about one actor’s personal share on one night.
324 Ibid. p.26 - This in contradiction to Harbage’s notion of an orchestra-like area on the first tier.
325 Cook, Privileged Playgoers p.182/3 – the quotation comes from John Davies, Epigram Three, Epigrams and Elegies (London, circa 1590)
Based on a random sampling of each day’s takings recorded by Henslowe in January 1596 Thomson observed that

…the typical income is over 20 but less than 30 shillings…”

He continued

…we need to distinguish between what is average and what is characteristic. There is a high probability that an audience of 600 or less was a more regular occurrence than an audience in excess of 1000. But the love of novelty together with an unembarrassed quest for entertainment boosted the numbers attending any performance that had a special promise.\(^{327}\)

Thomson considered that Harbage’s estimations of a growing level of theatrical attendance “give[s] a misleadingly comfortable view” when contrasted against Henslowe’s figures from 1598 which he found to be “equivocal, if not downright depressing” and he concluded that “contrary to a growing level of attendance there was no increase in the theatrical public since 1595.” Thomson’s observations certainly make sense when compared to the general level of the economy and therefore disposable income for the bulk of the population. Using Henslowe’s 20 to 30 shillings per day from the two penny gallery - Thomson took an average of 25 - and doubling this to reflect the total gallery takings produced a gallery audience of around 300. If the groundlings are only the same in number this gives a daily total of 50 shillings – “less than half the number that Harbage puts forward at the Rose in 1595.”\(^{328}\)

The weight of opinion seems to fall on the side of the yard being the much smaller component of income – Gurr alone seems to view revenues from each section being almost equal.

---

326 Thomson, *Shakespeare's Theatre* p.29
327 Ibid. p.30
328 Ibid. p.30
Thomson estimated William Shakespeare's theatrical earnings between 1599 and 1608 at £55330 without his income as a playwright - a figure close to my own calculations of just under £52 for a year with few or no interruptions or closures.

Table 17 - Hypothetical Financial Statement - Globe Theatre c.1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fallow</th>
<th>Gurr</th>
<th>Aaron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Galleries Sharers</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>375.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Galleries Housekeepers</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>375.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>770.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Royal Performances</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Touring</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other Performances</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,260.0</td>
<td>1,730.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plays</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Costumes</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Poor Relief</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sub Total Production Expenses</td>
<td>710.0</td>
<td>810.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ground Rent</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sub Total Theatre Expenses</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>824.5</td>
<td>860.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NET INCOME</td>
<td>435.5</td>
<td>870.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Housekeepers Earnings Net p.a.</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>375.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sharers Net Earnings p.a.</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>545.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Est. Earnings per sharer</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Est. Earnings per housekeeper</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Playing Days</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

329 The above table is an attempt to present the data on a comparable basis. Neither Gurr nor Aaron presents their data in this form nor are they working to precisely the same time periods and parameters. Accordingly, numbers have been averaged and interpolated where required. For a detailed commentary on these figures see x ref.396. The numbers in the first column of the above table are used only for ease of reference in the financial notes. The column “Gurr” refers to data from A Gurr, The Shakespeare Company 1594-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 2004). “Aaron” from Melissa Aaron, Global Economics (Cranbury, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2005). 330 Thomson, Shakespeare's Theatre p.34
Thomson also noted that the later addition of the Blackfriars, which Shakespeare bought into in 1608, being more profitable than the Globe, would have probably raised his theatrical earnings to over £200.\(^\text{331}\) The above three analyses of the Chamberlain’s/ King’s Men’s earnings at the Globe in a typical year between 1599 to 1603 indicate a range of earnings for someone who was both sharer and housekeeper of between £52 to £100. With an annual writing rate of two plays per year at a fee of £6, plus the gallery receipts for the second night of performance, this could be expected to add a further £20. Using my own estimate of £52 (sharer plus housekeeper earnings) this would produce a healthy annual income of about £72.

This £72 figure is before any interest or forgone investment costs were paid on the capital used or borrowed to finance Shakespeare’s becoming a Housekeeper at the Globe – initially £100 before rising to £118. Even at 10% interest,\(^\text{332}\) this would present a reduction of £12 a year in earnings without any amortization of the principal. This brings Shakespeare’s earnings back down to around £60 p.a. – a good wage when contrasted to the £12-17 a year of an artisan or the £10-30 of a schoolmaster – yet still far short of the £600 an established barrister might expect or £1000 for a junior judge. The Queen’s annual revenue was less than £250,000.\(^\text{333}\)

Nor were lower incomes restricted to the uneducated, as A. J. Cook noted

…Masters at the Merchant Taylors School received but £10 per year, and lesser courtiers or retainers of noblemen fared little better…\(^\text{334}\)

As demonstrated in earlier sections, other substantial earnings from patronage or publishing were most unlikely.

Against this, Shakespeare had the costs of maintaining himself in London and his family in Stratford, plus the costs of costumes if, as a sharer and housekeeper, he was also performing on stage.\(^\text{335}\) After attaining gentlemanly rank in 1599, he would also have been required to dress according to his new social status.

---

\(^{331}\) As referenced elsewhere in this thesis, there is evidence that the Blackfriars theatre though it may have opened in 1608, was not in positive cash flow till 1609 or 1610.

\(^{332}\) The legal maximum and often much less than many people paid. See x ref: 72

\(^{333}\) Thomson, *Shakespeare's Theatre*, p.28

\(^{334}\) Cook, *Privileged Playgoers* p.182

\(^{335}\) Thomson, *Shakespeare's Theatre* p.31 - Thomson, noted that senior members of the Company (the sharers) were generally expected to supply their own costumes.
A net £60 per annum would have supported a comfortable, but not extravagant, lifestyle but it would not, by any stretch of the imagination, have paid for the stream of investments he made between 1597 and 1613.

Table 18 - Major Shakespeare Investments 1597 - 1610

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sharer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>New Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Tithes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Gatehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Globe Rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet these only represent what might be called the more legally documented purchases – company shares, interests in contractual receivables (tithes) and freehold property. There are records of other minor, assumed or implied purchases such as the improvements to New Place, additional costs (£30) of clearing the title of the house with Hercules Underhill, applications for Gentlemanly Status (at the very least £40), legal fees in connection with all the above purchases and both personal and familial litigation. Collectively these costs can be conservatively estimated at £200 and could easily have been very much more.
**Portfolio Analysis, Income and Expenditure**

The largest emoluments that could have been derived from his [William Shakespeare’s] professional avocations [the theatre] would hardly have sufficed to accomplish such a result [the purchase of New Place in 1596], and the necessity of forwarding continual remittances to Stratford-on-Avon must not be overlooked. Halliwell-Phillipps, 1889\(^{336}\)

Shakespeare’s investments listed above share the investment qualities of low risk and capital preservation. Titles, houses, agricultural land, are all relatively immutable; though they may vary in value with supply and demand there is nothing speculative about them.

Even the tithes are conservative if the transaction was properly documented, the portfolio granular\(^{337}\) and all the legal niceties duly observed. The greatest risk in receivable purchases (i.e. the tithes) lay in the quality of the underlying promises to pay that Shakespeare as a Stratford man, can be reasonably expected to have understood. Where the risk in this particular investment may have been greater than he initially thought was in the satisfaction of the annual senior payments in the investment structure - i.e. those paid before his own portion. There are records of discrepancies here, though they were not fatal to the investment’s performance.

Overall, these are the investments of an individual who, having accumulated a “nest egg”, sought a stable portfolio that would retain value over time, while producing a steady income. In short, it is a pension plan based on capital preservation. It is not speculative and it was as diversified as could have been achieved at that time. This was not the risk-taking portfolio of a person seeking to double his or her money: investments like that existed in plenty, with the merchant trading companies for example or in financing piracy.

---


\(^{337}\) i.e. the receivable pool was made up of many small obligations where the failure to perform by any one payee would, in the case of default, not have a material effect on the overall performance of the portfolio
Of course this may have been just one portfolio – there may have been other riskier investments, with this one being kept as an anchor against the failure of other ventures.

**Income**

This thesis turns on the proposition that it is not merely important to establish how much money William Shakespeare made and spent from his theatrical endeavours but *when* the money was made and spent. The following table sets out theatre related revenues from 1593 to 1616. The figures in bold have been highlighted as they represent pre-plague revenue with the “Net Closures Income” showing the disastrous effects on earnings caused by disease.

**Table 19 - William Shakespeare's Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Playwriting</th>
<th>Sharer</th>
<th>House keeper</th>
<th>Tithe Income</th>
<th>Net Closures Income</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>893.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>2749.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in bold italics represent gross income had the theatres been open for the full playing year – which they were not. Net Closures Income represents what would have been received after taking the closures into account.
It is clear from these figures that Shakespeare had created a position of comfortable financial success. But it was only with the opening of the Blackfriars, with its much higher seat prices and different customer base, that it could be said that the theatre could have made him rich. Indeed the ‘rich’ part was delayed by the plague of 1609, which shut the theatres for the entire year.

Against this income, we have his estimated spending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>London Expense No Inflation</th>
<th>Stratford Expense No Inflation</th>
<th>Total Expense with 3% Inflation compounding</th>
<th>Stratford Investments</th>
<th>London Investments</th>
<th>Total Expenditure No Inflation</th>
<th>Total Expenditure With 3% Inflation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>3236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

338 A full scale financial model (outside the scope of this thesis) where every variable is capable of alteration would be required to refine these figures. 3% inflation is an extremely modest assumption given the general state of the economy through this period, yet even this low figure has a material effect - such is the power of compounding. With static prices for entry at the Globe through the earlier part of the first decade of the seventeenth century, if one assumes Shakespeare did not have other non-theatrical related income, then his family would have suffered a severe contraction in living standards - which we know not to be the case. Notes regarding the assumptions used in this table are included in the appendices x ref.396
Though investments were made over time it is the concentration of these in the early part of the first decade of the century that is most significant. In 1889 Halliwell-Phillipps had commented that even buying New Place would have stretched belief that his theatrical earnings could have met the cost. Indeed they would “hardly have sufficed to accomplish such a result” – and this from the expert in New Place. If New Place alone presents such a financial anomaly, how then could he afford all the other purchases made in the first years of James I’s reign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
<th>in v out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>-40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>-70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>-85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>393.0</td>
<td>-331.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>-64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>520.0</td>
<td>-442.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>393.0</td>
<td>-123.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>172.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>241.0</td>
<td>-41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ -546.1 \]

339 Despite earlier comments concerning inflation and TVM I have kept this table deliberately straightforward - expenses would not have remained static for example – inflation alone would have altered these.

Three possibilities present themselves as possible solutions to this cash deficiency.

- A patron gave him the money.
- He borrowed the cash and repaid it in later years.
- There are other sources of income - familial or personal - that remain to be determined.

The Patron

The first of these - a gift from a third party - remains highly improbable, as has been discussed earlier under the general heading of patronage. The spread of the investments over the best part of two decades makes any single lump sum unlikely. If we accept the Rowe “£1000”, then the portfolio would probably have reflected the single gift and the investments would have clustered around one date.

Another alternative is that he used the excess cash to make loans either personally or through a third party, until a suitable long-term investment came along. However, there is no apparent benefit in this strategy unless there was an appetite for high risk and potential for high reward. But that “high risk” element runs contrary to the personality behind the extremely conservative structure of the final portfolio. Without new documentary evidence, the gift from a patron notion can never be entirely dismissed though there is no evidence that this ever existed (beyond gossip for Shakespeare or any other playwright).

Borrowing

Borrowing the cash is possible, but most unlikely. Throughout this period liquidity (the availability of cash) was intermittent at best, and the compounding effect of interest would have made it prohibitively expensive, especially as the final investments would have probably yielded a lower return than the high cost of borrowing. There is also evidence that Shakespeare was seen as a likely source of cash rather than the reverse. This comes in Richard Quiney’s draft letter to Shakespeare of 25 October 1598.\(^\text{341}\) The date is key as it precedes his being even a housekeeper at the Globe - though he was by this date both a gentleman and owner of New Place. Quiney, on what was (at least in

part. official town business was most unlikely to have even considered approaching Shakespeare for the not inconsiderable sum of £30 if he had doubted that Shakespeare could have lent him the money or arranged a loan. Chambers remained open minded on the significance and precise meaning of this letter though he did agree that there was “an expectation of money to come from Shakespeare.”

It is both interesting and significant that the only surviving piece of correspondence addressed personally to Shakespeare, evidenced him as being cash rich, even before the Globe existed. The text in modern English

Loving Countryman, I am bold of you as of a friend, craving your help with £30 upon Mr Bushells & my security or Mr Myttons with me. Mr Roswell is not come to London as yet and I have special cause. You shall [be]friend me much in helping me out of all the debts I owe in London, I thank God, and much quiet my mind, which would not be indebted. I am now towards the Court in hope of answer for the dispatch of my business. You shall neither lose credit nor money by me, the Lord willing, and now but persuade yourself so as I hope and you shall not need to fear but with all hearty thankfulness. I will hold my time and content your friend, and if we bargain further you shall be the paymaster yourself. My time bids me hasten to an end and so I commit this to your care and hope of your help. I fear I shall not be back this night from the Court. The Lord be with you and with us all Amen. from the Bell in Carter Lane the 25 October 1598.

| Table 22 - The Quiney Letter |

An earlier letter to Quiney from Abraham Sturley dated 24 January 1598 related

342 Chambers, William II p.105
343 Ibid. p.106
344 Ibid. p.101
345 Chambers, William II p.102 – This is my own transliteration (apart from the names) see Chambers for text and good quality photograph of the original.
…our countryman, Mister Shakespeare is willing to disburse some money upon some …yardland\textsuperscript{346}…or other at Shottery or near about us…to deal in the matter of our tithes…we think it a fair mark for him to shoot at, and not impossible to hit…\textsuperscript{347}

Shakespeare did indeed buy his yardlands and tithes in the future but the date - January 1598 - stands out. Evidently word was already out (and believed by some) in the Stratford business community that Shakespeare had cash on hand.\textsuperscript{348} Moreover, he was seeking assets in which to invest his or his family’s money.

**The Other Sources of Revenue**

The aim of the first part of this thesis was to examine the commercial realities affecting the Early Modern Theatre in London and through this examination to determine the likelihood that the Shakespeare family wealth was derived from William’s artistic career.

After weighing up the evidence, including a review of the interpretations of other scholars both past and current, together with the documentary evidence, the conclusion must be that there is a large slice of expenditure that cannot be explained using theatrical sources of income alone.

A few scholars, notably Halliwell-Phillipps and more recently Thomson\textsuperscript{349} and Brownlow,\textsuperscript{350} have pointed out some of the financial inconsistencies. I believe they noted these through intuition borne out of well-reasoned study and profound biographical knowledge of William’s life and career. By taking a more commercial approach I aim to extend their work and provide explanations of where the cash actually came from.

\textsuperscript{346} Antique measurement of land: An area of land of varying extent according to the locality, but most frequently 30 acres: commonly taken as \(\frac{1}{4}\) a fourth of a hide. OED

\textsuperscript{347} The transliteration into modern colloquial English is my own – See Chambers, *William II* p.101 for original spelling.

\textsuperscript{348} Though Wells, among other scholars, has referred to two additional letters. The first from Quiney to Abraham Sturley with the news that Shakespeare would “procure us money” and in reply one from Sturley which included “Which I will like of as I shall hear and when, and where, and how”. Stanley Wells, *Is it True What they Say about Shakespeare?* (Ebrington: Long Barn Books, 2007). p.71


During the twelve years between the purchase of New Place and the family’s acquisition of the Hathaway family farm, the investment expenditure far exceeded the income that could have been derived even from Shakespeare’s multi-faceted career as player, playwright, company sharer and housekeeper. There are clear signs that even by the late 1590’s he was cash-rich, or appeared so to his Stratford friends, and already looking for long-term investments. That the Blackfriars after 1608 could, and probably did, generate strong cash flow - closures permitting - does not explain earlier investments. To put it another way, it is not what was bought that is so significant, it is when it was bought that is of key importance. Cash flows like water, and just as water is key to all life, then cash is the life-giver of commerce. The Shakespeares were providers of cash at a time when the economy was in general turmoil. But the theatre alone, as the above figures demonstrate, could not have supplied their liquidity. The other traditional sources of revenue and cash: touring, patronage, court performances, publishing and borrowing - all have significant limitations, individually or collectively, in explaining the missing money.

The second part of this thesis focuses on finding the “other” money.

This involves

- an analysis of the business and civic career of John Shakespeare, and his apparent fall from financial grace,
- a new commercially based view of the business milieu in which William operated during his career in London together with an analysis of the character of people he associated with,
- a detailed commentary on the documented Shakespeare investments.  

351 There are references suggesting that there might not have been cash flow till as late as 1610 – see A Gurr, The Shakespeare Company 1594-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 2004) p.108 which put the positive cash flow only starting in 1609 (due to plague closures) and having reviewed the finances for 1603-1608 he commences again with 1610 -1615.

352 To achieve these three goals, an examination of the key factors affecting the economy of the time (law, wool and cloth, and money) was also required. See appendices. *x ref.399.*
Chapter 3 - JOHN SHAKESPEARE & STRATFORD-UPON-AVON

Like it or not, it describes the world…
Lawrence Krauss, 2009

Thomas Plume, Archdeacon of Rochester, born thirty years after John Shakespeare’s death, left a description of him more fitted to Santa Claus than a successful businessman. Plume was, by his own admission, repeating hearsay when he described John as a “merry-cheeked” old soul. But, like all stories in the Shakespeare mythos, this one continues to spawn speculation. Greenblatt, as recently as 2005, suggested that the “merry-cheeked” description might indicate the ruddy complexion of a drunk.

By the late twentieth century a number of scholars were beginning to accept that John Shakespeare rose through the ranks of civic office and attained a degree of financial success – “buoyant and successful…impressively solid citizen…impressive entrepreneurial ambition…” is just one set of descriptions. However, the story still stands that during the early 1570’s he fell on hard times and lost both his wealth and position. So this bankrupt, merry-cheeked, possibly drunken, glover saw his boy march off to London and win his fortune on the stage.

This chapter sets out the evidence for a very different assessment with, at its core, a re-evaluation of whether any reduction in the Shakespeare family’s finances ever happened at all.

In a field as large as Shakespearean studies it is daring to say that this new model of John Shakespeare has never been proposed. However, if it has, no evidence of such a view has been uncovered. Indeed, the apparent absence of data on this family’s rise to wealth and position positively encourages romantic fantasy about William’s work.

355 There is a curious parallel here with Rowe’s “£1000”.
357 Ibid. p.58-60
Furthermore, the absence of systematic analysis permits infinite voyages of the imagination, for example, perhaps Shakespeare did not write his plays at all.

The above quotation of Lawrence Krauss was addressed to those who feel challenged by an effective scientific theory that does not fit with their own homespun view of the cosmos. Krauss was stating that it is of prime importance that a theory actually works - even at the cost of offending comfortable common sense. So it is in understanding the finances of the Shakespeares. To paraphrase Krauss, in this and the subsequent chapters, “like it or not this describes the Shakespeares.”

Building a Theory

The physical sciences have, in the four centuries since Shakespeare’s death, developed the “scientific method”.\(^{358}\) Even concepts relying on (as yet) unexplained paradoxes can be used in theories to make discoveries – as long as they work. That the paradox may one day be resolved does not stop useful discoveries being made along the way.

By comparison, many researchers into the life of Shakespeare continue to wait for a document to be “discovered” which will explain his thoughts and motivations and thereby crystallize the understanding of the man, his character and his money. Without this new “discovery”, progress remains, for many, effectively barred.

In 1984, D. L. Thomas and N. E. Evans came to the conclusion that

\[\text{...Unfortunately, further discoveries about John Shakespeare’s career are less likely to result from careful research than from serendipity.}^{359}\]

In spite of their opinion, this thesis proposes that adopting an approach more akin to the scientific method can determine the true nature and size of the Shakespeare family’s business activities. Using this analysis as a tool, aspects of both the Shakespeare family and the Early Modern Theatre that are presently not fully understood are examined. By never relying on a \textit{deus ex machina} document the physical sciences have taken what

\(^{358}\) see "scientific method" A Dictionary of Psychology. Edited by Andrew M. Colman. Oxford University Press 2009. - a less than precise term for the more correctly named “hypothetico-deductive” approach to discovery, where tentative explanations for phenomena are subject to criticism by rational argument and refutation by empirical evidence.

was known and then, out of necessity and through ruthless testing, developed methodologies for making educated projections.

Speculating which aristocrat may or may not have been Shakespeare’s patron, or repeating half remembered, and almost certainly apocryphal, folk tales about youthful indiscretions (poaching) is certainly one approach. However, an alternative more likely to produce results is surely to list what is known, form a theory with this as a foundation and then build on this to investigate the Shakespeares’ lives.

In 1905, a Swiss patent clerk wrote a short paper entitled “On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies”. He described an incongruity

…It is known that Maxwell’s electrodynamics… when applied to moving bodies, leads to asymmetries, which do not appear to be inherent in the phenomena…

Later he added

…We will raise this conjecture …the purport of which will hereafter be called the “Principle of Relativity”…

Factual items – not merely “asymmetries” – are known about the lives of John and William Shakespeare and yet much scholarly time has been spent in sporadic, if not in some cases downright romantic, sallies into what motivated and inspired William’s work. Albert Einstein in the last of the nine footnotes in his paper noted

…It is more to the point to define force in such a way that the laws of momentum and energy assume the simplest form…

The goal in this thesis is that if Einstein’s dictum were to be applied to William’s work, then it could be presented as: it is important to define Shakespeare’s work in such a way that we understand it in its commercial reality and to then articulate this in its simplest form.

The conjecture now raised is that a key to understanding Shakespeare’s creative life lies locked in an analysis of “the money”.

---

360 Albert Einstein, “On The Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies,” in The Principal of Relativity (London: Methuen, 1923) - it is only twenty-three printed pages and nine footnotes.
This Chapter

This chapter examines the background and commercial milieu of John Shakespeare and together with the next two chapters, which examine William’s London environment, collectively supports a postulate of their finances. The result presents credible explanations for “asymmetries” in the lives of the Shakespeares, both long established and emergent, such as

- why John Shakespeare comprehensively removed himself from public life in 1576,
- why William’s years 1585 – 1592 were “lost”,
- why none of the Shakespeare brothers ever held public office,
- what were the sources of the Shakespeare family wealth,
- what John Shakespeare’s sons actually did all day.

Before starting a detailed examination of the factual experiences of John Shakespeare’s life it is appropriate to examine how he is typically regarded in current authoritative writing. As an example, the 2009 edition of The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare contains a chapter by Ernst Honigmann entitled “Shakespeare’s Life”. I have compressed his description of John Shakespeare to twenty-one points by removing the intervening prose but have quoted Honigmann’s own words

1. “He worked as a glover and whittawer (a curer and whitener of skins)…”
2. “…but he also became ‘a considerable dealer in wool’ (Nicholas Rowe, in his Life of Shakespeare, 1709, confirmed by recently discovered records)”
3. “…he sold barley and timber, and he bought houses”,
4. “…his probably complex business dealings”
5. “… he participated in civic affairs …and rose from minor duties to hold office as chamberlain, member of the town council, alderman, and… high bailiff (we would say ‘mayor’)”
6. “…he signed official documents with his mark which may mean that he could not write, though this does not necessarily follow.”
7. “…he must have had a good head for business since he was asked to take charge of civic accounts.”

---

361 Gilbert 1566 -1612, Richard 1574-1613, Edmund 1580-1607
8. “…Is it not likely, though that Shakespeare's parents were both remarkable people…”

9. “…Having prospered for some twenty years, John ran into difficulties in the late 1570’s.”

10. “…He was let off paying his weekly 4d. for poor relief”

11. “…He failed to attend council meetings”

12. “…He was deprived of his alderman's gown (1586)”

13. “…He mortgaged part of his wife's inheritance…”

14. “…It could be that he only pretended to be poor and withdrew from council business for religious reasons…”

15. “…i.e. he refused to give up the “Old Faith”, Roman Catholicism…”

16. “…List of non-attenders: apparently he alleged that he stayed away because he feared that he might be arrested for debt.”

17. “Nevertheless he continued to own houses in Stratford;”

18. “In 1580, summoned to appear in court at Westminster, he was fined £40 (equivalent to a schoolmaster's salary for two years) for non-appearance…”

19. “…The court, we are told, would not have imposed such a fine if John was believed unable to pay…”

20. “…Did his fortunes really decline, or did he withdraw from the council because, as a recusant, he did not wish to take part in punishing other Catholics?”

21. “…The evidence is not clear…”

These divide into two groups. The factual - points one to eight - portray a smart, skilled, successful businessman and public servant. Points nine to twenty present items that support only one (the author’s) interpretation of events. The objective of the remainder of this chapter is to deliver a more balanced view of the evidence, placing documented fact over convention.

---

363 Honigmann, Shakespeare's Life p.1-3
**The Corporation**

The story of the Shakespeares starts and ends in Stratford and John’s arrival in the town around 1550, aged about 15, was timely. The last of the medieval governmental structures were about to be replaced with the town’s incorporation as a Borough. This change would create a new, successful, self-made, class of citizen. The teenage glover’s apprentice, John Shakespeare, would be one of them. But to begin the analysis of John it is first necessary to examine how the “new” Stratford actually worked as a commercial, legal and civic entity.

Following the Charter of Incorporation of 1553, The Corporation of Stratford-Upon Avon was organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive and Legal Authority (2)</td>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>The leading borough magistrates during their term of office, both Justices of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Bailiff and Head Alderman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Body (28)</td>
<td>Aldermen (14)</td>
<td>Aldermen alone elected aldermen, the whole body elected Burgesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burgesses (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Finances (2)</td>
<td>Chamberlain (active)</td>
<td>Served two years in turn (though jointly responsible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamberlain (passive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control (2)</td>
<td>Tasters</td>
<td>Oversaw bread, meat, and beer sold in the borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(food &amp; beverage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Public Order (4)</td>
<td>Constables</td>
<td>Charged with maintenance of order and oversight of the watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control (2)</td>
<td>Leather Sealers</td>
<td>Approved and stamped leather offered for sale in the borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(leather)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Process &amp; Ceremonial (2)</td>
<td>Serjeants-at-the-Mace</td>
<td>Waited in attendance, one on the Bailiff the other on the Sub-Bailiff or Head Alderman, for the execution of their warrants and other orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The pinnacle of executive power in the new Borough was the annually elected Bailiff, the equivalent of Mayor. A Sub-Bailiff (Deputy Mayor) who was also Head Alderman assisted the Bailiff. Both men also served as Justices of the Peace, judges, in the town’s own permanent Court of Record. The town’s governing body - the Corporation or (Town) Council - met in the Guildhall.\textsuperscript{366} It was made up of twenty-eight individuals divided between fourteen Aldermen - senior town councillors in today’s parlance - and fourteen burgesses effectively junior town councillors. To become Bailiff an individual would customarily have worked his way up the chain of authority by taking roles of increasing responsibility. Other specialist roles included finance - two chamberlains, policing - four constables and a number of other job specific civic functions. The borough was an autonomous, self-controlling, hierarchical legal entity that was, for the most part, run by unpaid volunteers. John Shakespeare rose from humble apprentice (trainee craftsman) to Bailiff (mayor) having performed almost every key job in the Borough. However, civic duty (unpaid), had to be complemented by a successful career in business, the senior members of the council i.e. the burgesses and aldermen, were customarily the principal merchants and successful tradesmen of the town.

Officers were elected annually by their fellow Aldermen and Burgesses at Michaelmas.\textsuperscript{367} In some more technical roles, such as Leather Sealers, individuals might hold the same position for several years.

The Burgesses, Aldermen, Sub-Bailiff and Bailiff each wore their respective gowns of increasing cost denoting their civic status. Aldermen were entitled to be called and addressed with the title “Master”.

As previously noted, neither John Shakespeare’s birth date nor ancestry is certain – 1530 for birth is the most common estimate.\textsuperscript{368} Warwickshire had a large number of recorded Shakespeares with a multiplicity of spellings. The probability was that he was the son of Richard, a tenant farmer in Snitterfield, a village four miles northeast of

\textsuperscript{366} Now part of the King Edward VI School, Stratford-upon-Avon.
\textsuperscript{367} See Glossary
Stratford and brother of Henry though some sources suggest that he had two or more other brothers, Anthony\(^{369}\) and/or Thomas.

This chapter continues by looking into key aspects of John Shakespeare’s life and challenges many conventional views of his business and family life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Title</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>1530-1556</td>
<td>Farm boy came to town and after seven year apprenticeship became a glover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Very Civil Officer</td>
<td>1556-1579</td>
<td>Held positions at every level of civic office, some with considerable distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shakespeare Businessman</td>
<td>1556-1601</td>
<td>In business he quickly left glover behind and became a national level wool broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seeming Fall from Financial Grace</td>
<td>1576-1601</td>
<td>Completely withdrew from civic life as wool broking, always illegal, became the target of a new royal proclamation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford’s “Middling Sort”</td>
<td>1556-1601</td>
<td>How the Shakespeares were so representative of the new merchant “middle” class in Stratford.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{369}\) See Glossary – John Shakespeare’s Brothers.
Apprenticeship

Must I not serve a long apprenticehood
To foreign passages, and in the end,
Having my freedom, boast of nothing else
But that I was a journeyman to grief?

Richard II, iii

John moved to Stratford where he successfully
“undertook an apprenticeship of at least seven years
to become a glover and whittawer, or dresser of
white leather”.371 Apprentices in Elizabethan
England were vital to the growing pre-industrial
towns and in an age when people might never make
a journey of more than a few tens of miles, children
would be taken considerable distances to their new
master and mistress. In 1550 it has been estimated
that ten per cent of London’s population were
apprentices.372 Foreshadowing the rise of the British public school and the shock some
foreigners express over sending young children away to a regimented environment,
Anne Yarbrough in her excellent study of Bristol apprentices, quoted one Italian visitor

…The want of attention in the English is strongly manifested towards
their children, for after having kept them at home until they arrive at the
age of 7 to 9 years at the utmost, they put them out, both males and
females to hard service in the houses of other people. Binding them
generally for another 7 or 9 years. And these are called apprentices and
during that time they perform all the most menial offices: and few are
born who are exempted from this fate…373

He was perhaps a little off in the age children were customarily removed from home –
14 to 16 might be a better figure - but he was probably completely correct about the
“menial offices”. By long established practice apprenticeship did not end before the age
of 24, so working backwards, if John Shakespeare arrived in Stratford in 1550 at aged
15 to 16 or so it is probable he was born within a few years of 1534.

370 Areas of text in this section are drawn from my article: David Fallow, "Like father like son: Financial
372 Keith Wrightson, Early Modern England: Politics, Religion, and Society Under the Tudors and
373 Ann Yarborough, “Apprentices as Adolescents in Sixteenth-Century Bristol,” Journal of Social
That “proto-capitalism” needed skilled workers is unquestioned, but the willingness to give up one’s children rose from a number of reasons - impartible inheritance being a major one.\textsuperscript{374} If John Shakespeare did indeed have elder brothers and therefore no prospect of an inheritance, his only chance for self-advancement beyond tenant farmer would have been apprenticeship.

Another reason was teenage hormones. It’s not hard to find sermons preaching to apprentices about the dangers of being ‘privy pickers’ (masturbators) or how they should resist being ‘naughty’ with the mistress – even if she was the one doing the importuning. As an apprentice, a young man would, it was felt, be more closely controlled. His natural parents might indulge him; a master seeking to get as much work as possible out of him would not spare the rod. William at eighteen was himself perhaps “trapped” by the unplanned pregnancy of the twenty-six year-old Anne Hathaway. Whether the “trap” was of his making is another question. As to the “dangers” of leaving adolescents in their own home, Yarborough noted that

...in the mid-16th century play “The Disobedient Child” there is a father’s lament for his errant son.

“If I might live a hundred years longer.  
And should have sons and daughters many,  
Yet for this boy’s sake I will not suffer  
One of them all at home with me to tarry:  
They should not be kept thus under my wing.  
And have all that which they desire:  
For why it is but their only undoing.  
And, after the proverb, we put oil to the fire.”\textsuperscript{375}

It is tempting to think of John Shakespeare’s life both as farm boy and then as apprentice glover in somewhat romantic terms - halcyon days in the outdoors followed by stitching fine leathers in a pleasant warm workroom. The reality was probably very different, with backbreaking dawn to dusk labour in all weathers, followed by beating cold stinking hides or scraping filth from pieces of leather.

This was an age when corporal punishments were many and varied - clearly apprenticeship was a toughening process for any young man and just as brutal and

\textsuperscript{374} “Incapable of being parted or divided; not subject to partition or division into parts; indivisible. Now chiefly in legal use, of an estate” OED I.e. the eldest son inherited the bulk of the estate.  
\textsuperscript{375} Yarborough, Ibid.
thorough as any later boarding school or army training. The individual that came successfully through the ordeal of apprenticeship would be both resilient and practical.

The notion that John Shakespeare was illiterate is discussed later. However it is appropriate to record here that part of the master’s duty towards an apprentice was education. This could vary from attending a local school on a part time basis to being taught by the master or mistress.

Later in the century, a bestseller would be *The English Scholemaister*, “[a] book as written in art for artisans and tradesmen” who had “undertaken the charge of teaching others.” It does still beg the question of what happened in an illiterate household. John Brewer estimated that “male literacy in England slowly and steadily increased from ten percent in 1500 to forty-five percent in 1714 and to sixty percent in 1750”. Female literacy lagged behind with respectively one percent, twenty-five percent and forty percent in 1750.

In 1598 literacy saved Ben Jonson from the gallows after his disastrous duel with Gabriel Spencer. Lawrence Stone also remarked on a defence of literacy, also called the “benefit of clergy”

…a petty thief [with] the capacity to read a sentence of the Bible made all the difference between death by slow strangulation at the end of a rope and life with a scarred thumb. “The said Paul reads, to be branded; the said William does not read, to be hanged”

Even more pertinent was Stone’s observation that of the 204 men sentenced to death for a first offence by the Middlesex Justices in 1612-14, no fewer than ninety-five successfully pleaded benefit of clergy. Literacy was much more widespread than many have inferred and if no examples remain of John Shakespeare’s signature it can be explained in numerous ways. The repeated use of symbols in lieu of signatures may be one explanation. Alternatively it may have been a deliberate strategy of avoiding signed business records.

---

376 x ref.176
John’s father, Richard Shakespeare, was not a penniless peasant though it would be rare for any tenant farmer to be described as wealthy. However, he would certainly have been able to arrange John’s apprenticeship with a glover in nearby Stratford. Some apprentices received a measure of on-going financial support from their birth families (as do many university students today) but in John Shakespeare’s case it’s more likely that his leaving was the relief of a financial burden to the family or can be considered to be cost neutral.

Leather

The Tudor leather industry can be divided into two: the ‘heavy’ - preparing hides for shoe leather, harnesses, bellows etc. and the ‘light’ - working with leather for clothing, gloves etc. Both were fairly noisome, with heavy leather being tanned with lime and thereafter treated with bird droppings and other excreta - a two-year process.

As L.A. Clarkson noted

…In contrast with tanning, the manufacture of leather with oil or alum was a much simpler process. First the skins were prepared, usually by hanging them in wood smoke which loosened the hair or wool without damaging it. Oil dressing was done by placing the skins in troughs and soaking them with train oil. They were then beaten and soaked again, the operation being repeated several times. Finally the skins were piled up and left in the open air for several days. Alum - dressed - or tawed - leather was made by preparing a paste of alum, salt, flour, and egg yolks with water and applying it to the skins.

John Shakespeare’s work as an apprentice would have been hard, smelly, manual labour mostly out of doors. At the end of this, entry into the Master’s Guild was far from automatic – Yarborough estimates only one in three apprentices ever rose to be ‘freemen’ of the town, to be craftsmen in their own right and establish a household. For those who failed – either to keep their master’s goodwill or in some other way - they were left in a no man’s land of being forever viewed by society as ‘young’ regardless of their age. John survived the training to become a full member of society both a guild freeman and a householder.

379 Train Oil - obtained from the blubber of a whale or other marine animal - OED
The Very Civil Officer, 1556-79

The civic roles played by John Shakespeare described a man who, in the earlier part of his life, appeared to have been a model citizen. From 1556 to 1579 he held numerous borough appointments and his few shortcomings while in office appear negligible.

Civic responsibility in England during the Early Modern Period was decidedly double edged and far more complex than it is today, when it is a voluntary service to the community carried out in return for a heightened civic presence. Then, as well as granting a measure of seniority in the local community, it contained elements of wealth tax, career employment and opportunity for financial gain (both legitimate and illegitimate). Many of the more dangerous and administrative functions now dealt with by central government agencies or permanent local authority departments were left to members of the ‘local’ community who worked at these additional duties (typically on annual basis) in addition to their paid principal employment. A list of these tasks: food and beverage quality maintenance, financial management, local level justice, sanitary inspection, policing, fire-fighting, supervision of education, product quality control, licensing, equipping and training soldiers.

In 1864 George Linneus Banks described John Shakespeare as follows

> During the poet's early days, his father, Master John Shakespeare, was a prosperous woolstapler; but, the trade of the district decaying, his fortune declined, and his son William was in consequence withdrawn from school, to render assistance at home to his parent, who had now recourse to the business of a butcher.

And these few lines, with some minor variations (a mention of him holding civic office in Stratford is often included) have become accepted as fact and are brought forward in any discussion of John Shakespeare. However, both factual and circumstantial evidence runs contrary to this inadequate and inaccurate summary – especially concerning his civic duties and the depth of his legal knowledge. This evidence also makes references to the many times William Shakespeare in his plays utilized the details and “colour” of the various public roles his father played in real life.

---

381 A position in the administration of counties, cities, towns etc.
382 Woolstapler: a merchant who buys wool from the producer, grades it, and sells it to the manufacturer. OED
He [John Shakespeare] appears to have run [sic] the gauntlet through the regular course of municipal life; in 1556 he was a juror in the court-leet; in 1557 an ale-taster; in 1558 burgess; in 1559 a constable; in 1561 borough chamberlain; in 1565 an alderman; and in 1568–1569 high bailiff or mayor.385

Arthur Hodgson, 1902

Arthur Hodgson, despite being Mayor of Stratford-upon-Avon on five occasions, only managed to present an incomplete list of John Shakespeare’s various civic appointments. In 1902, the systematic work of Richard Savage describing the records of the Borough and the accompanying summaries of Edgar Fripp had not yet been published.386 Yet many of the old stories about John Shakespeare’s life evidently lingered. Eighteenth, nineteenth and even some early twentieth century writers, scholars and actors were so keen to beatify the poet and sanctify the memory of both father and son that reality was often buried in legend before being exhumed, wrapped up and presented as fact. Examples of maudlin romanticism abound. David Garrick’s eighteenth century doggerel about William stands as a fine example of misplaced sentiment - quoted by Halliwell in the nineteenth century:

And May no sacrilegious hand
Near Avon’s banks be found
To dare to parcel out the land,
And limit Shakespeare’s hallowed ground387

G. M. Woodward lampooned both Garrick and Samuel Ireland’s idolatry of William in 1796 with his *Familiar Verses from the Ghost of Willy Shakespeare to Sammy Ireland* that included the lines of Shakespeare’s ghost talking of Ireland:

He’d never give his deep researches up,
Until he found my spoon and christ’ning cup:
Some curious remanents of my mother’s spinning:
My little shoes, and all the child-bed linen

---

Fable to Fact

C.C. Stopes, writing in 1914, somewhat misleadingly noted of John Shakespeare that

…The only definitive notice we have of him is “that he was a merry-cheeked old man who said ‘Will was a good honest fellow; but he darest have crakt a jest with him at any time’” …John had risen through all the grades of honour in the town…  

A complete summary of John’s civic service is as follows

Table 25 - John Shakespeare’s Civic Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Contemporaneous Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juror</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ale Taster</td>
<td>1556-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Burgess</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Mary I died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afeeror 390</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Elizabeth I acceded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>1561-5</td>
<td>Plague started 1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff, Head Alderman and Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>1568-9</td>
<td>The Northern Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Alderman, Deputy Bailiff, Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>1570-1</td>
<td>Papal Bull excommunicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew from public life</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Whitgift became Bishop of Worcester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During his twenty years of service he held a full share of posts391 and performed some of them at considerable personal risk arising principally through violence or disease.392 His duties as Constable and as Borough Chamberlain are examples of this. After his voluntary self-removal from public office (and public life) the Borough not only kept him listed as an Alderman for ten years but de facto exempted him from all taxation.393

389 Stopes, Environment p.4 - she states the source as being “Dr. Andrew Clark, from the Plume M.S. at Maldon.” Thomas Plume's Library at Market Hill, Maldon, Essex contains the collection of Plume (1630-1704), D.D., Archdeacon of Rochester who bequeathed his books to the town of Maldon. x ref.105
390 “Afeeror was a civic officer (acting singly or in a group of three) who set the levels of court fines where there was no statutory penalty see also “Afeeror” later in this chapter: afeer “To fix or settle the amount of an amercement, to assess; to reduce to a fair or equitable amount.” OED
391 x ref.179 For further detail concerning civic service.
392 During times of plague the Chamberlain could be actively involved in directing the removal of bodies etc.
393 x ref.311 – where Fripp inter alia notes: “…in view also of the valuable services he had rendered and the generosity he had shown on more than one occasion to the Corporation, he was let off not only this levy of January 1578, but his fines for absence on Election days - as on 3 September 1578 when John Wheeler was called upon to pay 20s. and William Smith haberdasher 10s. - his poor-rate of 4d. weekly on 19 November, 2 and, it would appear, all penalties whatsoever. There is no evidence that he paid a single amercement [fine]…”
Exemption from taxation was, in itself, a remarkable occurrence in an age when in municipal accounting every penny was accounted for. These benefits even extended to what were mandatory taxes such as contributions to the Poor Law. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Fripp reached\textsuperscript{394} that his earlier work had built up such a store of good will that he merited extraordinary treatment.

As each of the posts was closely connected with the legal process - it is not an exaggeration to say that the holder be frequently, if not habitually, in court. The legal expertise that John acquired from the various duties apart from his own numerous law suits, would over many years have made him highly knowledgeable in the law.

In date order, the following amplifies the duties of each of the offices he held. These start in 1556, just after the successful completion of his apprenticeship and a year before his marriage to Mary Arden.

\textsuperscript{394} x ref. footnote 391
The jury, passing on the prisoner's life,  
May in the sworn twelve have a thief or two  
Guiltier than him they try.  
*Measure for Measure* II, i

...Shakespeare was summoned to the Jury but made reasonable excuse...³⁹⁵  
Richard Savage, 1923

The meanings of the terms “jury” and “juror” have changed over time. For example, to a medieval jury “the question” could have taken different forms and not have been restricted to “guilty or not guilty”. It could have been a question of law they were being asked to adjudicate, but it could have been a mixture of fact and law e.g. “…Name all the land-owners of your district and say how much land each of them has… is Roger guilty of having murdered Ralph?... [which] of the two has the greatest right to Blackacre?”³⁹⁶ The jury system in the Middle Ages and even into the Early Modern Period was predicated on intensely local knowledge. Evidence, if it had any place, came far behind familiarity with the accused and understanding of their character.³⁹⁷ Typically, the accused did not speak in their own defence, but relied on the jurors knowing them personally. Hence it was necessary to have good, honest, men who judged knowing the accused’s character whereas a modern jurist’s independent judgment is based on the facts of a case as presented and on the evidence delivered in court.

In a community such as Stratford in 1556 the term “Juror” meant more than the once-in-a-lifetime experience of the present day. A Juror had been identified as “a good man and true”.³⁹⁸ It denoted social status in the community of an individual thought fit to sit in judgement of his neighbours - though as is noted in the above quotation from *Measure for Measure*, the odd thief could sneak in. However, having raised the notion

³⁹⁸ *Much Ado about Nothing* III, iii – though here this is addressed to the watch and not a jury. Later found in Thomas Randolph, *The Muses Looking-Glass* (London, 1642). “I had rather see him remitted to the Jayle, and have his twelve God-vathers, good men and true contemn him to the Gallowes, and there see him vairely persecuted.” p.72 Scene 4
of dishonest jurymen, William was quick to establish later in the same speech that the jury system could still work despite the occasional mistake.

The DeWindts in describing the town of Ramsay note that “jurors” were drawn from a group of about forty “pre-qualified” individuals who typically came from the “richer half of the local taxpayers…in some cases the choice of jurati was at least influenced by the local lord.”

**Ale Taster - 1556**

I thank your worship. For mine own part, I never come into any room in a tap-house, but I am drawn in.

*Measure For Measure* II, i

Ale-taster is an officer appointed and sworne in every Leet to looke that the due assise be kept of all the Bread, Ale, and Beere sold within the Jurisdiction of the Leet.

1641 Termes de la Ley

As Fripp noted, “In September (1556) he was elected a Taster”. John Shakespeare was on the first officer rung of the civic ladder. “Able persons and discreet” is the qualification specified in the Leet Book at Coventry. In Leicester around this same date they promised

---


400 Leet: “A special kind of court of record which the lords of certain manors were empowered by charter or prescription to hold annuallie or semi-annually” OED

401 John Rastell, *Termes de la Ley* (London: Beale, 1641). The full title is ‘Les termes de la ley: or, certaine difficult and obscure words and termes of the common lawes and statutes of this realme now in use expounded and explained’ p.18 see also OED.

402 This Illustration - In Coventry a special place in Hell was reserved for Ale-wives (brewing was associated with women) that diluted their stock – see Glossary “Coventry Doom” the wife in the foreground is indeed pissing into the bucket – the belief was that this (or spitting into the vat) aided the fermentation process.

403 Savage, *Minutes and Accounts* I p.XXXIV
“…We shall duly and truly search and assay, and that which is good we shall able, and that that is ill we shall not able, and we shall not let for favour or for hatred, kin or alliance, but we shall do even right and punish as our minds and consciences will serve.”

The position was not merely a sinecure. In an age when potable water was at a premium it was safer to drink ale, beer or wine. Ale was traditionally brewed by women either at the larger household level or on a small scale for resale by ale-wives or innkeepers and victuallers. Under the late Tudors brewing began to be produced on a more industrial scale in cities but in small towns and villages very small scale brewing was still the norm. Jane Peyton, is quoted as saying “women created beer …[i]t was considered a food and fell into the remit of women’s work.” Any impurity could have had serious public health implications and the practice of selling short measures was rife. In Banbury, for example, the tasters swore to

…weekly and diligently search and foresee that both ale and drink be well and wholesomely made, well brewed and sufficiently barmed as it ought to be, and also the said Tasters shall justly and truly from time to time present all those that shall at any time offend without favour, fraud, covine or malice, as well any other victuallers as brewers, strangers as townsmen, upon pain to forfeit for every offence 10s. in the discretion of the Tasters

The DeWindts, writing of Ramsay, the small Fenland town of a similar size to Stratford, concluded that

…the most active presenter in the Leet, all across England, after the sworn 12 was the ale taster. By 1268, the date of the earliest surviving Ramsey Court roll, all tasters were making presentiments in court along with the 12 jurati. Their job was to ensure the quality of the ale sold in the town and supervise pricing policy… A seventeenth century book of oaths preserves an ale taster’s oath for us:

“You shall well and truly execute the office of ale-taster within this Leet, you shall see that all victuals, bread and beer put on sale within this Leet, be sweet and wholesome, and of full weight and measure, and you shall at all other things execute the said office over ale taster within this Leet, according to the best of your skill and knowledge: so help you God.”

---

404 Ibid. p.XXXIV  
406 Barm - To mix with yeast; to leaven, ferment. OED. See Glossary  
407 Private agreement, compact, covenant; often with unfavourable connotation. OED.  
408 Banbury Orders, 24 April, 1564 see Savage, Minutes and Accounts I p.XXXV.  
409 jurors  
Burgess - 1557

Your mind is tossing on the ocean;
There, where your argosies with portly sail,
Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood…

*The Merchant of Venice* I, i

About the first of October 1557 John Shakespeare was elected a “Principal Burgess.” “Burgess” at its simplest could simply mean an inhabitant of a borough but when used in a stricter legal sense it referred to an individual “possessing full municipal rights; a citizen, freeman of a borough or corporate town; a citizen”. The addition of “Principal” here equates to “leading”. When Shakespeare referred to “signiors and rich burghers”411 he is giving a continental gloss to his description (the play is after all, set in exotic and far-off Venice). However the more Germanic term “burgher” was also used in England at the time alongside the home grown “burgess” to denote one of the self-made middle class. Many contemporary and later references to this emergent group suggest portliness and wealth mixed with overtones of pomposity and a dash of *nouveau riche*. Louis B. Wright, in 1935, described them as being

…Proud of their self-made success, proud of their material accomplishments, proud of their greatest city, London, the Elizabethan middle class developed a self-respect and a self-esteem that at times reached the proportions of smug self-satisfaction. Suffering from no complex of inferiority because of his business, the tradesman believed himself deserving of social recognition… 412

A century later in 1651 “…every Burgess at age…hath power to trade, and bear office”.413 Fifty years on from that, Alexander Pope described the eighteenth century pecking order: “…All persons of honour, lords spiritual and temporal, gentry, burgesses and commonalty…”.414

But even in 1557 it was clear that a burgess was a cut above the ordinary.

Contemporaneous with John Shakespeare’s civil career, a term derived from the Old French term * burgeis* meaning townsman, and having its root in the Latin *burgus,* would

---

411 “Burghers” Chiefly used of continental towns, but also of English boroughs, in a sense less technical than “Burgess” OED.
414 1716 - Pope Acct. E. Curl 4 - OED
come to describe this new class – the bourgeois had arrived. For the Shakespeares, “Principal Burgess” brought with it civic, legal and even national political status, though in the last case by the mid sixteenth century this was more notional than practical.

In theory it was from the locally resident “Burgesses” that Members of Parliament were selected. Knights from each shire had previously been the most prominent group in the Commons. Two were elected for each of the 37 counties under royal jurisdiction. In 1536 the twelve counties of Wales were incorporated into English rule by statute and they each returned one member to Parliament. Later, in 1543 and 1673, the two counties considered outside royal jurisdiction, the county palatines of Chester and Durham, were each permitted two members. As John Milton was to put it. (albeit somewhat naively) “The said Citizens...shall be enabled…to choose and return Burgesses into the same Parliament”.415

However, as A. R. Myers and David Douglas more pragmatically observed

The growing prestige of the Commons was reflected in various ways. The Lancastrian period saw the first attempts over the Commons to claim parliamentary privileges, such as freedom from arrest for members and their servants, and freedom of speech. Generally speaking, these attempts were successful when no great persons were involved; …this period also witnessed the first restrictions on the right to elect “Knights of the Shire” including the Forty Shilling Freeholder Act416, and an act of 1445 that required the county representatives to be either knights or squires, gentleman born. And in spite of an act of 1413 requiring … [the] elected to be bona fide residents of their constituencies, non-burgesses began to compete for borough seats. In the early days of parliament there had been a reluctance to undertake such an onerous and humble duty as that of member of Parliament… [now] the prestige and power of the Commons was so considerable that country gentry, lawyers and civil servants… [were] glad to be returned as member for the borough. This arrangement suited both sides, for the borough would gain an influential member, who would secure favours for it more readily, and often serve without wages. By 1450 half the borough representatives were non-resident…417

416 Limited the franchise to knights of the shire elected by persons “dwelling and resident in the same Counties, whereof every one of them shall have free Land or Tenement to the Value of Forty Shillings by the Year at least, above all Charges.” See Glossary for detail.
The 1429 Statute disenfranchised those of “low estate” - only freemen who owned freehold land worth 40 shillings had the vote.\(^{418}\)

During the Wars of the Roses, the leading peers of the different factions tried to build up the number of their followers in the Commons and they took advantage of the opportunity to restrict the elections, both voters and candidates, to landowners like themselves. From this point, the knights of the shire largely came from and primarily expressed the interests of, the landed elite, known as the gentry, and were often brought into Parliament by the influence and efforts of the peers in the Lords. The larger group in the Commons\(^{419}\) were the 222 burgesses.\(^{420}\)

However, by being able to dictate where royal charters were granted, irrespective of population, location etc., the Monarch could dictate who could become burgesses and the total number of seats in the Commons. As Stratford received its charter in the dying days of Edward’s reign, then members from Stratford would probably have had political and religious sympathies in common with the strongly Protestant regime that elevated the town’s status.\(^{421}\)

It is also worth noting that schools were often created with the specific aim of “instructing the children of burgesses” and that examples of this can be found well into the nineteenth century.\(^{422}\)

For John Shakespeare in this year of his marriage, elevation to burgess moved him on to the national political board. It also ensured the free education of his eldest son, William, born seven years later.

\(^{418}\) The “40 shilling” franchise was only abolished by the “Great Reform Act” (1832).
\(^{419}\) http://www.parliament.uk/about/livingheritage/evolutionofparliament/birthofparliament
\(^{420}\) 244, after 1536 when Wales was “united” to England.
\(^{421}\) Interestingly this ability to ‘stack’ voting power still exists in the United States where the President by having the sole ability to nominate candidates for the Supreme court is, (more often than not) de facto setting the political complexion of the court after his term of office as appointments to the court are for an unspecified period.
\(^{422}\) Grant, *Burgh. Schools Scotland* II ix.288 (1876).
Attorney - 1558

Therefore, good mother, - I must call you so -
Be the attorney of my love to her
Richard III IV, iv

I will attend my husband...for it is my office,
And will have no attorney but myself
Comedy of Errors V, i

The term “attorney” has, principally in the United States, become almost
interchangeable with such others as “lawyer” and “solicitor”. However to John
Shakespeare it would have meant an individual who represented another in the Court of
Record without being formally qualified in the law.

Fripp described the role as being fit for

…Townsmen with recognized experience of the law, such as Adrian
Quiney and John Shakespeare, [who] might act as attorneys… The same
month John Shakespeare was named as attorney in the Court of
Record for Richard Lane – “Goodman Lane” as he was called, a
victualler and yeoman in Bridgetown (at the other end of Stratford
Bridge) and tenant of the old Gild garden — but he declined to act.

From the above it is also plain to see that the role was a discretionary one which the
individual being asked to represent the accused had the right to decline. The military
term “prisoner’s friend” for an officer who acted in a court martial on behalf of the
accused is perhaps an analogous role.

At this time John Shakespeare is a newly married man still in his twenties. Though
“attorney” in this case falls far short of qualified lawyer it is significant that he is
certainly performing like one and in a court setting and gaining further insight into the
legal process.

423 August 1556
424 Savage, Minutes and Accounts I, p.XXXV
425 See OED - 1900 Westm. Gaz. 24 Nov. 10/1 Lieutenant -------- was assigned as advocate for the
prisoner, or ‘prisoner's friend’, as the term stands in the military system of jurisprudence.
Constable - 1558

Escalus. ...How long have you been in this place of constable?
Elbow. Seven year and a half, sir.
Escalus. Alas, it hath been great pains to you. They do you wrong to put you so oft upon 't: are there not men in your ward sufficient to serve it?
Elbow. Faith, sir, few of any wit in such matters: as they are chosen, they are glad to choose me for them; I do it for some piece of money, and go through with all.

Measure for Measure II, i

From the days of the parish constable, control has always been local. While initially fairly successful, this system gradually fell into disrepute because wealthier or busier elected citizens tended to pay someone else to serve their year's term for them. Increasingly, these substitutes were drawn from the unemployable, corrupt, or just plain stupid. F.Y. Bailey, 1999

Schoenbaum in his William Shakespeare A Documentary Life, noted that "In the autumn of 1558 John was sworn one of the four constables: able bodied citizens defending the peace". Like present day Italians who make jokes about stupid carabinieri, the Elizabethans poked fun at constables as being dullards. Ben Jonson in 1599 had a character remark "You might be a constable for your wit". Shakespeare maintained the formula with constables such as: Dull (Love’s Labour’s Lost) and Dogberry (Much Ado about Nothing).

One additional Shakespearian Constable, one that Schoenbaum does not refer to is Elbow in Measure for Measure. Yet it is with Elbow that Shakespeare reveals most about his knowledge of how the office of constable should have worked. Escalus, in the above quotation, seeks to learn from Elbow how a dullard like him could be a Constable – an office that is burdensome in nature and is supposed to be shared out amongst able citizens on a rotational basis. Elbow tells him he “does it for some piece of money” i.e.

---

428 See Glossary re “carabinieri”
429 Ben Jonson, Every Man Out of His Humor. I.i http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/3695/pg3695.txt. Jonson also took a dig at the nouveau titled Shakespeares In III. i. a new coat of arms has a crest features a " boar without a head, rampant - A boar without a head, that's very rare!" and the motto "Not without mustard." The Shakespeare family coat of arms was embellished Non Sans Droit, "not without right."
smarter men would rather shirk their civic duty and just pay an idiot. Escalus, fully cognizant of what has been going on, tells him to bring in the leading citizens from his ward presumably to give them a telling off for deliberately undermining the serious business of law and order.

The exact text of the oath that John Shakespeare would have taken as constable has not survived. However, in a similar sized town to Stratford - Northampton – this was the oath side-by-side with its comic parody in *Much Ado About Nothing*

Table 26 - Constables Oath of Northampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liber Custumarum</th>
<th>Much Ado About Nothing III, iii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constables Oath) of Northampton</td>
<td>Dogberry. Are you good men and true? . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye shall well and truly serve the King within the precinct... of this Town. In time of watch ye shall give due commandment and charge in the King's behalf to the watchmen such as shall be summoned by the Serjeant to appear before you; and that they keep and make due watch and true from the time of your charge-giving until the sun be upon the morrow; and that they keep their own quarter, and come into none other till they be required of any other watch or but any horn blow, any fray made or outcry, peril of fire or children and all such other; also that they behave them in goodly wise in keeping of their watch, stilly going without noise or loud speech; also if any strange man or woman happen to come to this Town by night time, that then they honestly do examine such man or woman; and if they be not suspicious, bring them to an Inn, and if they be found suspicious or untrue then that they be brought to ward until the Mayor and Bailiffs have had examination of them.</td>
<td>This is your charge: you shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand, in the Prince's name. . . . You shall also make no noise in the streets. . . . You are to call at all the ale-houses, and bid those that are drunk get them to bed. . . . If you meet a thief, you may suspect him... to be no true man. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman. If we know him to be a thief, shall we not lay hands on him?</td>
<td>Dogberry. Truly, by your office you may. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verges. If you hear a child crying in the night, you must call to the nurse and bid her still it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schoenbaum also draws attention to the fact that in the real world “these guardians had to deprive angry men of their weapons and hale into court quarrelsome types who had started bloody street brawls.” Examination of Savage’s *Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-Upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620* yields more data about the probable character of John Shakespeare as well as the office of Constable.

In his introduction Fripp had noted “In the autumn of 1558, shortly before Queen Mary I’s death, he [John Shakespeare] was appointed a constable.” Fripp described it as “depriving single men of their weapons and otherwise helping to preserve the peace.”

---


431 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.30
Significantly he goes on to make the observation that “He must have been a man of some courage and physique”.

The full official oath setting out a Constable’s duty in disarming individuals reads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27 - A Constable's Oath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Constabulles from tyme to tyme do dylygently for se &amp; ouer sey yt no Sengleman from hensfurthe wear eny dagger nor other weapon w’in the burro but y’ the constabull Season of the Same weapon or dagger as a forfeit &amp; for the same be answerable to the bellyf &amp; for lak of his offece so execuyntge the Cunstabull in whom Such neglygence shalbe found to forfeit for every Suche defalt vjs viijd provyded always yt shal &amp; may be laffull for eny Sengleman rydynge or goyng furthe of the toune about hys lauffll busynes to have hys weypon about hym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Constables from time to time to diligently enforce and oversee that no individual from henceforth shall wear a dagger nor other weapon within the borough but that the Constable shall seize the same weapon or dagger as a forfeit and for the same be answerable to the Bailiff and for lacking in the execution of his office the Constable in whom such negligence shall be found, shall forfeit for every such default 6s. 8d. provided always that it shall and may be lawful for any individual riding or going forth from the town about his lawful business to have his weapon about him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was no small task and the fine if levied was hardly trivial at six shillings and eight pence – the equivalent of a week’s wages for a skilled workman.

A more contemporary analogy to all this might be in a formulaic Hollywood western film where the new Marshall tries to make his mark by disarming the “bad guys” when they ride into town bent on a wild night. In both ages, one fictional and one real, most males would have been armed at least part of the time. The year John Shakespeare became one of the four constables and the following year when only he continued on as a constable, i.e. the other constables were excused, was a time of political upheaval. Elizabeth I had replaced her sister Mary I on the throne and the country teetered on the brink of a religious civil war. During a time of unrest, enforcing the byelaws by

---

432 Savage, Minutes and Accounts Vol. 1 XXXVI
433 Ibid. p.100
434 Fines in the Early Modern Period were often stated but in practice rarely fully enforced – however by listing relatively high limits it gave the judicial process greater flexibility. See: Robert Bearman, “John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless,” Shakespeare Quarterly (Shakespeare Quarterly) 56, no. 4 (2005): 411-433.
disarming armed men (potentially intoxicated) in the Stratford streets would indeed have called for men of “courage and physique”.\textsuperscript{436}

Another entry in the byelaws of 1557 concerned the four Constables. Every month, “upon pain to forfeit 6s. 8d.” John Shakespeare and his three fellow constables were required to call a meeting of “a convenient number” of the Borough Council, to keep a “privy watch” for the “good government of the Town”. Any “member who refused their summons without a sufficient cause was liable to the same fine of 6s. 8d.”.\textsuperscript{437} As well as policing the town, the unpaid constables were on a monthly basis, to convene a meeting of a quorum of town councillors to review town security and their own performance.\textsuperscript{438}

Fripp, after studying the records of prosecutions for violence,\textsuperscript{439} concluded that “John Shakespeare as constable found his office by no means a sinecure”. At the Court Leet of 14 April 1559 cases of assault were numerous… even the former bailiff, Master Rafe Cawdrey (an alderman), was fined for assaulting Alexander Webbe of Bearley, brother “ot [sic] Widow Arden of Wilmcote and brother-in-law of John Shakespeare”.\textsuperscript{440}

Nor was John Shakespeare himself free from a history of fisticuffs. Thomas Siche of Armscote sued him in the Court of Record\textsuperscript{441} for £8 concerning an assault. In 1556 the case lasted through four sittings and resulted in Shakespeare’s favour. He had pleaded successfully that he had “justly used” physical force on the plaintiff.\textsuperscript{442}

\textsuperscript{436} Savage, Minutes and Accounts I [Fripp’s Introduction] XXXVI.
\textsuperscript{437} Ibid. p. XXXVII
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid. p. XXXVII
\textsuperscript{439} x ref. Table 28 - Sample of Stratford violent assaults for a sample of Stratford violent assaults
\textsuperscript{440} Savage, Minutes and Accounts I XXXVI.
\textsuperscript{441} The Town’s own court was able to deal with matters involving sums up to £32.
\textsuperscript{442} Savage, Minutes and Accounts I XXXVI
Table 28 - Sample of Stratford violent assaults

From the Records | In modern English
---|---
m’ mr trussell for makynge a fray & drawynge blud on roger brunt he standes a merced. | Mister Trussell is fined for attacking and drawing the blood of Roger Brunt.
m’ thomas fetherston for makynge a fray on Thomas walford he standes a merced | Mister Thomas Fetherston is fined for attacking and drawing the blood of Thomas Walford.
m’ thomas holyday alias drudge for makynge afray & drwblud on luke hurst he standes a merced | Mister Thomas Holyday, alias Drudge, is fined for attacking and drawing the blood of Luke Hurst.
nota m’ Humfrey Homys for makynge a fray & drw blud on [ ] | Note: Mister Humphrey Homys for attacking and drawing the blood of [ ].
bene nota m’ [blank] merrye made afray vppon John Henshaw therefore he standes amerced | Note well: Mister [ ] Merrick attacked John Henshaw he is therefore fined.
nota m’ Raff Cawdrey for makynge afray vppon thither lanli\l\ bene grene of wotton he standes amerced | Note: Mister Ralph Cawdrey is fined for attacking [ ] of Wotton
nota m’ mr Harbadge man thomas [blank] for makynge a fray vppon thother of mr Harbadge man ye Irysheman hestandes amerced | Note: Mister Harbage’s man Thomas is fined [ ] for attacking another of Mister Harbage’s men, the Irishman.
m’ Richard a Court for gevenge the Constabulles obprobryous woordes & revylynge the Constabulles he standes a merced | Mister Richard a Court is fined for using scornful language and reviling the Constables.

Affeeror - 1559

The title is affeer’d⁴⁴³ Fare thee well, lord: I would not be the villain that thou think'st For the whole space that's in the tyrant's grasp, And the rich East to boot Macbeth IV, iii

The minutes of this Court were witnessed by the Affeerors… the Affeerors attached their signature or mark… [John] Shakespeare's is a glover's compasses and denotes, no doubt, 'God encompasseth us,'⁴⁴⁴ Fripp, 1931

Tanistry,⁴⁴⁵ the practice of the eldest and most meritorious of his kinsmen succeeding a deceased king or lord prevailed in the Scotland of Macbeth - the actual historical figure

---
⁴⁴³ Stephen Greenblatt, ed., The Norton Shakespeare (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), p. 2603 has afferred as ‘confirmed’ which undoubtedly makes sense however, ‘adjudged’ might have been a more accurate choice of term.
⁴⁴⁴ See Glossary
and not Shakespeare’s character. Primogeniture, succession of the firstborn son, became prevalent shortly after Macbeth’s death. Scottish Kings of the time were “affeer’d” i.e. elected by a coterie of powerful figures in the extended kinship group. “The title is affeer'd” as Shakespeare puts it was the corrected way to describe how title would have passed to the “fittest”, decided by the senior and most trusted members of society.

But the practice of making assessments by the trusted continued into the Stratford of Shakespeare’s time where an Affeeror was a civic officer (singly or in a group) who acted as an assessor of court fines i.e. these men set the levels of court fines where there was no “expresse” statutory penalty. The fine, an “amercement”, was described in the 1641 Termes de la Ley as being a “summe of money, which he is to pay…ought to be assessed & affeered by the good and lawful men of the neighbourhood…”. Again this notion of a “good and lawful man” appears. It must be concluded that by being an Affeeror, John Shakespeare served in the role twice in 1559 and 1601, he was held in high regard by his peers. Affeerors in Macbeth elect the king; Affeerors in Stratford assess the punishments. Both are the trusted members of the community.

Chamberlain - 1561-5

…his two chamberlains
Will I with wine and wassail so convince
That memory, the warder of the brain,
Shall be a fume…
Macbeth IV, iii

One of the most trusted servants to a king or lord would have been his chamberlains – those individuals who waited on their master in his own “chamber”. Over centuries, the title came to mean an individual who received “rents and revenues” on his master’s behalf and de facto functioned as the high steward or factor i.e. the man who held the purse strings. In a modern corporate setting he or she would be the finance director.

---

445 A system of life-tenure among the ancient Irish and Gaels, whereby the succession to an estate or dignity was conferred by election upon the ‘eldest and worthiest’ among the surviving kinsmen of the deceased lord’. OED See also Diane MacLean, “Macbeth,” Scotsman (Edinburgh, 10 2 2005).
446 With Macbeth's death, tanistry died in Scotland. Macbeth's successor, Lulach the Simple, his stepson by Lady Macbeth, survived only seven months after Macbeth’s death when Malcolm Canmore slew him in battle, thereafter Malcolm Canmore and his descendants ruled through primogeniture.
447 1641 Termes de la Ley 13: Affeerors are such as be appointed in Court leets, &c. to mulct such as have committed any fault which is arbitrably punishable, & for which no “expresse” penalty is prescribed by Statute.
By 1561 there were two chamberlains to the Borough of Stratford, one senior in his second year of performing the role, the other learning the job in his first. This dual officer approach offered a measure of security as both would have had to collude to falsify accounts. The position was not purely a financial one - though they did receive, disburse and ultimately account for the town’s finances - any activity funded by the borough came under their project management. For example, when buildings owned by the town were being repaired, altered or even constructed, then a Chamberlain actually supervised the work, making on the spot decisions as to what was appropriate and necessary for the task.

In John Wilkinson’s “Court Leet” a work he himself referred to as a “treatise collected out of the statutes of this kingdom, and according to common experience of the lawes, concerning …the keeping of a court leet…” a Chamberlain

…well and truly shall serve the maior, aldermen, and burgesses of this town… in the office of chamberlaine or generall receiver…

In Leicester the oath of office ran

…We shall be faithful and true officers unto our master the bailiff, diligent of attendance, at all times lawful, obedient to his commandments and ready to do his precepts. We shall improve the livelihood belonging to the commonality of this town to the most behoof of the same, and the tenements thereof we shall well and sufficiently repair during our office. And we shall well and truly charge and discharge ourself of all lands’ rents belonging to this town and of all other money as shall come to our hands belonging unto the commonalty of this town, and there of a true account shall yield up unto the auditors assigned in the end of our year, and all other things lawful thatbelongeth or pertaineth to our offices well and truly to our powers we shall do. So keep us God, the Holy Evangel and the contents of this Book!

---

448 John Wilkinson, Court Leet, 2nd. edition from copy in Bodleian Library (Adam Islip, 1620).
449 The form at Leicester per Fripp in Savage, Minutes and Accounts I p.L
In October 1562 John Shakespeare began his year as senior chamberlain, John Taylor taking the junior role. By the following spring he was supervising the felling of trees in the churchyard and their sawing into lumber for repairs to the Vicar's house and chapel. Also erected was the pinfold for animals straying onto common ground. Significantly, he would have been involved in the protestantization of the Chapel. Not under Episcopal jurisdiction, the Guild Chapel had been left intact but “It was not spared under the auspices of John Shakespeare”.450 i.e. whitewashing over the “catholic” murals (such as the Doom extract above) and removing decoration. A task that runs contrary to some suggestions that he and his family were holders to the old faith.

On 6 October, 1563 his term of office should have ended but he was “requested or allowed” to continue the work specifically including the “reformation” of the Chapel. At a Council meeting on 26 January the minutes show that the Corporation owed “unto John Shakespeare £1 5s 8d”. It would appear that he was using his own money to support the work.

By the summer of 1564 plague had broken out in Stratford. “Hic incepit pestis” wrote the Vicar, John Bretchgirdle, in his register of a burial on 11 July. Plague claimed over 10% of Stratford’s population before the end of the year. The Town Clerk, Richard Symons, lost three children. The Borough Council met at least once in the Guild Garden that John Shakespeare, as Chamberlain, had secured for their use. The minute of 30 August records: “money was paid towards the relief of the poor” i.e. the council members were using their own cash to relieve suffering. Wealthier members paid more, John Shakespeare was assessed at a shilling. The minutes show additional levies were

---

450 Ibid. *ref.431* – For “Coventry Doom” see Glossary. Whitewashing over the “catholic” murals (such as the Doom extract above) and removing decoration. An interesting task for a man some scholars consider to have been a closet catholic.
made at later meeting of the council: “on 6 and 27 September, varying from 18d. to 4d. and 12d. to 4d., John Shakespeare paying on each occasion 6d. At a fourth levy, made on 20 October, he paid 8d.”

Records also show John Shakespeare repeatedly paid for clerical assistance from his own pocket. It was not until 21 March, 1565 that his accounts were finally presented.

At election time in September 1564, when the Plague was at its height, John Shakespeare again remained Chamberlain – the fourth year in the role and the third as Acting (Senior) Chamberlain. The week of the elections, from 27 September to 4 October, saw nineteen burials.

**Alderman - 1565**

…My own knee! when I was about thy years, Hal, I was not an eagle's talon in the waist; I could have crept into any alderman's thumb-ring: a plague of sighing and grief!

*Henry IV*, I, II, iv

…O, then, I see Queen Mab hath been with you. She is the fairies' midwife, and she comes In shape no bigger than an agate-stone On the fore-finger of an alderman…

*Romeo and Juliet*, I, iv

After his efforts as chamberlain it was unsurprising that in 1565 John Shakespeare joined the elite of Stratford and became one of the fourteen aldermen. His aldermanic ring, new gown and title “Master Shakespeare” would collectively have evidenced his change in status.

Rings still signal social status. Many use wedding rings to demonstrate the bond between couples. Fraternity brothers in America wear them, as do the players in American Superbowls who are awarded them as team mementoes. American college graduates often sport class rings to show both college and seniority. Engraved seal

---

451 Technically these meetings were called “halls” – the corporation council grew out of a town’s trade guild that met in the guildhall. After the creation of boroughs the meetings generally continued in the Guildhall - as was the case in Stratford.

452 The 2008 “understated” ring for the Pittsburgh Steelers is shown above.- http://sports.yahoo.com/nfl [accessed 20/7/09]

453 The annual “Cup Final” of the American Football Season.
rings still appear on the little fingers of the English upper classes. William Shakespeare himself left careful bequests for friends to receive money for memorial rings.\footnote{x ref.434}

In all these cases there is a message being conveyed beyond the intrinsic value of the item – they symbolize that the individual has become one of the team; that the holder now belongs to a special class or group. The eviction of “unscrupulous” Ralph Bott from the office – had created the available seat.\footnote{x ref.256} In time the Shakespeares would have Bott’s other seat, New Place, which further attested to their social climb.

\textbf{Bailiff, Head Alderman and Justice of the Peace - 1568-9}

Vices, I would say, sir. I know this man well: he hath been since an ape-bearer; then a process-server, a bailiff; then he compassed a motion of the Prodigal Son, and married a tinker’s wife within a mile where my land and living lies;

\textit{The Winter’s Tale} IV, iii

John Shakespeare was first nominated as bailiff in 1567, receiving three votes to Robert Perrott's sixteen. Both men excused themselves and Rafe Cawdrey took up the office. The following year Perrott again refused and Shakespeare’s year as bailiff commenced. Elected on the fourth of September he was formally “sworn in” the following month. Both ceremonies would have been “quaint and solemn …the oath administered to John Shakespeare…[as follows]”\footnote{Taken from Fripp, see \textit{x ref. footnote 1075}}

\textbf{Table 30 - Oath of Bailiff and Principal Alderman}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Modern English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You shall swear that as a Justice of the peace and bailiff of this borough of</td>
<td>You shall swear that as a Justice of the peace and bailiff of this borough of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and liberties hereof for this year to come, you shall and to the</td>
<td>Stratford and liberties hereof for this year to come, you shall and to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uttermost of your Cunning, wit and power maintain and defend the liberties of</td>
<td>uttermost of your Cunning, wit and power maintain and defend the liberties of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the same borough and shall do equal right as well to the poor as to the rich</td>
<td>the same borough and shall do equal right as well to the poor as to the rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after your knowledge, wit and power and after the laws and the Customs of the</td>
<td>after your knowledge, wit and power and after the laws and the Customs of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realm and statutes thereof made, And you shall not be of Counsel with any</td>
<td>Realm and statutes thereof made, And you shall not be of Counsel with any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person in any quarrell or sute that shalle Come before you, nor shall lett for</td>
<td>person in any quarrell or sute that shalle Come before you, nor shall lett for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{454 x ref.434} \footnote{455 x ref.256} \footnote{456 Taken from Fripp, see \textit{x ref. footnote 1075}}
Deputy mayor and High Alderman was John Wheeler a close neighbour of the Shakespeares.

Shakespeare and Wheeler, as justices of the peace both presided as judges at the borough’s own Court of Record. Legal assistance was provided by the Steward, Henry Higford, who, twenty-four years later was presented together with both of them for recusancy. A summary of Fripp’s observations of the Court of Record (with selected extracts from the minutes and accounts) of the period ran…

Cases of debt, breach of the by-laws and the assize of meat and drink were usual. Warrants of distraint or arrest were executed by the two Serjeants. He presided also, on his “footstool” at the “halls” of the Council, of which unfortunately there are minutes of only six, again with the help of Master Higford. Here too, as in the Court of Record, he had assistance from old Symons, formerly, and perhaps yet, Town Clerk, whose shaky Gothic handwriting still occasionally appears in the records. He approved leases, took a survey of the Corporation deeds (1 June, 1569), “carried on negotiations with the lord of the manor (the Earl of Warwick), and made a journey to London with Adrian Quyny and Thomas Barber on borough business”. Urgent instructions from the Privy Council and their commissioners for the preservation of the Peace demanded his attention. Early in March the High Sheriff of Warwickshire was required “to make inquisition of vagabonds and rogues and punish them.” The same month, magistrates were appointed for the taking of musters “of men, horses, armour and weapons”. On 20 June the Privy Council issued an order that strong watch was to be kept on the night of Sunday 10 July and next day in every town, village, and parish for vagrant persons. Search was to be continued monthly until 1 November, unlawful games were to be “avoided” (that is, got rid of) and archery was to be encouraged. Any “raising of the people” must not be attempted “as in some corners of the realm hath been lately”. On 27 June Sir Robert Throgmorton, Sir Thomas Lucy and Sir William Wigston reported from Warwick the enlisting of 640 men - 40 light horsemen, 100 footmen with pikes, 200 with arquebuses, 200 with bows and arrows, and 100 with bills…

457 Shakespeare the maximum 13 times, Cowdrey only one less.

In the Chamberlains’ Account at Stratford there are the actual costs of the preparations (27 Jan., 1570)

...For dressing of harness 11s. 5d., to Robert Locke 3s. 4d. for dressing of harness another time 3s. 4d., to the soldiers at their first muster 4d. to Robert joiner for a gunstock 2d. to Simon Biddle for dressing of two pikes and a bow 2s. 4d.

On 25 July, Wigston and Lucy reported the choosing of practice-grounds for archery. Certificates of men and arms were sent to London on 4 September. Of the billmen recruited at Snitterfield was Anthony Shakespeare, brother of Thomas Shakespeare of Snitterfield, and of John Shakespeare of Clifford Chambers (the three sons perhaps of Anthony Shakespeare, who left Rowington in 1530).

As bailiff and head alderman, John Shakespeare and John Wheeler would have sat with their wives on Sundays in the front pew on the north side of the nave of Stratford Church in their scarlet and furred gowns. Other aldermen and their wives [ranked by seniority] sat behind them.
High Alderman, Deputy Bailiff, Justice of the Peace - 1571-2

It is petter that friends is the sword, and end it:
and there is also another device in my prain, which
peradventure prings goot discretions with it
_The Merry Wives of Windsor_, i

On 5 September, 1571, John Shakespeare was elected High Alderman and deputy to the new Bailiff, his old colleague, Adrian Quiney. “The first act of the new Bailiff and his High Alderman was to dispose of the Romanist vestments remaining at the Gild Chapel”.

At a meeting of the council held on 10 October it was resolved “that Master Quiney should sell the copes and vestments here underwritten to the use of the Chamber and yield accompt of all such money as he shall receive for the same”.

| Table 31 - A Scene From Hell | Such “relics of the Amorites” were no longer to be in possession of the Council, but were disposed of for cash. Ironically, they next welcomed the new schoolmaster Simon Hunt who obtained his Protestant licence to teach in _Schola Grammaticali_ at Stratford from the Bishop of Worcester on 29 October, 1571. Both Shakespeare and Quiney attended the Court of Record and the meetings where Henry Rogers of Sherborne attended as both Steward and Clerk. Eleven sets of Halls minutes survive, and at the Hall of 18 January, it was agreed “that Master Adrian Quiney and Master John Shakespeare shall at Hilary term next deal in the affairs of the Borough [in London] according to their discretions”, and that “Master

---

459 Savage, _Minutes and Accounts_ [Fripp Introduction] p.XXIII  
460 Ibid. p.XXIII  
461 Ibid. p.XXXIII - A member of any of a group of Semitic tribes… described in Biblical texts as inhabiting the land of Canaan before the arrival of the Israelites. OED – here it would be taken to mean the old or former religion i.e. Roman Catholicism.  
462 Who later fled to France, turned Catholic and ended up a Jesuit in Rome.  
463 Fripp speculates, given the dates involved, that Hunt may have influenced the young William Shakespeare in his early days at school.  
464 The illustration is a photograph of a portion of the fresco of the Last Judgement, attributed to an unknown Flemish artist in the French Cathedral in Albi ( Cathédrale Sainte-Cécile d'Albi) – photograph taken by self in 2007. It is representative of the sort of decoration that would have been previously removed from the chapel in Stratford, the “Romanist vestments” were disposed of for the same reasons. It is significant that John Shakespeare was involved with this process on these two occasions.
Thomas Barber, one of the Chamberlains, shall deliver to Master Bailiff aforesaid at the said Hilary term at London £6”. Quiney received £1 on his departure from Stratford and £7 while in London. Both had returned by 7 February as they attended a large meeting of the Chamber on that date.

The three meetings in April were probably in anticipation of the assembling of Parliament on 8 May. That of 28 May, during the sitting of Parliament, passed a resolution that “Master Adrian Quiney shall deal in all causes now in variance between the Earl of Warwick and the Borough according to his discretion”. A further resolution assured him of repayment before Michaelmas of “all such money as he shall disburse concerning the Council's suits.”

This records John Shakespeare in London, representing the borough and dealing with senior aristocrats or at least their servants. Not quite the “merry-cheeked” old soul at the start of this chapter who might or might not have been a drunk.

JOHN SHAKESPEARE, BUSINESSMAN

Usurer and illegal wool dealer are not titles which have traditionally been associated with Shakespeare’s father. Thomas & Evans 1984.466

A knight of Cales [Calais], and a gentleman of Wales, And a laird of the north country A yeoman of Kent with his yearly rent Could buy them out - all three Traditional nursery rhyme467

That John Shakespeare was a glover, wool trader and money lender is established beyond reasonable doubt. However, where a clear record is lacking, is in the nature and full scope of his business activities.

In 1984, D.L. Thomas and N.E. Evans468 produced John Shakespeare in the Exchequer, an article that detailed four cases in the Court of Exchequer where John Shakespeare

---

465 Hilary Term was from 23 January to 12 February.
467 http://history.wisc.edu/sommerville/367/367-03.htm
468 Ibid.
was prosecuted as both usurer and wool dealer. In the quarter century since the article’s publication, the notion of William’s father as both an illegal trader and moneylender has become more widely accepted in both populist Shakespearean biography and in academic circles. Some examples of this

### Table 32 - Contemporary Views of John Shakespeare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wood⁴⁶⁹</td>
<td>So on the face of it an acceptable member of Elizabethan society. But… John Shakespeare was also a dealer. Not that he traded narcotics, but he did trade illegally in the hottest currency of the day, wool. The wool industry at this time was a state monopoly and the transference of material strictly controlled. John looks to have been quite successful in his illegal trade as a &quot;brogger,&quot; using the money to buy property. (2005)                                                                                                                                |</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Greenblatt⁴⁷⁰</td>
<td>John Shakespeare bought and sold wool…here he was violating the laws that restricted this business to authorized wool merchants…but the wool trade, called wool brogging was potentially lucrative…money lending for which he was twice taken to court in 1570… (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Kornstein⁴⁷¹</td>
<td>In 1572 in the court of Exchequer for illegal wool dealing…two years later he was twice accused of breaking the usury laws by lending money at 20% interest…(1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thomas and Evans related how in the Hilary term 1570

…one of the barons of the exchequer⁴⁷² exhibited an information by Anthony Harrison [a professional informer, see below] …in the information dated 21st of October 1569 Harrison claimed that John Shakespeare of “Stratford upon Haven”, Glover, had between 26th of October 1568… given to a certain John Mussum of Wolton… in Warwickshire the sum of £100. The principle was to be repaid… to Shakespeare together with £20 interest… as the loan was a clear breach of a statute of 1552⁴⁷³, Harrison demanded that Shakespeare forfeit the capital and interest and that he be imprisoned and fined… there is no further record after the accusation…⁴⁷⁴

The cases were held in the Court of Exchequer⁴⁷⁵ and it appears John avoided any unpleasantness in the Harrison case, though the absence of any record of punishment is

---

⁴⁷² Court of Exchequer - “One of the three courts of common law into which the curia regis was divided (the others being the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Common Pleas) whose jurisdiction was merged into that of the High Court by the Judicature Acts 1873 – 75.” The judges of the Exchequer were known as Barons. See "Court of Exchequer" *A Dictionary of Law.* by Jonathan Law and Elizabeth A. Martin. Oxford University Press 2009
⁴⁷³ 5 & 6 Edw. 6, c.20
⁴⁷⁵ Now held in the Public Records Office
not, in itself, conclusive, given the incomplete nature of the records of the time. He definitely did not fare as well in case E 159-359 Hil, 237 which involved another professional informer – James Langrake of Whittlebury, Northamptonshire. Langrake was to bother Shakespeare twice more and these later cases appear to have been illegally settled by Shakespeare “compounding” with Langrake.

In the following table comparison can be made between the relative size of John Shakespeare’s transactions versus the other large market players

**Table 33 - Examples of Large Wool Broking Transactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1572 - <em>prosecuted</em> - Claim that Shakespeare had illegally bought 100 tods (2800 pounds) of wool at 14s. per tod from Edward and Richard Grant</td>
<td>1586 - <em>bought</em> 220 stones (110 tods) from John Isham</td>
<td>1581 - <em>sold</em> 400 stones to a Somerset clothier</td>
<td>1593 - <em>resold</em> 1000 stones of wool - “a great occupier in the making of cloth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572 - <em>prosecuted</em> - Claim that Shakespeare and John Lockeley (also of Stratford) had illegally bought 200 tods (5600 pounds) of wool at 14s. per tod from Walter Newsam</td>
<td>1586 <em>bought</em> 400 stones (200 tods) from John Freeman a Northamptonshire gentleman</td>
<td>1588 - <em>bought</em> 600 stones from a Wolverhampton dealer named Thomas Huntbache acting for Sir Thomas Leveston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1586 *bought* 400 stones (200 tods) from Mr. Brickmylles a
| 476 About fifty miles from Stratford (on modern roads) and fourteen miles from Northampton.
478 Shakespeare Centre Library and Archive: Halford estate ER 3/2246 - 30 July 1630 - “Conveyance from Thomas Buller of Halford, gent., to Sir Hercules Underhill of Idlicote, knight, for £620, of the messuage in which he then dwelt in Halford, with a close thereto adjoining, closes called Well Close and Long Close, another close near the church, then in possession of William Mushen, four yard lands of arable meadow and pasture in the common fields of Halford then in the tenure of Thomas Buller, and three messuages in Halford with appurtenances then in the several tenures of John Burnam, William Pewe and Walter Duke. Witnesses: Ger. Hall, John Lockley and Thomas Royser” [emphasis added – the name “John Lockley” here may indicate be a related family member or mere coincidence – but the Hercules Underhill is almost certainly the one who Shakespeare was to later pay to secure the title of New Place x ref/256].
479 The likeliest candidate for the Walter Newsam of this transaction is the one buried in the now disused church of All Saints, Chadshunt. That Walter Newsam died in 1621 and it is very likely he was a man of property as his memorial is the largest in the church. Chadshunt is about 8 miles from Stratford.
Examination of the relative sizes of transactions above shows that John Shakespeare, far from being merely a small “brogger” running a marginal activity, was, in fact, a large regional player, if not indeed national-level player. Bowden, though not mentioning Shakespeare, made the observation that

…The glovers of the central and east Midlands and those of Northampton in particular, were great wool dealers…

It is interesting to compare these transactions. Thomas Adkins for example had, like John, been at the top of local politics. Both men dealt in large wool trades with the local “gentlemanly” landowners.

However, as noted in the attached paper, Wool and Cloth, there was some illegal element in the activities of almost all large players in the market. John and his fellow glovers, at least those who had moved a portion or all of their business activities into wool trading, would have considered themselves justified in broking wool. Tradition had established that in buying sheepskins for leather a certain amount of surplus wool was sold by glovers to local clothiers. The Merchants of the Staple were clearly directed to exports and their move into the domestic wool market presumably caused great resentment to the domestic market traders.

As to the physical characteristics of wool trading, medieval sheep yielded fleeces weighing about a pound and a half. Selective breeding and better understanding of both diet and animal husbandry increased this to about three and a half pounds by Shakespeare’s time. This is still a modest yield compared to modern farming practices as Table 34 (below) illustrates.

---

480 Bowden, Wool Trade p.82
481 In John Shakespeare’s case this included the local Grant family. John Grant was involved in the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 for which he was executed. One of the participants in the Essex Rebellion, he was the lord of the manor of Norbrook, located a few miles north of Stratford-upon-Avon. His parents were Thomas Grant of Norbrook and Alice Ruding - both the Grants and Rudinges were old, established families in the county. The main seat of the Grant family had been at Snitterfield, but in 1545 they came into possession of the nearby estate of Norbrook. See Antonia Fraser, The Gunpowder Plot - Terror and Faith in 1605, Reprint (London: Arrow, 1999). Also http://www.gunpowder-plot.org/grant.asp.
482 x ref. 414
For John Shakespeare and John Lockeley to have purchased 5600 lbs. of wool from one breeder in 1572 (see Table 33 above) meant that the flock would have been at least sixteen hundred sheep. Few farmers in England would have had a flock of this size. Moreover, fourteen shillings a tod (six pence per pound) indicates premium pricing for top quality wool. By comparison, a skilled sheep shearer would typically earn a shilling a day. A total transaction of £140 was very large in 1572 – nearly three times the purchase price of New Place a quarter of a century later.

Most counties could claim their own particular breed, raised to take maximum benefit from the types of feed, land and climatic conditions of a particular location. 484

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Originates</th>
<th>Centres on</th>
<th>Distance From Stratford</th>
<th>Fleece Weight In lbs.</th>
<th>Fleece Weight In lbs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryeland</td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>50 Miles</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>4.5-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>42 Miles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>90 Miles</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who transported the fleeces and when they were collected varied widely based on the location of the farmer and the individual terms of the purchase. Bowden made the following observations.

…sometimes carriers were employed to fetch wool…[but] the …middlemen themselves frequently came with the transport to fetch wool from the [farmer’s] house 486 …Where an advance agreement was made for the supply of wool the middleman generally undertook delivery…one large Shropshire dealer, for instance, sold wool to a Shepton Mallet clothier at Shrewsbury, and later sent his servants to deliver the wool at Bristol 487

It was common for the larger broggers to buy an entire grower’s production for a year, store it for a time then break up the clipping into smaller lots. Well into the seventeenth century, packhorses were used for small lots or farmers in hilly districts and since medieval times, carts and small wagons pulled by a couple of horses had been used to move goods. However burgeoning demand and corresponding increased production began to outstrip the availability of both men and horses. For the larger

484 Interestingly Warwickshire was one that did not.
486 Ibid. p.91
487 Ibid. p.92 and P.R.O. Req. 2/113/13
flocks an altogether better form of transport evolved – the stage wagon. Eric Kerridge noted

…Two-wheeled carts carrying about 20 cwt, which had been the usual vehicles, hardly sufficed for the increasing volume and weight of goods to be moved, and by about 1600 had generally been replaced by four-wheeled wagons drawn by up to ten or twelve horses and taking loads of 60 or 70 cwt. Wagons were first introduced into England about 1558 and their use spread to most parts before very long. In 1582, for example, Robert Lane was the first man to bring such a vehicle into public service at Ipswich, “for which the borough gave him a patent for ten years.” …the use of wagons much facilitated the regular movement of heavy goods. 488

Table 35 - Small Goods Wagon - Fifteenth Century

On a good day a laden stage wagon with a dozen horses might travel twelve miles. However, the use of wagons also quickly destroyed the road surface. Wheels of large wagons were rimmed in studded iron that quickly tore up the soft road surface. For obvious reasons they were banned in towns. 490 Legislation would be enacted after the civil war to upgrade roads, but prior to this these huge wagons would churn the surface to a quagmire in wet times or pulverize it to dust in the summer months. 491

489 Amb. 317.2° Folio 32 verso, Cuntz Wagenmann Beruf:Wagenman http://www.nuernberger-hausbuecher.de
490 Kerridge, *Trade* p.8
491 As Fripp noted, the Borough acted to limit access to Stratford roads. *x ref. footnote 1049*
Large-scale brogging was not a one-man trade. The goods themselves were not standardized, nor were the terms of trade or the means of collection and delivery. Constant inspection against poor quality goods and close supervision to avoid theft were necessary. Brogging at a large regional level called for financial resources, trusted employees, equipment and storage or distribution facilities. To prosper in this business a successful dealer needed help and the logical source would have been the brogger’s own family. The relationship between the emergent middle class in Stratford - the “middling sort” - and the Shakespeares is considered later in this thesis but the probability stands that the Shakespeare sons, like other sons of the middling sort, would have been integral to the success of the family business.492

The Law concerning Interest, Tax and Trade Credit

Tudor Parliaments, lacking the means to police their own tax levies, created a body of informers to bring “qui tam”493 cases to the courts in return for half the fine. Legislation had fallen far behind market reality and, as Thomas and Evans related, trade in the sixteenth century was heavily reliant on credit. Unfortunately, reflecting the attitudes of an earlier age which regarded the charging of interest as wrong, the law had failed to keep pace with economic necessity.494

As regards laws governing money lending, the Act of 1545495 permitted interest up to a limit of 10%, but it was replaced in 1552 by a new statute496 that prohibited “…usury, a vice most odious and detestable”.497 John Shakespeare was convicted under the 1552 Act in 1570.498 A year later, the law was relaxed499 and those lending at interest rates of 10% or less were to forfeit only the interest: previously they had to surrender both principal and interest, as well as suffer a fine and imprisonment. The new “bounty

492 x ref. footnote 618
493 The first words in an action on a penal statute are qui tam, short for qui tam pro domina regina quam pro se ipso in hoc parte sequitur, meaning “he who sues for the queen as well as for himself.” The modern ‘whistleblower’ is a descendant of this concept, which has its roots in thirteenth-century English Law.
495 37 Hen. 8, c.9
496 5 & 6 Edw. 6, c.20
497 37 Hen. 8, c.9
499 13 Eliz. 1, c.8
hunters”, not least Langrake and Harrison, were what one might expect of self-appointed government spies. Thomas and Evans\textsuperscript{500} noted of the former

…James Langrake appears to have been a notorious character. In 1570 he was [accused] of the rape of one of his servants\textsuperscript{501} … On 2 December 1574 Langrake, together with 11 other informers, was committed to the Fleet prison for compounding with offenders.\textsuperscript{502}

The first Langrake case was settled with Shakespeare agreeing to a “reasonable fine” of two pounds to reduce the costs of litigation - a pittance compared with the maximum provisions of the statute. But the amounts tied up in these transactions are perhaps the most interesting factor of all - they run to several hundred pounds worth of merchandise and cash and, as such, are evidence of the activities of a well-to-do merchant and not merely those of a small town glover.

Men such as Langrake and Harrison squeezed money from their victims either by dragging these unfortunates into court or by “compounding” with (extorting money from) them, itself an illegal activity.\textsuperscript{503} Through their actions in the early 1570’s, John Shakespeare was taken to court and fined. As one examines the cases against him, it is possible to see through the legal verbiage that both John and his judges were frustrated that he was found guilty of something which was common practice and considered to be a natural adjunct to the glover’s trade. The final adjudication of a two-pound fine was a derisory amount given the size of the transactions. But even a symbolic two pounds, plus whatever he had to pay Langrake out of court, would have had the effect of making John Shakespeare more guarded about the details of both his business and personal life and made him want a lower public profile and to take steps to protect his assets.

It is interesting to note that by 1574 the law was catching up with the informers “compounding” out of court, which was, after all, reducing Royal revenues

…On 2 December 1574, Langrake, together with eleven other informers was committed to Fleet prison …the following February he was fined £40 and banned from bringing any further \textit{informations} for a year…\textsuperscript{504}

\textsuperscript{500} Thomas and Evans, \textit{John Shakespeare}.
\textsuperscript{501} Ibid. Langrake tried to evade the charge by suing almost everyone in sight, and Thomas and Evans note how poorly he was thought of by his fellows.
\textsuperscript{502} Ibid. p.316. For another example of Langrake’s activities see Glossary “Langrake”
\textsuperscript{503} Ibid. They note that cases of this type may have peaked in 1574 (afterwards the law began to catch up with the informers themselves) – they quote M.W. Beresford, “The Common Informer, The Penal Statutes and Economic Regulation,” \textit{Economic History Review}, 1957: 221-238. Thomas and Evans also note that under the law “paying off” a “would-be” or “actual” informer (as John almost certainly did in the last two Langrake cases) was in itself also an offence.
\textsuperscript{504} Ibid. p.318
The mention of a year’s penalty shows that the intent was not to stop informers, merely to scare those who were not in jail into ensuring that the state got its share.

**Legal Records**

The table below highlights John Shakespeare’s principal financial and legal transactions. As these took place over five decades - from apprenticeship to death - the list is long and supported by documents of varying evidentiary quality. Given the age and the nature of the records themselves, the many different courts and the complexity of the legal process as it affected commerce, it can never be taken as being complete. However, it indicates the scope and geographical range of his commercial business.

Most of the legal suits referred to here were, in reality, legal posturing and commercial manoeuvrings. However, regardless of their underlying purpose, they are wholly consistent with the commercial activities of a successful businessman of the period.

Thomas Carter writing in 1906 stated that

> …He [John Shakespeare] was one of the most litigious of men… from July 2 Phil. and Mary, to March, 37 Elizabeth, there are no less than 67 cases in which his name appears on one side or the other…

Unfortunately Carter does not enumerate all “67” instances he refers to, confining himself to a few samples of “Writs of Distraint” and comments that “…nearly every businessman in Stratford had been proceeded against in this way…”. And “it carries no weight in deciding for or against a man’s financial position.”

Bearman produced a partial analysis of John Shakespeare’s Court of Record appearances. In contrast to Carter, Bearman had a more cautious approach to his litigiousness

> …it would certainly be unjustified to conclude from this summary that John was more litigious than his fellow townsmen, many of whose names appear just as frequently in the court records…

---

506 Ibid. see section B. p.200
Table 37 - John Shakespeare’s Legal Cases per Bearman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Plaintiff</th>
<th>Defendant</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Lost</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Office Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Bailiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bearman interprets the reduction in the number of suits over time as suggesting a tapering off in business activity resulting from his more burdensome civic duties. There is some merit in this observation but he subsequently omitted any analysis of the next thirty-one years, during which John Shakespeare was hardly a stranger to the courts.

The following table shows representative transactions and actions in which he was involved.

**Juror** indicates John Shakespeare served as a juror in the Stratford Court of Record. **Summoned** means he was brought to the Court of Record accused of a misdemeanour. **Prosecuted** indicates that he was indicted by the Crown for felonious conduct breaking the law i.e. committing one or more criminal offences contrary to Statute and subject to fines and or imprisonment. **Suing** was where he initiated a civil (person-to-person) action against another party, **Sued** is the reverse of this. **Conveys** indicates a transfer of legal title, usually of land. **Petition** was where he as an individual appealed to the Crown to take action on his behalf. **Exempted** indicates where he was released from a taxation obligation by a competent legal authority i.e. the Borough of Stratford-upon-Avon. **Fined** indicates where a court had imposed a legal charge on him and his

---

508 I have prepared this table based on Bearman’s text.
property in response to either an illegal act or contempt of Court. However, fining, as is demonstrated below, could be a far step from actual collection at that time.

Table 38 - John Shakespeare’s Business Dealings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Legal Events being Prosecuted (by the Crown), Sued or Suing making investments</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
<th>Stratford Positions Contemporaneously held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Juror.</td>
<td>Court of Record – 21/3.12/8 On 9/23 re one Rhodes J.S. was his essoiner – i.e. brought his excuse.</td>
<td>Bailiff, Head Alderman, Justice of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Suing.</td>
<td>June/July - J.S. won case vs. Thomas Siche. Later that year a suit re barley was recorded but appears to be settled out of court.</td>
<td>High Alderman, Deputy Bailiff, Justice of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Juror.</td>
<td>Juror in review of Frankpledge 1 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Suing.</td>
<td>Sues: Richard Wagstaff, William Richardson, John Asshell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Summoned.</td>
<td>Summoned to the Court of Record 2/23 for dirty gutters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Prosecuted. JS is actively lending money at interest (i.e. the illegal practice of usury) in amounts of £100.</td>
<td>Court Rolls: E159/359 m. 215 PRO The Harrison Case re Loans to John Mussum+++</td>
<td>Bailiff, Head Alderman, Justice of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Prosecuted. JS fined and enters a guilty plea after the attorney general asked that his case for usury be sent for jury trial – pays 40 shillings fine</td>
<td>Court Rolls: E159/359 PRO m. 237 The Langrake Case No.1 re loans to John Mussum+++</td>
<td>High Alderman, Deputy Bailiff, Justice of the Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Prosecuted. Claim that JS illegally bought 100 tods (2800pounds) of wool at 14s. per tod from Edward and Richard Grant</td>
<td>Court Rolls: E159/363 Records, Hil, m.68d. PRO Langley Case No. 3 re illegal wool dealing with the Grants+++</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Prosecuted. Claim that JS and John Lockeley (also of Stratford) had illegally bought 200 tods (5600 pounds) of wool at 14s. per tod from Walter Newsam</td>
<td>Court Rolls: E159/362 Records, Hil, m.68d. PRO Langley Case No. 2 re illegal wool dealing Walter Newsam+++</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Suing. Glover in Banbury JS awarded £50</td>
<td>Court Records CP+++</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

509 I have prepared this table using data from numerous sources including Bearman and Savage, Minutes and Accounts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Sued. JS and Mussum both sued by Henry Higford of Solihull in the Court of Common Pleas for £30 each.</td>
<td>Court Records CP40/1313m. 399+++ Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Conveys. Buys two houses in Grimley near Worcester for £40</td>
<td>++ Alderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576/7</td>
<td>J.S. exits “Public” Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Conveys. Mortgages house and 56 acres (part of Asbies Estate) for £40 to his wife’s brother-in-law</td>
<td>+++ None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Conveys. 86 acres in Wilmcote to “a Webb relative” - sold to Robert Webb for £4 in 1579</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Exempted. from Poor Relief Tax</td>
<td>SBTRO Council Book A, p.190 +++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fined. £20 for not attending Court of Queen’s Bench</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Petitions. Queen’s Bench against four Stratfordians for “fear of death and mutilation of his limbs”</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Juror.</td>
<td>Sits twice as juror per Fripp – “evidence that he had not lost caste”^{510}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Sued.</td>
<td>By Nicholas Lane in Court of Record for £10 – part of a debt of £22 owed by his brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Conveys. Attempts reconveyance of Asbies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Suing. Sues John Walford (three time Mayor of Marlborough in Wiltshire) for failing to pay on demand £21 for 21 tods of wool</td>
<td>Court Records – Docket 1599 only++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Suing. Sues John Walford (three time Mayor of Marlborough in Wiltshire) for failing to pay on demand £21 for 21 tods of wool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


^{511} Halliwell-Phillipps noted of the Queen’s Bench suit that: “it is ascertained from an interesting passage in his Bill of Complaint (see Estate Records, No.2), that he was still engaged in commercial speculations”. J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, Eighth, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1889). Vol. 2. p.243
The Seeming Fall from Financial Grace

John Shakespeare withdrew from public life after a council meeting in November 1576. Thereafter he ceased

• to attend any council meetings - the only exception to this in ensuing years was a single appearance to vote in a council election,
• to pay local taxes - even poor rates,
• his efforts to obtain “gentlemanly” status even though these were at an advanced stage - he would have already paid hefty fees to the College of Heralds to prepare his case for consideration,
• to attend church – he and his family became Recusants.

The years after 1576 also brought a flurry of asset disposals and subsequent litigation.

Various theories have been advanced for this.

1. Business failure left the Shakespeare family penniless.
2. Bishop Whitgift’s “Commission” fiscally attack recusants of both Protestant and Catholic beliefs.
3. The Shakespeares were Catholics.
4. The fall into poverty never occurred.
These represent the four most popular reasons though some commentators have blended their assessment by favouring more than one of these. Taking each of these in turn:

1. **Business failure left the Shakespeare family penniless.**

   There can be no doubt whatever that the words … Johanes Shackspere nihil hahet unde distringi potest [John Shakespeare had nothing able to be distrained] - are not to be taken literally, and that they merely belong to a formula that was in use when a writ of distringas failed in enforcing an appearance… Halliwell-Phillipps, 1889

   In the above quotation Halliwell-Phillipps drew attention to a court entry of 1586 that John Shakespeare had nothing to be “distrained” (capable of seizure to ensure court attendance) but noted that this was not in fact an actual sign of poverty. Many later scholars chose either not to pay attention to this caveat or indeed found it more convenient to take the statement at face value as meaning that the Shakespeares were in severe financial distress.

   It had become customary over centuries of Shakespearian biography to say that John Shakespeare fell upon hard times, starting in the late 1570s. However, across the twentieth century the attitude of scholars became increasingly inflexible. This issue moved from possibility (Chambers) through probability (Halliday) to a situation today where most writers feel secure in making emphatic statements merely amplifying the opinions of earlier scholars without any reference to source documents such as *The Minutes and Accounts*.

   The following table shows a selection of researchers’ opinions – in each case two quotations are cited to illustrate that the opinion in each

---

512 J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, Eighth, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1889). II p 238. He further noted that “there is unfortunately no record of procedure that was adopted in this Court” [Stratford Court of Record]. The actual case in question involved “Johannes Browne” and proceedings on the case are shown for 19 January, 16 February and 2 March at which point the case was dropped or settled out of court – as mentioned earlier in Chapter 1, gamesmanship over debts i.e. ignoring the case till the last moment or ignoring it until it was clear the other party simply wouldn’t give up were a common business tactic. Halliwell-Phillipps makes this statement based on his extensive knowledge of the court records – as he notes in this case John Shakespeare was placed on Court of Record juries on 25 May and 20 July from which it can be inferred he was overall in good standing with the Borough.

513 Carol Chillington Rutter referred to interpretations of Henslowe’s “diary”, passed on between scholars, as a “series of begats as sonorous as the Book of Genesis, generations of playhouse handed down one Philip Henslowe to the present day.” This was how she described the process similar to the “hardening” of the “one” John Shakespeare. Carol Chillington Rutter, *Documents of The Rose Playhouse*, Revised Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999). p.2

514 Savage, *Minutes and Accounts*
case was not merely a single quote taken out of context – all quotations are taken from the works footnoted below

**Table 40 - Hardening Attitudes to the “Poverty” of the Shakespeares**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Quotation 1</th>
<th>Quotation 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>E.K. Chambers⁵¹⁶</td>
<td>Indications of a decline in his fortunes</td>
<td>He was still in a position to spend £50 on property in 1575…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>F.E. Halliday⁵¹⁷</td>
<td>The twenty years 1576-96 appear to be years of adversity</td>
<td>His fortunes are restored 1596-1601, probably by the poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Samuel Schoenbaum⁵¹⁸</td>
<td>The evidence suggests that John Shakespeare had fallen on hard times</td>
<td>Adversaries as well as adversaries, oppressed him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Anthony Holden⁵¹⁹</td>
<td>Father’s affairs in ever more rapid decline (1579)</td>
<td>Fine £20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Stanley Wells⁵²⁰</td>
<td>His father’s fortunes were in decline.</td>
<td>Sold land, mortgaged a part of his wife’s inheritance…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Katherine Duncan-Jones⁵²¹</td>
<td>John Shakespeare’s financial difficulties during the late 1570’s are well documented… he lacked the funds even to hang on [sic] to all the property he possessed…</td>
<td>Grinding poverty of the Henley Street House…[of Anne Shakespeare] she fed her children herself… [wet nurse] a luxury far beyond the young couple’s means… …Fear of arrest for debt and the consequent social humiliation…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Robert Bearman⁵²²</td>
<td>there are indications that he had fallen on hard times.</td>
<td>[J.S.] …needed money…by November 1578…urgently…he sold and mortgaged property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Stephen Greenblatt⁵²³</td>
<td>…around the time Will reached his thirteenth year, things began to turn sour for his buoyant, successful father</td>
<td>Ceased going to church for fear of being dunned [sic] for unpaid debts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Kate Emery Pogue⁵²⁴</td>
<td>In 1576 John Shakespeare’s speculations in wool dealing sent his fortunes into a long decline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edgar Fripp, the long time collaborator of Richard Savage,⁵²⁵ was an advocate for the simplest of all explanations for the financial fall of John Shakespeare - it simply never happened.

---

⁵¹⁵ I have prepared this table using the referenced works.  
⁵²⁰ Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare for All Time* (London: Macmillan, 2002). p.21  
But there are dissenting voices to his view. For example Robert Bearman as recently as 2005, held to the “sudden poverty” line when considering if John Shakespeare deliberately hid his wealth. Bearman concluded that “[his] small-scale dealings do not have this air about them.”

2. Bishop Whitgift’s “Commission” fiscally attacks recusants of both Protestant and Catholic beliefs.

In the summer of 1577 Bishop Whitgift made “visitation of his diocese in the hope of catching recusants” with the intent of extracting fines wherever practicable. Fripp quoted from a letter Whitgift sent to Lord Burghley.

…two kinds of men delighted in molesting and troubling him, namely the contentious Protestant and the stubborn Papist …both with backing from “great men”…

Fripp reasoned that the move into recusancy and apparent poverty flowed from a change in Crown policy that left much of the protestant, if not indeed puritan, majority of Borough Council members vulnerable through the appointment of Bishop Whitgift. Suddenly, according to Fripp, John Shakespeare took elaborate steps to avoid being classified as a potential victim of the new bishop’s cash-hungry regime. As Bishop of Worcester (later Archbishop of Canterbury) Whitgift appeared determined to follow Elizabeth’s middle course for the Church of England and was a man who pursued both wealthy Catholics and Non-Conformist Protestants (the key word perhaps being “wealthy”) with fiery fiscal vigour. Tempting though it may be to attribute this move on the part of the Crown to philosophical or doctrinal grounds there was a strong economic motive, given Elizabeth I’s pressing need for cash.

J. B. Marsden, a source often quoted by Fripp, stated that in 1584, after six years’ experience in Warwickshire, Whitgift again complained to Burghley

---

525 Savage, Minutes and Accounts See also p.311 - David Fallow, The Abridged Introductions of Edgar I. Fripp and Accounts etc. (2009).
528 William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley.
529 Ibid. p.90
530 1530?-1604. Bishop of Worcester 24 March 1577. In August 1583 he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.
...it is hard to get witnesses against the Puritans, because most of the parishioners favour them, and therefore will not present them nor against them. If Archbishops and Bishops should be driven to use proofs by witnesses only, the execution of the law would be partial, and their costs in procuring and producing witnesses would be intolerable...

What is interesting in light of John’s later behaviour (see below) is the reference to the costs of “procuring and producing witnesses” with its implication that this apparently moral crusade was indeed being run with an eye for the cash box. The consequence is that if an accused could make the prosecution sufficiently expensive, then the matter would, perhaps, be dropped. Of course Whitgift was also stating that the best way to get more cash would have been to abandon the processes of English Common Law. This was an easy enough proposal for a man who rationalized his own view of the “Grand Commission” as being

...by no means to be compared with the [Spanish] Inquisition, inasmuch as the Inquisition punished with death, the commissioners only with deprivation...

However, a note of caution must be sounded concerning Marsden’s writing - notwithstanding Fripp’s faith in him as a reliable source. Marsden’s staunchly pro-Puritan stance remains highly reminiscent of, and just as biased as, the pro-Catholic writers of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In studying Marsden’s work in toto, a rational balance has to be struck between the facts as he interprets them and the documentary evidence. In the case of deprivation, the letters, some fragments of which are quoted above, appear to support both Marsden and later Fripp’s analysis. Fripp also can also be conspicuously partisan in his interpretation of events. Schoenbaum, though accounting him “a distinguished scholar in the great Stratfordian antiquarian tradition,” was rightly critical of Fripp’s need to lay all explanation of John Shakespeare’s behaviour at religion’s door – especially Whitgift’s. For Schoenbaum “Fripp could never proceed beyond a romantic and uncritical love for his

532 Established in April 1576 “...to order, correct, reform and punish any persons wilfully and obstinately absenting themselves from church and service...” Michael Wood, _In Search of Shakespeare_, BBC Edition (London: BBC, 2005). p.70
533 Ibid. p.164
534 Marsden, _Puritans_. In the preface – in the book the term “Advertisement” is used – on the first page Marden states “the stream of puritan history runs deep and clear” which indicates where Marsden’s own sympathies lay.
535 In this case government seizure of possessions.
536 In addition to being scholars, both men were non-conformist clergymen.
Though in many ways correct in this observation, Schoenbaum does not appear to admit the possibility that some of Fripp’s romantic leaps of faith might have been, on occasions, more unconscious pattern recognition than mere fancy.

Fripp described a sequence of related events that demanded an overall explanation

...[John Shakespeare] had avoided ‘gentlehood’ [i.e. he abandoned his costly application for a coat-of-arms with its attendant Gentlemanly status], but his name appeared near the top of the list of “Gentlemen and Freeholders” in Stratford drawn up at the time of the Musters. He was a marked man... He was, beyond doubt, an obstinate recusant suddenly anxious to appear “of no account”, “a very beggar”, ready to plead “debt” and “fear of process”, unwilling to pay his levies and fines, and much befriended by neighbours. Sure of his tenements and goods within the borough, he parted his property outside, conveying it to friends from whom he expected relief, trusting in one case to a brother-in-law, proved, it appears, a knave.

The above point concerning financial substance at the time of the 1570 musters - that John was “wealthy and near the top of the list” - means that he was indeed identified as an economic target. By 1580 he was fined £40 for failure to appear in court when bound over to do so: £20 was for his own non-appearance, with a further £20 for not bringing John Audley, a hatmaker of Nottingham, into court.

Early Modern legal practice in England relied heavily on co-guarantors, both in commercial and criminal actions, who would indemnify the Crown against the failure of an individual to either appear in court or to perform some specified action. Many scholars have focused on this £40 fine using it as evidence of poverty while still failing to explain how, if insolvent, he could have come up with such a cash sum.

---

538 As noted earlier, Schoenbaum could have his own sporadic moments of fancy. See “the river was the silver streaming silent highway” Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). See p.97 - for prose that would not be out of place in a romantic novel.
539 Ibid. p. 32 & 172
540 Gentlemanly status was double edged – on the positive side title, coats-of-arms, ability to wear certain types of clothing – in general prestige – on the negative, greater notoriety therefore vulnerability to taxation at local and national level where ability to pay (or perceived ability) dictated the level of imposts for a whole range of taxes involving both the State and the Borough.
541 Musters ‘of men, horses, armour and weapons’ in March 1570 – often used as a technique to signal public authority in times of potential political unrest. The costs for these were distributed based upon apparent wealth, to appear at the top meant an individual would be liable for what was, in effect, a wealth tax to pay for raising troops.
542 A reference to the mortgaging of the house and 56 acres (part of Ashies Estate) for £40 to his wife’s brother-in-law who per Fripp pulled an underhanded trick by keeping what was not rightfully his.
543 “ad inveniendum sufficientem securitatem pads domine Regine erga ipsam dominant Reginam et cunctum populum suum prout sub recognizone super se assumpsit”
Fripp again delivered the alternative explanation - it was never paid. Though still unable to determine how the following arrangement was coordinated, Fripp did show how it proved possible to defeat the Elizabethan court system with its own bureaucracy.

...On the day John Shakespeare was fined, the hatter John Audley was fined £70 - £10 for not bringing John Shakespeare into court; £40 for his own non-appearance *ad inveniendum sufficientem securitatem de se bene gerendo* [etc.]... and £20 for his ...non-appearance *ad inveniendum sufficientem securitatem* [etc.]... Simultaneously, Thomas Cooley of Stoke in Staffordshire (described as a yeoman) was fined £30 - £10 for not bringing John Shakespeare into court, and £20 for not bringing John Audley into court. Lastly, Nicholas Walton (a yeoman of Kidderminster) and William Lonley of Emley in Worcestershire (husbandman) were each docked £10 apiece for not bringing John Audley into court...

The purpose of all this cross guaranteeing was that the courts, based as they were on Church dioceses, had no central means of coordinating fines. Continuing on from the above quotation Fripp noted

...The distribution of the security is striking - Stratford, Nottingham, Stoke, Kidderminster and Emley Lovett (near Kidderminster) are widespread. John Shakespeare and his two sureties, Audley and Cooley, were in three dioceses under separate jurisdictions, and the procedure for the getting of the fines imposed would be so complex that we may well doubt whether they were [ever] paid...

Table 41 - Roads and Dioceses

![Roads and Dioceses Diagram](chart)

Key: Gray lines are diocesan boundaries. Solid black lines are major modern roads and motorways. Black lines with circles are Early Modern post roads.

---

544 See x ref.311, for his full explanation of events. Also x ref. footnote 1103
545 See Glossary re Fines (Ecclesiastical)
546 Stratford-upon-Avon to Nottingham (68.2 Miles), Stoke (97 Miles), Kidderminster (31.8 Miles) Emley Lovett/Hartlebury 31.4 (Miles) – distances on modern (2009) roads.
547 The above diagram relies on data from a number of sources, modern maps, and Episcopal records. It is approximately to scale.
Fripp stopped his analysis at this point, proposing no further explanation.

But there exists one economic explanation of how all this was arranged across these quite considerable distances and between men who apparently do not share a close common trade. Indeed, the distribution may well have been more significant than Fripp observed as the locations of the individuals in question all fan out North from Stratford and all lie on, or are close to, both Early Modern and present day major arterial roads and motorways which follow the ancient routes.

The Early Modern “North” of England was much less closely regulated with regard to the wool and cloth trade and it was also where various techniques were used to increase the return through adulteration and blending of wool and yarns.\textsuperscript{548} That John Shakespeare was a significant trader in wool in the 1570s is demonstrated in the court cases previously cited. If he were willing to be in a dubious business (from a strictly legal standpoint) then he would hardly have hesitated to sell the wool in the less regulated North where the ability to maximize profit lay. The probability was that John’s business flowed north from Stratford and, as is seen in the evasion of fines, his business contacts (i.e. the cross guarantors) came through the illegal movements of fleeces and cloth. There is also the possibility that these linked businessmen had some mutuality of personal beliefs (religious or economic). One additional piece of evidence comes from Elizabeth Crittall who, writing of the cloth industry in Wiltshire, (where regulation was almost as fluid as in the North), noted that

\[\ldots\text{men\ldots} \text{described indiscriminately as “weaver”, “clothman”, or “clothier” and from those weavers, sometimes called “yeomen”, sometimes “husbandmen”}\]

were, despite the apparent difference in trade titles, all fundamentally in the same business i.e. wool and cloth. Given this, the differing business titles of John Shakespeare’s co-guarantors would have been no bar to their actual involvement in wool and manufacture of cloth. John Audley may easily have been no more a hatter at this date than John Shakespeare was, by this time, a glover.

\textsuperscript{548} And a sufficient financial incentive to offset the cost of transporting the wool north on horseback over Elizabethan roads.

\textsuperscript{549} Elizabeth Crittall, \textit{A History of the County of Wiltshire - Cloth 1550-1640}, Vol. 4 (1959).
Fripp described “Alderman Shakespeare” faced with Whitgift’s Commission and the sudden apparent move into penury as being “curled up like a hedgehog at the approach of the dog”.  

3. The Shakespeares were Catholics

In 1952 Heinrich Mutschmann and Karl Wentersdorf, published in German a book that was later sold in English with the title *Shakespeare and Catholicism*. The title rather prejudged the book’s message that “religion mattered supremely to the Shakespeares… a point upon which most scholars are agreed.” However, the conclusion was perhaps unsurprisingly, that the Shakespeare family were all Catholics, and fanatical ones at that. However, if one looked beyond this there was a good review of historical events and, interestingly, a heavy reliance upon the works of Edgar Fripp. With reference to Fripp however, no mention is made of his own Protestant solutions beyond an acknowledgement that “theoretically Puritans were also in danger.”

On the matter of “John Shakespeare’s Recusancy” they too dismiss the notion of a sudden commercial downturn noting

There was no big fire at the time which might have destroyed his property… nor called on to fill [expensive] social functions… or had fallen into disfavour with his colleagues…

There then follows an analysis of events assuming that the explanation for his “abrupt break with borough life must…be found in his religious convictions”.

---

550 Ibid. p.91
552 Ibid. p.44
553 Ibid. p.44
Table 42 - Catholic Motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Explanation per Mutschmann &amp; Wentersdorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Application for coat of arms withdrawn</td>
<td>Catholic “counter reformation” provokes voluntary withdrawal from public life rather than take Oath of Supremacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Withdrawal from Borough Council</td>
<td>“presupposes great courage and firm faith” [in Catholicism] – but no proofs for this are offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Whitgift’s failure to bring many to book</td>
<td>“his officials and clergy many of whom were apparently sympathetic in secret towards the Catholics” – again, no evidence for this statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Militia levy (musters) non-payment</td>
<td>“had come out as an opponent of the new religion”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only four examples of what might be termed Catholic “wishful thinking” are listed above – it is possible to relate many more. Suffice it to say that every event in John Shakespeare’s life is traced back to the Catholic “struggle”, but matching these up against events without any documentary evidence hardly progresses analysis.\(^\text{554}\)

---

\(^{554}\) Robert Hugh Benson, *Come Rack! Come Rope!*, Reprint (London: Burns & Oates Limited, 1966). Burns & Oates describes itself today as ‘Publishers to the Holy See’. The title for the above work, a romanticized tale of Midland catholics under Elizabeth I, was “taken from a letter of Blessed Edmund Campion…he had betrayed ‘no things of secret, nor would he, come rack, come rope.’” The story includes many of the figures referenced in this thesis. The good are Catholics – Campion, Mary Queen of Scots, Babington etc. The bad are all Protestants – Cecil, Topcliffe etc. The conclusion of the book’s own summary is that “first and foremost this is a story of Robin and Marjorie who give up their chance of happiness together to serve God with a devotion they both knew could have only one ending…the rack and the rope”.

Table 43 - Come Rack!
William’s Catholic Lost Years

…it is probable that Southwell [Jesuit priest] had read Shakespeare, it is practically certain that Shakespeare had read Southwell and imitated him…
Herbert Thurston, 1912

…itIf you’re going to be a Christian, you may as well be a Catholic…
Muriel Spark, 1989

In 1985 Honigmann produced his book *Shakespeare: the “lost years”* which also supported the notion of a catholic Shakespeare family, albeit through an effort to prove that William had worked for and resided with a catholic family in Lancashire. In 1581 one “William Shakeshafte”, a “player”, had appeared in a will and was left a bequest.

Chambers had earlier fuelled the twentieth century debate over William’s possible Catholicism when in 1943 he wrote of

…my Elizabethan Stage of 1923 (I. 280)… [in which] I quoted from a will executed on 3 August 1581 by Alexander Houghton, of Lea, Lancashire, in which, after making a legacy of his play clothes to his brother Thomas, or if he should not to keep players, then to Sir Thomas Heskethe, …to be friendly to Foke Gyllome, William Shakeshafte, then dwelling with the testator, and either to take them into his service or else to help them to a master. And I added the comment, ‘Was then William Shakeshafte a player in 1581?’

…I do not know why I did not refer again in my William Shakespeare (1930) to this William Shakeshafte, which, rather than Shakshafte, is the normal spelling of the will… I do not think that his father John ever appears as Shakeshafte, but it is at least conceivable that William might have adopted the variant as a player. It does not, of course, recur in his London career. I now return, however, to the William Shakeshafte of 1581…

Chambers’ article though only five pages long was enough to excite others to openly speculate, often at book length, on the “lost years” in Shakespeare’s biographical record (1585-1592) being spent in service with this Lancastrian family. The notion was that if William were catholic then the wider Shakespeare family must have been like-

minded. Both proposals got short shrift from several eminent scholars. For example, Mark Eccles, in 1961, was unconvinced - “there is no real evidence to support the theory that William Shakeshafte was William Shakespeare”.

But the debate continued, prompting Douglas Hamer to produce a careful analysis of the question in 1971. Hamer focused on two aspects of the question. Firstly, that “Shakeshafte” was a relatively common name in that part of Lancashire; and secondly, would such a young man only recently arrived on the scene have been lumped together with old family retainers in a will? Shakespeare would, at this date, have been only a teenager. Schoenbaum was also sceptical at least in the early editions of his most significant works.

In 1985 Honigmann refreshed the question by focusing on John Cottam, a schoolmaster in Stratford from 1579 to 1581. Cottam’s brother was a catholic priest who resided ten miles from where Alexander Hoghton, and therefore William Shakeshafte, lived. This was enough proof for Honigmann who concluded his book with the rallying cry

…Let us brace ourselves, then, for howls of anguish about a catholic Shakespeare…

Yet again, an eminent scholar had breathed new life into the old debate. Schoenbaum in 1991 carefully reiterated Honigmann’s arguments but considered

…Still, if Shakespeare was seventeen in Houghton’s service he would have had to be back in Stratford to woo, impregnate, and marry Anne Hathaway before his nineteenth birthday, not - on the face of it - the most plausible of scenarios.

In 2002 Bearman authoritatively supported the anti-Shakeshafte view. He delivered a measured response

…Hamer’s main objections to the identification of William Shakeshafte as William Shakespeare are thus as valid now as when they were made some thirty years ago. The name of Shakeshafte can be shown to be even more common than he demonstrated, with a particular concentration in the area where Hoghton family influence was preeminent. His reservations concerning the compatibility of William Shakeshafte’s age

---

with that of William Shakspere also remain unanswered. No doubt speculation that Shakshafte might still be Shakspere will continue, but we should at least be aware that, in our current state of knowledge, it is speculation carried on in the face of the more likely but distinctly less-exciting scenario that William Shakshafte was a middle-aged man born and bred in Lancashire…

In 2003 Honigmann responded to Bearman’s article with a number of counter arguments. While some are marginally valid, others were purely speculative. An example of the latter was his response to the question of why a seventeen year old would merit a bequest.

…Would it be so surprising if a strong-willed and wealthy man such as Hoghton was favourably impressed by young Shakspere and chose to treat him generously? This possibility, and it is only a possibility, has to be placed in the context of John Aubrey’s statement that Shakspere “had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country”.

Honigmann had earlier noted Aubrey’s description of John Shakspere as a butcher. On that occasion he had considered that “we need not take it…too seriously”. Evidently Honigmann was selective as to what was authoritative in Aubrey’s writing. However, Honigmann did acknowledge Bearman’s point concerning how common the “Shakshafte” surname was in Lancashire.

In 2010, I conducted my own investigation into how obtaining data through a search of Parish records and testamentary dispositions could be used to present intellectually satisfying but completely erroneous conclusions. In part, these formed the introduction to an article in which I showed that William Shakspere died on the 6 July 1579 in Stratford. There are the genuine parish records that prove it, right down to the cost of the church bell. The very day before William’s inquest, John Shakspere had taken his own life. The following is a quotation from the article

…And so the world lost a great playwright at the age of fifteen. Presumably his father John, overcome with grief…ended his distress with a noose. The evidence is clear…

Of course not…

567 E.A.J. Honigmann, Shakespeare: the “lost years” (Manchester: MUP, 1985). p.2
The entries are genuine but the conclusions false. Yet this evidence is much clearer as to place, name, date, circumstance etc. than William Shakeshafte being the playwright or the real Shakespeares ever being Catholic.

Protestant Arguments

He had outwardly conformed to the Protestant rule, and there is certainly as little… that he was secretly attached to the old religion.”\textsuperscript{570}  
J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, 1889

Halliwell-Phillipps, when one reads his commentary surrounding the above quotation was merely suggesting that there was little evidence either way concerning John Shakespeare’s own religious views. This of course has not stopped speculation by either side of the argument.

Carter, a puritanical clergyman, took his first shot with the title of his 1897 book \textit{Shakespeare Puritan and Recusant}\textsuperscript{571} For this author, the Stratford Corporation was strongly Protestant if not actually Puritan. In such company, he considered that John Shakespeare could hardly have been a secret Catholic.

Carter’s key arguments were that Shakespeare had been

• active as the borough Chamberlain in the Protestantization of the Guild Chapel,
• disposing, as Deputy-Bailiff with Adrian Quiney as the Bailiff,\textsuperscript{572} of the Romanist vestments,
• a “passive resister” under Whitgift’s episcopate at Worcester, incurring fines and penalties,
• disposing of his property “under appearance at least of stress (whence the theory of his poverty)”",
• presented in 1592 for recusancy as one of the Puritan, not Catholic, defaulters.

Carter’s book remained partisan throughout and often fell short in the test of credible proof versus wishful thinking.

\textsuperscript{572} Fripp refers to this action as being their first official act in these positions.
Fripp, in the matter of Catholicism and the Shakespeares added that

- The first two martyrs under Mary - were Warwickshire men, and the third was [the Protestant Bishop] Hooper.
- Snitterfield, birthplace of John Shakespeare and his brother, Henry was “an early home of the Reformation”.
- Stratford was surrounded by burnings of Protestants at Coventry, Gloucester, Lichfield, Leicester, Northampton, Oxford.
- William Shakespeare’s deposition in the “Mountjoy” lawsuit indicates that he was resident with the Huguenot Mountjoy family in Silver Street in London circa 1602.
- On the accession of Elizabeth I, the Corporation got rid of their steward, Edgeworth, and their Catholic vicar, Father Dyos.
- In these days John Shakespeare was ‘malcontent’ and guilty of indiscretion that put him on the wrong side of the law.

If the pro-catholic commentators are willing to make claims based on almost any aspect of the Shakespeare family, insisting it is of significance, then it is possible to find an offsetting protestant opinion. One is forced to Halliwell-Phillipps’ conclusion that there is very little quality evidence on either side of the argument.

4. The fall into poverty never occurred.

In 2005 Peter Ackroyd in his biography of Shakespeare was a rare, non-religiously motivated, voice in questioning the financial fall. He wrote “…It is unlikely he [John Shakespeare] was in any financial trouble” and “[had fallen into] penury… but this may simply be a misunderstanding.”

Schoenbaum also started a fuller investigation of the reasons behind the apparent poverty. He dismissed the question of “ideological waywardness” as the cause of John’s “pecuniary embarrassment”, with consequential “defying [of] authority and

574 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.38/9 are a very elegant dismissal of much of the poor scholarship around the financial distress issue and deserve close examination. However, just as he says “The records are silent about the causes of John Shakespeare’s difficulties” Schoenbaum himself slips into one of his own philosophical interludes and drifted into “poverty breeds other miseries…illegitimate births etc…” and the moment of fiscal clarity is lost.
partaking in forbidden ceremonies”. In Baconian fashion, he dismissed both Catholic and Protestant militants, those who claimed that one or other branch of religion motivated him, with his cool observation that “John Shakespeare was a tradesman, not an ideologue”. However, while he fully recognized the nature of the man, he hesitated to question if a commercial explanation lay behind John’s actions: “…the records are silent about the causes of John Shakespeare’s difficulties”.

As shown above, both sides of the religious argument found a doctrinal explanation. In October 1576

…The new bishop of Worcester, John Whitgift, was also here [in Stratford] in October, making notes of any non-conformity. The Queen is particularly anxious to suppress the extreme Puritans at the moment and to get lists of those not attending church. He stayed at the Swan in Bridge Street, costing the Corporation a further 8s 8d. in wine…

Tangible evidence also exists in the Privy Council’s attempts to drive unlicensed wool middlemen out of business. The timing of John’s “last” Council meeting in November 1576, following hard on Whitgift’s visit, can hardly be coincidental with the issuance of Proclamation 621/712 of 28 November. 621/712 suspended wool trading licences for a year and banned even the Merchants of the Staple from acting in the domestic trade. In the hierarchy of wool middlemen both Licensees and Merchants of the Staple were definitely of a higher status than unlicensed broggers such as John. Those unlicensed brokers with the most to lose were those whose business was large enough to have previously attracted both informers and prior prosecution – situations that applied to Shakespeare. It must have seemed, at that moment, that the Privy Council was intending to truly reform the wool broking industry.

Six months after Proclamation 621/712, letters to the Justices of the Peace in twenty counties were issued, this time squarely attacking the unlicensed market and demanding

---

575 Francis Bacon, “Of Usury,” in Essays (London: Penguin Classics, 1985) is shining example of how to dismiss irrelevancies, especially those of religious origins.
576 Ibid. Schoenbaum does however acknowledge in a footnote on page 34 “I am chiefly indebted to Fripp for details of corporate life” – a sign perhaps of his own regard for the thoroughness of both Fripp’s, Shakespeare Man & Artist, 2nd Edition (London: OUP, 1964) and Savage’s underlying Minutes and Accounts.
577 Extract from http://www.stratford-upon-avon.co.uk/soahstry.htm – which I believe was written by Robert Bearman but there is no attribution – the event is recorded in other sources.
578 One unpublished writer who has also pointed out this timing issue out is: Donato Colucci, Solved: John Shakespeare’s "Reversal of Fortune", www.donatopresents.com/shakespeare/Reversal.html (accessed July, 2011). However, the provenance of Colucci’s scholarship is unknown though he references some of the texts used in the preparation of this thesis.
£100 bonds from broggers “that they would not buy for resale”. This was not the end of the matter, for later in 1577, the Staplers pressed for two new proclamations. The first was to restrict the number of broggers, but the second - to ban glovers even from selling the wool left on fleeces bought for leather - would have removed any legitimacy to the Shakespeares’ business. In barely a year, glovers who were large scale unlicensed middlemen would have seen their businesses move to the edge of dissolution.

Moreover, during this time it would have been impossible to tell if the attack would continue. No middleman, such as John Shakespeare, could have known that the reluctance of the Justices of the Peace to prosecute their local dealers (many of whom, like John, would be fellow Councillors or prominent local citizens) would render the Privy Council’s instructions impotent. Nor could anyone have known for certain that the Staplers would fail in their attempts to drive all glovers out of the wool business.

Neither of their proposed proclamations was ever issued. Against all these circumstances, a lowering of public profile - if not indeed strenuous efforts to appear poor and cashless on the part of the Shakespeares is surely a credible thesis. Even after the passing of time had blunted the attack on wool dealers, the notion that re-regulation could occur would argue strongly against any return to public prominence. After all, with friends still on the council, the only effect of Shakespeare’s “disappearance” would be for him to have his tax burden effectively reduced to zero. In contemporary parlance, the Shakespeare family business had become part of the “black” or “underground” economy.579

This is not to say religion did not provide the Shakespeares with a convenient smokescreen. Recusancy and sham poverty when used together would have provided an even stronger curtain against informers.580

Bertrand Russell expressed the notion of the simplest solution being the best as

579 …the economic sector of private business deals in which tax liability is not reported – OED.
580 Bearman, John Shakespeare p.424. Bearman discounted how events may have looked at the time to someone vulnerable to these initiatives. He noted (with the benefit of hindsight) that the actions had minimal long-term effect and then concluded that they were therefore of no consequence. He preferred to attribute the withdrawal to poor business decisions and seized on one case involving Henry Higford though, like many business related cases of the time, there is no record of the outcome. On this slim evidence he built a thesis that this somehow presaged financial disaster. However, he did note that “we do not have the names of those Warwickshire broggers compelled to give sureties to cease trading under the order of May 1577”, though, inexplicably, he continued “… it is very unlikely that John was one of them.”
…a form of Occam’s Razor⁵⁸¹ [that is to say]…whenever possible, substitute constructions out of known entities for inferences to unknown entities…⁵⁸²

The most elegant solution to John Shakespeare’s apparent fall from financial grace, the one that best fits the facts, is the one propounded by Fripp.

It never happened.

⁵⁸¹ See Glossary “Occam’s Razor”.
Making their marks

Jack Cade: Let me alone. Dost thou use to write thy name? Or hast thou a mark to thyself, like an honest plain-dealing man?

Clerk of Chatham: Sir, I thank God, I have been so well brought up that I can write my name.

All: He hath confessed: away with him! he's a villain and a traitor

Henry VI II, IV, ii

The only way that’s left now, is to looke Into thy Papers, to reade or’e thy Booke.

Digges, An Elegy on Ben Jonson

There is a belief that John Shakespeare was illiterate and to many merely the mention of this is enough to suggest a lack of intellect as well as education. But there are some who take pains not to leave signatures or detailed financial records - sharp businessmen, tax dodgers and fraudsters. All of these groups aim to leave no traces for the authorities to follow - the very absence of evidence can, in itself, be significant.

Even a cursory comparison between William Shakespeare and Ben Jonson shows that Jonson intended to be memorialized through his work and Shakespeare did not or was, at the very least, indifferent to how history would view his literary achievements.

Mark Bland noted that

…there are more than three hundred and twenty surviving volumes from Jonson’s library, a number of which contain marginalia that directly relate to Jonson’s texts. There are nearly six hundred manuscript copies of Jonson’s poems in scribal miscellanies as well as autograph witnesses to a number of them, and another two hundred manuscript texts from the masques and plays, many of which are songs.

Absent signatures, William Shakespeare left nothing incontrovertibly in his own script.

585 Bland, Ben Jonson p.393
We cannot, to paraphrase Digges\textsuperscript{586} “look into [his] papers” because both he and his father had nothing to gain by keeping any. F.E. Halliday provided an excellent summary of one possible source of Shakespeare’s hand in the manuscript for the play \textit{Sir Thomas More}.\textsuperscript{587} There are no less than six different hands evident in the sixteen surviving pages\textsuperscript{588} plus a seventh in that of Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels (1597-1610).

Yet, despite all the study invested in this one ambiguous (though tangible) piece of writing, there has been a remarkable silence about why there is no remaining sample of either of the Shakespeares’ writing.

Schoenbaum\textsuperscript{589} documented that John Shakespeare avoided taxes for nearly twenty years. Furthermore he stated that John, despite managing the Stratford Town financial accounts for four years – one year entirely on his own – was supposedly illiterate and could not even sign his name.\textsuperscript{590} Scholars have come up with various notions as to how he did this while being supposedly illiterate – using counters or stones, dictating to scriveners etc. But there remain the two simplest explanations of all – either he did sign, but just not in a manner that looks like a signature to contemporary eyes and/or he chose not to leave a paper trail by never suggesting he could write.

Fripp was in no doubt that Borough officers signed documents in different ways

...The minutes of this Court were witnessed by the Affeerors - including John Shakespeare. Symons wrote the names at the bottom of the page, on the right hand, and the Affeerors attached their signature or mark. Biddle and Wheeler signed; Lewes ap Williams, Tyler, and Shakespeare made their marks. Ap Williams's mark resembles a church-gable and possibly means Holy Church; Tyler's consists of two concentric circles quartered by a cross and may signify the Trinity; Shakespeare's is a glover's compasses and denotes, no doubt, ‘God compasseth us’\textsuperscript{591}

\textsuperscript{586} Ibid. p. 371
\textsuperscript{588} As an aside, this is evidence, if any were needed, of the collaborative norm in plays of around 1593, the “best guess” date of the writing.
\textsuperscript{590} Ibid. 31, 32
\textsuperscript{591} x ref.311
The above page is reproduced from the Court Leet Book of 1561

John Shakespeare, his mark.

Chambers was of the same opinion

...In view of contemporary habits, it is no proof of inability to write that he [John Shakespeare] was accustomed to authenticate documents by a mark, which was sometimes a cross and sometimes a pair of glovers dividers.  

Charles Sisson produced an outstanding article titled *Marks as Signatures*, based on his presentation of 16 January 1928 to the Bibliographical Society. In this work he traced the use of marks to identify parties to a contract or piece of work, from antiquity through to the Early Modern Period

...No survey of the subject can fail to observe the conflict between the ancienrty and dignity of the mark and the newfangled qualifications for gentry or respectability by literacy which emerged at the end of the Middle Ages...

Sisson was keenly aware of the potential implications of the Jack Cade speech in *Henry VI II*, IV, ii. Shakespeare was expressing how the very use of a signature was a statement about the pretensions of the signer - an eerie foreshadowing of cultural revolutions in twentieth century Cambodia and China where the slightest signs of

---

592 Court Leet Book of 1561 – 4 May, Birthplace Trust Records Office, Misc. Doc. VII, 56. – Schoenbaum appears to agree with Fripp on this point: “John Shakespeare here uses as his mark a pair of glovers compasses. The mark of Lewes ap Williams may be a church gable”. Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.30
594 C.J. Sisson, “Marks as Signatures,” *The Library* (Bibliographical Society) 9, no. 1 (June 1928): 1-37. This is an outstanding article, exhaustively detailed yet full of wit and precision.
intellectuality could mean death. John Shakespeare would never have signed with a full name. He and his fellow Aldermen, true to their guilds, would have “used their mark” to identify themselves as “honest plain-dealing men”.

In the table below - part of one attached to the Sisson article - are examples of symbols used chiefly by tradesmen but also by some gentlemen (No.15 is an example of a gentleman’s signum) - in the mid to late sixteenth century.

Table 45 - Early Modern Signums

Stanley Wells, writing in 2002, had this comment

…John Shakespeare also signed with a mark; it may seem hard to believe that one so able and successful in both public and business service was illiterate, but equally it is improbable that if he had indeed been able to write no document subscribed by him should have survived in the town’s ample archives

It cannot be proved that John Shakespeare could write. Reading was at the time viewed as an independent skill, but the longer one examines his business dealings and common practice during his time in civic office, the more likely it appears that he could write.

595 During their respective “Cultural Revolutions” under Pol Pot and Chairman Mao.
596 Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare for All Time* (London: Macmillan, 2002). p.6
William rarely used a signature - only six examples remain, all from after 1612. Even here his writing is barely legible, he used different spellings, and wrote only where legal documents necessitated a signature.597

Table 47 - W.S. Signatures

| From 1612 deposition | William Shackper |
| 1612 Blackfriars deed | William Shakspear |
| 1612 Blackfriars mortgage | Wm Shakspea |
| His 1615 will, page 1 | William Shackspeed |
| Will, page 2 | Willm. Shakspe |
| Will, page 3 | William Shakspeare 598 |

Because these signatures are from a relatively short time period, the differences in spelling cannot be explained by the period’s casual approach to the issue. It is not difficult to find contemporary scholars commenting on the flexibility of Early Modern spelling. From Emma Smith’s 2007 introductory volume on Shakespeare where she observes that “standardized spelling is still a long way off in Shakespeare’s time”599 to

598 Often questioned as by a different hand the upward sweep of the “W” is very uncharacteristic as it is that single signature’s legibility that makes it stand out.]
David Kathman’s hyper-detailed analysis of spellings of the Shakespeare name⁶⁰⁰ there are numerous references to the flexibility of Elizabethan spellings. However this default assumption prevents consideration of a much simpler answer – varying spellings lessen the certainty of the writer’s identity.

| Table 48 - Literary References (1593-1616)⁶⁰¹ |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Spelling                  | Total | Printed | Written |
| Shakespeare              | 120   | 108    | 12     |
| Shake-speare             | 21    | 21     | 0      |
| Shakspeare               | 10    | 5      | 5      |
| Shaxberd                 | 4     | 0      | 4      |
| Shakespere               | 3     | 0      | 3      |
| Shakespeare              | 3     | 1      | 2      |
| Shak-speare              | 2     | 2      | 0      |
| Shakspear                | 2     | 0      | 2      |
| Shakspeare               | 1     | 0      | 1      |
| Shaksper                 | 1     | 0      | 1      |
| Schaksp.                 | 1     | 0      | 1      |
| Shakespereare            | 1     | 1      | 0      |
| Shakespe                 | 1     | 0      | 1      |
| Shakspe                  | 1     | 0      | 1      |

Additionally, for a playwright to blot the ink in two out of six signatures may be explained by poor pens or quills and indifferent quality of ink, but there is also the possibility that these imperfections were not accidental.

**Illiteracy**

In 1977 David Cressy took on the daunting task of estimating levels of illiteracy in England for the two centuries after 1530. Using Norwich as his datum he not only produced bands for different strata of society but also looked at variations between the trades. His results, summarized in the following tables, are interesting though not conclusive. If Stratford had literacy levels akin to Norwich - and there seems to be no reason why this should not be the case - then there was about a one third to one half chance, based solely on his trade, that John Shakespeare was indeed literate.

⁶⁰⁰ David Kathman, "The Spelling and Pronunciation of Shakespeare's Name," Shakespeare Authorship - Dedicated to the Proposition that Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare, see Shakespeare authorship.com/name1.html (accessed March 1, 2009).
⁶⁰¹ Ibid.
Table 49 - Illiteracy of social groups in Norwich 1580 – 1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Sampled</th>
<th>% Illiterate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy and Professionals</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomen</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tradesmen &amp; Craftsmen</strong></td>
<td><strong>1838</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbandmen</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 - Illiteracy of Tradesmen in Norwich 1580 – 1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number Sampled</th>
<th>% Illiterate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwrights</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltsters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glovers</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatchers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51 - Illiteracy In Norwich by Decade 1580 – 1620

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Yeomen No.</th>
<th>Yeomen %</th>
<th>Husbandmen No.</th>
<th>Husbandmen %</th>
<th>Tradesmen No.</th>
<th>Tradesmen %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

603 Ibid, p.5
604 Ibid, p.11 – part of Table 3
As previously noted, there is also the question of whether the two skills of writing and reading were necessarily fused together as they are in modern times. Certainly those with a formal education either through schools or private tutors were likely to have both, indeed there is perhaps a third element in the question of how elegant the script itself was – simply writing to convey information not being sufficient in itself.

The career of John Davies (1564/5-1618) is perhaps illustrative. P.J. Finkelpearl noted that “[Davies] was tutored by a London writing-master named Daniel Johnson.” Davies may himself be aptly described as a “writing master”. Finkelpearl continued

…His writing students included royalty …and the highest nobility. If his incessant complaints are to be trusted, Davies was not richly rewarded for his teaching. The Earl of Northumberland’s book of household expenses would seem to confirm this, recording in 1607 a payment “To John Davis for teaching Lord Percy to write, for a year £20[605]

This suggestion that poor handwriting could on its own prove an embarrassment perhaps reinforces the sixteenth century notion that the three skills – reading, writing and calligraphy were independent and the absence of evidence of the latter two does not preclude the ability to read - surely the first skill that was learned. Between the last two there is also a hint that to some it may have been “better” not to write at all rather than write badly.

---

STRATFORD’S “MIDDLING SORT”

…what it shows above all is the utterness of the Shakespeares’ absorption in the Stratford community. Too little account is taken of that. What we need is a full study of the Stratford bourgeoisie (“middling sort”), with due notice taken of the details of individual lives…

Peter Thomson, 2009

…friendship is a disinterested commerce between equals …

Oliver Goldsmith, 1768

Before the Borough of Stratford-upon-Avon came into existence, the town formed part of the Bishop of Worcester’s estate. Levi Fox’s researches led him to conclude that there was no evidence of friction between the tenants and their Ecclesiastical overlords who operated through their “manorial jurisdiction”.

However, this medievalism began to crumble as the Reformation inexorably began to replace Church with State in the day-to-day governance of the townspeople. First to go was the town’s College and in 1547 it was followed by its Guild with all its “properties, revenues and plate”.

The Guild, or to give it its full title The Guild of the Holy Cross, complemented the rule of the manor and had by the mid-sixteenth century already existed for three hundred years. It functioned as a religiously based mutual fraternity engaged in good works for the benefit of its brethren and the community at large. By 1403 its success permitted it to absorb two other similar “fraternities.” The Guild’s stated goal was the “salvation after death of the souls of its members” that stored up credits in heaven by performing good works on earth. But its functions extended well beyond the scope of a present day charitable trust. The term “fraternity” gives some clue as to how invasive and pervasive its functions were as it de facto replaced the manorial court, leet, in conflict resolution - members were foresworn not to go to law before laying their “grievances before the Master and Aldermen of the Guild.”

In its secular mode it provided both almshouses for the old and infirm as well as education through the provision of the school.

---

606 Peter Thomson made the above observation after reviewing the digest of Fripp’s Introductions to Savage’s Minutes and Accounts x ref.311.
607 The Good-Natured Man (1768) Act I
609 Ibid. p.88
The notion of fraternalism was to continue into the new borough, as secular authority based on common commercial goals replaced religious ideals as the unifying force behind the community. A successful self-made man such as John Shakespeare had life-long friends who were both neighbours and fellow aldermen. Even a cursory examination of the town’s records shows how tight some of these interpersonal relationships became, with children being named after neighbours and friendships being transgenerational – as demonstrated in William’s own will where “ring money” was left to friends whose fathers had been friends of his own father.

But of key significance is how these friendships between the “brethren” could transcend religious schism. From a modern perspective, the divisions between Puritans, Church of England and Catholic may appear clear cut, but the reality was considerably more confused as orthodoxy could sweep into heresy and then reappear a few years later as dogma as Henry VIII’s children moved in and out of power. It is hardly surprising then that mutual survival and indeed mutual prosperity often overcame religious nicety.

Mervyn James, in his excellent study of the Durham region covering the years 1560 to 1640, wrote of Newcastle’s men of business that they “refused to allow their solidarity of social and political interest to be disrupted by religious differences.” Mervyn James, Family, Lineage and Civil Society: A Study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1560-1640, 1st. Edition (Oxford: OUP, 1974). p.158

Kate Emery Pogue in 2006 extended a similar observation about William - “his friendships transcended religious beliefs.”


Thomson has commented on the “utterness” of the absorption of the Shakespeares into the Stratford community and in examining their friends of the “middling sort” it is possible to see that they both conformed with and then deviated from the town’s norms.

Taking Pogue’s study as a basis for identifying friends and neighbours in Stratford, I have prepared the following table listing twenty four individuals, spread across fifteen families, that have some established link to the Shakespeares – either as friends or providers of professional services to William and the extended family. Names in bold indicate some contact with Shakespeare’s own will.

610 Where a testator left a bequest of money to enable the recipient to buy a memorial ring.
613 Ibid p.9-45
**Table 52 - “Middling Sort” Contacts with Shakespeare Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Civic Career</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Collins</td>
<td>Francis (? – 1617)</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drew up Shakespeare’s will and other key documents. Overseer of the will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Combe</td>
<td>William (1551-1610) John (c.1561-1614) Thomas (c.? – 1609)</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>William was legal adviser to the Borough of Stratford from 1597 until his death in 1610. Anglican rather than Puritan in Whitgift’s confidence “served as an ecclesiastical commissioner from 1601 to 1608”. He sat in Parliament three times, was later Sheriff for Warwickshire and held office in The Middle Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Field</td>
<td>Henry, Richard (1561-1624)</td>
<td>Tanner Printer</td>
<td>Printer by 1587 one of only 22 master printers in London</td>
<td>Printed <em>Venus and Adonis</em>. In 1596 Field signed the petition against Burbage’s plan to use Blackfriars as a public Theatre. No mention in will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Greene</td>
<td>Thomas (c.1578 - 1641)</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Town Clerk</td>
<td>Shakespeare’s cousin? – lived in New Place 1609-11. Drew up papers preserving Shakespeare’s rights re tithes. Not mentioned in the will – falling out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hall</td>
<td>John (1575-1635)</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Joined town council (reluctant) 1632, refused knighthood 1626</td>
<td>Son-in-law, B.A. &amp; M.A. Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nash</td>
<td>Anthony (?-1622) John (?-1623) Thomas (1593-1647)</td>
<td>Farmer Innkeeper Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>John and Anthony were both left ring money. Anthony managed Shakespeare’s tithes. Thomas married Shakespeare’s granddaughter Elizabeth Hall. Anti-puritan sentiments. Thomas lived off family land &amp; inherited inn. Nash House stood next to New Place. His grave lies next to Shakespeare’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Quiney</td>
<td>Richard, Adrian, Richard (c.1557-1602)</td>
<td>Mercer – Richard joins father Adrian’s</td>
<td>Principal Burgess 1580, Alderman 1588, Bailiff</td>
<td>Draft letter of 25/10/1598 seeking money. Son Thomas marries Judith Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

614 Names in bold either are beneficiaries of, or were involved in some way, with Shakespeare’s will.
The fifteen families and twenty-four individuals listed above, spanning three generations, can be segmented as follows:

- Childhood friends of William  
- Childhood friends, still friends at time of William’s death  
- University or legally educated/trained  
- Lawyers and Doctors  
- Tradesmen/Merchants  
- Served on or were employed by the Council  

Friendship is a very imprecise term, and the best evidence of William’s actual feelings towards his friends comes from his will. But if one accepts Goldsmith’s notion that “friendship is a disinterested commerce between equals” - implying that relationships rarely survive the success of one party without commensurate advancement on the part of the other - then it is interesting to note that the Shakespeares never completely

---

abandoned the self-made merchant class. A change in William’s attitude was perhaps inevitable however and as the above table shows, the new friends of Shakespeare’s maturity are from a higher cut in local society. As Pogue noted “John Hall is typical: well educated, professional and highly successful.”

Of the middling sort, the pattern was that the son often entered the father’s business and continued the tradition of civic service. Here the Shakespeares do not fit the pattern. John’s withdrawal from public life is followed by none of the Shakespeare children serving on the council in any capacity. Equally unusually, we have no credible data about what the Shakespeare men actually did in Stratford over the decades following 1576. However, the simplest suggestion must be that they at least kept to the first part of the pattern of the middling sort and worked in the family business. The complete lack of records must be either a simple misfortune i.e. they were lost or, the Shakespeares did not want anybody knowing about them or their family’s business.

---

617 Pogue, *Shakespeare's Friends* p.34
618 X ref. footnote 492
John Shakespeare – A Summary

At the start of this chapter, five issues were raised concerning the Shakespeare family’s history. With the benefit of the foregoing research, it is possible to present the following explanations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why John Shakespeare comprehensively removed himself from public life in 1576</th>
<th>The evolution of the wool trading market in the latter half of the sixteenth century in England dictated the nature of the Shakespeare family’s business i.e. market forces outside the family’s control required the business to evolve. The attempt in 1576 to end “brogging” (Proclamation 712) cannot be coincidental to all the Shakespeares (father and sons) disappearing from civic service, tax payments etc. The simplest explanation of John Shakespeare’s financial fall is that it never happened.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why William’s years 1585 – 1592 were “lost”</td>
<td>The sons of Stratford’s “middling sort” usually went into the family business. The notion that canny John Shakespeare would pay wages when he had four sons is, to say the least, improbable. Brogging was not a one man job – to think of it in terms of a modern day commodity trader who deals in standard weights and qualities who never sees, examines or transports the commodities he or she deals in, seriously understates what was involved. Though various complex theories have been presented as to explain the “lost years” the simplest explanation was that he worked in the family business and it is highly probable that it was the family business that first took him to London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why none of the Shakespeare brothers ever held public office.</td>
<td>Holding public office was, <em>inter alia</em>, a means of being taxed. By the time of the Shakespeare sons’ maturity the pattern of apprenticeship, civic service etc. that John had had to follow to get his start in commercial life was simply not necessary for his sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the sources of the Shakespeare family wealth</td>
<td>As Rowe put it “John Shakespeare was a considerable dealer in wool”(^{620}). As the market changed from raw material export to cloth production, so did John’s business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What John Shakespeare’s sons actually did all day</td>
<td>Brogging was about face-to-face negotiation, transportation of materials and delivery. Carriers to move goods certainly existed, but a brogging business engaging in the sizes of trades of John’s called for additional trusted workers - his sons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{619}\) Gilbert 1566 -1612, Richard 1574-1613, Edmund 1580-1607  
\(^{620}\) *x ref. 360*
Chapter 4 – WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE IN LONDON

THE MEDIAN PLAYWRIGHT

That someone would refer to Shakespeare in 1592 as an “upstart”, a “bombast” and a “crow” has been taken by many writers as an indicator that he would have had a tough time establishing himself in London as a playwright. But when viewed dispassionately and factually, would Shakespeare really have been out of place in the playwriting community because of his social and educational origins? Was there really a group of university-educated playwrights somehow blocking the less socially qualified? Before we can analyze how Shakespeare financially penetrated the London theatre it is prudent to understand what, if any, “barriers” 621 would have existed to his pursuing a career on the boards, and if these did exist, how they would have restricted his earning potential.

The first written reference to Shakespeare in London, the *Groatsworth of Wit Bought with a million of Repentance* - purportedly written by the well-educated Robert Greene, 622 criticized him for a supposed lack of originality, refinement and education. Chambers called it “a scoffing notice”. 623 Greene supposedly wrote to his fellow “University Wits”, those “fellow Schollers about this Cittie” who “spend their wits in making plays” - Marlowe, Nashe and Peele,

…There is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his Tiger's heart wrapped in a player's hide, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you; and being an absolute Johannes Factotum, is in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country… 624

---

621 Used here in the business sense of a “barrier to entry” which can be defined as “factor(s) that prevent competitors from entering a particular market. [these] reduce the level of competition in a market, *Dictionary of Business and Management*. Ed. Jonathan Law. Oxford University Press, 2009.


624 Greene, *Groatsworth*. 
The “Shake-scene,” and the presumably deliberate misquotation of Shakespeare’s line “O tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide” make the intended target very clear.

Written in 1592 and entered into the Stationer’s Register only after Greene’s death, as Charles Nicholl noted

…it is the earliest certain allusion to Shakespeare as a writer, though clearly he had already achieved some success in the field: this is implied by Greene's pique, and is corroborated by the 1592 account books of Philip Henslowe, impresario of the Rose theatre, which record high takings for “harey the vi”, almost certainly Henry VI Part 1.

The impression created by supposedly Greene’s words was of a man of limited education and/or social background at odds with the better educated. Greenblatt encouraged this interpretation thus: “it would be surprising if they [the university wits] did not look down upon him and surprising if he did not perceive it”. He had previously noted

---

625 Henry VI III 1, iv
626 Nicholl, Shakespeare’s Circle
627 “Supposedly” here refers to the question of whether Greene wrote the Groatsworth at all and that it was not merely a scandal sheet produced by Henry Chettle. The matter is considered later in this chapter. See x ref. 245
628 I have resisted the temptation here to investigate the Poetomachia or “War of the theatres” that Harbage calls the “picturesque spite-combat between Jonson, Marston, Dekker and a variable number of other contenders.” Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968). p.90. Suffice to say that Greene’s words may have had little or no effect apart from amusement to Shakespeare in an age when raucous criticism was rather the norm than a rarity.
First and foremost, Shakespeare lacked the principal qualification of belonging to their charmed circle; he had not attended Oxford or Cambridge.

But facts are at variance with this view. I have assembled the table\textsuperscript{630} “Representative London Playwrights” below to illustrate a representative group of Early Modern playwrights. Even a cursory examination of the data shows that Shakespeare’s educational background and social circumstances were not at all out of place in this group. In fact, it is possible to describe him as the “median” figure.\textsuperscript{631} If one examines family status plus education plus father’s profession as a social “mix” then the

- country (i.e. not London or even city) bred
- grammar school educated
- Bailiff/Glover/Wool Merchant fathered
- soon to be raised to “gentlemanly” ranked family,

made Shakespeare an “average” playwright of his time from a social standpoint.

In preparing the data, there was a difficulty in even determining which playwrights should be considered as Shakespeare’s “peers”. A researcher could, in the absence of a third party definition of who was or was not a major playwright, skew the selection of data towards a favoured conclusion. To avoid this, the table below was drawn from The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature (“Cambridge Bibliography”) which provides this distinction. In general terms, it is the volume of commentary on a playwright’s work listed in the Cambridge Bibliography that appears to determine the difference, between “major” and “minor” status. Furthermore, it differentiates between groups by the reigning monarch – see column marked “M” below. While it is all too easy to take issue with some of its editor’s criteria for the categorizations this is outweighed by the independent nature of the data. To supplement these individual entries, The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography has been used to supply the personal data – again, an independent source.


\textsuperscript{631} Median – the term is used here in the financial sense. “The statistical number which represents the half-way point between the highest and lowest of a series of numbers (cf. mean; mode).” See Peter Moles and Nicholas Terry, The Handbook of International Financial Terms (Oxford: OUP, 1997).
It is not possible to determine all the educational and social backgrounds of even the playwrights listed here, but of this group of twenty four the following figures are noteworthy:

---

632 James H. Forse, *Art Imitates Business* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993), p.8 – Forse, to his credit, experimented with similar data in tabular form. However, the data selection was biased, meagre, inconsistently presented, missed several key aspects and was often incorrect as to fact. In short, it illustrated both his strengths (willingness to take a fresh approach) and his weakness (poor execution).

---

**Table 54 - Representative London Playwrights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>F. Occ.</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Drayton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hartshill</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Butcher/ Tanner</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Haughton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Fiddler</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Kyd</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Scrivener</td>
<td>Merchant Taylors'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Grocer (bankrupt)</td>
<td>Merchant Taylors'</td>
<td>Avignon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lyly</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Notary</td>
<td>Kings, Canterbury</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Marlowe</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Salisbury?</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Kings, Canterbury</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Nashe</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Thetford Gr. Father?</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Christ's Hospital</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Stratford-upon-Avon</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>Kings, Stratford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Grace-Dieu</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Hitchin</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Yeoman, Copyholder</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Dekker</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Cambridge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Jonson</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Marston</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Wardlington</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Massinger</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Oxford?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Stratford?</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Merchant Taylors</td>
<td>Cambridge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril</td>
<td>Tourneur</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Barrister?</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Carriage Maker</td>
<td>Merchant Taylors?</td>
<td>Middle Temple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: M= Monarch, POB= place of Birth, DOB= Date of Birth, DOD= date of death, F. Occ. = father’s occupation

---

632 James H. Forse, *Art Imitates Business* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993), p.8 – Forse, to his credit, experimented with similar data in tabular form. However, the data selection was biased, meagre, inconsistently presented, missed several key aspects and was often incorrect as to fact. In short, it illustrated both his strengths (willingness to take a fresh approach) and his weakness (poor execution). x ref.378
• Ten come from London – hence fourteen, including Shakespeare, are from outside London.

• **Fourteen** can be linked to a university – but not all of these graduated. A University education was clearly not a *sine qua non* for a successful playwright. This table broadly confirms the sort of percentage mix of university educated vs. non-university that Harbage in 1968 had calculated, based on both his examination of plays of the period and the incidence of playwrights with “pretensions of learning”.

  …no more than two fifths of the popular repertory as a whole was composed by men with pretensions of learning, even if we include Heywood among university writers…

• Ten have backgrounds in the non-manual trades and it would be one less if we classify “scrivener” as a manual rather than intellectual pursuit. A father or family in “trade” is the customary background, not the exception. It is true that a start in trade for many of the fathers became something else in career terms - John Shakespeare is a case in point - however, Shakespeare’s family origins would have been no barrier to his establishing himself as a playwright.

Louis B. Wright in 1935 took over seven hundred pages to conclude that with the emergent mercantile class the “cunning of the peasant [quickly] gave way to the shrewdness of the businessman.” But it is necessary to look beyond Wright’s conclusions as he frequently takes facts at face value when it suited his argument. For example, seeking to show the humble origins of many playwrights, he lists among others George Peele’s father James as a “salter”, whereas a more complete summary of his career includes

  …Clerk of Christ's Hospital … the author of two works on double-entry bookkeeping, *The Maner and Fourme How to Kepe a Perfecte Reconyng* (1553) and *The Pathe Waye to Perfectnes* (1569). A respected citizen and salter of London, James was also responsible for city pageants, and he was the clerk of Christ's Hospital, the second in its history, from 1562 until his death.

---

633 Harbage, *Rival Traditions* p.101 - earlier in the same page: “Heywood speaks of residence at Cambridge; but if he had received a degree he would probably have let us know about it…”
635 Ibid. p.17
In brief, Wright’s thesis was that a title could always be had if one had enough money. Birth and other medieval means of social advancement such as prowess on the battlefield had been joined, if not actually eclipsed, by hard cash.

In 1993 James Forse started his investigation into art and business in the Early Modern Theatre by also quoting Harbage. Forse clearly had little time for Harbage’s more romantic notions of what motivations were at work. To illustrate, he quoted Harbage

…we diminish the breadth of their involvement [theatre entrepreneurs, actors and playwrights] if we suggest that they were in it only, or even primarily for the money…there hovers a dubiety about the situation that might occasion a resigned pursing of lips on our part if we were dealing with a mere group of business associates...

Forse sided with cash over art – according to him the artists were indeed in it “for the money”, like the mere speculators of “…Henslowe or Langley.” The actual situation probably lay somewhere between these two – but, as this thesis demonstrates, probably more inclined to Forse than Harbage.

In the previous chapter I detailed how entrenched the belief had become that William arrived in London the son of a bankrupt father and consequently the child of a poverty stricken family. The implicit suggestion accompanying this was that his achievements were all the more praiseworthy in the circumstances of no money and no social standing. But, as the evidence above shows, he would not have been particularly disadvantaged by his origins even if his family were penniless - which they were not - nor were his origins much humbler than those of the playwrights that he competed against. Just as his father had been in the right place at the right time with his move to Stratford, so William had the good fortune, or perhaps good sense, to arrive in London when his personal “mix” of background and skills gave him the opportunity to succeed.

---

637 Forse, *Art Imitates*  
638 Ibid. p.89  
639 Ibid. p.7  
640 *x ref. 153*
Francis Bacon was, in the above quotation, making an observation about a “people”, but he could equally have made the comment about how an individual accumulates great wealth. Any individual seeking to amass a fortune should first pay no taxes - which is precisely what William Shakespeare did.

Shakespeare’s only mention of “taxes” in his plays comes in Richard II of 1595/6 when taxes are “pil(l)ed” i.e. heaped on or used to strip bare the people. Moreover, taxes are “grievous”. It may be merely indicative of his personal views of taxation, but it certainly was an interesting observation by a man who, according to our current knowledge, never paid any.

A modern example of tax avoidance is that of Philip Green. Nick Cohen writing in the Observer in 2006 noted

…retail tycoon Philip Green, the owner of the Bhs chain of shops, does not need to worry about the tax demands his fellow British citizens must meet because he transfers billions to his wife's accounts in a tax haven…Green and his family had ‘saved themselves’ £300m from their £1.2bn salary by living for a part of the year in Monaco, whose residents don't pay income tax….

The story of Green, who was awarded a knighthood shortly after this event, is instructive. First transfer assets to a nominee you trust - if you do not own something you cannot be taxed on it - which is exactly what John Shakespeare and Philip Green

---

did. Second, find the tax “wrinkles” that permit you to “be” in two places at once yet exist as a taxable entity in neither - which is what Philip Green and William did.

With the help of a certain amount of power, bribery, larceny or skill in manipulating the law, many have been able to avoid taxation whatever the pressure on the taxing system to obtain funds.

But before we can comment on Shakespeare’s taxation habits it is necessary to review the tax regime during his professional career in London at the end of the 1590’s and into the first decade of the next century.

It is also noteworthy that Chambers referenced a quotation attributed to Queen Elizabeth I concerning the play which had been performed for Essex and his supporters on the eve of their failed rebellion earlier that same year.644

…That which passed from the Excellent Majestie of Queen Elizabeth, in her Privie Chamber at East Greenwich 4 August 1601, 43 Reg. sui, towards William Lambarde645 …

…He presented her Majestie with his Pandecta646 of all her rolls, bundells, membranes, and parcels that be repose in her Majestie's Tower at London; whereof she had give to him the charge 21st January last past… She proceeded to further pages, and asked where she found cause of stay.... He expounded these all according to the original diversities ... so her Majestie fell upon the reign of King Richard II saying, “I am Richard II know y not that?”…

By 1601 the taxes were, certainly “piling up”.647 From an average taxation of £165, 816 p.a. on the laity across 1579-1585, this rose threefold to £470,533 p.a. for 1594-1598.

646 “A complete body of the laws of a country, or of any system of law (natural or statutory). Also in plural ...Derives from the compendium in fifty books of Roman civil law, made by order of the emperor Justinian in the 6th cent., systematizing opinions of eminent jurists and given statutory force.” OED.
647 Richard II (1377–99)’s reign was “fraught with crises - economic, social, political, and constitutional.” The Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 was triggered, though perhaps not actually caused, by the introduction of a poll tax of four pence a head at the end of Richard’s grandfather’s (Edward II) reign. More poll taxes followed in 1379, and a third in 1380. These taxes were largely to pay for the war in France and at the time of the Essex rebellion Elizabeth, like her ancestors, was short of cash for foreign wars. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/615557/United-Kingdom/44812/Richard-II-1377-99?anchor=ref482854.
Elizabeth I, like Richard II, recognized that she was vulnerable not just from rebellion rising from a struggle for political power, but also unrest fuelled by the taxes necessary to address a huge revenue shortfall. It is true that war and rebellion “make rattling good history” and peacetime taxation “poor reading” but Elizabeth’s daily problem, as previously noted, was simply in finding cash. R.W. Hoyle in 1997 commented that faced with taxation

…the loyalty of the population at large to the Government could not be relied upon…there was therefore a need to tread carefully in placing impositions upon them least disorder resulted...

On the question of Elizabeth I’s finances in the final years of her reign, Lacey Baldwin Smith calculated that

…At home the cost of almost two decades of war (£4 million) raised havoc with the queen’s finances. It forced her to sell her capital (about £800,000, or roughly one-fourth of all crown lands) and increased her dependence upon parliamentary sources of income, which rose from an annual average of £35,000 to over £112,000 a year...

Hoyle also made the valuable observation that

…Over the reign of Elizabeth…8 per cent of the receipts of the Exchequer were directly transferred to the Irish Treasurer for War. In 1599 and 1600…the figure was around 30 per cent in years when the Exchequer was awash with taxation and land sale revenues…overall 45 per cent of the income raised by sales of land and lay and clerical taxation was spent on the Irish wars...

Learning Financial Manipulation

William learnt his financial sophistication, the ability to massage taxes and hide income, from his father. John Shakespeare, as detailed in the previous chapter, was fully alert to the legal, taxation and commercial realities of the day.

---


649 Thomas Hardy, The Dynasts Pt.1 Act 2 Scene 5 “My argument is that War makes rattling good history; but Peace is poor reading."

650 x ref.57
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In November 1576 John Shakespeare, after the issuance of Proclamation 712, began a series of asset disposals in the manner of Philip Green. He placed much of the family property, at nominal prices, into the hands of friends and relations. The mantra of the wealthy is repeated through history - if you do not own something it cannot be seized or taxed. However, in at least one case, John found out the hard way just how frail some familial relationships can be when cash is involved.

Schoenbaum made the following observations in setting out the events of his asset sales:

…The picture [of the supposed fall from financial grace] is of a piece; John Shakespeare incurred debts and exchanged land for ready money.

…On 14 November 1578 he borrowed £40 by mortgaging part of his wife's inheritance - a house and fifty-six acres in Wilmcote - to her brother-in-law Edmund Lambert of Barton on the Heath, to whom he already owed money… when the borrowed £40 fell due at Michaelmas 1580, John could not pay it, so Lambert held on to the property. He was still in possession when he died seven years later. There followed litigation in the court of Queen's Bench in Westminster, as the Shakespeares (John and Mary, joined by their eldest son William) tried to recover their holding from Lambert's son and heir John. The plaintiffs claimed that John Lambert had promised an additional £20 in return for full title to the parental estate. Lambert denied making any such promise. In another suit ten years later, this time in Chancery, the Shakespeares insisted that they had offered Lambert the £40 for the property, only to be spurned - he wanted other money which they owed him. They never did get back this land, part of the Asbies estate.

…In November 1578 [the same month as the above transfer] John and Mary Shakespeare conveyed eighty-six more acres in Wilmcote, including meadows and pasture, to a Webbe relative for a period of years, after which the land would revert to the original possessors and their heirs; again a need for cash - immediate cash - seems to have motivated the transaction.

…The Shakespeares were also obliged to let go their ninth part in the two houses and hundred acres in Snitterfield, the property leased to Alexander Webbe. This they sold in 1579 to Webbe's son Robert for the mean sum of £4.

However, Schoenbaum in his analysis of these transfers did not ask two important questions:

---
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1. Were these assets sold for fair market value? We know that William paid £320 in 1602 for just over a hundred acres of land. Granted that inflation was a feature of the final decades of the sixteenth century and that not all land is of like quality, these transfers are at derisory rates. The only logical conclusion is that they are “friendly rates” reflecting the intention that the assets will return to the original owner i.e. these were only nominal transfers of title to achieve other results than the raising of cash.

2. If the Shakespeares were in the wrong over the “Asbies” transfer would they have been foolhardy enough to pursue the matter in expensive litigation many years after the sale? I would argue they would not, and being deprived of an asset they never intended to sell, remains a much more credible explanation. Certainly Fripp was in no doubt that John Shakespeare

   …parted with his property outside [his immediate family]… trusting in one case to a brother-in-law, who proved, it appears, a knave.”

Manifestly, John was manipulating his potential tax liabilities and protecting his assets. William needed no better teacher, nor example of the pitfalls inherent in the process, than that of his father.

---

William, The Artful (Tax) Dodger

The National Archives in their Education Service activities take the enlightened view that part of their goal

…is to provide material that encourages pupils to challenge traditional expectations of Shakespeare. By investigating tax records … pupils are able to identify how Shakespeare avoided paying his tax… 657

Two noted scholars - Chambers and Greenblatt - have each made their own analysis and drawn differing conclusions from Shakespeare’s history of evading tax payments. But while both their analyses are instructive as to detail, when one examines not the possible motives for evasions but the actual cash transfers during this period, then a different possibility emerges.

From Chambers 658 we obtain an excellent statement of William’s tax documents. 659

The following are direct quotations in sequence from his William Shakespeare of 1930.

1. Two payments [by William] as a resident in St. Helen's Bishopsgate were not forthcoming.
2. The first was a sum of 5s. due as a second instalment of the last of three subsidies granted by the parliament of 1593. The assessment was made in October 1596 and payment should have been made by February 1597, but the collectors reported in the following November …that they had been unable to collect it.
3. A new subsidy was granted by the parliament of 1597 - Shakespeare was assessed, again in St. Helens, on 1 Oct. 1598 at 13s. 4d. on goods valued £5, and should have paid in the following winter.
4. ‘Affidavit’ was subsequently written in the margin of the assessment against his name, which indicates that again the collectors swore to their inability to collect.
5. The arrear was reported to the Exchequer (e) and entered on the Pipe Roll for 1598-9, with the marginal notes ‘Surr<ey>’ and ‘R’, probably for ‘R<espondebit>’.
6. These were intended for reference at the sitting of the Court of Exchequer in October 1599.
7. At this sitting a note seems to have been added to the main entry, directing the sheriff for Surrey and Sussex, which were combined for fiscal purposes, to answer for the amount on the Roll for 1599-1600. The marginal R was then cancelled.
8. The amount appears on the Sussex membrane of the Roll for 1599-1600. And here there are three marginal notes: [“three” here appears to be an error as there are, obviously, four]

657 http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/lesson34.htm
659 x ref. 393 for copies and translations of these.
Despite his one typographical error, Chambers’ sequence of events appears to be accurate. Concerning the four marginal roll notes he made the following comments on each:

- indicates the origin of the entry as an amount to be answered from the London membrane for 1598-9;
- that the sheriff for Surrey and Sussex was to be charged with the amount unless he showed cause to the contrary;
- that the amount was referred for collection to the Bishop of Winchester, who had a liberty, the Clink, in Surrey, outside the sheriff's jurisdiction, and,
- probably a later addition, [emphasis added] that the amount was collected and would be accounted for.

Chambers then concluded

...And in fact the Bishop of Winchester did account in the Roll of 1600-1 for a lump sum received from various persons referred to him by the sheriff. This probably includes Shakespeare's 13s.4d., although names are not given. Shakespeare has not so far been traced in any other subsidy rolls, either for London or Surrey or Stratford, where his name certainly does not appear, or for the Royal Household, of which he became an officer in 1603.

Seventy-five years after Chambers, Greenblatt, in Will in the World using, in part, the same records, produced his version of events. Greenblatt’s words are also quoted here but with the connecting prose edited out to present a list of his arguments/conclusions.

1. Shakespeare had made his fortune virtually entirely on his own.
2. His mother's inheritance, such as it was, had been first mortgaged and then forfeited
3. through his father's incompetence or improvidence
4. his father's standing in Stratford had been compromised by debt and possibly by Recusancy
5. his brothers amounted to little or nothing,
6. his sister, Joan, married a poor hatter
7. he himself had married a woman of very modest means.
8. no convenient bequests had come his way
9. no wealthy relations had provided assistance at key moments
10. no local magnate had spotted his brilliant promise when he was still a boy and helped him to a start in life
11. New Place was the tangible fruit of his own imagination and his hard work.

---

12. To acquire such a house meant that Shakespeare had had to save his money.
13. The limited evidence that survives suggests that in London he lived frugally.
14. He rented rooms in relatively modest surroundings: records from a minor lawsuit show that in 1604 - the year he wrote part or all of *Measure for Measure, Alls Well That Ends Well, and King Lear* - he lived above a French wig-maker's shop on the corner of Mugwell and Silver Streets in Cripplegate, at the northwest corner of the city walls.
15. He seems to have had an affinity for neighbourhoods - Shoreditch, Bishopsgate, Cripplegate, and the Clink in Surrey - inhabited by artisans, many of whom were migrants from France or the Low Countries.
16. These were not disreputable haunts, but they were modest, and the rents were low.
17. How many rooms he rented, or how spacious they were, is unknown, but he seems to have furnished them sparsely.
18. His personal property in London, assessed for tax purposes, was only five pounds.
19. The property of the most affluent inhabitant of the parish was assessed at three hundred pounds.
20. Of course, Shakespeare could have hidden things away - books, paintings, plate - to reduce his liability, but the assessors at least saw very few signs of wealth.
21. Generations of scholars have combed the archives for more details, but the principal records are a succession of notices for the non-payment of taxes.
22. In 1597, the year Shakespeare bought the handsome New Place, the tax collectors for Bishopsgate ward affirmed that William Shakespeare, assessed the sum of thirteen shillings four pence on his personal property, had not paid.
23. The next year he was again delinquent, and a further notice, in 1600, when he was living on the Surrey side of the river, suggests that he was still in arrears.
24. He may in the end have paid his taxes - the records are incomplete - but it does not seem likely.
25. Shakespeare was someone who not only lived a modest London life but also hated to let even small sums of money slip through his fingers.

[Perhaps]

I. he was worrying about the financial security of his wife and daughters back in Stratford
II. he hated the example of his father's embarrassments
III. he told himself that he would do anything not to end up like the wretched Greene.
IV. For whatever the reason, Shakespeare seems to have treated money - his money at least - with considerable seriousness
V. No one refers to him as a skinflint, but he did not like to waste his substance,
VI. and he was clearly determined not to be an easy mark for anyone

From Chambers then we have the detail of the entries - the £5 assessment on his London “property” is an example. However, both writers provided different and non-factual assessments of the data. Chambers was eager to tidy up discrepancies - “This probably includes Shakespeare's 13s. 4d., although names are not given”. This may be so, but is certainly not a fact.

Greenblatt leads his argument (above) with five points, numbered 1 through 5. None of these are facts. Also absent from his consideration was the question of whether William could have conceivably earned through the theatre the money he spent.

To examine his five points:

1. “Shakespeare had made his fortune virtually entirely on his own.” This is at the very least “not proven.” Halliwell-Phillipps may have lived a hundred years before Greenblatt but recognized that quite simply the figures do not add up.\(^\text{661}\)

2. “His mother's inheritance, such as it was, had been first mortgaged and then forfeited.” Again Asbies is raised but the question of where these supposedly poverty-stricken Shakespeares got the money to litigate over this is not asked. There is also the inference that this one piece of property was the only family asset, which we know was not the case.

3. “Through his father's incompetence or improvidence.” This is a negative assumption arrived at in the absence of any in-depth financial analysis.

4. “His father's standing in Stratford had been compromised by debt and possibly by Recusancy.” As noted previously,\(^\text{662}\) nothing suggests John’s withdrawal from public life was anything but voluntary - the standing in which his colleagues held him, and continued to hold him is clear in the records. The fact that his absence was felt on the Council is shown by their extreme leniency in non-attendance fines and the length of time that passed before they reluctantly removed him from the Council.

\(^{661}\) “The largest emoluments etc.” See \(x\) ref. footnote 336

\(^{662}\) \(x\) ref.205
5. “His brothers amounted to little or nothing.” This is a very aggressive conclusion to a simple unknown. Certainly they did not hold public office nor is their wealth recorded and, given their father’s early life of dutiful civic service this is all the more remarkable. The Shakespeares, after John’s withdrawal from public life, went to extraordinary lengths not to appear in records. It is only years after William’s death that anything like a complete edition of his work is published and that by his former colleagues. The only brother whose fate we know in any detail at all is Edmond who died as a young man. The others may have lived very comfortably, tax free, in the black economy.

Greenblatt presented a William Shakespeare who was a strong, purposeful, self-denying, self-made capitalist - all of which he may well have been. Indeed, he probably was just like this. Unfortunately, the financial analysis does not support that all his purchases were made with money from his theatrical activities.

Taking agreed factual points from both Chambers’ and Greenblatt’s observations (referenced above) and my own researches, consensus stands around the following points

- William Shakespeare was a tax-avoider.
- His tax assessment at £5 property was only just above the lowest possible of £3.
- His £5 assessment was current even as he was investing heavily in Stratford.
- He deliberately kept a low profile financially in London living modestly in lodgings.
- He cared more about his investments than preserving his plays.
- Despite decades of research, no other tax record of William, has been uncovered. No record has been found showing that he paid taxes at all.
- His residences in London tend to be with the trading/artisan classes.

The general system of Early Modern taxation in England comes in for considerable comment on its shortcomings, with the frequent observation that evasion and understatement were rife. Yet, in examining the returns, one of the most striking qualities is of a taxation regime that pursued William, across jurisdictions, for thirteen shillings and four pence. In the entries listed above, there is evidence of a system that was persistent but not draconian. If it were open to evasion then it was deliberately so.
According to Hoyle, unlike many countries such as France, tax gathering in England was “not backed by threat or actual force”. Governments feared rebellions resulting from raised taxes. Hoyle continued

…The English system may have served to keep yields low but this voluntary (if not consensual) approach meant the costs of collection were minimal and little was siphoned off into the hands of local officeholders…  

But, notwithstanding a soft approach to tax gathering where persistence was the key collection tool, for William never to have paid tax anywhere suggests a very well organized individual, alert to the shortcomings of the taxation process. Given this, it is inconceivable that his avoidance of tax was merely coincidental for it would have been a rare individual who could avoid paying anything while accruing or keeping significant wealth.

---

663 Hoyle, Place p.213
Chapter 5 – IN SEARCH OF THE PLAYWRIGHT

…the desire to amass money was like a fierce universal lust in the Jacobean period…
Antonia Fraser, 1996

…Money is like muck, not good except it be spread. This is done, chiefly by suppressing, or at least keeping a strait hand, upon the devouring trades of usury, ingrossing great pasturages, and the like.
Francis Bacon, 1625

The challenge to any researcher investigating Shakespeare’s London career is the lack of verifiable information concerning his life outside of the texts of his plays and poems. In the absence of “new” discoveries, the proposal is that techniques can be borrowed from other disciplines that have successfully employed innovative techniques to help circumvent this problem.

By 27 January 2011, astronomers had detected 519 “exoplanets”, that is planets lying outside our solar system. Being too dim and distant, they have not actually been seen through a telescope, but their presence has been deduced through the gravitational effect planets have on their respective stars – they make them wobble. Simply, a presence is detected by looking at something that can be studied to determine the characteristics of something that cannot be observed.

Though we have little detail of William Shakespeare in London, like the exoplanets, we can learn and deduce much from examining his effect on the careers and lifestyles of those he is known to have interacted with, or who were prototypical of the environment in which he lived and worked. But also, like hunting exoplanets, it is the selection of the various “stars” of the Early Modern Theatre that is crucial. Indeed, there is a danger that unless the selection process is truly representative, the final data could be skewed away from fact towards a false image. A full analysis would require perfect information about all parties even tangentially involved with Shakespeare and the London theatre of his time. This body of data neither exists nor is the time available for such an examination in the context of this thesis. However, like the astronomer commencing a

---

666 See http://exoplanet.eu/ for the latest totals.
search, there are logical starting points: those who are mentioned in lawsuits with Shakespeare, those with whom he collaborated in the writing of his plays or someone who lampooned him in print. These three filters suggested a pool of candidates from which four were selected. In addition to this, there are the group of individuals who made the greatest financial returns out of their manifold business ventures, including the theatre. From this list the two most successful have been chosen. Collectively these six are the core of the following analysis and to these I have added a seventh, the greatest courtier of the period, to see if his methods of acquiring wealth or, indeed his behaviour, were any worthier than the other six.

This chapter then, is an examination of William’s professional career through an analysis of the financial histories and characters of seven men whose actions - some deliberate, some unintentional - influenced Shakespeare’s life and hence the accumulation of the Shakespeare family wealth.

They include:

- **Francis Langley** who built the Swan Theatre and nearly diverted Shakespeare from the Lord Chamberlain’s Men and the subsequent creation of the Globe Theatre.

- **William Gardiner**, Langley’s enemy who, by proxy, sued both Shakespeare and the corrupt Langley.

- **Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn** who succeeded above all others in the accumulation of wealth through using the theatre as one part of a multi-pronged business strategy.

- **George Wilkins**, pimp, aspiring writer and friend of the Belott-Mountjoy family with whom William lodged while writing *Measure for Measure* and who was very probably involved in the creation of *Pericles*.667

667 The degree of his involvement remains a subject of debate. One incontrovertible link was referenced by Stanley Wells: “Its success was exploited, also in 1608, by the publication of a novel, by George Wilkins, *The Painful Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre, Being the True History of the Play of Pericles as it was lately presented by the worthy and ancient poet John Gower*. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *The Oxford Complete Works* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986). p.1037.
• **Henry Chettle** who lampooned Shakespeare in print while hiding behind the name of another and then, under his own name, ridiculed all “broggers”.

Lastly, outside these six, in a class of his own for illegal wealth accumulation,

• **Robert Cecil** whose personal revenge on Langley was to close the Swan and thus divert the course of Shakespeare’s career.

Some of the recorded incidents of William’s career include

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shakespeare</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interacts with</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Who Discovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Named in Gardiner v. Langley law suit</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Gardiner &amp; Francis Langley</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Hotson, 1932668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness in Belott v. Mountjoy</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Extended Mountjoy family, George Wilkins</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Wallace, 1909669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Defaulter 670</td>
<td>1597-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Quiney</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>King’s Men and their business friends</td>
<td>Previously Unknown</td>
<td>Malone, 1793671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of the Blackfriars Gatehouse</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because there are so few documented events, each is of special significance. Most were discovered after the Shakespeare *mythos* was well established which has, to some degree, discouraged their close examination.

In the *Gardiner v. Langley* suit - which will be examined in some detail - though Shakespeare is the first named party, there is a remarkable unwillingness to confront the truth that William Shakespeare was named in a nuisance lawsuit between two crooks. To use a twentieth century American analogy, this was the equivalent of Frank Sinatra having Sam “Momo” Giancana named second as a co-defendant in a suit initiated by “Lucky” Luciano.672 This “minor legal drama”673 is significant in any evaluation of

---

669 Charles W. Wallace, *Nebraska University Studies* (University of Nebraska), 1910.
671 x ref.360 references Malone.
672 The references here are merely illustrative see Steve Fischer, *When the Mob Ran Vegas* (Omaha: Berkline, 2007) should detailed backgrounds for these individuals be required see Glossary “Sinatra”.
673 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.146
Shakespeare’s business dealings, in that it connects him with two criminal financial manipulators of the time.

Gardiner had used an established legal device to counter-attack his adversary Langley, and sought to draw three people into the suit to cause as much fiscal and emotional distress to his adversary as possible. Therefore, Shakespeare had an existing or potential business relationship with Langley sufficient to make him not just a tempting target but the first target.

To recap, the first six individuals under consideration have histories that intersect with both Shakespeare and the London Theatre. Collectively they illustrate - through their own business and theatrical activities - the economic milieu in which Shakespeare thrived. All had contacts (in Langley’s case multi-level involvement) with the theatre and all had multiple sources of personal revenue both legal and illegal.

**Table 56 - Six of Seven Characters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Theatrical Relationship</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Other Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Langley</td>
<td>Theatre Owner, Impresario</td>
<td>Swan, Boar’s Head</td>
<td>Alnager, Landlord, Property Developer, Usurer, Extortionist, Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gardiner</td>
<td>Regulator (Bankside)</td>
<td>All Bankside</td>
<td>Usurer, Extortionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Henslowe</td>
<td>Theatre Owner, Impresario</td>
<td>Rose, Fortune</td>
<td>Landlord, Property Developer, Usurer, Extortionist, Trader, Brothel Owner, Pawnbroker, Blood Sports Promoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Alleyn</td>
<td>Actor, Impresario, Theatre Owner</td>
<td>Rose, Fortune</td>
<td>Landlord, Property Developer, Usurer, Extortionist, Trader, Brothel Owner, Blood Sports Promoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wilkins</td>
<td>Playwright, Writer</td>
<td>Globe,</td>
<td>Tavern Landlord, Pimp, Brothel Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Chettle</td>
<td>Playwright, Writer, printer</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Plagiarist, Scandalmonger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their businesses these individuals incessantly crossed the divide between legal and illegal. They illustrate how it was possible for someone to bridge the issue of legality and still have an effect on William Shakespeare’s own career and the London theatre in general. It would have been possible to expand this list – for example the Burbages are
not included. But the selection criteria focused not only on the quality and quantity of information available but also on their multiple, often overlapping, financial dealings – these six represent the best, but not by any means the only possible subjects for this examination.

**THE CRIMINAL THEATRE OF THE SOUTH BANK**

A play by Shakespeare is related to the contexts of its production - to the economic and political system of Elizabethan and Jacobean England - and to the particular institutions of cultural production (the court, patronage, theatre, education, the church)…

*Jonathan Dollimore & Alan Sinfield, 1985*

…sympathy conditioned by our century’s ideology, by recent scholarship, and no doubt above all, by our safe distance from the fear and loathing of [the sixteenth century]…

*Stephen Greenblatt*

The proposal is that the six parties operated on both sides of the then prevailing law and were engaged in, or were closely allied to, organized criminal activity. The contention is that at least three of them behaved in a manner more akin to modern mafia “Godfathers” than mere commercial entrepreneurs.

**The Business of Organizing Crime**

The sociologist Mary McIntosh divided criminality between project organizations - criminals working alone or in gangs for task-specific, short-term, purposes and business organizations that are somewhat permanent. Though dismissive of the possibilities of “Napoleons of crime” akin to Conan Doyle’s Moriarty (evil geniuses reigning over criminal empires) she did acknowledge that there are criminal leaders, “racketeers” who control

---


675 Stephen Greenblatt, "Murdering Peasants: Status, Genre and the Representation of Rebellion,"

*Representations* (University of California Press), no. 1 (February 1983): 1-29. p.9 Greenblatt actually uses the date 1525 as he starts his essay with this year, when “Albrecht Dürer published his *Painters Manual*”.
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...two closely related kinds of crime that in some circumstances can become organized on a basis of permanent business operations; these are extortion and the provision of illegal goods and services.  

What makes these unique in her estimation is that the “customer-victim” knows what is going on and for some reason accepts it.

There is no stealth here and the “racketeer” has to make some arrangement with the authorities in order to continue in their illegal business. Indeed both the operator of the “racket” and the official conniving with him are, by definition, committing an illegal act.

Thomas Schelling, the American economist, took this line of argument a stage further by asserting

…there is, I believe, a characteristic of organized crime… exclusivity, or, to use a more focused term, monopoly. From all accounts, organized crime does not merely extend itself broadly, but brooks no competition. It seeks not merely influence, but exclusive influence. In the overworld its counterpart would be not just organized business, but monopoly. And we can apply to it some of the adjectives that are often associated with monopoly - ruthless, unscrupulous, greedy, exploitative, unprincipled. [It] collectively negotiates with the police not only for [its] own security but to enlist the police in the war against rival[s]…

To ‘monopoly’ can be added ‘integration’. Organized crime spreads not just horizontally by acquiring or destroying competitors but also vertically as it seeks to own all stages of the process from raw material to finished goods and sale.

**Sin City**

Red Light districts are areas of prostitution in cities and even where prostitution is tolerated, (certain counties in modern Nevada and in the city of Amsterdam for example) there is a strong undertow of criminality. However, I would propose it is the integration of ‘entertainment’ facilities, both legal and illegal, with some degree of distinct geographical differentiation or legal status, that upgrades a mere red light area

---

678 Ibid. p.50  
679 orig. Brit. A dishonest or fraudulent line of business; a method of swindling for financial gain; a scam. OED  
681 See Glossary  
682 See Glossary
into what may be termed a “Sin City”. Furthermore, in a Sin City two other factors are prevalent. Firstly, there has to be the active cooperation or at the very least connivance of the authorities. Secondly, there is the use of sharp business practice, driven by authoritarian Godfathers who view human weakness as potential for profit and create the medium in which such a business can flourish.

**GODFATHERS OF BANKSIDE**

…While most of the trades it operates in are either totally illegal or a little shady, it has used some very effective conventional business practices to make them thrive. Nick Louth, 2008

Nick Louth’s observation on the twenty-first century American Mafia could have been made of the Early Modern “Godfathers” of Bankside.

To these “businessmen” human beings became commodities whether their motivation was greed for money, power or both. Equally, in their off-duty hours, these individuals frequently lived “normal” lives and had the same family relationships and the same travails and consequential stresses as any other successful businessmen of their age. A dispassionate study of the rise of the Early Modern London theatre confirms that there existed a sin city of varying entertainments run by criminal Godfathers rather than a half-timbered equivalent of today’s National Theatre complex.

In reality the “sharer and housekeeper” of the Globe, William Shakespeare, equated more to a “points owning” Frank Sinatra in the Las Vegas of the 1950s, rubbing shoulders with the criminal and unscrupulous, than a pantomime Dick Whittington.

A preliminary indication of just who these ruthless bosses were can be gleaned from their paper trails, in the legal documents, land conveyances and litigation of their day. Equally, their traces appear in the legal complaints and judicial appeals made against their activities. If one looks to facts, then non-tax payers with a reluctance to sign anything who engage in certain patterns or types of litigation are likely to be this kind of

---


685 “Points” is an American term for a percentage ownership.
individual. As previously noted, truly smart criminals and sharp businessmen don’t get caught and if they become super successful then they buy dynastic legitimacy for their sundry offspring.\textsuperscript{686}

Francis Langley and William Gardiner

Two unscrupulous men at odds with one another, one of them having the advantage of civil authority.\textsuperscript{687} Ingram, 1978

It is possible to describe Langley and Gardiner as being merely businessmen and moneylenders. However, this is akin to describing Mario Puzo’s Don Vito Corleone\textsuperscript{688} as an olive oil importer—his legitimate business façade. Gardiner, notwithstanding earlier court cases, fines and a sullied reputation - was made a Justice of the Peace with responsibility for Bankside in 1580, an office he held till his death in 1597.

Leslie Hotson noted of Gardiner that

\begin{quote}
...an examination of the Surrey [Records] ...reveals him as by far the busiest justice in the county...his total record of committals to prison in his years of office is 297, as against the 193 of his nearest competitor.\textsuperscript{689}
\end{quote}

However, this “busyness” was in an age where prisoners were almost certain to be tormented in what Gamini Salgado described as “a system of extortion and corruption of frightening proportions.”\textsuperscript{690} The accused were trapped in a process where, from the judicial top down, the objective of those holding office was to remove whatever money the individual could beg, borrow or had previously stolen.

One example of how an individual (Gardiner) acquired judicial and public office is fully considered later in this thesis,\textsuperscript{691} however, financial return through misfeasance and malfeasance manifestly lay at the heart of it. Judges were particularly open to “incentives” – and the alacrity of Gardiner’s sentencing probably relates as much to

\textsuperscript{686}In the twentieth century the rise of such businessmen as the late Joseph Kennedy is instructive. See Arnold Offner, “Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, 1938-1940: An Anatomy of Appeasement by Ralph F. de Bedt,” \textit{American Historical Review} 92, no. 3 (1987).
\textsuperscript{689}Leslie Hotson, \textit{Shakespeare versus Shallow} (London: Nonesuch Press, 1931). p.47
\textsuperscript{691}x ref.222
personal gain as the unquestionably high levels of criminality in the parts of Surrey over which he had jurisdiction.

The Writ

England. Be it known that William Shakspere, Francis Langley, Dorothy Soer wife of John Soer, and Anne Lee, for fear of death…

King's Bench, Controlment Roll, 1596

“Somehow Shakespeare was drawn into the feud” commented Schoenbaum as Shakespeare became “one of the dramatis personae in this minor legal drama.” Langley and Gardiner (together with Gardiner’s stepson William Wayte) had been figuratively at daggers drawn for some time and the above extract from a “writ of attachment” was part of the litigious exchange between them. As Ingram observed

A writ of attachment was, in essence, a directive to the sheriff of a given county to apprehend a specified person, or persons…on the formal grounds that he or they constituted a serious threat to the life and safety of the person entering the complaint…the person complained of was required to enter into sufficient bonds before the court, with the requisite co signers…if he should break the peace within a year, the bonds would be forfeit…many such writs were sworn out of malice.

Table 57 - Extract from Controlment Roll

Leslie Hotson who unearthed this writ in 1931 and published his findings the same year had previously found a matching one initiated by Langley against Gardiner and Wayte

---

692 In full: Writ of Attachment issued and directed to the Sheriff of Surrey, returnable the eighteenth of St. Martin. Public Record Office, Court of King's Bench, Controlment Roll, Michaelmas Term 1596, K.B. 29/234.
only two weeks previously. Was the “William Shakespere” in the writ the same as the Stratford playwright? Why would the “nefarious” Gardiner through his “creature” Wayte⁶⁹⁵, as Hotson put it, name him at all? Furthermore, who were the two women named in the document? To investigate this puzzle it is necessary to examine the life and career of Francis Langley.

**Langley b.1548 d.1602**

Reared by his childless uncle, a prosperous London goldsmith and later Lord Mayor, the orphan Langley was apprenticed to a draper. Following undefined “inappropriate liberties” his master dismissed him⁶⁹⁶ but with the direct or indirect patronage of his uncle, he eventually obtained his freedom in the Company of Drapers. His benefactor also arranged a “reversion” for him as an alnager,⁶⁹⁷ one of the small number of City officials in charge of certifying the quality of cloth. Langley had to wait till 1585 for a vacancy to be available to him.⁶⁹⁸ There is ample documentary evidence to show that, from the first, he treated this official position as a platform for extortion and bribe taking.

The letter of the law demanded that woollen cloth entering the city had to first receive an alnager’s stamp. It is apparent in various lawsuits that Langley would have the inns around the market watched for merchants arriving with woollen cloth from the country. If they were foolish enough to visit their lodgings before going to the market then Langley, with his accomplices, would break into merchants’ rooms and “discover” unstamped cloth. Cash payments were then extracted by Langley to “overlook” the offence of having uncertified cloth in the city.⁶⁹⁹

Margot Heinemann⁷⁰⁰ drew attention to Thomas Middleton’s play *Michaelmas Term* (1604-6) that portrayed the linkages between cloth, financial fraud and the corrupt use

---

⁶⁹⁷ See Glossary
⁶⁹⁸ Despite the terms of the Reversion, Langley it appears was passed over for the first available positions when these fell vacant.
⁶⁹⁹ Ingram, *London Life* p.61
of financial manipulation. During this period a growing number of self made men who, as Heinemann puts it, were

…middle-rank merchants …often the victims of oligarchic privilege and financial extortion…

who joined with humbler shopkeepers and traders to form a new social stratum, and who

…would soon display their talents as soldiers, organizers and businessmen in the upheavals of the Civil War.

Even before obtaining his alnager’s office, Langley had been active as a moneylender and middleman, often defrauding his clients. Without banks, those seeking cash would approach middlemen - the term “goldsmiths” is often used, as originally it may have been bona fide goldsmiths that made loans – men who, by virtue of their trade, could bring the lenders and borrowers together. If the borrower had insufficient security (usually other guarantors or co-signers) then the middleman - Langley for example - would offer to co-sign their bond for an indemnity that in the event of default, twice the value of the bond would be payable, in addition to the sum advanced. A foolish borrower could then find that, had the letter of the bond not been followed, or they failed to pay, Langley would pursue them for his defaulted payment. Moreover, even if the loan were repaid, Langley would frequently keep the bond but pretend to have misplaced it. Later he would claim that the debt had never been satisfied and that he was entitled to his money. Gardiner also favoured this technique in his money-lending activities.

Significantly, for the Early Modern Theatre and William Shakespeare, when the young and naïve Thomas Cure failed to pay, Langley got the manor of Paris Garden. At the time this was a hundred acre site on the south side of the Thames abutting both the Rose Playhouse and the “stews” that stood along the riverside. Like other legal and religious jurisdictional anomalies, Paris Garden stood outside the City of London and therefore beyond the control of the Lord Mayor and aldermen. Paris Garden was, from a legal standpoint, under the authority of the Surrey Sheriff and Justices of the Peace.

701 Ibid. p.89
702 Ibid. p.25
703 Hotson, Shakespeare Versus p.39
704 The character of Easy in Michaelmas Term is almost a double of the real Thomas Cure, except in the play with its “happy ever after” ending Easy triumphs which Cure did not.
705 Stew(s) - A brothel… on account of the frequent use of the public hot-air bath-houses for immoral purposes. OED
Langley began to develop the site as an integrated commercial and entertainment complex and built rental property, landing stages to bring in the customers and, in 1594–5 as its centrepiece, the Swan playhouse. About a year after it was finished, Johannes de Witt, a Dutch traveller, described the Swan as being the most impressive of all the London playhouses.706

His acting as a “fence” complemented Langley’s illegal dealings in fraud and extortion. He bought and sold stolen merchandise. Langley’s involvement with a diamond stolen from the prize the Madre de Dios was integral to a crisis of the Early Modern Theatre - the play The Isle of Dogs. But before commenting on that event, it is necessary to examine the writ itself in greater detail.

**Table 58 - de Witt’s Sketch of the Swan Theatre**

![Image of Swan Theatre sketch]

The Nature of the Writ

Playhouses need players and those engaged in the illegal trading of wool and cloth need, or at the very least could greatly benefit from, the assistance of corrupt alnagers. Here are two potential links to John and William Shakespeare: the Writ of Attachment and Francis Langley.

---

Countersuits, seeking to hit back at someone litigating against oneself, have always been a good source of income for the legal profession. They are a non-violent way to counter-attack an adversary or to raise the stakes in any legal battle. Often, to increase the impact, parties not germane to the dispute will be named to inconvenience the litigant. This is almost standard procedure in most employee/employer litigation in the United States today.\textsuperscript{707} The attorneys for the employee seek to extort money from the employer by inconveniently deposing critical senior staff and thereby inflicting commercial embarrassment and damage on the employer.

Interestingly, John Shakespeare also initiated a Writ of Attachment at least once. Bearman noted that
\begin{quote}
…in Trinity Term 1582… John himself appealed directly to Queen’s Bench that four men were bound over to save him from “fear of death and mutilation of his limbs.”\textsuperscript{708}
\end{quote}

While seeming to be unaware of the commercial uses this type of writ served (despite quoting Hotson, albeit not in \textit{Shakespeare versus Shallow}) Bearman notes that the appeal to Queen’s Bench might reflect that one of the four - Ralph Cawdrey - was high bailiff that year and therefore presumably “fireproofed” as far as local justices were concerned.

It appears virtually certain that the 1596 writ was an attempt at retaliation, aimed at causing Langley as much financial distress as possible. With the Swan finished, Langley needed it to start operating quickly and effectively, not just for profit but also to cover its construction costs. Moreover, if there was a business relationship with the Shakespeares this too represented a source of revenue. As to the two women, it appears that at least one was a tenant of Langley’s on the Paris Garden site. The obvious, though as yet unsupported, proposition (which demands further investigation) is that the three named “employees” in the writ represented key businesses for Langley: Shakespeare for the Swan (and possible alnager-related activity) and the two women for Langley’s other businesses on the site – perhaps inns or brothels. However there

\textsuperscript{708} Bearman, \textit{John Shakespeare} p.417
remains genuine puzzlement even in modern writing over these “four quite ill-matched names.”

That Shakespeare is named first has been attributed to his possibly lampooning Gardiner in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* where the character Justice Shallow could, in the minds of some (including Hotson), be a caricature of Gardiner, and his son-in-law Wayte, the physical manifestation of the ninny Abraham Slender. However, it is likely that money was a stronger motive for this line of attack, and Gardiner was hardly a Justice Shallow being himself at best little better than Langley. Schoenbaum considers that Hotson’s

...argument [is] on a fragile foundation... Shallow foolish, senile, essentially harmless - will hardly pass muster as a caricature of Gardiner...”

It is possible that *The Merchant of Venice* of 1596/7 contains a likelier parallel of both Gardiner and Langley in the shape of Shylock. Here is a man who usually charges interest, but whose real aim is to press for the penalty hoping the bond will be defaulted upon (a practice of both Langley and Gardiner). But to make Hotson’s sequence of events work, it is necessary to move *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to a first performance date of 1596-7 which challenges the play’s customary dating. Today Greenblatt describes it as a play of the 1597-98 season and Andrew Gurr refers to it as being “in 1597”.

In 1571 John Shakespeare sued a John Luther for £50 plus damages—a case John won, though the damages awarded were only thirty-three shillings and not the ten pounds he had sought. Representing Shakespeare on that occasion was Henry Burr who also represented William Gardiner in his various legal suits during the same period.

The possibility exists that Gardiner knew that William was the son of John Shakespeare

---
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and, through Henry Burr, may have gained some insight into the Shakespeare family’s business.
Langley and Bonds

Langley made one innovation that had an immediate impact on Shakespeare, Early Modern Theatre and the subsequent history of all theatre – the performance contract. Ingram wrote that

…the plainants were shocked to discover “that your said subjects would become bound to him, the said Langley, in some great penalty with condition that they should not absent themselves nor play elsewhere but in the said playhouse called the Swan…”

The plainants, the reconstituted company of players known as Pembroke’s Men, were seeking a theatre to perform in. There exists the possibility that Shakespeare wrote and performed for Pembroke's Men (the Company operating under the patronage of Henry Herbert, 2nd Earl of Pembroke) in the early 1590s. Though quarto printings can at best be viewed with careful scepticism, on a case-by-case basis, the Henry VI, Part 3 octavo of 1595 notes that Pembroke's Men did indeed perform the play. Certainly the title page of the 1600 quarto states that the play was “sundry times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke his seruantes”. Moreover, as a line from the play was quoted in A Groatsworth of Wit of 1592 it is almost certain to predate that work.

Titus Andronicus (quarto of 1594) lists three companies, “As it was Plaide by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembrooke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants”. Three acting companies for one play is rare, but given the economic upheaval of the decade, and plague related theatre closures, there was considerable mixing of players between companies, as players must have struggled to survive.

All eight permanent members of the reconstituted company signed with Langley to play the 1597/8 season at the Swan, with a penalty of £100 each if they defaulted. For Langley this was merely transposing the techniques of default penalty from his money.

---

720 Halliday refers to the 1595 printing as being a quarto while the British Library correctly describes it as an octavo.
723 University of Victoria, "Titus Andronicus - First Quarto," ed. Drew Mildon, 1594, intermetshakespeare.unic.ca.
lending into the theatre. Later in 1597 Henslowe, owner of the nearby Rose Theatre, caught up with his rival and he too started requiring bonds from players. Carson quoted from Henslowe’s own notes of 25 July of that year where Thomas Hearne was “not to departe frome my company tyll this ij years be eaned (f.233)”. Later on the same page, Henslowe is referenced seeking Richard Jones to “playe in my howsse only”.

Langley and Henslowe both employed another business technique still popular in the modern era - they lured staff away from their competitors. Richard Jones had been one of Pembroke’s Men earlier in 1597 but later that year he signed up with Henslowe.

Whatever their state of mind, Pembroke’s Men began playing in the Swan by 20 February, 1597 and the defections from the Admiral’s Men at the Rose to the Swan caused interruptions to that company’s playing schedule. However with some false starts, both companies had managed to get their seasons underway. Ingram, noted that …theatre historians will argue that at the end of July the players in the Swan, by staging a scurrilous play called the Isle of Dogs, brought down upon themselves the wrath of both City and (Privy) Council and that a Council order for the cessation of playing and the pulling down of playhouses was the direct and immediate result of this affront.

Circumstantial evidence does exist. A letter seeking the closing of the theatres had been delivered to the Privy Council on the 28 of July from the Lord Mayor. It was one in a series of near duplicates seeking an end to playing. Meanwhile though pressed by matters of state, the Council also met on the same day and (as had happened previously) did indeed announce a suspension of playing in the hot (plague vulnerable) summer months. One irony is that the man charged to tell Langley of the prohibition was his enemy Gardiner. However, on August 15 the Privy Council acted.

…Upon information given us …a lewd play [The Isle of Dogs] that was played in one of the playhouses on the Bankside, containing very seditious and slanderous matter…[it] caused some of the players to be apprehended and committed to prison, whereof one of them was not only an actor, but a maker of part of the said play.

---
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Ingram infers that Lords Howard and Hunsdon as theatrical patrons were particularly keen to protect their reputations. Lord Hunsdon, as Peter Thomson notes, “was enriched by the brothel trade in the Paris Garden Manor, of which he was Lord”. Complex land conveyancing had hidden the true nature of Hunsdon’s share of the profits and like any competent criminal Lord Hunsdon, patron of Shakespeare’s own Lord Chamberlain’s Men and cousin of the Queen, took a prudently circuitous route in arranging matters to his own financial advantage.

The outcome of the Council’s deliberations was that Roger Topcliffe was directed to conduct an examination. In the end no theatres were torn down, playing went on and the only long-term casualty – though rarely identified as such, was Langley and his Swan Theatre. The story of The Isle of Dogs fiasco, that started five years before the Swan even opened, is long and involved, but it was sufficiently revealing of the money making mechanisms of the time to have merited an analysis in its own right.

**Langley v. Woodliffe & Samwell**

However, the Swan was not Langley’s last involvement with theatre development.

As Ingram put it

…[Oliver] Woodliffe was no more a haberdasher than Francis Langley was a draper…[a man whose] livelihood lay elsewhere, in an assortment of speculative dealings.

The Boar’s Head Inn was one of these speculations. In 1594, just as Langley was erecting the Swan across the river, Woodliffe leased the inn with a view to upgrading it into a place of entertainment as well as a hostelry. C.J. Sisson was of the opinion that Woodliffe’s motives were “…apparently purely financial…he shows no respect for the acting profession”.

---
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From the start legal complexities dogged the project. The inn was rented at £40 a year for twenty years from the owner Jane Poley, who retained a residence there. The lease also provided that Woodliffe spent £100 within seven years in upgrading the structure. Failure to do so would result in forfeiture of the property and a bond of £300 becoming payable. Like so many of Langley’s (and Gardiner’s) financial transactions, default could be much more lucrative than full performance.

By 1598 however, Woodliffe was sub-letting the hostelry side of the business (also for £40 a year) to Richard Samwell for the balance of the lease period. According to Herbert Berry, the original plan was that Woodliffe and Samwell should jointly construct galleries to seat the audience with the playing being conducted in the “great yard”. Having constructed these, Woodliffe convinced Samwell to first demolish and then replace these with higher capacity seating. Not surprisingly both men ran out of money and the balance of the £100 needed for improvements had evaporated as well, with only three years left out of the original seven.

Samwell turned to a player named Robert Browne for short-term loans but by 1599, unable to repay, Browne had gained control of Samwell’s interest in the lease. The total consideration was £360 minus sums advanced. Browne then moved into the premises with his company of players and finally the theatre started making money.

Woodliffe, pressed for cash, then made the mistake of approaching Langley for money. Langley later deposed that he had offered to “buy the whole interest of the said Woodliffe…for £400”. Langley agreed to pay £100 cash and three bonds for £100 each but extracted a counter bond of a thousand marks (£666) from Woodliffe to confirm that the title to the lease held by him was valid.

As Ingram puts it, “the stage was now set for a confrontation between Langley and Woodliffe on the one hand and Samwell and Browne on the other” over who actually had control over the yard. The original lease had been ill defined on this point and on this ambiguity Langley intended, like the fictional Shylock, to “feed fat”.

---
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The full array of Langley’s harassment techniques was now brought to bear: suits flew in both directions, writs abounded, gangs of Langley’s bully boys seized control of the buildings, armed with (according to Samwell) “swords, daggers, rapiers, pistols and other weapons”. Langley even sub-leased his own interest to one of his henchmen, Thomas Wollaston who, in turn, sub-leased it to another of his men, Richard Bishop, thus increasing the number of parties able to file nuisance suits. This continued till 1600 when after inconclusively ending up in the Star Chamber, Samwell simply gave up, went home, and died.

Now it was Woodliffe’s turn. If Langley could prevent the £100 worth of improvements being carried out by the seven year cut off date then the £666 would be payable. Woodliffe in desperation offered to return the £100 and to deliver back the three other Langley bonds. Langley, who effectively had paid nothing for his portion, declared that he was “likewise content” to accept this offer.

Holland’s Leaguer

The financial decline that started with The Isle of Dogs and the resulting financial drain made the end almost inevitable. Langley eventually lost Paris Garden with, as a parting shot, his final funds being swindled away from him in a mining speculation in Wales. On July 9, 1602 he died age 54. As Ingram put it “he left a wife, six children, and innumerable unresolved lawsuits and debts. He had neglected to make a will.”

One irony is that the Paris Garden manor house, Langley’s home, would in the space of a few years become Holland’s Leaguer, the most notoriously expensive and successful brothel of the early Stuart dynasty and reputedly where James I, on occasion, disported himself.

---
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Gardiner b.1531 d.1597

His life… a tissue of greed, usury, fraud, cruelty, and perjury: of crime in short enough to make him a marked man even in the Elizabethan age

Hotson, 1931

It is somewhat rare for a much quoted and highly respected academic writer to give full vent in decrying the character of an historical figure. Yet the late Leslie Hotson’s disgust for Justice William Gardiner was very evident from the above assertion. Contrasting Gardiner with his enemy Langley certainly gives a modern reader a practical example of what Shakespeare observed in *King Lear* that “change places and, handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief?”. Indeed one wonders whether the playwright may have had Gardiner in mind when writing the play.

Born in 1531, Gardiner was the son of a yeoman or gentleman who farmed Bermondsey Grange on the borders of Southwark. By 1556 he had inveigled himself into the freedom of the City of London, which permitted him to do business, by buying himself into the Company of the Grey Tawyers (workers in grey skins and leathers). As Hotson put it

...[Gardiner] got in by false pretences, for we find a complaint lodged in the Lord Mayor’s Court to the effect that Gardiner – was “not skilful in the said art, nor yet do practice the same”.

On his brother Richard’s death in 1556, Gardiner came into his father’s valuable Bermondsey estate and he compounded his good fortune by marrying money in the form of Frances, the widow of Edmund Wayte formerly a well-to-do leatherseller, and eldest daughter of Robert Lucy, another wealthy and successful leatherseller. Through this marriage Gardiner also acquired a stepson, William Wayte. Now well connected to the Leathersellers, Gardiner arranged an elevation into a fellowship of the Leathersellers via the Grey Tawyers. His pride in his new fellowship was demonstrated by his failing to pay his first dues of £5 – his proportionate share of a loan made by the Company to the Queen.

---
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His career in delivering false testimony starts shortly thereafter with, in 1560, what Hotson described as his “first recorded lie”.749 His conduct eroded further and by 1565 he was sent to Newgate for using “language and behaviour to the Wardens of the Leathersellers’ Company so outrageous that they were driven to ask the Lord Mayor’s Court to send him to prison”.750 He seems not to have learned much from this experience since, having extricated himself from jail for this first offence, by May 17 1565 he was back in again “for his misdemeanours towards them” [the Company of Leathersellers]. Impenitent, he next took suit against a former Lord Mayor (Sir Thomas Lodge) in “an attempt to extort a second payment of a debt secured by a bond of £500 penalty”.751 Gardiner was evidently working exactly the same ploy as his future enemy Langley would. It is recorded that the suit was unsuccessful.

The following years of 1567/8 produced three more examples of Gardiner’s activities. The Leathersellers were put to legal expenses of sixteen shillings in attempting to get their dues from him. He was fined £10 for making false claims in the Court of Queen’s Bench. Most revealing was the case of Thomas Ducke. Gardiner accused him of perjury as Ducke had previously borne witness against him in a case involving £13 12s. Gardiner, out for revenge, wanted the maximum punishment permitted for this offence by having Ducke “nailed by the ears to the pillory.” Justice did eventually prevail but as Hotson put it “what a picture of Gardiner’s use of power and legal corruption for purposes of revenge!”752

The three examples above are merely indicative. There are no records of exactly how often Gardiner was successful before anything came to trial. Gardiner’s activities appear to have focused on what H.J.M. Milne referred to as “the acquisition of property by fair means or foul.”753 In spite of his personal conduct, his “acquisitions” took him to the top of the Leathersellers having senior positions in 1568 and 1570, though the Company fined him forty shillings in 1573 “for words spoken by him”.754 The following years brought a stream of frauds directed at fellow Leathersellers, neighbours, and, perhaps most reprehensibly, family members. Halliday, with reference to his wife’s
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family, comments “he cheated her brothers and sisters of their father’s fortune…defrauded his step-son [sic].” In 1579 execrated by many, he sought refuge under the patronage of Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex, the Lord Chamberlain.

As a wealthy citizen Gardiner was now open to nomination as one of the two, annually appointed, offices of Sheriff of the City. Far from being an honour, this could involve considerable expense to the titleholder. William Smith, writing in 1588, noted that “the charge that one Sheriff in London keepeth amounteth sometimes to £2500 that year.” Such an “honour” was definitely not for Gardiner and he refused to take office, which in turn resulted in a £200 fine that through his patron’s intervention was reduced to £50, which lesser amount he again refused to pay. In 1582, after three years of litigation, with bad grace he finally paid the £50. In 1585 with Sussex dead, the City again voted another sheriff’s appointment. But there was to be no fine paid this time as Gardiner’s friend Chief Justice Anderson heard the case.

**Philip Henslowe c.1555 - 1616 and Edward Alleyn 1566 - 1626**

Most theatre owners – Henslowe, Alleyn, Langley, Aaron Holland and others were brothel owners too. Gamini Salgado, 1977

Whether Henslowe was a good or a bad man seems to me a matter of indifference. He was a capitalist. E.K. Chambers, 1923

Henslowe unquestionably played the part of good citizen to the hilt, obtaining (perhaps buying would be a more accurate verb) what Walter Greg referred to as “an assured and honoured social position among his fellow citizens.”

During the Early Modern Period royal honours, and therefore patronage and respectability, were literally bought and sold as part of the system of paying for Government, with the benefit to the Crown being paid in cash or kind. Of course, the
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business of buying Royal Patronage persists today through warrants and titles. Royal Warrants are still, according to one source

…a mark of recognition to individuals or companies who have supplied goods or services for at least five years to HM The Queen, HRH The Duke of Edinburgh or HRH The Prince of Wales. Warrants… have always been regarded and are highly prized… Warrant Holders may display the relevant Royal Arms and the legend ‘By Appointment’ on their products, premises, stationery, vehicles and advertising.  

The practice of selling titles also persists with the most recent incarnation being “cash for honours” which was examined extensively in the Parliamentary Select Committee Report of 2007.  

Henslowe’s social climb started in 1592 when he was appointed Groom to the Chamber “a post that required him to spend considerable time at court.” After James I came to the throne he moved on to be Gentleman Sewer of the Chamber – though he later tried to sell this title for £220.  Perhaps evidenced in The Isle of Dogs incident referenced above …Philip Henslowe was consistently a member of the court circle. Moreover, there is every indication that he used his privilege both to protect and to promote his commercial interests, including the ownership of several London playhouses.  

Royal honours aside, in 1607 he and his son in law Edward Alleyn became vestrymen of the Parish of St. Saviour and in the following year Henslowe was made churchwarden. From March 1608 to 1609 both he and Alleyn were among the assessors of “the third Subsidy graunted to the kinges maty [majesty] for the Clincke Liberty”. By 1612 he was one of six Governors of the local Grammar School.  

To be clear – Henslowe, like many, if not most, others in this period, bought his respectability.  He purchased it with cash gleaned from activities that ranged from:

- the legal – property development, lumber trading, manufacturing etc.
- the marginally legal (though in their day viewed by many as merely risqué) – blood sports (principally baiting and fighting of animals), inns, gambling, 

---

pawnbroking, theatre management etc. (what today can be termed the “hospitality” industry).

• the downright illegal - prostitution, loan sharking (usury).

Several authors (e.g. Greg, Carson, Cerasano) have been careful to direct their readers’ sympathy in favour of both Henslowe and Alleyn. The following is representative

...Partial as it is, the evidence which survives gives no indication that Henslowe’s pawnbroking activities continued once he began lending money to the players...no suggestion he was guilty of usury and there is no contemporary allusion to such a charge ever being brought against him. 766

Moreover, it is possible to read Susan Cerasano’s current entry for Henslowe in the (2009) Oxford Dictionary of National Biography and never encounter the word “brothel” or the term “brothel-owner”, “stews” or even “illegal.” Indeed, Henslowe, according to Cerasano was a man who was known for...never missing an opportunity to turn a penny... he apparently engaged in a variety of business investments including starch making, pawnbroking, and property investment...

The list goes on to mention other innocuous trades such as goatskin trading, lumber sales, land development etc..

The nearest Cerasano comes to censuring Henslowe (and that is carefully tempered before being fully expressed) is to observe that...Like many landlords he was periodically denounced by one of his tenants for being overly harsh. 767

That Henslowe made his payoffs - politically and literally - there can be no doubt. Equally, however, there is overwhelming circumstantial and direct evidence that his business dealings often crossed from the legal to illegal. Walter Greg, at the beginning of the twentieth century, described some of the properties Henslowe owned and acquired as having been ‘stews’ (i.e. brothels) though he was quick to state that they might not have continued as such during Henslowe’s ownership...

...That among these were certain of the licensed brothels of the Liberty can hardly be doubted. There is indeed no evidence on which to accuse

766 Ibid. p.30. However, Natasha Korda, “Household Property/Stage Property: Henslowe as Pawnbroker,” Theatre Journal, 1996: 185-195. at p.193 she notes that Henslowe employed “at least” four women as his pawnbroking agents. She also cites the documented transfer of apparel between the pawnbroking and theatre playing businesses, before concluding that “pawnbroking functioned as a supplement to both household and playhouse economies during the period” p.194-5.
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Henslowe of himself keeping houses of ill-fame, but there is no question that he was intermediate landlord between the stew-keepers and the Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Winchester. Whether he actually shared the profits of the trade, otherwise than as the recipient of a fixed rent, is unknown; if he did he might have pleaded that it was as a sort of insurance against the uncertain character of theatrical enterprise.  

Henslowe, originally a dyer, may also have been lampooned in Henry Chettle’s *Kinde Harte’s Dream* of 1592—a forerunner of Charles Dickens’ *A Christmas Carol* where ghosts interact with the hero in dreams. In this work according to Burford, Chettle writes about “dy[e] houses turned into whorehouses.” Burford then goes on to draw an inference that “such large profits could be earned by prostitution that the dyers…found it better to change their type of business.” But a close examination of Chettle’s work fails to support Burford’s assertion, at least not in connection with brothels. There is certainly anti-landlord propaganda and there is reference to brew, bake and dye houses being turned into an “Alley of tenements… [which] keep tip[p]ling in the fore-house.” Henslowe is possibly being satirized here but Cerasano was right to caution against taking Burford’s analysis at face value.

Of Alleyn, J.R. Piggot, custodian of the archives of Dulwich College, noted in 2004 that

…There was also an unsavoury side to Alleyn's success and wealth... To begin with, Alleyn was appointed “Squire of the Bears”, an official appointment made by King James for a supervisor of the royal bears, bulls and mastiffs and which included a licence to organise blood sports... These included the whipping of blind bears, as a handwritten poster in the College Archives announces. This position also enabled Alleyn to make a vast amount of money in issuing licences for dog fights. Alleyn was also the proprietor of a tavern on Bankside, The Unicorn, and of three bordello in that notorious neighbourhood... ...In 1605 Alleyn bought the manorial estate of Dulwich for £35,000 from Sir Francis Calton who was in financial difficulties... In 1613 [he] moved from Bankside to the manor house at Dulwich, Hall Place...

He was childless, and must have pondered the best use of what Thomas Fuller, writing shortly after Alleyn's death, called his “bad shillings”. Alleyn first thought of founding a

---

769 Henry Chettle, *Kind-harts dreame Conteining fiue apparitions* (Chettle, 1593).
hospital (presumably on account of the plague) but next proposed to commemorate himself by a foundation to be called “Alleyn's College of God's Gift”. 772

Joseph Lenz, writing in 1973 described Edward Alleyn as being

…a self-made man, a nice example of newly fashioned affluence, but ultimately he fails to reduce the odds between licentiousness and piety, to re-dress himself in the garb of respectability.” 773

Even by the end of the eighteenth century there was evidence of writers commenting on how Alleyn came to prominence off the stage. Daniel Lysons writing of him in 1792 commented

It has been a matter of inquiry, how Alleyn should have made so considerable a fortune in a profession, which, at that time, was not very lucrative even to the most eminent. To account for this, the editors of the Biographia suppose, that he inherited some paternal estate, and that he improved his fortune by marriage. The tradition in the college has always been, that he had three wives; but there is no certain account of more than two… Alleyn was sole proprietor [sic] of the Fortune play-house in Whitecross-street, which he built at his own expense; and which, no doubt, as he was a favourite actor, was a source of considerable emolument. He was likewise proprietor of a bear-garden on the Bankside, in partnership with Mr. Philip Henslowe, long before he obtained the place of master of the king's bears… Bear-baiting was an amusement so much in fashion in Alleyn's time, that it afforded entertainment to all ranks of people; and his garden, probably, yielded him as much profit as his theatre… 774
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Strumpet’s Souls - Brothels

The triple pillar of the world transform’d
Into a strumpet’s fool

Antony and Cleopatra, I i.

Like as you are: a panderly, sixpenny rascal.

The Honest Whore, Part One
Thomas Middleton

…a man should not give over or enthral his credit and honour to harlots…
less in the end when he is clean wiped from all his wealth

Levinus Lemnius, *trans.* Newton. 1576

Not all contemporary scholars are reticent in describing the reality of the
Henslowe/Alleyn family. As Gamini Salgado put it: “Alleyn’s wife, who was
Henslowe’s stepdaughter was carted along with some others in 1593.” Even he
speculates that she may have been “carted” for not closing one of the family brothels
down as required by edict during the plague season of 1593, rather than actually running
the day-to-day business. Cerasano is even kinder to the lady’s memory, in discussing
the Alleyn family portraits she comments on

...a portrait of Joan Alleyn, also the property of Dulwich College,
[which] shows a well-to-do woman with gloves and Bible, wearing a hat.
She - whom Alleyn referred to as his “mouse” - seems aptly depicted.

The practice of carting - the parading of the guilty through the streets, especially
whores, pimps or brothel keepers - was often accompanied by flogging either during the
journey or on arrival at the prison

... in November 1555 “the ill-woman who keeps the grayhounde on
Grasschurch” was carted and whipped “about the cite” and the woman
who kept the Bell in the same street was carted “as a bawd” and
whipped. (The Bell ... afterwards became one of the first theatres to be
allowed within the city).

But carting was no trivial matter within the mores of Elizabethan society. This was a
serious punishment. Gustav Ungerer called carting a “procesional spectacle” and for

---
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those it was inflicted upon it stood as “the severest possible punishment” on “mortifying days”.\textsuperscript{781} Nor was it gender or class specific – it was chiefly reserved for brothel keepers and was “very much in use in the last decade of Queen Elizabeth’s reign”. The process could take several hours and involved the object of the punishment being pelted with ordure or stones in various locations throughout the city before, in some cases, a flogging that could leave the recipient scarred for life. A surviving letter to Joan from her husband “expresses regret that she had been made to ‘ride in a cart by my Lord Mayor’s officer.’”\textsuperscript{782} Which may appear, wrongly, to be a mild punishment. The overwhelming probability was that Joan Hall was, in modern parlance, a “madam”.

After Mrs Alleyn’s death aged 53 in June 1623, the 57 year old Alleyn wooed then wedded on 3 December 1623, Constance, the nineteen year old daughter of the Dean of St. Pauls, John Donne.\textsuperscript{783} “Despite her relative youth the couple had no children, and Alleyn lived only another three years.” So Cerasano noted in Alleyn’s entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. However, she avoided drawing attention to the interesting interchange between Donne and Alleyn where Alleyn suspected that his future father-in-law (six years his junior) does not approve of him. Donne had insisted that Alleyn settle a substantial income on his wife to be. Alleyn did so by pledging the annual rents of £100 from four inns (almost certainly brothels) to his new wife’s benefit.

Lenz, in contrast to Cerasano wrote

…faced with the prospect of Alleyn, Donne later writes that he would rather his daughter were in the “nunnery in heaven with the blessed virgin there than suffer the mediocrity of his house.”…Ironically, one of those inns was the Unicorne, a brothel inherited from Henslowe. Thus, either out of a supreme sense of spite or complete naïveté, the actor bought the preacher’s daughter with profit gained from prostitution…Even after the marriage, Donne continued to complain that “we do but borrow children of God to lend them to the world. And when I lend the world a daughter in marriage, or lend the world a son in a profession, the world does not always pay me well again”…Alleyn was reduced to writing a draft of a letter to his disgruntled father-in-law, asking Donne to justify his treatment of him. This letter, probably written

\textsuperscript{781} Ibid. p.176-7
\textsuperscript{782} Salgado, Elizabethan Underworld. p.58
\textsuperscript{783} There is some confusion over the girl’s age at the time of her marriage – some sources state 19 others 17. Hosking, The Life and Times of Edward Alleyn (London: Jonathan Cape, 1952) - puts her at 20, but his book is one-sided in its praise of Allen and this, together with all other aspects of his life, are “sanitized” by Hosking. He stated that at the time of the marriage “Alleyn was fifty-eight, Constance twenty”. p.227. [neither is correct].
in late January, 1624/25, testifies to Alleyn's ultimate failure to gain the esteem for which he had striven so hard… Alleyn writes of his father in law’s “unkind, unexpected and undeserved deniall of common curtesie.”

Like the businessman he was, Alleyn appeared to equate everything to cash…

In Donne's eyes, he is a plain man: vulgar, common, mediocre, perhaps even stupid, for only a simpleton would see no harm in securing a marriage with a whorehouse. Perhaps grown unaccustomed to the stage, he lacked the nerve to send the letter…

Lenz’s last thought about Alleyn’s lack of resolve was, of course, speculative.

However, the notion that brothels were not a major source of revenue for the Henslowe/Alleyn family, as will be shown, flies in the face of the evidence.

Trish Thomas Henley in her doctoral thesis of 2007 draws together evidence of the prices of prostitution based on her own and other examinations of records of the period…

…Bridewell records show that most prostitutes “lay” at a particular brothel and paid for the space by the week, with the fee the prostitute paid ranging from 4 to 6 shillings… Griffiths on a sample of 111 payments comes up with an average of 4s 3d…


785 Hosking, Edward Alleyn p.231 for the text of the letter. Hosking’s book is interesting but devoid of footnotes, endnotes or any proper referencing. Moreover, it is a very partisan view of Alleyn and it must be regarded as such. Arnold Edinborough in reviewing Hosking’s work calls it a “disappointment” – though it stands as the first full attempt at a biography of Alleyn. See the review - Arnold Edinborough, “The Life and Times of Edward Alleyn,” Shakespeare Quarterly (Folger Shakespeare Library) 4, no. 1 (1953): 83-84. An excellent photograph of the letter “MSS 3, Article 102, 02 recto: Letter from William Beecher to Edward Alleyn presenting a candidate for the almshouse, with a draft letter regarding money on the versos by Alleyn to his father-in-law John Donne, complaining about Donne's 'manie vnkind passages' and especially the ‘vnkind, vnxpecketed and vndeserved deniall of yt comon curtesie afforded to a frend’, c. 1625.” is available at http://www.henslowe-alleyn.org.uk/images/MSS-3/Article-102/02r.html. It is noteworthy that the frugal Alleyn used the back of an earlier piece of correspondence to set out his draft. See also Edinborough, Life p.84

786 Lenz, Base Trade p.844

787 Trish Thomas Henley, Dealers in Hole-Sale: Representations of Prostitution on the Elizabethan and Jacobean Stage (Florida State University, 2007). p.74-77

788 Especially - Paul Griffiths, “The Structure of Prostitution in Elizabethan London,” Continuity and Change, 1993: 39-63. Henley suggests that: “No book length study of Tudor or early Stuart prostitution yet exists.” And if one is looking for a careful academic study she is probably correct – see earlier comments on E.J. Burford.
The picture that emerges both from the Bridewell records as well as plays and literature of the period, is one of a Bankside where prostitution was one of the pillars of the economy. Browner quoted Thomas Nashe in *Christs Tears* of 1594, describing the metropolitan suburbs as little better than “licenced stewes” functioning with the connivance of magistrates. Nashe described half-a-crown as being “the set price of a strumpet’s soul.” In the same section he had railed

...London what are thy Suburbes but licenced Stewes. Can it be so many brothel-houses, of salary sensuality, and six-penny whoredome, (the next doore to the Magistrates) should be set vp and maintained, if bribes did not bestirre them? ...I am halfe of belief it is not a reasonable soule, which effecteth motion and speech in them, but a soule imitating the duel, who (the more to despise God,) goes and enliueth such licentious shapes, and (in them) enacteth more abomination and villany, then he could in the euillest of euill functions, which is, in diuelling it simply. I wonder there is any of these sher etaying bodietraffiquers...

Prices vary then from a few pence at the low end of the scale, to a mid-price rage of three to ten shillings with occasional “specials” in excess “a Mr. Paul Mowdler, merchant [who] apparently bought Katherine William’s maidenhead for 40s.”

By the accession of James I, the luxury end of the market included the notorious Bess Broughton who charged £20 for a dinner that “presumably did not include the cost of post prandial entertainment.”

Attempting to quantify earnings is difficult at best - indeed there are views that suggest that any attempt to quantify fees is pointless given the huge range of compensation possibilities. Faramerz Dabhoiwalala concluded

...there is thus little point in calculating such a thing as “the average fee” for a sexual encounter – indeed just to talk of a “maximum fee” would be nonsense, so any minimum fee too is arbitrary.

The deluxe end of the brothel market was Broughton’s “Holland’s Leaguer”. This was hardly in a volume business with its sumptuous gardens and fantasy rooms and

---

789 Thomas Nash, *Christs Tears over Jerusalem Whereunder is annexed, an admonition to London* (London: Andrew Wise, 1594).
791 Nash, *Christs Tears* S. 158
792 Henley *Dealers* p.77
793 Browner, *Wrong Side* p.23
expensive, exotic, imported talent. Businessmen such as Henslowe and Alleyn, given the number and range of establishments they owned and controlled, would probably have had a range of price points\textsuperscript{795} to match every pocket. Henley makes the valuable observation that, being a pawnbroker, Henslowe could have also had a means to supply his sex workers with cut-price garments which presumably would have recycled downwards as they fell into disrepair.\textsuperscript{796} It is also plausible that female costumes from his various theatrical endeavours, as they lost their “glosses”\textsuperscript{797} moved from public to private performances of another sort.\textsuperscript{798}

Griffiths took a sample of 219 cases in the Bridewell records of the 1570s and subjected these to an analysis to determine the occupation of the “customers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices and Servants</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and Tradesmen</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign merchants and gentlemen</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60 - Carted

\textsuperscript{795} price point n. Marketing a retail price, selected from the range of available or established prices as that most liable to attract consumers and ensure profitability. OED

\textsuperscript{796} Henley Dealers p.80. She also considers that the pawnbroker in Middleton’s “Your Five Gallants” could be a “caricature for Henslowe”.

\textsuperscript{797} “That our garments, being, as they were, drenched in the sea, hold notwithstanding their freshness and glosses” - Gonzalo, The Tempest, II i


\textsuperscript{799} Paul Griffiths, “The Structure of Prostitution in Elizabethan London,” Continuity and Change, 1993: 39-63. & Henley Dealers p.78 – these figures are, of course, derived from actual court cases and therefore while representative of the total market they are not in themselves evidence of the total market.
E.J. Burford in 1976 claimed that Alleyn owned the Barge, Bell, Unicorn and Cock inns – almost certainly brothels despite Cerasano’s assertion that there is a lack of proof of these being brothels when Henslowe and Alleyn owned them.

In Cerasano’s sanitized world Alleyn’s wife (and Henslowe’s step-daughter) was carted in a case of mistaken identity. She commented on Burford’s work in her 2001 article on his reissuance of his earlier 1976 volume. In this she sliced into Burford’s lack of academic rigour and use of speculation over hard evidence. She performed a very creditable academic exercise in doing so, but the one question she seemed anxious not to address was - sloppy and sensation seeking as Burford’s work was - could it be true? Four establishments and four categories of client would seem to indicate some price point differentiation.

Unlike sports that presented an opportunity for the males of different classes to mix socially, sex was stratified by fiscal reality - there was a clear price versus quality issue at work here.

Given that an average theatre’s takings might be £5 per performance and require a Company of sixteen or so players plus expenses, this still equates to only 30 visits to an average brothel in gross revenue terms. Not that prostitution and playing are mutually exclusive - far from it, they are complementary to one another from a commercial perspective and link into numerous other associated businesses such as alcohol, gambling etc. Simply renting working space to prostitutes was a potentially remunerative, if morally bankrupt, means of earning a living. Using Griffiths’ estimate of 4s 3d. a week, this produces £8 10s. a year per worker which is about the same wage as a skilled tradesman earned for a seventy hour week. Moreover, the sale of food and drink at inflated prices was valuable collateral income that could be further increased through gaming or blood-sports.

---

801 Burford is writing for a popular commercial audience; over several decades he has written mostly the same book about “naughty London” again and again. His work lacks both rigour and precision but clearly he never intended either – his obvious goal was sales which does not per se invalidate his ideas as long as one takes a rational look at what he proposes. Cerasano despite all her incisiveness wins the legal argument but loses the common sense one.
Alleyn’s £10,000 to found Dulwich College and £35,000 for his estate came from somewhere – the economics of the theatre pre-1610 preclude that level of cash accumulation. On a very conservative estimate, 30 prostitutes working at four brothel/taverns with an average of two customers a night at an average fee of four shillings and performing 300 nights a year, produces £3000 p.a. gross for the sex alone.

The figures are a compelling pointer to where the real profits lay. As Henley noted “in Elizabethan England, Bankside is still the hotbed for hothouses”.

**The Bearwardens Vail**

Cry “Havoc,” and let slip the dogs of war;
Julius Caesar III i.

A Mastiff of true English blood
Lov’d fighting better than his food;
He glory’d in his limping pace,
The scars of honour seam’d his face;
In every limb a gash appears,
And frequent fights retrench’d his ears
George Jesse, 1866

In England, both men and dogs baited bulls. These displays were a precursor to the slaughter of the animals and were justified by a belief that baiting tenderized the meat and thus rendered it fit to eat. Even medium sized towns possessed a bullring in which the process was carried out and the spectacle drew large crowds.

Bear-baiting was the related “sport” of setting dogs to attack a bear chained to a stake. Between the two forms of baiting, bear baiting was more often referred to as being the better “sport”. The baiting of bears was also the ideal opportunity to train dogs for war.

…When Henry VIII sent a force to Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, in 1544 to aid him against the French king, the 400 English soldiers were accompanied by 400 English mastiffs, each with an iron collar.

---

802 Henley, Dealers. p.70.
803 Vail = Advantage, benefit, profit. OED
The Earl of Essex also embarked dogs for his disastrous Irish campaign.

...William Resould wrote to Cecil from Lisbon reporting that local rumour put Essex’s force at 12,000 men and 3,000 mastiffs. We have no evidence that the force actually included such an enormous number of dogs, but the subject had clearly been under discussion. A year later, in January 1599, another letter recorded that Essex “...of carrieng over two or three hundred mastives to worry the Irish (or as I take it) theyr cattell”.806

These “dogs of war”, roughly the size of large male lions, trained to attack bears, were used to harass civilians, soldiers and other animals. These dogs were, like rapiers, desirable fashion accessories for the dashing young aristocrat or man-about-town.

...emblems of a particular kind of national identity, mastiffs were increasingly popular with the aristocracy. Chatsworth, Elvaston Castle and Hadzor Hall all eventually became breeding centres for dogs of this type.807

Mastiff dogs were becoming national symbols.

...The mastiffs’ courage and strength were appealing to those who wanted to advertise English masculine valour, both to themselves and to foreigners.808

In 1603 one foreigner, Abraham Ortelius, in his Epitome of the Theatre of the Worlde809 called England famous for its women and “a most excellent kine of mastiffe dogges of a wonderful bigness and admirable fierceness and strength.”

806 Ibid. p.26 also Calendar of State Papers, 270.25. and see Robert Lemon and Mary Anne Everett Green, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth [and James I.] 1547–[1625], 12 vols (London: Longman, 1856), 266.116.
807 MacInnes, Mastiffs p.31
808 Ibid. p.22
809 A Flemish cartographer and dealer in maps, books, and antiquities. The Epitome of the Theatre of the Worlde is considered by many to be the first modern atlas. From Twelfth Night III, iii “he does smile his face into more lines than is in the new map of the Indies” Full title: “Abraham Ortelius his epitome of the theatre of the worlde. Now latlye renewed and augmented. The mappes all newe grauen by Michael Coignet. London, printed for Ieames Shawe, 1603.”
Shakespeare, in *Henry V*, articulated the sentiment of his own day putting the
description into a fictional scene just before the battle of Agincourt

Rambures That island of England breeds very valiant creatures: their
mastiffs are of unmatchable courage.

Orleans Foolish curs, that run winking into the mouth of a Russian
bear and have their heads crushed like rotten apples! You
may as well say, that’s a valiant flea that dare eat his
breakfast on the lip of a lion.

Constable Just, just; and the men do sympathize with the
mastiffs in
robustious and rough coming on, leaving their wits with
their wives: and then give them great meals of beef and
iron and steel, they will eat like wolves and fight like
devils.\(^\text{810}\)

Howard Roberts and Walter Godfrey put the earliest specific reference to bear-baiting
on Bankside in 1546, with the proclamation of the abolition of the “Stews on Bankside
and of bear-baiting in that row or in any place on that side [of] London bridge.” \(^\text{811}\)
But “sport”, like “sin” was not that easily expunged and quickly made its return. In the
same year

…Thomas Fluddie, Yeoman of His Majesty's Bears, was granted a
licence in September, 1546, to “make pastime” with the king's bears “at
the accustomed place at London, called the Stewes.” \(^\text{812}\)

---

\(^{810}\) *Henry V*, III. vii

\(^{811}\) Howard Roberts and Walter Godfrey, *The Bankside Playhouses and Bear Gardens - Survey of London*
22 (London, 1950). – this is itself a précis of extracts from: C. L. Kingsford in his article "Paris Garden
and the Bear-baiting" in *Archaeologia*, Vol. 70, by W. W. Braine in *The Site of the Globe Playhouse,
From 1550 Bear Gardens were in the liberty\textsuperscript{813} of the Clink adjacent to the brothels. Despite this, Paris Garden was often referred to as their location. Robert Crowley wrote in 1550\textsuperscript{814}

Of Bearbaytynge.

What follye is thys, to kepe wyth daunger,  
A greate mastye dogge and a foule ouglye beare;  
And to thyse onelye ende, to se them two fyght,  
Wyth terrible tearynge, a full ouglye syght.  
And yet me thynke those men be mooste foles of all,  
Whose store of money is but verye smale,  
And yet euerye Sundaye they will surelye spende  
One penye or two, the bearwardes lyuyng to mende.  
At Paryse Garden ecche Sundaye, a man shall not fayle  
To fynde two or three hundredes, for the bearwardes vaile.

Of Bearbaiting [in modern English]\textsuperscript{815}

What folly is this, to keep with danger,  
A great mastiff dog and a foul ugly bear;  
And to this only end, to see these two fight,  
With terrible tearing, a full ugly sight.  
And yet me think those men be most fools of all,  
Whose store of money is but very small,  
And yet every Sunday they will surely spend  
One penny or two, the bearwardens living to mend.  
At Paris Garden each Sunday, a man shall not fail  
To find two or three hundreds, for the bearwardens vail.

Contemporaneously, Thomas Sampson referred to God's judgment on “certayne Gentlemen upon the Sabboth day, going in a whirry [sic] to Paris garden to the Beare bayting” who were drowned.\textsuperscript{816}

\textsuperscript{812} Roberts and Godfrey, Bankside Playhouses reference 4.  
\textsuperscript{813} Liberty: an area of local administration distinct from neighbouring territory and possessing a degree of independence...the existence of such areas caused difficulties esp. for the administration of justice; therefore in the 19th cent. various Acts of Parliament brought most liberties within the regular administrative structures for most purposes - OED  
\textsuperscript{814} Roberts and Godfrey, Bankside Playhouses reference 139.  
\textsuperscript{815} My own transliteration.  
\textsuperscript{816} Roberts and Godfrey, Bankside Playhouses reference 140.
Alleyn’s association with the “Bear Garden” was shown by the Token-Books[^1] for the years 1613–18 under the heading “Paris Garden”. These have the insertion “Mr. Jacob of the beare garden” and “Mr. Edward Alleyn” referencing Rose Alley and Mosses Alley adjacent to the Gardens.

This could explain references in the Dulwich College manuscripts to Edward Alleyn and Philip Henslowe at Paris Garden, and probably resulted from the linking of Paris Garden with bear-baiting in popular speech.

---

[^1]: Ibid. See Glossary for definition of Token-money and Token-book
[^2]: This English mastiff is Aicama Zorba of La Susa. Zorba stood 89 cm at the shoulder and was 251 cm from the tip of his nose to the tip of his tail, the size of a small donkey. Guinness World Records 2000 p.106. see also http://www.guinnessworldrecords.com.
Table 63 - Henslowe and Alleyn – Investing in Blood Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Alleyn bought interest in Bear Garden for £200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Henslowe obtains adjacent land to Bull Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Deputyship of Master of the Royal Game of Bulls etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Obtained Office of Cheefe Master, Overseer and Ruler of our beares, Bulls and mastiffe dogges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Bull Ring rebuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>The dual-purpose Hope theatre built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1606 refurbishment they contracted, at a cost of £65, to have pulled down …so much of the tymber or carpenters worke of the foreside of the messuage … called the beare garden, next the river of Thames … as conteyneth in lengthe from outside to outside fyftye and sixe foote … and in bredth from outside to outside sixeteene foote" … and to rebuild the same with "good new sufficient and sounde tymber of oke."819

Again in 1613 hard on the heels of the Globe’s destruction820 they undertook the building of …one other game place or plaiehouse fitt and convenient in all thinges bothe for players to plaie in and for the game of Beares and bulls to be bayted in the same, and also a fitt and convenient tyre house and a stage to be carried or taken awaie and to stand uppon tressels" the whole to be "of suche large compasse, fforme, widenes and height as the plaie housse called the Swan in the libertie of Parris garden” 821

For the new theatre, the Hope, Henslowe and Jacob Meade a waterman raised a company of players under Nathan Field, and by 1614 they performed Jonson's Bartholomew Fair in the new venue.

In the time of Elizabeth I, bear-baiting had been a sport for Sunday afternoons, but the Sunday performances were stopped early in the reign of James I. After the building of the Hope it was used for both bear and bull-baiting on Mondays, and for plays during the rest of the week.

Chambers noted that according to …a note in Henslowe’s diary… the receipts for it [the Bear Garden] for the three days next after Christmas 1608 were £4, £6 and £3 14s. which

819 Ibid. ref. 79
820 29 June 1613
may be compared with the average of £1 18s. 3d. received from the Fortune [theatre] during the same three days.\textsuperscript{822}

Though intended as a dual-purpose venue - players and animals - it quickly proved unworkable to maintain the two, and the theatre reverted in popular parlance back to the title of Bear Garden and again as Chambers put it

…The Hope is mentioned from time to time, chiefly as a place of baiting up to the civil wars.\textsuperscript{823}

In 1620 a dispute arose over the site of the theatre. A bricklayer, John Browne, was called and testified

…there was a sinke or open gutter for the use . . . of the beare garden on the West side of the old beare garden running southward which is now stopped vpp and that the old dogg Kennells were more westward beyond the same and that the now new playhouse is in part built vppon the said sinke and where the old dogg Kennell stood…

He also attested that Henslowe started to lay the foundation of the playhouse on part of the old Bear Garden but that on Edward Alleyn's persuasion he moved it southward a few feet “so that it should be wholly on the king's land”.

In 2003 Jason Scott Warren made the valuable connection between royalty and blood sports, just as playing was supposedly supported as a Royal pastime. He recorded a number of occasions including requests by both King James I and Henry the crown prince.

…[King] James then asked Edward Alleyn, Master of the Bear-Garden, to set “Three of the fellest dogs in the Garden” on “the lustiest Lion” in the Tower.\textsuperscript{824}

It appears this particular contest did not come to much as the lion had the good sense to let the dogs fight amongst themselves while he headed back to his den. Other lions however, were not so lucky.

But perhaps the real source of revenue from bear baiting lay in the dogs themselves and the gambling surrounding the sport.

…Although the owners of the bear garden maintained their own

\textsuperscript{823} Ibid, p.470
kennels (around seventy dogs lived in them), audience members were free to bring and bet on their own dogs.  

Substantial revenues from the related activities of selling, trading and raising of dogs for sale - together with the related gambling revenues - would explain the size of the baiting investments made by Henslowe and Alleyn. Like the theatre and perhaps even their brothels, the true profit may have lain in the ancillary sources of income.

George Wilkins d.1618 and Henry Chettle d. 1603

Unlike the previous two pairs, where the first were enemies and the second relations through marriage, Wilkins and Chettle could both accurately be described as amongst the dregs of the theatrical and playwriting community. Yet both are illustrative of their time and both were involved with the theatre and affected - directly in the case of Wilkins and indirectly with Chettle - Shakespeare’s professional career.

George Wilkins

…the wildness of his youth and the feats he hath done about Turnbull Street; and every third word a lie

Henry IV, Part II. III. ii

Anthony Parr writing in 2004 generously described Wilkins as a “playwright and pamphleteer.”  
Roger Prior had earlier called him a “minor dramatist” and showed restraint when he noted that “his life and his literary works have some strange characteristics in common.” Scavenger of the literary world, thief and pimp are certainly more accurate descriptions. In his writing he reworked others’ ideas, plagiarized shamelessly and participated in producing ‘bad’ quarto editions of plays from memory.

His frequent brushes with the law have provided valuable insight into his life and later career as a nominal vintner and practical brothel keeper. Parr noted

---

825 MacInnes, Mastiffs p.32
828 The original scripts (as was customary) being closely guarded literary assets of the performing Company that commissioned and paid for them.
…Records show that he was in trouble with the law as early as 1602, and he was regularly in court from 1610 until the end of his life… he was accused of “abusing one Randall Borkes and kicking a woman on the belly which was then great with child”…

This was not the only time he was arraigned for violence against women.

When Shakespeare lodged with the Mountjoy family in Cripplegate, Wilkins was a frequent visitor to the home and he already knew all the members of the household. Shakespeare gave evidence in the Court of Requests in 1612 concerning the contested Mountjoy/Belott dowry of 1604, as did Wilkins. If, as seems likely, Measure for Measure with its underlying theme of illicit sex was written in the 1602-1604 period, it is possible that Wilkins in some way supplied Shakespeare with characters or first hand experience of the sexual underworld.

His short writing career has been tabulated below. It is probable that he had one or more literary supporters who encouraged him, the most obvious candidate being Shakespeare himself, given that Wilkins was catapulted from literary obscurity to writing for the King’s Men in 1606. The two men knew each other at the Mountjoys, The Miseries of Enforced Marriage was a financial success at the Globe and the only two credible candidates to have authored Pericles are Shakespeare and Wilkins. Wilkins’ larcenous nature took him to Gosson the publisher (who in 1611 stood bail for him) which neatly explains why Wilkins never worked with any playing company after stealing Pericles from the King’s Men.

---

829 Parr, Wilkins
830 Charles Nicholl, The Lodger - Shakespeare on Silver Street (London: Penguin Allen Lane, 2007). Though not written to full academic standard this book is interesting as it takes Shakespeare’s residence with the Mountjoys as its central theme.
## Table 64 - The Short Literary Career of George Wilkins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>History of Justine</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarized Golding³³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Jests to Make you Merrie</td>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>Thomas Dekker</td>
<td>King’s Men, Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>The Miseries of Enforced Marriage</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>The Travels of the Three English Brothers</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>Queen’s Men, Red Bull,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Three Miseries of Barbary</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>William Rowley</td>
<td>Clerkenwell, Published by Gosson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Law Tricks</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>First nine scenes Wilkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>Published by Gosson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>The Painful Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published by Gosson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wilkins appears in the legal records of the Middlesex Session from 1610 to 1618 thirty-eight times in connection with eighteen cases. During this period he resided as a “victualler” at Cow Cross, a place Prior described as: “…notorious as the haunt of whores and thieves, a reputation which the Sessions records amply confirm…”³³² The court records repeatedly show that Wilkins was indeed running a brothel. The local community dealt him the same treatment as the fictional Viennese authorities delivered to Mistress Overdone in Measure for Measure. “But shall all our houses of resort in the suburbs be pulled down?” asks Overdone.³³³ His house certainly was.

…George Wilkins of Cow Cross, victualler, to give evidence…for a riot; …for the said Richard Greenham of Long Lane, accused that he, in the company of divers other unruly and disorderly persons, did make a very notable riot at Cow Cross, and pulled down a great part of the dwelling-house of George Wilkins.³³⁴

As Prior noted “theatres and brothels were the buildings most likely to be pulled down. To ‘deface Turnbull’³³⁵ and ‘ruin the Cockpit’³³⁶ was a custom of the apprentices on Shrove Tuesdays.”³³⁷ Burford also commented on this phenomenon

---

³³² Prior, Wilkins p.141
³³⁴ Middleton’s Inner Temple Masque of 1619 refers to Shrove Tuesday attacks with “Cause spoil in Shoreditch…deface Turnbull and tickle Cod-Piece Row” see Gordon Williams, A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature (Athlone Press, 1994). p.270. See Glossary “Turnbull” See also introductory quote from Henry IV Part II
³³⁵ “The apprentices on holidays attacked the Cockpit” [theatre]… see also Andrew Gurr, The Shakespearean Stage 1564-1642 (Cambridge: CUP, 1992). p.225
A link to Philip Henslowe, another brothel owner, appeared in 1611 when a reputed whore and associate of Wilkins, Magdalen Samwaise, was charged with stealing fifty shillings. Wilkins made a “composition” over the matter and “carried the woman away.” However, in 1881 George F. Warner\(^{839}\) had, in examining the manuscripts of Alleyn’s “College of God’s Gift,” found that Magdalen had borrowed (nominally) forty shillings from Henslowe. The amount advanced may have been less, but the debt was to be repaid in quarterly instalments of ten shillings – the last one being due around the time of the theft. There was a further twist. One of the sureties for Magdalen was John Bonner, a young heir who was defrauded out of his fortune in a manner curiously similar to that of the character William Scarborow in The Miseries of Enforced Marriage. Though perhaps not the prime mover in the fraud, Wilkins certainly played a part in the corruption and fleecing of the young man. How Magdalen compensated Bonner can only be imagined.

Henry Chettle

Emma Smith, writing in 2004, was in no doubt about the origins of Henry Chettle, the son of a dyer who died in the year that Chettle began his seven-year apprenticeship to a printer. Smith called his work “shadowy” in that

\[\ldots\text{As printer and as author again and again he is associated with a work but not credited with any part of it when it comes to print.}^{841}\]

The use of “credit” is interesting because the only thing that Chettle did not bring on himself was credit in the other usages of the word. Gossip-monger and plagiarist might be more accurate, if emotive, terms. John Jowett concluded that he contributed to the

---

\(^{837}\) Prior, Wilkins p.148


\(^{840}\) Schoenbaum, Documentary Life (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.117 “The publisher of the Groat’s-Worth, William Wright, evidently anticipated a storm for he took the precaution of disassociating himself from the pamphlet;…he added the exculpatory clause, ‘upon the perill of Henrye Chettle’.”

bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* of 1597. One much quoted reference to Shakespeare came with the *Groatsworth of Wit* published in 1592 in the name of the recently deceased Robert Greene. Smith reported that Shakespeare and Marlowe considered that Chettle, not Greene, was the author. Certainly its inclusion in the Stationers’ Register has the line “upon the perille of Henry Chettle a booke intituled Greenes Groatsworth of Wyt”.

In 1592 Chettle went into partnership with the disreputable printers Hoskins and Danter and though the partnership did not last, the association with Danter continued for a number of years. The printing of the *Groatsworth* and the subsequent *Repentance of Robert Greene* both had Danter as printer, either singly or in combination with another printer. Jowett described Chettle as an “intermediary” between authors and Danter and was firm in his opinion

…He [Chettle] actually forged *Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit*.

Jowett in a 2004 article described Danter’s reputation as “extraordinarily low” – W.W. Greg had, nearly a century earlier, called Danter’s work “a record of piracy and secret printing.”

*Kind Heart’s Dream* has already been referenced for its use of ghosts to tell a story. The work is unusual in that Chettle actually put his name on it. “Intensely topical” is how Jowett describes it. Nominally it was an attack on the suppliers of scurrilous and bawdy ballads but it was no more censuring immorality than a *News of the World* article about adultery. It is in itself salacious but when analyzed from a business perspective there was a layer of gossip intended only for those “in the know” about certain individuals’ commercial activities. The “Rupert Murdoch” in Chettle’s life was Henslowe, and his Notebook shows “repeated instances of Henslowe’s advancing Chettle small loans”.

---

844 Jowett, *Notes* p.384
845 Ibid. p.386
847 Henry Chettle, *Kind-harts dreame Containing fiue appartitions* (Chettle, 1593).
In *Kind Heart’s Dream* there is the following observation that has no immediately apparent target. Here the barb was less obvious than the much-quoted stab at Shakespeare in the *Groatsworth* that misquoted *Henry VI* on the subject of a tiger’s heart.\(^{849}\)

...There is an occupation of no long standing about London called broking or brogging... in which there is pretty juggling, especially to blind law, and bolster usury: if any man be forced to bring them to pawn, they will take no interest, not past twelve pence a pound for the month; marry they must have a groat for a monthly bill: which is a bill of sale from month to month; so that no advantage can be taken for the usury.\(^{850}\)

Here Chettle appears to be pointing the finger at what would today be called pawnbroking. Chettle’s commentary about dyers converting dye houses to brothels has already been referenced in this thesis. Henslowe was both dyer by trade and pawnbroker by choice and yet the target appears curious given that Henslowe became Chettle’s patron - advancing these “small loans”, generally ten shillings a time; however the last one in November 1603 was only three shillings. Henslowe may of course simply have taken these in good humour or even employed Chettle just to hush him up. Another alternative target may have been Shakespeare, with the references to brogging.

---

\(^{849}\) O tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide! *Henry VI III* I, iv; see Glossary, *Tiger’s Heart* for the conventional, if erroneous, explanation. \(x\) ref. \(249\) et seq.

\(^{850}\) Chettle, *Kind-harts*. Quotation appears in section “William Cuckoo to all close Jugglers with the discovery of their crafts, *and punishment for their knaveries.*”
All Honourable Men – The Example of Robert Cecil

It is not the business of the historian to strike moral attitudes. And indeed, owing to his happy lack of personal experience, an Englishman living in the twentieth century is singularly unfitted to form a balanced judgment about corruption in public life. As Lord Keynes once remarked, in some societies corruption is the simplest and most convenient method of taxation. Under certain circumstances, and practised with moderation, it is not incompatible with a devotion to the public interest.851

Lawrence Stone, 1961

For Brutus is an honourable man;
So are they all, all honourable men—
Julius Caesar, III ii

In England during the Early Modern Period if you stole a shilling you could be mutilated, branded or hung. If you stole tens of thousands of pounds you would probably end up as an Earl. Lawrence Stone’s comment (above) was written about Cecil’s family. It could be hoped that Stone, author of many excellent and detailed historical studies, was merely being sarcastic in this particular essay. But it seems unlikely as he took great care in this otherwise very cogent piece of research – an analysis of Cecil’s various corrupt practices – to fawn upon the then Marquis of Salisbury. Corruption, regrettably, has festered in all ages - even in Stone’s halcyon “England” of 1961. But even the passage of an additional fifty years from Stone’s *apologia* has still not halted the excuses. Pauline Croft, in 2004, considered that

…modern standards do not apply; in an era which did not pay adequate official salaries, it was expected that great servants of the state would reimburse themselves by exploiting their offices…

She also noted that

…There can be no doubt that he used his official position for personal financial gain on an extraordinary scale… after 1603 he acquired a fortune, and was greedier than his father had been…on his deathbed owed the huge sum of £37,867. He had borrowed a total of £61,000 over

---

851 Lawrence Stone, *Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England* - The Fruits of Office, ed. F.J.Fisher (Cambridge: CUP, 1961). p.113. Here Stone referenced Pepys entry for 2 July, 1664 which runs “After dinner sat close to discourse about our business of the victualling of the garrison of Tangier, taking their prices of all provisions, and I do hope to order it so that they and I also may get something by it, which do much please me, for I hope I may get nobly and honestly with profit to the King.” Pepys negotiated to receive £300 a year for the award of the victualling contract for Tangier.
the previous four years, more than half from the leading merchants of London. 852

Unlike Walsingham who was steadily bankrupting himself to carry out official business, Cecil’s main expenditure was in raising monuments to himself i.e. the greatest palaces of the day - Theobalds and Hatfield.

The excuse that illegality was prevalent pardons nothing, and the fact that the Cecils stole so much that time has not eradicated their wealth, is surely an indicator of just how accomplished the Cecils became at dealing “under the table”.

As an example of Cecil’s shady dealings, in January 1603 he wrote to Raleigh to invite him to join in a privateering expedition with Lord Cobham. It concluded

…I pray you as much as may be conceal our adventure, at the least my name above any other. For though I thank God I have no other meaning than becometh an honest man in any of my actions, yet that which were another man's pater noster would be accounted in me a charm… 853

By 1603 all Mediterranean nations were clamouring against English piracy and a series of legal measures had been put in place in response, with another more significant one, due later that same year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1599</td>
<td>Forbade attacks on Florentine and Venetian shipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1600</td>
<td>Forbade armed English vessels in the Mediterranean without licences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1602</td>
<td>Repeated the order of 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1603</td>
<td>Forbade all English piracies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65 - The End of Piracy, English Legal Actions

The letter of January 1603 is documentary evidence that Cecil, the Crown’s chief minister, was out to obviate the law and set up Raleigh and Cobham as the potential scapegoats for this particular piece of piracy.

853 Historical MSS. Commission, Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury xii. 599. 3. See L. Stone, “The Fruits of Office: the Case of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury, 1596-1612”, in F. J. Fisher (ed.), Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England, p.89-106. This deals briefly with Cecil’s interest in privateering and was the first notice of it as a significant phenomenon. For wider views and further references see J. Hurstfield, “Political Corruption in Modern England: the historian's problem”, History, lii (967), 6-34. 4. The core of the material is to be found in the Salisbury MSS. at Hatfield and the calendar, and in the records of the high court of admiralty in the PRO.
It is important to recognize that the system itself was, by any rational standard, corrupt from the top down. In such a world anyone making large sums of money had at least one foot on the wrong side of the legal divide. The Shakespeares were, as this thesis shows, no exception to this rule.

The following verse surfaced after Cecil’s death describing him as

Oppression’s praiser,
Taxation’s raiser …
The country’s scourger,
the cities’ cheater,
of many a shilling

The king's misuser,
The parliament's abuser,  
Hath left his plotting,
… is now a-rotting.854

A concurrent personal letter to the English ambassador to Venice sets out the situation

... the memorie of the late Lord Treasurer growes dayly worse and worse and more libells come as yt were continually, whether yt be that practises and juglings come more and more to light…855

Which has a curious parallel to Chettle’s

…in which there is pretty juggling, especially to blind law, and bolster usury856

England had, for a time, “become regnum Cecilianum”857


856 x ref. footnote 850

857 Croft Cecil
William in London - A Summary

[Every] …dog will have his day

Hamlet V, i

…At the kynes court, my brother, Ech man for hymself, ther is noon oother.

Chaucer, c.1386

As previously referenced at the beginning of this chapter, the careful selection of representative figures is crucial in gaining valid insight into the business environment in which William thrived. For example, select six or seven divines and one could erroneously conclude that Early Modern London was a serene, well-ordered place. To avoid this, the seven men in this chapter were chosen for the following reasons:

In four cases they have direct, documented links to Shakespeare in London.

Langley and Gardiner drew him into not a minor legal case, but an acrimonious exchange over money. For Shakespeare to be named first showed his commercial importance to Langley.

Chettle - in print - first lampoons Shakespeare and afterwards damns him with faint praise before sniping at all broggers and the business of “brogging”.

The high probability is that Wilkins co-wrote Pericles and Shakespeare was almost certainly his patron in having his other work performed by the King’s Men. Both men give depositions in the same legal case. Wilkins was a close friend to the family with whom Shakespeare lodged. The full extent of the relationship between Wilkins and Shakespeare - fraternal, commercial, or merely accidental - is impossible to quantify. However, there was certainly a commercial tie between the two that lasted for several years.

Of the other three, Henslowe and Alleyn were the most financially successful individuals in the theatre business. But this was an activity where seat prices alone


859 Anthony Parr, “Wilkins, George,” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: OUP, 2004). “Scholarship has confirmed Wilkins's authorship of the first nine scenes of the play, and has constructed a plausible narrative from initial collaboration to its first publication in 1609”.


859 Anthony Parr, “Wilkins, George,” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: OUP, 2004). “Scholarship has confirmed Wilkins's authorship of the first nine scenes of the play, and has constructed a plausible narrative from initial collaboration to its first publication in 1609”.

could not account for their own considerable wealth. That Shakespeare would have known them both is a given. A possible substitute for analyzing these men would have been the Burbage family where the exact sequence of events would have been different but the characters revealed would, almost certainly, have proved similar.

Cecil, the most powerful man in the realm, could be replaced in this analysis by almost any of the leading courtiers of his day. The choice could have settled on such men as Bacon, Coke, Topcliffe etc.. All three ended up in prison for theft and other reasons. Indeed, Topcliffe’s incarceration resulted from his having the temerity to say out loud what everybody knew - that behind the flowery verbiage it was every man for himself. But Cecil deserves his place in this chapter because he was the quintessential example of how to accumulate money in the Early Modern Period.

Cecil set the tone of the age. If the Shakespeare family acquired and kept money then looking at Cecil gives clues as to how wealthy Early Modern individuals conducted themselves. In short it can be summarized as - public virtue, private vices.

---

861 The notion is summarized by many in various ways, in this case it was taken from the title of an article: M.M. Goldsmith, “Public Virtue and Private Vices,” Eighteenth Century Studies 9, no. 4 (1976): 477-510. Others have at various times past argued that vice is necessary and presumably would have defended Cecil. The Dutch philosopher Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733) in 1705 published The Grumbling Hive: or, Knaves Turn’d Honest. This tells of total virtue creating a poor, ascetic society. He suggests that vices are the necessary engines of a wealthy and powerful nation. He wrote “private vices by the dextrous management of a skilful politician may be turned into publick benefits”. This proposal was not well accepted in Mandeville’s time as he himself put it, the proposal: “went down with the public like chopt Hay”. Alex Voorhoeve, “Bernard Mandeville,” Philosopher’s Magazine of the Internet, October 2003, http://www.philosophers.co.uk/cafe/phil (accessed July 5, 2011).
Chapter 6 – THE SHAKESPEARE FAMILY INVESTMENTS

…there is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination and engages the affections of mankind, as the right of property…only with Plowden’s reports…in the later sixteenth century…did references to property and *jus proprietatis* in land and to “proprietors” and “owners” of land begin to appear with any frequency…

William Blackstone 1766

As David Seipp noted, when writing of William Blackstone

…for Blackstone, this right of property was “that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe.”

Thomson conservatively estimated Shakespeare’s annual income between 1599 and 1608 at £55. This has to be balanced against the tangible (house, land) and intangible (title, tithes, housekeeper status etc.) investments totalling between £1000 and £1500 listed in this chapter, together with all the various living expenses of both himself in London and his family in Stratford.

The analysis of each of these is complicated by the common practice of undeclared or undocumented payments made in the Early Modern Period relating to taxes and property conveyances. Therefore, if anything, these calculations underestimate the cost of purchases as the intention behind deliberate understatement of costs was to avoid taxes and other duties.

What follows is a brief summary of each major investment together with notes on aspects of that particular acquisition which support or inform the core themes of this thesis.

864 Seipp, *Property* p.29
865 Peter Thomson, *Shakespeare’s Theatre*, 2nd Edition (London: Routledge, 1992) p.34. though as he notes “this [£55] makes no allowance for any special payment for the plays he provided, nor for the stronger possibility that he was allowed all the taking on a second-day benefit performance of each of his new plays.”
Gentlemanly Achievements
Date of Investment: 1596

Achievement: Originally an escutcheon or armorial device
…later a representation of all the armorial devices to
which a bearer of arms is entitled…
Oxford English Dictionary

Let this be so.

His means of death, his obscure funeral-
No trophy, sword, nor hatchment o'er his bones,

Hamlet IV, v

Lawrence Stone estimated that the total acreage of land taken from the Church
following the dissolution of the monasteries was a quarter of the whole of England. 866
He also observed that it was a time when the ruling elite were being “nudged by
newcomers” 867 i.e. those moving up the social strata, whom he collectively referred to
as “entrants”. The process of advancement driven by the massive redistribution of land
and wealth was recorded in every county and every borough. From a medieval world
where blood was almost everything, a new permeability to the upper levels of society
now clearly existed for the ambitious. Sometimes they came from the most modest of
backgrounds and 868

…had a clearer perception of the hazards of living beyond their means
and were more determined in their social aspirations… they were
therefore more cautious about adopting an expensive life-style…they
were staking a claim to status. 869

“Entrants” according to Stone made their money through “law, office or business” and
were comparatively careful with their new wealth. Though writing of a whole emergent
sub-class he could easily have been writing about the Shakespeares, so closely do their
actions follow the pattern he laid out. Having made one's “money” the next step was to
elevate one’s social class by buying gentlemanly status – obtaining a “Grant of Arms”. This
customarily involved the invention of noble ancestors or reference to some real or
imagined civic services caused by the applicant’s relations.

867 Ibid. p.111
868 Ibid. p.115/6
869 Ibid. p.116
Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Shakespeare Grant of Arms lies in the character of William Dethick the herald who made the grant.

...[he] became York herald by patent dated 24 March 1570. Displaying early signs of arrogance...he made three grants of arms under his own seal... he succeeded [his father] as Garter king of arms. He bribed the signet clerk to add a clause to his patent, dated 21 April 1586, allowing him to make visitations and grant arms, thus breaching the rights of [other] kings of arms... earning a severe reprimand from Lord Burghley. He surrendered [his] patent, but following Burghley's death in 1598 he produced a copy of the original one. He continued to make grants himself, including one to William Shakespeare's father, which was criticized by his fellow herald Ralph Brooke... In 1595 Dethick was cited in Star Chamber for having granted [arms] on the basis of a false pedigree...there were other charges of pedigree forgery too...870

The above summarizes a man who might be truly described as a “cad”. In 1573 he attacked the Chester herald's wife, “pushing her head into the fireplace with his boot... pouring hot ashes, alcohol, and the contents of her chamber pot over her head, and was only prevented from killing her by his cousin”. He punched his own father, stabbed his brother, and slandered and assaulted his fellow heralds. The seal was set on his character when in 1586 he reduced the funeral of Sir Henry Sidney, the former lord deputy of Ireland, to a shambles by striking

...the minister, and that of the countess of Sussex in Westminster Abbey...with his dagger, for which he was indicted at Newgate, though he escaped being charged because he knew the recorder...871

In short, this arrogant, foul-mouthed rogue would have been the first stop for any commoner seeking, in exchange for enough cash, a quick elevation of the family pedigree, merited or not.

For the Shakespeares, the sudden upsurge in status reflected the willingness and the capacity to pay over any other consideration. A playwright at the beginning of his career with only his theatrical earnings - especially one with a purportedly bankrupt father - did not have the financial resources for this kind of purchase.

871 Ibid.
New Place  
Date of Investment: 1597

Halliwell-Phillipps in 1864, noted that one visitor to Stratford in 1540 described “a praty house of bricke tymbre” constructed by “Hugh Clopton, major of London wherein he lived in his latter dayes and dyed”. With this statement the erroneous history of New Place was being recorded. Halliwell-Phillipps was quick to correct this particular piece of fiction when he concluded that no member of the Clopton family ever lived in the house in the sixteenth century. Yet this was not the last piece of romantic fiction the property was subjected to from 1540 to the present.

In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries even something as inanimate as William Shakespeare’s long-demolished house excited scholars. Indeed some of the most recent commentaries rank among the most inaccurate.

In 2005 James Shapiro in his book *1599*, described the building as

…New Place, an imposing house on the corner of Chapel Street and Chapel Lane, across from the Guild Chapel. It was the second best house in town, which Shakespeare had bought two years earlier for the considerable sum of £120. New Place was a fifteenth-Century, three-story brick-and-timber building. It was very spacious, with ten rooms warmed by fire-places, far more than the small family and any servants could have needed. The property also contained two gardens, two orchards, and two barns. Shakespeare’s recently acquired coat-of-arms would have been prominently displayed. In putting so much money into a huge home far from where he worked Shakespeare may have been trying to assuage his guilt over living so far away from his wife and daughters. He may have been thinking ahead towards an early retirement. Or perhaps it was simply a good investment, one that few in hard-hit Stratford were in a position to make.

Certainly Shapiro included some correct facts about the property and he had no hesitation in attributing idealized twenty-first century motivations to William.

---

873 Ibid. p.3
874 James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare: 1599* (London: Faber & Faber, 2006). Throughout reference will be made to an abbreviated ‘1599’ as different titles were used on either side of the Atlantic.
In sharp contrast there was the earlier 1963 approach of Eccles. C.J. Sisson in reviewing *Shakespeare in Warwickshire*, Eccles scrupulously detailed chronology of the Shakespeares, observed that

…He [Eccles] rigidly schools himself to the practice of pure fact-finding. Indeed, perhaps, sometimes he leans too far in this direction, leaving his reader to deduce the significance of his facts…The book is designed as a repository of facts certified by the documents cited in the Notes.

The facts listed by Eccles are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Eccles</th>
<th>Observation re New Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Shakespeare in Warwickshire</em> 1963, pp. 84/110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1567 he [Ralph Bott] sold New Place for forty pounds to William Underhill [Sr.] of the Inner Temple.</td>
<td>Documented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [William Underhill Jnr.] though he was imprisoned for recusancy …and indicted before 1592 | Documented – ‘a subtle, covetous and crafty man’
| The town of Stratford was suing William Underhill for tithe rent in 1597 when he sold New Place | Documented |
| [Underhill] ...Died of poison…on July 7, 1597 | Documented |
| His son Fulke was executed at Warwick …for murdering his father | Documented |
| …the second son Hercules secured a grant of the forfeited estates [in 1602]…Shakespeare probably paid a small sum to Hercules to clear the title | Documented but incomplete – ‘Shakespeare, paid a prescribed fee, equal to one quarter of the yearly value of the property’
| Shakespeare paid William Underhill sixty pounds, if the fine is right, for the house with two barns and two gardens | Documented however he could have gone on to note as did Schoenbaum “…the consideration mentioned is customarily a legal fiction. We do not know how much Shakespeare actually paid for Sir Hugh Clpton’s great house, however decayed this may well seem absurdly low…”
| Shakespeare may have repaired the house since a | The sale of the stone is documented, its

---

876 He does however continue: As a reference book, however, its use will be hampered by the want of an index beyond a bare index of names and places, except for a brief analysis of items under Stratford and William Shakespeare…Bearing in mind again the interests of future research in this field, we could have wished for some account of the scope of the inquiries pursued, and indeed for a catalogue of archives examined.
879 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.173
"Mr Shaxspere" either he or his father, sold the town a load of stone in 1598

Shakespeare probably settled his family at New Place during 1597

Thomas Greene … had lived in Shakespeare's House and set down in his diary what Shakespeare said to him

New Place is the only house in which the Halls are known to have lived

In contrast to Shapiro’s referencing of New Place, Eccles never bowed to the need for sensationalized commentary even when relating the most striking facts about the property.

The full history of New Place and the Shakespeare family's involvement with its various former owners and how the purchase and renovation were funded, all seem to have been either overlooked or merely taken for granted – even by Eccles.

William Long delivered a nine thousand word polemic on Shapiro and his book [1599] is not a scholarly study and should not be confused with one. Unfortunately, this volume is basically a house of cards. From a distance, the edifice is interesting and even pleasing. But a push here and there collapses the structure. Incorrect facts and unsupportable suppositions do not provide firm bases for supporting Shapiro’s contentions.

Long dissects almost every aspect of Shapiro’s writing becoming at times irritatingly petty. But if one sifts through the invective there are indeed numerous factual discrepancies between Shapiro’s hyperbole and fact. A few examples of these that referenced New Place included

---

880 However this is open to interpretation, there is also “Halls Croft”. Schoenbaum observed “local tradition holds that the Halls lived in a handsome half-timbered house in Old Town, close to Holy Trinity, and even closer to New Place … Today the house is called Hall's Croft, but I have been able to find no reference to it by that name earlier than the listing of “Hall Croft” in Spenell's Family Almanack, Directory of South Warwickshire, and Annual Advertiser, for 1885… When Shakespeare died, the Halls moved into New Place. There they stayed for the rest of their lives.” Schoenbaum, Documentary Life (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.237. Joan Lane in the current ODNB entry for Hall does not reference Hall’s Croft at all. See also Mark Eccles, “Review of: Shakespeare's Son-in-Law [etc.] by Harriet Joseph,” Shakespeare Quarterly (Folger Shakespeare Library) 17, no. 4 (1966): 432-433. In this Eccles commented: “there is no evidence to support the myth that he lived in the house now known as Halls’ Croft”. Eccles was reviewing: Harriet Joseph, Shakespeare's Son-in-Law: John Hall, Man and Physician (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1964).


...he [Shapiro] claims that the chapel of the Guild of the Holy Cross "had stood at the heart of Stratford's civic and religious life since the thirteenth century"...Shapiro would seem to be saying that this chapel opposite the side of New Place was the parish church...[but] Holy Trinity Church was and remains the parish church; it is where Shakespeare was baptized...at no time in its existence was the chapel ever the "heart" of religious and civic activity in Stratford.

...Hugh Clopton, the builder and original owner of Shakespeare's New Place, would have obtained a crick in his neck trying to see "the beautiful stained-glass windows" of the chapel from his garden. New Place...[was] effectively blocking any good view of the windows from any point in the gardens.

One also wonders what Shapiro fantasizes [that] he would have seen by looking from any angle at any stained-glass window from the outside. In natural light, from the outside a stained-glass window is just so many grey and black pieces of glass held in place by stone tracery or lead.

Long concluded

...I shall close with a sentence worthy of James Shapiro: "You get the picture; there's a lot wrong with this book." Shapiro's 1599, ultimately, seems to this reader to be a botched opportunity. An interesting, perhaps even an exciting, study could have been written about Shakespeare's artistic development in or about 1599; but to do so would have necessitated leaving out the froth and the suppositions, expunging the romanticism and the sentimentality...a path Shapiro, for whatever reasons, chose not to follow.883

Towards A New Description

The following is a new summary of how New Place came to be owned by William Shakespeare

Sir Hugh Clopton, former Lord Mayor of London and local benefactor, died leaving New Place to William Clopton. His son William Clopton [jr.] leased the house to former royal physician Dr. Thomas Bentley in 1543, but Bentley died in 1549 leaving the property, as Clopton [jr.] would later declare in Chancery, ‘...in great ruyne and decay and unrepayered’. In 1560 on William Clopton [jr.]’s death William Bott “occupied” the house and managed to wrest the title in 1563 from William Clopton [III]. It appears that Bott, when acting as Clopton’s agent, had been helping himself to the young Clopton’s legacy and the whole issue of fraud and malfeasance ended up in Star Chamber in 1564 and thereafter in Chancery.

883 Long, Review:1599
Bott appears to have been a generally untrustworthy character. One Roland Wheeler told him to his face in the Swan [the Stratford inn, not the theatre] that he was “a false harlot and a false villain”. Bott, an alderman in Stratford, was thrown off the Council for his assertion that “ther was never an honest man of the Councell or the body of the corporacyon of Stratford”\textsuperscript{884}. His place on the council was taken by the ambitious glover, John Shakespeare.\textsuperscript{885}

Bott sold the property to William Underhill (sr.) whose son William (jr.) described as being a subtle, covetous, and crafty man, sold it to William Shakespeare. That the ‘official’ purchase price of £60 was understated seems very probable\textsuperscript{886} – but simply stating it was £120, as some writers have done, is at best unproven. Additionally Shakespeare almost certainly made alterations (upgrades) to the house and a later payment to Hercules Underhill (brother to William) was required to clear the title. This was in 1602 when Hercules reached his majority, i.e. 21 years of age. Many authors have dismissed this event as a minor cost, “a prescribed fee equal to one quarter of the yearly value of the property”.\textsuperscript{887} That the title should need to be confirmed relates to William Underhill’s murder by his first-born son Fulke. Two months after the sale to Shakespeare, Underhill died mysteriously or ally bequeathing “all his land” to Fulke. In 1599 the heir, though still a minor, was hanged for poisoning his father.\textsuperscript{888} At this juncture under the law, the estate was forfeited to the crown as a result of the felony, however it was later regranted to Hercules. At this point the question of the validity of Shakespeare’s title was in grave doubt and necessitated the payment to Hercules.

Hercules was later knighted by James I\textsuperscript{889}, and though it cannot be assumed he was like his father and brother in temperament, we can surmise that he was no fool. Schoenbaum, though careful to record that he is “merely speculating” commented that Shakespeare, in paying off Hercules, was acting to “prudently safeguard his title to New Place”. However, he then went on to make the assumption that “very likely Hercules went through the motions at Shakespeare’s request”.\textsuperscript{890} Quite how Schoenbaum arrived at this latter conclusion is difficult to gauge. Hercules Underhill’s claim against the

\textsuperscript{884} James Halliwell, \textit{An Historical Account of the New Place, Stratford Upon Avon}, first (London: J. E. Allard, 1853).
\textsuperscript{885} x ref. footnote 331
\textsuperscript{886} Halliwell, \textit{New Place} p.19 “but I believe that the sums named in fines are not always to be depended upon” though he then concluded that in this case the fine might have actually been correct and reflected the very poor condition of the property.
\textsuperscript{887} Schoenbaum, \textit{Records} p.53
\textsuperscript{888} Ibid. p.53
\textsuperscript{889} Thomas Birch and Williams R.F., \textit{The Court and Times of James the First} (London: Henry Colburn, 1849). II p.48
\textsuperscript{890} Schoenbaum, \textit{Records} p.53
property would have given him a good, if not very good, legal position to extract much more than the equivalent of three months rent from New Place’s owner.\footnote{The legal position of conveyances made in good faith and for value was in flux in the English Law at this particular time. For example, in bankruptcy see Harvard Law Review, “Good Faith and Fraudulent Conveyances,” Harvard Law Review (HLRA) 97 (Dec. 1983): 495-510. “Fraudulent conveyance law has protected creditors by invalidating certain transactions that render debtors’ assets unreachable” was enacted by 13 Eliz., Ch. 5 (1570). The article continued “The Statute of Elizabeth is remarkably similar to modern fraudulent conveyance law in both purpose and language. The focus on intent in modern fraudulent conveyance law is derived from a similar focus in the Statute of Elizabeth”. The medieval notion of entail was being washed away by commercial realities and though bankruptcy may seem worlds away from confiscation post felonious acts, the concept of conveyance and good faith is common to both. Interestingly, by 1602, new legislation was being enacted that would start to clarify the position. Certainly Hercules had some legal basis for challenging Shakespeare’s ownership of New Place and it would be naïve to suggest he did not take advantage of this. See also: W. J. Jones, “The Foundations of English Bankruptcy: Statutes and Commissions in the Early Modern Period,” Transactions of the APS (APS) 69, no. 3 (1979): 1-63.}

Why this matters is twofold. Firstly, Shakespeare is seen to be proactively protecting his investments. Schoenbaum suggests he does so through an excess of caution - a position I cannot entirely agree with. However, Shakespeare is certainly policing this one most carefully. Secondly, whatever it cost to make Hercules go away, it was met comfortably from cash on hand as evidenced by the significant investments Shakespeare went on to make post 1602.

Returning to £120 being quoted as the purchase price. The first instance appears to be by Edgar Weiss\footnote{Edgar Weiss, Shakespeare’s Stratford (1928).} in 1928. Certainly by 1949 Frank Hill felt secure enough to assert that £60 was merely a “down payment …the total cost being £120.”\footnote{F. Hill, To Meet Will Shakespeare (Manchester, NH: Ayer & Co., 1949). p.235} By 2005 to James Shapiro it had simply become a factual £120.\footnote{James Shapiro, A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare:1599 (London: Faber & Faber, 2006).}

But where did the money come from to buy and refurbish New Place? Simply to state that Shakespeare must have been doing well in London to afford this hardly explains where even the £60 in silver came from. Halliwell-Phillipps speculated

…it is not impossible that Shakespeare gave a security for all or part of the purchase money of New Place by way of mortgage on the estate instead of paying money…when Shakespeare paid off the security in 1602, the second fine…may have become necessary…\footnote{Halliwell, New Place p.16}

But this was just speculation.
William Shakespeare’s wealth was greatly enhanced by his becoming part owner of the Globe and not remaining merely an actor and playwright. This part ownership occurred in two stages – the first in 1594 in becoming a sharer. But it was not till 1599 - two years after the purchase of New Place – that he became a housekeeper. In 1597 he could have hardly afforded the £60, let alone the cash to refurbish the property. That the Shakespeares had moved into the house by February 1598 is evidenced by a document (a “Noate”) of Shakespeare as a holder of corn and malt – the authorities were at that time recording and limiting amounts held by individuals due to shortages following three wet summers.  

Schoenbaum recorded

The house described as run down a half century earlier underwent restoration by its new owner [Shakespeare]…In his 1733 edition of Shakespeare, Lewis Theobald reports… that [he] ‘repai red and modell’d it to his own mind’.  

A £120 purchase price is manifestly unproven. However all the circumstantial evidence supports the notion that New Place would have cost Shakespeare considerably more than the £60 recorded in the first fine.

**Sharer and Housekeeper**

Date of Investment: 1594 & 1599

…William Shakespeare, whose decision to purchase a share in the Chamberlain's Men proved decisive, and whose ability to purchase it is surprising…

Peter Thomson

…but to be said an honest man and a good housekeeper goes as fairly as to say a careful man and a great scholar.

Feste, *Twelfth Night* IV, I

For Thomson, buying into the Lord Chamberlain’s Men was a significant step for the thirty-year-old William though he did wonder where the cash had come from to accomplish this.

To Chambers broadening the ownership of the Globe in 1599 was, on the part of the Burbage brothers, “hit upon [as] the device of binding the interests of some of the

---

896 SBTRO, Misc. Doc 1, 106
897 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.178
898 SBTRO, Item 1, Case 8, New Place Museum, Nash Place.
leading actors more closely to their own by giving them a share in these profits of the
‘house’.

Chambers, great scholar he was, seems unable to see any commercial
rationale. The fact was that the brothers were technically insolvent. The new theatre
had to be finished and the amounts expended by the family on the Blackfriars, which
would not really bear fruit financially till nine years later must have more than strained
their coffers.

Selling half the theatre was the only choice, and disposing of half to five known parties
who individually could never challenge the brothers, must have seemed the best of all
the bad options open to them. Chambers described the process

...[The Globe] was conveyed by lease to 2 distinct moieties. One the
Burbages held; the other was divided amongst five of the actors.
Subsequently it was several times redivided into a fleeing number of
fractions, according as one man dropped out, or it was desired to admit
another to participate in the benefits... this gave rise to some trouble,
owing to the remarriage of widows with persons who are not members of
the company at all... there was a rent payable to the ground landlord, and
to this each holder of a fraction made a proportionate contribution.

It is possible to conceive of this arrangement as an early workers’ commune – the
workers (actors) literally controlling the means of production. Political sentimentality
aside, the structure proved barely workable. This was documented in 1635, albeit in a
partisan fashion by Cuthbert Burbage, when the Lord Chamberlain was petitioned to
broaden the number of housekeepers

...at like expense built the globe with more sums of money taken up at
interest, which lay heavy on as many use, and to ourselves we enjoi
those deserving men, Shakespeare, Heminges, Phillips, and others
partners in the profits of what they call the house, but making the leases
for twenty one years have been the destruction of ourselves and others,
for they dying at the expiration of three or four years of the lease, the
subsequent years became dissolved [devolved] to strangers, as by
marrying with their widows, and the like by their children. Thus,... as
concerning the Globe, where we ourselves are but lessees...

901 Ibid. p.15 “on 4 February 1596 Burbage completed the purchase of the Parliament Chamber of the
Blackfriars at a cost of £600...he then began work on converting the building at once…”
902 Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, I. p.356
Table 67 - Shakespeare’s Ownership of the Globe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>% Owned by Shakespeare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/2/1599</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later in 1599</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605-8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/2/1612</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interest varying between seven and twelve and a half percent of the Housekeeper’s share of the Globe’s earnings made a sound addition to Shakespeare’s income – plague permitting. But this was not, in itself, the stuff to make him rich.904

The final word on the reality of the shareholding and housekeeping belongs to Thomson. The fact is, if the sharers of the Chamberlain’s Men were equals, [Richard] Burbage was more equal than the others.905

Land in Fee Simple
Date of Investment: 1602

…An I were so apt to quarrel as thou art,
any man should buy the fee-simple of my life for an hour and a quarter…

Romeo and Juliet III, 1

Here's the lord of the soil come to seize me for a stray,
for entering his fee-simple without leave…

Henry VI, Part II IV, 10

On May 1, 1602, William Shakespeare bought land in Old Stratford from William Combe of Warwick, esquire, and John Combe of Old Stratford, gentleman. The deed was “Scaled and delivered to Gilbert Shakespere to the use of the within named William Shakespere in the presence of Anthony Nashe, William Sheldon, Humfrey Maynwaringe, Rychard Mason, John Nashe.” For three hundred and twenty pounds paid in full Shakespeare acquired in fee simple (absolutely)906

…four yards of land907 of arable land … Containing by estimation One hundred and Seven acres be they more or less And also all the Common pasture for sheep horse cows or other cattle in the fieldes of Old Stratford

904 Ibid. Pages 68 & 69 contain a very erudite analysis of the question.
906 An estate in land, etc. belonging to the owner and his heirs for ever, without limitation to any particular class of heirs… in fee-simple: in absolute possession. OED
907 A yard of land (OE. {asg}yrd landes = L. virgata terra): An area of land of varying extent according to the locality, but most freq. 30 acres: commonly taken as = a fourth of a hide. The question of the extent of the hide has been much controverted. The general conclusion appears to be that it was normally = 120 acres; but the size of the acre itself varied. OED
aforesaid to the said four yard land belonging or in any way appertaining
And also all hades\textsuperscript{908} leys tyinges proffittes advantages and Commodities
whatsoever . . . hertofore reputed taken known or occupied as part parcel
or member of the same… now or late in the several tenures or
occupations of Thomas Hiccox and Lewes Hiccox…\textsuperscript{909}

As Schoenbaum noted of the last line in the above quotation, Thomas and Lewes were
…the tenants of the freehold; whether they stayed on after the ownership
changed hands is not known…five months later [Shakespeare] acquired
the copyhold title to a quarter acre of land, comprising a garden and a
cottage, on the south side of Chapel Lane, facing the garden of New
Place.\textsuperscript{910}

Chambers was silent on just how much rent (if any) was paid on the land. The question
of the rent’s possible effect on Shakespeare’s cash flow is exceedingly complicated.
Chambers notes that there was a Hiccox as a tenant in 1552. This was a freehold
purchase but there may have been a long leasehold rental on the property.

Traditionally, leases had been up to 1000 years though there were strenuous efforts on
the part of landowners to ratchet down these exceedingly long periods to permit the
rents to be raised periodically. A pre-existing lease may have been at a very old (low)
rate set when land prices were depressed. Paul Slack, writing of the middle of the
seventeenth century, put the national average for land at six shillings and eight pence
per acre but it would be foolhardy to suggest that this automatically was reflected in this
purchase earlier in the century.\textsuperscript{911}

The Combes also agreed to take additional legal steps to ensure Shakespeare’s title,
should these be necessary, in the following five years. A “fine” or “final concord” - a
fictitious legal suit to confirm a transaction\textsuperscript{912} - was belatedly started in 1610 in the
court of Common Pleas. This fictional legal action called for Shakespeare to have paid

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{908} Hades - A strip of land left unploughed as a boundary line and means of access between two ploughed
portions of a field; also, according to some recent writers, a small piece of greensward left at the head or
end of arable land upon which the plough turns. - OED
\item \textsuperscript{909} Schoenbaum, \textit{Documentary Life} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). p.188
\item \textsuperscript{910} Ibid. p.188 also E.K. Chambers, \textit{William Shakespeare}, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1930). p.110 and
111.
\item \textsuperscript{911} Paul Slack, “Measuring the Wealth in Seventeenth Century England,” \textit{The Economic History Review}
(EHS) 57, no. 4: 607-635. p.615 “The average rent per acre is therefore 6s. 8d., and at 18 years purchase
the total capital value [of all agricultural land in England] is £144 million.”
\item \textsuperscript{912} In the absence of a comprehensive land registry a pretended lawsuit was the only route available to
have transactions recorded in an official, legal manner. It also illustrates how amounts paid and received
could also be under or over stated to avoid or minimize taxes and duties as well as (the case here) when,
what was in all probability, a fictional payment was due.
\end{itemize}
£100 – in all probability this was a made up amount, but the court records duly showed the transfer of title. The fine listed described one hundred and seven acres of land and twenty acres of pasture, the same amount bought in 1593 by William Combe. The pasture, therefore, was part of the land he sold in 1602. The deed to Shakespeare conveyed land “within the parrishe feildes or towne of Olde Stratford”.

Shakespeare's will references property in Old Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe. In 1634, John Hall his son-in-law is referred to as having owned four yardlands [sic] out of seventeen and a half in “the whole town” of Bishopton.

Like New Place an earlier owner had been a Clopton. In 1570, William Clopton had sold this property to Rice Griffin. William Combe purchased it twenty-three years later from Griffin and nine years after that he sold it to William Shakespeare.913

The Moiety of a Lease of the Tithes
Date of Investment: 1605

In 1544, the ecclesiastical body known as the “College”, or to give it its full title Collegiate Church of Stratford-upon-Avon, possessed large tracts of Warwickshire including lands, buildings, and tithes. To protect the College’s interests, the Warden and Chapter, collectively its governing body, conveyed all their properties in a 92 year lease, the consideration for which was an annual payment by one William Barker (and his successors) of £122, 18s. 9d. The lease survived the College’s abolition and in 1553 Edward VI granted that the property would revert to the Stratford Corporation upon the lease expiry in 1636. The lease was inherited by John Barker who in 1580 transferred it to Sir John Huband914 while retaining an annual rent of £27 13s. 4d. for himself. This was in addition to the amount due to the Corporation under the terms of the 1553 grant. Barker had previously started to divide (by sub-leases) the total pool and one of these through Sir John Huband’s estate formed the portion that Shakespeare invested in. On July 24, 1605 for a consideration of £440, Shakespeare acquired from Ralph Huband of

---

913 On 28 September of the same year as the land purchase Shakespeare acquired a cottage which seems to have been a humble affair – Chambers thought it likely to have been “a servant’s dwelling”. A further cottage was purchased on 24 October 1604 in Rowington Manor (E.K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1930) II p.111/112). As the value of these would have been a very small portion of the total family estate I have not included it in the earlier calculations of William’s income nor listed in here as a separate purchases.

914 For reasons of consistency I have used “Huband” throughout as the spelling of the family name – this accords with Chambers however, many other writers including Schoenbaum use “Hubaud”.
Ipsley, a half-share (a “moiety”) in the “tythes of corne, grayne, blade, and heye” from Old Stratford, Welcombe, and Bishopton and in the “tythes of wooll, lambe, and other smalle and pryvie tythes” from the parish of Stratford, aside from certain tithes of Luddington and Bishopton and certain rights of Lord Carew and Sir Edward Greville.

Shakespeare's deed was explicit - for his moiety (share) he was obligated to pay seventeen pounds rent annually to the Corporation as well as £5 to John Barker (a disproportionately high share of the £27 13s. 4d.).

In 1925 Tucker Brooke\(^915\) presented a very detailed account of the overall financial picture of the Stratford tithes and how Shakespeare’s share related to these. Moreover, he gave a very detailed explanation of the Chancery Petition that he, Richard Lane and Thomas Greene initiated in defence of their holdings. Understanding their reason for this demonstrates clearly just how aware Shakespeare was of the importance of maintaining the fiscal structure that preserved their legal rights. His actions were those of a shrewd investor who was actively policing his financial interests.

It is important to recognize that Shakespeare held only one half of a particular tranche of these receivables - not half of the total as is sometimes indicated. The total pool, according to Brooke, was valued at an annual income of £473 16s. 8d. held amongst 42 individuals and divided into many individual holdings specifically related to a district, particular building or property. The portion Shakespeare invested in yielded £122 18s. 9d. p.a. of which he was entitled to half. Accordingly, his share was about one eighth of the total, yielding him at the outset slightly over £60 per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Est. Value £. p.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lane</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Greene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Carewe of Clopton</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward Greville</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir E. Conway</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Combe</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nashe</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (32) on average</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that the 32 “others” were a very disparate group based on the size of the holding and social status and education. Overall, the total pool had a wide degree of variance by average receivable size and what proportion of the individual’s total income the investment represented. For example, £2 a year for Sir Edward Greville would most likely have been insignificant compared to his total revenues - £60 for William Shakespeare would be material. This pool has, in the jargon of modern structured financing, very poor homogeneity or granularity.

In summary, the financial transaction was a purchase of leases of tithes for a specified period of time (till 1636) minus “rents” made on a periodic basis.

In a time without banks and no specific mechanisms for a whole range of financial transactions, this purchase was, even by present day standards, a sophisticated piece of financing. Shakespeare purchased a partial participation in a stream of cash flows defined as a fraction of a share of agricultural produce whose underlying price varied with changes in commodities determined by supply and demand. Moreover, there is an in built priority of payments with the “rents” de facto having a prior claim on the cash flows.

In a modern securitization a pool of cash flows (financial receivables), be they credit cards, instalment loans, mortgages etc., are pooled together in a financial vehicle, typically a company formed for this sole purpose. Using this as collateral, layers of securities are created, each layer having a different priority of payment from the next. Hence, if there are two classes of securities created, and Class A gets the cash first, then the premium (margin) on these securities will be reduced as the risk is presumed lower. This is because the cash will go to Class A first, leaving Class B with whatever is left after deduction of administration charges. Class B holders will only have bought into the transaction if they expect to make higher returns from taking a greater risk.

The following table compares the Stratford Tithes with a modern Collateralized Debt Obligation916 of 1989 – Freedom Finance B.V.

---

916 Collateralized Debt Obligation (CDO) is similar in structure to a collateralized mortgage obligation (CMO) or collateralized bond obligation (CBO). CDOs are unique in that they represent different types of debt and credit risk. In the case of CDOs, these different types of debt are often referred to as “tranches”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 69 - Two Structured Financings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratford Tithes 1605</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. £5 to John Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. £17 to the Bailiff and Burgesses of Stratford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service Costs p.a. to Anthony Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Residual Revenue to Purchasers 50% to W.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freedom Finance B.V. was a nominal (paper) Dutch company into which secured bank loans from the United States were conveyed before being used as collateral for two classes of Notes. Though the amounts are inverted, i.e. the larger portion in Freedom Finance is Class A vs. the Tithes where the Residual Revenue is larger, the concepts behind the two transactions are identical. Equally, the quality of legal drafting apart from the modernization of some legal terms is of a similar standard.

Indeed the sixteenth century drafting was, if anything, superior in that it documents the transaction in a much more precise manner than the later transaction.

Shakespeare was buying what in modern parlance would be called “Class B residual risk notes.” This transaction was appropriate for a sophisticated, knowledgeable investor who had confidence in the legal drafting and in the administration and accounting, as well as an excellent appreciation of the risks involved. Today, specialist legal firms and trust companies have made their businesses out of documenting this type of financial arrangement. Anthony Nash of Welcombe managed Shakespeare’s

---

or “slices”. Each slice has a different maturity and risk associated with it. The higher the risk, the more the CDO pays. See http://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/cdo.asp

917 No corporate relation to the UK’s Freedom Finance, a consumer lender. This transaction was arranged by Mellon Bank N.A., the Trustee was J.P.Morgan and the lead investors were Japanese clients of The Industrial Bank of Japan.

918 Shakespeare’s share.

919 LIBOR - London Interbank Offered Rate – the rate at which Banks lend (wholesale, in lots of $1,000,000) to each other in the City of London.

920 Backed in some cases by both tangible and intangible assets in addition to the individual borrowers’ promises to repay.
“moiety” interests. The legal drafting was by Francis Collins who would later draft and redraft Shakespeare’s will.

Shakespeare’s share was residual and would be computed after the rents (Class A) had been paid. In 1617 Thomas Greene sold his lease for four hundred pounds, well below his asking price of five hundred and fifty pounds for a similar share to Shakespeare’s. In 1625 the Halls, as William’s heirs, sold their share back to the Corporation for four hundred pounds at which time the net annual income stood at sixty-eight pounds.\footnote{After the £22 in rents had been satisfied.}

After Ralph Huband’s death, on January 31 1605, his estate listed a debt of twenty pounds “owinge by Mr. Shakespre.”

The Chancery Bill

Shakespeare and the two other owners in Shakespeare’s portion lodged a Chancery Bill of Complaint. Their argument was that there was no pro rata scale across the investors to apportion fairly the annual rent due to Barker.

Many investors had paid nothing at all towards the rent and unless another investor took on a disproportionate payment, under Barker's lease he could have foreclosed on the entire pool.

The complainants joined in a plea of equity to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. The suit (in 1610 or 1610/11 – the exact date is uncertain) was drawn against George Lord Carew of Clopton, Sir Edward Greville, Sir Edward Conway, Mary and William Combe, and Henry Barker.

Barker, as assignee of his father, travelled to Stratford in 1612 to testify about the tithes. The borough had offered to buy the Barker lease in May 1610, offering ten times the yearly rent, but Henry Barker was now threatening to repossess the tithes and other property (which his father in 1580 had leased to Sir John Huband) unless he received his full yearly rents of £27 13s. 4d. Here lay the inherent weakness in the legal structure - a disagreement about who paid the rents. Shakespeare was liable for “only” £5, as was William Combe, the holder of the other half. The balance of £17 13s. 4d. was owed by
others who derived land from Sir John Huband, and they “could never yet be drawen to agree howe to paye the residue: the said rente” so that “Richard Lane and William Shackspear and some fewe others of the said parties, are wholly… usually dryven to pay the same.”

As Brooke noted, no formal decision of the case has been found, but equally there is no evidence that Barker ever foreclosed. It is probable that some form of agreement was reached.

Another 20 Acres
Date of Investment: 1610

In 1610 Shakespeare bought, for £100, a further 20 acres from the Combe family, adding to his previous purchase of 127 acres eight years before.

Buying The Farm
Date of Investment: 1610

C.C. Stopes noted: “In Richard Hathaway's will of September, 1581. To his eldest son, Bartholomew, he left the farm, to be carried on with his mother”. To his six other children he left £6 13s. 4d. with varying conditions and Sir William Gilbert, clerk and curate of Stratford witnessed the will. She continued “The farm was not a freehold; Bartholomew did not become its owner until 1610…”

As Peter Ackroyd neatly put it

…In this period his brother-in-law, Bartholomew Hathaway, paid £200 for the farm and farmhouse at Shottery where Anne Hathaway had been brought up. It was their real family home. It was more than likely that Shakespeare helped his relative to find that large sum. Cymbeline was written at this time and [contained references] …to “buying and selling, value and exchange, every kind of payment.”

The Hathaways had long been copyholders (tenants). Bartholomew purchased the property subject to a chief-rent of 33s. 4d., from William Whitmore and John Randoll,

922 Mark Eccles, Shakespeare in Warwickshire (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1961). p.105-6
to whom the Manor of Old Stratford had been granted by the Crown, by letters-patent of James I.

On Bartholomew Hathaway’s death in 1624, the Shottery property came, under the terms of his will, into the hands of his son John, and a portion of the property together with the house known as Anne Hathaway’s Cottage remained in the possession of the family until 1838.\textsuperscript{925}

Dr. John Hall was overseer of Bartholomew Hathaway's will in 1621, and in 1625 he was one of the trustees at the marriage of Isabel, his granddaughter, the daughter of Richard Hathaway of Bridge Street.

**Blackfriars Gatehouse**

Date of Investment: 1613

Yes we did our bit, as you folks say, I’ll tell the world…

T.S. Eliot, 1932\textsuperscript{926}

The Dominican monastery in London had, by the Reformation, become a sprawling precinct between the River Thames and Ludgate Hill. The area became commonly known as the “Blackfriars”, reflecting the black robes of the monks. A “liberty” outside the city’s jurisdiction, yet within its walls, it had historically functioned both as a religious centre and as a meeting place for Parliament and the Privy Council. But with the dissolution of the monasteries its many buildings and land were divided up piecemeal and sold off.

In 1576, a lease was granted to Richard Farrant, Master of the Children of the Chapel, of the Upper Frater\textsuperscript{927} of the old monastery, to permit the “Children” to rehearse and perform plays in private prior to these being performed at court. The Children of the Chapel, as well as other children's companies, continued to perform there until 1584, when the theatre was closed. Gabriel Egan attributed the closure to “legal wrangles

---

\textsuperscript{925} Birthplace Manuscripts No. 86.
\textsuperscript{927} The eating or refreshment room of a monastery; a refectory. OED
between the partners,” 928 Roger Bowers to a “hostile landlord”, 929 while Joseph Q. Adams put it down to the bellicose character of Sir William More the property’s owner. 930 Whatever the interpretation of events in 1584, it is certain that James Burbage paid £600 for the property in 1596 and commenced its alterations into a permanent theatre venue for the Chamberlain's Men. However, local sentiment ran contrary to the plan, and the Privy Council acted to prevent its use by adult actors. Presumably boys performing represented less of a threat, for when Richard Burbage (the father James now being dead) was prevented from using the venue for the Lord Chamberlain’s men, he then leased it to Henry Evans, who had previously used the space for boys’ companies twenty years earlier. Egan noted that

...Evans's boys changed names and managements several times during their residency at the Blackfriars. In March of 1608 they gave a performance of George Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron* which offended King James and the company was disbanded, leaving the Blackfriars playhouse vacant. 931

This gave Burbage the opportunity to break the lease and, now as leader of the King’s Men, he renewed his plans for an adult theatre in the Blackfriars. In August 1608 Burbage formed a seven-man consortium of housekeepers for the theatre much in the manner of the Globe theatre housekeepers a decade earlier. This new group included the two Burbage brothers, Heminges, Shakespeare, Condell, Sly and Evans. But active playing did not commence till the final months of 1609 as plague had kept all theatres closed.

Shakespeare’s Gatehouse Investment of 1613

All investments generate a financial return, customarily expressed as a percentage over and above the principal amount. The rate of the return, which Shylock calls the “rate” and Antonio calls “interest”, 932 generally reflects the risk being taken in holding that particular investment. For example a simple deposit with a Bank, traditionally considered a “low” risk, attracts a much smaller “rate” than a speculative venture, such
as shares in a new company. To put it another way, the greater the risk, then, the greater the potential return, but the higher the chance of loss.

Individual investments generate their own rate of return commensurate with their perceived risk, a risk that can move up and down with markets as well as political upheavals, product substitutions (the steam engine was invented and the price/value of sailing ships collapsed) and preferences for particular asset categories, e.g. real estate loans over consumer loans. Lenders typically aim to reduce their overall risk by spreading their loans across several different asset and conditions of payment, i.e. loans of differing final maturities. One common transaction in financing large commercial buildings is “sale and leaseback” where the owner of a property keeps the use of a building while releasing the capital he has invested in either constructing or purchasing the building. The assumption is that the cash released by the sale of the building can be used to make more money even after a) deducting the lease payments (rents) that will now be payable, plus b) foregoing any future appreciation in the relative value of the building.

The parties to a sale and leaseback will be a cash-rich investor seeking a secured, long term, low risk, real estate related investment (the buyer) and, typically, a corporation with a successful business whose activities are generating a high rate of return (the seller). Selling one’s building is a means of raising capital without recourse to other alternatives such as issuing new shares in the company.933 A recent example of this type of financing was in 2009 when HSBC bank sold, but immediately leased back, its London headquarters from the National Pension Service of Korea (NPSK). NPSK is one of Asia’s largest investors who effectively became HSBC’s new landlord.934

The purchase of the gatehouse in 1613 was, in many ways, akin to this HSBC/NPSK transaction, with Shakespeare taking the same role as the NSPK, that of long-term landlord and investor.

---

933 Issuing new shares leads to equity dilution so a sale and leaseback may be preferable depending on the company’s perception of the relative costs of the two capital raising transactions. Equity dilution: “An increase in the number of ordinary shares in a company without a corresponding increase in its assets or profitability. The result is a fall in the value of the shares and lower dividends. The percentage of the equity held by each existing shareholder (and hence his or her voting power) will likewise be reduced.” “Dilution of Equity” A Dictionary of Finance and Banking, ed. Jonathan Law and John Smullen (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

934 http://www.bankingtimes.co.uk/15112009-hsbc-sells-canary-wharf-headquarters/ -
The acquisition itself was, according to Schoenbaum “an investment pure and simple…[but]…in some ways not so simple.”

As the conveyance (indenture) itself is key to what follows, a new transliteration into modern English is set out in the appendices. All following quotations from the indenture are taken from this.

Though Shakespeare was the real purchaser - he supplied the cash - there were three other “co-purchasers”: William Johnson, John Jackson and John Heminges – probably the John Heminges who was a member of the King’s Men. From the indenture

...Witness that the said Henry Walker (for and in consideration of the sum of one hundred and forty pounds of lawful money of England to him in hand before the sealing hereof by the said William Shakespeare well & truly paid, whereof and wherewith he the said Henry Walker doth acknowledge himself fully satisfied and contented, and thereof, and of every part and parcel thereof doth clearly acquit and discharge the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and each of them by these presents) hath bargained and sold and by these presents doth fully, clearly, and absolutely bargain and sell unto the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson, and John Heminges, their heirs, and assigns forever;

The fact that Shakespeare was the source of finance does not suggest that the other co-purchasers were not wealthy men in their own right. It merely sets out who actually paid for this particular purchase.

The indenture called for Shakespeare to make the payment in two tranches, one of £80 and, at a later date, a further one of £60. He was also required to lease the property back to its vendor, Henry Walker, by profession a “minstrell”. In all important aspects this was, from a commercial standpoint, a sale and leaseback where Walker got Shakespeare’s cash, Shakespeare obtained a long term investment and the Burbages and King’s Men put another property into “friendly” hands. Crucially, the three co-purchasers became joint owners of a property within the precincts of the Blackfriars. As far as the three co-purchasers were concerned, they could legally represent themselves

---

936 x ref.423
937 The £60 was by way of mortgage due the following Michaelmas though as Lee and other have noted it remained unpaid at the time of Shakespeare’s death.
and have the day-to-day running of the leased property without any legal need to draw Shakespeare into the process. In effect, they were acting as trustees on Shakespeare’s behalf.

Explanations for the Gatehouse purchase.

Various explanations for this complex conveyance have been suggested. Chambers largely ignored it, beyond reporting the facts of its existence. Sidney Lee asserted the aim was to reduce Shakespeare’s wife Anne’s rights in widowhood: i.e. it might have been a way to obviate her right to the widow’s portion of the property. Undoubtedly it had this effect, but the amount concerned was very modest compared with the Shakespeare family’s total wealth. Moreover, it would have been a most convoluted, public and expensive approach to achieve this modest result.

Lee in 1899 phrased it as

…He [Shakespeare] had barred her dower in the case of his latest purchase of freehold estate, viz. the house at Blackfriars. Such procedure is pretty conclusive proof that he had the intention of excluding her from the enjoyment of his possessions after his death…

But having made the assertion, one that boosts the notion of marital strife, Lee then immediately recanted this as proof positive of enmity between the couple:

….. But, however plausible the theory that his relations with her were from first to last wanting in sympathy, it is improbable that either the slender mention of her in the will or the barring of her dower was designed by Shakespeare to make public his indifference or dislike…

Another theory revolves around the building’s use as a place to hide priests and for other Catholic activities. Chambers wrote of the building being “at later dates a headquarters of Catholic intrigue”939. Later in the same work he noted.940

…The earlier history of the house is of interest… William Blackwell, town clerk of London from 1538 to his death 1569…married Margaret Campion, a kinswoman of the “martyr”. About 1586 Richard Frith, himself a dweller in Blackfriars, reported his suspicions of:

One great house in or adjoining to the Blackfriars, wherein Mr Blackwell, the town clerk, sometime dwelt… It hath sundry

---

940 Ibid. II. p.165-168 the above quotations have been edited. For the sake of brevity, I have modernized the inner quotation’s spellings as well as the text. Chambers presented these in their original form.
backdoors and by-way, and many secret vaults and corners. It hath been in time past suspected, and searched for papists but no good done for want of good knowledge of the backdoors and byways and of the dark corners...

The gate-house came to Mathias Bacon in 1590 and here the tradition of Catholic intrigue continued. The second [tenant] John Fortescue... was nephew and in 1574 servant to Sir John Fortescue, ... unlike his uncle, he was a Catholic. His father, Sir Anthony, was concerned in the conspiracy of 1562. ... In 1591 the priests Anthony Tyrrell and John Ballard, who himself used the alias of Fortescue, presented John and Ellen with “such stuff as we brought from Rome”. In 1591 “Fennell the priest doth use to come very much to John Fortescue his house”. John and his uncle were warned by Richard Topcliffe, the priest-hunter, of the risk he ran, and on 1 March 1598 the house was searched for hidden priests on a report [which] described it as having “many places of secret conveyance in it” apparently communicating with secret passages “towards the water”. Fortescue was away. His wife resisted the searchers, and, ... one of two priests who were there slipped away with Hugh the butler. An examination of Ellen Fortescue and her daughters produced admissions of recusancy, but denial of the presence of priests...

Chambers’ comments are voluminous, detailed and factually based. The same bias-free construction was not present when Mutschmann and Wentersdorf performed the same analysis.941 To their minds almost everyone ever associated with the building was either a Catholic or related to a priest and therefore, by implication, Shakespeare, in buying the property, must have held to the old faith.

Exciting as secret tunnels to the Thames and “dark corners” may be, there is no factual link here to Shakespeare and Catholicism. As noted previously, the Shakespeares had friends and business contacts whose religious beliefs ran the gamut from Puritan to Catholic and back again.942 Surely the simplest explanation is that the conveyance satisfied the aims of all the parties involved without the need for unstated purposes relating to relationships or religion, and it is in the conveyance itself and its underlying commercial aims that the true explanation rests.

To recap, Shakespeare got a long term investment though he had to rely on the honesty of his co-purchasers to protect his real commercial interests, i.e. he “owned” it all but relied on his co-purchasers to deliver back the whole sale price to him or his heirs when the time came. He did something similar to his father’s placing of property into safe

942 x ref. 153 et seq.
hands in the years following Proclamation 712. It is true that he was slightly better protected than his father had been in the case of the Asbies estate - he was one of four owners of record - but the technique was comparable. In the event, he chose his friends wisely as the cash from property was ultimately transferred according to his testamentary wishes.

But the co-purchasers William Johnson, John Jackson, and John Heminges\(^{943}\) also got something out of the transaction. By being actual property owners in the Blackfriars this gave them a say in shifting influence in favour of members of what can be called the “King’s Men and Friends” - I will use the term “King’s Men” hereafter in this section to describe this group - in directing the future of the precinct.

This transaction was probably part of the King’s Men’s attempt to gain commercial control of the area. Barroll made the observation in 1991 when he commented that after their father’s death in 1597

\[
\text{…Richard Burbage and his brother Cuthbert… continued to extend their Blackfriars holdings by the purchase of an interest in more property there, an interest whose fruition would have to wait upon the death of one of the other owners. Nevertheless, the Burbage brothers continued their purchasing program, buying more space in the Blackfriars structure in 1601, 1610, and 1614. There seems to have been some long-range (Burbage) plan here that did not necessarily involve drama...Surely the Burbage brothers must have assumed that any future public theatrical enterprise might be opposed by the residents as they had opposed it in 1596…}^{944}
\]

Barroll moved the notion of a long-term business strategy much further forward than earlier writers, indeed he felt that this was the case “despite what Chambers and later Schoenbaum have inferred.”\(^{945}\) Thomson concurred with Barroll and also remained open to the possibility that this may have been “a landlord’s determination to improve the precinct.”\(^{946}\)

\(^{943}\) Heminges - to avoid confusion I have used “Heminges” throughout this thesis. Thomson and Chambers both use “Heminges”. Halliday opted for “Heminge” though the one quotation in his reference to the actor is actually spelt “Heminges”. See F.E. Halliday, A Shakespeare Companion, Penguin (London: Penguin, 1964). p.213. The name is also spelt a number of other ways including Heming, Hemminge, or Hemnings see also http://www.britannica.com/shakespeare/article-9039961.


I would extend this notion even further than Barroll or Thomson. The proposition stands that, like both Langley and Henslowe, the Burbages, over a number of years, sought to control, either personally or through friends and associates, the business area and property surrounding the theatre. It is logical to conclude that they did so both to consolidate the operating viability of the Blackfriars, i.e. to resist attempts to oust the theatre by other residents of the quarter (as had happened in 1596), and to influence the Corporation against permitting any competitors to set up in business, other than on terms acceptable to the King’s Men.

Should the King’s Men gain the commercial upper hand in the area they would be in a position to

- trap the theatre’s related entertainment earnings
- protect against the local tenants trying (in the future) to have the theatre shut down as they had done successfully before in 1596 – because they themselves controlled enough of the neighbouring property
- prevent a competitor from opening another theatre in the area and/or,
- ensure continued access, particularly vehicular access, to their theatre.

The Co-Purchasers

Aside from Heminges, the choice of the other two co-purchasers was significant. William Johnson, landlord of the Mermaid, was one - and in examining the indenture one is reminded of the earlier Chomley/Henslowe proposed partnership where Chomley was to benefit by controlling food and drink sales at the Rose. The other trustee is less certain. Hotson thought that the John Jackson here might be the “shipping magnate of [Kingston Upon] Hull” who

---

947 It seems most unlikely that Burbage was buying property for a residence as the records of 19 February, 12 James I [A.D. 1614–15]. Sess. Roll 538/80, 83, 229, 230, 234. G.D.R. 2/44d. records “at the homes of Cuthbert Burbage [Burbidge] of St. Leonard’s, Shoreditch, gentleman, at Holywell Street…and for breaking into the house of Richard Burbage, gentleman, at the same, about twelve o'clock at night.” http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk

…enjoyed the company of noble wits at the Mermaid and was married to the sister-in-law of Elias James, a brewer at the foot of Puddle Dock Hill…

Concerning the gatehouse there remains the clear, documented purchase by

- a long term, passive, cash-rich investor (Shakespeare)
- direct links into the King’s Men (Heminges and Shakespeare)
- two individuals in the entertainment business (Johnson and Walker)

With a possible connection into the

- brewing, shipping and capital investment businesses (Jackson).

Schoenbaum, with no business background, finds the conveyance “not so simple”. However, it is much less complex if one looks at what the individuals concerned were seeking to achieve financially.

A New Theatre

What must eclipse coincidence was, as Chambers describes it, an

…authority…for the erection of a new theatre by [a] patent of 3 June 1615…within the Precinct of ther Blacke ffryers neere Puddlewharfe in the Suburbs of London.

The history of this new theatre - Porter's Hall - is unclear beyond the fact that its life was short, and that obtaining permission under the Great Seal suggests very substantial political or even royal influence. The prime mover behind it was an established musician, composer and theatre company manager - Philip Rosseter.

According to Ian Harwood

…Rosseter was appointed a court lutenist from midsummer 1604, at a salary of £20 per annum, with £16 2s. 6d. for livery. His wages, livery, and payments for lute strings continued until the year of his death.

Rosseter had access to the powerful at court. In 1610 he had been permitted to reconstitute the Children of the Queen’s Revels, the company previously disbanded in

---

949 Schoenbaum Documentary Life. p.223
950 Ibid. p.223
1608 after the performance of George Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron.* Initially they played at the Whitefriars, but the lease expired in 1614, hence their need for a new playing venue.

English Heritage maintains that this new theatre at the Blackfriars “in 1615 enjoyed only a very brief existence and was said to have been closed down the same year” and “while it was in use, the troupe of child actors known as the Children of the Queen's Revels, were resident there.” They go on to note “No further information exists regarding its structure, plan or materials used in its construction.” Andrew Gurr concurs with this but considers “Porter’s Hall playhouse enjoyed only a single performance, if that…”

In 1613, Rosseter had combined his own company, the Children of Whitefriars, with the Lady Elizabeth's Men, managed by Henslowe. Later that year this joint company performed at the Swan. Subsequently, they merged again, this time with Prince Charles's Men and then acted at Henslowe’s newly built Hope Theatre on October 31, 1614. In 1615 the company fell out with Henslowe and listed their complaints in

---

953 Egan, “Blackfriars” *Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. There is an apparent discrepancy here between Egan, who gives the date as 1608 and Harwood who states “Children of the Queen's Revels. The royal patronage had been withdrawn in 1606”. However it may be explained by the fact that two companies of boys were closed down: one in 1606 – The Children of “Pawles” [Paul’s] and one in 1608 the “Blackfriars Boys” see Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). p.344 for a fuller analysis of the time sequence.


955 English Heritage – see Glossary is a non-departmental public body of the government of the United Kingdom and functions under the National Heritage Act (1983). It functions as the Government's statutory adviser on the historic environment and its commentaries on historic sites are taken to be authoritative.

956 http://pastscape.english-heritage.org.uk/hob.aspx?hob_id=1511135#aD


958 This company of child actors performed under a variety of names at different times (see Glossary)

959 E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1923). II, p.469. This arrangement did not last long as the Hope at this time was being used for both baiting and playing as Gurr puts it “The Hope stank”. Gurr, *Playing Companies* p.121
“Articles of Oppression against Mr. Hinchlowe.” Many of their gripes were financial - that Henslowe had loaned them money on extortionate terms, that he withheld scripts that had already been paid for but, most significantly for this thesis, that he had “broken and dismemb'red five companies” in the preceding three years.

Chambers presumed that the demise of Rosseter’s new theatre was attributable to the fact that … the inhabitants of the Blackfriars, who had already had one theatre in their midst, thought that one was enough…

However, by 1615 various new owners of some Blackfriars and adjacent properties including the Gatehouse were “King’s Men” and it can be presumed that they would not have welcomed competition in what was practically an adjacent building to their own theatre.

Given the pressure from residents and property owners, the Corporation approached the Privy Council concerning an inconvenience [sic] in “Puddle Wharf.” The Council in turn referred the matter to the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Edward Coke. Coke, described by Chambers as “no friend of players”, duly produced a legal “wrinkle” which Chambers, perhaps rather generously, called a “technical flaw” - that the Blackfriars was somehow not in the suburbs for this purpose. Building work was stopped on 26 September 1615. Of course this contradicts the original reason for the Blackfriars Theatre’s location in 1596 – that the religious history of the property excluded it from Corporation control – but Coke never let facts get in the way of a fee. The Privy Council’s instruction to the Corporation confirming the suppression notice referred to the theatre as being “almost if not fully finished.” It referenced the “pulling down of a great messuage in Puddle wharfe” and “erecting a newe playhouse”. The minute of the Privy Council read

962 Ibid. 473
963 One might cynically but with justification add – “unless there was a fee involved”.
964 “By 1600 Coke was a very wealthy man with many possessions; he eventually owned at least 105 properties…he was extremely acquisitive.” Allan D. Boyer, “Coke, Sire Edward (1552-1634),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: OUP, 2004). This was a considerable fortune indeed for a man who, according to Boyer, when he set off for London to win his fortune “left with the horse on which he rode, £10 in his pocket, a rapier, and a diamond ring inscribed O prepare”.
965 Documents of Control CLVII dated September 26, 1615 – see also Chambers *Elizabethan Stage IV* p.343.
any of the patentees or their workmen shall proceede in their intended building contrary to this their Lordships inhibicion, and that then the Lord Mayor shall commit him or them so offending unto prison and certify their Lordships of their contempt in that behalf…

...persons that go about to set up a playhouse in the Blackfriars … have lately erected and made to fit a building which is almost if not fully furnished, … the same shall be pulled down so as to be unfit for any such use…966

From a financial standpoint this went far beyond merely stopping the building of a second Blackfriars theatre. By demolishing and then erecting a new theatre, Rosseter and his backers (who almost certainly included Henslowe and Alleyn) faced a double financial disaster - loss of income plus writing off the investment in the building. The “fig-leaf” in the complaint had rested on the issue of the noise of the new theatre disturbing nearby church services.

Defeated, Rosseter made sporadic attempts during 1617 to tour part of the Company now “of the late Queen’s Revels” but withdrew in about 1620, at which point the era of children’s theatre, effectively ended.967 By 1623 he was dead.

The whole matter of Porter’s Hall reeks of politicking and influence peddling – on both sides of the question. Though it is unlikely ever to be proved absolutely, the proposition remains that its destruction resulted from a long term and well-orchestrated effort on the part of the Burbages and others of the King’s Men (including Shakespeare) to protect their own Blackfriars Theatre.

Though it is speculative, the division of the £140 purchase price into £80 followed by £60 could reflect Shakespeare’s personal cash flow situation. £80 would be a likely sum for a payment due to him through his housekeeping income from the Blackfriars with £60 either the same or a known future cash payment from his tithes which were yielding about £60 p.a. at that date. In the event, he never cleared the mortgage. Smith

966 Minute of the Privy Council, M.S.C. i.374 see also Chambers IV p.345. I have modernized the spelling.
suggested this might have been due to the burning down of the Globe which would have cost him dearly

…At that time Shakespeare held a one fourteenth interest in the Globe and was therefore liable for a fourteenth part of the cost of rebuilding...£50 or £60 – that levy coming less than four months after his disbursement of £80 for the gatehouse.\(^{968}\)

The issue of why the mortgage was not redeemed remains moot.\(^{969}\) One small historical irony that has been noted by Halliwell Phillips and others is that

…at some time previous to his death, he [Shakespeare] had granted a lease of it to John Robinson, who was, oddly enough, one of the persons who had violently opposed the establishment of the neighbouring theatre…\(^{970}\)

It is merely conjecture, but who would have been better than Robinson to lobby against the proposed Porter’s Hall theatre?

**Summary**

The two following tables illustrate the sequence of events around the various incarnations of the Blackfriars’ theatres.

---


\(^{970}\) Ibid. I p.239, also Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars* p.252 & p.481 which contains a copy of the original petition.
Table 71 - The Blackfriars Theatres 1576 – 1608

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Open</th>
<th>Theatre Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Landlord</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1583-1584</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Sub-Lease – not permitted in original lease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>The Second Blackfriars Playhouse</td>
<td>Children of the Chapel</td>
<td>James Burbage dies February 1597 aged 67 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Burbage purchases the “Seven Great Upper Rooms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>The Second Blackfriars Playhouse</td>
<td>Children of the Chapel</td>
<td>Henry Evans Nathaniel Giles James Robinson</td>
<td>Richard Burbage</td>
<td>21 years at £40 p.a. plus Bond of £400 from Evans &amp; Alexander Hawkins (Evans son-in-law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>The Second Blackfriars Playhouse</td>
<td>(1603) Children of the Revels to the Queen</td>
<td>Edward Kirkham William Rastall Thomas Kendall</td>
<td>Henry Evans As Lessee but with continuing interest in the business</td>
<td>Follows Evans being censured in Star Chamber over the Clifton affair. Much legal wrangling between the partners follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>The Second Blackfriars Playhouse</td>
<td>Children of the Revels or Children of Blackfriars</td>
<td>Robert Keysar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Day’s Isle of Gulls forces out Kirkham, ensures name change of Company King closes theatre after Chapman’s play Duke of Byron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72 - The Blackfriars Theatres 1609 Onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Open/Close</th>
<th>Theatre Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1609 Closed 1614</td>
<td>Whitefriars</td>
<td>Children of Whitefriars</td>
<td>Robert Keysar Phillip Rosseter</td>
<td>Rosseter has “Children of Whitefriars” patent 1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Blackfriars Playhouse</td>
<td>King’s Men</td>
<td>Richard Burbage John Heminges William Shakespeare Cuthbert Burbage Henry Condell William Sly Thomas Evans</td>
<td>1608 Richard Burbage executed six leases one to each partner for a one seventh share for 21 years. The total rent remained £40 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615 Closed 1615 Licence Revoked 1617</td>
<td>Porter’s Hall</td>
<td>Children of the Revels, for the time being of the Queen’s Majesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The history of the Blackfriars as a theatre during Shakespeare’s lifetime can be characterized as hard-nosed businessmen jockeying for the earnings of a venue that could produce strong positive cash flow. The level of aggressive litigation among all the various partners is remarkable. When their various suits are examined it is evident that truth had very little to do with it. Side-deals were repeatedly made out of commercial pragmatism and not one of the parties involved was averse to doing another down if the opportunity presented itself. One example was that of Rosseter who, though he was ultimately to lose out to the King’s Men over Porter’s Hall, had just a few years earlier, connived with the King’s Men to stifle competition by paying Edward Pierce (see above reference to Paul’s Boys) not to perform. Another comes with a “Thomas Evans” being a new Housekeeper in 1608 to placate the residual interests of Henry Evans in the original 1596 lease.

The Blackfriars Gatehouse was a key part of the King’s Men’s business strategy – this is evident from the trouble they went to in acquiring it. The Blackfriars in the early years of the first decade of the sixteenth century was an unquestioned money-maker. Richard Burbage, pressed to turn it into an earning asset, had created his biggest

---

971 See Smith, Shakespeare’s Blackfriars p.426-559 which sets out many of these complaints and other useful transliterations of relevant documents.
competitor. Evidence for that comes from no less a source than *Hamlet*. “Shakespeare probably wrote *Hamlet* in 1600 …but the precise date of composition is uncertain…” so records Greenblatt and by 1600 the “Children” or “eyases” (young hawks) across the river were making financial inroads into the adult player’s income

Rosencrantz. Nay, their endeavour keeps in the wonted pace; but there is, sir, an eyrie of children, little eyases, that cry out on the top of question and are most tyrannically clapp’d for’t. These are now the fashion, and so berattle the common stages - so they call them - that many wearing rapiers are afraid of goosequills and dare scarce come thither.

Hamlet. What, are they children? Who maintains ’em? How are they escoted? Will they pursue the quality no longer than they can sing? Will they not say afterwards, if they should grow themselves to common players - as it is most like, if their means are not better - their writers do them wrong to make them exclaim against their own succession.

Rosencrantz. Faith, there has been much to do on both sides; and the nation holds it no sin to tarre them to controversy. There was, for a while, no money bid for argument unless the poet and the player went to cuffs in the question.

Smith goes further suggesting that

…Ben Jonson also bears testimony to the crippling effect of the competition presented by the Children. In *Poetaster*, acted in 1601, a character named Histrio, who serves as spokesman for the public theatres in general and perhaps for the Globe in particular, tells of a play that he plans to present

Histrio. O, it will get us a huge deal of money, captain, and we have need on't; for this winter has made us all poorer than so many starved snakes: nobody comes at us, not a gentleman…

…and since the winter of 1600-1601 was virtually free of plague, Histrio's complaint can be attributed only to the Children's rivalry.

Many reasons have been cited for the explosive rise of the reincarnated children’s theatre:

---


973 *Eyas* - A young hawk taken from the nest for the purpose of training, or one whose training is incomplete. OED.

974 *Hamlet* II, ii

• convenience, the wealthy could ride in their carriages to the theatre, leave the coachman outside while the performance was on,\textsuperscript{976}
• the likelihood of risqué or even scandalous material on stage,\textsuperscript{977}
• protection from the elements.

Profit is what accountants call the “balancing charge” – the sum that evens the scales between earnings and costs. Children were in no position to demand wages or shares in the business, especially when those running the theatre were vested with powers such as these:

\textbf{July 15, 1597}

\textit{Elizabeth, by the grace of God, & c., to all mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, constables, and all other our officers, greeting;}

For that it is meet that our Chapel Royal should be furnished with well-singing children from time to time, we have and by these presents do authorize our well-beloved servant, Nathaniel Giles, Master of our Children of our Said Chapel, or his deputy being by his bill subscribed and sealed so authorized, and having this our present commission with him, to take such and so many children as he or his sufficient deputy shall think meet, in all cathedral, collegiate, parish churches, chapels, or any other place or places, as well within Liberty as without, within this our realm of England, whatsoever they be; . . .

Wherefore we will and command you, and every of you to whom this our commission shall come, to be helping, aiding, and assisting to the uttermost of your powers, as you will answer at your uttermost perils.\textsuperscript{978}

Smith summarized the situation:

In recruiting boys for their company, the managers of the troupe had made occasional use of a commission that the Queen had granted to Nathaniel Giles, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal. In effect, it gave him the right to kidnap children for her Majesty's service as chapel choristers… There was nothing unusual about the commission or its issuance. Giles's predecessors had held similar writs from the time of Edward IV on, and perhaps even earlier. But Giles, or Evans and Robinson as his deputies, interpreted the commission more liberally than his predecessors had done; for whereas previous Masters had exercised the instrument only to recruit boys for her Majesty's service as choristers in the Chapel Royal, Giles and his colleagues

\textsuperscript{976} Thereby clogging the roads of the district to non-theatre going residents and worshippers alike – there is extensive evidence of this in related legal documents.
\textsuperscript{977} “Risqué” here refers to what some might term politically incorrect today. Adults in the theatre, including Ben Jonson, were put in jail for this – more difficult perhaps to put children in prison?
\textsuperscript{978} Smith, Shakespeare's Blackfriars p.180 and Charles W. Wallace, The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars 1597-1603 (University of Nebraska, 1908). p.61 n.1
exercised it to recruit boys for their own service as actors at Blackfriars.\textsuperscript{979}

It was the exercise of this power that almost brought the theatre to its halt and the Giles-Evans-Robinson combine to an end. The “egregious blunder” was in “picking up the thirteen year old son of an influential gentleman named Henry Clifton”.\textsuperscript{980} Clifton was so incensed that he took the matter to the Star Chamber. “The Replication of Edward Kirkham” makes interesting reading containing the following at clause 43

[Evans] …unorderly carriage and behaviour in taking up gentlemen’s children against their wills, and to employ them for players…\textsuperscript{981}

The “crime” it would appear was in lifting a “gentleman’s” child. Presumably if the impresarios had stuck to abducting the children of the masses, nothing would have been said about the matter.

Conclusion

It seems evident that even in 1596 James Burbage knew that an indoor theatre catering to the wealthy was potentially highly profitable. It took his sons nearly fifteen years to realize that vision. By 1613 the King’s Men at the Blackfriars would have been producing positive cash flow and guarding the theatre must have been a priority.

Shakespeare, by buying the gatehouse, was as T.S. Eliot put it “doing his bit”\textsuperscript{982} for his comrades.

Postlude – After William

Owning property in Blackfriars did not automatically mean the King’s Men were free of continuing attempts to remove the theatre. In 1619 a group of churchmen and officers of the precinct petitioned the Lord Mayor and Aldermen to close the Blackfriars theatre citing

…hackney coaches, bring in people of all sorts…that sometimes our streets cannot contain them …every day in the Winter time…from one or two of the clock till six at night…\textsuperscript{983}

The upshot was an Order of the Corporation suppressing the “Blackfriars Playhouse”.\textsuperscript{984}

But, by this date, the King’s Men were so well entrenched in Blackfriars, as well as

\textsuperscript{979} Smith, \textit{Shakespeare's Blackfriars} p.180
\textsuperscript{980} Ibid. p.182
\textsuperscript{981} Ibid. p.545
\textsuperscript{982} To do one's bit : to play one's part; to fulfil one's responsibilities or obligations; to make one's contribution to a cause or the like, esp. by serving in the armed forces. OED
\textsuperscript{983} Reproduced in full in Smith, \textit{Shakespeare's Blackfriars} p. 489
being integrated into the court of James I, that a new royal licence was granted and the question did not arise again till 1633. 985

One final twist comes in the complaints that culminate in the Privy Council sitting of December 29, 1633. This again refers to coaches in the Blackfriars but also mentions the trouble around an ordinance of the time stating that “no coaches may stand within the Blackfriars Gate” 986 In other words – if one were going to have a theatre in the Blackfriars then, from a commercial point of view, one would want to be able to control access for wealthy patrons in carriages. Hence any right thinking players would want to own not only the theatre space but also to know the gatehouse was also in friendly hands - someone that would not complain about the coaches nor bar access to the theatre itself.

---


985 Ibid. p.488

986 Ibid. p.499
Chapter 7 – THE SUMMATION OF THE EVIDENCE

It is a capital mistake to theorize before you have all the evidence. It biases the judgement. 987
Arthur Conan-Doyle, 1888

In this thesis I set out to examine if William’s theatrical activities could, alone, have provided the cash to support the Shakespeare family’s lifestyle and investments. This chapter draws together the various lines of research into one cohesive story. As it does so, it supplies answers to many traditional “problems” surrounding the Shakespeares and presents a financially credible explanation - a “theory” - of how events unfolded. This theory explains much and it does so without the need for ghost-writers, closet Catholics or any other Deus ex machina that have provided much entertainment over the centuries. The love of money may or may not be the “root of all evil” 988 but, for the Shakespeares, I would propose that the pursuit of money sat at the root of many things.

This Chapter is divided into three short sections:

1. A summary of the research findings divided into those focusing on
   a. John Shakespeare and Stratford,
   b. William in London,
   c. the Early Modern Theatre immediately before, during and after
      William’s professional career in London.

2. The conclusions drawn from the findings and,

3. A “Chain of Events” that summarizes how, based on this thesis, circumstances unfolded in the rise of the Shakespeare family wealth.

988 King James Bible: 1 Timothy 6:10 “For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”
THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

“It is a capital mistake to theorize before you have all the evidence. It biases the judgement.” It is ironic that it was not a lawyer but an Edinburgh doctor of medicine who articulated this great conclusion concerning evidence and presented it through the mouth of a fictional detective. Yet, that was precisely what Conan-Doyle did, and what many of the builders of the Shakespeare mythos have consistently ignored.

Given the size of the body of research already referenced in this thesis, it is inevitable that its findings should in many areas agree with some previous investigations, extend the scope or depth of others as well as present new data. To summarize my findings, I have indicated this division in each case, as well as defining the relative importance of each by commenting on whether I consider them to be of “major” or “minor” importance both to my overall themes as well as to the wider field of study.

John Shakespeare & Stratford

Major

John Shakespeare was indeed, as Nicholas Rowe stated, “a considerable dealer in wool” and was engaged in extending what would today be called commercial credit facilities in relation to his main business – at the time legally defined as usury. The prosecutions against him for illegal dealing and usury demonstrate this. An important new finding has been the position of his trading activities in the context of the national picture of the wool trading business. When those trades (the ones he was indicted for) are compared with others of the time it confirms his was not a marginal or small-scale business. It can be confidently stated that he was a dealer at a national level given the record of transaction sizes that match other top-level traders in terms of both weight and value.

Major

No record exists that John Shakespeare ever plunged into poverty or suffered any significant financial reverses. The only credible evidence is the timing of Proclamations intended to shut down illegal (unlicensed) trading in wool. Proclamation 712 of

989 x ref.360
990 x ref.141
November 1576 was followed by more strenuous efforts than had been previously seen to enforce control through local Justices of the Peace in twenty counties. Warwickshire was one of these counties. The timing of P.712 matches perfectly John’s last council meeting and his immediate withdrawal from public life.  

Major
The record of John Shakespeare’s public service up to the month of the issuance of Proclamation 712 is exemplary, as are the records of many of his long-term friends and fellow townsmen. It is not an exaggeration to say that he distinguished himself both as Constable and later as Chamberlain during the plague years. Though briefly acknowledged by other researchers, the detail of his service, much of which resonates through his son’s plays, has been ignored. Where it becomes crucial is in gauging the amount of accrued goodwill he retained with the Council even after he ceased attending council meetings. This is evidenced by the Council’s willingness to treat him far more generously than other non-attending councillors and other tax avoiders. Without the Council’s tacit support he could not have continued in business after P.712. Proof that he did, is evidenced in his continuing litigation extending at least until he was 69 – only two years before his death.

Major
In the process of preparing this thesis not a single, primary, factual document has come to light that links John or any member of his family to a clandestine maintenance of Catholicism during the reign of Elizabeth I. By “factual” and “primary” here I am referring to official records of any sort. As has been shown, recusancy is not per se Catholicism any more than it is extreme Protestantism. The only purportedly tangible evidence, John’s supposedly “spiritual testament”, now lost, was an original document supplied to Edmond Malone by a professional “treasure hunter” and John’s name was added in another hand from the original writer’s own. Malone was at first deceived by this though he later repudiated its authenticity. Indeed, there is documented evidence clearly showing John was, on more than one occasion, in charge of the removal of Catholic decoration and the disposal of Catholic paraphernalia. However, he maintained friendships with both Catholics and Puritans, the social and commercial bonds between the townsmen often eclipsing their “duties” to “foreigners”. This is not

---

[991] x ref.153  
[992] x ref.117
to say that its own cliques and factions did not, at times, rive the Council. As one closely examines the town’s records for this period it becomes clear that the dynamics of running the Borough were much more complex and widespread in scope than in a modern Borough. The operation of the Council and its officers functioned to replace most of the services that a central Government now supplies. For the townsfolk the operation of the council was a matter of life and death.\footnote{993}

**Major**

John was a lifetime litigator, starting in his twenties. He served as both attorney and judge and was himself indicted in one of the highest courts of the land. His legal activities match the patterns of other successful merchants of the time and there is evidence of his adept use of the law as a tool for both conflict resolution and as an offensive business technique. His skilful use of the law as a business tool is far beyond the scope of a small-town glover who fell on hard times.\footnote{994}

**Minor**

The case supporting his illiteracy is unproven – he signed with his own, quite carefully drawn, mark, as did many of his fellows in Stratford. Even if he were shy of writing, the two skills - reading and writing - were not viewed as inextricably linked at this time. It is possible that he may have had more than adequate reading skills but left the drafting of documents to others. His business and civic service activities show that he simply could not have been innumerate.\footnote{995}

**Minor**

It is highly probable he was a vigorous, well built man who in his early years was physically sound and capable of carrying out civic duties which at one time required him to arrest armed individuals. While he may not have been intellectual he was extremely capable and shrewd, as evidenced by the longevity of his business career.\footnote{996}

\footnote{993 \textit{x ref.110}}
\footnote{994 \textit{x ref.153}}
\footnote{995 \textit{x ref.176}}
\footnote{996 \textit{x ref.117}}
William Shakespeare in London

Major

The myth of Shakespeare the romantic, rags-to-riches player, can now be refuted as the improbable fiction it always was. A creation of the eighteenth century, it was greatly embellished during the nineteenth and codified (if not actually ossified) in the first half of the twentieth. Like many great theories, it falls before the observational, factual and numerical evidence.

That such a myth should have evolved, in a curious parallel to Dick Whittington, is not surprising. The quality of Shakespeare’s work when “rediscovered” in the eighteenth century deserved the literary respect and position it quickly attained. Perhaps we should not be too critical of Alexander Pope who began the purification of Shakespeare’s memory.

But the facts do not accord with the myth. Shakespeare could not have spent the money he invested, when he did, entirely through his theatrical endeavours. The numbers simply do not add up. Earlier scholars have, in varying degrees, commented on this. Halliwell-Phillipps knew that William could not have afforded New Place based on his theatrical earnings at the time.

Shakespeare’s theatrical income - notwithstanding his rare participation as an actor, writer, sharer and housekeeper - cannot fully account for the cash used to purchase the stream of investments in Stratford. This is especially true of those purchased between 1597 and 1605. The theatre-related activities of publishing, patronage, and touring could not have filled the earnings gap and there is no primary evidence to suggest that they did. Nicholas Rowe’s assertion of 1709 about the £1000 gift from the Earl of Southampton was mere fantasy – Rowe himself had no sooner stated the story than he immediately lampooned it.

---

997 As Shakespeare himself put it “If this were played upon a stage now, I could condemn it as an improbable fiction” Twelfth Night, III iv
999 x ref.256
1000 x ref.40
1001 x ref.364
Shakespeare deserves the honour of an honest assessment of all aspects of his life - financial, social and artistic - to better comprehend his work. Based on the research undertaken in the preparation of this thesis, it appears to be the first to quantify the “financial” component of the assessment.

**Major**

This thesis provides a commercially viable explanation of why the Blackfriars Gatehouse purchase took place and how it was documented in such an apparently convoluted manner. It was simply about money and business.¹⁰⁰²

**Major**

Shakespeare devoted much care to the selection and timing of his Stratford investments. Shakespeare was a shrewd investor, his purchases being made when prices were most depressed.¹⁰⁰³ The investments themselves were conservative, long term and tangible - they shun short-term gain or loss and have extremely low investment volatility.¹⁰⁰⁴

**Major**

The appearance of Shakespeare on the Wyatt/Langley/Gardiner writ is of major significance. Though many researchers have chosen to dismiss it as an irrelevancy, the fact is that it tangibly links Shakespeare to a noted known villain. A modern equivalent might be Alan Bennett being named before the Kray twins in a lawsuit. The suit itself is a prime example of a technique used to economically harass an adversary, and Shakespeare’s inclusion - amplified by his being named first - strongly indicates that Shakespeare was financially important to Langley’s business operations. The business relationship was certainly connected to the Swan theatre but was also probably linked to Langley’s alnager related activities. The Shakespeare family business had grown to incorporate the export of wool or cloth through London, and Langley’s ability to certify goods would have been extraordinarily convenient to the Shakespeares. This cannot at the moment be demonstrated beyond doubt, but it clearly merits further investigation.¹⁰⁰⁵

---

¹⁰⁰² *x ref.272*
¹⁰⁰³ *x ref.411*
¹⁰⁰⁴ “Investment Volatility” see Glossary *x ref.97*
¹⁰⁰⁵ Any proof will most likely be found in what William Ingram (and earlier Herbert Berry) referred to as the “documents in the Public Records office about Francis Langley that ought to be pursued.” William Ingram, *A London Life in the Brazen Age, Francis Langley, 1548-1602* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978). p.IX. *x ref.213*
Major
From the records we have of Shakespeare’s life in London, the documentary evidence supports the conclusion that he was, like his father, a tax avoider if not indeed a tax dodger.\textsuperscript{1006}

Minor
There are still those who question Shakespeare’s authorship. Mark Rylance, the first Artistic Director of Shakespeare's Globe Theatre (1995-2005), and the actor Derek Jacobi unveiled their “Declaration of Reasonable Doubt” on the authorship of Shakespeare's work after a performance of \textit{I Am Shakespeare}, in September 2007.\textsuperscript{1007} These are both highly respected figures in the Shakespeare “world” and therefore this “question” obviously still persists. Julia Cleeve for the “Oxfordians” reported on a Conference at Shakespeare’s Globe entitled \textit{Shakespeare: from Rowe to Shapiro} held on Nov. 28, 2009.\textsuperscript{1008} It is ironic that the conference title embodies both Rowe - who manifestly made up his biographical essay substantially on hearsay - and Shapiro, possibly the “loosest” of major modern biographers and a man then preparing a book on the authorship question.\textsuperscript{1009} Cleeve, unsurprisingly, concluded that the question still remained open. Shapiro’s book was published on All Fool’s Day 2010. Reviewing it in the Observer on 4 April, Peter Conrad, presumably wishing to preserve the ambiguity which is always “a happy hunting ground for the critic”,\textsuperscript{1010} concluded with the lines

\begin{quote}
…some puzzles – like that of how this nondescript provincial came to be the greatest and most elusively polymorphous of writers – are best left unsolved…
\end{quote}

This thesis contradicts this persistent irritant – Shakespeare’s plays are saturated with his familial experiences and intimate knowledge of Stratford. Two of the clearest examples of this was the deaths of Kathleen Hamlett and Jane Shaxspere.\textsuperscript{1011} The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1006} x ref.191
\item \textsuperscript{1007} Mark Rylance and Matthew Warchus, \textit{I Am Shakespeare}, directed by Mark Rylance, performed by Mark Rylance, Mercury, Chichester, 2007. See \url{http://www.doubtaboutwill.org/declaration} – the “Declaration” is still accepting signatories. By 8 November 2010 its website stated that it had attracted \textit{inter alia} 331 “academic signatories”.
\item \textsuperscript{1008} http://shakespeareoxfordsociety.wordpress.com/2009/12/07/sat-trustee-julia-cleeve-reports-on-shakespeare-bio-conference-at-the-globe/
\item \textsuperscript{1009} James Shapiro, \textit{Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?} (London: Faber & Faber, 2010).
\item \textsuperscript{1011} David Fallow, “Hamlet, Crowner’s Courts and the exhumation of rotted corpses,” \textit{Studies in Theatre and Performance} (Intellect) 31, no. 1 (2011): 113-120, p.114. Kathleen Hamlett was a girl who drowned in the Avon. The circumstances surrounding her death are more than coincidentally repeated in \textit{Hamlet}. On 8 June 2011 the BBC reported that “Dr Steven Gunn [Merton College, Oxford] has found a coroner's
likelihood that any non-Stratfordian could feasibly have known about either of these cases is so remote as to be negligible.

As this thesis demonstrates, the Shakespeares - father and son - were not “nondescript provincial[s]” but serious self-made men who created wealth through their own efforts and achieved a considerable measure of financial success and social position through both trade and the theatre.

Minor
Professionally, William deliberately maintained a low public profile avoiding incarceration and any discernible conflict with the law, beyond tax avoidance and illegal trading. The matter of his religious beliefs is interesting but only as a curiosity - the probability must be that he was largely indifferent to the question as, the primary materials indicate, was his father. There is ample evidence that of prime importance to the Shakespeares was money, social position and passing the wealth on to the next generation of the family. The absence of any handwritten material by Shakespeare is almost certainly due to a deliberate mindset on his part and contrasts starkly with writers such as Ben Jonson who went to great lengths to preserve and memorialise their works.

The Early Modern Theatre in London

Major
Virtually all Shakespeare’s contemporaries involved in theatre ownership ran other businesses on the side, albeit many were activities related to the “hospitality” trade – Henslowe and Alleyn are good examples of this. Both men were certainly brothel owners and were almost certainly brothel keepers, though this last activity may have been through employees rather than direct personal involvement. The notion that Alleyn’s wife was carted by some “accident” not connected with the family’s brothels is naïve in the extreme.¹⁰¹²

¹⁰¹² Report into the drowning of a Jane Shaxspere in 1569…the real-life inspiration for Shakespeare's tragic character, Ophelia.”
¹⁰¹² X ref.229
Minor

The debacle over The Isle of Dogs illustrates how the theatre and those who ran it were involved in the overall economic and political picture. This thesis reinforces this notion against attempts to see either the plays or the theatres themselves as islands distinct from what was going on around them. Ingram’s insights into Langley’s background have been fully supported and make perfect sense when added to other evidence accumulated on the subject of Topcliffe and how the Privy Council operated. It was, as has been shown, the Privy Council that paid the players for Court Performances and it is evident that its members would have been fully aware of the theatres, either through their patronage of playing companies, or in approving individual payments on behalf of the crown.1013

CONCLUSION: NEC MANIFESTUM

…a man stealing the property of another [furtum] was either manifestum or nec manifestum. It was clearly manifestum when the person was caught in the act; but in various other cases there was a difference of opinion as to whether the furtum was manifestum or not1014.

William Smith, 1875

Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Hebrews 11:11015

Roman Law has the interesting concept of different levels of culpability depending, in certain circumstances, on whether an act such as theft is incontrovertible - manifestum - or open to doubt - nec manifestum. As Smith noted (above) the problem of definition comes when an act moves from one category to another. Evidence often has the same difficulties, especially when it encounters conspiracy theories or myth. For some, no matter what is demonstrated, there will always be alien abductions, a second shooter on the grassy knoll1016 or someone else writing Shakespeare’s plays. Yet again one is reminded of Peter Thomson’s observation that ambiguity is “a happy hunting ground for the critic”.1017

1013 ref.440
1014 William Smith, A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities (London: John Murray, 1875).
1015 King James Bible, 1611
1016 The “grassy knoll” of Dealey Plaza in Dallas, Texas, is a small, sloping hill inside the plaza itself and is one possible site (according to conspiracy theorists) for a second shooter when John F. Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963. See: Mel Ayton, “Forty Years on: Who Killed JFK?,” History Ireland 11, no. 4 (2003): 45-49.
In the documented life of Shakespeare, the gaps and inconsistencies in the records have fed the creation of various conspiracy theories, religious fantasies and even suggested professions and foreign travel that, while entertaining, have added little to a credible analysis of his life and career. However, the facts we do have are, I believe, sufficient to produce a single, credible, coherent picture of a Renaissance man who was brilliant as a playwright, successful as a businessman and in many ways typical of an emergent self-made class of individual. Shakespeare represented the shift from his father’s early adult life of guild-based public service, to that of capitalist self-interest - a move from paternalistic medievalism to Early Modern capitalism. To comprehend the Shakespeare family, their commercial interests, together with their abilities in both making money and keeping it, had to be explained. What is proposed here is a single theory of Shakespeare’s life that rationally includes all the known factual data points that have, so far, been accumulated. Like all theories, it should now be rigorously challenged by other researchers to see if it supports its findings and conclusions. Scientific theories are held to be merely proposals until they have been replicated by others in controlled conditions and I see no reason why this new, financially based explanation should not be tested and modified if necessary, or indeed be consigned to the dustbin if it is found completely wanting.

No matter what this thesis contains, there are some who take on a religious zeal where their own views on the life of William Shakespeare are concerned. Nothing in this thesis will win them over and I have not tried to do so. But for those with open minds I have assembled evidence that follows the cash flows in and around both the Shakespeares and the age in which they lived. I have attempted to do so in a non-doctrinal fashion, not using personal or fashionable hobbyhorses to carry the argument. What is asked of the reader is to take the view of the legal “reasonable person” sitting in the jury in a court of law. The evidence can never be absolutely manifestum after the passage of four hundred years – even a trunk full of documents written in William’s hand and freshly unearthed would have someone crying “forgery”, whether they were genuine or not.
A Chain of Events

Based on the research summarized in this thesis, each link forged with factual evidence, I would propose the following sequence of events as the best description to date of how the acquisition of the Shakespeare fortune took place.

John Shakespeare went to Stratford where he became a glover. Even before his apprenticeship was formally concluded, he began to take an interest in wool broking and property ownership – the former having some legal licence through the tradition that glovers were tacitly permitted to sell the wool clipped from fleeces purchased for their leather. By the early 1570’s John had risen through the ranks of Stratford’s emergent middle classes by means of civic service and the growth of his business, which was primarily wool broking – he had become a brogger at a national level.

In business he was dealing directly with members of the aristocracy as well as the largest landowners in and around Stratford. Like the sons of other prosperous burghers, William Shakespeare attended school. When he finished grammar school William did what the sons of most of his father’s friends on the Borough Council did, he went to work for his father. The so-called seven “lost years” in William’s life were, probably, spent in informal familial apprenticeship in Stratford. Because of successive attempts to drive unlicensed broggers out of the market and for sound commercial reasons, in late 1576 John Shakespeare took his business out of the public eye and himself with it. He abandoned plans for gentlemanly status and deliberately assumed the lowest of low profiles, using the shield of apparent religious conviction as a tacit excuse. He also, crucially, stopped paying any taxes.

The profound shift in the mid and late 1500’s concerning wool production in England involved the switch from the export of the raw wool through regional ports to finished cloth through London. For the Shakespeare family business to survive it needed trustworthy representation in London – that is the most logical explanation for William’s move to the City.

William made commercial contacts on the family’s behalf, and like all businessmen of the age, those he met and did business with often crossed the line between legitimate
and illegal activities. Francis Langley is a case in point. Langley was, in his official guise, an alnager – a certifier of wool cloth and a most useful contact to a family in the business of wool broking and cloth export.\textsuperscript{1018} William’s poetry and playwriting was initially similar to, say, Leonardo Da Vinci’s interest in painting: i.e. it was an adjunct to his other interests. Leonardo himself wrote “I am no artist (to speak of) but ever since I can remember, I liked to draw”.\textsuperscript{1019}

As Shakespeare’s artistic career developed, giving him an alternative source of income he was able to move the family’s accumulated cash resources - predominantly illegally accumulated - into a series of purchases in the late 1590s and the early 1600’s, to legitimize the family’s assets and social position. By the start of the next decade he had semi-retired and for a few years enjoyed his family’s accumulated wealth, selecting lawyers and doctors as his chosen company.

None of this was accidental. William took great pains, like his father after 1576, to keep a low profile while avoiding the taxman at every opportunity. He took no steps to preserve his literary legacy but was punctilious concerning his investments and properties. This behaviour, in itself, speaks volumes. To understand him better we must recognize his own financial ambitions and examine how these and his own life experiences are intimately woven into his plays.

Leona Hemsley, the New York property tycoon, was a rare example of a tax evader who actually was imprisoned though this was only after carelessly remarking that “we don't pay taxes, only the little people pay taxes...”.\textsuperscript{1020} John and William Shakespeare both demonstrated how in the sixteenth century as the business classes blossomed, so too did the business of tax avoidance, and a family from humble peasant origins rose to wealth and position. William Shakespeare at his death was most definitely not a “little person”.

\textsuperscript{1018} J. P. Cooper, “Economic Regulation and the Cloth Industry in Seventeenth Century England,” Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Royal Historical Society) V, no. 20 (1969): 73-99. – Corruption amongst Alnagers was a problem that continued well into the seventeenth century see p.77 “trying to restrain abuses by alnagers” in 1608.
\textsuperscript{1019} Martin Kemp and Walker Margaret, Leonardo on Painting (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2001). p.137. One can put this statement down to excessive modesty on Leonardo’s part - but I believe he was being honest in how he saw himself - certainly painting only represents a tiny part of his total creative output.
Afterword

The advice from the character “Deep Throat” in the film *All the President’s Men* (1976)\(^\text{1021}\) was “follow the money” and that is what I have done.

But I personally prefer William’s earlier observation\(^\text{1022}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
  \ldots & \text{ Why, nothing} \\
  & \text{comes amiss, so money comes withal.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\textit{finis}\]
POSTSCRIPT - FURTHER RESEARCH

In 1989 Gary Miles was comfortable enough to make the statement in a respected academic journal that

…Shakespeareans have taken for granted the obvious: that Shakespeare's Romans reflect his own values and attitudes and those of his world

Miles’s article examined how the historical figures in plays such as Julius Caesar are portraying themes contemporaneous to Shakespeare’s own time rather than reflecting any attempt at historical accuracy. He continued

…as is well known, Shakespeare's chief sources for Julius Caesar and Antony and Cleopatra were Thomas North's English translations of biographies written by Plutarch, a Greek born sometime before A.D. 50 who died sometime after A.D. 120. Plutarch's Lives reflects the tendencies to stereotype, to polarize, and to exaggerate that are inherent in the propaganda surrounding his subjects…

Equally, when one reads Macbeth we do so with some acceptance that what we are reading is not even a pasteurized version of Scottish history written by Hector Boece, later adapted by Raphael Holinshed. What we read is diluted Scottish history used as thematic material for a play from the year of the Gunpowder Plot (1605) that deals with regicide and the dangers that surround the fictionalized story.

This thesis does not take issue with the Romans reflecting Shakespeare’s “values and attitudes and those of his world” but what it does assert is that as well as the stock characters and plots drawn from books there are two other key sources of both characters and settings.

- Real-world characters in London, past and (then) present.

---

1024 Ibid. p.257
1025 In 1527 he published the book for which he was became known, his Historia Gentis Scotorum (History of the Scottish People), The text was heavily influenced by a desire to pay tribute to Scotland’s James IV.
1026 Raphael Holinshed, Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, 6 vols. (London: J. Johnson et al, 1808). The 1577 edition was compiled by Holinshed and others, the 1587 edition was edited by John Hooker, assisted by others including John Stow. The 1808 edition was reprinted from the 1587 edition, with earlier excisions ordered by the Privy council replaced, and was edited by Sir Henry Ellis. Ellis noted that “the description of Scotland ... by Hector Boetius”. See http://www.archive.org/details/holinshedschroni06holi for the (1808) original now in the University of California Library System.
• Personal and familial experiences involving trade, money and the law.

The first of these is hardly a revolutionary notion. Many authors have spent considerable time, with varying degrees of success, trying to attach the fictional characters in Shakespeare’s plays to actual historical characters.

As an example, there is Falstaff who first appears in *Henry VI, I*

If Sir John Fastolfe had not play’d the coward:
He, being in the vaward, placed behind
With purpose to relieve and follow them,
Cowardly fled, not having struck one stroke.\(^{1027}\)

The real Sir John Fastolf was a career soldier who lived to the ripe age of 81. But unlike the cowardly Falstaff, his military record is outstanding, including service at Agincourt (1415), Verneuil (1424) and Rouvay (1429). In June 1429, after a battle at Patay,\(^{1028}\) he was indeed accused of cowardice by Talbot but was much later cleared of the charge. John Paston, a friend of Fastolf’s, described him in old age as being irascible, acquisitive and ruthless in his business dealings. In 1439 the real Fastolf did acquire a Boar’s Head Tavern in Southwark where he also built himself a residence. The tavern in *Henry IV* is also the Boar’s Head but is fictionally situated in Eastcheap. Fastolf died childless and litigation ensued over his will. The then Bishop of Winchester eventually obtained some of his estate which went towards the costs of the new Magdalen College at the University of Oxford.

The fictional Falstaff, had another historical parallel in Sir John Oldcastle, the original name used by Shakespeare. Oldcastle had been a friend of Henry V both prior to and after his ascension to the throne and had served with the Prince in Wales. While his military career was not quite as prominent as Fastolf’s it was distinguished. But Oldcastle’s sin was to be a Lollard\(^{1029}\) and after many opportunities to recant remained obdurate to what John Thomson called that “sect”.\(^{1030}\) He was hung in chains before being burned as a heretic.

\(^{1027}\) *Henry VI, I* i.i.

\(^{1028}\) Falstolf was, in the real battle, actually in the vanguard of a body of troops when the rearguard was attacked.

\(^{1029}\) “A name of contempt given in the 14th c. to certain heretics, who were either followers of Wycliffe or held opinions similar to his.” OED.

I have described these two biographical threads which both have elements of the fictional Falstaff not because the research itself is in any way new, but to highlight how Shakespeare “bridges” reality to fiction. In doing so he is relying on at least some of his audience having background knowledge of the history of the characters he fictionalized. I would propose that this process is going on between the playwright Shakespeare and different sectors of his audience on a continual basis. The audience at the Globe encompassed all social classes and some of these historical, social, legal or mercantile bridges are built into the text to access every kind of person in the theatre. This goes far beyond merely pitching a vulgar visual pun at the groundlings then a witty and cerebral bon mot at the galleries. It encompasses the entire social history that the audience could be deemed to know. The proof lies in the detail - why bother using references to real, but long dead characters, if it would be entirely lost on the whole audience? Certainly an argument could be made that this was mere expediency in that it was simply easier to copy straight from a book and not change the name. Yet, this does not fit with the constant barrage of what I would describe as multi-layered data being streamed at the audience. Whatever one’s class, in Shakespeare’s day, sitting or standing in the Globe there would have been, in Shakespeare’s plays, a “bridge” into the text being presented to you. By the nineteenth century, it had become a cliché to say that anyone could prove anything based on Shakespeare’s plays. One example of this appeared in 1897, …Shakespeare: Puritan and Recusant. An addition to Shakespearean literature, distinct and notable, and at this time of day! Mr. Carter being himself a Puritan, and the son of a Puritan, is delighted to find that Shakespeare was a Puritan and the son of a Puritan also. He seems to prove it, even amid the proverbial facility with which you can prove Shakespeare was everything under the sun…1031

To the audience of Shakespeare’s day these multiple bridges of common experience or emotion would have rendered the work engaging to the point that it was almost impossible to ignore. The term “enthraling” is much overused in contemporary usage, but here the word, with its underlying meaning of enslavement, is truly justified. Shakespeare then, and now, enslaves his audience.1032 He himself used the word: Titania dosed with herbal Rohypnol1033 is so enchanted she tells Bottom - So is mine eye

---

1031 The Expository Times, Vol. 9, No. 1, p.31-34 (1897)
1032 “To reduce to the condition of a thrall; to hold in thrall; to enslave, bring into bondage. Now rare in lit. sense.” OED
1033 A proprietary name for: flunitrazepam, a sedative and hypnotic drug…1997 The Telegraph. 5 Sept. 11/1 “Concern is growing that Rohypnol, a drug 10 times more powerful than Valium, is being used by men intent on rape or sexual abuse, to spike women's drinks.” OED
enthralled to thy shape. If in the twenty-first century, we find the plays compelling, containing a rich vein of commentary on the human condition, then how much more so would they be if we, the audience, understood even a fraction of the bridges built by the playwright? The conclusion is inescapable. If Shakespeare’s plays can be used to prove almost any thesis then that is because they contain elements of almost every thesis.

In such “a well foughten field” as the analysis of Shakespeare’s plays there is the question of originality. This thesis’s aim was to better understand, perhaps understand for the first time, the finances of the Shakespeare family. As Shakespeare wrote, he drew from both written material and life experience with the aim of producing a commercial product. Nothing in his history suggests he ever sought immortality through his work. Quite the reverse - money made, he returned to Stratford to enjoy the family’s winnings with his new friends, predominantly lawyers and doctors. Unlike Ben Jonson, he did not attempt to preserve his work. This was genius used for commercial ends. As such, the plays are crafted for the precise milieu of their performances. They are structured to strike chords with every member of his audience, though not all chords were similar or struck the same recipients.

This is not like Van Gogh who painted sunflowers whether people wanted or appreciated them or not.

This is not even Ben Jonson, who died with an estate of eight guineas yet somehow looked down on everyone who did not appreciate his genius.

Shakespeare’s plays are commercial products that have, almost accidentally, stood the test of time even when the “modern” audience of each successive era would have understood a decreasing number of the references to Early Modern political, religious or social affairs. The challenge for future scholars using the work set out in this thesis is to analyze - from a commercial standpoint - just how sophisticated the referencing in the plays actually was and what the subliminal messages being delivered really achieved with Shakespeare’s own audiences.

1034 Midsummer Night's Dream iii. i.
1035 “…in this glorious and well-foughten field” Henry V IV, vi
I believe the study of these “messages” and implied “speechless messages” using psychological tools from marketing and sales research could yield data on why Shakespeare’s work is so universally appealing, even to audiences that appreciate only a small fraction of its full contemporary referencing.

By 1935 Wright was noting that

…Shakespeare enriched his character studies and Jonson enlivened his satires with situations and motivations growing out of the application of [then] contemporary theoretical psychology…

Knutson, referring to the present, also touched on the psychological from what she described as “economists”. She described commercial playing companies in Early Modern London as being able to close ranks for commercial support when presented with a common threat or sales opportunity

…[in] the phenomenon economists now call “cluster marketing”…the manifestation of cluster marketing today include food courts in suburban malls, car dealerships on arterial highways between urban centers….

A Piece of Work

Shakespeare is not a God nor is his ground hallowed. Baconians, though perhaps misguided, are not committing heresy. Moreover, I agree with Evelyn Hall and would defend the right for everyone’s voice to be heard - no matter how much I disagree with it.

It is perhaps sufficient to observe that William Shakespeare, amongst many other things, was a very clever businessman. A researcher with multiple training in psychology, both current and of the Early Modern Period, and/or marketing and business sales as well as an abiding interest in the Early Modern Theatre could, I

---

1036 Merchant of Venice I, i “...sometimes from her eyes, I did receive fair speechless messages...”
1037 Louis B. Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England, Reissued, 1964 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1935). p.588 See footnotes 85 and 86
1039 Hamlet, II, ii
1040 “And may no sacrilegious hand, near Avon’s Banks be found, To dare to parcel out the land, And limit Shakespeare’s hallowed ground” David Garrick. Quoted in James Halliwell, An Historical Account of the New Place, Stratford-upon-Avon, first (London: J. E. Allard, 1853). p. Frontispiece
1041 J.M. Robertson, The Baconian Heresy (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1913). Baconian: “In modern times used with reference to the theory that Francis Bacon wrote the plays attributed to Shakespeare.” OED.
believe, produce a new “sales” analysis that would complement the financial and legal one started in this thesis.

Alexander Pope’s quotation opened this thesis, and his thought about William’s career and motivations is so apposite it deserves to be repeated as the starting point for further research.

Shakespeare (whom you and every playhouse bill
Style the divine! the matchless! what you will),
For gain, not glory, wing’d his roving flight,
And grew immortal in his own despite.\textsuperscript{1043}

\textsuperscript{1043} Alexander Pope, \textit{Imitations of Horace} (London: T. Cooper, 1737). I. ii. i. 69
\textsuperscript{1044} This thesis is (minus footnotes and abstract) 87,010 words in length.
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I - THE ABRIDGED INTRODUCTIONS OF EDGAR I. FRIPP

Richard Savage (1847-1924) was secretary and librarian of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust from 1884-1910. The Trustees of the Trust were incorporated by an Act of Parliament in 1891, later modified under the terms of the Shakespeare Birthplace Act, 1961. On Savage’s death his notes and research were purchased by the Trust. This body of work was used as the basis for the multi-volume Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-Upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620. This work was a long-term collaboration between Savage and Edgar Fripp, the first volume appearing in 1921, three years before Savage’s death. Prefacing each volume Fripp wrote voluminous introductions - part commentary, part analysis of the records that followed. When first directed to these by Mairi Macdonald of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, I was struck by the absence of a digest of how these records touched upon the Shakespeare family. The following summary is my attempt to remedy this situation.

The reader should remain mindful of the particular religious bias Fripp maintained in all his work. Notwithstanding this, I believe the abridged summary drawn from the introductions to the first three volumes (1553 to 1586) shows details relevant to the Shakespeare family, their friends and how the Stratford-upon-Avon of their day actually functioned.

---

1046 As at 6/2011 these are held as ER82, 547 files, Shakespeare Centre Library and Archive
The Town and People

Misdemeanours were usually connected with strong drink, though drunkenness does not seem to have been very common until the reign of James I. Wine was sold in taverns by vintners, beer in alehouses by tipplers. Both vintners and tipplers were licenced. Ale, largely brewed at home, was of a light quality and almost universally partaken of. Drink for sale, like bread, was regulated in price and quality and supervised by Tasters. Hops and ‘other subtle things’ were prohibited in beer. There were four inns. Ale and victualling houses were numerous and did good business on Market and Fair Days, when the town was very much alive.

The population of the parish was about three thousand, at least two thousand of whom would be resident within the town. Sanitary conditions were primitive and perilous. The authorities did their best to keep the streets clean and limit the refuse-heaps to the four or five public ‘muck-hills’. Periodic attention to the cesspools did not prevent contamination of the wells, and the stream that ran through the town was a frequent source of trouble. Infant mortality, to judge from the registers, was very high. In 1564, and again, in a much less degree, in 1578,1596, 1597, and 1604, the Borough was visited by plague. The streets had paved, i.e. cobbled, side-walks, which the adjoining owners and leaseholders were required to keep in repair. Heavy wagons drawn by long teams of oxen lumbered through the town, and in consequence of their damage to the roads their size had to be limited by order of the Chamber. It was forbidden to let ducks, pigs, or unmuzzled dogs wander in the streets.

They were both superstitious and religious. They believed in ghosts and fairies, in witches and the evil eye; they believed also in God and Christ and the Future Life as unquestioned realities. Religion was inseparably bound up with politics—with questions of the papacy and the divine right of princes, with episcopacy and civil freedom—and was a frequent cause of division and strife.

In 1403, when it absorbed the Old Stratford Gild of the Blessed Mary and St. John the Baptist, it consisted of Brothers and Sisters, eight Aldermen, a Master and two Proctors, and two or more Priests (as funds permitted) to say mass and offer prayers for the souls of the departed. Yearly the Brothers and Sisters elected the Aldermen, and these chose the Master and Proctors. Sir Hugh Clopton, who had prospered as a mercer in London, died a wealthy bachelor on 15 September, 1496, bequeathing his Stratford

1048 This Abridged version by David Fallow, June 2009. All footnotes have been added to aid in the reading of Fripp’s text. Fripp’s introductions have been used extensively in this thesis. This summary focuses on items relating to the Shakespeare family. To date, no other abridged version of these has come to light.
1049 x ref. footnote 491
property to his brother's grandson, William, including his “great house”, New Place, afterwards owned by Shakespeare.

At its dissolution in 1548 the lands and possessions of the Gild were of the annual value of £43.

The Court Leet

Prior to the Charter of Incorporation of 28 June, 1553, authority in Stratford was derived from the Lord of the Manor. For centuries this lord had been the Bishop of Worcester, but in 1549 Bishop Nicholas Heath parted with the manor to John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, in exchange for lands in Worcestershire. The same year the Earl made it over to King Edward VI, to receive it again in 1553. Thus the Court Leet of April 1548 was held in the name of Bishop Heath by his steward or seneschal. Sir George Throgmorton of Coughton, ‘but that of April 1552 was kept by the king's representative.’ Twice a year, shortly after Easter and after Michaelmas, the lord's steward summoned the freeholders and other inhabitants to a Great Leet or Law Day. A Jury of at least twelve ‘substantial and honest persons’, designated ‘the Twelve Men’, heard the presentments of the Borough officers and pronounced upon them. At the Michaelmas Leet officers were chosen for the coming year, namely the Bailiff and two Sub-bailiffs, two Tasters of Victual, two Constables, and one or two minor functionaries like the Town-crier and the Beadle. Punishment was by fining, whipping, or correction in the stocks, pillory, or cucking-stool. The Court had no right to imprison.

On the 29th April, 1552, the Constables, reported all well (omnia bene). The Sub-bailiffs, presented a townsman for drawing blood on another with a stick, for which offence he was fined 20d. with forfeiture of the stick, valued at 1d. The Tasters, reported five bakers, who were fined 4d. apiece, and twelve victuallers, all women and wives of townsmen, who were fined 1d. each, for breaking the assize, and no less than forty-five tipplers (retail sellers of beer), all wives or widows, who were fined 1d. each for serving their customers in unsealed pots.”

They also presented four innkeepers two vintners, seven butchers, six chandlers, two victuallers, and four salted-goods-sellers, who were fined id. apiece for excessive charges. Offenders against the bye-laws were five householders who had neglected to keep clean their portion of the stream in Walkers Street, including William Bragdon the curate and Richard Charnock, occupant of New Place 'through his marriage with the widow of the late Doctor Bentley, Physician to King Henry VIII ; four who had made refuse-heaps in front of their houses in the King's highway, including Richard Symons the deputy Steward, and three who had made a refuse-heap in an unauthorized spot in Henley Street, namely Humfrey Reynolds, Adrian Quiney, and John Shakespeare, future father of the Poet. They were all fined 12d. each. Seven butchers and six chandlers were fined 12d. apiece for selling tallow and candles contrary to order. Two bakers had to pay 3s. 4d. and 2s. respectively for selling bread under weight.

1051 The Court Leet continued for some time after the granting of the Charter.

“Yet would you say ye were beaten out of door;
And rail upon the hostess of the house;
And say you would present her at the Leet
Because she brought stone jugs and no seal'd quarts.”

_Taming of the Shrew_, Prologue 2
The ‘Twelve Men’ consisted of fifteen leading townsmen, [sic] some of whom or their wives were among the delinquents presented. The Affeerors, who fixed the amount of the fines, were three in number - one of whom was also a Sub-bailiff.\textsuperscript{1052}

As the parish of Stratford extended beyond the Borough, a second court was held for the outlying hamlets of Old Stratford, Shottery, and Welcombe. Each township had its Tithingman [under Constable] (decennarius) or its Constable. Old Stratford had both, and a Bailiff. The Tithingman of Shottery reported in 1552 omnia bene. The Constable and the Tithingman of Old Stratford presented three tipplers, who were fined 1d. each.

The Charter of Incorporation

After the dissolution of the Gild in 1548, a petition was sent to Edward VI by the leading townsmen praying for a Charter of Incorporation, which was granted.

‘Whereas', runs the royal grant of 1553, the inhabitants have had and enjoyed divers franchises, liberties, free customs, jurisdictions, privileges, exonerations and acquittances by reason and pretext of the aforesaid Gild, and by reason and pretext of charters, grants and confirmations by our progenitors to the Masters and Brethren of the aforesaid Gild and otherwise of ancient time made, which the same inhabitants cannot now hold and enjoy for that the said Gild is dissolved, and for other causes now to us apparent by the pretext whereof it is likely that the Borough and the government thereof will fall into a worse state if a remedy thereto is not speedily provided:

…whereupon the inhabitants have humbly besought us that we should extend our abundant grace and favour to them for the amelioration of the Borough and of the government thereof, and for the supporting of the great charges which they from time to time are forced and ought to sustain and support, and that we would deign to make, reduce and create the same inhabitants into a body Corporate and Politic, know ye that we do grant that the same Borough may be a Free Borough for ever hereafter.

Fourteen of the ‘better and more honest and discreet inhabitants’ were named as Aldermen, who should be able to choose and associate with them 'fourteen others to be called ‘Capital Burgesses’. Together they constituted the Common Council. Annually in September, before Michaelmas, they were to elect jointly a Bailiff and a Head Alderman, who should be Justices of the Peace within the Borough during their term of office. In place of the Sub-bailiffs two Serjeants-at-the-Mace were appointed. Constables and some other officers were retained, while others were added. The two Chamberlains or Borough Treasurers were to fulfil the duties which, so far as that large portion of the Gild estate which now became the property of the Chamber is concerned, were formerly carried out by the two Proctors. The Almshouse was to be maintained with its twenty-four inmates, who received 4d. a week and ‘commodities heretofore had’. The Grammar School was renamed The Kings New School of Stratford-upon-Avon and the Master's salary raised from £10 to £20. The clear yearly value of the Gild property handed over was £46 3s. 2d. A portion of the College estate also came to the Council (though the Chamberlains did not immediately have the collection and disposal of its revenues). Tithes to the value of £34 per annum were to provide the Vicar £20 a year for his salary, 40s. for his tenths, the rent of a residence, and £10 for his assistant.

\textsuperscript{1052} The ‘Twelve Men’, in terms of social status, ranged from ‘gentleman’ down to ‘day-labourer’.
To the lord of the manor was assigned the nomination of the Vicar and Schoolmaster, and the name of the Bailiff had to be submitted to him for approval. The Chamber, however, could choose the Steward, the Under Steward or Town Clerk, and the Recorder. The Sheriff of the County was to have no right of entry within the Borough. The Bailiff was to be his Escheator, Coroner, Almoner, and Clerk of the Market.

The market was to be held weekly, and a Piepowder Court on market and fair days for the settlement of pressing disputes. A Court of Record [i.e. a court which has a permanent record of its proceedings maintained] was to be kept fortnightly for the hearing of petty cases.

The Aldermen named in the Charter, no doubt in order of seniority or standing, are, with two or three exceptions, townsmen: at the head of the list was a Catholic and at the bottom was a Protestant.

This had been obtained, doubtless, through the good offices of John Dudley as lord of the manor and Earl of Warwick, now Duke of Northumberland and father-in-law of Lady Jane Grey, and care would be taken to ensure a majority favourable to the Reformation. Eight days after the signing of the Charter King Edward died, and Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed his successor. On the 19th July she was committed to the Tower. A month later, on the 22nd August, Dudley was executed, and the manor of Stratford passed to Queen Mary.

During Mary's reign the new Corporation recorded its proceedings in the manner of the manorial Court Leet. Symons's usual heading to them, 'Visus Franci plegii cum Curia et Sessione Pacis' becomes on the 14th October, 1557, 'Visus Franci plegii cum Curia ballivi aldermannorum et burgensium de Stratford'. And of about the same date is a book of 'Orders made by the Baily, Aldermen and Burgesses, being the Common Council of the Borough of Stratford'.

We gather that the Aldermen nominated in the Charter lost no time in selecting the Principal Burgesses. These included a wide range of trades including a: former Guild Proctor, draper, victualler, skinner, mercer, corviser, yeoman, ironmonger, victualler, fishmonger, baker, brewer, lawyer, and scrivener.

Religious Conflict

Evidences of the existence of personal feeling and religious strife among the members of the Corporation are by no means wanting. A fine of 3s. 4d. imposed in October, 1553, for reviling the Bailiff or other Queen's officer was raised in April, 1554, to 10s.

1053 (Law) An officer whose duty it is to observe what escheats [reversions of property to the state in the absence of legal heirs or claimants] have taken place, and to take charge of them. Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary, published 1913 by C. & G. Merriam Co.

1054 In England, a Court of Piepowders was a special tribunal organised by a borough on the occasion of a fair or market. These courts had unlimited jurisdiction over personal actions for events taking place in the market, including disputes between merchants, theft, and acts of violence. In the Middle Ages, there were many hundreds of such courts, and a small number continued to exist even into modern times. Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England in 1768 described them as “the lowest, and at the same time the most expeditious, court of justice known to the law of England” Halsbury's Laws of England: volume 12(1), paragraph 662, note 10; and volume 10, section titled “Inferior courts and tribunals and ancient courts”, paragraph 851 and following.

1055 A shoemaker - OED
with three days imprisonment the Council now possessing a Gaol Hall of their own in the High Street. On 11 October, 1555, the fine was increased to 20s. with three days' imprisonment. This day also it was resolved that any one who refused or forsook the office appointed unto him should pay £5.

The Book of Orders drawn up at Michaelmas, 1557, is full of vindictive penalties. Aldermen were to be fined 20s. and Principal Burgesses 10s. for absence on Election Day. Refusal to act as Bailiff or High Alderman was to be visited with forfeiture respectively of £15 and £12. Those who declined to be Constable or Taster were to be fined £5 or 40s. Non-attendance at an ordinary Hall would involve a payment of 6s. 8d., and failure to wear a gown1056 or join in procession a fine of 12d.

For disclosing the ‘words or deeds' of the Chamber the punishment would be for the first offence a fine of £5, for the second a fine of £10, and for the third expulsion for ever. Members were not to revile one another within or without the Chamber. They were to be ‘brotherlike' in Council, and to ‘depart in brotherly love’, under pain of 6s. 8d. And to say, do, or write anything prejudicial or derogatory to the Charter meant a fine of one hundred marks (£66 13s. 4d.).

Relations among members were strained, if not at breaking point. Protestant feeling was strong in Stratford as elsewhere in Warwickshire. The first two martyrs under Mary were Warwickshire men, and the third was the late Bishop of the diocese.

The history, imprisonment, and examinations, of Mr. John Hooper, Bishop of Worcester and Gloucester.

About eight o'clock, on February 9, 1555, he was led forth, and many thousand persons were collected, as it was market-day. All the way, being straitly charged not to speak, and beholding the people who mourned bitterly for him, he would sometimes lift up his eyes towards heaven, and look very cheerfully upon such as he knew: and he was never known, during the time of his being among them, to look with so cheerful and ruddy a countenance as he did at that time. When he came to the place appointed where he should die, he smilingly beheld the stake and preparation made for him, which was near unto the great elm-tree over against the college of priests, where he used to preach.

Now, after he had entered into prayer, a box was brought and laid before him upon a stool, with his pardon from the queen, if he would turn. At the sight whereof he cried, “If you love my soul away with it”. The box being taken away, Lord Chandois said, “Seeing there is no remedy, despatch him quickly.”

Command was now given that the fire should be kindled. But because there were not more green faggots than two horses could carry, it kindled not speedily, and was a pretty while also before it took the reeds upon the fagots. At length it burned about him, but the wind having full strength at that place, and being a lowering cold morning, it blew the flame from him, so that he was in a manner little more than touched by the fire.

1056 In other Protestant boroughs, like Leicester and Coventry, leading townsmen held back from office and refused to wear the scarlet gown, being of the colour of the Whore of Babylon: Revelation xvii, 4: And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH (King James Bible).
Within a space after, a few dry fagots were brought, and a new fire kindled with fagots, (for there were no more reeds) and those burned at the nether parts, but had small power above, because of the wind, saving that it burnt his hair, and scorched his skin a little. In the time of which fire, even as at the first flame, he prayed, saying mildly, and not very loud, but as one without pain, O Jesus, Son of David, have mercy upon me, and receive my soul! After the second fire was spent, he wiped both his eyes with his hands, and beholding the people, he said with an indifferent loud voice, For God's love, good people, let me have more fire! and all this while his nether parts did burn; but the faggots were so few, that the flame only singed his upper parts.

The third fire was kindled within a while after, which was more extreme than the other two. In this fire he prayed with a loud voice, Lord Jesus, have mercy upon me! Lord Jesus receive my spirit! And these were the last words he was heard to utter. But when he was black in the mouth, and his tongue so swollen that he could not speak, yet his lips went till they were shrunk to the gums; and he knocked his breast with his hands until one of his arms fell off, and then knocked still with the other, while the fat, water, and blood dropped out at his fingers' ends, until by renewing the fire, his strength was gone, and his hand clave fast in knocking to the iron upon his breast. Then immediately bowing forwards, he yielded up his spirit.

Stratford was encircled by the martyr fires - at Coventry, Lichfield, Gloucester, Wotton-under-Edge, Banbury, Oxford, Northampton, Leicester. Men well known in the district were victims, or close friends of victims and John Foxe the martyrlogist, late tutor to Thomas Lucy at Charlecote. Latimer had spoken of Stratford and Warwick in 1537 as the “blind end” of his diocese, but by the close of Mary's reign Stratford at least was a Protestant stronghold. Objection had been taken to the appointment by the Queen on 3 November, 1553, of Roger Dyos as Vicar over the head of Edward Alcock, late Subwarden of the College. Sixteen months passed before the Council agreed to pay him his stipend, and then they did so under pressure, in an elaborate deed in Richard Symons's best handwriting with initials in red ink, reciting at length the terms of the Charter as if in jealousy of their recently-acquired privileges. It was dated 7 February, 1555, the day of the arrival of Laurence Saunders in Coventry and of Bishop Hooper In Gloucester to be burned. Nor did the Council give Dyos more than ten months' salary of that due. Very different was their treatment of the old Schoolmaster, William Dalam. By the terms of the Charter the Schoolmaster was to receive £20 a year instead of £10. A new master was engaged, William Smart, a graduate of Cambridge and Fellow of Christ's College, and, as it proved, a Protestant. Dalam, who was old, was retained as his assistant, Smart receiving £13 16s. 8d. (less a contribution for four years towards reparations), and Dalam £6 13s. 4d. This arrangement was agreed to at Christmas 1554, Smart undertaking ‘to employ himself with such godly wisdom and learning’ as ‘God hath endowed him with’ and to ‘teach all such scholars and children as shall fortune to come’ fit for the Grammar School ‘godly learning and wisdom’. Whatever Protestant sympathies Dalam may have manifested in King Edward's reign, and it is unlikely that he would have retained his post if he had shown none, he was willing when the old worship was restored to say mass in the Gild Chapel and offer prayers for the dead. Smart escaped this duty by the arrangement made; and when in October 1555 the old man (senio afflictus) was relieved of his schoolwork a life pension of £8 was granted

1057 Foxe, Acts and Monuments. Foxe entered the service of William Lucy about July 1545, and while at Charlecote, on 3 Feb. 1547, married Agnes Randall, who was in Mistress Lucy's service, a daughter of Humfrey Randall of Coventry.
him, with use of a chamber next the Gild Hall, on the understanding that he continued to celebrate mass in the Chapel, and on the feast days in the Parish Church, ‘so long as he shall live and be lawfully disposed to the same’ (quamdiu xixerit cum ad hoc legitime dispositus fuerit). The Council evidently were of opinion that the disposition might again become ‘unlawful’.

Later, when the Steward, Roger Edgeworth, who was a Romanist, put on the screw, there was deep resentment. The Book of Orders of Michaelmas 1557 proves it, and fierce brawling in the town seems to confirm it. A quarrel which began among strangers at the market or September Fair spread to members of the Council. Master John Walsingham of Exhall and others, including two kinsmen of Principal Burgess Robert Perrott, a Protestant, were attacked by one Morris, manservant to Mistress Clare. Perrott took his kinsman's part and resisted with ‘opprobrious words’ the Constable, who happened to be the Town Clerk, Richard Symons, in the performance of his duty. Thomas Dickson alias Waterman, son of the Alderman of the same name, was involved in this or another quarrel, wherein he drew blood on the Chamberlain, Lewes ap Williams. These cases were reported and dealt with on Friday, 1 October, 1557, and the same day the following resolution was passed:

‘That no single-man dwelling in Stratford after Sunday now next coming do wear about him within the Borough or liberties of Stratford any bill, sword, woodknife, or dagger or any other such like weapon, under the pain of forfeiture of the same, and their bodies to prison, there to remain at the Baily's pleasure.’

John Shakespeare

In these days of conflict two neighbours were ending their lives within a few miles of each other, who associated as landlord and tenant interest us greatly as the grandfathers of the future William Shakespeare. Robert Arden of Wilmcote, son of Thomas Arden of the same, and probably grandson of Sir Thomas Arden of Park Hall, Warwickshire, owned the farm at Snitterfield which Richard Shakespeare occupied. Robert Arden had a large family of daughters. His second wife, the step-mother of these girls, was a widow, Agnes Hill nee Webbe, sister to Alexander Webbe of Bearley, whom he married some time between April 1548 and July 1550. He made his will on 24 November, 1556, bequeathing his soul, like a good Catholic, to “Almighty God and to our Blessed Lady Saint Mary and to all the Holy Company of Heaven”. Richard Shakespeare, if we may recognize the father in his son, took the opposite side in religion, and followed the lord of the manor of Snitterfield, the Puritan John Hales. His grandfather had received a grant of land, probably for service at the Battle of Bosworth,\(^{1058}\) which may have descended to an uncle at Balsall. He, at any rate, was a tenant farmer, holding the chief portion of Robert Arden's estate in Snitterfield. He had two sons, John and Henry, and apparently kinsmen, John, Thomas, and Anthony Shakespeare, who lived at Snitterfield. A sister of Richard Shakespeare may have been the mother, or his daughter may have been the wife of Thomas Greene of Warwick, a mercer in the High Pavement, who died in July 1590, and whose son, afterwards Town Clerk of Stratford, and a friend of William Shakespeare, called himself Thomas Greene alias Shakespeare. The two John Shakespeares must not be confused with one another,

\(^{1058}\) There seems no good reason to doubt the statement in the grant of 1599 by the College of Heralds, probably made on the authority of the poet, ‘that John Shakespere, now of Stratford vpon Avon in the countie of Warwick, gent., whose parent great-grandfather and late antecessor for his faithful and approved service to the late . . . King Henry VII . . . was advanced and rewarded with lands and tenements given to him in those parts of Warwickshire.’
nor with a third John Shakespeare, probably also a kinsman, son of Thomas Shakespeare of Warwick, a shoemaker, and owner of land at Balsall. The third John Shakespeare followed his father's craft at Warwick, in a house in the Market Place, then at Stratford, where he married the fairly well-to-do widow of Thomas Roberts of Bridge Street, and again at Warwick, where he died in February 1624. The second John Shakespeare removed from Snitterfield to Clifford Chambers, where he married on 15 October, 1560, a widow with some possessions, Julian Hobbins, and where he died in October 1610.

The first John Shakespeare and eldest of the three, son to Richard Shakespeare, died in 1601. Born about 1528, he was apprenticed to a glover and whittawer, no doubt in Stratford, where his father had friends and he himself became speedily a trusted and leading townsman. A neighbour of his father in Snitterfield was John Townsend of the Wold, whose daughter, Joan, was wife of Thomas Dickson alias Waterman, glover and whittawer in Bridge Street, Stratford. It is not unlikely that John Shakespeare entered the service and household of Thomas Dickson, who was appointed an Alderman of the Borough by the Charter of 1553, and was able to help his old apprentice to a good position in the town.

John Shakespeare would serve his seven years and, becoming a householder, would set up for himself, paying 6s.8d. for his ‘freedom to the Mystery, Craft, or Occupation of the Glovers, Whittawer, and Collar makers, of which it was necessary to be a member. Four times a year he paid his 2d. ‘quartering’. The brotherhood met in their Hall, on dates arranged, for the consideration of matters affecting their ‘commodity’, on the summons of their beadle or reeve. Absence involved a fine of 12d., and refusal to attend of 6s.8d. Summons was issued in the name of the Master and Warden, who were elected annually on the first Wednesday after Michaelmas, when the Accounts were presented. Half the fees and fines went to the Borough Council, by whom the rules and proceedings of the Mystery were authorized. The rights of the craft and its individual members were carefully safeguarded. Skins of sheep and lambs were not to be purchased before removal from the beast and dressing, nor were kid skins, calves' skins, or any skins used in the trade to be bought before exposure in the Market Place, or within fifty feet of the same in the open street, nor were they to be laid out for sale before 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

Horse-hides and skins of swine and dogs were not to be sold to tanners, and butchers had to bring the skins of sheep and lambs with the flesh to market. The glovers’ standing-place on market-days was at the old, quaint Market Cross. Here on Thursdays the Poet's father met his customers. Rules were strict with regard to apprentices. Any boy taken into employment and instructed in the business must serve for seven years, after signing his indenture in the presence of the Bailiff and Steward of the Borough. The engagement was a binding one on both apprentice and master, with right of complaint by either to the Bailiff.

Incidentally John Shakespeare had to do with wool and meat, whence the legends that he was a woolstapler and a butcher. He was a yeoman as well as a glover, and farmed land at Snitterfield with his father, later at Ingon probably with his brother Henry. Many of the Stratford tradesmen were yeomen. In April 1552 John Shakespeare was fined  

1059 So it was in 1618 and no doubt long before. On the 6th November, 1618, it was agreed by the Council ‘that the seven glovers which by the High Cross have their standings shall have their standings to the midst of the Street at their common charges’ (Council Book B, p.364). This would indicate an almost prescriptive right here.
with Adrian Quiney and Humphrey Reynolds for making a muck-hill ‘in an unauthorized
spot in Henley Street’, where he probably lived, in one of two houses he subsequently
owned and occupied.

Four years later he comes conspicuously into view. He was sued in the Court of Record
by Thomas Siche of Armscote for the large sum of £8. The case lasted through four
sittings and resulted in his favour, being allowed to go by default on the 12th August,
1556. He pleaded that he had justly used physical force on the plaintiff. In September he
was elected a Taster. The office was one of trust and the usual first step in municipal
promotion. ‘Able persons and discreet’ is the qualification in the Leet Book at
Coventry. In Leicester they promised:

‘We shall duly and truly search and assay, and that which is good we shall able, and that
that is ill we shall not able, and we shall not let for favour or for hatred, kin or alliance,
but we shall do euen right and punish as our minds and consciences will serve.’

Nor was their duty a light one if, as at Banbury, they made ‘weekly and diligent search’.
The same month John Shakespeare was named as attorney in the Court of
Record for Richard Lane — ‘Goodman Lane’ as he was called, a victualler and yeoman
in Bridgetown (at the other end of Stratford Bridge) and tenant of the old Gild garden
—but he declined to act.'

At the Court Leet of 2 October John Shakespeare was presented as having purchased a
tenement in Henley Street, with a garden adjoining, from Edward West, and a tenement
in Greenhill Street, with garden and croft, from George Turner. The chief-rent of the
former, which was 6d., enables us to identify it with the eastern house of the two above
referred to.

On 19 November he sued his friend, Henry Field the tanner of Back Bridge Street, for
the non-delivery of 18 quarters of barley; and the same day he was appointed arbiter by
the Court in an action brought by William Brace, a draper in Corn Street, against a
miller, William Rawson. His suit against Field occupied four sittings and ended
apparently in arbitration. The purchase of barley shows his interest in agriculture,
possibly in malting, though he is never mentioned as owning malt. He was a yeoman of
Snitterfield until 1561. By farming and glove-making he prospered during his
bachelorship. He may have known Mary Arden, daughter of his father's landlord, for
years before he married her, perhaps from her childhood. He was certainly a good deal
her senior. He was the eldest son and she the youngest daughter of contemporaries, and
she came at the end of a large family. He lived to be over 70, and she survived him [by]
seven years. In the spring or summer of 1557, after a wedding celebrated most probably
at Aston Cantlow, he brought her to Henley Street. It is worth observing that he was
fined on 2 June for having failed to attend as Taster at three sittings of the Court of
Record. This is unlike an aspirant to Borough honours, and very unlike what we know
of John Shakespeare at this period. He was probably engaged in things matrimonial and
other private affairs. His wife's legacy of £6 13s. 4d. and freehold farm of Asbies at
Wilmcote were welcome additions to his rising fortunes. Twice in 1557 he was
summoned to serve on the jury of the Court Leet, on 30 April (when he was excused)

1060 Is ordained that the Tasters shall weekly and diligently search and foresee that both ale and drink be
well and wholesomely made, well brewed and sufficiently harmed as it ought to be, and also the said
Tasters shall justly and truly from time to time present all those that shall at any time offend without
favour, fraud, covine or malice, as well any other victuallers as brewers, strangers as townsmen, upon
pain to forfeit for every offence 10s. in the d(iscretion) of the Tasters’. (Orders, 24 April, 1564).
and 1 October (when he attended), and about the latter date he was elected a Principal Burgess. 1061

In the autumn of 1558, shortly before Queen Mary's death, he was appointed a Constable. To him at that critical time fell the task of depriving single-men of their weapons and otherwise helping to preserve the peace. He must have been a man of some courage and physique. The oath of the Constables runs thus in the Liber Custumarum of Northampton 1062

...Ye shall well and truly serve the King within the precinct... of this Town. In time of watch ye shall give due commandement and charge in the King's behalf to the watchmen such as shall be summoned by the Serjeant to appear before you; and that they keep and make due watch and true from the time of your charge-giving until the sun be upon the morrow; and that they keep their own quarter, and come into none other till they be required of any other watch or but any horn blow, any fray made or outcry, peril of fire or children and all such other; also that they behave them in goodly wise in keeping of their watch, stilly going without noise or loud speech; also if any strange man or woman happen to come to this Town by night time, that then they honestly do examine such man or woman; and if they be not suspicious, bring them to an Inn, and if they be found suspicious or untrue then that they be brought to ward until the Mayor and Bailiffs have had examination of them.

That the oath administered to John Shakespeare did not materially differ from this may be inferred from his son's burlesque of the office in Much Ado About Nothing. One particular duty is named in the Bye-Laws of 1557. Every month, ‘upon pain to forfeit 6s. 8d.’ John Shakespeare and his three colleagues were required to ‘call unto them a convenient number of the Company’, i.e. of the Borough Council, to keep a privy watch for the good government of the Town, and any member who refused their summons without a sufficient cause to be allowed by the Company ‘was liable to the same’ fine of 6s. 8d.. On the 15th September, 1558, between his election and his swearing-in as a Constable, John Shakespeare took his firstborn child, a daughter, to be baptized. Father Dyos no doubt officiated, and the child was named Joan, probably after Mary Arden's sister. Mistress Joan Lambert of Barton-on-the-Heath.

Orders and Customs

The Council which, under Roger Edgeworth's stewardship, drew up the Book of Orders of Michaelmas 1557, consisted of the twelve Aldermen and ten Principal Burgesses. There may have been more members - the number is short by two Aldermen and four Principal Burgesses of that prescribed in the Charter - or there may have been vacancies due to death, resignation, or obstinate refusal to serve.

The company had changed very considerably since April 1559. Four old Aldermen, were gone and their places taken by Principal Burgesses and among the Burgesses were

1061 He is not listed among the Burgesses of 29 September.
three new. The Council met in the Old Gild Hall (whence their assemblies were known as ‘halls’), probably in the handsome chamber in the upper story over the former ‘Counting House’.

The hour of meeting was eight or nine in the morning, and the small bell of the Chapel was rung for a quarter of an hour previously. Members had warning also from the Serjeants. The assemblies were monthly, unless business required otherwise (which was frequently the case), and nearly always on a Wednesday. Sometimes a second meeting was held in the afternoon. Members who were absent without the Bailiff's permission were liable to a fine, which on Election Day (the Wednesday before the Nativity of Our Lady, 8 September) was a heavy one. Aldermen and Burgesses had to wear their gowns at the Hall and in procession through the town. In the absence of the Bailiff the Head Alderman presided. Resolutions were carried by the voices ‘of the more part’ present. Proceedings were strictly private, and members were sworn to secrecy. The Steward or his deputy, the Town Clerk, kept the minutes. The Bailiff received certain perquisites, such as one-third of all fines above 3s.4d. towards his expenses, which in the matter of hospitality were not small. He was waited upon daily by his Serjeant, and once a week by the Town Clerk. On Leet Days, Fair Days, and certain other occasions, Aldermen and Burgesses attended in their gowns at his house to escort him to Church or through the market or in perambulation of the Borough boundaries. They wore their gowns at Church on Sundays and holidays, and had seats near the pulpit. Their wives were entitled to seats near them. On the death of one of their number or of his wife, they accompanied the body to the burying, and stayed until the service was ended. At Christmas, from 15 December until ‘Twentieth Day’ (14 January), they hung lanterns before their houses from 5 o'clock until 8, when respectable townsmen, their servants and dogs, were expected to be in bed.

Whatever controversies, public or private, from time to time divided the Stratford Corporation, there seems to have been little or no friction between the Aldermen and Principal Burgesses, such as seriously disturbed the Warwick Council, where the lower body of Assistants or Commoners had hardly more than a consultative function. At Stratford the Burgesses enjoyed equal rights with the Aldermen, save that the latter filled up the vacancies in their own ranks caused by death, expulsion, or resignation. Aldermen elected Aldermen. They also had the coveted social distinction of being addressed as ‘Master’.

The Court of Record

The Court of Record, like that at Banbury, was modelled on the pattern of the Court at Coventry. It was held every fortnight, if required, almost invariably on a Wednesday. The Bailiff and the Head Alderman sat on the bench as the Justices of Peace for the Borough, supported by two or three of their ‘Brethren’, i.e. Aldermen who had served as Bailiff, and by the Steward. The Steward was a lawyer of some standing in the neighbourhood, and able to guide the proceedings. He or his deputy, the Town Clerk, kept a record in Latin of what was done. Cases involving a sum not exceeding £30 could be dealt with. Summons was formally delivered by one of the Serjeants. If the defendant failed to appear, a distringas, or writ to compel appearance, was issued.

\[\text{1063} \quad \text{The Black Book of Warwick}, \quad \text{Thomas Kemp, p.10-14, 56-61, 105-16. The Assistants at Warwick envied the Principal Burgesses of Stratford (ib. p.113). 'Such pleas, complaints and actions be there heard and determined according to the law and customs of our City of Coventry (Charter of Incorporation of Banbury, 26 January, 1551). See 'The Regulations of the Court of Record’ in the Book of Orders of Banbury, 14 May, 1558.}\]
which the Serjeant again formally delivered. If the defendant still failed to appear the Serjeant returned nihil, that is, he made formal declaration in Court that he had waited upon defendant at his house and found ‘nothing to distrain upon’, and he asked for a capias a warrant to arrest. Then the defendant had either to go to prison or find sureties, who would answer the charge against him, or pay the penalty, or bring him dead or alive into the Court. The capias generally had the desired effect. It was drawn up under the hand of the Steward or the Town Clerk. No capias was granted at the suit of a ‘foreigner’, or nontownsman, except it appeared plainly that he had a good case. The Steward or Town Clerk had to make ‘good and perfect declarations’ and deliver them to the two Attorneys of the Court. Townsmen with recognized experience of the law, such as Adrian Quiney and John Shakespeare, might act as attorneys. Legal knowledge had spread with the break-up of the monastic estates and consequent speculation in landed property. It was a litigious age, and the law on the whole was cheap and trustworthy. Business men went readily into Court to enforce payment of debt and settlement of differences. Money was scarce and hardly to be obtained at 10 per cent., and defendants often delayed payment until the capias.

The commonly accepted evidence of John Shakespeare's poverty in after life, that nothing was found in his house to distrain upon, is quite worthless. Nor does his presence in the Court with Adrian Quiney against him imply any want of friendship. Going to law was so common that there was little or no disgrace in it or ill feeling. The best of neighbours fought out their case before the Bailiff and Steward. ‘Please ye,’ says Tranio in The Taming of the Shrew (i. ii. 276-9), ‘we may ... as adversaries do in law, strive mightily but eat and drink as friends.’ There seems no reason to limit ‘adversaries’ here to professional lawyers. The Court of Record at Stratford and its procedure are of singular interest to Shakespeareans; firstly, because John Shakespeare appeared there frequently, both as plaintiff and defendant; and secondly, because his son, William Shakespeare, probably had experience of it in a professional capacity. The one subject the Poet shows an expert knowledge of, besides his player's art, is the routine and practice of a country attorney's office.

The Crafts of Stratford

Litigation often arose from trespass of one trade upon another. The crafts were jealous of their functions and privileges. Any person might bake, brew, and kill for home consumption, and many townsmen and their wives were bakers, brewers, and butchers for their households; but nobody might bake, brew, or kill to sell unless a Common Baker, Brewer, or Butcher licensed by the Council. Many made tallow-candles, but only Common Chandlers might make them for trade. Brewers in their turn were not to sell ‘in pot or by the dozen’, the retail trade being the right of Common Tipplers and Victuallers. Butchers might not encroach upon the Chandlers, being forbidden to send their tallow out of the town, and were required to sell it at a price below what the ‘foreigner’ or non-resident buyer might give. Nor was meat to be brought to market without the hide or skin. This, as we have seen, was in the interest of skinners and tanners. In return for their monopolies, traders were required to observe the orders of the Council and the Assize, providing goods of a specified quality at a regulation rate. Bread had to be marked, drink sold in sealed measures, and taverns (for the sale of

---

1064 There can be no doubt whatever that the words—quod predictus Johannes Shackspere nihil hahet unde distringi potest—are not to be taken literally, and that they merely belong to a formula that was in use when a writ of distringas failed in enforcing an appearance’ (Halliwell-Phillipps, Outlines, ii. 238).

1065 The earliest plays, for example, are full of legal expressions, some of them of a highly technical character.
wine, not beer) indicated by a bush, ale-houses by a stake. Hence the need of Tasters or Inspectors of Victuals. In 1556, Stratford there were more than a dozen [trade companies]. Besides the Butchers, the Bakers, and the Victuallers, there were the Haberdashers (including, as at Warwick, Mercers, Grocers, and Fishmongers), the Weavers, the Walkers and Fullers, the Dyers and Shearmen, the Curriers (including Barkers and Tanners), the Skinners and Tailors, the Glovers and Whittawers and Collarmakers (Pointmakers at Warwick), the Shoemakers and Saddlers, the Smiths, the Brewers, and, last but not least, a company which comprised all engaged in the Building Trade and some others: Masons, Joiners, Carpenters, Tilers, Wheelwrights, Ploughwrights, Tuggerers (makers of carts and cart gear), Fletchers (makers of bows and arrows), and Coopers. Next to corn and cattle, malt and ale, the chief commodities seem to have been leather and wool and their various products. The two Leather Sealers were important town officials.

To enter a craft a youth served an apprenticeship of seven years, living for this period in his master's house as one of the family, being, as a rule, fed and clothed and taught by him and given an increasing amount of pocket-money. At the end of this period he became a journeyman on wages, and upon payment of a fee (small if he had served in the town but larger if he had been an apprentice elsewhere) he obtained his ‘freedom’ in the ‘Brotherhood’ with the right to set up in business for himself. The craft had its Hall, its Master and Warden, and its Book of Rules (sanctioned by the Council). Most tradesmen supplemented their earnings by farming, malting, or victualling. The number engaged, one way or another, in victualling was very large. Markets and Fairs were chiefly responsible, and Protestantism was a factor in the case. The dissolution of the monastic houses, which were the mediaeval hostels, and the weakening of the civil authority of the Church had brought custom and independence to the Inn, the Tavern, and the Ale-house. Protestant ‘liberty’ found expression there. The ‘heretical talk’ at the ale-house at Offchurch near Warwick, when Latimer's sermons at Bristol were discussed in the year 1533, had become widespread, and in a score or more of Stratford eating and drinking houses men debated and quarrelled over the mass, pilgrimages, images, ceremonies. Bishop Hooper of Gloucester and Worcester, and the Prayer Book. Puritans at this time saw no harm in a tankard of ale or a glass of wine. Their preachers were regularly and liberally entertained with sack and sugar. It is hardly too much to say that in the reigns of Edward and Mary and the first half of the reign of Elizabeth there was a rather close connexion between Puritanism and the ‘trade’.

The Borough and the Church

The loss of the Churchwardens’ Accounts prior to the year 1617 has deprived us of a valuable source of information respecting the religious changes in Stratford, such as is supplied by those of St. Nicholas's Church, Warwick. The Church Ale at Stratford was held at Easter time, and was presided over by the Vicar. The retiring wardens presented their account, and new wardens were elected - two for the Borough and two for the rest of the Parish. Sidesmen were also chosen, and surveyors of the highways, in each case two for the Borough and two for the rest of the Parish. From time to time the Churchwardens and electing parishioners made a levy for the repair of the Church and other extraordinary expenses. Very occasionally, as in the matters of the

---

1066 In Stratford Robert Perrott and Robert Salisbury, brewers, were advanced Protestants, and John Sadler, owner of the Bear, seems to have been of their party.
1067 Churchwardens Accounts of the Parish of St. Nicholas, Warwick, 1547-1621 transcribed and ed. by Richard Savage
1068 Assistants (elected) to the churchwardens of a parish. OED
receipt and payment of the Tithes and of the tenure of the Churchyard, their authority
trespassed on that of the Borough Council. As a rule there seems to have been harmony
between the Churchwardens and the Chamberlains, and those who filled the one office
not infrequently, but not simultaneously, filled the other

The belfries, like the chancels, suffered under the Puritan regime of Edward VI …The
bells thus placed were those familiar and dear to Shakespeare, as in the repeated
description of human fellowship:

    Orlando. If ever you have looked on better days.
    If ever been where bells have knolled to church . . .

    Duke Senior. True is it that we have seen better days.
    And have with holy bell been knolled to church.

The Chamberlains had the care of the bells at the Chapel, the great bell and the little
bell, which served for the clock, for summons to Council meetings and sermons, for the
alarm of fire, for the passing of the dying, and the burial of the dead. Shakespeare heard
them often enough, as a schoolboy and as a resident at New Place. The great bell tolls
through his poems and plays, from Sonnet LXXI:

    …the surly sullen bell
    Give warning to the world that I am fled…

To the burden ‘Ding-dong’ of Ariel's song in The Tempest.

The Accession of Queen Elizabeth

One of those pardoned at the Coronation of the new Queen on 15 January, 1559, was
Alderman Jeffreys of Sheep Street. He was a staunch Catholic, had been Bailiff in the
first year of Mary, and during her reign had been guilty of actions which made it
advisable to seek the royal clemency. He was forgiven everything committed before 1
November, 1558, except what might be of a treasonable nature, on payment of 26s. 8d..

John Shakespeare as Constable found his office by no means a sinecure. At the Court
Leet of 14 April, 1559, cases of assault were numerous.

Master Rafe Cawdrey the Alderman, late Bailiff, was fined for making a fray upon
Alexander Webbe of Bearley, brother of Widow Arden of Wilmcote and brother-in-law
of John Shakespeare.

In the autumn Adrian Quiney was elected Bailiff. His colleagues were William
Whateley, High Alderman: John Shakespeare, William Tyler, and William Smith,
haberdasher. Constables: Humfrey Plymley and John Wheeler, Chamberlains: Thomas
Dickson alias Waterman, and Roger Greene, Tasters: Richard Sharpe and William
The Serjeants, and in a less degree the Leather Sealers, were permanently, though pro-
forma annually, appointed.

The rest were chosen more or less in succession and according to seniority, but there is
no mistaking the Protestant complexion of this first body of officers elected in the new
reign. The new officers were sworn on 6 October. The minutes of this Court were
witnessed by the Affeerors - including John Shakespeare. Symons wrote the names at the bottom of the page, on the right hand, and the Affeerors attached their signature or mark. Biddle and Wheeler signed; Lewes ap Williams, Tyler, and Shakespeare made their marks. Ap Williams's mark resembles a church-gable and possibly means Holy Church; Tyler's consists of two concentric circles quartered by a cross and may signify the Trinity; Shakespeare's is a glover's compasses and denotes, no doubt, ‘God encompasseth us’.

Eight days after the swearing-in of Adrian Quiney and his fellows [a] significant letter was addressed to them by Sir Robert Throgmorton and Sir Edward Greville, complaining of their treatment of the Vicar, Roger Dyos. Salaries were paid half-yearly, at Lady Day and Michaelmas, and we gather from the letter that Dyos had received nothing since 29 September, 1558, the last pay-day under Mary. He evidently contemplated ‘departure’ when the magistrates wrote on 14 October, 1559, and when the Council were assured of it they gave him a portion of the amount claimed. He asked for £30; they paid him less than £10; and seventeen years afterwards he sued for and recovered the balance - £13 17s. 6d. This sum they had probably spent on Protestant preachers, and felt justified in deducting from the stipend of the Vicar, whom they had never wanted and whose services they considered to be dispensed with at Mary's death. Protestants, we may be sure, officiated in the interval between the ‘departure’ of Dyos and the appointment of a new Vicar, Master John Bretchgirdle, in January 1561.

John Bretchgirdle

For four years and four months John Bretchgirdle, unmarried, with a sister, perhaps two, to keep house for him, was head of the wide Stratford parish in the contentious days of transition from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism. The Prayer Book services were organized on Puritan lines, frescoes were whitewashed, stained glass was replaced by plain, and carvings were hacked. Feeling ran high. Cases of assault were again dealt with at the Court Leet of 4 May, 1561. The fine for reviling an officer was still kept at 20s. and John Shakespeare acted as one of the Afferrors attaching his mark to the names written at the end of the minutes by Richard Symons — the glover's compasses — a again daintily drawn.

John Shakespeare had recently buried his father at Snitterfield. On the 10th February he took out letters of administration on exhibition of an inventory of his goods and chattels valued at £38 7s. 1d.. In the bond father and son are described as of Snitterfield, and John is called agricola. John retained for a few months an interest in his father's farm, and was held responsible for the condition of the hedges in October.

About this time, Michaelmas 1561, his brother-in-law, Alexander Webbe, entered into possession. He brought with him from Bearley his wife Margaret (nee Arden) and four young children - Anne, Robert, Elizabeth, and Mary. Two more children, Edward and Sarah, were born to him at Snitterfield. These boys and girls were first cousins of William Shakespeare, and of special interest to him as living in his father's and grandfather's old home. There is evidence of friendship between the John Shakespeares and the Webbes.

On 3 October, 1561, John Shakespeare was sworn Chamberlain of the Borough of Stratford with John Taylor, the shearman of Sheep Street, as his senior colleague. John

1069 Corrupted in a less religious age into ‘Goat and Compasses’ - the sign of a public-house at [321] Euston Road, London. [the particular pub Fripp refers to survived at least until 1950 (it is noted as the venue for RAF reunion functions) but appears to have been renamed at some point thereafter.]
Taylor was his fellow Constable of 1558-60. The oath they took was very much as follows

…We shall be faithful and true officers unto our master the bailiff, diligent of attendance, at all times lawful, obedient to his commandments and ready to do his precept. We shall improve the livelihood belonging to the commonalty of this town to the most behoof of the same, and the tenements thereof we shall well and sufficiently repair during our office. And we shall well and truly charge and discharge ourself of all lands' rents belonging to this town and of all other money as shall come to our hands belonging unto the commonalty of this town, and thereof a true account shall yield up unto the auditors assigned in the end of our year, and all other things lawful that belongeth or pertaineth to our offices well and truly to our powers we shall do. So keep us God, the Holy Evangel and the contents of this Book.

The Bailiff whom John Taylor and John Shakespeare promised to serve was the Welshman, Master Lewes ap Williams, ironmonger in High Street. The Head Alderman was Master Robert Perrott the brewer. John Taylor's Account for the year Michaelmas 1561 to Michaelmas 1562 is a bare statement of receipts and expenses. It was presented and passed on 24 January, 1563. We have only the official copy made by Symons. It is signed at the back by John Taylor with his cross.

In October 1562 John Shakespeare entered on his year as acting Chamberlain, his colleague John Taylor taking the passive part. Humfrey Plymley was Bailiff and Adrian Quiney Head Alderman.

On 2 December the Chamberlain took a second child, again a daughter, to the Parish Church to be christened. She was named Margaret, no doubt after her mother's sister, Margaret Webbe of Snitterfield. In April following the child died, and was buried on the 30th. Happily John Shakespeare was busy. He had to do with the felling of trees in the Churchyard (which had now a new sacredness for him), and the sawing and squaring of the trees for repairs at the Vicar's House and Chapel and the erection of a pinfold [animal pen - often used for straying animals on Common Ground]. John Bretchgirdle's residence was overhauled - the central chimney was rebuilt, the roof retiled, wood-work renewed, and the ground-floor clayed and sanded - at an outlay of £6 15s. 5d. It was perhaps during the ‘reparations’ that the Vicar took the lease of a small house in Church Street, at a rent of 8s. per annum. The pinfold was erected in Tinkers' Lane on land belonging to the Almshouse, and a rent of 8d. a year was henceforth paid to the inmates. The Protestantizing of the Chapel was in hand and ‘images’ had been ‘defaced’ when the energetic Chamberlain's term of office expired in October. Not coming under episcopal jurisdiction, the Gild Chapel had been left in status quo, probably through the influence of the Cloptons and William Bott. It was not spared under the auspices of John Shakespeare. When the frescoes were discovered under the whitewash in 1804, some were found in nearly a perfect state, but in the chancel ‘many parts, especially the crosses, had been evidently mutilated by some sharp instrument through the ill-directed zeal of our early Reformers’.

1070 The form of oath used at Leicester.
On 6 October, 1563, when George Whateley was sworn Bailiff and Roger Sadler Head Alderman, new Chamberlains were appointed in the persons of William Tyler and William Smith the haberdasher. John Shakespeare, however, was requested or allowed to continue the work he had begun, and he served as acting Chamberlain for the next year. He concluded the reformation of the Chapel, taking down the rood-loft, and providing seats for the minister and the clerk, and perhaps a communion ‘board’. The officiating minister here was not Bretchgirdle nor his Curate, but the Schoolmaster, William Smart.

John Shakespeare made his Account with John Taylor for 1562-3 on 10 January, 1563-4. Among the items is, ‘payd to Shakspeyr for a pece [of] timber iij’.

At a Council meeting on 26 January Symons notes in his minutes that the Chamber is found in arrearage and is in debt unto John Shakespeare £1 5s. 8d. From time to time the public-spirited Chamberlain advanced money for work in hand. On Wednesday, 26 April, he took his third child and first son, William, to be baptized, as we learn from the entry in Bretchgirdle's register:

1564 April 26 Gulielmus filius Johannis Shakespeare.

We need not look far for the godfather. He was probably John Shakespeare's neighbour in Henley Street, William Smith the haberdasher. The two men had much in common, were about the same age, and lived within a few yards of each other for half a century. They began business about the same time; were engaged in occupations which at more than one point met; were colleagues on the Borough Council; had been Constables together, and were now fellow Chamberlains; were men of enterprise and ambition and independence of judgment, and not infrequently opposed to the powers in being, and had sons who became well to do and gentlemen. In support of the identification it may be noted that whereas John Shakespeare's eldest son was named William, William Smith's eldest son was named John.

Plague

In the summer of 1564 plague broke out in Stratford. It came from [Le] Havre, and was probably brought by the Earl of Warwick's soldiers into the Midlands. It broke out in Leicester in June, where it was promptly isolated. An act of the Council there on 30 June forbade those ‘visited’ to go abroad within a space of two months after a death in their house under a penalty of £5. The same summer the epidemic raged in Coventry. Hic incepit pestis are the words written by John Bretchgirdle against the entry in his register of the burial on 11 July of Oliver Gunn, apprentice to Thomas Gethen alias Deeye, a weaver in the High Street of Stratford. Gethen was doubtless a foreigner, probably a refugee from Flanders. He lived in the house next but one to Ely Street, which is now the Garrick Inn. His wife Joanna, who may have nursed the boy and was the second victim, was buried on 20 July. From 1 January to 20 July there were 22 burials. From 20 July to the 31st there were 16. In August there were 35, in September 84, in October 58, in November 26, and in December 18. Households perished, mostly of the poorer folk, but some well-to-do families suffered lamentably. The Town Clerk, Richard Symons, lost two sons and a daughter. The Court of Record suspended its sittings during August and September. The Borough Council met at least once in the Gild Garden - which under John Shakespeare's Chamberlainship had been secured for their use, with its orchard and dovecote, old walnut-tree, seats and bowling-green. ‘At the Hall holden in our Garden’ runs the minute of 30 August, ‘money was paid towards
the relief of the poor’ - the sufferers, that is, from the pestilence. John Shakespeare was present, so was William Smith the haberdasher. They were both assessed at a shilling. Richer men paid more, poorer men less. The Town Clerk was not rated, and the minutes are not in his hand. That very day he buried a son and a daughter. Further levies were made at halls held on 6 and 27 September, varying from 18d. to 4d. and 12d. to 4d., John Shakespeare paying on each occasion 6d. At a fourth levy, made on 20 October, he paid 8d. The minutes of these and subsequent meetings are in the handwriting of the Steward or Symons's deputy. Symons did not return to his duties until 15 February, John Bretchgirdle had a terrible time, and John Shakespeare's hands as acting-Chamberlain were very full. The Vicar buried a sister, Cicely Bretchgirdle, on 14 March 1564, shortly before the Plague appeared. Rafe Hilton, his curate lost three children in October and November. Bretchgirdle was overworked, and probably ill. John Shakespeare again and again paid for clerical assistance. His Account, presented late (doubtless because of the pestilence) on 21 March, 1565, shows the following items:

Paid to Master Vicar £1 7s. 0d., paid for a priest's board and his drinkings at the Swan, 11s. 6d., paid for going for John Tong's brother [David Tong] 2s., paid to the preacher £2 10s., paid to the same preacher £1, paid to Master Vicar 6s. 8d., paid to Thomas Waterman [alias Dickson, of the Swan] £2 13s. 4d.

Other entries in John Shakespeare's Account are to be noted:

Received of Master Smith £2 10s. 0d., more of Master Smith £2 10s. 0d. more of Master Smith £2 10s. 0d.; received of Master Walford £4 0s. 0d., of Master Walford for Wilmecote [tithe] £1 6s. 8d.

This was tithe money, which the energetic Chamberlain was properly getting into his hands. Master Smith, the Alderman, farmer of the College tithes, buried in the Plague time, on 3 September, his sister-in-law. Mistress Elizabeth Watson, sister to John Watson, the future Bishop of Winchester. Her decease, apparently, was not due to the pestilence, for the Smith household was a large one and no other member died.

At election time in September, when the Plague was at its height, there was difficulty, as we may understand, in getting a Bailiff. Nominations were made on the 6th. [September] - John Wheeler for Bailiff, Lewes ap Williams for Head Alderman, William Smith, haberdasher, and William Tyler for Chamberlains. John Shakespeare, to his great credit, again undertook the duties, which were strenuous and perilous, of the acting Chamberlainship. John Wheeler felt unequal to the position of chief officer and magistrate of the Borough at that time and declined to serve. His name, nevertheless, was sent to the Earl of Warwick and was by him approved. The resolution passed on the 27th September, with its interesting signatures and marks. John Wheeler duly appeared on the 29th, according to the terms of the resolution, and pleaded with such success that he was let off with a fine of £10; on the understanding presumably that he served as Bailiff the year after (1565-6). Richard Hill, whose honesty and virtue are celebrated on his monument in the Church, stepped into the breach and was made Bailiff. That week, from 27 September to 4 October, there were nineteen burials in the churchyard.
The School was doubtless closed for a considerable period, and the Master probably devoted himself to parish work in aid of the Vicar. At any rate Smart had ceased to be Master at Lady Day 1565, when his successor, John Brownsword, was appointed. To John Shakespeare as Chamberlain fell the duty of bringing him and his wife and goods from Warwick and putting his dwelling-house in order. In his Account are items for tiles, laths, nails, slate-pins, lime, sand, eaves' poles, and carriage of four loads of timber for work in the Chapel and School and for tiling the Schoolmaster's House. Apparently the old Schoolhouse, with the chamber over it, was converted into a residence for Master and Mistress Brownsword, and the upper story of the Gild Hall, the ‘Over Hall’, was made a School-house. Hence the memorandum on the flap of the old Rent Roll, ‘Master John Brounswerd geveth xijs towarde ye makyng of ye schole’.

The Vicar's House and the Schoolmaster's House were thus side by side in the Chapel precincts. After five years master and pupil were together again, almost under one roof, happy in each other's company and probably looking forward to many years of fellowship and co-operation. But within three months Bretchgirdle was dead. The Plague, we may believe, had been too much for him. On 20 June, 1565, he made his will, and next day was buried within the Parish Church. Bequests of books show his interest in education and his strong Protestant principles: Unto Dissidentium (the source of so much trouble to the Christian Brothers at Oxford in 1528) went to an old fellow-student at Christ Church.

William Bott

Extensive changes took place in the Council in the years 1557 - 65…over the heads of the new Principal Burgesses, so far as we know without previous service as a Principal Burgess, William Bott had been created an Alderman. On 9 May, 1565, William Bott departed in the manner of his advent, concluding his meteoric appearance on the Council by his expulsion.

William Bott was well known to Richard and John Shakespeare at Snitterfield, where he resided at the Wold and was in request as an appraiser of the goods and supervisor or witness of the wills of his neighbours. He was appointed overseer with Richard Maids (a highly respected fellow parishioner) of the will of Hugh Porter. A list of the debtors of Hugh Porter, drawn up 26 November, 1557, contained the following:

Richard Shakespeare of Snitterfield oweth unto the same 40s. The executors of Robert Arden of Wilmecote and Thomas Stringer of Bearley oweth unto the same for Robert Arden £5 2s. 3d. William Bott of Snitterfield £30, for the which sum of £30 William Bott hath to mortgage to the forenamed Hugh Porter all the land within the town of Hatton.

The executors of Robert Arden were his daughters, Alice and Mary, the second being in November 1557 wife of John Shakespeare in Henley Street. Hugh Porter's will was proved in the Court of Canterbury on 7 February, 1560, and to Bott and Porter's natural and loved daughter, Eleanor, fell the task of distributing the residue of his estate 'in charitable deeds and works, for the wealth of his soul and all Christian souls. Thus again Bott had the handling of money that was not his own. With Richard Shakespeare
and others, he made on 21 April, 1559, the inventory of the goods of Roger Lyncecombe, and on 1 June, 1560, the inventory of the goods of Henry Cole, the Snitterfield blacksmith.

Bott, who was probably a lawyer, became William Clopton's agent. William Clopton, champion of the Catholic party in the district (as against William Lucy of Charlecote), must have felt keenly the transition from Mary to Elizabeth. He had taken part in Mary's Coronation feast on 1 October, 1553, serving the wafers at the Queen's table and receiving for his fee ‘all the Instruments as well of silver or other metal for making of the same wafers, and also all the napkins and other profits thereunto appertaining’. On 31 January, 1559, rather more than a fortnight after the Coronation of Elizabeth, he buried his wife in the Parish Church of Stratford; and less than a year later, on 4 January, 1560, he signed his will and died, leaving instructions that he should be interred in the same place. Their bodies were laid, no doubt, in what is sometimes called ‘the Clopton Chapel’, in the east end of the north aisle, behind the handsome monument built for himself by Sir Hugh Clopton. There is nothing to mark the grave. Any intention the heir, William Clopton, may have cherished of erecting a tomb was probably prevented by the difficult years that followed for himself and his children. William Bott witnessed the will, and on the removal of the heir from New Place to Clopton House he left Snitterfield to live in New Place. In virtue, no doubt, of his position he acquired the seat on the Aldermanic bench. On 30 August, 1564, he was called upon to contribute more than any member of the Council, including the Bailiff, to the relief of the plague-stricken. The garden where they met was a few yards from his door. His signature occurs in the order respecting John Wheeler on 27 September. He attended again on 20 October and 20 December, 1564, and, for the last time, on 15 February, 1564/5. On 9 May, falling to ‘come to his answer’ for opprobrious words of the Council and of the Bailiff, Richard Hill, he was ‘expulsed’ Symons hated him and roundly declared that he was dishonest. Young Clopton found reason to complain of his dealings when, having sold him New Place, he went abroad, some time after 30 September, 1563, with his wife and children. Bott, he said, took advantage of his absence to withhold the rents, and even forge a deed relating to his property. William Underhill of Idlicote, a lawyer, cousin of Edward Underhill the ‘hot gospeller’, won the gratitude of ‘poor men’ in and around Stratford by his resistance to the unscrupulous agent. ‘No poor man might dwell by him if Master Underhill did not assist him’,1071 was the testimony of John Walsingham of Exhall.

On 4 July, 1565, John Shakespeare was elected Alderman in Bott's stead; from which day John Shakespeare was Master Shakespeare among his fellow townsmen.1072

John Shakespeare Alderman, 1566

On 15 February 1566, John Shakespeare made his final account as Borough Chamberlain. Next day he probably attended, as an alderman, the public burial of the old burgess, John Lewis.

This month the Queen paid her first visit to Warwickshire. She had given great offence to Protestants1073 by the publication, in 1565, without authority of Parliament or

---

1072 See above re Bott.
1073 They required of Ministers that they should be re-licensed to preach, should wear the surplice, baptize at the font and process at Rogation. They also demanded of communicants that they should receive kneeling.
Convocation, of The Advertisements and with characteristic boldness she made her summer progress through her puritan Midland capital.

A case in the Court of Record this autumn is evidence of friendship between Alderman Shakespeare and Richard Hathaway of Shottery. John Page the ironmonger, living at the corner-house of Wood Street and Rother Market, sued Richard Hathaway for a debt of £8, and on 28 August obtained a writ of capias whereby the serjeants-at-the-mace were authorized to bring the defendant into court. Pledges for the plaintiff were William Reeve and John Stone, and surety for the defendant was John Shakespeare. The writ was granted by the Bailiff, John Wheeler, and signed by the Steward, Henry Higford. On 11 September the Serjeants (William Butler and Henry Russell) reported that they had brought Hathaway into court; and upon Hathaway's declaration of inability to pay, the plaintiff asked for an injunction against Shakespeare. At the same time a suit against Hathaway by another creditor, Joan Biddle, for a debt of £11 reached a like stage; and Alderman Shakespeare being again Hathaway's pledge, precepts were granted to both Page and Joan Biddle to distrain on his goods for the amounts claimed, together reaching the considerable sum of £19. In the end Hathaway probably paid, his harvest gathered in. There was nothing unusual or unfriendly in such litigation, but security at one and the same time for £19 is a mark of unwonted confidence and goodwill. John Shakespeare's eldest son, William, was then two and a half years old, and Richard Hathaway's eldest daughter, Anne, about ten years old. At which time, moreover, a second son was born to John Shakespeare, On Sunday (for Alderman Shakespeare at this time was not afraid of publicity), the 13th of October he took this child to church to be christened. …the child was named Gilbert.

The Queen of Scots

While Elizabeth irritated her Protestant subjects and exasperated not a few in her endeavour to reconcile the Romanists, the menace of a Catholic rising grew steadily in the north. In July 1565 Mary of Scots, aged two and twenty, married Henry, Lord Darnley, who was three years her junior, and on 19 June 1566 she bore him a son, afterwards King James I of England. The child was christened ‘after the popish fashion at Stirling on 17 December, the Scottish Protestant nobles and Queen Elizabeth's representative, the Earl of Bedford, standing at the door of the chapel.’ On 10 February 1567 Lord Darnley was murdered by Mary's lover, the Earl of Bothwell. ‘God amend all that is amiss,’ wrote Cecil to Norris in Paris, on 21 March; and in May, after tidings of the Queen's marriage, ‘the nobility offended remain with the Prince and keep apart from her. What will follow I know not. God forgive us all!’ Queen Mary and Bothwell, and ‘loathsome and abhorring of her husband, as every good and godly man cannot but abhor the same’.

John Shakespeare Bailiff, 1568-9

At this moment John Shakespeare entered on his bailiwick. He had been nominated in 1567, receiving three votes to Robert Perrott's sixteen. Neither served, Perrott making bad excuse (as it proved) and Shakespeare good. Rafe Cawdrey therefore filled the office. But in 1568, on Perrott's continued obstinate refusal, John Shakespeare was appointed. He was elected 4 September and sworn 1 October. Both at the election and
swearing there were quaint and solemn ceremonies, similar no doubt to those at Banbury.\textsuperscript{1074}

Among the by-laws adopted at the latter place on 2 September 1573 were the following

\ldots On the morrow after St. Matthew the Apostle, the Common Council shall repair to the Common Hall, and the Bailiff shall call to him the Justice and two other Aldermen, who shall name two Aldermen to stand for the office of Bailiff who shall be approved of the remainder \ldots Then the said Bailiff shall go foremost, having the Serjeant-at-mace afore him with his mace on his right shoulder, and after the Bailiff shall follow the Justice and next after the same two Elect shall go together, and then all the rest of the said Aldermen and Burgesses in their ancienity to accompany the Bailiff to his house and then to depart for that time. \ldots

On Michaelmas day after,

\ldots the Aldermen and Burgesses together with the said two Elect shall between twelve and one of the clock in the afternoon of the same day, repair unto the Bailiff his house, then being within the same borough, and there decently arrayed with gowns and caps and other comely apparel, in sage and discreet manner shall make their abode until the said Bailiff shall be ready to go to the said Election, and then in like manner according to their ancienity and degrees in office accompany the same Bailiff from his house unto the Church, and from thence to the said Common Hall, and the Serjeant-at-mace shall go before the said Bailiff in a long gown, having the one end of his mace in his hand the other leaning upon his right shoulder \ldots

The two Elect having retired to an inner chamber and the ‘paper of their election’ being produced, the Bailiff, Aldermen, and Burgesses present were severally to set pricks against the name of him they would have to be Bailiff. Then the two Elect being brought to the bar,

the Steward or Town Clerk shall go to the bar and taking the alderman to whom most voices shall chance to be given by the hand shall bring him to the Clerk’s table; upon which standing the old Bailiff shall pronounce to him his election. And thereupon the Steward or Town Clerk shall give him his oath, and then the old Bailiff in taking him by the hand shall give him his place and deliver up his Mace and wish him good success in his office, and all the house shall say Amen

In respect, moreover, that the Bailiff

\ldots is to be a lanthorn in good usage and order as well to all the rest of his Brethren as to the whole commonalty of the Borough, the said Bailiff shall well and decently behave himself in all degrees and indifferently' and rightly judge and deal towards all men of the same Borough according to the right of the cause; and so likewise shall be comely
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attired in apparel, and also at all such times as he shall be occasioned to go into the said Town or the perambulation of the same either on the Fair days, Market days or any other times, and about the execution of his office or together with his Brethren touching any affairs or business of the said Borough, he shall have on his gown; and in like manner when it shall fortune the said Bailiff to accompany any noble or worshipful within the said Town; and in all the said doing he shall have the Serjeant-at-mace to be attendant upon him with his Mace.

…the oath administered to John Shakespeare…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Oath of the Bailiff &amp; Principal Alderman [Council Book A, 352]</th>
<th>[The Oath of the Bailiff &amp; Principal Alderman – Modern English]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yow shalle swere that as a Justice of the peace &amp; baylyffe of Str[atford] &amp; liberties thereof for thys yere to Come, ye shalle to &amp; the vtermost of your Cuninge wytt &amp; power mayn]tene &amp; defende the liberties of the same borowgh, and shalle do egall right as well to the pore as to the riche after your knowledge wytt &amp; power &amp; after the lawes &amp; Customes of this Realme &amp; statutes thereof made, And yow shalle not be of Counsell withe any person in any quarrell or sute that shalle Come before yow, nor shall lett for any gyfte or other Cause but well &amp; truly shall do your office in that behaffe, And yow shall not directe or cause to be directed any warrant by yow to be made to the parties to the accon,' but ye shalle directe them to the officers &amp; ministers of the seyd borowgh or to some other indifferent person or persons to do execution thereof so helpe yow god, &amp;c</td>
<td>You shall swear that as a Justice of the Peace and Bailiff of this borough of Stratford and liberties hereof for this year to come, you shall and to the uttermost of your cunning, wit and power maintain and defend the liberties of the same borough and shall do equal right as well to the poor as to the rich after your knowledge, wit and power and after the laws and the Customs of the Realm and statutes thereof made, And you shall not be of counsel with any person in any quarrel or suit that shall come before you, nor shall let for any gift or other cause but well and truly shall do your office in that behalf, And you shall not direct or cause to be directed any warrant by you to be made to the parties of the action, but you shall direct them to the officers and ministers of the said borough or to some impartial person or persons to do execution thereof so help you God.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sworn with him as his Deputy and High Alderman was John Wheeler, his neighbour in Henley Street. Thirteen times during his bailiwick John Shakespeare presided at the Court of Record, supported, save on one occasion, by John Wheeler, and with the legal assistance, no doubt on every occasion, of the Steward, Master Henry Higford (who lived at Solihull, a friend of Edward Aglionby, and as pronounced a Protestant as John Shakespeare or John Wheeler, destined to be presented with them in 1592 for recusancy). He dealt with cases of debt and breach of the by-laws or the assize of meat and drink, and issued warrants of distrain or arrest to the Serjeants (who were Henry Russell and William Butler). He presided also, on his ‘footstool’1076 at the ‘halls’ of the
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Council, of which unfortunately there are minutes of only six, again with the help of Master Higford. Here too, as in the Court of Record, he had assistance from old Symons, formerly, and perhaps yet, Town Clerk, whose shaky Gothic handwriting still occasionally appears in the records. He approved leases, took a survey of the Corporation deeds (1 June, 1569), carried on negotiations with the lord of the manor (the Earl of Warwick), and made a journey to London with Adrian Quiney and Thomas Barber on borough business. Urgent instructions from the Privy Council and their commissioners for the preservation of the Peace demanded his attention. Early in March the High Sheriff of Warwickshire was required ‘to make inquisition of vagabonds and rogues and punish them’. The same month magistrates were appointed for the taking of musters ‘of men, horses, armour and weapons’. On 20 June the Privy Council issued an order that strong watch was to be kept on the night of Sunday 10 July and next day in every town, village, and parish for vagrant persons. Search was to be continued monthly until 1 November, unlawful games were to be ‘avoided’ (that is, got rid of) and archery was to be encouraged. Any ‘raising of the people’ must not be attempted ‘as in some corners of the realm hath been lately’. On 27 June Sir Robert Throgmorton, Sir Thomas Lucy and Sir William Wigston reported from Warwick the enlisting of 640 men - 40 light horsemen, 100 footmen with pikes, 200 with arquebuses, 200 with bows and arrows, and 100 with bills.

In the Chamberlains' Account at Stratford (27 January 1570) we read:

For dressing of harness xjs vd., to Robert Locke iijs. Iiijd. for dressing of harness another time iijs iiijd, to the soldiers at their first muster iiiij to Robert joiner for a gunstock ijd. to Simon Biddle for dressing of two pikes and a bow ijs. iiijd.

On 25 July Wigston and Lucy reported the choosing of practice-grounds for archery. At Stratford the Butts’ Close was by the Bridge. Full certificates of men and arms were sent to London on 4 September. Of billmen recruited at Snitterfield was Anthony Shakespeare, brother of Thomas Shakespeare of Snitterfield, and of John Shakespeare of Clifford Chambers (the three sons perhaps of Anthony Shakespeare, who left Rowington in 1530).

As Bailiff and Head Alderman, John Shakespeare and John Wheeler sat with their wives on Sundays in the front pew on the north side of the nave of Stratford Church in their scarlet and furred gowns. Other aldermen and alderwomen sat behind them. On 15 April, 1569, Friday in Easter Week, John Shakespeare had his daughter Joan baptized. She was the second of the name, the first (baptized 15 September, 1558) having died probably since the baptism of her sister Margaret on 2 December, 1562. The christening of the Bailiff's daughter would draw a large gathering of friends. Joan Lambert, the mother's sister, we may believe, served again as godmother.

Robert Perrott

The first and the last act of the Council under John Shakespeare's leadership was an attempt to bring the obstinate Alderman Perrott to book. On 1 October, 1568, they passed a resolution inflicting the fine of £3 6s. 8d. on any inhabitant who refused to serve in an office to which he had been appointed by the Council, with an additional penalty of 40s. from 'hall to hall', until he did yield himself. But Perrott, who had twice
refused the bailiwick, failed to respond. On Election-day, therefore, 1569, which was 7 September, Perrot failing to answer the special summons to appear, was drastically dealt with. For his wilful absenting himself he was fined £5, and a resolution was passed that the Serjeants or one of them shall repair to the said Master Perrott and require him to be at the Council House upon Friday next, before nine of the clock in the forenoon, upon pain to forfeit to the use of the Chamber if he make default, Twenty Pounds, and Five Pounds at every hall hereafter until he do yield himself.

Friday morning came, the 9th of September, but no Master Perrott; whereupon it was agreed that: ‘the said Master Robert Perrott wilfully made default and forfeited the said pain of £20’.

Perrott was a well-to-do Puritan, who was thus punished for shirking his responsibilities in a critical hour.

The Northern Rebellion

The Queen of Scots was in the Midlands. In February, 1569, she was imprisoned at Tutbury. In March, she was removed to Wingfield, in May, to Chatsworth; in June, she was brought back to Wingfield. She was kept on the move because of the intrigue that constantly surrounded her. In July, Protestant ministers driven from the north reported that a rising was imminent. The Duke of Norfolk sought to release and marry the prisoner. Foxe warned him that such ‘a catastrophe’ would be ruinous to himself and dangerous to the tranquillity of the kingdom.

On 17 September Don Guerau, the Spanish ambassador, wrote to King Philip, ‘I do not believe the Duke will desist’. A stronger guard has been placed around the Queen of Scots. On the 21st she was again at Tutbury, under strict surveillance of the Earl of Huntingdon, brother-in-law of the Earls of Leicester and Warwick. On the 25th Elizabeth wrote from Windsor to Paul Wentworth to bring the Duke to Court ‘even if in a litter’ (he had feigned sickness as an excuse for his absence), and to the Earl of Huntingdon to search Mary's coffers and forward her papers: an indignity at which she raged ‘like a wild cat in a cage’. On 3 October, Wentworth had the Duke in custody at Burnham, whence Sir Francis Knowles conveyed him to the Tower.

On the 8th, Don Gueru wrote to King Philip,

…The Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cumberland and Derby, and the whole body of the Catholics, are furious at the Duke's timidity. They will take forcible possession of the Queen of Scots, make themselves masters of the northern counties and re-establish the Catholic Religion.

A month later, on 10 November, Dean Whittingham fled from Durham; and on the 14th the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, calling on ‘all true and faithful subjects’ to restore ‘the ancient customs and liberties to God's Church’, entered the city, replaced the altar in the cathedral and celebrated Mass. In a second proclamation they appealed to ‘favourers of God's Word’ to join them for the reformation of abuses and a declaration of the succession to the Crown. The news like wild-fire came south. On 17 November, the anniversary of Elizabeth's accession, church bells rang out in Warwick
in defiance of her enemies. On the 23rd, amid intense excitement, Mary was conveyed for greater security by the Earl of Huntingdon to his castle at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and thence to Leicester, where an emergency meeting of the Corporation was held by candle-light. The same night she was taken to Coventry, the Leicester burgheers providing twenty soldiers for her escort at a cost of £5 9s. 0d. At Coventry, sixteen miles, as the crow flies, from Stratford, ‘the fair she-devil’, ‘witch’, ‘bosom serpent’, and ‘mother of all mischief’ (as leading Protestants described her), was accommodated in the Mayor's parlour.

Warwickshire levies prepared to march northward under the Earls of Warwick and Leicester. A letter from the Catholic Bishop of Ross at Burton to the Earl of Leicester on Mary's behalf, dated 28 November, is worth quoting for its reference to the story of Lear, the fabulous king of Leicester

Let her Majesty of England remember what great commendations and immortal fame many kings and princes have purchased for themselves for benefit bestowed on princes in like distress. Did not noble Cordelia set up again in the royal throne of Britain her father driven from thence by his two unkind and unnatural daughters?

The reading of histories (even Geoffrey of Monmouth's Chronicle), like the witnessing of plays, in 1569 was more than a recreation. On 8 December, the Earl of Warwick set out from Leicester with Sir Edward Hastings, the Corporation presenting him with ‘four dozen of woodcocks and six couple of capons, and his brother-general with a purse of £5.’ Chaplains in his army were William Kethe (author of ‘All people that on earth do dwell’) and John Tymes, the recently appointed vicar of St. Mary's, Warwick. To Edward Aglionby, Henry Higford's friend and the future Recorder of Warwick, was entrusted money for the forces, - Bishop Sandys was alarmed at the wavering of Protestants in his diocese and the lack of respect to ‘Religion’ in the appointment of officers in the army. He himself feared assault in Worcester, and asked for authority to raise a body-guard of one hundred men from his tenants. On the approach, however, of the Queen's troops the ‘crusade’ collapsed. To save his men (as he hoped) the Earl of Northumberland disbanded them. Dean Whittingham returned to Durham in the Earl of Warwick's train (they were old friends).

‘Thanked be God’, wrote Cecil to Norris on Christmas Eve, ‘our rebellion is fallen flat to the ground and scattered away.’ On 2 January, 1570, Mary was taken back to Tutbury. On the 10th, the Earl of Leicester had returned to Kenilworth, whence he wrote to the Queen,

Here be your sweet Eyes, with much cold and scarcity. My good brother is this night to come hither. He is well and all this hard weather hath every day travelled on horses. Your Majesty's service hath made him forget his pain, and I trust hath caused him to leave his gout among your Northern worse-natured subjects. He is even now come, and assuredly he is marvellous weary.

Robert Salisbury had succeeded John Shakespeare as Bailiff of Stratford, having received ‘all the voices’ on 7 September, 1569, and been sworn, with the Earl of Warwick's approval, on 5 October. He was a newcomer, had only joined the Council in October 1564, and evidently ‘voiced’ their religious convictions. In Stratford the Rebellion had its consequences. The vicar, curate, and schoolmaster all departed. William Butcher was deprived of the vicarage at the moment of the outbreak, his
successor Henry Haycroft being presented by the Earl of Warwick (in the midst of his preparations for the North) on 26 November. If he was the William Butcher referred to by Anthony Wood, ‘President of Corpus Christi College’, he retired, ‘being in animo Catholicus to his small cure at Downbourne Militis near Cirencester and lived there obscurely many years’. The curate, James Hilman, left Stratford in February, 1570, Sir Gabriel taking his place for five weeks in Lent. Early in April, John Sadler sued Hilman in the Court of Record for a debt of 15s., and distraint was granted quia predictus Jacobus est fugitivus. Part of his salary was only paid by command of Bishop Sandys. Besides debt he left, apparently, a wife and two children behind him. Ralph Sharpe succeeded in the curacy in September. The schoolmaster, John Acton, departed at the end of 1569 and was followed in the new year by Walter Roche. Roche was a Lancashire man and a graduate of Oxford. He obtained a Fellowship at Corpus on 26 November, 1558. On 23 November, 1569, the Queen presented him to the rectory of Droitwich. In the bond of his induction at Droitwich 1 May, 1570, he is styled ‘of Stratford-upon-Avon, clerk’. Apparently he enjoyed the living of Droitwich while schoolmaster at Stratford.

We must notice the reparation of the Town stocks early in 1570, and the further Protestantizing of the Gild Chapel at midsummer by the reglazing of the windows (substitution, that is, of clear for the old stained glass).

An Order in the matter of Robert Perrott

We must notice also the following items in the Chamberlains’ Account presented 9 January, 1571: ‘Item money delivered to Master Shakespeare at sundry times vjli. Item money delivered to Henry Russell when he went to London xliij. Iiijd’. Russell was the senior Sergeant at the Mace. He had gone to London probably with or on the business of John Shakespeare, the late Bailiff, in obtaining a decree on behalf of the Corporation against Robert Perrott. The sum expended was large, and may have seemed to some thrown away, but it brought, after many days, an adequate return. On 3 January, 1571, a commission sat in Stratford to arbitrate in the case. Sir Thomas Lucy of Charlecote, Master Clement Throgmorton of Haseley, and Master Henry Goodere of Polesworth attended, heard the dispute, made their award, and were entertained at a dinner at the Bear which cost 37s. 8d. ‘We do order’, said the three magistrates, in consideration of an oath which Robert Perrott hath made never to be of the Corporation, wherewith he may not be persuaded to dispense with himself in conscience, although he be very sorry for the same, the said Robert Perrott shall from this day forward be exempt from bearing of any office, all appearance at the Common Hall and all other charges, in consideration whereof he shall pay £13 6s. 8d. upon the first of May next, and of his own mere and free goodwill and the love he beareth to the Town and Corporation give £40 — at Michaelmas, 1571, £20, and at Michaelmas, 1572, £20—to be employed during his lifetime as he will, and be assured to the Corporation for ever. This promise of £53 6s. 8d. the wealthy and conscientious brewer for an outlay of £8 3s. 4d. with the cost of the dinner and 2s. spent on horse-hire to the magistrates, was not bad business in John Shakespeare and his brethren’s eyes, especially as Master Perrott (who was not present) had to send his contribution of 15s. to the expense of the dinner by the hand of his son-in-law, Richard Woodward of Shottery. But more than thirty years passed ere the ‘mere and free goodwill’ gift of £40 came into the possession of the Chamber. Perrott had something besides a conscience. He and his son-in-law were dead before the money was paid, and John Shakespeare also was in his grave.
John Shakespeare as Head Alderman, 1571-2

On 5 September, 1571, John Shakespeare was elected Head Alderman and deputy to the new Bailiff, his old colleague, Adrian Quiney. Between his election and his swearing in on 5 October, John Shakespeare (on Friday 28 September) took his daughter, Anne, to the church for baptism by Henry Haycroft. She was probably named after Anne Arden, the mother's sister, who was wife first to John Hewins of Bearley, then of Thomas Stringer of Stockton in Shropshire, before her death some time previous to October, 1576.

The first act of the new Bailiff and his High Alderman was to dispose of the Romanist vestments remaining at the Gild Chapel. At a meeting of the Chamber held on 10 October it was resolved that ‘Master Quiney should sell the copes and vestments here underwritten to the use of the Chamber’ and ‘yield accompt of all such money as he shall receive for the same’.

Such ‘relics of the Amorites’ were no longer to be in possession of the Council, but sold speedily, and thriftily, for secular purposes.

Their next function, by a curious irony, was to welcome the new schoolmaster, successor to Walter Roche, a young man from Oxford, who became in a short while a Romanist and a Jesuit, and probably exercised no small influence on the High Alderman's eldest son in his first years at school. His name was Simon Hunt, and all we know of him at the University is that he supplicated for his degree of Bachelor of Arts on 30 March, 1568, was admitted 5 April, and determined in 1569. He received his licence to teach in Schola Grammaticali at Stratford from the Bishop of Worcester, Sandys' successor, Nicholas Bullingham, on 29 October, 1571. To obtain this he at least passed as a Protestant.

Side by side the two magistrates attended the Court of Record and the meetings of the Chamber with the help of Henry Rogers of Sherborne as their Steward and Clerk. There are minutes of eleven ‘halls’. At the meeting of 18 January, it was agreed ‘that Master Adrian Quiney and Master John Shakespeare shall at Hilary term next deal in the affairs of the Borough according to their discretions’, and that ‘Master Thomas Barber, one of the Chamberlains, shall deliver to Master Bailiff aforesaid at the said Hilary term at London £6’. Hilary Term was from 23 January to 12 February. Quiney received £1 on his departure from Stratford and £7 during his sojourn in London. He and his colleague were home again on 7 February, when they attended a large meeting of the Chamber. The three meetings in April were probably in anticipation of the assembling of Parliament on 8 May. That of 28 May was during the sitting of Parliament, when a resolution was passed that ‘Master Adrian Quiney shall deal in all causes now in variance between the Earl of Warwick and the Borough according to his discretion’. A further resolution assured him of repayment before Michaelmas of ‘all such money as he shall disburse concerning the Council's suits’. Quiney was bent on obtaining concessions from the lord of the manor which, without loss to the earl, should be of substantial benefit to the Corporation, and in this enterprise he evidently enjoyed the wholehearted support of his colleague. Parliament was fiercely Protestant, clamorous for the execution of Mary of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk, and against the ‘neutral government’ of Elizabeth and her marriage negotiations with a French prince. Archbishop Parker wrote to Cecil on 19 May,
This Machiavel government - the rule, that is, of her Majesty - bringeth forth strange fruits. As soon is the papist favoured as the true protestant, the true subject not regarded but overthwarted, the rebel borne with; when the faithful subject and officer hath spent his wit to search, to find, to indict, to arraign and to condemn, yet must they be kept still - Mary and the Duke - for a fair day to cut our throats. Yea, if I had not been so much bound to the mother - Anne Boleyn - I would not so soon have granted to serve the daughter - her Majesty. One thing in this hurly-burly I pray your honour to let me speak to you. I am informed credibly that ye profess that ye be at your wits' end. Sir, let the world know no such thing.

On the 21st Cecil wrote to Walsingham in Paris,

…The Commons are sound throughout and in the Lords there is no lack, but in the Highest Person such slowness and such stay in resolution, I am overthrown in heart. I have no spark of good spirits left in me. I am carried into the Parliament House …

He suffered from lameness. Presbyterians made the most of their opportunity. Thomas Cartwright, driven by Whitgift from Cambridge, was on the Continent. Edward Deering begged Cecil, as Chancellor of the University, that he might return and succeed Cavallerius as Hebrew professor. Nobody denied Cartwright's learning. Field and Wilcocks in a reissue of their 'Admonition to Parliament' a pamphlet of 1571 advocating a wholesale remodelling of the Church on Presbyterian lines, added A View of Popish Abuses yet Remaining in the English Church, for the which Godly Ministers have Refused to Subscribe. Cartwright brought his learning to the support of these popular dissertations, and from this time to the defeat of the Spanish Armada Presbyterianism was a growing power in England, as already it was triumphant in Scotland.

But Elizabeth would none of it. Whatever her ministers might think of her irresolution, her will was of iron. She pursued her own course, deceiving her friends that she might deceive her enemies, under a cloak of feminine fickleness and coquetry. She executed Norfolk on 2 June, shut up the authors of the Admonition in Newgate on 7 July, and encouraging her French suitor, whom she had not the remotest intention of marrying, to continue his addresses, she set out for her summer progress once more through the puritan Midlands, to override opposition, as she well knew how, by the force and charm and divine glamour of her personality, and to enjoy herself to the full as a daughter of Eve (and Anne Boleyn) in the stately houses and parks of her wealthy landed gentry. These favourites had been enriched at the expense of the National Church, and she had not the least scruple in throwing herself and her retinue upon their hospitality.

The French ambassador La Mothe Fenelon (one of the many French gentlemen whose names are taken in vain by Shakespeare in Loves Labour’s Lost) was with the Queen awaiting her answer to a communication from his master's court, when she arrived with her splendid cavalcade of nobles and dames and other illustrious personages on Monday 11 August in Warwick. We owe to John Fisher a graphic account of her reception and stay in the borough. His matter-of-fact style is, for once, inflamed by his subject. He himself as steward, and Edward Aglionby as recorder, and the puritan preacher, Ralph
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Griffin, recently appointed master of the new Leicester Hospital (destined to be Dean of Lincoln), took part in the welcome. On Wednesday her Majesty was escorted through the streets to the Northgate, and thence through the Priory grounds on her way to Kenilworth, where the Earl of Leicester provided ‘princely sport’ until Saturday. In the evening of this day she returned to Warwick, looking in on the Earl and Countess of Warwick (who had vacated the Castle for her own occupation) at the Priory at supper and conversing with ‘the goodman of the house’, Thomas Fisher, grievously vexed ‘with the gout, in his chair in the gallery’. On Sunday the 17th she saw country dances from her window, and after supper a show of fireworks on a most elaborate and, to John Fisher, alarming scale (it must have owed a good deal to the Earl of Warwick as Master of the Ordnance), for it set fire to a number of houses in the town (four were in flames at once), and burned an old couple out of their home at the end of the Bridge. ‘This fire appeased’, says the writer, ‘it was time to go to rest’. Next morning she proceeded again to Kenilworth. She stayed until Saturday. On Friday she gave her reply to La Mothe. She was afraid that her age and religion were insuperable barriers. On Saturday she journeyed to Sir Thomas Lucy's at Charlecote, thence to Compton Winyates en route for Woodstock. Toward her journey Stratford paid its modest levy of 6s. 8d.

At Woodstock the Queen received intelligence of the appalling massacre of Huguenots in Paris on the eve and day of St. Bartholomew (23 and 24 August). After three days La Mothe was admitted to offer an explanation. ‘Silence as in the dead of night’, he says, ‘reigned through the royal apartments’; the ladies and courtiers were ranged on each side clad in deep mourning; and as I passed through them not one bestowed on me a civil look or made the least acknowledgement of my salutation.’ Cecil (now Lord Treasurer Burghley) wrote to Walsingham, ‘I see the devil is suffered by Almighty God for our sins to be strong in the persecution of Christ's members. We are vigilant in our own defence, and also call ourselves to repentance, a national fast being appointed.’

The Drama in Shakespeare’s Country

Stratford and Banbury were incorporated at almost the same time, one immediately before, the other shortly after the death of King Edward. How the men of Stratford celebrated the charter we are not informed; but at Banbury among the festivities was a pageant, entitled The Ditcher of Bramley. Master Kemswell and the Puritan Squire Cope, of Hanvvell, gave each a tree for the ‘scaffolds’.

Players' gear was purchased at Coventry. The trade companies, twelve in number, contributed sums varying from 4s. to 10s., and probably found the performers in the different scenes, as in the Corpus Christi Play at Coventry. Master Kemswell was in the town on 5 February, 1555, apparently to witness the pageant. Other visitors were Master Rainsford of Clifford Chambers, Master Fiennes of Eroughton Castle, Master Lucy of Charlecote, and his old tutor (not yet fled to the Continent), John Foxe. Unfortunately we know nothing of The Ditcher of Bramley.

And we know little of the Shepherds' Play on the Cotswolds. Lads and lasses chose their king and queen by means of a cake in which were embedded a bean and a pea. A personage called the ‘Cutter of Cotswold’ divided the cake, and the happy recipients of the pieces containing these lucky ingredients were crowned. The ceremony was conducted with dialogue.

Until the building of the London theatres in 1576 there was no antagonism between players and preachers. On the contrary, they were in friendly cooperation, rivals in anti-
Catholic propaganda, in the supply of moral edification, and in the provision, it might be said (they were both so run after), of popular entertainment. No towns outside London were more Puritan than Norwich, Coventry, Leicester, and Bristol, and no towns at this period more enthusiastically patronized the drama. The Chamberlains’ Accounts at Leicester, for example, are strewn with payments to preachers and players.

We are not surprised, then, that John Shakespeare as Bailiff of Stratford welcomed players. Two companies visited the town in 1569 and received a donation, by his order, from the borough purse. The Queen's players were at Bristol in the second week of August and about that time performed in the Gild Hall at Stratford. They were paid 9s. by John Sadler as a reward from the municipal funds. The Earl of Worcester's men were at Nottingham on 11 August and probably played at Stratford on their tour thence to Gloucester and Bristol. They performed at Bristol in the third week of September. At Stratford they received but 12d. from the Chamberlain for their performance.

Interesting light is thrown on these and similar visits (in 1573 the Earl of Leicester's men came to Stratford, and in 1575 the Earl of Warwick's and the Earl of Worcester's servants) by an account of a play at Gloucester at this very time in Robert Willis's Mount Tabor. Writing in 1639, when his age, as he tells us, was 75 (he was born therefore in the same year as William Shakespeare), Willis says

In the City of Gloucester the manner is, as I think it is in other like corporations, that when players of interludes come to town they first attend the Mayor to inform him what nobleman's servants they are, and so to get licence for their public playing; and if the Mayor like the actors or would show respect to their lord and master, he appoints them to play their first play before himself and the Aldermen and Common Council; and that is called the Mayor's Play, where every one that will goes in without money, the Mayor giving the players a reward as he thinks fit to show respect unto them. At such a play my father took me with him, and made me stand between his legs, as he sat upon one of the benches, where we saw and heard very well. The play was called The Cradle of Security, wherein was personated a King or some great Prince, with his courtiers of several kinds; amongst which three Ladies were in special grace with him; and they, keeping him in delights and pleasures, drew him from his graver councillors, hearing of sermons and listening to good counsel and admonitions, that in the end they got him to lie down in a cradle upon the stage; where these three Ladies, joining in a sweet song, rocked him asleep that he snorted again, and in the meantime closely conveyed under the clothes wherewithal he was covered, a vizard like a swine's snout upon his face with three wire chains fastened thereunto, the other end whereof being Holden severally by those three Ladies…

The above has often been quoted; but not what follows, which is to be commended to those who fancy that a didactic play is essentially undramatic or that a Puritan Bailiff would not patronize a company of actors in 1569.

…This sight took such impression in me that when I came towards man's estate it was as fresh in my memory as if I had seen it newly acted. From
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whence I observe out of my own experience, what great care should be had in the education of children to keep them from seeing of spectacles of ill examples and hearing of lascivious or scurrilous words, for that their young memories are like fair writing-tables, wherein if the fair sentences or lessons of grace be written, they may by God's blessing keep them from many vicious blots of life, where withal they may otherwise be painted, especially considering the general corruption of our nature, whose very memories are apter to receive evil than good, and that the well seasoning of the cask at the first keeps it the better and sweeter ever after; and withal we may observe how far unlike the plays and harmless morals of former times are to those which have succeeded many of which by report of others, may be termed schoolmasters of vice and provocations to corruption, which our depraved nature is too prone unto, nature and grace being contraries.

The old Puritan squire's last observation will sufficiently explain why Stratford and many other boroughs which encouraged players in 1569 and for a generation afterwards, at a later date, when the drama had lost, for the most part, its didactic aim and religious earnestness, refused to allow them to perform and even paid them to go away.1079

William Shakespeare’s Home in Sunshine

In April, 1575, William Shakespeare entered his twelfth year. He was the eldest of five children. Gilbert was eight years and six months old, and probably at school with William, Joan six years old, Anne three years and a half, Richard thirteen months.

William had probably been at school since 1571. Here we will take note of a change of head master at midsummer 1575. Simon Hunt, B.A., followed Edmund Campion the Jesuit, first to Douay, then to Rome. He matriculated at Douay in the summer of 1575 with other Angli pauperes including Rafe Sherwin and John Curry, Masters of Arts of Oxford. Sherwin died with Campion at Tyburn six years afterwards. Hunt proceeded to Rome between 17 September, 1576, when he was held up in Douay by plague, and 6 March, 1577, when the news reached Douay of his safe arrival in the Holy City. He was admitted to the Society of Jesus 20 April, 1578. His successor at the King's New School at Stratford was Thomas Jenkins, also an Oxford graduate, a scholar of St. John's College. A letter from Sir Thomas White, founder of St. John's, to the President and Fellows, dated 12 December, 1566, requesting leave of absence for Jenkins for two years that he may give himself to teach children, throws light on the youth's parentage and nationality. Jenkins is a Welsh name, and it has been plausibly conjectured that Thomas Jenkins was the prototype of Sir Hugh Evans, especially in the scene between the schoolmaster and his pupil William in The Merry Wives of Windsor (Act IV Scene 1) … it may be doubted whether a boy brought up in London and educated at Oxford would make such ‘fritters of English’ as Evans was capable of doing. Nevertheless the Welsh accent, like the odour of garlic, is strong and lives long, and it may, with other singularities, have offended the taste of young Shakespeare in the new master. We cannot doubt that the new master, especially if he came from Warwick, gave the boys holiday to see the Queen during her eighteen or nineteen days' sojourn at Kenilworth in July, 1575. She witnessed a display of The Lady of the Lake at the bridge. Triton rode on a swimming mermaid, blowing his horn as a sign that he came on an embassy…

1079 For Stratford see Council Book B.95 and Chamberlain’s Account 10 Jan. 1623.
followed by Arion on a dolphin's back. Herewith says a spectator, young Robert Laneham, clerk of the Privy Council chamber door, no mean musician

...Arion after a few well-couched words to her Majesty, began a delectable ditty, to the accompaniment of instruments within the dolphin's body.  

We need not doubt that young Shakespeare was present, and that the occasion inspired the lovely lines, full of sweet memory and compliment for the Queen (‘the fair Vestal throned by the West’), twenty years after —

Thou rememberest  
Since once I sat upon a promontory  
And heard a Meremaid on a Dolphin's back  
Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath  
That the rude sea grew civil at her song.  
And certain stars shot madly from their spheres  
To hear the Seamaid’s music.

Vain is it to object that at Kenilworth the mermaid did not ride on the dolphin! Shakespeare never imitates. The singer and the dolphin, the ‘sea and the night sky’, the ‘incomparable melody’ and the ‘Fair Vestal’ were all there, unforgettable.

Another reminiscence of the poet's youth is of a different kind. Property above and below Alderman Shakespeare's house in Henley Street was changing hands. Two tenements between his house and Richard Hornby's smithy, purchased by William Wedgewood, the tailor, a few years before, were again in the market. On 20 September, 1575, Alderman Shakespeare and Richard Hornby witnessed the deed of sale of these tenements by Wedgewood to one Edward Willis, of King's Norton, for £44. The tailor was returning to Warwick, ‘compelled to go from Stratford’, where, it appeared, he had been living with a woman who was not his wife; and the 'honester sort' in Warwick greatly 'misliked' his taking a house in that town.

Wedgewood, we are told, was ‘a man very contentious, proud and slanderous, oft busying himself with naughty matters and quarrelling with his honest neighbours’.

The apparent sketch of him haranguing Hornby in King John IV.ii. is hardly complimentary

I saw a smith stand with his hammer, thus,  
The whilst his iron did on the anvil cool,  
With open mouth swallowing a tailor's news;  
Who, with his shears and measure in his hand,  
Standing on slippers, which his nimble haste  
Had falsely thrust upon contrary feet,  
Told of a many thousand warlike French . . .

---
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In Michaelmas Term, 1575 (it began 10 October and ended 17 November), Alderman Shakespeare enlarged his property in Henley Street by the purchase, for £40, from Edmund and Emma Hall, of Eshbury in Worcestershire, of the western portion of ‘The Birthplace’. It is described as ‘two messuages’, with ‘two gardens’ and ‘two orchards’ and ‘appurtenances’. There was room now for the Alderman’s family and business. That the former had grown we know, and that the latter had increased in proportion is a natural inference from the purchase itself, and from the Alderman's application shortly afterwards to the College of Heralds for a coat of arms. John Shakespeare aspired, like Adrian Quiney and other fellow aldermen, to gentlehood. For ten years, in virtue of his aldermanship, he had been ‘Master Shakespeare’. To become ‘John Shakespeare gentleman’ he must give evidence of his ability to live without ‘manual labour’, and ‘bear the port, countenance and charge of a man of substance’. His wife must dress well and keep servants, have time for visiting and recreation, attend town functions and make merry with friends at christenings, churchings, and weddings, as well as duly take part in a funeral. In 1575 or 1576 as a Queen's officer and Justice of Peace within the borough of Stratford, who had served as Bailiff, possessing lands and tenements of good wealth and substance and married to a daughter and heiress of Robert Arden, a gentleman of worship, he applied to the Clarencieux in London, Robert Cooke. When twenty years later, in 1596, he renewed his application, he declared his fortune to be £500 William was then living with him, and the sum probably represents the joint wealth of the household. But in 1576 John Shakespeare was worth not less than £200. Before his marriage he owned a house in Greenhill Street and the eastern portion of the property in Henley Street. His wife brought him a dowry of £6 13s. 4d., the freehold farm of Asbies (which he valued at £60), and an interest in the Snitterfield estate. From his father he inherited part of the £38 at which his goods and chattels were assessed. He had stock, no doubt, on his land at Ingon as well as leather-ware in his shop in Henley Street. And now he owned the western and back portions of ‘The Birthplace’. What more, if anything, or less he possessed we do not know; but Clarencieux Cooke was satisfied, granted him arms, and suggested a ‘pattern’ or sketch of the same, which was probably that approved in 1599 and familiar to us on the Poet's monument in the Church.

But a strange thing happened. John Shakespeare did not proceed with his application. At the eleventh hour, for some reason, when the coat-armour was practically his, he declined it. Simultaneously, moreover, he withdrew from the Borough Council, and in consequence from the magistrates’ bench. Between Election day, 5 September, 1576, and Account day, 23 January, 1577, he made up his mind to absent himself, and from the latter date he was a persistent absentee. What was the cause of this sudden change of front? A straw shows the wind; and a successful suit by the late Romanist vicar, Roger Dyos, for unpaid wages and annuity, with rather heavy damages from the Corporation in November, though not the cause of John Shakespeare’s resolution, may indicate pretty clearly where we ought to look for it.

1084 Adrian Quyny was ‘gentleman’ in 1574
The Grand Commission Ecclesiastical

We have arrived at a critical moment in Elizabethan statesmanship. Slowly but surely the Queen had gained autocratic power. Aided by the menace from abroad and the dread of civil war at home, by the continued peace and growing prosperity in the country, by her own personal popularity, and by the loyal efforts of Burghley and Parker, often against their own convictions, to carry out her policy, she had steadily bent Council, Bishops, and Parliament to her will.

Parker died on the 17 May, 1575, worn out by the opposition of Protestants, and savage with the Earl of Leicester as his chief antagonist. He confessed to Burghley, ‘Does your lordship think that I care for cap, tippet, surplice or wafer-bread or any such but for the laws so established I esteem them.

To Parker succeeded an archbishop of a tougher type, certainly not in love with Presbyterianism, but immovable where his conscience clashed with the dictates of his royal mistress. Elizabeth expected to use Edmund Grindal as she had used his predecessor, and she discovered her mistake. His election on 10 January, 1576, created a vacancy at York. On the 23rd died the Bishop of Durham, James Pilkington. The Earl of Leicester hoped to fill one of these vacancies by the appointment of his old friend, even tougher than Grindal, William Whittingham. He sent to him to come to Court. Whittingham replied that he was unfit ‘by age and infirmity’ In the best of health the friend and champion of Knox would scarcely have undertaken the episcopal office.

Parliament met in February, and severe things were said of bishops. Peter Wentworth complained that the Commons were forbidden to deal with matters of religion save those laid before them from the bishops. He had understood that the banishment of the Pope and the restoring of True Religion had their beginnings from that House and not from the Bishops. Meeting defiance with aggression, the Queen sent Wentworth to the Tower.

In April her Majesty appointed a Grand Commission Ecclesiastical for the whole Realm. It was empowered to inquire by jury, witnesses, and other means into all infractions of the Four Statutes of Supremacy, Uniformity, Authority over states and subjects, and Reformation of disorders among ministers; into all singular, heretical, erroneous and offensive opinions, seditious books, contempts, conspiracies, false rumours, slanderous words, enormities, disturbances, misbehaviours, frays, &c., committed in any church, chapel, or churchyard; to order, correct, reform, and punish any persons wilfully and obstinately absenting themselves from church and service; the penalties prescribed for such misdemeanours to be levied by the churchwardens for the benefit of the poor, fine and imprisonment to be imposed by the commissioners, the obstinate being visited with excommunication and other ecclesiastical censures, bond or recognizance to be taken for the appearance of offenders. Among the commissioners were Grindal, Sandys, Home, Cox, Bullingham, Parkhurst, Alexander Nowell, Thomas Smith, Francis Walsingham, and Cartwright's bitter enemy at Cambridge, John Whitgift. The majority were ready to run to earth the Papists, Whitgift at least was prepared to hunt the Presbyterians. In the meantime, on 18 April, died Bullingham, Bishop of Worcester. Thus was created a third vacancy, of greater moment to the Dudleys than those of Durham and York. “If only Whittingham were available” must have been the desire of the Earls of Leicester, Warwick, and Huntingdon, and their party. But it was not to be. Sandys was nominated for York, John Aylmer for London in
succession to Sandys, Richard Barnes for Durham, and John Whitgift for Worcester. They owed their promotion to Burghley’s desire both to counterbalance the Leicester influence and to satisfy the Queen. Sandys, Aylmer, and Barnes, more despotic than in their days of adversity twenty years since, were unwelcome to the Puritan leaders in the Privy Council, and Whitgift, it need hardly be said, was an athema.

Coming events cast their shadows before them. Roger Dyos seized the moment to sue the Puritan Corporation of Stratford for long owing [sic] arrears; and John Shakespeare as a determined Puritan took steps to meet the worst.

What William Shakespeare learned in his Father’s Shop.

John Shakespeare was a whittawer and glover. As a whittawer, or dresser of white leather, he ‘tawed’ the skins of horses and deer as well as of sheep, goats, and hounds, but not those of cattle or swine. William Shakespeare refers to the hides of ‘oxen and horses to calf-skin, sheep-skin, lambskin, fox-skin and dog-skin, deer-skin and cheveril.’ He knew that neat’s-leather was used for shoes, sheep’s leather for a bridle.

‘Is not parchment’, asks Hamlet, ‘made of sheep-skins’. And Horatio replies, ‘Ay, my lord, and of calf-skins too’. The uniform of the serjeant-at-mace in the Comedy of Errors,’ and no doubt in Stratford town, was made of calf-skin. The poet was aware that horse-hair was used in bowstrings and ‘calves’ guts in fiddle-strings. He notices leathern aprons, jerkins, and bottles the ‘sow-skin bowget’ or bag carried by tinkers and he comments humorously on the capacity of tanned leather to keep out water. He alludes to ‘flesh and fell’, to the ‘greasy falls of ewes’ and, with evident pleasure, to the lamb’s ‘white fleece’. He knew that the deer's hide was the keeper's perquisite, and we may believe that his father made purchases from the keepers round Stratford. References to cheveril, the skin of the roebuck, are much to the point. On account of its softness and flexibility it was used in the making of finer qualities of gloves. Shakespeare speaks of ‘a wit of cheveril, that stretches from an inch narrow to an ell-broad’. This is technical language, borrowed from his father's business. He mentions also a ‘soft cheveril conscience’, capable of receiving gifts if the owner will ‘please to stretch it’ and ‘a cheveril glove . . . how quickly the wrong side may be turned outward.’ Such a glove is that referred to by the French lord, Lafeu, ‘an easy glove . . . goes off and on at pleasure’. Gloves were much worn both by gentlemen and ladies. Othello and Desdemona wore them: and the dandy Slender, in The Merry Wives, woos sweet Anne Page in a pair of gloves which are much in evidence, and the source of his favourite and feeble oath, ‘by these Gloves’. They were presented to ladies by their lovers, as by Dumain to Katherine in Love’s Labour’s Lost and by the Count Claudio to Hero in Much Ado. The last were perfumed. Sometimes they were sent with a motto or ‘a pair of verses’, as by Alexander Aspinal to his betrothed. Gentlemen wore their ladies’
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gloves in their hats as favours, or threw down their own as a challenge to a duel. Romeo wishes he were a glove on Juliet's hand. Tarquin sees Lucretia's glove upon the floor, and picking it up ‘from the rushes’ pricks his finger with a needle she had left in it. Autolycus has gloves in his pack ‘as sweet as damask roses’. They were dyed and sometimes furred. The pair of Elizabethan gloves, said to have been Shakespeare's and presented as such to Garrick in 1769, are embossed and embroidered with silk. Last but not least is Shakespeare's reference to a tool which he must often have seen in his father's hand. ‘Does he not wear’, asks Dame Quickly of Slender, in the Merry Wives ‘a great round beard like a glover’s paring-knife?

John Shakespeare's sign-manual, it will be remembered, was his Glover's Compasses (used for the ornamental cuttings on the back of the glove), with a single or a double adjusting screw, signifying, we may believe, the devout thought ‘God Encompasseth us’.

**Whitgift in Warwickshire**

Whitgift's presence in Warwickshire was more than a snub for the Dudleys. It meant a breach between the Queen and her favourite. She paid no more visits to Kenilworth, and there was no more talk of her marriage with a subject. As an antidote to Grindal at Lambeth she sent Whitgift into the Midlands. The first question at issue was of ‘Prophesyings’.

Grindal's famous letter to her Majesty refusing to suppress them was sent in December 1576 by the hand of the Earl of Leicester. In the Queen's judgement these disputes were a menace to ‘uniformity’ and an invasion of authority. Whitgift almost alone supported the royal opinion. He was a martinet. He spied upon his clergy as upon his scholars at Cambridge. He was confirmed in his episcopate on 16 April and consecrated on the 21st. The same month the Queen wrote to him: ‘to make express order throughout all his diocese ‘that, in the interest of ‘a uniform unity’ and the prevention of ‘novelties’, the ‘prophesyings’ be foreborne; and to signify to her the ‘names of all persons that maintained such exercises’, and ‘in what places’. In May she wrote, to him and all the bishops, ‘there are no small numbers of teachers and preachers, though neither lawfully thereunto called nor fit for the same, which do daily devise new rites and forms, as well by their preaching, readings and ministering the sacraments, as by procuring unlawful assemblies of a great number of our people out of their ordinary parishes and from places far distant and some of good callings to be hearers of their disputations and new devised opinions’.

At the same time commissioners were appointed for ‘musters’. Enlisting of soldiers invariably accompanied repressive enactment. Grindal was ‘sequestered’ and imprisoned in his own palace. Whitgift, after a provisional visitation of his diocese by his archdeacon, known as ‘Browne's Visitation’ set out for a personal inspection of his new field of labour.

At Stratford the Corporation entertained him and his suite at a drinking at the Swan paying Mistress Waterman (the first Mistress Waterman, John Burbage's widow Phillipa) 8s. 8d. for the wine. This was in September. On 15 October a despatch was
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sent post-haste from Windsor to Whitgift, and other bishops, requiring him within seven days after his receipt of the message to certify the names of all persons in his diocese who refused to come to church together with the values of their lands and goods as he shall think they are and not as they are given in the Subsidy Book.  

On St. Luke's day, the 18th, Stratford was busy with the musters. Wine was bestowed on the visiting magistrates—Sir William Devereux, Sir Fulke Greville, Sir Thomas Lucy, Edward Aglionby, Edward Boughton, Thomas Dabridgecourt, or some of them—and money was laid out on the dressing of guns, bows and arrows, swords and daggers, gunpowder and matches, breakfast to recruits, and ‘help’ to a wounded soldier.

On 24 October Bishop Cheyne sent in his report of recusants. He gives thirty-nine names presented by churchwardens and gathered from Master Poins—Sir John Tracy (a kinsman of Sir Thomas Lucy) being engaged in the musters. The estimate of their lands and goods is made from common report. For the cause of their refusal some, supposed to savour of papistry, alleged sickness; some other alleged debt and refused, fearing process—which was then permissible on Sunday at the door of the church; the third sort, commonly called Puritans, wilfully refuse to come to church as not liking the surplice, ceremonies and other service now used in the Church, whereupon they have been arraigned and indicted in several sessions and ‘now remain in prison’.  

All sorts of pretexts and devices are mentioned in the reports throughout the country. Sickness, debt, fear of arrest, poverty—many who had lands and goods were eager to appear ‘of no account’ and ‘very beggars’. Well-to-do men ‘shifted their habitations’ into an adjoining diocese while ‘privily resorting to their old domiciles’. Others ‘convey all their lands and goods to friends of theirs before their convictions and are relieved by those that have the same lands’. Ministers befriended and were befriended by their parishioners, and churchwardens assisted. Justices also were lenient.

Here is light on the doings and hardships of Alderman Shakespeare. He was, beyond doubt, an obstinate recusant—suddenly anxious to appear ‘of no account’, a ‘very beggar’, ready to plead debt and ‘fear of process’, unwilling to pay his levies and fines, and much befriended by neighbours. Sure of his tenements and goods within the borough, he parted with his property outside, conveying it to friends from whom he expected relief, trusting in one case to a brother-in-law who betrayed him.

Levy for the musters was made on the Chamberlains’ Account day, 29 January 1578. Alderman Shakespeare was assessed at iijs. iiijd. More than a year later, on 11 March 1579, he and nine others were presented for non-payment. Among them was George Badger, a Catholic, recently married to a Catholic, who had not paid his. Two delinquents, were well-to-do men. Master Thomas Reynolds of Old Stratford, a Catholic, and Master Thomas Nash a Protestant, agent of the Earl of Leicester’s steward. Sir John Huband. Master Nash had two sons, Anthony and John, who were
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contemporaries and friends of Alderman Shakespeare's son. In his will of January 1616, William Shakespeare left money for rings to ‘Anthony Nash gentleman’ and ‘Master John Nash. And curiously, he left the same to ‘William Reynolds gentleman’, son of the above Master Thomas Reynolds. Not a common want of cash, but a common resentment to persecution, we may believe, linked these three fellow-townsmen in their refusal to pay for 'pikemen'.

In view of the attitude Master Shakespeare had taken up and the peril he incurred as a recusant, in view also of the valuable services he had rendered and the generosity he had shown on more than one occasion to the Corporation, he was let off not only this levy of January 1578, but his fines for absence on Election days - as on 3 September 1578 when John Wheeler was called upon to pay 20s. and William Smith haberdasher 10s. - his poor-rate of 4d. weekly on 19 November, 2 and, it would appear, all penalties whatsoever. There is no evidence that he paid a single amercement. Evidently his old colleagues hoped that the storm would blow over—as indeed it did, after a much longer period than they anticipated—and he would return to the work which they knew to be after his heart.

In the meantime he took steps to safeguard Asbies. The farm was let to a freeholder of Wilmcote, one George Gibbs, whose lease expired at Michaelmas 1580. On 14 November 1578 Master Shakespeare and his wife, Mary Arden, made a provisional release of the main part of the property (the house, one yard-land and four acres of arable land) to their brother-in-law, Edmund Lambert of Barton-on-the-Heath, the well-to-do husband of Joan Arden, for the remainder of the lease, for £40, Lambert taking in lieu of interest Gibbs' rent. On the expiration of the lease, on 29 September 1580, a more complicated and permanent arrangement was to come into operation. Lambert was to receive again his £40 and surrender the property, which was to be leased in perpetuity for a sum of money or annual rent not specified to Thomas Webbe and Humfrey Hooper — whoever these may have been — with a proviso that Gibbs was to have the house for 21 years at a rent of one quarter of wheat and one quarter of barley annually to be paid to Webbe and Hooper. Thus, ostensibly and legally parting with their estate and throwing themselves on the honour of trustworthy accomplices, the owners escaped Whitgift's ‘band of rooking officials’ (as Milton described them), 'with cloak-bags full of citations and processes to be served by a corporality of griffon-like promoters and apparitors'.

‘Monsieur’

The storm grew. Protestants were furious at the renewal of the ‘French Marriage’. Simier was in England nearly the whole of 1579 negotiating a treaty. ‘Monsieur’ himself le Duc d'Alencon was at Greenwich in August when John Stubbs of Lincoln's Inn wrote, with brutal frankness, his Discovery of a Gaping Gull – 'whereunto England is like to be swallowed by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the banns by letting her Majesty see the sin and punishment thereof'. He dwelt on the moral and physical defects of the Duke, and warned his fellow countrymen of the host of French parasites that would feed on the English oak. The Dudleys were strong against the match. On the night when Elizabeth danced for her ‘lover's edification' behind a curtain, the Earl of Leicester held a meeting of the Puritan leaders. Philip Sidney supported his uncle. The Privy Council on 27 September called in Stubbs' pamphlet, but they warned Her Majesty, in a resolution of 2 October, that the country was 'in great and increasing danger' and she must be 'zealous for God's honour and maintain the laws

1098 Mendoza to Philip II, 25 August : “Some afterwards remarked that Parliament would have something to say as to whether the Queen married or not. The people in general seem to threaten revolution about it”
for Religion’ if her ‘attached subjects’ were to increase and ‘the uneasy humour die away’.

The Queen continued her politic game, with cruel results to blundering patriots who stood in her way. Poor Stubbs had his hand chopped off - on 3 November, ‘upon a stage set up in the Marketplace at Westminster’, the people mute with fear and commiseration, ‘and a secret inward repining at the Marriage, which they suspected would be dangerous to Religion’. Sidney, at Leicester's instigation, wrote a private letter to Her Majesty in the new year, touching her ‘Marriage with Monsieur’. She probably agreed with every word of it; but for his pains she sent him into the country. Leicester had already withdrawn into ‘exile’.

The ‘uneasy humour’, of which the Privy Council were conscious, showed itself in Stratford. Musters were held at Whitsuntide to counteract it. On 15 July 1579 a Council meeting, to which Alderman Wheeler had been specially summoned but failed to come, was so disorderly that ‘the whole Hall’ was ‘proclaimed’. On the 26th a royal proclamation forbade the carrying of fire-arms - the disorder ‘having grown very great in common carrying of dags, pistols and such like in all parts of the realm ... and great pieces as harquebusses, calivers etc under colour of learning or exercising to shoot therein’. That day, which was a Sunday, two dozen hooks were put up in the Gild Hall at Stratford for the town-armour by Richard Hornby. An emergency meeting of the Council was held on Sunday 2 August (a most unusual day and date) for the election of the Bailiff. Nicholas Barnhurst and John Wheeler were chosen Bailiff and Head Alderman by the Puritan majority. On 2 September it was resolved that proclamation be made on the morrow ‘in the Market-place, that all persons coming to our market keep the Queen's Majesty's peace within our borough, and leave their weapon s at their inns; and that all inhabitants assist the officers in keeping the peace, in pain of imprisonment and loss of their freedom’. The minute of a special meeting called for the 9th runs, ‘No act done at this Hall for lack of the Company’.

The Earl of Leicester was at this time at Kenilworth. He wrote to Burghley, who had now definitely superseded him as leader in the Privy Council, that ‘her Majesty's displeasure grieved him the more having so faithfully and chargeably served her this twenty years; and whereas he had lain under great blame for his supposed opposition to the Queen's marriage, for his clearing in this matter or to atone for his judgment, he offered his own exile’1099. The Jesuit writer of the libellous and, for the most part, fabulous ‘Leicester's Commonwealth’ for once gives us a bit of local history in his account of a journey in Warwickshire from Cambridge ‘- wherein we must understand Oxford’ - in 1579

When Monsieur's matter was in hand I was myself that year not far from Warwick when the Earl came thither from the Court, a full malcontent, and when it was thought most certainly throughout the realm that he would have taken arms soon after if the marriage of her Majesty with Monsieur had gone forward. The thing in (Oxford) and in all the country as I rode was in every man's mouth, and it was a wonder to see not only the countenances but also the behaviour, and to hear the bold speeches of all such as were of his faction. My lord himself had given out a little before at Kenilworth that the matter would cost many broken heads before Michaelmas day next; and my lord of Warwick had said openly at
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his table in Greenwich, Sir Thomas Heneage being by, if I be not deceived, that it was not to be suffered - I mean the Marriage: which words of his once coming abroad, albeit disliked by his own lady then also present, every serving-man and common companion took them up in defence of his lordship's part against the Queen's Majesty. Such running there was, such sending and posting about the realm, such amplification of the powers and forces of Casimir and other princes ready, as was affirmed, to present themselves unto his aid for defence of the realm and religion against strangers (for that was holden to be his cause), such numbering of parties and accomplices within the realm, whereof himself showed the catalogue to some of his friends (Sir Thomas Layton) for their comfort; such debasing of them that favoured the Marriage, especially two or three Councillors by name who were said to be the cause of all (the Lord Treasurer, Lord Chamberlain, Master Comptroller), and for that were appointed out to be sharply punished to the terror of all others; such letters were written and intercepted of purpose, importing great powers to be ready; and so many other things done and designed, tending all to manifest and open war, as I began heartily to be afeared and wished myself back at (Oxford).

For the 'better prevention of the shedding of blood' a proclamation for the shortening of swords and bucklers was issued at Westminster on 12 February 1580. Burbage's Theatre in Shoreditch was the scene of 'great affrays, assaults, tumults and quasi-insurrections' on 21 February and days before and after. On 16 March commissioners were appointed for musters throughout England in 'defence of her Majesty, Crown, Realm and Good Subjects against all attempts both inward and outward'. To Stratford came Sir Thomas Lucy from Charlecote, and Sir William Catesby from Lapworth, with 'Master Greville', who may have been young Fulke Greville, the friend of Philip Sidney, from Beauchamp Court, his father being sick. They saw that the armour was clean and in repair, and that the four trained men were properly 'furnished'. Sir Thomas Lucy's sympathies, as assuredly Master Greville's, were with the Earl of Leicester; Sir William Catesby's were against him. Catesby was prepared shortly afterwards to welcome Jesuits to his house.

In these days John Shakespeare was 'malecontent' and guilty of indiscretion that brought him within the power of the law. He had avoided 'gentlehood', but his name appeared near the top of the list of 'Gentlemen and Freeholders' in Stratford drawn up at the time of the Musters. He was a marked man, and sufficiently prominent to be bound over in some local court to appear at the Queen's Bench in Westminster on a day in Trinity Term (3-22 June) with adequate assurance for his maintenance of the Queen's Peace. The penalties for his non-appearance were heavy, yet he incurred them, relying on a clever preconcerted plan of mutual security to save both himself and his fellow-sureties. The day came and he was fined £40 — £20 for his own non-appearance ad inveniendum sufficientem securitatem de se bene

---

1100 Leicester's Commonwealth, 1584. A scrap of truth here and there in this audacious libel gave point to the falsehood.
1102 He was committed to the Fleet on 21 August 1581.
gerendo - he had evidently seriously misbehaved himself - erga ipsam dominant
Reginam et cunctum populum suum iuxta formam statuti in huiusmodi casu editi et
provisi prout sub recognitioine super se assumpsit; and £20 for his own non-appearance
ad inveniendum sufficientem securitatem pads domine Regine erga ipsam dominam
Reginam et cunctum populum suum prout sub recognitioine super se assumpsit. Again,
one Thomas Cooley, of Stoke in Staffordshire, yeoman, was fined £30 - £10 for not
bringing John Shakespeare into court, and £20 for not bringing John Audley into court.
Finally, one Nicholas Walton, a yeoman of Kidderminster, and one William Lonley of
Emley in Worcestershire, husbandman, were fined £10 apiece for not bringing John
Audley into court. The distribution of the security is striking.1103 Stratford, Nottingham,
Stoke, Kidderminster, Emley Lovett near Hartlebury are far afield. John Shakespeare
and his two sureties, Audley and Cooley, were in three dioceses under separate
jurisdictions, and the procedure for the getting of the fines imposed would be so
complicated and costly that we may well doubt whether they were paid.

But if John Shakespeare managed to evade the law, he was less successful with certain
of his ‘friends’. In Edmund Lambert of Barton-on-Heath and his wife, Joan Arden, he
and his wife, Mary Arden, Joan's youngest sister, had shown especial trust. Mistress
Lambert had been almost certainly godmother to their two daughters Joan, baptized 1 5
September1558 and 15 April 1569; and with the same probability we may infer that
Master Lambert acted as sponsor at the baptism of their youngest son and last child,
Edmund, so recently as 3 May of this year, 1580. To Master Lambert, it will be
remembered, John Shakespeare mortgaged Asbies, pending the new lease which was to
come into operation on 29 September 1580. When, however, on this date, as he declared
and reiterated, he rode over to his brother-in-law's dwelling-house in the wild
neighbourhood of Barton, on the edge of the county, fifteen miles from Stratford, and
tendered the; £40 mortgage-money, Lambert, to his astonishment, refused to receive it,
unless, as he made excuse, other moneys owing to him were paid. How other debts, if
they existed, could affect this one, it is difficult to see. Clearly in the eyes of John and
Mary Shakespeare their kinsman acted illegally; and, if we may believe their version of
the story, he took advantage of the Alderman's perilous situation, as a recusant and a
delinquent in the matter of the Queen's Peace, to retain possession of a family-property
which his wife, as eldest-but-one of Robert Arden's eight daughters, may have thought
unjustly inherited by the youngest. In any case, John Shakespeare in 1580 had no
alternative but to lie low and bide his time. And when the moment arrived, seventeen
years afterwards, for an effort at recovery, the means of proving his case apparently had
passed.

William Shakespeare an Attorney’s Clerk

Alderman Shakespeare's acquaintance with the law was more than inherited by his son.
There is little doubt that the Poet on leaving school entered an attorney's office. It is not
merely that, as has been often pointed out, his legal terms are legion, sometimes highly
technical, frequently metaphorical, and often wrought into the very fibre of his writing,
but, and this is much more convincing, they flow from him unconsciously to the injury
of his work.

But at the back of it all is the early training. We cannot claim for Shakespeare profound
legal knowledge. He was no barrister nor councillor. The expressions and experience
which he spontaneously and exuberantly employs are those of the Court Leet and Court
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of Record, their presentments and suits, fines and punishments (by ‘burning’, printing in
the hand for sheep-stealing, whipping, setting in the stocks, cucking-stool or pillory);
the issue of warrants by the Steward and execution by the Serjeants; the duties of
Taster, Constable, and Affeeror; Chamberlains' Accounts and Council Minutes; leases
and conveyances, wills and inventories, the making of marks and signatures; the
handling of paper and parchment, pen, ink, wax and seal. In such matters he is entirely
at home. He has studied his Manwood and Swinburne, and grown so familiar with the
phraseology of country town law that he has to restrain rather than recall it. It turns up
on the oddest occasions. Hamlet has quietus in his great speech on suicide; [with] Dame
Quickly (of all persons!). Dogberry in Much Ado ‘and which is more, a householder
and one that knows the law’. Many of these and similar phrases would escape detection
except by the scholar, as coming from the Town Clerk's office in Wood Street, or
wherever it was in the proximity that Shakespeare served his articles, and toiled not
unhappily for his wife and children.

Contemporary dramatists use legal terms, some frequently, but their employment of
them is quite unlike Shakespeare’s. It is intermittent, decorative, self-conscious;
Shakespeare’s is persistent and inherent, and often involuntary. It is impossible, in fact,
for Shakespeare to write anything of any length without betraying the attorney—
even that lovely dirge The Phoenix and Turtle has, ‘From this session interdict’, and
Prospero's farewell epilogue, Release me from my bands. His medicine, which is very
interesting, is after the fashion of Ben Jonson's law - brought-in and worked-up for a
purpose. His law slips from him unawares. And it is in this that we cannot help we see a
bit of Stratford.

Such experience was less likely in the service of Thomas Trussell (a kinsman probably
of his mother), Walter Roche (his late Schoolmaster) or William Court (son of a former
Steward), than of the Town Clerk and Steward from 1570 to 1586, Henry Rogers.
Shakespeare was probably in Rogers's office when on 11 February 1580, after nearly
two months' local talk and excitement, the body of Katharine Hamlet, spinster, was
taken from her grave at Alveston, and Rogers as coroner held an inquest on the same,
and concurred with the verdict of the jury that her death by drowning in the Avon at
Tiddington (about a mile from Stratford) on 17 December 1579, was per infortunium
(by accident) and not a case of felo de se: whereby she was entitled to Christian burial.

William Shakespeare's Marriage

Shakespeare, like Browning, married a wife considerably older than himself. A love-
sick youth in Twelfth Night who never knows his own mind, saying one thing one
moment and the opposite the next, to whom the Jester remarks,

…The tailor make thy doublet of changeable taffeta,
for thy mind is a very opal,

pronounces the oracular opinion, knowing no doubt all about the matter, that in
marriage a woman should take

…An elder than herself, so wears she to him,

1104 Quite remarkably Fripp does not draw out attention to the coincidence of Miss Hamlet suffering the
same fate as Ophelia – especially so given the legion of cross-references he makes to the precise usage of
legalese in Shakespeare’s plays and poetry – one can only conjecture that perhaps he considered the
parallel so self-evident that it hardly deserved special mention.
So sways she level in her husband's heart.

This is the dramatist's way of saying that the opinion (which touched himself) is hardly a profound one. At nineteen he stood head-and-shoulders above young men of his age (his comrades, Richard Quyn and Richard Field, were his seniors), and was ready for a wife of graver years. She, doubtless, was his anchor in his strenuous career, as also she was the survivor.

This wife was Anne Hathaway alias Gardner, daughter of the Richard Hathaway alias Gardner to whom Alderman Shakespeare stood surety in 1566. Her grandfather, John Hathaway alias Gardner, was a prominent man in the parish, serving as Beadle, Constable, Affeeror, and one of ‘the Twelve Men’ of Old Stratford. We hear of him as an ‘able’, that is substantial, yeoman and ‘an archer’ in 1536. He was assessed on; £10 in goods in 1549, and was living at Hewland Farm in Shottery (which he had leased in 1543) in October 1556 in which year, before 6 August, Anne was born. Her birthplace, we may assume, was Hewland, whither, according to custom, her father would bring his wife to share the parental home. Richard Hathaway married twice. By his first wife, who may have come from Temple Grafton, he was the father of Anne, Bartholomew, and Catherine. Catherine was baptized in the parish church on 11 October 1563. The mother died soon afterwards, and was succeeded as mistress of Hewland by the second wife, Joan, whose daughter, Joan, was baptized on 9 May 1566. This child died in 1572. Other children of the second wife were born in 1569, 1575, 1577, 1578. Anne's place in the home, then, until her father's death in 1581, was that of an eldest daughter, with a brother a year or two younger than herself, a sister seven years younger than herself, and step-brothers and a stepsister who were children when she was grown up. She was 25 at the making of her father's will on 1 September 1581, and apparently betrothed, with her father's approval, to young Shakespeare. He left her £6 13s.10d. 'to be paid unto her at the day of her marriage'. He bequeathed the same sum, in the same terms, to Catherine, who was nearly 18 and apparently also betrothed. To Margaret, who was a child of 5, he left the same sum 'to be paid unto her at the age of seventeen'. His bequest to Bartholomew is what we might expect in a double and not altogether united household

Item my will is (with the consent of Joan my wife) that my eldest son shall have the use, commodity and profit of one half yard-land, to be tilled, mucked and sowed at the charges of Joan my wife, he only finding seed, during the natural life or widowhood of the same Joan my wife, to be severed from the other of my land. And my will is that he, the same Bartholomew, shall be a guide to my said wife in her husbandry, and also a comfort unto his brethren and sisters to his power. Provided always that if the said Joan my wife shall at any time or times after my decease go about to disannul or to take away from my said son the foresaid half yard-land, then the said Joan shall give unto my said son within one year after such denial the sum of Forty Pounds.

He was buried on 7 September. Bartholomew married less than three months afterwards, and went to live for a year or two at Tysoe. Anne apparently went to live, with her mother's people, at Temple Grafton, and married William Shakespeare on 30 November or 1 December 1582.

Brother and sister seem to have been of the ‘godly’. Their family was very closely associated with the parish church. He prospered, as she did, perhaps with the Poet's
assistance, was churchwarden from 1605 to 1609, and purchased in 1610 his own and Anne's old home, Hewland Farm. His eldest son, Richard, became churchwarden (1616-7) and 'gentleman' and his younger sons, John and Edmund, lived to be churchwarden in successive years (1634-5 and 1635-6). His will is Puritan in sentiment (16 September 1621):

I bequeath my soul to the hands of Almighty God my maker, and by faith in the merits and passion of His Son, Jesus Christ, I believe and hope to be saved; and my body to the earth from whence it came, to be buried in the Christian burial of the parish-church of Old Stratford, hoping to arise at the Latter Day and to receive the reward of His elect.

He was buried in the Church, on 20 October 1624 where his sister had been interred fifteen months previously by the side of her illustrious husband. Mistress Shakespeare was of the same religious temper. Her daughter's well-known piety ('Wise to salvation was good Mistress Hall') was inherited. Susanna's grief for her mother's death is religious

Quam mallem, amoueat lapidem bonus angelus ore Exeat vt Christi corpus, imago tua.

Mistress Shakespeare entertained a preacher at New Place in 1614 preacher at the Chapel of one of the Sermons before the Bailiff and his Brethren (the Oken on Election-day in September, the Hamlet Smith at Easter, the Perrott at Whitsuntide). She acted as godmother, no doubt to her brother's daughter, Anne, on 14 January 1584, and probably to the daughters of friends, Anne Parsons and Anne Quyny, on 14 March 1585 and 5 January 1592. There is evidence of friendship between herself and her father's old shepherd, Thomas Whittington, who entrusted to her 40s. of his savings as a gift to the poor of Stratford.

The poet...infirm in March 1616 when he added to his will the affectionate little bequest of the 'second-best bed with its furniture' to ensure her possession of the fourposter and chamber which they had shared in New Place.

These facts and probabilities throw light on their marriage. He was eighteen in April 1582 - the age at which his cousins at Snitterfield, Robert and Edward Webbe, were entitled by their father's will (of which Alderman Shakespeare was the overseer) to their portions. The summer following, about the time of the probate of her father's will (9 July 1582), he and Anne cohabited—as young couples not unfrequently did, between betrothal, which legitimized children, and marriage which entitled to dowry. They were intimate as were others of their class (such as George Badger of Henley Street and Alice Court in 1578, and Robert Young and Margery Field, sister of Richard, in 1586), and even of the Court (like Sir Walter Raleigh and Mistress Elizabeth Throgmorton in 1592, and the Earl of Southampton and Mistress Elizabeth Vernon in 1598) whose love was both passionate and unchangeable.

We need not doubt Shakespeare's romantic passion for his 'Queen of Curds and Cream'. Marriage with him was a 'consummation'.

In November 1582 Anne was with child and wanted her dowry. To get married was not easy. Under Whitgift regulations were rigorously enforced. Advent was a prohibited season, in which no marriage could be celebrated without a special and costly licence, from 2 December to 12 January; and on 27 January (Septuagesima) began a similar period, which would delay an ordinary wedding, with threefold publication of the
banns, until after 7 April 1583. Young Shakespeare, therefore, rode to Worcester and on
Tuesday, 27 November, obtained at the Episcopal registry a common licence permitting
the ceremony after a single publication of the banns.' The necessary allegation of the
ages of himself (he was a minor) and his bride, and the consent of their relatives, was
taken as satisfactory; and the next day his two sureties, Fulke Sandells and John
Richardson, both of Shottery and friends of Anne Hathaway, witnesses perhaps of the
betrothal, signed the usual bond, for; £40, relieving the officials of responsibility in the
event of lawful impediment—such as precontract or consanguinity.

It was now Wednesday. The remaining ‘holy-day’, on which banns could be published,
was Friday (St. Andrew's Day), 30 November. No doubt the banns were put up on
Friday, and the wedding followed that day or the next—at Worcester or Temple
Grafton. Being a minor, Shakespeare had his father's consent to the marriage; and he
might have had his pledge for the £40 were he not under the shadow and burden of
recusancy. Liable to heavy fine, Alderman Shakespeare was more than disqualified in
the eyes of Whitgift's officers. And, doubtless, according to custom, ‘to his father's
house in Henley Street Shakespeare brought his wife’. The second of the three
tenements which then comprised the ‘Birthplace’ terminated in the picturesque ‘back’,
an independent little dwelling with separate kitchen and staircase. Here, we may
believe, Shakespeare had his home and, when at home, his study, from his marriage
until his purchase in 1597 of New Place. Had it been elsewhere we almost certainly
would have had a hint of it. And what could be better than that his wife and children
should be under the parental roof during his many and long absences as a player?

Here, among the apple-trees (there were two orchards on the premises) and early
summer flowers, we will venture to think, Anne gave birth to her child, towards the end
of May 1583, and enjoyed the care of the Poet's mother, Mary Arden. On Sunday 26
May, which was Trinity Sunday, the Feast Day of the parish church, the young father (a
month over nineteen) accompanied the babe in her embroidered ‘bearingcloth’ to the
sacred edifice, and there, after the second lesson (so it was appointed in the Prayer Book
2), in the presence of an unusually large congregation, gave her the name of the heroine
in the Apocrypha, Susanna. The vicar, Henry Haycroft, probably, officiated, not
unconscious that he was christening the obstinate alderman's first grandchild. The
function was social as well as religious, an occasion for the gathering of friends,
including the godparents, whose names are unknown. Twins followed twenty months
later, which were baptized at Candlemas (2 February) 1585 and named Judith and
Hamnet - probably after Shakespeare's friends Hamnet (or Hamlet, the names are
interchangeable) Sadler and his wife,
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1105 The name Susanna, which was much in favour among Puritans, was just coming into use in Stratford. It appears in the Register of Baptisms for the first time in November 1574, for the second time in April 1575, the third in June 1582. Then comes a trio of Susannas, on 9th and 29th of April and 26th of May 1583. Judith occurs for the first time in November 1574, then in December 1579, April 1581, August 1582, and 2 February 1585 (Shakespeare's daughter). It is just possible that Mistress Susanna Lucy, wife of Sir Thomas Lucy's brother Timothy, did the Shakespeares the favour of acting as godmother. She and her husband seem to have been godparents to Henry Rogers's children Susanna and Timothy. Henry Rogers, the Town Clerk of Stratford, was in the service of Sir Thomas Lucy, and lived at Sherborne. If William Shakespeare was in the Town Clerk's office he would have occasion to know the Lucys, and it would not be altogether surprising if this brilliant youth won the regard of Mistress Timothy. She was the daughter of an elder brother of Sir Henry Fanshaw of the Exchequer Office. 4 Register, p.39
Master John Wheeler

The career of John Wheeler, yeoman, touches that of his neighbour, John Shakespeare, at more points than one. Son of the John Wheeler who was on the Jury of Frank-pledge for Old Stratford in 1546 and 1547, tenant of ground in Windsor in 1553, and buried at Stratford on Sunday, 3 April 1558, he came to the front about the time of his father's death. He was elected Taster in 1554, Juror of Frank-pledge and Afferor in 1555, Burgess in 1555, Constable in 1554-5 Juror of Frank-pledge in 1556, Chamberlain and Afferor in 1559, Juror of Frank-pledge in 1560 and again Chamberlain, and Alderman about 1562. He married a wife, Elizabeth, who was his comrade in Puritan obstinacy and recusancy. Their son, John, born about 1557, followed in their steps, and was presented with them and Master Shakespeare for refusal to attend church in 1592. A younger son, William, was born about 1558, and a daughter, Agnes, about 1560. Agnes died in June 1562, and a daughter born a month or two later received her name. A daughter Joan was baptized 3 September 1563. These children were senior contemporaries of William Shakespeare and lived on the opposite side of Henley Street. Concern for his young family was probably the cause of Master Alderman Wheeler's refusal to undertake the bailiwick in the autumn of the plague-year, 1564. He attended the meeting of the Council held for safety in the Chapel Garden on 30 August, and paid his is 6d. (only three contributions were larger) towards the relief of the stricken; but he did not appear again until 20 October when the epidemic was beginning to decline. He was elected Bailiff on 6 September and fined, as was also Alderman Perrott, for his absence at their next coming to the town. Evidently they had fled from Stratford. On 27 September a stern resolution was passed requiring Master Wheeler's appearance 'upon Friday next the 29th, by 9 of the clock, under the pain of £20', and again upon Wednesday the 4th day of October under the pain of £10. He made excuse, promising to serve the following year, Richard Hill was chosen in his stead, and his fines were reduced to £10 for his refusal and 10s. for his absence. Eventually £4 of the £10 was remitted, and he paid altogether £6 10s. for his offence. He was duly elected on 12 September 1565 and sworn on 4 October. Between these dates his third son, Richard, was baptized and buried. John Wheeler and his junior colleague on the Council, John Shakespeare, had been acquainted some years before their appointment by the Court of Record as arbitrators in the case of Edward Bate v. Christopher Smith on 15 November 1559.

As Bailiff, Wheeler issued in 1566 the interesting capias against Richard Hathaway of Shottery which is evidence of friendship between the Hathaway and Shakespeare families. In 1568 - 9 John Shakespeare was Bailiff, and Wheeler was his deputy as High Alderman. Together they sat on the bench of the Court of Record in the Gild Hall and at the head of the table in the adjoining Council Chamber. Their first and last act was an endeavour to bring Robert Perrott to book, the rich Puritan brewer and alderman who shirked his responsibilities in that year of intrigue and peril preceding the Northern Rebellion. Master Wheeler was well-to-do. He had four properties in Henley Street, where he resided, a tenement in Windsor, a barn and a close in Greenhill Street, and a tenement in Old Stratford. He served as Bailiff for a second time in 1576-7 (the year of Master Shakespeare's withdrawal from the Council) and was employed in the Queen's service (probably to watch against the engrossing of grain) in 1578. His name appears in the ‘Book of Gentlemen and Freeholders’ of 1580. His son William married in 1578, and his son John about 1583; on 21 February 1585 his daughter Agnes (Annes) became the wife of John Wilmore - the enterprising young ironmonger, who probably built the fine house at the corner of High Street and Ely Street (the so-called ‘Tudor House’).
after the fire of 1594, when married to a second wife, a daughter of the wealthy Thomas Rogers (the builder of the adjoining handsome house of 1596, miscalled ‘Harvard House’. In 1586 Wheeler dropped out of the Council. The minute of 6 September runs: ‘At this Hall, William Smith and Richard Court are chosen to be aldermen in the places of John Wheeler and John Shakespeare; for that Master Wheeler doth desire to be put out of the Company, and Master Shakespeare doth not come to the Halls when they be warned nor hath not done of long time.’ Master Shakespeare in fact had made one attendance in ten years; and that his name was not struck off long before is evidence of the high value set upon his past services by the Council and their reluctance to let him go. Wheeler now joined him as malcontent; and their neighbour in Henley Street, William Smith, haberdasher (William Shakespeare's godfather, as we have surmised), chosen an alderman in their stead, declined to serve, and for his persistent refusal was at length excluded with them, from the Council, with a fine of five marks (£3 6s 8d.)

In the bailiwick of William Parsons in 1590-1 Master Wheeler was entertained by him and the Steward, Master Jeffreys, at some kind of Borough festivity, for which wine was supplied by the Corporation at a charge of 11s. 8d.. In the spring and again the autumn of 1592 he was presented with Master Shakespeare for recusancy; when friendly churchwardens offered for them and seven other Stratford men, including two other past or present members of the Council, and John Wheeler junior, doubtless all of them Puritans, the excuse on both occasions that they were thought to absent themselves from worship for ‘fear of process for debt’. We can no more believe that Master Wheeler and Master Shakespeare in March and again in September 1592 ‘forbore the church for debt’ than that Mistress Clopton, Master and Mistress Reynolds, the Cawdreys, Master John Lane and other staunch Catholics, as declared by the same lenient presenters in September, have now ‘since March, all either conformed themselves or promised to go to church.’

John Wheeler died not long after this business, in November 1592, and was spared the fire of 1594 which seriously damaged his late property in Henley Street; but his widow, who had been presented with him and their son as a recusant and excused on the ground of her ‘impotency’, survived the catastrophe and lived until December 1596.
II - FURTHER READING

The following sets out the methodology used to identify the groups of writers who have written about William Shakespeare and in the process commented on John Shakespeare or the Shakespeare family. These “groups” mirror the trends prevalent in Shakespearian biography at that particular time. In some cases these individual scholars were contemporaries and some even collaborated. In others, writers are linked by a single idea or thesis that was passed on from one to another whether openly acknowledged or not. They are brought together in this way to bring structure to a vast body of work that resembles a Bach fugue more than a steadily growing linear body of research. Both fugue and Shakespeare biography have distinct themes that are exposed, developed, recapitulate and twist about one another. In some cases a theme was repeated so often it moved from conjecture to fact – this analysis aimed to identify the most significant of these.

Literary Sources

The blocks of writers and commentators have been divided into three broad categories and within each, into major literary or methodological sub-groups. However, as many writers’ work straddles two or three categories and frequently to varying degrees, a Venn\textsuperscript{1106} diagram has been used to illustrate where each writer was focused. For example, Edgar Fripp sits in the group of Shakespeare biographers who demonstrate a particular aspect of the Shakespeares relevant to a political, religious or other interest of the writer. In Fripp’s case, he concentrated on what he interpreted as the family’s purported Protestant leanings. However, his non-religious insights are closely akin to those of the group defined as “Edwardian biographers”, such as E. K. Chambers. A third influence is evident in Fripp’s close collaboration with Richard Savage a leading “archivist” within the “historians”. Accordingly, Fripp would be placed where all three circles overlap, closest to the centre of the “B” Group of Political Biographers, next closest to the “C” Historians yet still included in the “A” Biographers.

Keeping this A, B, C approach the following sections look at each group and its individual sub-groups in turn. Within the sub-groups a few characteristic writers are referenced in each case. Those selected are only intended to be illustrative of the principal arguments and by necessity (the bibliography cites over 500 references) the list is not all-inclusive.

This thesis is money and how the acquisition of it provided the means for William Shakespeare’s literary career and financed the Early Modern Theatre. Just as with Shakespeare, how each of the writers used, or did not use, their work to earn a living had an effect on the tone and in some cases even the selectivity they showed in presenting their arguments. Accordingly, a comment on the origins of their respective sources of income is made within each sub-group.

Where another writer, outside those listed in each sub-group, has made a pertinent observation or has reviewed the work under discussion I have included this reference where it crystallizes the issue under consideration. The field of Shakespearean scholarship is vast, four centuries deep and many authors have commented on the work of their predecessors and rivals. Schoenbaum, a noted scholar whose work has been referenced many times in this thesis, produced a six hundred page volume - *Shakespeare’s Lives*[^1107] - which was almost entirely composed of potted biographies of only some of the writers whose life’s study was commentary and analysis of the

playwright and his work. This summary aims to compress both the data itself together with an appreciation of how it has been considered and manipulated whilst taking careful note of how the particular research in question was funded. A summary of the writers referenced appears in the table on the next page.
Table 74 - Representative Writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Early Biographers</th>
<th>British Academic Biographers</th>
<th>Commercial Biographers</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>The Religionists</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Historical Writers &amp; Biographers</th>
<th>Editorial Biographers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>1709-1812</td>
<td>1930 Onwards</td>
<td>2000 Onwards</td>
<td>Political Biographers</td>
<td>1880 Onwards</td>
<td>Historians &amp; Editors</td>
<td>1875 Onwards</td>
<td>1970 Onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Religionists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Writers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Religionists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial Biographers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Nicholas Rowe**
- **Alexander Pope**
- **Edmond Malone**
- **J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps**
- **Frederick Gard Fleay**
- **C. C. Stopes**
- **E. K. Chambers**
- **J. M. Robertson**
- **Mark Eccles**
- **Leslie Hotson**
- **Alfred Harbage**
- **Samuel Schoenbaum**
- **William Ingram**
- **James H. Forse**
- **James Shapiro**
- **C. J. Sisson**
- **Stanley Wells**
- **Andrew Gurr**
- **Peter Thomson**
- **Peter Ackroyd**
- **Charles Nicholl**
- **Thomas Carter**
- **Edgar Fripp**
- **Heinrich Mutschmann**
- **Eamon Duffy**
- **Ernst Honigmann**
- **Peter Bowden**
- **John Burnett**
- **Melissa D. Aaron**
- **Daniel Kornstein**
- **B. J. & M. Sokol**
- **Lawrence Stone**
- **Martin Ingram**
- **Richard Savage**
- **Robert Bearman**
- **Stephen Greenblatt**
- **Jonathan Bate**

Note: Writers in bold represent principal secondary sources.
Group A – The Shakespeare Biographers

Early Biographers 1709-1812

Nicholas Rowe (1674 - 1718)
Alexander Pope (1688 - 1744)
Edmond Malone (1741 - 1812)

Schoenbaum rightly refers to the playwright’s first biographers as creating the “Shakespeare of the Legends.”

Writers of this period frequently altered biographical details to fit their story or to improve the growing mythos surrounding the family. Even the texts of Shakespeare’s plays themselves were not exempt from their edits. A study of these sources is vital because many later scholars relied blindly, in some cases almost implicitly, on the accuracy of what these first biographers knew to be personal invention or gossip. To begin to understand the Shakespeares’ finances, it is crucial to try to separate fact from fiction.

Table 75 - Rowe 1709

In 1709 Nicholas Rowe wrote in the preamble of what has been described as the first biography of Shakespeare

“…how fond do we see some People of discovering any little Personal Story of the great Men of Antiquity, their Families, the common Accidents of their Lives, and even their Shape, Make and Features have been the Subject of critical Enquiries. How trifling soever this Curiosity may seem to be, it is certainly very Natural; and we are hardly satisfy’d with an Account of any remarkable Person, till we have heard him describ’d even to the very Cloaths he wears…”

Rowe appears to have been fully aware of just what he was doing in assembling a fairly light-hearted group of anecdotes surrounding Shakespeare’s life. An appeal was made for those with “materials” which could assist in the publication to come forward: the following is the text of the advertisement:

---

1108 Ibid. p.42
1109 Nicholas Rowe, The Works of William Shakespear (London: Jacob Tonson, 1709).
Schoenbaum noted that “Any gentlemen having by them materials that might further the project were invited to it to pass them on, as a favour to the editor…”\textsuperscript{1111}

It is only by reading Rowe’s biographical essay (it runs to barely 40 pages) that one gets a good impression of what was actually intended. His edition of Shakespeare’s works was being prefaced by a gossipy piece, parts of which would not have been out of place had they appeared a few years later in Joseph Addison and Richard Steele’s The Spectator.\textsuperscript{1112} It is an assembly of stories (some wildly inaccurate: for example William was one of ten children) written for a tiny aristocratic or at least gentlemanly audience. Unfortunately, some of the few accurate inclusions in Rowe’s biography were among the very first to be “edited” out by Alexander Pope and other commentators. Rowe’s first description of John Shakespeare asserts he was “…a considerable dealer in wool”, a fact largely ignored until the last few decades.\textsuperscript{1113}

Schoenbaum noted that

…a writer in The Universal Magazine could declare near the end of the [18th] century ‘the first thing that would surprise him [should William Shakespeare miraculously reappear] would be, to learn that above 150,000 pounds have lately been devoted towards splendid editions of his works’…\textsuperscript{1114}

\textsuperscript{1111} Ibid. p.87
\textsuperscript{1112} See http://meta.montclair.edu/spectator/about.html First published 1711. “It, along with the Tatler, inaugurated the tradition of the daily periodical whose subject was not news, but literature and manners, and they adapted the gentlemanly culture of polite letters to a wide print audience.”
\textsuperscript{1114} Schoenbaum, Lives, p.99. Also See Glossary re “Universal Magazine”.

**Table 76 - The Search for Anecdotes**

**THE WORKS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEAR**

*a very neat and correct edition of Mr. William Shakespeare’s works… Is now so near finished as to be published in a month; to which is designed to be prefixed an account of the life and writings of the said author, as far as can be collected.* \textsuperscript{1110}

17 March 1708
One piece of gossip - clearly identified as such - that has given rise to more misunderstanding of the commercial realities of Shakespeare and the Early Modern Theatre derived from Rowe:

…there is one Instance so singular in the Munificence of this Patron of Shakespear’s, that if it had not been assur’d that the Story was handed down by Sir William D’Avenant who was probably very well acquainted with his affairs, I should not have ventured to have inserted, that my Lord Southampton, at one time, gave him a thousand Pounds, to enable him to go through with a Purchase which he heard he had a mind to. A Bounty very great, and very rare at any time, and almost equal to that profuse Generosity the present Age has shewn to French Dancers and Italian Eunuchs…

Accordingly, Rowe’s often quoted £1000 was based on a story that, if one transliterates Rowe’s flowery terminology “an unnamed person attributed to William D’Avenant (who himself had died six years before Rowe was born) that the Earl of Southampton once gave Shakespeare a £1000”.

An earlier reference to £1000 has also added to the confusion and possibly was taken as support for the Rowe claim. Fifty years after William’s death, and twenty five before Rowe’s biography, The Reverend John Ward, Vicar of Holy Trinity in Stratford, asserted that William “supplied the stage with two plays every year, and for that had an allowance so large, that he spent at the rate of £1000 a year as I have heard…”.

Where Ward got his “facts” from is unstated - though he did know William’s daughter Judith Shakespeare in her dotage.

But such is the power of the mythos that writers continue to recount the £1000 story. For example, Katherine Duncan-Jones in her 2002 *Ungentle Shakespeare* though stating that £1000 is “incredible”, still spends the best part of a page debating if some lesser figure was credible.

D. Nicol Smith noted in 1903 one additional problem with Rowe:
[Rowe’s] Account of Shakespeare was the standard biography during the eighteenth century. It was reprinted by Pope, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson, Steevens, Malone, and Reed; but they did not give it in the form in which Rowe had left it. Pope took the liberty of condensing and rearranging it, and as he did not acknowledge what he had done, his silence led other editors astray. Those who did note the alterations presumed that they had been made by Rowe himself in the second edition in 1714. Steevens, for instance, states that he publishes the life from “Rowe's second edition, in which it had been abridged and altered by himself after its appearance in 1709.” But what Steevens reprints is Rowe's Account of Shakespeare as edited by Pope...

He continued,

…Pope omitted passages dealing only indirectly with Shakespeare, or expressing opinions with which he disagreed.1119

In his 1995 doctoral thesis A.D.J. Brown, writing of Alexander Pope, observed,

…Pope’s edition of Shakespeare has been rarely discussed. Where it has been discussed it has been treated without sympathy…However, since it is eventually my contention that Pope’s editorial procedure is not a describable process, but a creative activity…

…He did arrive at general propositions about the quality of each individual [quarto] text, but his ultimate criteria were atextual in the sense that his final judgements were based on poetic, stylistic and dramatic principles…1120

Brown concluded that Pope did not consider himself bound by any convention but his own taste. As a practising Catholic he was (by necessity, Catholics being barred from University entrance) a self-taught scholar who earned his living by writing. Though it neither confirms nor invalidates their assertions, in the end, both Rowe and Pope were, at least in part, motivated by the prospect of sales of editions of Shakespeare’s work. Edmond Malone, who followed them, had an altogether different source of cash.

Funded by inheritance, educated at Trinity College, Dublin and trained as a barrister, Malone became a noted literary figure in London. Peter Martin, writing in 2004, described him as being

…well known in the luminous Johnsonian circle of literary, social, and political personalities and a close friend of many of them,… friendships with the likes of

1119 D. Nicol Smith, Introduction to Rowe’s Life of Shakespeare (Glasgow: MacLehose & Sons, 1903).
Edmund Burke, Edward Gibbon, Dr Charles Burney, James Boswell, Joseph Banks, William Windham, and Charles James Fox developed from his election to Johnson's famous Literary Club. He soon became the club's first treasurer, holding the office until his death and becoming its greatest promoter and historian. Malone, free of commercial pressures and of even familial ones as he never married, was able to bring both a scholar’s and a lawyer’s mind to the field of Shakespeare studies. He was also the first writer to focus on original (primary) documentation as the basis for some of his work. Martin noted,

...Malone also struck up correspondence with James Davenport, vicar of Stratford, who lent him the parish registers and did some research for him...

With his systematic approach,

...Malone ended up debunking much erroneous tradition about Shakespeare that Nicholas Rowe had perpetuated in his 1709 biography, discovering more about the poet's life than was known before or has been discovered since...

Martin went on to observe that,

...[literary] criticism in the 1980’s and 1990’s attempted to minimize this monumental achievement in Shakespearian studies by discounting the importance of Malone's unprecedented documentary and textual research, but his work heralded a new age of scholarship in which he helped define the scholar's code for generations to come.

In 1790 Malone published to great acclaim his ten volume *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. This success prompted at least one spiteful and critical pamphlet that caused Malone to write in response *A Letter to the Rev. Richard Farmer, D.D.* of 1792. The ‘Letter’, though essay might be a better term as it runs to thirty nine printed pages, provided a rare glimpse into Malone’s working methodologies, illustrating his thirst for well substantiated research. Martin rightly describes it as being an “important definition of editorial practice.” Malone, by selecting fact over appealing stories, can be considered truly the first serious researcher into Shakespeare’s life and work. Possessing intellectual rigour plus the financial freedom to accept or

1121 Ibid. …a supper and conversational club founded by Joshua Reynolds in February 1764, partly to furnish ‘The great delight of [Samuel Johnson’s] life’.
1123 Ibid.
1124 Ibid.
1126 Ibid.
decline a “newly discovered” juicy morsel of biographical ephemera meant that his work was free to be dispassionately critical and generally free of the flights of fancy that were to cloud the prevailing and future research. When offered what has come to be called “John Shakespeare’s Spiritual Testament”, a document purportedly found in the Shakespeare birthplace, he was, on reflection, able to dismiss it for the forgery it almost certainly was. His other great contribution was his insistence on examining original documentation. Unlike Rowe, who looked for anecdotes through newspaper advertisements, or Pope who selected only those bits he liked, here was a scholar whose standards would today be called “forensic” or even “clinical”. If his successors could have avoided the “romance”, much of the Shakespeare *mythos* could have been avoided.

Victorian Biographers 1830-1889

J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps (1820 - 1889)  
Frederick Gard Fleay (1831 - 1909)

The term ‘literary phenomenon’ could be rightly used to describe J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, a man responsible for hundreds of publications during his lifetime. Elected to the Royal Society in 1839 he wrote, in that same year the “saucily titled for a lad of nineteen” *A Few Hints to Novices in Manuscript Literature*. A man whose initial literary interests lay in scientific books (hence the Royal Society), by 1842 he wrote “I grow fonder every day” when describing his passion for Shakespeare’s work. By twenty-eight he had written his *Life of William Shakespeare* which he advertised as including “many particulars respecting the poet and his family never before published.” The “many particulars” were a result of his having “combed the records of Stratford-upon-Avon and nearby communities.” By 1861 he had personally initiated the campaign to preserve the site of New Place and was active in the establishment of the library of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. In 1864 he published his *An Historical Account of the New Place, Stratford-upon-Avon*. Just as the Malone Letter reveals the inner workings of one scholar, so the first edition of his account of New Place is rich

---

1128 Halliwell to Joseph Hunter 15 January 1842, BL, Add. MS 24869. Hunter (1783-1861) was himself a noted antiquarian and record scholar.  
1129 Freeman, *Halliwell*  
with Halliwell’s own style of writing and presentation. Like a Victorian drawing room, the amount of clutter is remarkable. It is as if the text was written and then steel engravings, which are only marginally relevant at best - were clustered around and throughout it. Like the architecture of the time, the sheer amount of extraneous decoration almost obscures the very fine structure underneath.

In 1881 his *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* appeared - a work that has rightly been described as “magisterial” and “the culmination of all his biographical labours.”\textsuperscript{1132} That it was used in the attached thesis, together with the account of New Place, indicates the timeless quality of the research and the meticulous love of detail that he brought to his writing.

At thirty he had been admitted to Lincoln’s Inn, though he never practised. Both Malone and Halliwell-Phillipps were non-practising lawyers and both were keen investigators of the Stratford records using facts as the basis for their biographical work.

It is clear that Halliwell-Phillipps knew there were inconsistencies between the timing of the Shakespeare investments and the possible generation of income through the theatre

…Unless the general truth of the story [the £1000 gift] be accepted it is difficult to believe that Shakespeare could have obtained, so early in his career, the ample means he certainly possessed in that [1597] and the following year. The largest emoluments that could have been derived from his professional avocations would have hardly sufficed to have accomplished such a result, and the necessity of forwarding continual remittances to Stratford-on-Avon must not be overlooked.\textsuperscript{1133}

The fact that he writes in the flowery pedantic manner of his period should not obscure the fact that Halliwell-Phillipps was financially aware. He spent his life embroiled in overlapping financial deals buying and selling rare books and papers\textsuperscript{1134} and it was from this source he derived much of his own income.

However, having pointed out this important inconsistency, he retreated to the task of trying to sort out the historical order of Shakespeare’s plays so as to avoid, as he

\textsuperscript{1132} Freeman and Freeman, *Phillips, James Orchard Halliwell*.
\textsuperscript{1134} Freeman, *Halliwell* – this abbreviated biography is replete with financial detail.
himself might have put it, besmirching the Bard’s good name with too much speculation on the “sordid topic of coin”\textsuperscript{1135}

If one were being kind to the memory of Frederick Gard Fleay, as a biographer of Shakespeare in particular and the Early Modern Theatre in general, then one could endorse Sidney Lee’s view that Fleay tended to “questionable conclusions… [which] diminished both the reception of his other works and his overall reputation.”\textsuperscript{1136} A less charitable view would be that his work was simply slapdash and full of errors.

However, what is important to this thesis was his 1890 attempt to quantify Shakespeare’s theatrical earnings, even though his aim was to present what he considered to be the final word on the subject:

…from these details, among other things, we gather that an actor in 1635 got £180 and a housekeeper for each share in Blackfriars, about £112…So that Shakespeare in 1635, had he lived, might have received

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{For his four shares in the Globe} & \quad \text{£1088} \} \\
\text{For his two shares in Blackfriars,} & \quad \text{£ 272} \} \\
\text{As poet say} & \quad \text{£ 30} \} \quad \text{Total £1575 [p.a.]} \\
\text{As actor} & \quad \text{£ 180} \} \\
\text{Court money} & \quad \text{£ 5} \}
\end{align*}
\]

Making all allowances for the difference between 1610 under James and 1635 under Charles, but remembering also that the Globe was in Shakespeare’s time the Court theatre \textit{par excellence} as well as the most popular, I think I may consider that the interminable dissertations as to how he got his money may as well come to an end, especially as he had his shares for nothing…\textsuperscript{1137}

All Fleay’s figures are incorrect in almost every aspect, but his manner in laying out the various sources of income to yield an annual figure of £1575 p.a. was an advance in that it tried, probably for the first time, to systematically compute Shakespeare’s possible theatrical earnings.

\textsuperscript{1135} “The sordid topic of coin…” Martin Donovan and David Koepp, \textit{Death Becomes Her}, film, directed by Robert Zemeckis, 1992. Joyce Grenfell (1910-1979) also used the similar term “sordid matter of coin” in her performances.
\textsuperscript{1137} Frederick Gard Fleay, \textit{A Chronicle History of the London Stage 1559-1642} (London: Reeves and Turner, 1890). p.328
C.C. Stopes was an eccentric independent scholar who, with virtually no resources, unabashedly challenged the great biographers of Shakespeare and continued to do so with relish and élan into her eighties.\textsuperscript{1138} Published when she was seventy-three, her Shakespeare’s Environment\textsuperscript{1139} has a preface which is both charming and hilarious by turns. Not that hilarity was intentional. She shares with us that on 23 April 1908 in Stratford-upon-Avon was a day of “storm, snow and sleet”. She continued “I have collected a few of my old papers which all contained something new [her emphasis] at the date at which they appeared.” Unfortunately the scholarship supporting the articles is somewhat uneven, with at least one “discovery” being previously reported by Halliwell-Phillipps.\textsuperscript{1140} If one reads through her unfailingly conversational style of writing and can forgive her almost desperate desire to rush to conclusions, she does present some material that she personally unearthed, though she was to be denied the major find that would have earned a place among the great Shakespeare researchers. Also to her credit, she had little time for totally unsubstantiated fables, treating William as “an interesting Warwickshire gentleman”,\textsuperscript{1141} an approach Schoenbaum described as “refreshing” though in summary he found her work to be slapdash and poorly collated. When she does mention money it is only in the most simple of terms. She took the financial “fall” of John Shakespeare entirely at face value,\textsuperscript{1142} content in repeating financial figures with no explanation or understanding of the law of the Early Modern Period. Numbers were her enemy not her friend and her work is of such poor quality and consistency that her major contribution was, if anything, negative, in that she further romanticised the mythos at the cost of reality.

Like Alexander Pope, J.M. Robertson was a self-taught scholar who left school at thirteen. After working as a clerk for the railways and having served time in a

\textsuperscript{1138} Schoenbaum calls it a “rage for discovery” in Schoenbaum, Lives, p.460
\textsuperscript{1139} C.C. Stopes, Shakespeare’s Environment (London: Bell & Sons, 1914). p.V.
\textsuperscript{1140} This reference is to the 1595 “Mr. Shaxpere” indebted to “Jone Perat” for one book – an earlier reference appears in Halliwell-Phillipps New Boke of 1850.
\textsuperscript{1141} Schoenbaum, Lives, p.461
\textsuperscript{1142} Stopes, Shakespeare’s Environment p.42.
solicitor’s office again as a clerk, he became a journalist before becoming a Member of Parliament. Michael Freeden quoted H. J. Laski who said of Robertson “I doubt whether there was a more learned man … in Great Britain.” Living in an age when the weight of opinion held that Shakespeare wrote very little of his work, Robertson was a noted opponent of that position. While writing may have been a component of his income, his seat in Parliament removed the need to sell his publications and accordingly he was free to express his own opinions in his best tub-thumping manner.

Inclined to prolixity, his attack in The Baconian Heresy is unsurprisingly wordy. However, where his work has been valuable to this thesis lies in his analysis of litigation and legalism. Robertson wrote extensively about the unwillingness of many writers to acknowledge the evidence for the general currency of legal phrases in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods: “they pervade all Elizabethan literature, and they tell of a general litigiousness which is at once the cause and the explanation.” He quoted many examples to illustrate his point that the literature of the time is larded with legalese. His writing was especially useful where it concerns John Shakespeare:

…Shakespeare's father was a man of many lawsuits but nowhere in connection with this question has note been taken of the extent and significance of that expedience in the Shakespeare household…

He later continued,

…the fact seems to be that when John Shakespeare was distrained upon for debt and the writ was returned endorsed with the note… “quod predictus Johannes Shakspere nihil habit unde potest habet” … he was not at all devoid of means, but was simply baffling the suit against him...

---

1144 Long-serving Professor of Political Science at LSE and later Chairman of the Labour Party 1945-1946.
1145 However his position on this issue was not universal.
1146 Robertson was MP for Tyneside from 1906 to 1918, and was Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, 1911-15, and Privy Councillor. Salaries for MPs commenced in 1911 at £400 p.a. and remained unchanged till they were reduced in 1931 to £360 p.a.. see: www.parliament.uk/about/faqs/house.
1148 Ibid. p.140 Some of his other examples: “‘Thou'llt go to law with the vicar for a tithe goose’, says Hobson in Heywood's Edward IV…As Nashe has it in Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Devil ‘Lawyers cannot devise which way in the world to beg, they are so troubled with brabblements and suits every term, of yeomen and gentlemen that fall out for nothing’.”
1149 Ibid. p.144
1150 Ibid. p.146 – John Shakespeare does not have anything which can be distrained (seized as debtors payment see Glossary)
Robertson considered that if John Shakespeare were in reduced circumstances - as many supposed - then how could he have paid the fines which the same critics point to as evidence of his poverty?

He concluded this part of his investigation with three observations:

“…the normality of litigation in Stratford as in Elizabethan England in general…”
“…the abundant share of the Shakespeares in legal experience…”
“…the possibility of error in the old inference, accepted by most of us, as to the father’s impecuniosity…”[1151]

E. K. Chambers was described by Schoenbaum as “This most eminent of modern Shakespearians”.[1152] Like Robertson and Stopes, Chambers could be described as an “amateur” in that Shakespearean biography and theatrical analysis were an adjunct to his civil service career. Chambers himself could be equally modest in insisting on the part-time nature of his scholarship. Yet his accomplishments are quite simply staggering in terms of volume produced and detail included. A knighthood recognized his service both to education and scholarship. In 1892 he had begun service in the Education Department, later to be the Board of Education.

Among Chambers’ greatest achievements was his four volume work The Elizabethan Stage[1153] and two volume biography William Shakespeare.[1154] However, in both there are signs of a definite inflexibility of viewpoint. When a fact emerged that did not fit with his view it was either not relevant or he somehow knew all about whatever it was already. There is an Edwardian, some would say Imperial, approach to how he dismissed opinion or research that deviated from his own, and in so doing perhaps limited the range of his work. The only other aspect of his writing that occasionally jars is when, like Schoenbaum, he becomes wrapped up in the romance of his own imaginings – Chambers described Shakespeare’s last days as being set in …the open fields and cool water-meadows and woodland of Stratford, and the great garden of New Place, where the mulberries he had planted were yet young…[1155]

---

[1151] Ibid. p.146
[1152] Schoenbaum, Lives p.521
[1155] Ibid. p.88
There are no enclosures, starvation, filth and plague in this vision, or if there were, they were kept in their proper place. The financial figures he quotes are accurate but the financial conclusions are either absent or naïve at best and he spends an entire chapter of his *The Elizabethan Stage* reporting on the amounts of investments made by successful players together with a rudimentary analysis of theatre earnings. In this latter case his arguments rely heavily on the opinions of Alwin Thaler who in 1918 had tried to bring some sense of reality to the inflated claims of Sidney Lee.  

Fleay had put Shakespeare’s annualized earnings at £1545 p.a. after which Lee, with marginally better accuracy, estimated these at over £700 p.a.. Thaler with considerable ease knocked this down to £350 p.a.

Chambers himself correctly rejects suggestions that Shakespeare spent £1000 a year as nonsense but there is no great confidence in his writing where numbers are concerned. He takes a thousand pages in his *William Shakespeare* of 1930 to describe the man and his works, but the subject of money is always quickly dispatched.

But perhaps the greatest compliment that can be paid any writer - and it is certainly so in the case of Chambers – was that he stood, and in some aspects still stands, as the benchmark for others to aspire to.

Edwardian Postscript

All three of the above writers were, in true British fashion, amateurs. Stopes can lay the best claim to being a writer, though the manner in which she approaches her work could hardly be called professional. Robertson and Chambers were civil servants who purportedly had full time occupations. All three lack any form of financial or even mathematical training; they manifestly loved Shakespeare’s work and idolized the man. Unsurprisingly all three become less authoritative when their investigations move on to the subject of money.

---

1158 All six volumes (3000 densely printed pages) referred to above permanently sit within my arm’s reach on my desk.
British Academic Biographers 1930 Onwards

C. J. Sisson (1885 - 1966)
Stanley Wells (1930 - )
Andrew Gurr (1936 - )
Peter Thomson (1938 - )

The British university system, post Chambers, produced professors of Shakespeare and the Early Modern Theatre who were able to successfully combine teaching with their own research and writing.

On 25 April 1934 C. J. Sisson delivered the annual Shakespeare lecture to the British Academy entitled The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare - an event described “as momentous in its own way as Chambers’ lecture ten years previously.”\textsuperscript{1159} Hazelton Spencer, in review,\textsuperscript{1160} described Sisson as “protesting with learning and wit” in a lecture that mostly dwelt on the pointlessness of the over-dramatization of Shakespeare’s own life. He wanted to establish that too much fanciful interpretation, without facts, is hardly productive or useful. Spencer asserts that he delivered “a swashing blow… against [earlier] biographical follies.” As a sample of Sissons work there is his The Boar’s Head Theatre - a short yet beautifully detailed account of the inn-yard theatre.\textsuperscript{1161} In the preface to the 1972 edition Stanley Wells wrote of his first meeting with Sisson,

\begin{quote}
\ldots A day in 1947 when, as a schoolboy, I travelled from Yorkshire to London as an applicant for a place in the English Department of University College…
\end{quote}

He continued,

\begin{quote}
\ldots as an undergraduate I attended his lectures on Shakespeare…[he was] mischievous, ripe in sagacity, genial in his capacity for irreverence…his obvious warmth of heart…\textsuperscript{1162}
\end{quote}

The remaining three writers, all now Professors Emeritus, are still writing about Shakespeare. They all commenced their academic careers in a period when University

\textsuperscript{1159} Schoenbaum, Lives p.526
\textsuperscript{1160} Hazelton Spencer, “The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare,” MLR (MRHA) 30, no. 3 (July 1935): 363-364.
\textsuperscript{1162} Ibid. Preface.
education was available to those of ability and their work resonates with the same rational tone set by Sisson. All three write with skill, knowledge and wit.

Andrew Gurr’s *The Shakespeare Company 1594-1642*1163 of 2004 was of particular assistance in the preparation of this thesis. In this he sought to chronicle “the first complete history of the theatre company created in 1594.” Within his chapter: “Will money buy em?: company finances”1164 he presented his effort as being to

…register an individual company’s business activities in modern accountancy terms, turnover, income and expenditure accounts, the sharers’ profits, levels of staff pay…1165

This was a remarkably brave statement, given that Gurr’s career had been in the teaching of English, though he lists others who supported his work - including both Aaron1166 and Carson.1167 That Gurr’s analysis fell short was partly due to a lack of empirical data, partly due to a desire to express and interpret financial analysis as prose. However, his recognition of the crucial approach i.e. abandon fable and look for tangible figures, deserves the highest praise.

Peter Thomson, modestly delivered a neat bombshell when in 19831168 he made the observation that

…his [William Shakespeare’s] annual income from the Globe alone between 1599 and 1608 may be conservatively estimated at £55…

He then mentions other potential payments in addition to the £55 might have been in respect of:

…the plays he provided …nor for the stronger possibility that he was allowed all the takings on a second-day benefit performance of each of his new plays…1169

In ninety years Shakespeare’s annual earnings had fallen, in estimate, from Fleay’s 1890 £1545 to Thomson’s £55 (plus tips) of 1983.

---

1164 Ibid. p.85-119
1165 Ibid. p.85
1169 Ibid. p.34
Now £55 a year was far from a trivial sum as an annual wage at the time. But it is far short of the many hundreds of pounds of investments that the Shakespeares made during these years, nor could earnings from his plays have made up the difference. Elsewhere in the same volume he termed Shakespeare’s ability to raise the cash to become a sharer in 1594 as “surprising.”

Gurr and Thomson were addressing both the same key questions: who made what out of the business of the Early Modern Theatre in London and when? The last word belongs to Thomson. He observed of Henslowe - and we must consider the possibility that this applied to many more of those involved with the theatre - “Henslowe went where the money was…”

American Biographers 1890 Onwards

Charles William Wallace (1865 - 1932)
Gerald Eades Bentley (1901 - 1994)
Mark Eccles (1905 - 1998)
Leslie Hotson (1897 - 1992)
Alfred Harbage (1901 - 1976)
Samuel Schoenbaum (1927 - 1996)
William Ingram (1940- )
James H. Forse (1939- )

In 1998, Conrad Sordino made the following observation in Mark Eccles’ obituary:

…no one has made fuller and better use of England's public records than the American Shakespeare scholar Mark Eccles. His researches in the manuscript records of the Public Record Office, the London Guildhall, the Corporation of London, Westminster, and London and Warwickshire parishes…

In doing so he was perhaps being a little unkind to Eccles’s fellow American scholars, several of whom also deserve praise for their gritty assault on English public records in their search for new data about the Shakespeares and the Early Modern Theatre.

1170 Thomson, Shakespeare p.14
1171 Ibid. p.27
An early critique of the technique of delving into public records in search of new, tangible, evidence about Shakespeare, so central to the Americans’ efforts, came in E.K. Chambers’ review of Wallace’s *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars, 1597-1603* of 1908. The tone in the preamble to this volume would likely, on its own, have raised eyebrows – it describes Wallace as having

…In 1905 …discovered and published in London, as side-lights on larger results, three contemporary documents concerning Shakespeare. These, as the first scrap of information since Halliwell's discovery thirty-five years before, were widely reviewed and discussed in the metropolitan newspapers and literary journals of Europe and America. But their immediate worth was in inducing the realization that not all records touching the Poet were yet known …

Chambers launched his review with

…a foretaste of his results has already been given by means of certain communications to the daily journals…

As far as he was concerned Wallace only

…Claims to have tracked much unpublished material…

He continued,

…I venture to think that his conclusions are in certain respects vitiated by an exaggerated conception of the extent to which it is possible to get behind the often conventional phraseology of official documents…Like Lear, Dr. Wallace will talk of court news and take upon him the mystery of things, as if he were God's spy…

Was Chambers misplaced in his criticisms? As one reads Wallace, there is no doubt where the strength of his work lies. Even Chambers acknowledges that “his assembling is done exhaustively” with the qualification that it is done “…on the whole with commendable, although not perfect, accuracy…”. However, many of Wallace’s conclusions were indeed highly conjectural.

Twenty years later W.W. Greg, commenting on one of the next generation of Americans - Leslie Hotson - made the observation of his *Shakespeare versus Shallow* that

---

1175 Ibid.
Hunting for records of Shakespeare is a heart-breaking and not very profitable game that is played mainly by American professors, to whom naturally and very properly the plums usually fall. The skill and perseverance of Professor Hotson have been rewarded by the discovery that in the autumn of 1596 one William Wayte swore the peace against William Shakespeare, Francis Langley, and two unknown women, and this fact has been elaborated to the extent of a hundred and thirty pages…

In writing this, Greg very neatly summarized both the greatest strength and perhaps the corresponding weakness in the work of this group of American scholars – great and exhaustive persistence in searching records but poor or fanciful presentation and analysis.

That the Americans’ work existed at all is due in large part to the various foundations established by the corps of American millionaires who, during the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, came to Europe to buy culture and cultural respectability. So large were some of these fortunes that building a library or museum went in tandem with establishing foundations to fund further scholarly research. The Folger Library in Washington D.C. is a case in point, with its origins in the cash derived from two great family fortunes, and it was in this library that Halliwell-Phillipps’ collections were eventually housed, after the City of Manchester declined to purchase them, following his death, for £8000.

With foundation or academic support the Americans were, and remain, able to investigate “England's public records” in painstaking detail.

For example, Mark Eccles in 1961 listed his latter-day patrons and hosts as being

…the Fulbright Commission, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation… the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin… the Folger library

That they have made valuable discoveries (perhaps rediscoveries would be the better term) remains beyond question but where there is a lack is in the successful transmutation of these individual finds into a cohesive structure that resolves other gaps in the record. W.W. Greg’s severe attitude to Hotson’s work can be justified only on

---

1177 *Sordino, Mark Eccles, Obituary*
the basis that he was indeed factually correct – most of Hotson’s “hundred and thirty pages” were indeed of fairly poor quality from a scholarly standpoint. Much of it could be rightly described as padding. Alfred Harbage was one writer who took a different tack both in terms of academic approach and to a limited extent in finance. If one looks beyond his flowery prose, there was considerable originality in the manner in which he determined the finances of the early theatres by returning to first principles and calculating what the seating/standing capacities could have been. That his calculations contained errors need not diminish his originality and his desire for fact over anecdote.1179

James Shapiro, William Ingram and James Forse represent the current body of American academics focused, in varying degrees, on the English Early Modern Theatre. All three, in differing, ways still represent the American willingness to take what can be termed either fresh approaches or liberties, depending on one’s point of view, with established scholarship.

Margaret Rose Jaster described Forse’s *Art Imitates Business* as having the ability to both “stimulate and irritate.” Yet she found that

…Forse convincingly argues that it was the commercial pursuits of Burbage, Henslowe, Alleyn, and Shakespeare that catapulted England into her dramatic glory.1180

However, an English reviewer N. W. Bawcutt found the aim of the same book was

…to emphasize the financial side of the Elizabethan theatre, its functioning as a commercial business whose aim was to make money, sometimes in very dubious ways. There are frequent comparisons to Hollywood and modern big business.1181

And yet, he accurately observed that

The scholarship of the book is sometimes defective… somewhat slapdash in manner [and] the book is a strange mixture of wary scepticism and wild speculation… clearly the book provokes a mixed

1179 He also took an alternative approach to personal funding for while drawing his salary as a Harvard professor he moonlighted as “Thomas Kyd” creator of the fictional police investigator Sam Phelan. *Blood is a Beggar* (1946), *Blood of Vintage* (1947), *Blood on the Bosom Devine* (1948), and *Cover His Face* (1949). Amusingly a “fine” first edition copy of *Blood is a Beggar* now trades for upwards of $200 – far in excess of his scholarly works.
response: there are good things in it, but there are also fantastic implausibilities, and it obviously needs to be read very cautiously…

In 2005 James Shapiro in *1599* produced what Gary Taylor writing in the Guardian called “…a hitchhiker's guide to the Shakespearean universe”¹¹⁸³. Robert McCrum in the Observer gushed that it was an “unforgettable illumination of a crucial moment in the life of our greatest writer…Shakespeare lovers everywhere will be grateful for it”. Yet William Long in a nine thousand word critique of Shapiro and his book in 2008 commented

…*[1599]* is not a scholarly study and should not be confused with one. Unfortunately, this volume is basically a house of cards. From a distance, the edifice is interesting and even pleasing. But a push here and there collapses the structure. Incorrect facts and unsupported suppositions do not provide firm bases for supporting Shapiro's contentions.¹¹⁸⁴

In 1978 William Ingram produced his biography of Francis Langley, the man behind the building of the Swan Theatre.¹¹⁸⁵ He embarked on this work at the suggestion of another author, Herbert Berry, who had commented to him about the numerous documents in the Public Records Office concerning Langley. Ingram, very much in the manner of Wallace, began an extended search. What emerged was an analysis of a man who operated in close proximity to Shakespeare and who, as Hotson¹¹⁸⁶ had established earlier, was named in the same writ - an event that figures prominently in this thesis.

Why the “American” contribution matters

Their contribution is threefold: first in their willingness to search for and find new data in the public record, often taking years of painstaking research – typified by Wallace and Hotson. Secondly, their search for documentary evidence over hearsay and myth - as demonstrated by Eccles, Schoenbaum, and Ingram. Thirdly, they demonstrate a willingness to go outside the bounds of convention to seek alternative ways of interpreting data or deriving fact from factual analysis.

¹¹⁸² Ibid.
The weaknesses in their work is when they drift from fact into surmise and sentimentality which often blinds the writer to any unpleasant conclusions that could be safely drawn from the facts as presented. Robert Bearman called him “the ever-cautious Schoenbaum” yet even Schoenbaum, one of the most rational and factually driven of the group, when confronted with the unquestionable existence of William’s name on the Langley/Gardiner writ, a writ initiated between two manifest villains, sought to sweep it away with “somehow Shakespeare was drawn into this feud”. The question of how and why Shakespeare appeared in the suit was never asked and the evidence was brushed aside as being part of a “minor legal drama.” But when the more sentimentally satisfying but much weaker proposal of Shakespeare “in Lancashire” received a boost from Honigmann in 1985 then “Schoenbaum [was] prepared to temper his initial scepticism”. As Bearman continued,

…it should come as no surprise [i.e. with Schoenbaum on board with the proposal] that bolder spirits have since developed the “Lancastrian connection” into an edifice of startling proportions.

However, book sales were not the primary funding source for this body of work. Little or none of this research would have been possible without the patronage of the American University system financially underpinned (then and now) by a small group of the hyper-wealthy in search of memorialisation. As English kings once sought to ameliorate their family’s sins - post factum - so this group of wealthy families continues to subscribe to purifying the family names through scholarship.

In the patron’s actions one is reminded of the lines from *Henry V*

…Toward heaven, to pardon blood; and I have built Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do; Though all that I can do is nothing worth, Since that my penitence comes after all, Imploring pardon.

This section started with the work of Mark Eccles and it is only fitting it concludes with the same. Eccles observed that

---

1187 The writ itself is actually sworn out by William Wayte who Ingram rightly descries as Gardiner’s “creature” though Gardiner himself is also a party to the document. Ingram, *London Life* p.144.
1188 Schoenbaum, *Documentary Life* p.146
1191 *Henry V*, IV, i
As soon as Shakespeare had a house of his own [New Place, 1596/7] he began to think about buying land near Stratford. Adrian Quiney told Abraham Sturley, and Sturley wrote to Richard Quiney on January 24, 1597, “that our countryman Mr. Shakespeare is willing to disburse some money upon some land or other at Shottery or thereabouts, he thinks it a very apt time for him to deal in the matter of tithes”.

Eccles’ research is accurate, his summary neutral and the follow-through missing, like much of the American contribution. Surely the key issue is not that Shakespeare bought the land or tithes - he did both in 1602 and 1605 - but where did the money come from? True, Shakespeare in 1597 might have been merely window-shopping in looking for investments for which he did not yet have the cash, but the tone of the letter does not suggest this.

Commercial Biographers 2000 Onwards

Peter Ackroyd (1949 - )
Charles Nicholl (1955 - )

These are representative of the body of professional writers who have recently popularized aspects of Shakespearean biography with varying degrees of accuracy. The study of Shakespeare is not a lifetime academic quest for them and their skills in storytelling are what earns their income through book sales. To some, such as Charles Nicholl, Shakespeare is an interesting historical figure – but only one of a number of interesting historical characters. His earlier books included biographies of Thomas Nashe and Leonardo da Vinci. In general, he approximates an academic style of research and his writing lists numerous sources, yet the scholarship is only skin deep as the text often repeats poorly supported legends. *The Lodger, Shakespeare on Silver Street* was unquestionably a commercial success and popularized the study of Shakespeare but overall added nothing to the base of knowledge. Peter Ackroyd’s *Shakespeare the Biography*, though still in the popular domain, is altogether academically stronger. Ackroyd’s research is painstaking and where he could not find corroborating evidence he demonstrated considerable strength of character in avoiding the customary explanations. His refusal to join the legend over John Shakespeare’s

1192 Mark Eccles, *Shakespeare in Warwickshire* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1961). p.92 – In the book the spelling has not been modernized, I have done so here (italicized) to aid the flow of the material.

plunge into poverty was a case in point. However, detailed as his work was, it restricts itself to reportage. No conclusions are extrapolated from the data he presents. His work focuses on book sales and, like Nicholl, he moved onto other biographies such as those of Turner and Newton which he completed in 2006 and 2007 respectively.

But works of this type are superficial, there will be no hard questioning, nothing new will emerge. The strongest of these authors accept less fable and more fact, the weaker shun real research and deliver a précis of more scholarly work.

From a personal standpoint they can provide an afternoon’s pleasure, an experience akin to watching a good television documentary programme. From a scholarly standpoint they are, at best, interesting and, at worst, downright misleading.

Group B – Shakespeare’s Political Biographers

The Religionists 1880 Onwards

Thomas Carter unknown
Edgar Fripp (1861 - 1931)
Heinrich Mutschmann (1885 - 1955)
Eamon Duffy (1947 - )
Ernst Honigmann (1927 - )

Speculation around the religious beliefs of the Shakespeares still plays a part in Shakespearian biography even in the twenty-first century. True, much of this is a legacy from earlier periods and akin to the debate over Shakespearian authorship. But this fascination with religion still permeates and at times obstructs the analysis of the Shakespeares’ lives and finances. Ernst Honigmann writing in 2009,\(^{1194}\) persisted with the question of John Shakespeare’s possible Catholicism. Even outside Shakespearian biography, writers such as Eamon Duffy continue related debates. In 2009\(^{1195}\) Duffy wanted his readers to believe that Queen Mary I’s “regime was neither inept or


backward looking” that it was “inspired” and “effective” and as they were “inevitable”, then the “devastatingly effective…burnings” were simply what was necessary in the circumstances.

Considering both Protestants and Catholics in one group may seem incongruous, but both factions seek to use the Shakespeare family to add prestige to their own religious beliefs. To them, the works of William Shakespeare are so important that he must have belonged to their own brand of religion.

The degree of “propaganda” spread by each writer varies enormously with both their level of conviction and the time in which they were writing. Thomas Carter and Edgar Fripp, both protestant clergymen writing in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, certainly pull no punches in their writings.

*The Expository Times*, a publication of the Church of Scotland, in its commentary on Carter’s book presented the following (tongue-in-cheek?) review in 1897:

...Shakespeare: Puritan and Recusant. An addition to Shakespearian literature, distinct and notable, and at this time of day! Mr. Carter being himself a Puritan, and the son of a Puritan, is delighted to find that Shakespeare was a Puritan and the son of a Puritan also. He seems to prove it, even amid the proverbial facility with which you can prove Shakespeare was everything under the sun. And what then? Why, then, Puritans are proud all the world over. And besides all that, Shakespeare being a Puritan, knew his Bible, was trained on it, knew it well, and loved it too, you may be sure. And of that the evidences are everywhere throughout his works. Mr. Carter tells us even (following Phillips) which version he used. It was the version of 1560, the Puritan version of Geneva. It's a very pleasant book; at once literary and religious.

However, Fripp must be placed in an altogether different category from Carter. His two volume *Shakespeare: Man and Artist*, absent its religious gloss, stands firm alongside Chambers’ biography as one of the great works on the subject. Fripp had factors working both for and against a valid recognition of his work. In favour, he followed the approach of Malone in focusing on the Stratford Records themselves. Additionally

---

1197 The publication is still in existence. Iain Torrance, President of Princeton Theological Seminary and former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1987 made the ‘recommendation’ that “The Expository Times inhabits a unique niche position. It is trustworthy both academically and pastorally. It publishes notices of new books more rapidly than any other journal. If a working pastor is to subscribe to any single journal, this is probably the wisest choice”. The Expository Times, volume 9, number one, p.31 to 34.
1198 *The Expository Times*, Vol. 9, No. 1, (1897) p.34
Malone had his contact/collaborator/investigator in Stratford in James Davenport – as did Fripp in Richard Savage.

Savage carefully brought all the Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-Upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620 together in a most painstaking fashion. When one examines his original notes in the Shakespeare Birthplace Library both the care and the dedication he brought to the task are evident in his tiny, spidery handwriting. And these records, edited and accompanied by very large introductions by Fripp, contain the facts that were the foundations to Fripp’s own work.

Against Fripp’s recognition were his religious bias and his untimely death seven years before Shakespeare: Man and Artist was finally published in 1938.

Sisson in his review of the volumes made the comment that

…”Mr Fripp will surely gain common consent to his thesis that Shakespeare should be approached mainly from his antecedents, in the light of an older England of which he was the heir. Yet such consent will be more difficult if these antecedents are glossed, as by Mr Fripp, with a predominantly Protestant and “Liberal” bias, the inevitable concomitant of Mr Fripp’s own strong convictions…”

Sisson points out the central problem of the religionist biographers - the “good” was often obscured by the “worthy.” Yet Fripp gives a far more rational explanation of how and possibly why John Shakespeare counter-indemnified other parties to avoid fines and in doing so demonstrated a clear understanding of the legal process of the time, and its shortcomings.

A shining example of conviction over reality is Heinrich Mutschmann and Karl Wentersdorf’s Shakespeare and Catholicism, a book that shares both Carter’s directness of title and single mindedness of approach. But whereas Fripp took the trouble to seek factual support for some of his conclusions, the authors were content

---

1199 Savage, Minutes and Accounts
1200 Such is my own admiration for Fripp and Savage’s achievement and my belief that the Records are vital in any analysis I have prepared my own summary of Fripp’s introductions and this is attached to the thesis. x ref.311
1202 x ref. footnote 544
recounting old stories - though it must be granted they recounted them fairly well - and then blindly insisting that everything confirmed the Shakespeare family’s closet Catholicism. Where there is some reference to money it is invariably incorrect, startlingly naïve or folded into the proposition that the only question on anyone’s mind during this period was of religion. An example of this concerns the purchase of New Place where it is clear neither Mutschmann nor Wentersdorf has any grasp of how property was conveyed or even questioned where the purchase price was obtained.\footnote{1204}

By some miracle, the closing words of this four hundred page book state that

\[ \text{[William Shakespeare] before he died, he received the last sacraments of that faith in which he was born and brought up – Catholicism} \]\footnote{1205}

Quite how this conclusion was validated remains unclear.

Notwithstanding the extreme preoccupation of most religionists, there is no doubt that, almost accidentally, their work can highlight some aspect of the Shakespeares’ finances or legal affairs that has been overlooked by mainstream biographers. Fripp’s explanation of John Shakespeare’s fines is surely the best and most logical analysis of what actually took place. As a group, much of their work is too coloured to be of use but there are occasional gems, even if they are coincidental.

**Group C – Historians and Editors**

**The Historical Writers & Biographers 1875 Onwards**

Peter Bowden \hspace{1cm} (1925 - )
John Burnett \hspace{1cm} (1925 - )
Melissa D. Aaron
Daniel Kornstein
B.J. (& M.) Sokol
Lawrence Stone \hspace{1cm} (1919 - 1999)
Martin Ingram
Richard Savage \hspace{1cm} (1847 - 1924)
Robert Bearman

\footnote{1204} Ibid. p.143
\footnote{1205} Ibid. p.385
The term “Historians” describes this group of economists, social historians, lawyers and archivists.

In Peter Bowden\textsuperscript{1206} and John Burnett there are two economic historians writing of the history of the wool trade and the cost of living. Though neither mentions the Shakespeares, the work of both is important to this thesis. In Bowden’s case he quantifies not just the nature of the industry but also describes individual business transactions. These transactions can then be compared to those of John Shakespeare listed in his various legal cases. By tying these sets of data together we have evidence of the actual size of John’s business, relative to other national-level wool dealers. Bowden supplies the pieces necessary to prove that John Shakespeare was not the marginal player many have assumed but a major trader and consequentially he supported Rowe’s assertions. Burnett supplied the data necessary to start the process of quantifying the economic conditions in which the Shakespeares’ business operated, and most importantly the fiscal reality prevailing when William made his investments, crucial data when trying to gauge relative buying power after four centuries.\textsuperscript{1207}

Melissa Aaron, already mentioned in connection with Andrew Gurr, focused in 2005\textsuperscript{1208} on the economics of the Globe though, as noted earlier, she herself is an Associate Professor of English who specializes in “Shakespeare, …the history of the theater business in the Early Modern era…”.\textsuperscript{1209} Aaron’s reference to the “theatre business” is significant for it is the “business” aspect that draws this group together. Despite her conclusions being overly optimistic, both she and Gurr\textsuperscript{1210}, prior to this thesis, delivered two of the most systematic attempts to show abbreviated balance sheets for the business of playing.

The range of Lawrence Stone’s writing was quite remarkable and frequently when looking for information on a precise aspect of life in the Early Modern Period one discovers he had written a highly detailed account of that particular issue. Both Stone and Martin Ingram\textsuperscript{1211} commented on the question of the social tone in Early Modern

\textsuperscript{1209} See http://www.csupomona.edu/~maaron/main.html
\textsuperscript{1210} Andrew Gurr, \textit{The Shakespearean Stage 1564-1642} (Cambridge: CUP, 1992).
England. Stone took an essentially dark view of early modern life. He wrote about a society where neighbour spied upon neighbour and the church and state spied on everyone. Ingram did not dispute facts. However, he held that there was some truth to the notion of Hazlitt’s 1212 “Merry” England where laughter and beauty did exist. Apart from the factual detail, what these authors present is a clear illustration that investigation cannot rely on one writer, as personal preference can have a profound effect on how a particular circumstance or event is reported.

Daniel Kornstein and the Sokols represent current attempts to take a multi-disciplinary approach to the questions surrounding Shakespearean scholarship using, in part, their skills as lawyers. Indeed Shakespeare, Law and Marriage asserted it was an …interdisciplinary study [which] combines legal, historical and literary approaches and applies them to the practice and theory… 1213 and the Sokols stated their ultimate goal as being …a better understanding of these issues, …illustrates both Shakespeare’s work and his age. 1214

The work of Richard Savage in connection with Edgar Fripp has already been referenced. However Robert Bearman, one of the subsequent holders of a similar position in The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, deserves special credit. Bearman’s article of 2005 John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless, 1215 was the first writing to focus on Shakespeare’s father in a hundred years. However, though informative, one wonders to what degree the writing had to be shaped to fit in with the mythos, given that it had to conform both to Stratford orthodoxy as well as the helpers 1216 he lists. However, he graciously acknowledged that …my biggest debts, however, are posthumous: to Edgar Fripp, whose voluminous notes on Shakespeare’s Stratford have provided many useful pointers…

---

1213 Daniel Kornstein, Kill All The Layers, 2005 (new edition) (Bison Books, University of Nebraska, 2005).
1216 Professor Katherine Duncan-Jones, Professor René Weis, and Professor Sir John Baker are specifically mentioned.
The Editorial Biographers 1970 Onwards

Stephen Greenblatt (1943 - )
Jonathan Bate (1958 - )

Jonathan Bate and Stephen Greenblatt stand on either side of the Atlantic, with one as the co-editor of the RSC *William Shakespeare Complete Works* and the other the general editor of the American *The Norton Shakespeare*. Both are professional academics and may be described as being literary critics, theorists and scholars.

From Greenblatt’s first book - on Walter Raleigh1217 - there were inklings of an underlying philosophy that he would later articulate as “my deep, ongoing interest…[in] the relation between literature and history.” He first adopted the term “new historicism” in 19821218 to illustrate the “mutual permeability of the literary and the historical.” But his philosophical approach, important and brilliant as it is, has centred on how to understand or view problems and differed from the earlier “American” researchers who sought to make “new” discoveries.

Both Bate and Greenblatt have, in recent years, published commercially successful Shakespearian biographies, and how they define John Shakespeare is instructive. Greenblatt recounts all the customary stories with accuracy, but the approach is hardly innovative – he quoted Nicholas Rowe (as many have) and noted the evidence of the “ten” children mistake.1219 But, unlike Peter Ackroyd, he is already going down a well-trodden path to John Shakespeare’s supposed financial decline. Bearman contrasts Greenblatt with several other authors and makes this careful observation

...Stephen Greenblatt… in *Will in the World*… presents a more complex character [than others], but a man still much preoccupied by his religious beliefs.1220

---

1217 Stephen Greenblatt, *Sir Walter Ralegh* (New Haven: Yale University, 1973) this was based on his own doctoral thesis.
1220 Bearman, *John Shakespeare*. 
For Bate, John Shakespeare hardly exists, meriting only an occasional reference.\textsuperscript{1221} However, he has recently focused on the court structure of the time in particular the Consistory Court\textsuperscript{1222} and this has been of value in preparing this thesis.

\textsuperscript{1222} Jonathan Bate, "Shakespeare and the Law" (University of Warwick, 2007). Conference Paper.
Transcript of an extract from a certificate by London tax commissioners 1597 (E 179/146/354)

St Martyns Outwhiche parish.
Anthony Treavys........ viii li ...... viii s
Robert Whorewood....... v li ...... v s

St Ellens parish.
Peter Dallila............. l li ...... l s
William Shackspeare....... v li....... v s
Thomas Smythe gent....... xxx li ...... xxx s
William Boyele.......... xxx li ...... xxx s

...... dyd saye and affirme that the persons hereunder named are all other dead departed and gone out of the sayd warde or their goodes so eloined or conveyed out of the same or in suche pryvate or covertte manner kepte whereby the severall Sommes of money on them severally taxed and assessed towards the sayde second payment of the sayde laste subsydye nether might nor coulde by anye meanes by them the sayde Pettycollectors or ether of them be leveyed of them or anye of them to her majestie's use.
2. By London tax commissioners, 1598 (E 179/146/369)

St Hellens parish
Sir John Spencer knight a commissioner..ccc li.... xl li

... 

John Robinson the yonger...........x li....xxvis viiid
John Scymme..................iii li...viii s
Affid
William Shakespeare..........v li.....xiii s iii d
George Axon...............iii li...viii s
Edward Jackson..........iii li....viii s

Note: Each line contains the name of the person being taxed, the first number in the line is the value of their belongings and the second number (at the end of the line) is the amount of tax they have to pay at this collection. Therefore Sir John Spencer has goods worth 300 and he therefore owes 40 in tax.

Affid. = affidavit: this indicates that the person has not paid the tax which he/her [she] owes to the Exchequer.  

---

1223 Emphasis added. The “her” is a typographical error in the original PRO website.
3. Entry on main account of the Exchequer 1599 (E 372/445)

Transcript of entry on main account of the Exchequer 1599 (E 372/445)

“William Shakespeare in the parish of St. Helen's, 13s. 4d. of the first entire subsidy granted in the said thirty ninth year [of the reign of Queen Elizabeth] which is required upon the same there.”

Note: This Pipe Roll lists an old debt of tax owed (13s, 4d.) and points out that it is the business of the sheriff of Surrey and Sussex and according to a note in the margin of the document, this matter was sent to the Bishop of Winchester for his attention. In both Surrey and Sussex, the Bishop only had authority over the area of the Clink in Southwark. This is where many of the London Elizabethan theatres, including the Globe Theatre were built.

The National Archives section from which the above is drawn could also have included two further references to Shakespeare in the Residuum London Accounts of 6 October 1599 (PRO Pipe Rolls E. 372/444) Residuum Sussex Accounts of 6 October 1600 (PRO Pipe Rolls E. 372/445)

Both of these are effectively follow-up entries to the three listed above.
### IV - Explanatory Notes to Financial Tables

x ref. Table 17 - Hypothetical Financial Statement - Globe Theatre c.1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gurr(^{1224}) and Aaron have been selected as comparative analyses as both are recent and both offer a degree of a consistency in financial approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Year of publication – see footnotes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Income is gross income from the activity of playing i.e. from all sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Galleries ( sharers) Gurr estimates gallery income at £750 gross for 1594-7, rising to £800 for 1603-8 based on “increased earnings as the Company’s status rose.”(^{1225}) At the Rose Theatre income from galleries 1594-6 was £672.(^{1226}) I have tended towards Thomson’s observation of a much flatter earnings curve than Gurr or Aaron “…no increase in the theatrical public since 1595…”(^{1227})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Despite the earlier evidence from the Rose that gallery receipts exceeded those of the yard, Gurr in all his analysis shows the reverse – which from a financial standpoint favours the Company over the Owners.(^{1228}) Aaron has the yard at only 50% of Gallery income. To put it another way: per Henslowe’s notebook Gallery income is 53% of the gross, Gurr for 1594-7 is 49% falling to 48.5% for 1603-8, Aaron has the Galleries at only 33% as “Forse and Baldwin assume that the gallery represented two thirds of the total receipts”(^{1229}) though she does not detail exactly where and how these two authors reached this conclusion. Forse does not (even) provide an index to his work (certainly not in the 1993 edition).(^{1230}) However, I am convinced that the two thirds galleries is the better approach based on Thomson, Cook etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have followed the assumption that 6 per year is a good average figure – Chambers notes that: “The longest number of plays given before given before Elizabeth in any one winter was probably in 1600-1, when there were 11…during the greater part of the reign the number ranged from six to ten”(^{1231}) The question then arises what share would have fallen to the Lord Chamberlain’s Men? Six out of a total of 11 appears reasonable. Chambers continues by stating that £10 was the usual fee for “presentinge.” Gurr’s £50 is defensible as a good average figure But as there were occasional exceptional fees such as one paid to the (then) King’s Men of £30 in 1603(^{1232}) for the players “paynes and expenses” in coming down to Mortlake in what was the plague Winter. It is of course highly debatable that Elizabeth would ever have paid over the odds - £10 being the norm - versus her spendthrift Scottish successor. I have edged the amount higher to £60 to reflect some possibility of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Touring is shown as a net revenue figure – while the REED data is convincing that a viable touring circuit existed the amounts involved do not suggest any great income could be derived from it – Aaron simple ignores it focused as she is on the Globe Theatre. £60 is probably a generous estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aaron gives no allowances for other performances or gratuities – Gurr on the other hand is bullish on the issue. It is most unlikely that “tips” wouldn’t be forthcoming and that requests such as the Richard II performance for the Essex rebels (well documented) with a £2 special fee were occasionally available. But the scale of these – like those for patronage-type dedications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1225 Ibid. p.108
1226 Ibid. p.106
1228 Curiously even in the pages before his own tables he correctly shows the figures for the Rose (Table 3.1) the other way round see Gurr, *Shakespeare Company* pages p.106, 108
1232 Ibid. p.217/8
would, using the Essex/Richard II case as an indication were most likely to have been in the order of a few pounds.

11 Other income relates to some measure of compensation for those selling refreshments and cushions in the theatre during performances as well as exceptional fees such as the “£2 that the Exeter conspirators paid to have Richard II restaged”.

12 Gurr feels that £1500 is an “at least” figure — but here he is grossing up from figures in Henslowe’s notebook without recognizing that an additional theatre would mean more supply of entertainment and hence a lowering of price or number of customers — i.e. just opening a theatre does not magically increase the total number of available patrons overnight. Earlier he noted that £5 a day at the Theatre produced £1100 for a playing year of 220 days.

15 & 16 All three estimates for costs of plays are close together, the data supporting these being from several disparate references – the estimate for costumes is less well supported, if anything it is still low at £250.

16 See Section 3.3 (above) x ref. 60 for a discussion on this issue. Gurr has clothing falling in price as a cost in 1603-1608 in contrast to his £300 for the earlier and later periods – I have included his “£250” though one wonders if this was an oversight on his part? Again, Gurr seems high and Aaron too low.

17 Aaron’s actual estimate was £144 — but as she herself notes this is not an all inclusive cost – she makes no estimate for musicians and uses the term “at least” before the £144 – the £50 notional increase reflects the additional charges she alludes to but does not quantify. Gurr put the figure on a much higher basis and though he details his thinking there is altogether a suggestion of “rounding up” in his final £300.

18 Aaron inexplicably makes no specific addition for this – she references “Poor Law” twice but only in another context. Gurr’s estimate of £10 is acceptable.

21 Gurr is tacit on this cost while Aaron’s figure seems extortionately high. The probability is that the Burbages themselves – a family of joiners and at least one painter (Richard) would have done at least some portion of any work themselves. Even Aaron noted that the £108 Henslowe paid for the Rose in 1592 included a remodelling and enlargement of the theatre.

22 Again Gurr is non-specific on this cost.

24 Aaron appears to understate this figure – as Gurr notes “we may note it as a signifier of the general lack of money the fact the Burbages failed to pay their Licence Fees to the Master of the Revels until he took them to court in 1604”.

41 Gurr

Note: This table was prepared as a quick comparison to the recent work of two other scholars – I have prepared my own estimates using the methods described in the thesis especially using the approaches of Harbage and others. I have concluded that the history of estimating theatre revenue has been one of grossly overestimating - or simply wishful thinking - while understating expenses. My own contention is that strict ticket sales (alone) from patrons have very, very rarely supported any theatrical performance over time The ancient Greek theatre relied in part on sponsorship in lieu of taxation of the wealthy just as performance in modern day Las Vegas is, in truth, only existing because of gambling and other revenue streams. Based on my analysis, Early Modern Theatre in London was no “golden age” despite very low salaries. Theatrical fortunes were made, but not through entrance fees alone.

1233 Gurr, Shakespeare Company p.98
1234 Ibid. p.97
1235 Ibid. p.98
1236 Aaron, Global Economics p.54
1237 Gurr, Shakespeare Company p.102
1238 Aaron, Global Economics p.52
1240 Gurr, Shakespeare Company p.98
x ref. Table 20 - William Shakespeare's Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Joint London and Stratford Expense starts at £35 per annum, compounding starts. £50 London investment as he becomes sharer in Lord Chamberlain’s Men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Living expense jumps to £55 with the acquisition of New Place, compounding continues. Stratford expense is New Place at £60 (though this is, in all probability understated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Expense moves to £65 with change in status, New Place etc. compounding continues. £60 to become Housekeeper in Globe, £40 in connection with title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>£320 for land in Stratford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>£440 for tithes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>£200 (assumed) to B. Hathaway for farm. £100 for a 20 acre parcel of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>£140 for gatehouse - only £80 is actually paid for the Gatehouse balance is mortgaged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V - THREE SHORT PAPERS – FACTORS AFFECTING COMMERCE

Paper I Law
Paper II Money
Paper III Wool and Cloth

Paper I - Law

Justinian the Emperor by commissions directed to diverse persons learned in the laws, reduced the Roman Laws... from vastness of volume and a labyrinth of uncertainties unto that course of the Civil Law which is now in use. Francis Bacon, 1629

[like an] Ancient palace, that hitherto hath bene acoumpted (howsoever substantiall) yet but darke and melancholy John Cowell, 1607

Law in England at the end of the sixteenth century was, as Francis Bacon commented, lost in a labyrinth. The reasons for this were many and varied. Religion, following changes of sovereign, accounted for much of the confusion. By the time Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558 an individual born in 1531 would have lived through legislative environments that tried to appease state enforced episcopalianism (Henry VIII), militant Protestantism (Edward VI) and reactionary Catholicism (Mary I). Even during Elizabeth’s reign the law struggled to keep society on her middle road of her own Church of England style Episcopalianism. To complicate matters further with the Union of the Crowns in 1603, James VI of Scotland became James I of England and the new sovereign ruled over two kingdoms, one with a Roman Law based legal system (Scotland) and the other with its English Common Law - a legal duality that exists to the present. However, the rise of the middle (merchant) class and its accompanying trade related activities also rendered much of the existing legal mechanisms obsolete and created anachronisms and ambiguities that were ripe for plunder.

In the new Borough of Stratford in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries there were, as in all of England, both Civil (Roman) and English (Common) Law in active use. To appreciate how these two legal strands functioned it is necessary to briefly review their individual origins.

1242 Francis Bacon, "To The King: of a digest to be made of the Lawes of England (1629).," in Certaine Miscellany Works (New York: Da Capo Press, 1855). A commentary on the need to reform English Common Law
1244 Created by Royal Charter in 1553.
Roman & Civil Law

Laws in all of Christendom have a common root in those of the Roman Empire as codified by the Emperor Justinian and later interpreted by the eleventh and twelfth century Glossators.\textsuperscript{1245}

Laws split between religious laws, “Canons” of the church, and temporal laws enacted by sovereigns with or without parliaments or peers. “Civil Law” is a broad term concerning “the law of Roman citizens; thence, the Roman Law as a whole, especially as received…after the Middle Ages”\textsuperscript{1246}. This is not to say that there were not strong national and regional divergences – most notably over the extent to which Law created by individual Kings held or did not hold sway over Justinian’s precepts. Adding to the confusion were strong cadres of Catholic clerics who took “nationalized” standpoints on many issues e.g. the French Catholic Church.

As Europe reformed and fragmented (from a religious standpoint), each territory, as it diverged from Rome’s supremacy, developed its own distinct branch of the Civil law, amending and evolving new statutes for its own people. By 1545 the Catholic Church counter-attacked the Reformation through the creation of the Council of Trent. This ran, off and on, for eighteen years\textsuperscript{1247} and was intended to stiffen the resolve of Catholic nations to stay loyal to Rome. In the decrees that finally emerged the Church conceded much, especially with regard to loosening its own prohibitions around previously incestuous “cousin” marriages, to maintain its control. Nor was Trent universally accepted even by those nations who retained allegiance to the Pope. The French, for example, never adopted the Council’s final Decrees.

Canon Law\textsuperscript{1248} (sometimes also referred to as Ecclesiastical Law) is a sub-division of Civil Law. However, Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church could and did vary widely in application from country to country. As countries broke away from Rome many retained “Canon Law” though as time passed it increasingly began to diverge (as new Canons were being independently created at the individual national level) from the Canon Law of the Church of Rome.

English Common Law

Of all European nations the one with the most convoluted legal evolution was England, which created its own unique legal system. As John Hudson put it:

\begin{quote}
in the mid 1230’s the rulers of England were confronted with a problem concerning bastards. Church Law\textsuperscript{1249} legitimized children born out of wedlock whose parents subsequently married.\textsuperscript{1250}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{1246} OED, Roman Law

\textsuperscript{1247} In one case suspended for two full years while Bavaria teetered on the edge of reforming.

\textsuperscript{1248} The term ‘Canon’ singly refers to any rule, law, or decree of: [a] ‘Church; especially a rule laid down by an ecclesiastical council’ OED

\textsuperscript{1249} A very imprecise non-legal term – Canon Law or even Ecclesiastical Law might have been better here – one can only assume that the brevity of the article or assumptions about his readers dictated its use here.

This did not please the Barons who were accustomed to controlling who inherited by selecting when to marry (though they did not restrict themselves to fathering offspring only within marriage). To justify their stance reference was made to ill-defined customary “Laws of England”.

To administer these nebulous “laws” a legal profession evolved which (and to some extent remains) more a religious sect than anything else - the “Inner Temple” being particularly well named. Over the next four centuries these lawyers nurtured the Laws of England into a conflicting morass of courts, titles and legislation. Its cases were recorded in a near incomprehensible hybrid language (Law French) only, and most definitely unevenly, comprehended by its initiates. By King James’s accession the members of the Inns of Court had carved out for themselves a position of highly profitable and self-sustaining complexity.

“Law” here should not be confused with “Justice”. The Law was then as it is now no more than a set of evolving rules administered by a group of individuals whose first concern was their own remuneration and advancement. However, even some of their number had concerns, as Collum notes

…one of the fears of laypersons and lawyers alike was that the law introduced uncertainties by exceeding its own confines. The English legal system was commonly felt to be governed by a hopelessly confusing set of laws administered in a professional discourse that, through its obscurity and multiplicity, invited abuse and sheer confusion. Law French, in which much of the law was recorded, was called by Thomas Elyot a "barbarous" language .... The language of the law was not pure but multiple, “myngled with dyvers languages…” (Richard Morison, A Persuasion to the King,… [states that it] was a “Hotchpot French, stufft up with such variety of borrowed words.”

The Gesta Grayorum purports to be a summary of the student revels at Gray’s Inn in 1594. It refers clearly to The Comedy of Errors being performed as part of the revels. This is a highly unreliable document of unproven authorship, however it does summarize very neatly what was undoubtedly required for the English Common Law of the time

…Then look into the state of your laws and justice of your land; purge out multiplicity of laws, clear the incertainty of them, repeal those that are snaring, and press the execution of those that are wholesome and necessary; define the jurisdiction of your courts, repress all suits and vexations, all causeless delays and fraudulent shifts and devices, and reform all such abuses of right and justice; assist the ministers thereof, punish severely all extortions and exactions of officers, all corruptions in trials and sentences of judgement…

---

1253 The Speech of The Fifth Counsellor, The Gesta Grayorum
The authorship of the play *The White Devil* is in no doubt. In this drama, John Webster ridiculed the legal pedantry of the day

Lawyer: Most literated judges, please your lordships
So to connive your judgments to the view
Of this debauch’d and diversivolent woman;
Who such a black concatenation
Of mischief hath effected, that to extirp
The memory of ’t, must be the consummation
Of her, and her projections ----
Vittoria: What ’s all this?
Lawyer: Hold your peace!
Exorbitant sins must have exulceration.
Vittoria: Surely, my lords, this lawyer here hath swallow’d
Some ’pothecaries’ bills, or proclamations;
And now the hard and undigestible words
Come up, like stones we use give hawks for physic.
Why, this is Welsh to Latin…

E.F.J. Tucker reflected on how George Ruggle’s comedy *Ignoramus*, a satire on the disarray of Common Law legal language, was the “hit” of 1614. Indeed, Edward Coke, then Lord Chief Justice of The King’s Bench, was said to have been infuriated. When King James saw the play in March 1615 he enjoyed it so much that returned to see it again barely two months later. Hilaire Kallendorf noted that the play ran for five hours and in the March performance attracted an audience of two thousand in Oxford.

Plans of how to ‘reform’ English Common Law were drawn up by two members of the Inns of Court, — Francis Bacon and Edward Coke. Bacon favoured a return to the style of the Civil Law. Writing to King James in 1621 he proposed that the King use the Emperor Justinian as an example to transform English law as Justinian had supposedly rationalised Roman Law “from [a] vastness of volume and a labyrinth of uncertainties.” Coke favoured, and largely succeeded in his aim of, codifying English Common Law in his own idiosyncratic *Institutes of the Laws of England* the first volume of which was completed in 1628. But both Coke’s *Institutes* and Bacon’s *Proposition* lay in the future. For those living at the time of William and John Shakespeare’s business careers there was no such clarity.

---

1254 The White Devil III, ii 1612
1256 Based on a play by the Italian Giambattista della Porta’s *La Trappolaria*
1257 later Sir Edward Coke
1259 Later 1st Baron Verulam and Viscount St. Albans (1561-1626)
English Bifurcation

Law in post-reformation England (after 1535) operated by necessity under both legal systems. There was the Common Law, formed by the King and his House of Lords creating statutes which worked in conjunction with Case Law - a body of legal precedents rising from decided legal cases argued by professional advocates and judges and these two elements were lumped together with nebulous ancient “Laws of England”.

The other branch was Ecclesiastical Law and Ecclesiastical Courts which were fundamentally Civil Law based and run by churchmen concerned with matters touching family and moral legal issues such as marriage, witchcraft etc.. The churchmen administering this legal system could also call on Civil Law trained lawyers when the need arose.

Therefore in England, there were two different types of legal professionals. Common Law Lawyers had on-the-job training. D.J. Seipp records that no record of a rank-and-file Common Law lawyer attending any University appeared till 1620 when a James Whitelock became a serjeant. Seipp continued:

Common [Law] lawyers maintained the body of law as a living tradition, a common learning passed down to new entrants … texts of Statutes and Year Book reports were a means of preserving bits of the ancient oral wisdom but they were not themselves “the common law”.

Common Law Courts dealt with temporal matters and imposed temporal punishments such as fines, mutilations and death. Church Courts (Ecclesiastical Courts) dealt with spiritual matters and imposed spiritual sanctions, principally public naming and shaming rising to excommunication. It is reasonable to suggest that the weighting between these two types of law in the Early Modern Period was fairly evenly balanced in terms of impact on the life of the average citizen.

Common Law had a vigorous growth ahead as capitalism greatly increased the need for mercantile law (and subsequent litigation).

On the other hand the Church Courts had both a body of Civil Law lawyers and a clergy that was increasingly university educated and more centrally controlled. The publication that year of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical agreed upon with the King’s Maiesties Licence in...the Synod begun at London Anno Dom. 1603 contained many tangible signs of the Church of England tightening its control over each citizen’s life. Here the Church was attempting to reassert its pre-reformation authority and inter
alia making a conscious attempt to impose greater moral authority over the lives of citizens.

Over the next four centuries (assisted greatly by Cromwell’s Commonwealth) the secular Common Law would win through and strip the Civil Law based Church Courts of any real power. Never fully extinguished, Church Courts now exist only as an internal control mechanism of the Church of England.

The Stratford Courts

Piepowder

Stratford market was a weekly event and Piepowder\textsuperscript{1268} Court on market and fair days sat to adjudicate “pressing disputes”. Originally, it had referred to the dusty feet (in French, pieds poudrés) of vagrants, travellers and vagabonds.

Court of Record

“Please ye, we may ... as adversaries do in law, strive mightily but eat and drink as friends.

\textit{The Taming of the Shrew} I, II

The Stratford Court of Record, followed the pattern of the Court at Coventry\textsuperscript{1269} and was held every two weeks generally on a Wednesday. The Bailiff and the Head Alderman sat on the bench as the Justices of the Peace for the Borough supported by two or three of their “Brethren”\textsuperscript{1270} and the borough Steward. The Steward was a lawyer of some standing in the neighbourhood and guided the proceedings. He or his deputy, the Town Clerk, kept a record in Latin of the court’s activities.\textsuperscript{1271} Cases up to £30 were heard. Summons was formally delivered by one of the Serjeants. If the defendant failed to appear, a \textit{distringas}, or writ to compel appearance, was issued, which the Serjeant again formally delivered. If the defendant still failed to appear the Serjeant returned \textit{nihil}, that is, he made formal declaration in Court that he had waited upon the defendant at his house and found “nothing to distrain upon”, and he asked for a capias - a warrant to arrest. Then the defendant had either to go to prison or find sureties, who would answer the charge against him, or pay the penalty, or bring him dead or alive into the Court. The capias was drawn up by the Steward or the Town Clerk. No capias was granted at the suit of a “foreigner”, or non-townsman, except where there was a manifest case to answer. The Steward or Town Clerk had to make “good and perfect declarations” and deliver them to the two Attorneys of the Court. Townsmen with recognized experience of the law, such as Adrian Quiney and John Shakespeare, could

\textsuperscript{1268} In England, a Court of Piepowders was a special tribunal organised by a borough for a fair or market – see Glossary.

\textsuperscript{1269} The new boroughs of Banbury and Stratford were both based on the structure of Coventry – see The \textit{Black Book of Warwick}, Thomas Kemp, p.10-14, 56-61, 105-16. The Assistants at Warwick envied the Principal Burgesses of Stratford (ib. p.113). “Such pleas, complaints and actions be there heard and determined according to the law and customs of our City of Coventry” (Charter of Incorporation of Banbury, 26 January, 1551). See “The Regulations of the Court of Record” in the \textit{Book of Orders of Banbury}, 14 May, 1558.

\textsuperscript{1270} Aldermen who had previously served as Bailiff

\textsuperscript{1271} Hence the Court’s name.
act as attorneys. Businessmen went readily into Court to enforce payments and resolve disagreements and defendants often delayed payments until the capias.

Fripp has noted that going to law was so common that there was little or no disgrace in it or ill feeling, indeed a legal suit was the only practical way to create a public record of commercial transactions. John Shakespeare through his various civil positions would have been a regular if not habitual presence in the Stratford Court of Record.  

The Bawdy Court

...the theatre and the consistory [religious] court (the so-called "bawdy" court) were the two principal public spheres in which relations between the sexes were played out in Shakespeare's time... Shakespeare's plays -- Measure for Measure, Much Ado, All's Well and The Winter's Tale in particular - constituted a kind of alternative bawdy court...

Jonathan Bate, 2007

The Act of Uniformity 1558, passed in 1559, stipulated a one-shilling fine for failure to attend church on Sunday. Forced church attendance meant that offenders of the Church Courts were confessing their moral lapses before the entire community – sometimes in ordinary dress, sometimes clad in a white sheet holding a white rod as symbols of repentance. It was unquestionably one way, together with sermons, to ensure that the populace knew something of Canon Law even if it amounted to no more than a list of ‘thou shalt nots’.

The court itself often had a distinct physical presence and was often located in the room above the Church Porch. There was typically a raised dais and suitably impressive chair for the judge (the Vicar in the case of Stratford) and below this a large table for the notary. The Churchwardens, drawn from the congregation, were “sworn in” and were given a list of offences “Articles of Inquiry”. Their job was to root out the transgressors at which time “Bills of Detection” would be drawn up and citations to appear delivered by “Apparitors”.

E.R.C. Brinkworth sets out in detail the principal types of cases and the process for hearing them in Stratford’s own Church Court through reference to the Stratford Court

\[1272\] See Chapter 2.
\[1275\] Not a trivial amount given that a skilled craftsman would have earned about that for a day’s work.
\[1276\] The drawing (above) is of The Consistory Court in Chichester Cathedral it is the only one remaining in its original condition E.R.C. Brinkworth, Shakespeare and The Bawdy Court of Stratford (London: Philmore, 1972) p.9. OED - Consistory – “A court, a company surrounding a throne, as in heavenly consistory, c. of saints and martyrs”.
\[1277\] The list was long and included: adultery, whoredom, incest, drunkenness, irregular marriage, blasphemy etc.
Act Books for the years 1590 to 1625. He quotes A.G. Dickens that this type of court
…ground through their ancient routines, keeping the morals of men
under observation; …their notaries scribbled down the sins and quarrels
of society in spidery hands across countless pages…
Religion was both pervasive and invasive. Lawrence Stone takes a dark view of a
society where everyone was telling tales on everyone else and privacy was virtually
nonexistent. Martin Ingram holds to a much lighter course suggesting that English
society was overall relatively light-hearted at this time. The truth probably lies
somewhere between the two with wide variations depending on the rigour of the local
clergy.
Each of the two Archbishops (Canterbury and York), every bishop and every
archdeacon maintained his own court. In addition there were 300 ‘peculiar’
jurisdictions (Stratford and its outlying villages with a population in Shakespeare’s time
of around 2000 was one of these ‘peculiars’) where the parish church doubled as a
court. The Stratford Church Court met monthly with the Vicar sitting as judge or
“Ordinary”. Proceedings were recorded in Act Books. The surviving Act Books for
Stratford include several Shakespeare family names: Shakespeare’s elder daughter
Susanna, son-in-law Thomas Quiney husband of his daughter Judith, his brother
Richard, sister Joan and brother-in-law Bartholomew Hathaway.

One of the few well-documented events in Shakespeare’s own life is the case of his son-
in-law, Thomas Quiney. Just as Quiney was about to marry Shakespeare’s younger
daughter Judith, rumours circulated that another woman was pregnant by him. In spite
of this, Thomas and Judith were married in Stratford Parish Church. A month after the
wedding Margaret Wheeler died in childbirth. Apparitor Greene personally served a
citation on Quiney to appear in open court in 1616. As Brinkworth noted

…before the Vicar, John Rogers, sitting as judge, Quiney confessed he
had carnal copulation with Margaret Wheeler…the court meted out one of the
severest punishments recorded in the (parish) Act Books…(he) was
ordered to face “open shame” of “three days penance done” …Quiney
managed to escape the full rigour of the penalty by offering by way of
commutation to give five shillings to the use of the poor…the judge
accepted this though he directed Quiney to make acknowledgement of
the crime (so it is called in the record) clad in his ordinary clothes before
the minister in the comparative privacy of the chapel out at
Bishopton.

However, Quiney and his new wife may have received another form of punishment in
that the (then) dying Shakespeare, in the face of this disgrace, changed his will.

1278 Brinkworth, Bawdy Court Those that remain – the records themselves being part of the Sackville of
Knowle Manuscripts deposited (as of 1972) in the Kent Archives Office.
1279 Ibid. p.3
1280 Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800 (London: Weidenfeld and
1282 Ibid. p.5
1283 Ibid. p.80
1284 Schoenbaum, Documentary Life p.247 see also Chapter 4.
Brinkworth also referred to

…the case of Martin Wright, curate of Luddington…he was cited by the Judge, the Vicar, directly for getting married to Frances Cooke 1285, without having either banns called or getting a licence instead. Although a curate of the Parish he did not appear upon the first citation and accordingly incurred excommunication (26 March 1616). However, he shortly complied and admitted both the fact itself and that the marriage had been solemnised by one William Jervis who was only a deacon. He asked the favour of the court both for himself and for others who had been present at the wedding. He secured dismissal upon payment of one shilling to the poor of Luddington. 1286

Bate 1287 compares the Church Court to the theatre and when one reads records of the Stratford “Bawdy” Court there is more than a passing resemblance. Not everyone “toed the line” and some of the exchanges were indeed much more akin to something Pompey Bum might have said in Measure for Measure than would be tolerated in modern court procedure. The “bawdy” epithet is probably fully justified. 1288

The Church Court was indeed a court. It not only looked like one but its proceedings were conducted in a substantially similar manner to the temporal courts. There are no records of attendance levels but in Shakespeare’s time with a population of two thousand or so in greater Stratford it would be extraordinary if most people did not know of every juicy scandal – and either witnessed the guilty party in Church confessing their guilt or knew of the fine paid in lieu.

Laws, Statutes and Proclamations

Under English Common Law a proclamation is a formal announcement, with a Royal Proclamation (made under the great seal) being a Royal Announcement that had, in effect, the force of law. Before the 1530’s the question of whether a proclamation could, or even did, supersede a law enacted by Parliament (with the Royal Assent) seems to have had little or no consideration.

In 1531 Thomas Cromwell, seeking absolute power for his master Henry VIII referred the question to “chief legal officers” 1289 seeking a loophole in an existing statute that would make Royal proclamations at least the equivalent (pari passu) with Statutes. The answer was that there were “diverse opinions” and with a Parliament handpicked by Cromwell a Statute “An Act that Proclamations Made by the King Shall Be obeyed” was enacted in 1539, though repealed in 1547. 1290

Leading up to the Civil War the Stuarts increasingly used Proclamations in furtherance of their “divine right” which in many ways built up the pressures for the subsequent conflict. James I in a speech framed his position thus

1285 Not to be confused with Francis Coke daughter of Edward Coke.
1286 Brinkworth, Bawdy Court p.108
1288 Brinkworth, Bawdy Court p.70
1290 31 Henry VIII, c.8, repealed by 1 Edward VI, c.12. see Youngs, Ibid. p.28
Although we know well that, by the Constitution of the frame and policy of this kingdom proclamation was on not of equal force and in like degree as laws; yet nevertheless, we think it a duty appertaining to us and inseparably annexed to our crown and regal authority to restrain and prevent such mischiefs and inconveniences as we see growing in the common weal, against which no certain law is extant, and which may tend to the great grief and prejudice of our subjects, if there should be no remedy provided until a parliament; which prerogatives our progenitors have, as well in ancient as latter times used and enjoyed. 

In 1616 Sir Edward Coke was said to have been dismissed from the bench for disagreeing with the King on four key issues of the day - “Pride, Prohibitions, Praemunire” and Prerogative” however, as Esther Cope notes a fifth “p” which could have been added to the list that of “Proclamations.”

Proclamations have survived as executive orders in Common Law systems with their uses being confined to specific situations where legislation would be too cumbersome to address specific causes where time does not permit the enacting of a new statute - such as declarations of war.

In the sixteenth century one use for the Proclamation was to execute control over the wool and cloth industries. When used in this manner the Proclamation was a tool of economic policy, less likely to have been a personal desire or decision of the monarch, and more probably an instrument of fiscal control exercised by one or more members of the Privy Council.

---


1292 The offence of introducing foreign authority into England, the penalties for which were originally intended to depress the civil power of the Pope in the kingdom.” Webster's Dictionary 1913 See also http://www.luminarium.org/encyclopedia/praemunire.htm

1293 Cope, Coke and Proclamations p.215 – The reference was made in a letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton
The most striking aspect of price change in England over the past seven hundred and fifty years was the prolonged periods where there was low or no price volatility. A major exception to this occurred in England between 1580 and 1613 when inflation (increase in money supply versus the price of goods), coupled to rising population and other factors forced a huge reallocation of wealth and a profound shifting in terms of relative value between both goods and wages. This had a profound effect on those such as the Shakespeares who were accumulating wealth.

To better understand relative values it is first necessary to estimate how buying power then equated to present day costs for the same or similar commodities. This is important in demonstrating that goods were not always “cheap” in the past but have to be compared to average costs in their own respective time period.

For example, unskilled labour might be “cheap” relative to a judge’s wages in 1604, but while the judge earns more than the labourer in the present day the mathematical ratio of one to the other has changed radically.

Even a cursory review of how these cost ratios stood produces a better understanding of the tastes, values, and cost priorities of both those who produced plays and those who sat in the audience of the Early Modern Theatre. Additionally, it may help avoid the temptation to apply present day values, both cash and moral, on an earlier society where relative values were very different.

In trying to equate prices from one period to another researchers have taken varying approaches.

The Single Commodity

In this method a single product or commodity, whose price is known, was selected from one historical period and then contrasted with the present day price: e.g. Peter Thomson noted that an orange at the Globe “might cost a farthing”. An orange in Sainsbury’s on 22 October 2008 cost 29p. Converting this into a ratio then results in a 280-fold price increase.

In this simplest model by multiplying another 1604 known cost, for a specific article, by 280 it could deliver an approximation of its current cost.

Accordingly, take Thomas Platter’s statement that “anyone who remains on the level standing pays only one English penny”. The “only” was perhaps significant, suggestive

---

of relatively good value. If the ‘orange’ ratio is correct, then we could expect the New Globe – assuming no change in relative charges and values over time - to be charging £1.20 for an equivalent standing space. The correct (real) answer is £5.

There are numerous deficiencies in this method, to list a few:

Comparing like with like – Sainsbury’s is not the New Globe – places of entertainment generally charge much more than equivalent shops in 2009 and this might also be the case in Shakespeare’s time.

Quality – were oranges in the old Globe of high or low quality compared with Sainsbury’s – is the comparison really like with like?

Did buying an orange at the Globe have some social exclusivity attached to it that might have encouraged someone to pay the premium price of a farthing because of the social status it would denote?

This last point is not as fanciful as it might at first seem, for example in the present people continue to buy luxury brands far in excess of their cost of manufacture. Rolex watches might justify some level of premium pricing reflecting quality of manufacture but clearly the perception of exclusivity also forms a major part in any purchasing decision. Nor is it only the wealthy seeking exclusivity that pay premium prices. Harley Davidson motorcycles are heavy, expensive and, technologically dated and yet to a particular segment of the market they remain in demand because their lifestyle image remains attractive to some potential buyers.

The Small Representative Selection

Returning to Thomson’s Shakespeare’s Theatre, here the author chose a few representative commodities to give the reader some sense of both absolute costs – i.e. that an orange cost a farthing - together with relative costs a well-paid schoolmaster earned one fiftieth of a junior judge’s remuneration. This ratio is very high in comparison with the five times or so that nowadays would be more common. Thomson noted of a judge “in this litigious age…he would have been one of the very few Elizabethans in the four figure bracket”. According to the reader is being given a glimpse not only of absolute wages, but of why the pay was so high and in addition, some sense of where a judge would stand in the economic and probably social pecking order. A further implication was that where judges appear as characters in Early Modern and Shakespeare’s plays they are indeed very wealthy men.

This knowledge could have been significant to an audience member as it may have denoted both high social status and temporal power. A modern audience member might accord a £100,000 p.a. judge with respect but if such a man or woman was known to be earning a salary of £1,500,000 p.a. (50 times a present day teacher’s salary) how they would perceive such a character is, I would propose, significantly different. However helpful this approach might be in illustrating a particular point, its obvious shortcoming remains the random nature of the cost comparisons. Though informative, this approach is not systematic and is only tangentially useful to other situations.

---

Table 78 - Thomson’s Examples of Early Modern Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe Groundling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer (quart)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen’s egg</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef (per pound)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salaries**
- Schoolmaster p.a. 20
- Barrister p.a. 600
- Judge (junior) p.a. 1000

The Selected Basket

John Burnett in his *History of the Cost of Living* described the huge rises that occurred in prices across Europe in the sixteenth century. However, when he came to commenting on how these have been numerically quantified he made the following observation: “The best cost-of-living index for the period is that constructed by E. H. Phelps Brown and Sheila V. Hopkins, which is based on a supposed ‘basket’ of goods typically consumed by a family living in southern England: it relates to the basic necessities of life – bread, meat, fish, butter, cheese, beer, fuel, light and clothing – and is therefore a better guide to the expenditure of the less prosperous than to that of the rich.” And this opinion seems to have changed little right up to the present.

Phelps Brown and Hopkins in five short articles produced a clinical and precise view of relative price change. They started by charting the income of a single tradesman in the building trade over seven centuries. To this they later added the ‘basket’ (which Burnett refers to) of necessities and in doing so amplified their earlier work.

In practical terms they took each year from 1260 to 1954 and calculated the first two columns. The Ratio column indicates the likely financial distress caused to the average worker and their family resulting from these economic fluctuations. 1597 was the year (according to Phelps Brown and Hopkins) of the first performance of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* – it was also the year of the worst economic ratio in seven hundred years.

---

Table 79 - Basket of Goods vs. Builders Wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Basket Brown/Hopkins</th>
<th>Builders Wages</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1597</strong></td>
<td><strong>685</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.62</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translating the last column of the table into a graph

Table 80 - A Graphical Representation of Misery 1575 to 1615

The higher the peak the greater the economic misery\textsuperscript{1302}

The Misery Index table (above) shows diagrammatically when the buying power of workers wages was lowest against the basic commodities needed to sustain both self and family. The spike in 1597 and the general upward trend graphically demonstrate misery in terms of cold, malnourishment and starvation for the weakest members of society and implicitly when it can be assumed most goods and services would dip in price indicating a “buyers market” for the cash rich. In the group “cash rich” must be included the Shakespeare family, as later analysis will show they were able to raise cash at the very “worst of times”\textsuperscript{1303} and bought their key family assets during peaks of economic adversity when buying power for those with cash-in-hand was highest.

\textsuperscript{1302} This is my own ratio extrapolated from Phelps-Brown and Hopkins data – the Ratio of Builders Wages to a specified Basket of Goods.

The Bespoke Basket

…Unfortunately, there is no single source available for making comparisons over long periods of time, and a composite index has to be specially constructed for this purpose…

O’Donoughue and Goulding, 2004

In the present day, indexing techniques, creating indexes by and using baskets of commodities, have become established tools of Government financial monitoring. There is, for O’Donoughue and Goulding, no doubt that the buying power of money in one time period vs. another can be “answered by reference to an appropriate price index…questions about changes in the purchasing power of the pound are usually framed in terms of what the domestic consumer can buy”.

They do however note some significant limitations to this technique

…it should be noted that in general the relevance and quality of the primary sources diminishes the further one goes back in time. This means that comparisons further back in time and over long periods should be regarded as more approximate than comparisons over short periods in more recent years. In addition, there have been continual changes in the pattern of household expenditure over time. These changes can be accommodated in a price index, such as the retail prices. However, over a period of time these changes build up, with the result that the commodities for which we measure prices now are very different from 50 years ago, let alone 250 years ago. As a result, it is not possible to compare the cost of exactly the same fixed basket of goods and services over an extended time period…

In conclusion, tying the above general economic data to the Shakespeares:

• The timing of Shakespeare family investments compared to macroeconomic trends suggests smart buyers acquiring at times of peak economic distress and hence at depressed prices.

• Mary Oates and William Baumol in their 1976 examination of the Early Modern Theatre’s economic structure conclude that its existence was entirely as a result of the wages (of those who made plays) being so “depressed” and constrained over decades that this was a (if not “the”) major contributor to fiscal survival. 1305

• Shakespeare’s major works were written and performed at this financially “worst of times.”

Paper III - Wool and Cloth

History

In England, during the middle ages and Early Modern Period, wool and later cloth as the preeminent trade and export commodities were subject to both Statute, Proclamation and regulation governing their growth, processing and distribution.

In 1353 Edward III, by the “Ordinance of the Staple” designated 15 towns as “Staple Towns” to control the export of wool and thus ensure the customs tax due to the Crown. Ten years later, Calais was made the “wool staple” through which all wool exports had to pass. The highly profitable monopoly of the wool export trade was given to the “Company of Merchant Staplers” and the “continental staple” was to stand until 1617. The quid pro quo for this royal monopoly was to pay for the cost of the Calais garrison though on later occasions paying off selected Royal debts also became part of the price. One consequential effect of this monopoly was to create a dampening pressure on domestic English wool prices (to maximize the Staple’s gain) paradoxically encouraging the rise of the English cloth industry and its related manufacturers and merchants, such as the Clothworkers and the Company of Merchant Adventurers.

To ship wool to Calais a merchant had to be a member of the Company of Staplers and obey its ordinances - admission was either through a three to four year apprenticeship or by purchase. At the close of the fifteenth century nearly 400 men were members.

Despite the efforts of the Merchants of the Staple the demand for cloth outstripped supply as seen in the graph below – despite short-term fluctuations the price rise was inexorable.

Though it is tempting to think of wool itself as a fixed commodity - such as a metal with its purity scientifically defined - wool is far more variable. That different breeds of sheep will produce fleeces of differing quality is perhaps self evident, however varying the density of sheep on the land, grass quality, care in rearing etc. - all these have a direct impact on the quality of the wool produced and ultimately on the types and value of cloth that can be produced. The size of flocks varied enormously, from the smallholder with two or three sheep to breeders such as Sir Henry Fermor of Norfolk who, in 1521, had 20 flocks totalling 15,500 sheep.

---

1307 The above table would have an even steeper incline were it not for this effect. Data for this table was taken from Peter Bowden, The Wool Trade in Tudor and Stuart England, 1st Edition (London: Macmillan, 1962).
1308 The Clothworkers Company - Founded by Royal Charter in 1528 “to promote the craft of cloth working in the City of London”
1309 Founded by Henry IV in 1407, The Merchant Adventurers had a commercial monopoly on the export cloth from England.
1310 Bowden, Wool Trade p.219 – i.e. put simply demand outstrips supply and price rises.
The Wool and Cloth Trade

… [a]mong all manuall Arts used in this Land, none is more famous for desert, or more beneficiliall to the Commonwealth than is the most necessarie Art of Cloathing.1312
Thomas Deloney, 1597

… It is impossible to comprehend the development of English nationalism during the Early Modern Period without also understanding the culture of cloth.1313
Roze Hentschell, 2008

Akin to Saudi Arabia in the late twentieth century, Early Modern England was a one-export economy for two hundred years from 1350 to 1550. But from the early 1500’s onward a huge commercial shift took place from the export of raw wool to manufactured woollen cloth. By 15651314 woollen cloth accounted for 78% of all exports, wool having fallen to just over 6%.1315

In the early 1560’s, at Lord Burleigh’s initiative, the first concerted attempt at a “rudimentary economic information service” was made to determine “the precise nature of English commerce.” The pressures to do this stemmed less from a desire to promote trade than from a fear of a trade imbalance through the importation of luxury goods in excess of exports. The Crown was, according to Lawrence Stone, “tormented by a fear of the drain of bullion through an adverse balance of payments.”1316

The following table shows London’s balance of Trade 1559-61 (London representing approximately 80% of trade by value), excluding invisible items, freight costs, royal and private debts and interest payments. As Stone noted “…adverse balance was attributed entirely to the Aliens” i.e. foreign traders who were at this time still responsible for 38% of the value of imports and 23% of exports.

Table 81 - The Upward Trend in Wool - Price vs. Year

---

1314 By value
1316 Ibid. p.30
Table 82 - Balance of Trade 1560 & 1561

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Natives</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aliens</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table\textsuperscript{1317}

Exports in this table were almost exclusively of cloth at 134,055 cloths (bolts) though a decade later the number had fallen by a third as a result of wars and consequent disruptions. The effect on the change to cloth from wool was dramatic for all other ports outside London. Only Bristol seems to have avoided complete “decay” and forty years later it remained the only port outside London that had anything more than “negligible quantities” of the prestige broadcloth (i.e. premium) export market.\textsuperscript{1318} In 1565 two thirds of all English trade went through Antwerp with the balance to France and Iberia. This concentration of business through Antwerp was to prove a distinct vulnerability when the port closed through the wars of 1585-1603.

Wool Middlemen

As Bowden noted of the wool broking business in the latter half of the sixteenth century in England

…A trend towards regional specialization as the barriers of self-sufficiency were being broken down…[this] owed something to improvements in communication, but more largely it was due to the rise of classes of professional middlemen…\textsuperscript{1319}

His analysis categorized the classes of dealers as follows

\textsuperscript{1317} Ibid. p.36
\textsuperscript{1318} W. B. Stephens, “The Cloth Exports of the Provincial Ports, 1600-1640,” The Economic History Review (Wiley) 22, no. 2: 228-248. p.233
\textsuperscript{1319} Bowden, Wool Trade p.77


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Order Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Large Wool Dealers</td>
<td>The Staplers - after Calais fell returned to England - pursued domestic middleman business</td>
<td>Residence – part time in fine wool area – part time London</td>
<td>High Grade wool, large orders personally (up to 600 stones), his factor(^{1321}) deals with smaller orders (10 to 20 stones) – 50 to 200 typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Glovers, Fellmongers, Leather Sellers</td>
<td>“Glovers of the Central and East Midlands were great wool dealers”</td>
<td>Entry into broking through original occupation, stay in original domicile</td>
<td>Size of order varies could be as large as 800+ stones (exceptional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Brogging Clothiers</td>
<td>Brokers who got into the business by being or having been manufacturers</td>
<td>Entry into broking through original occupation, stay in original domicile</td>
<td>Size of order varies could be as large as 1000+ stones (exceptional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticeable that in each category there are examples of market participants who, despite their route into the business, rose to deal in the largest transactions. To some extent the term “brogging” could be applied to all three categories in that they all (as will be shown) in varying degrees operated outside the letter of the law. However, “brogger” with its disparaging overtone was more often applied to the “retail” dealers who numerically make up the bulk of category B and C and whose business was conducted between the smaller growers and clothiers. Though very large transactions are listed above for illustrative purposes, typical purchases - even for the large wool dealers - were generally much smaller and references exist for even Merchant Staplers buying wool in lots as small as “a dozen stones”\(^{1323}\)

At its simplest, broggers bought wool from rural farmers and sold it at a profit in regional markets. Often a price was set and paid in April or May and the wool was delivered after shearing in June. They were

- making a futures market in wool – pricing the commodity today for delivery later, thus risking the price would fall before sale,

\(^{1320}\) ibid. p.82 Table by Fallow drawn from text.

\(^{1321}\) “A person or agency that takes over and collects debts owed to other (esp. finance) companies.” OED

\(^{1322}\) fellmonger – “A dealer in skins or hides of animals, esp. sheep-skins”. OED

\(^{1323}\) Bowden, Wool Trade p.81 See also P.R.O. S.P. 12/114/47.
• factoring a receivable by extending a portion of its future value in cash in the present or, viewed from a different perspective, making a loan secured by a future promise to deliver the commodity.

Today, these would be considered legitimate, indeed sophisticated, forms of financial transaction as long as the parties involved held the appropriate licences. Then, all three were manifestly illegal though often practised.

A very bipolar attitude to wool broggers existed at different times and locations. During the reign of Henry VIII there is much evidence of brogging being complained of as a means of practising unfair pricing on vulnerable small producers. Smallholders whose arable harvest had failed and whose only cash crop was the wool on their animals had, of necessity, to resort to deep discounts on the future value of the fleeces to raise quick cash. Moreover, the Crown and other authorities were against anything that was cash based and therefore could not be taxed.

Beatrice Hewart writing of the cloth trade in the Northern counties later in the sixteenth century noted that:

In 1586 a petition against broggers was signed by eighteen northern clothiers among others. It described them as exacting exorbitant prices from poor men, who were compelled to buy from them as there was no market for small quantities.

On the legal position of brogging, Hewart also stated that

By an Act of Edward VI’s reign, middlemen had been forbidden to engage in the buying and selling of wool. Wool was to be sold by the grower either to the merchant of the staple or to the weaver or clothier actually engaged in the manufacture of cloth, not to an intermediate person.

However, legislation intended to be national in scope to control this activity had, of necessity, to have exceptions and was therefore doomed to failure

The Act of II and III Philip and Mary c.1 exempted the neighbourhood of Halifax from its operation, and stated in the preamble that the barrenness of the country round Halifax and the poverty of the clothiers who could not afford to travel far and buy a large stock, rendered it unwise to prohibit middlemen. The description of the Halifax clothiers is of poor men, each working for himself.

---

1324 “To sell (debts) to a factor.” OED
1325 “Things that may be received or accepted; spec. (short-term) debts owed to a business, esp. regarded as assets.” OED
1327 Ibid. p.25
1328 2 Add. MSS., Brit. Mus., 34, 324. 3 D.S.P. Eliz., vol. 117, 38. 538-539 “Causes moving the poor inhabitants of Lancashire, Richmond, Westmoreland, Cumberland, and the bishopric of Durham, to make petition to the Queen's Highness, to have licence and dispensation for the buying and selling of wools. [Signed, John Byron, K.]”
1329 Hewart, Cloth Trade p.25
Here then was the bipolar view of broggers. Though vilified for predatory business practices they were increasingly seen as the only way in which smaller producers and weavers (clothiers) could survive in a market that was already becoming concentrated in the hands of larger manufacturers. Reference has already been made to the issue of trading illegally – the picture of who was and was not doing this remained unclear throughout the period. The following table summarizes the significant events affecting the middlemen’s business.

**Table 84 - Wool Middlemen 1551-1592**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Effect/Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Collapse of export markets</td>
<td>Depresses wool prices in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1552 Merchant Staplers and Merchant Adventurers get Act (5 &amp; 6 Edward VI, c.7) passed</td>
<td>Both Companies maximize remaining market share at expense of other wool middlemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Loss of Calais to France</td>
<td>Staplers lose their market on the Continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562, 10 August</td>
<td>Proclamation 570 (Greenwich)</td>
<td>…No grower, breeder, brogger, or gatherer of wool to sell to any uncertificated person…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560’s</td>
<td>Merchant Staplers begin to serve as domestic middlemen</td>
<td>Despite being restricted to foreign trade Merchant Staplers take market share from other intermediaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570’s</td>
<td>Licences for wool middlemen circumventing earlier legislation</td>
<td>Widespread fraudulent multiple selling of Licences, often with no compensation if participants were found to be holding an invalid licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Wool price spiked</td>
<td>…The Clothiers complain that the greed of the Licensees in selling wool out of the kingdom has raised the price and diminished the supply. No such licensee is to buy any wool before All Saints’ next…[1330] all licences to be returned into the Exchequer for revision within two months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576, 28 Nov.</td>
<td>Proclamation 621/712 (Hampton Court)</td>
<td>Little or no effect on wool prices. Justices of The Peace reluctant to take action against their own local wool middlemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suspends licences for a year and bans Staplers from acting in the domestic trade.</td>
<td>Pure self-interest on part of the Staplers – neither proclamation was issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Privy Council sent letters to twenty counties ordering Justices of the Peace to take £100 bonds from broggers ‘that they would not buy for resale.’</td>
<td>However, this was still far from being a free-for-all permit for unlicensed broggers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Staplers proposed two royal proclamations – 1) to restrict the number of broggers 2) to ban gloves selling wool left on fleeces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Privy Council issues: APC, ix, 386; x, 24-5. Demanding enforcement of Proclamation 621/712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Privy Council concedes the need for middlemen, ordered J.P.s to let the licences be used freely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584 - 1591</td>
<td>Staplers force no new licences for 7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1330] The first of November 1577
Licences

Licensing of middlemen in wool became an issue of growing importance to the Government during the 1570’s. Records of legal cases in Star Chamber and other courts are plentiful\(^{1331}\) as one self-interested party after another lobbied for an ever-increasing share of the winnings from both the wool trade and the subsequent cloth manufacturing business. The various interested parties and their motivations can be summarized as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested Party</th>
<th>Motivation - Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Queen Elizabeth</td>
<td>Licences for wool export or wool trading were a non-cash way of rewarding favourites or avoiding cash payments due to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Privy Council Members – Dudley, Walsingham</td>
<td>Non Cash compensation(^{1332})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Patentees</td>
<td>Licences to patentees could be granted by the Crown in place of cash fees due. Opportunity for fraud by reselling licences many times over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Foreigners</td>
<td>Frequently the buyers of licences – provided a legal entry into the domestic wool trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Wool Middlemen (licenced)</td>
<td>Only means of operating legally – cost of licence typically halved first years profits – opportunity to resell (oversell) licences. Risk of Patentee being caught and invalidating licences after these had been paid for – no compensation in this event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Wool Middlemen (unlicensed)</td>
<td>Vulnerable to professional informers, Local Justices of the Peace – prosecution and fining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Professional Informers</td>
<td>Potentially a rich source of victims, however, prosecution and court costs could eat up profits hence only largest unlicensed middlemen were targets. Additionally, some targets off-limits due to their aristocratic status or patronage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Justices of the Peace</td>
<td>Reluctant enforcers of Privy Council motivated Proclamations – would have been enforcing in many cases against prominent local figures who themselves may have been Justices of the Peace.(^{1333})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Courts</td>
<td>Though hardly needed given the Early Modern love of litigation, yet another source of litigation drawing revenue into the court system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1331}\) Bowden, Wool Trade Chapter V. footnotes which list ranks of cases recorded in the PRO.

\(^{1332}\) In the case of Walsingham he used his own resources to part fund his secret service and notwithstanding compensation from the Queen died insolvent. See Robert Hutchinson, Elizabeth’s Spy Master (London: Phoenix, 2006). At p.237 are quoted the words from Walsingham’s Will of 12 December 1589 – “…my body, in hope of a joyful resurrection, be buried without any extraordinary ceremonies as usually appertain to a man serving in my place, in respect of the greatness of my debts and the mean state I shall leave my wife and heirs in…”

\(^{1333}\) Such as John Shakespeare, Justice of the Peace and Brogger.
Two Significant Proclamations

Royal proclamations were a quick non-statutory way of exercising executive power. The history, legality and effects of proclamations remains, in itself, a matter for a separate legal study. However, suffice here to note that these were in the sixteenth century executive orders issued in the monarch’s name but, for the most part, issued through the executive members of the Privy Council. Their purposes were varied – from political propaganda to economic management. Those in the latter category often reflected the influence of a particular pressure group that acted in its self-interest and applied political pressure for some specific outcome. As one source of Governmental revenue was the sale of monopolies and licences, monopolists and patentholders were, perhaps unsurprisingly, irate when illegal traders went unpunished. However, in the absence of any police force or even consistent means of enforcing economic legislation, not all economic proclamations achieved their desired effect. Proclamation 570 of 1562 failed as “…the importance of the middlemen in the wool trade was too great to be choked off…”. Proclamation 712 of November 1576 was followed up by more strenuous efforts to enforce control through local Justices of the Peace in twenty counties. In the wake of this …some returns from the counties had begun to trickle in, but further enforcement seems to have been based on some of the suggestions for reform which the Council had begun to seek…

In the event, market forces were to dominate as the Merchant Adventurers, Merchant Staplers and leading clothiers blamed each other and, of course, all unlicensed middlemen.

Linsey Woolsey and Alnagers

But what linsey-woolsey hast thou to speak to us again?

Alls Well That Ends Well IV, i

…The broggers continued to buy the wools of the northern farmers to sell again, and to the north too the coarse wools of Lindsay, Kesteven and other places. They were often accused of introducing “deceitfull and naughty stuffs such as flocks and hare” into their wares, and in time the northern clothiers grew dissatisfied with them…

The “linsey-woolsey” of Alls Well That Ends Well is the stuff of substandard truth the term coming from substandard cloth. The weave of this had been adulterated with the mixing of another fibre such as flax though as the above reference by Hewart notes almost any fibre would suffice even simply mixing different qualities of wool. Any adulteration could, in itself, be a profitable activity as long as the buyer was gullible

1335 Ibid. p.130
1336 Ibid. p.131
1337 Hewart, Cloth Trade p.24
enough to buy the cloth. Other money-spinners were short weighting and stretching. Hewart noted

…In 1576 Leake wrote: *A Discourse against Clothiers, Alnagers Searchers, Merchants, and Retaylers* in which, while he stated generally that he was fully of opinion “that for all cloth in this realm - the laws were never yet observed in any one place”, he singled out for special condemnation all kinds of northern cloths which were “worst of all for false dyeing, for shortness of weight, and for stretching.”

Leake’s reference to “Alnagers” - officials in charge of certifying the quality of cloth - is more significant than it first appears in relation to the Shakespeares. Francis Langley, theatre impresario, alnager and villain is considered at length in this thesis but it is sufficient to note here that if someone were dealing in adulterated cloth a corrupt alnager would be a highly valuable business contact.

Summary - Key Points

Throughout the period:

- the wool and cloth businesses were becoming steadily industrialized with a corresponding increase in the business size of successful growers, clothiers, and middlemen while smaller players were squeezed out.
- businesses became steadily more directed through London. While wool production and local weaving had originally created self-contained markets with exports through regional ports, by the end of the sixteenth century the trading centre was the capital.
- foreigners held a very large slice of both exports and imports. Therefore contacts with foreigners in the clothing trades would have been vital for any business exporting wool or cloth or importing raw materials used in cloth manufacture.
- from 1585 onwards the export picture fragmented - as a result of war and the closure of Antwerp a cluster of new “niche” markets - from the Baltic to Turkey - developed and greatly complicated the pattern of trade and reduced the need for an entrepôt. Representation in London would become vital to all significant wool or cloth traders.
- regulation of growing, manufacture and export/import was sporadic and hampered by attempts to convert medieval institutions and outdated means of regulation to a marketplace that was creating its own rules. If anything, regulation pushed changes in location and product mix into areas of lesser control or developed market niches around obviating outdated regulation.
- fraud through stretching, re-dyeing, blending or simple false certification of cloth greatly increased in England especially in regions where there was less regulatory control.

1339 Mr. Leake's discourse. Relative to the history of the cloth trade, and the means for preventing the abuses of clothiers, alnagers, &c., existing at present in that trade”. See reference in 'Queen Elizabeth - Volume 111: February 1577', Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, 1547-80 (1856), p.538-539. And Hewart, *Cloth Trade* p.26
1340 x ref.209
This Indenture made the tenth day of March, in the year of our Lord God according to the computation of the church of England, one thousand six hundred and twelve, and in the years of the reign of our Sovereign Lord James, by the grace of God King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland defender of the faith &c. (that is to say) of England, France and Ireland the tenth, and of Scotland the six and fortyth; Between Henry Walker citizen and Minstrel of London of the one part; And William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon in the county of Warwick gentleman, William Johnson, citizen and Vintner of London, John Jackson and John Hemming of London gentlemen, of the other party; Witness that the said Henry Walker (for and in consideration of the sum of one hundred and forty pounds of lawful money of England to him in hand before the sealing hereof by the said William Shakespeare well & truly paid, whereof and wherewith he the said Henry Walker doth acknowledge himself fully satisfied and contented, and thereof, and of every part and parcel thereof doth clearly acquit and discharge the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and each of them by these presents) hath bargained and sold and by these presents doth fully, clearly, and absolutely bargain and sell unto the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson, and John Hemming, their heirs, and assigns forever; All that dwelling house or Tenement with the appurtenances situate and being within the Precinct, circuit and compass of the late Blackfriars London, sometimes in the tenure of James Gardiner Esquire, and since that in the tenure of John Fortescue gentleman, and now or late being in the tenure or occupation of one William Ireland or of his assignee or assigns; abutting upon a street leading down to Puddle Wharf on the east part, right against the King’s Majesties Wardrobe; part of which said Tenement is erected over a great gate leading to a capital messuage which sometime was in the tenure of William Blackwells Esquire deceased, and since that in the tenure or occupation of the right Honourable Henry now Earl of Northumberland; And also all that plot of ground on the west side of the same Tenement which was lately enclosed with boards on two sides thereof by Anne Bacon widow, so far and in such sort as the same was enclosed by the said Anne Bacon, and not otherwise, and being on the third side enclosed with an old brick wall; Which said plot of ground was sometime parcel and taken out of a great piece of void ground lately used for a garden; And also the soil whereupon the said Tenement stands; And also the said brick wall and boards which do enclose the said plot of ground; with free entry, access, ingress, egress, and regress in, by and through the said great gate and yard there unto the usual door of the said Tenement; And also all and singular cellars, solars, rooms, lights, easements, profits, commodities and hereditaments whatsoever to the said dwelling house or Tenement belonging, or in any wise appertaining; And the reversion and reversions whatsoever of all and singular the premises, and of every parcel thereof; And also all

---

1341 x ref.272
13421613, Mar. 10. From Conveyance (in Guildhall Library, London), facs. Library Committee (1896). This is the counterpart held by the vendor; it was found in 1796 among the title-deeds of the Fetherstonhaugh family (Malone, Inquiry, 119) and bought by the Corporation in 1843. The deed held by the purchasers (pr. H.P. ii 31) was formerly in H.P.'s collection (Rarities, 148) and is now in that of H. C. Folger. It was enrolled (Close Roll, II Jac., p.31) on 23 Apr. 1613.
1343“...a dwelling house together with its outbuildings and the adjacent land assigned to its use.” OED
1344“Any kind of property that can be inherited; any thing, corporeal or incorporeal, that in the absence of testamentary disposition descended to the heir at common law.” OED
rents, and yearly profits whatsoever reserved and from henceforth to grow due and payable upon whatsoever lease, demise, or grant, leases, demises or grants made of the premises, or of any parcel thereof; And also all the estate, right, title, interest, property, use, possession, claim and demand whatsoever which he the said Henry Walker now hath, or of right may, might, should, or ought to have of, in, or to the premises, or any parcel thereof; And also all and every [of] the deeds, evidences, charters, scripts, muniments, [\textsuperscript{1345}] & writings whatsoever which he the said Henry Walker now hath, or any other person or persons to his use have, or hath, or which he may lawfully come by without suite in the law, which touch or concern the premises only or only any part or parcel thereof; Together with the true copies of all such deeds, evidences and writings as concern the premises (among other things) to be written and taken out at the only costs and charges of the said William Shakespeare his heirs, or assigns. Which said dwelling house or Tenement, and other the premises above by these presents mentioned to be bargained and sold the said Henry Walker late purchased and had to him, his heirs and assigns forever, of Mathew Bacon of Grays Inn in the County of Middlesex gentleman, by Indenture bearing date the fifteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and four, and in the years of the reign of our said Sovereign Lord king James of his Realms of England, France and Ireland the second, and of Scotland the eight & thirtieth; To have and to hold the said dwelling house or Tenement, shops, cellars, solars,[\textsuperscript{1346}] plot of ground and all and singular other premises above by these presents mentioned to be bargained and sold, and every part and parcel thereof with the appurtenances, unto the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson and John Hemming their heirs, and assigns forever; To the only and proper use and behalf of the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson and John Hemming their heirs, and assigns forever. [Vendors covenants] to Shakespeare for (i) freedom from encumbrances, ‘Except the rents and services to the chief lord or lords of the fee or fees of the premises from henceforth for or in respect of his or their seigniory [\textsuperscript{1347}] or seigniories only to be due and done’, to which a cancelled passage, not in the counterpart, added an exception for a lease granted by Henry Walker to William Ireland citizen and haberdasher of London, on 12 December 1604 for twenty-five years from the following Christmas at a rent of £7; (ii) quiet enjoyment; (iii) further, on request within three years, And further that all and every fine and fines to be levied, recoveries to be suffered, estates and assurances at any time or times hereafter to be had, made, executed, or passed by, or between the said parties of the premises, or of any parcel thereof, shall bee, and shall be esteemed, adjudged, deemed, and taken to be to the only and proper use and behalf of the said William Shakespeare his heirs, and assigns forever, and to none other use, intent or purpose.’

In witness whereof the said parties to these Indentures interchangeably have set their seals. Given the day and years first above written.

William Shakespeare
William Johnson
John Jackson

\textsuperscript{1345} “A document, such as a title deed, charter, etc., preserved as evidence of rights or privileges; an archival document.” OED
\textsuperscript{1346} “an upper chamber in a medieval house” OED.
\textsuperscript{1347} “A particular feudal lordship; in English Law chiefly, the relation of the lord to the tenants of a manor.” OED
Sealed and delivered by the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, and John Jackson, in the presence of William Atkin son; Edward Overy; Robert Andrews, scrivener; Henry Lawrence, servant to the same scrivener.

Notes to the Indenture

This Indenture made the eleventh day of March in the years of the reign of our Sovereign Lord James, by the grace of God, king of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c (that is to say) of England, France and Ireland the tenth, and of Scotland the six and fortieth; Between William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon in the county of Warwick, gentleman, William Johnson, citizen and Vintner of London, John Jackson and John Hemming, of London, gentlemen, of the one party, and Henry Walker, citizen and Minstrel of London, of the other party: Witness that the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson and John Hemming, have demised, granted and to ferme letten, and by these presents do demise, grant and to ferme letten to the said Henry Walker, All that dwelling house or Tenement, with the appurtenances, situate and being within the precinct, circuit and compass of the late Blackfriars, London [Description as in above] to have and to hold the said dwelling house or Tenement, cellars, solars, rooms, plot of ground, and all and singular other the premises above by these presents mentioned to be demised, and every part and parcel thereof, with the appurtenances, unto the said Henry Walker, his executors, administrators and assigns, from the feast of the annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary next coming after the date hereof, unto the end and term of one hundred years from thence next ensuing and fully to bee complete and ended, without impeachment of or for any manner of waste, Yielding and paying therefore yearly during the said term unto the said William Shakespeare, William Johnson, John Jackson and John Hemming, their heirs and assigns, a pepper corn at the feast of Easter yearly, if the same be lawfully demanded, and no more. Provided always that if the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, or any of them, do well and truly pay or cause to be paid to the said Henry Walker, his executors, administrators or assigns, the some of threescore pounds of lawful money of England in and upon the nine and twentieth day of September next coming after the date hereof, at or in the now dwelling house of the said Henry Walker, situate and being in the parish of Saint Martin near Ludgate of London, at one entire payment without delay; That then and from then forth this present lease, demise and grant, and all and every matter and thing herein contained (other than this proviso) shall cease, determine, and be utterly void, frustrate, and of none effect, as though the same had never been made, these presents, or any thing therein contained to the contrary thereof, in any wise notwithstanding. [Covenant by Shakespeare to Walker for freedom from encumbrances.]

1348 Copies of the original indenture used for the above transliteration. Schoenbaum, Documentary Life P221, Schoenbaum, Records and Images p.45 (fold out large scale copy). Folger Library – Electronic copy with magnification at http://luna.folger.edu/luna/servlet/detail/FOLGERCM1~6~6~575293~140001:Bargain-and-sale-from-HenryWalker;?sort=Call_Number%2CAuthor%2CCD_Title%2CImprint&fullTextSearch=fullTextSearch&qvq=q:Blackfriars;sort:Call_Number%2CAuthor%2CCD_Title%2CImprint;lc:FOLGERCM1~6~6&mi=64&trs=66

1349 1613 March 11. From Mortgage (Egerton MS. 1787), facs. B.M.; pr. in full, Var. ii. 591; H.P. ii. 34. It was found in 1768 among the Fetherstonhaugh title-deeds. It was given to Garrick, but was missing in 1796 (Malone, Inquiry, 119) and had apparently returned to the family solicitors. It was bought by the B. M. from one of the firm in 1858.

1350 The letters “had ne” appear here in the original.
In witness whereof the said parties to these Indentures interchangeable have set their seals. Given the day and years first above written. Wm Shakespe Wm Johnson, Jo: Jackson
VII - TITHES AS AN INVESTMENT

Spelling, grammar and in some cases terminology have been modernized to aid comprehension. Where archaic terms have precise legal meaning they have been given an explanatory footnote. Original legal drafting by Francis Collins.

The Conveyance to William Shakespeare of the Moiety of a lease of the tithes in and near Stratford-on-Avon

24 JULY, 1605

From the original reserved amongst the records of that town

This indenture made the fourth and twentieth day of July in the year of the reign of our sovereign Lord James, by the grace of God of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, &c., that is to say, of England, France and Ireland the third, and of Scotland the eighth and thirty, Between Ralph Huband of Ippsley in the county of Warwick esquire on the one part, and William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon in the said county of Warwickshire, gentleman, on the other part; Whereas Anthony Parker clerk, late Warden of the College or Collegiate Church of Stratford-upon-Avon aforesaid, in the said county of Warwickshire and Giles Coventry subwarden there, and the whole chapter of the same late college, by their deed indented, sealed with their chapter seal, dated the seventh day of September in the sixth and thirtieth year of the reign of the late king of famous memory King Henry the Eighth demise, granted, and to farm let (amongst diverse other things) onto one William Barker of Sonning in the county of Berkshire, gentleman, all and all manner of tithes of corn, grain, blade and hay yearly and from time to time coming, increasing, renewing, arising, growing, issuing or happening, or to be had, received, perceived or taken out, upon of or in the towns, villages, hamlets, grounds and fields of Stratford-upon-Avon, Old Stratford, Welcombe, and Bishopton in the said county of Warwickshire, and also all and all manner of tithes of wool, lamb, and other small and privy tithes, oblations, obvencions, alterages, monuments and offerings whatsoever yearly and from time to time coming, increasing, renewing or happening, or to be had, received, perceived or taken within the parish of Stratford-upon-Avon aforesaid in the said county of Warwickshire by the name or names of all and singular their manors, lands, tenements, meadows, pastures, feedings, woods, underwoods, rents, reversions, services, courts, leets, reliefs, wards, marriages, harriottes, perquisites of courts, liberties, jurisdictions, and all other hereditaments, with all and singular other rights, commodities, and their appurtenances, together with all manner of parsonages, glebe

---


1352 The presentation of money, goods, property, etc., to the Church for use in God's service - OED

1353 An incoming fee or revenue, esp. one of an occasional or incidental character. Chiefly in pl. (chiefly Ecclesiastical Law) OED

1354 A payment, varying in value and kind according to rank and tenure, made to the overlord by the heir of a feudal tenant on taking up possession of the vacant estate OED.
lands, tithes, alterages, oblations, obvencions, monuments, offerings, and all other issues, profits, emoluments and advantages in the county of Warwickshire or Worcester, or elsewhere whatsoever they be, unto the said then college appertaining, the mansion-house and the site of the said college, with their appurtenances within the precincts of the walls of the said college unto the said warden and sub-warden only excepted. To have and to hold all the said manors, lands, tenements, and all other the premises with all and singular their appurtenances (except before excepted) unto the said college belonging or in any ways appertaining, unto the said William Barker, his executors and assigns, from the feast of St. Michael the Archangel [29 September] then last past before the date of the said indenture, unto the end and term of fourscore and twelve years then next ensuing, yielding and paying therefore yearly unto the said warden and sub-warden and their successors at the said college £122 18s. 9d. of lawful money of England, as more plainly appeareth by the said indenture; And whereas also the reversion of all and singular the said premises, among other things, by virtue of the Act of Parliament made in the first year of the reign of our late sovereign lord King Edward the sixth for the dissolution of chantries, colleges, and free chapels, or by some other means, came to the hands and possession of the said late King Edward, and whereas the said late King Edward the sixth being seised, as in right of his crown of England, of and in the reversion of all and singular the premises, by his letters patents bearing date the eight and twentieth day of June in the seventh year of his reign, for the consideration therein expressed, did give and grant unto the bailiff and burgesses of Stratford aforesaid, and to their successors, among other things, all and all manner of the said tithes of corn, grain and hay, coming, increasing or arising, in the villages and fields of Old Stratford, Welcombe, and Bishopton aforesaid, in the said county of Warwickshire then or late in the tenure of John Barker, and to the late College of Stratford-upon-Avon in the said county of Warwickshire of late belonging and appertaining, and parcel of the possessions thereof being, and also all and all manner the said tithes of wool, lamb, and other small and privy tithes, oblations and alterages, whatsoever, within the parish of Stratford-upon-Avon aforesaid, and to the said late College of Stratford-upon-Avon belonging or appertaining, and then or late in the tenure of William Barker or of his assigns, and the reversion and reversions whatsoever of all and singular the said tithes, and every parte and parcel thereof, and the rents, revenues, and other yearly profits whatsoever reserved upon any demise or grant of the said tithes or any part or parcel thereof: and whereas also the interest of the said premises in the said original lease mentioned, and the interest of certain copyholders in Shottery in the parish of Stratford aforesaid, being by good and lawful conveyance and assurance in the law before that time conveyed and assured to John Barker of Hurst in the said county of Berkshire, he the said John Barker by his indenture bearing date the fourth and twentieth day of June in the two and twentieth year of the reign of the late Queen Elizabeth for the considerations therein specified, Did give, grant, assign and set over unto Sir John Huband Knight, brother of the said Ralph Huband, all and singular the said last mentioned premises, and all his estate, right, title and interest that he then had to come, of, in and to all and singular the said premises, and of all other manors, messuages, lands, tenements, glebe lands, tithes, obligations, commodities, and profits in the said original lease mentioned, for and during all the years and term then to come unexpired in the said original lease, excepting as in and by the said last mentioned indenture is excepted, as, by the same indenture more at large may appear, To have and to hold all and singular the said recited premises (except before excepted) to the said Sir John Huband, his executors and assigns, for and during the years then to come of and in

\[1355\] having ownership in
\[1356\] Properties
\[1357\] a glebe was an area of land belonging to a benefice (priest’s living)
the same, yielding and paying therefore yearly after the feast of St. Michael the archangel next ensuing the date of the said last mentioned indenture, for and during all the years mentioned in the said first mentioned indenture then to come and not expired, unto the said John Barker, his executors, administrators, and assigns, one annual or yearly rent of twenty seven pounds thirteen shillings four pence by the year, to be issuing and going out of all the manors, lands, tenements, tithes and hereditaments in the said indenture specified, to be paid yearly to the said John Barker, his executors, administrators, and assigns, by the said Sir John Huband, his executors, administrators, and assigns, at the feasts of the Annunciation of our Lady and St. Michael the archangel, or within forty days after the said feasts, in the porch of the Parish Church of Stratford aforesaid by even portions, and further paying, doing, and performing all such other rents, duties, and services, as at any time from henceforth, and from time to time, for and during the term aforesaid, should become due to any person or persons for the same premises, or any parte thereof, and thereof to discharge the said John Barker, his executors and administrators and if it should happen the said twenty-seven pounds thirteen shillings four pence to be behind and unpaid, in parte or in all, by the space of forty days next after any of the said feasts or days of payment, in which, as is aforesaid, it ought to be paid, being lawfully asked, that then it should be lawful to and for the said John Barker, his executors, administrator and assigns, into all and singular the premises, with their appurtenances and every parte and parcel thereof, to re-enter and the same to have again, as in his or their former right, and that then and from thenceforth the said recited indenture of assignment, and every article, covenant, clause, provision and agreement, therein contained on the parte and behalf of the said John Barker, his executors, administrators, and assigns, to be performed, should cease and be utterly void and of none effect; with diverse other covenants, grants, articles and agreements in the said indenture of assignment specified to be observed and performed by the said Sir John Huband, his executors and assigns, as in and by the said recited indenture it doth and may appear. And whereas the said Sir John Huband did, by his deed obligatoric, bind himself and his heirs to the said John Barker in a great some of money for the performance of all and singular the covenants, grants, articles and agreements, which on the parte of the said Sir John Huband were to be observed and performed, contained and specified as well in the said recited indenture of assignment, as also in one other indenture, bearing the date of the said recited indenture of assignment, made between the said John Barker on the one party and the said Sir John Huband on the other party, as by the said dead obligator more at large it doth and may appear. And whereas also the said Sir John Huband, by his last will and testament in writing, did give and bequeath unto his executors, amongst other things, the moiety or one half of all and singular the said tithes, as well great as small, before mentioned, to be granted to the said bailiff and burgesses of Stratford, and during so long time, and until of the issues and profits thereof, see much as with other things in his said will to that purpose willed, limited, or appointed, should be sufficient to discharge, bear, and pay his funerals debts and legacies, and also by his said last will and testament did give and bequeath the other moiety or one half of the said tithes unto the saved Ralph Huband and his assigns, during all the years then to come in the said first mentioned indenture and not expired, paying the one half of the rents and other charges due or going out of or for the same, that is to save the one half of ten pounds by year to be paid to the said John Barker, over and above the rents thereof reserved upon the said original lease for the same, as by the said will and testament more plainly appeareth; This indenture now witnesses that the said Ralph Huband, for and in consideration of the sum of four hundred and forty

1358 Any kind of property that can be inherited OED

1359 One who establishes an obligation under law.
pounds\textsuperscript{1360} of lawful English money to him by the said William Shakespeare, before the sealing and delivery of these presents, well and truly contented and paid, whereof and of every parte and parcel whereof he, the said Ralph Huband, doth by these presents acknowledge the receipt and thereof and of every parte and parcel thereof doth clearly acquit, exonerate and discharge the said William Shakespeare, his executors and administrators, for ever, by these presents, hath demised, granted, assigned, and set over, and by these presents doth demise, grant, assign, and sett over unto the said William Shakespeare, his executors and assigns, the moiety or one half of all and singular the said tithes of corn, grain, blade and hay, yearly, and from time to time coming, increasing, renewing, arising, growing, issuing, or happening or to be had, received, perceived, or taken out, of, upon, or in the towns, villages, hamlet's, grounds, and fields of Stratford, Old Stratford, Welcombe, and Bishopton, in the said county of Warwickshire, and also the moiety aforesaid or one half of all and singular the said tithes of wool, lamb, and other small and privy tithes, herbage, obligations,\textsuperscript{1361} obvencions,\textsuperscript{1362} alterages,\textsuperscript{1363} monuments, and offerings, whatsoever, yearly, and from time to time, coming, increasing, renewing, or happening, or to be had, received, perceived, or taken, within the parish of Avon-upon-Avon aforesaid: and also the moiety or one half of all and all manner of tithes, as well great as small whatsoever, which were by the last will and testament of the said Sir John Huband given and bequeathed to the said Ralph Huband, arising, increasing, renewing, or growing, within the said parish of Stratford-upon-Avon, and whereof the said Ralph Huband hath at any time heretofore been, or of right ought to have been, possessed, or whereunto he now bath, or at any time hereafter should have, any estate, right, or interest, in possession or reversion, and all the state, right, title, interest, term, claim, and demand whatsoever, of the said Ralph Huband, of, in, and to all and singular the premises hereby lastly mentioned to be granted and assigned, and every or any parte or parcel thereof, and the reversion and reversions of all and singular the said premises, and all and singular rents and yearly profit's reserved upon any demise, grant, or assignment thereof, or of any parte or parts thereof heretofore made in the privy tithes of Luddington and such parte of the tithe hay, and privy tithes of Bishopton, as of right do belong to the vicar, curate or minister there for the time being, always excepted and foreprised,\textsuperscript{1364} -- To have and to hold all and every the said moietyies or one half of all and singular the said tithes, before, in, and by these presents lastly mentioned to be granted and assigned, and every parte and parcel of them, and every of them, and all the state, right, title, and interest, of the said Ralph Huband, of, in, and to the same, and all other therefore demised premises, and every parte and parcel thereof (except before excepted) unto the said William Shakespeare, his executors and assigns, from the day of the date hereof, for and during the residue of the said term of fourscore and twelve years in the said first recited indenture mentioned, and for such and so long term and time, and in as large, ample, and beneficial manner as the said Ralph Huband should or ought enjoy the same, yielding and paying therefore yearly during the residue of the said term of fourscore and twelve years which be yet to come and unexpired, the rents hereafter mentioned, in manner and form following, that is to say, unto the bailiff and burgesses of Stratford aforesaid, and their successors, the yearly rent of seventeen pounds, at the feasts of St. Michael the archangel and the annunciation of blessed Mary the Virgin by equal

\textsuperscript{1360} Emphasis added.
\textsuperscript{1361} Oblation - The presentation of money, goods, property, etc., to the Church for use in God's service, esp. for the maintenance of ministers, services, religious communities, etc., or for the relief of the poor - OED
\textsuperscript{1362} An incoming fee or revenue, esp. one of an occasional or incidental character - OED
\textsuperscript{1363} rearing [as in people or animals] - OED
\textsuperscript{1364} To assume, take for granted - OED
portions, and unto the said John Barker, his executors, administrators or assigns, the annual yearly rent of five pounds at the feast days and place limited, appointed and mentioned in the said recited indenture of assignment made by the said John Barker, or within forty days after the said feasts by even portions, as parcel of the said annual rent of twenty seven pounds thirteen shillings four pence in the said assignment mentioned;

And the said Ralph Huband doth, by these presents for him, his heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant and grant to and with the said William Shakespeare, his executors, administrators, and assigns, that he the said Ralph Huband at the time of the sealing and delivery of these presents hath, and at the time of the first execution, or intention of any execution, of any estate by force of these presents shall have, full power, and lawful and sufficient authority certainly, surely, and absolutely, to grant, demise, assign, and sett over all and every the said moieties, or one half of all and singular the said tithes, and other the premises before in these presents lastly mentioned to be assigned and sett over, and every part and parcel thereof, unto the said William Shakespeare, his executors and assigns, according to the true meaning of these presents;

and also that the said William Shakespeare, his executors, administrators, or assigns, shall and may from time to time, and at all times during the residue of the said term of four score and twelve years yet to come and unexpired, for the yearly several rents above by these presents reserved, peaceably, lawfully and quietly have, hold, occupy, possess and enjoy all and every the said moieties, or one half of all and singular the said tithes of corn, grain, blade, hay, wool, lamb and other small and privy tithes, herbage, oblations, obvencions, offerings, and over the premises before by these presents granted and assigned, and every parte and parcel thereof, except before excepted, without any let, trouble, entry, distress, claim, denial, interruption, or molestation whatsoever of the said Ralph Huband, his executors, administrators, or assigns, or of any other person or persons having or claiming to have, or which, at any time or times hereafter, shall or may have, or claim to have, any thing of, in, or to the afore granted premises or any part thereof, by, from, or under the said Ralph Huband, his executors, administrators, or assigns, or any of them, or by, from, or under the said Sir John Huband, or by their or any of their means, consent, forfeiture, act, or procurement, and without any lawful let, trouble, distress, claim, denial, entry or demand whatsoever, other then for the said yearly rent of twenty seven pounds thirteen shillings four pence by the said recited assignment reserved of the said John Barker, his executors, administrators, or assigns, or any of them, or of any person or persons claiming by, from, or under them, or any of them, - the state and interest of the Lord Carew of, in and to the tithes of Bishopton and Ryen Clyfforde, and the interest of Sir Edward Greville knight of and in the moiety of the tithe, hay, wool, lamb, and other small and privy tithes, oblations, obvencions, offerings, and profited, before by these presents granted and assigned unto the said William Shakespeare, which is to endure until the feast of St. Michael the archangel next ensuing the date hereof, and no longer, only excepted and foreprised; - and the said Ralph Huband doth by these presents, for him his heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant and grant to and with the said William Shakespeare, his executors, administrators, and assigns, that all and every the said moieties of the said tithes before mentioned to be granted to the said William Shakespeare, and other the premises (except before excepted) now are, and so from time to time, and at all times hereafter during the residue of the said term of fourscore and twelve years yet to come and unexpired, according to the true meaning hereof unto the said William his executors or assigns, shall be, remain, and continue, free and clear, and freely and clearly acquitted, exonerated and discharged, or well and sufficiently saved and kept harmless, of and from all and all manner of bargains, sales, gifts, assignments, leases, recognisances, 1365

1365 A bond or obligation by which a person undertakes before a court or magistrate to perform some act or observe some condition, such as to pay a debt, or appear when summoned; the action or process of
statutes merchant, and of the staple, outlawries, judgments, executions, titles, troubles, charges, encumbrances, and demands whatsoever, heretofore had, made, done, committed, omitted, or suffered, or hereafter to be had, made, done, committed, omitted, or suffered, by the said Ralph Huband, Sir John Huband and John Barker, or any of them, their or any of their executors, administrators, or assigns, or any of them, or by any person, or persons whatsoever claiming, or which at any time hereafter during the residue of the said term, shall or made claim, by, from, or under them or any of them, or any of their executors administrators, or assigns, or any of them, or by any person or persons whatsoever claiming by, from or under them, or any of them, or by their or any of their means, act, title, grant, forfeiture, consent, or procurement, except before excepted; and also that he the said Ralph Huband, his executors, administrators, and assigns, shall and will, from time to time and at all times during the space of three years next ensuing, upon reasonable request, and at the costs and charges in the law of the said William Shakespeare, his executors or assigns, do, perform, and execute, and cause, permit, and suffer to be done, performed, and executed, all and every such further and reasonable act and acts, tying and things, device and devices in the law, whatsoever, be it or they by any means, course, act, devise, or assurance in the law whatsoever, as by the said William Shakespeare, his executors or assigns, or his or their learned counsel shall be reasonably devised, advised, or required, for the confirmation of these presents, or for the further or more better or firmer assurance, surety, sure making and conveying of all and singular the premises before by these presents demised and assigned, or meant or intended to be demised and assigned, and every parte and parcel thereof, unto the said William Shakespeare, his executors and assigns, for and during all the residue of the said term of fourscore and twelve years which be yet to come, and unexpired, according to the tenor and true meaning of these presents, so as the said Ralph Huband, his executors or assigns, be not hereby compelled to travel from Ippsley aforesaid for the doing thereof; And the said William Shakespeare doth by these presents for him, his heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant and grant to and with the said Ralph Huband, his executors, administrators, and assigns, that he the said William Shakespeare, his executors, administrators and assigns, shall and will, during the residue of the said term of fourscore and twelve years, which be yet to come and unexpired, yearly content and pay the several rents above mentioned, viz, seventeen pounds to the bailiff and burgesses of Stratford aforesaid, and five Pounds to the said John Barker, his executors or assigns, at the days and places aforesaid in which it ought to be paid according to the purpose and true meaning of these presents, and thereof shall and will discharge the said Ralph Huband, his executors, administrators and assigns. In witness whereof the parties aforesaid to these presents interchangeable have set their seals the day and year first written.

Bond for the performance of covenants. Noverint universi per praesentem me Radulphum Huband de Ippsley in com. War., armigerum, tencri et firmiter obligari Willielmo Shakespeare de Stratford-super-Avon in dicto com. Warr. generoso, in octoginta libris bonae et legalis monetae Angliae solvend. eidem Willielmo, aut suo certo attorn. executoribus vel assign. suis, ad quam quidem solucionem bene et fideliter faciend. obligo me, haeredes, executores, et administratores meos firmiter per praesentes sigillo meo sigillat. Dat. vicesimo quarto die Julii, annis regni domini nostri Jacobi Dei gratia, Angliae, Scociae, Franciae, et Hiberniae, regis, fidei defensoris, &c., scilicet Angliae, Franciae, et Hiberniae, tertio, et Scociae tricesimo octavo. The condition of this obligation is such, that if the above bounden Ralph Huband, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and every of them, shall and do, from time to
time and at all times, well and truly observe, perform, fulfil and keep all and every covenant, grant, article, clause, sentence, and thing mentioned, expressed and declared in a certain writing indented, bearing date with these presents, made between the said Ralph Huband on the one parte and the above named William Shakespeare on the other parte, and which on the parte and behalf of the said Ralph, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, or any of them, are to be observed, performed, fulfilled, or kept, according to the purported and true meaning of the said writing, that then this present obligation to be void and of none effect, or else to stand and abide in full force, power, and virtue.
VIII - William Shakespeare’s Will - 1616

Spelling, grammar and in some cases terminology have been modernized to aid comprehension. Where archaic terms have precise legal meanings they have been given an explanatory footnote. Original legal drafting by Francis Collins.

In the name of God Amen I William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon in the county of Warwickshire, gentleman, in perfect health and memory, God be praised, do make and ordain this my last will and testament in manner and form following, that is to say, first, I commend my soul into the hands of God my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing, through the only merits, of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting, and my body to the earth whereof it is made. Item, I give and bequeath unto my [son and] daughter Judith one hundred and fifty pounds of lawful English money, to be paid unto her in the manner and form following, that is to say, one hundred pounds in discharge of her marriage portion within one year after my decease, with consideration after the rate of two shillings in the pound for so long {a} time as the same shall be unpaid unto her after my decease, and the fifty pounds residue thereof upon her surrendering of, or giving of such sufficient security as the overseers of this my will shall like of, to surrender or grant all her estate and right that shall descend or come unto her after my decease, or that she now hath, of, in, or to, one copyhold tenement, with the appurtenances, lying and being in Stratford-upon-Avon aforesaid in the said county of Warwickshire, being parcel or holden of the manor of Rowington, unto my daughter Susanna Hall and her heirs for ever. Item, I give and bequeath unto my said daughter Judith one hundred and fifty pounds more, if she or any issue of her body by living at the end of three years next ensuing the day of the date of this my will, during which time my executors are to pay her consideration from my decease according to the rate aforesaid; and if she die within the said term without issue of her body, then my will us, and I do give and bequeath one hundred pounds thereof to my niece Elizabeth Hall, and the fifty pounds to be set forth by my executors during the life of my sister Joan Harte, and the use and profit thereof coming shall be paid to my said sister Joan, and after her decease the said £150 shall remain amongst the children of my said sister, equally to be divided amongst them; but if my said daughter Judith be living at the end of the said three years, or any issue of her body, then my will is, and so I devise and bequeath the said hundred and fifty pounds to be set our by my executors and overseers for the best benefit of her and her issue, and the stock not to be paid unto her so long as she shall be married and covert [by my executors and overseers]; but my will is, that she shall have the consideration yearly paid unto her during her life, and, after her decease, the said stock and consideration to be paid to her children, if she have any, and if not, to her executors or assigns, living the said term after my decease. Provided that if such husband as she shall at the end of the said three years be married unto, or at any after, do sufficiently assure unto her and the issue of her body lands answerable to the portion by this my will given unto her, and to be adjudged so by my executors and overseers, then my will is, that the said £150 shall be paid to such husband as shall make such assurance, to his own use. Item, I give and bequeath unto my said sister Joan £30 and all my wearing apparel, to be paid and delivered within

1367 Should read granddaughter according to Schoenbaum, Documentary Life p.247
1368 Law. (of a wife) under the protection of one's husband - 1563 Homilies II. Matrimony (1859) 506 - She is under covert and obedience of her husband. OED.
1369 Husband. - 1594 If a baron match with a femme that is an inheretrix. OED.
one year after my decease; and I do will and devise unto her the house with the
appurtenances in Stratford, wherein she dwelleth, for her natural life, under the yearly
rent of 12d. Item, I give and bequeath unto her three sons, William Harte, {Thomas}1370
Hart, and Michael Harte, five pounds a piece, to be paid within one year after my
decease [to be set out for her within one year after my decease by my executors, with
the advise and directions of my overseers, for her best profit, until her marriage, and
then the same with the increase thereof to be paid unto her]. Item, I give and bequeath
unto [her] the said Elizabeth Hall, all my plate, except my broad silver and gilt bowl,
that I now have at the date of this my will. Item, I give and bequeath unto the poor of
Stratford aforesaid ten pounds; to Mr. Thomas Combe my sword; to Thomas Russell esquire five pounds; and to Francis Collins, of the borough of .......... in the county of
Warwickshire gentleman, thirteen pounds, six shillings, and eight pence, to be paid
within one year after my decease. Item, I give and bequeath to [Mr. Richard Tyler the
er] Hamlett Sadler 26s. 8d. to buy him a ring; to William Reynolds gentleman, 26s.
8d. to buy him a ring; to my godson William Walker 20s. in gold; to Anthony Nash gentle
men 26s. 8d. [in gold]; and to my fellows John Heminges, Richard Burbage, and
Henry Cundell, 26s. 8d. a piece to buy them rings, Item, I give, will, bequeath, and
devise, unto my daughter Susanna Hall, for better enabling of her to perform this my
will, and towards the performance thereof, all that capital messuage1371 or tenement
with the appurtenances, in Stratford aforesaid, called the New Place, wherein I now
dwell, and two messuages or tenements with the appurtenances, situate, lying, and being
in Henley street, within the borough of Stratford aforesaid; and all my barns, stables,
orchards, gardens, lands, tenements, and hereditaments, whatsoever, situate, lying, and
being, or to be had, received, perceived, or taken, within the towns, hamlets, villages,
fields, and grounds, of Stratford-upon-Avon, Old Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe,
or in any of them in the said county of Warwickshire And also all that messuage or
tenement with the appurtenances, wherein one John Robinson dwelleth, situate, lying
and being, in the Blackfriars in London, near the Wardrobe; and all my other lands,
tenements, and hereditaments whatsoever, To have and to hold all and singular the said
premises, with their appurtenances, unto the said Susanna Hall, for and during the term
of her natural life, and after her decease, to the first son of her body lawfully issuing,
and to the heirs males of the body of the said first son lawfully issuing; and for default
of such issue, to the second son of her body, lawfully issuing, and to the heirs males of
the body of the said second son lawfully issuing; and for default of such heirs, to the
third son of the body of the said Susanna lawfully issuing, and of the heirs males of the
body of the said third son lawfully issuing; and for default of such issue, the same so to
be and remain to the fourth [son], fifth, sixth, and seventh sons of her body lawfully
issuing, one after another, and to the heirs males of the body of the body of the said
fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sons lawfully issuing, in such manner as it is before
limited to be and remain to the first, second, and third sons of her body, and to their
heirs males; and for default of such issue, the said premises to be and remain to my said
niece Hall, and the heirs males of her body lawfully issuing; and for default of such
issue, to my daughter Judith, and the heirs males of her body lawfully issuing; and for
default of such issue, to the right heirs of me the said William Shakespeare for ever.
Item, I give unto my wife my second best bed with the furniture, Item, I give and
bequeath to my said daughter Judith my broad silver gilt bowl. All the rest of my goods,
chattels, leases, plate, jewels, and household stuff whatsoever, after my debts and
legacies paid, and my funeral expenses discharged, I give, devise, and bequeath to my

1370 Left blank – “memory fails and a blank space is left for the third nephew” Ibid. p.247
1371 Messuage - Originally: a portion of land occupied, or intended to be occupied, as the site for a
dwelling house and its appurtenances. In later use (chiefly Law): a dwelling house together with its
outbuildings and the adjacent land assigned to its use. OED
son in law, John Hall gentleman, and my daughter Susanna, his wife, whom I ordain
and make executors of this my last will and testament. And I do entreat and appoint the
said Thomas Russell esquire and Francis Collins gentleman to be overseers hereof, and
do revoke all former wills, and publish this to be my last will and testament. In witness
whereof I have hereunto put my [seal] hand, the day and year first above written.

Witness to the publishing hereof

Francis Collins
Julyns Shaw
John Robinson
Hamnet Sadler
Robert Whatcott
IX - CONVEYANCE OF OVER A HUNDRED ACRES OF LAND

from William and John Combe to William Shakespeare, May, 1602

Spelling, grammar and in some cases terminology have been modernized to aid comprehension. Where archaic terms have precise legal meanings they have been given an explanatory footnote.

This Indenture, made the first day of May, in the four and fortieth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defendress of the faith, &c., Between William Combe, of Warwick, in the county of Warwick, esquire, and John Combe, of Old Stratford, in the county aforesaid, gentleman, on the one party, and William Shakespeare, of Stratford- upon-Avon, in the county aforesaid, gentleman, on the other party; Witnesseth that the said William Combe, and John Combe, for and in consideration of the sum of three hundred and twenty pounds of current English money, to them in hand, at and before the sealing and delivery of these presents, well and truly satisfied, contented, and paid; whereof and wherewith they acknowledge themselves fully satisfied, contented, and paid, and thereof, and of every part and parcel thereof, do clearly exonerate, acquit, and discharge the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns for ever by these presents, have aliened, bargained, sold, given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, do fully, clearly, and absolutely alien, bargain, sell, give, grant, and confirm unto the said William Shakespeare, all and singular those arable lands, with the appurtenances, containing by estimation four yard lands of arable land, situate, lying or being within the parish, fields, or town of Old Stratford aforesaid, in the said county of Warwick, containing by estimation one hundred and seven acres, be they more or less; and also all the common of pasture for sheep, horse, cows, or other cattle, in the fields of Old Stratford aforesaid, to the said four yard land belonging, or in any wise appertaining; and also all hides, leys,1372 tyings,1373 profits, advantages, and commodities whatsoever, with their and every of their appurtenances to the said bargained premises belonging or appertaining, or heretofore reputed, taken, known, or occupied as parte, parcel, or member of the same, and the reversion and reversions of all and singular the same bargained premises, and of every part and parcel thereof, now or late in the several tenures or occupations of Thomas Hiccox, and Lewes Hiccox, or of either of them, or of their assigns, or any of them; together also with all charters, deeds, writings, scripts, and monuments whatsoever, touching or concerning the same premises only, or only any parte or parcel thereof; and also the true copies of all other deeds, evidences, charters, writings, scripts, and monuments, which do touch and concern the said premises before bargained and sold, and any part or parcel thereof, which the said William Combe, or John Combe, now have in their custody, or hereafter may have, or which they may lawfully get, or come by, without suit in law; to have and to hold the said four yard of arable land, containing by estimation one hundred and seven acres, be they more or less, and all and singular other the premises before by these presents aliened and sold, or mentioned, or intended to be aliened and sold, and every part and parcel thereof; and all deeds, charters, writings, scripts, and monuments, before by these presents bargained and sold unto the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns for ever, to the only proper use and behove of the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, for ever. And the said William Combe, and John Combe, for them, their heirs, executors, and administrators, do covenant, promise, and

1372 leases – see Glossary
1373 enclosures (of land) – see Glossary
grant to and with the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, and assigns, by these presents, that they, the said William and John Combe, are seized, or one of them is seized, of a good, sure, perfect, and absolute estate, in fee simple, of the same premises before by these presents bargained and sold, or lent, or mentioned to be bargained and sold, without any further condition, or limitation of use, or estate, uses, or estates; and that he, the said John Combe, his heirs and assigns, shall and will, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, well and sufficiently save and keep harmless, and indemnified, as well the said four yards of arable land, containing one hundred and seven acres, and all other the premises, with their appurtenances, before bargained and sold, or mentioned or intended to be bargained and sold, and every part and parcel thereof, as also the said William Shakespeare, and his heirs and assigns, and every of them, of and from all former bargains, sales, leases, jointures, dowers, wills, statitics, recognisances, writings obligatory, fines, feoffments, entailis, judgments, executions, charges, titles, forfeitures, and encumbrances whatsoever, at any time before the sealing hereof, had, made, knowledge, done or suffered by the said John Combe, or by the said William Combe, or either of them, or by any other person or persons whatsoever, any thing lawfully claiming or having, from, by, or under them, or either of them, the rents and services hereafter to be due in respect of the premises before mentioned or intended to be bargained and sold to the chief lord or lords of the fee or fees only excepted and foreprised. And the said William Combe, and John Combe, for them, their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, do covenant, promise and grant to and with the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, by these presents, that they, the said William and John Combe, or one of them, bathe rightful power and lawful authority for any act or acts done by them, the said William and John Combe, to give, grant, bargain, sell, convey, and assure the said four yards of arable land, containing one hundred and seven acres, and all other the premises before by these presents bargained and sold, or meant or mentioned to be bargained and sold, and every part and parcel thereof, to the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, in such manner and form, as in and by these presents is limited, expressed, and declared; and that they, the said William and John Combe, and their heirs, and also all and every other person, and persons, and their heirs, now, or hereafter having or claiming any lawful estate, right, title or interest, of, in, or to the said arable land, and all other the premises before by these presents bargained and sold, with their and every of their other, other then the chief lord or lords of the fee or fees of the premises, for their rents and services only, -- at all times hereafter, during the space of five years next ensuing the date hereof, shall do, cause, knowledge, and suffer to be done and knowned, all and every such further lawful and reasonable act and acts, thing and things, devise and devises, conveyances and assurances whatsoever, for the further, more better, and perfect assurance, surety, sure making and conveying of all the said premises before bargained and sold, or mentioned to be bargained and sold, with their appurtenances, and every part and parcel thereof, to the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, for ever, according to the true intent and meaning of these presents, as by the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, or his or their learned counsel in

1374 The holding of an estate by two or more persons in joint-tenancy. OED
1375 The portion of a deceased husband's estate which the law allows to his widow for her life.
1376 Stat-tites those which enlarge or extend the common law remedy Stewart Rapalje and Robert Lawrence, A Dictionary of American and English Law (Law Exchange Limited, 1997).
1377 A bond or obligation by which a person undertakes before a court or magistrate to perform some act or observe some condition, such as to pay a debt, or appear when summoned; the action or process of entering such a bond. Also: a sum of money pledged as a surety for such a bond, and forfeited by a failure to fulfil it. OED
1378 A form of entail – see Glossary
the law, shall be reasonably devised, or advised, and required, be it by fine or fines, with proclamation, recovery with voucher or vouchers over, deed or deeds enrolled, enrolment of these presents, feoffment, release, confirmation, or otherwise; with warranty against the said William Combe, and John Combe, their heirs and assigns, and all other persons claiming by, from, or under them, or any of them, or without warranty, at the costs and charges in the law of the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, so as for the making of any such estate, or assurance, the said William and John Combe be not compelled to travel above six miles. And the said William Combe, and John Combe, for them, their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, do covenant, promise, and grant to and with the said William Shakespeare, his heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, by these presents, that the said William Shakespeare, his heirs and assigns, shall or may, from time to time, from henceforth for ever, peaceably and quietly have, hold, occupy, possess, and enjoy the said four yards of arable land, and all other the bargained premises, with their appurtenances, and every parte and parcel thereof, without any manner of let, trouble, or eviction of them, the said William Combe, and John Combe, their heirs, or assigns; and without the lawful let, trouble or eviction, of any other person or persons whatsoever, lawfully having, or claiming any thing in, of, or out of the said premises, or any parte thereof, by, from, or under them, the said William Combe, and John Combe, or either of them, or the heirs or assigns of them, or either of them, or their, or any of their estate, title, or interest. In witness whereof, the parties to these presents have interchangeably set to their hands and seals, the day and year first above written. 1602.

X - Conveyance to Bartholomew Hathaway, 1610.

Deed of Feoffment by William Whitmore, of London, Esq., and John Randoll, of Preston Bagot, co. Warw., gent., to Bartholomew Hathaway, of Shottery, husbandman, of land, etc., in Shottery in his own tenure and parcel of the Manor of Old Stratford, viz.: a messuage and yard-land sometime in the tenure of Thomas Perkins, a messuage and yard-land called Howlands, a toft and half yard-land called Hewlyn's and three closes called Howland's, Hewlyn's, and Palmer's, with common of pasture in Shottery, to hold the same at a yearly rent of 33s. 4d. Dated 1 April, 1610.

Signed: with seals.
Witnessed by Richard Cockes, Francis Collyns, Peter Roswell, John Roswell.

See Glossary
XI – TWO “PERFORMANCES” AND THE ISLE OF DOGS

Note: I have included the following research paper concerning The Isle of Dogs as it expands on several of the characters and situations referenced in Chapter 5. While the link to the Shakespeare family wealth and is tangential, the “event” of The Isle of Dogs clearly had a significant impact on the lives of William Shakespeare and Francis Langley. It is interesting to consider how Shakespeare’s career might have been influenced had Langley’s Swan theatre not been suppressed.

Performance

…Since Truth is ever drawn and painted naked, and I have lent her but a leathern patched cloak at most to keep her from the cold: that is, that she come not off too lamely and coldly…
Thomas Nashe, 1594

The “performance”, which took place five years before the playing of The Isle of Dogs on the stage of the Swan theatre in London, was on 20 September 1592 and had Walter Raleigh as its leading man. The stage was the maindeck of the Madre de Dios a captured Portuguese carrack loaded with exotic cargo from the Far East. She was probably the greatest prize ever sailed into an English port. A stage direction of the scene would have read “at anchor in the harbour of Dartmouth in Devon”. Other cast members included Raleigh’s jailer who had escorted him from his incarceration in the Tower of London as well as Robert Cecil, Francis Drake and an array of courtiers, mariners and the key members of Raleigh’s extended family.

---

1380 Thomas Nashe, The Terrors of the Night or A Discourse of Apparitions (London: William Jones, 1594).
1381 The spelling “Raleigh” is used throughout, however when some scholars have used another alternative spelling I have not altered their original choice of letters.
1382 “Carrack” is an English word see Glossary for Spanish and Portuguese equivalents.
An Accepted View

Our Voyage is to the Isle of Dogs, where the Blatant Beast\textsuperscript{1383} doth rule and reign, rending the credit of whom it please…

Anon.\textsuperscript{1384}

If I had thought the ship of fools would have stayed to take in fresh water at the Ile of Dogges I would have furnished it with a whole kennel of collections to the purpose.

Thomas Nashe, 1600\textsuperscript{1385}

Commentaries about the events surrounding \textit{The Isle of Dogs}, a play of which no copy now remains, have generally fallen into two camps – the “accepted” view adopted by noted scholars such as Fripp, Chambers, Egan and Wells and an “alternative” construction by Ingram.

In 1932 Fripp held that “Pembroke’s men including Ben Jonson brought out about 21 July 1597 a comedy by Nash which gave mortal offense to the state authorities”\textsuperscript{1386}.

Contemporaneous with Fripp was Edmund Chambers who put it that “offence was given by The Isle of Dogs”.\textsuperscript{1387} Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin as recently as 2003 referred to the play as being “highly critical of the government”\textsuperscript{1388} while yet another modern reference publication went even further and summarized the play as having “caused offence to an important person.”\textsuperscript{1389}

But tangible evidence of the nature of the play is tenuous and rests principally on the Privy Council order of 28 July 1596 and the subsequent letter of 15 August to Roger Topcliffe. The assumption that it “presumably was a satire of a scandalous [nature]”

\textsuperscript{1383} “Blatant Beast…in Spenser’s Faerie Queene, a monster, the personification of the calumniuous voice of the world, begotten of Envy and Detraction”. Elizabeth Knowles, ed., \textit{A Dictionary of Phrase and Fable}, ed. Elizabeth Knowles (OUP, 2006).


\textsuperscript{1385} Thomas Nash, \textit{A Pleasant Comedy called Summer's Last Will and Testament} (London: Burre, 1600).

\textsuperscript{1386} Ibid. p.457


\textsuperscript{1388} Stanley Wells, \textit{The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare}, ed. Michael Dobson (Oxford University Press, 2001). They also comment that it “landed the dramatists in jail”…which is factually incorrect as only one dramatist (Jonson) was incarcerated though accompanied by two other members of the company. Nashe maintained that he had been the junior party in writing the play with the lion’s share being contributed by Jonson. That there were two dramatists involved seems certain and runs contrary to Fripp’s statement of the play being ‘a comedy by Nashe’ see above.

and in consequence all the “...lewd matters, great disorders...and confluence of bad people” who resorted to the theatre had to be severely dealt with. The Privy Council’s solution was that all play houses were to be “knocked down” or at least so “de-faced” that they could not be used again for acting. Additionally playing in a public place, within 3 miles of London was to cease until 1 November of 1596.\textsuperscript{1390}

For some, it appears that Fripp’s “presumably” has hardened to “fact” with the passage of time.

Glynne Wickham in 1963, accurately drew attention to the only tangible net effect as being

…the Swan foundered on this account... and was never again officially allowed to function as a regular theatre.\textsuperscript{1391}

William Ingram, originally describing it as a ‘dissenting’ one in 1971,\textsuperscript{1392} presented a fully formed alternative construction in his later biography of Francis Langley\textsuperscript{1393}

…theatre historians will argue that at the end of July the players in the Swan, by staging a scurrilous play called the Isle of Dogs, brought down upon themselves the wrath of both City and (Privy) Council...\textsuperscript{1394}

Additional circumstantial evidence for the ‘accepted’ view does exist. On 28 of July 1597 one in a series of letters of complaint from the Lord Mayor to the Privy Council seeking the permanent closing of the theatres had indeed been delivered, though this was a near duplicate of earlier requests to put an end to playing. Meanwhile, despite being pressed by matters of state concerning Ireland and France, the Privy Council met on the same day and announced the suspension of all playing.

On August the fifteenth the Privy Council acted again, sending instructions to Roger Topcliffe

…Upon information given us [about] a lewd play that was played in one of the playhouses on the Bankside, containing very seditious and slanderous matter... [it] caused some of the players to be apprehended

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1390] Fripp, \textit{Shakespeare} p.457
\item[1392] William Ingram, “The Closing of the Theatres in 1597: A Dissenting View,” \textit{Modern Philology}, 1971: 105-115. This paper contains minor factual errors e.g. Ingram refers to a “Spanish” ship a fact he corrects to “Portuguese” in the later work. However, it rewards careful reading as it sets out the early proposals for his alternative approach.
\item[1393] Ingram, \textit{A London Life}
\item[1394] Ibid. p.167
\end{footnotes}
and committed to prison, whereof one of them was not only an actor, but a maker of part of the said play\textsuperscript{1395}

Topcliffe was directed

\ldots to examine those of the players that are committed, whose names are known to you, with an eye to determining what is become of the rest of their fellows who were sharers in ‘the lewd and mutinous behavior’…

Ingram was not shy of speculating about the possible motivations of some Privy Council members: “Howard and Hunsdon in particular, I suspect, \ldots[as] the Company in question might be one of their own.” As previously referenced, he held out that they would have been keen to pursue the matter to protect their “good names”\textsuperscript{1396}

Again, there is some circumstantial evidence to support this contention. Lord Hunsdon’s desire to protect his reputation had previously been seen in how he disguised being “enriched by the brothel trade in the Paris Garden Manor, of which he was Lord”.\textsuperscript{1397}

Hunsdon had legally conveyed Paris Garden, the manor in which the Swan stood with individual parcels being sold to a number of citizens using a circuitous method.\textsuperscript{1398}

While an apparent transfer of title had taken place Hunsdon had, in fact, retained a slice of the economic benefit.\textsuperscript{1399}

The upshot of the Privy Council letter was that Roger Topcliffe conducted his examination. In the end no theatres were plucked down, playing went on and the only long-term casualties were, as Wickham noted, Francis Langley and his theatre.

I propose another “alternative” construction to that of the “accepted” view of events surrounding the Isle of Dogs, one much closer to that of Ingram. This “alternate” approach starts in 1592, five years before the opening of the Swan and an examination

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1395] Acts of the Privy Council (APC) 1597 p.338
\item[1396] Ingram, \textit{London Life} p.180
\item[1398] Paris Garden, had been transferred under the archaic ‘knight service’ that by this date time would be paid in cash. See Glossary “knight service” “By far the greater part of England [in the 13th century] is held of the king by knight's service. . . . In order to understand this tenure we must form the conception of a unit of military service. That unit seems to be the service of one knight or fully armed horseman (servitium unius militis) to be done to the king in his army for forty days in the year, if it be called for. - Pollock, Sir Frederick; F.W. Maitland The History of English Law before the Time of Edward I. 2d ed. CUP Cambridge 1898
\item[1399] Ingram, \textit{London Life} p.299
\end{footnotes}
of this reveals the scope and range of corruption, theft and extravagant theatrical behaviour demonstrated on both sides of the legal fence by all levels of society. The following explanation of events may appear circuitous but it does have the advantage of answering a mystery that has been unsolved for four centuries. Moreover, it also provides a credible explanation of why all the theatres were closed down and why the Swan never really re-opened. It starts with the Mother of God and a wedding.

Raleigh and the Mother of God – 1592

Oh, sir, upon her nose all o'er embellished with rubies, carbuncles, sapphires, declining their rich aspect to the hot breath of Spain; who sent whole armadoes of caracks to be ballast at her nose. The Comedy of Errors 1594

It is surprising how nearly coextensive with the world is the stage on which this endless, marvelous, incomparable tragedy, or if you will comedy, can be played; its area is in fact that of the whole world.

John of Salisbury, Policraticus 1159

Table 86 - Portuguese Carrack

Walter Raleigh, by marrying one of the Queen’s Ladies-in-Waiting without Her Majesty’s consent, earned a place for himself and his new wife in the Tower. Both were committed on the seventh of August, 1592.

To modern eyes marrying without Royal approval might appear to be a trivial matter, one hardly meriting imprisonment. However, the Italian style of austere and ritualized courtly behaviour, though somewhat mocked by English traditionalists, had become entrenched during the first half of Elizabeth’s reign.

1400 The Comedy of Errors [III, 2]
1401 In 2008, Mary Partridge set out in considerable detail the Italian Baldassare Castiglione’s rules for “correct” Renaissance behaviour drawn from his Book of the Courtier of 1528. She notes that in 1561 Thomas Hoby, recorded that the Courtier “is become an Englishman” – evidently the book had arrived and had seen active use in England. Mary Partridge, Images of the Courtier in Elizabethan England, Modern History, University of Birmingham (Unpublished, 2008).
1402 Ibid. p.48. The writer Gabriel Harvey in 1578 boasted that Queen Elizabeth “had told him he looked just like an Italian when he entertained her with an oration”. “Thomas Nashe, with whom Harvey became embroiled in an acrimonious pamphlet war, brought up he episode ‘De vultu Itali’ (‘of the Italian look’) twice. In his Strange newes, he recounted ‘a merryest’: The time was when this Timothie Tiptoes
By marrying without the Queen’s consent - moreover by marrying one of the Queen’s own ladies - Raleigh as a courtier had perpetrated an enormous social gaffe contrary to the rules of Italianate Princely worship. In a very real social sense he had given the Queen no choice in the matter but to act severely against the couple.

**The “Italian” Courtier**

Stephen Greenblatt wrote of Raleigh

…he seems to have had what I should like to call “a dramatic sense of life”: a histrionic lifestyle and, with this, a consciousness of the universe and of the self shaped in theatrical terms. It is not surprising that for Raleigh … the theatre was a central metaphor for man’s life…

Greenblatt also refers to Pierre Lefranc who speaks of Raleigh’s theatricality (Lefranc used the term théâtralisme) that he finds more Italian than romantic, by virtue of its cold control and extreme attention to the public gaze.

Raleigh himself wrote

What is our life? A play of passion,
Our mirth the music of division;
Our mothers’ wombs the tiring-houses be
Where we are dressed for this short comedy…

Mark Nicholls and Penny Williams set the background for Raleigh’s *coup de théâtre*

…the fleet [Raleigh] had recently sent …succeeded in capturing a Portuguese carrack, the *Madre de Dios*. The ship was brought home … exaggerated tales reached London of how the vast treasure on board was being rapidly plundered… In this administrative chaos lay Raleigh's opportunity. On 15 September [1592], at the request of Sir John Hawkins and through the mediation of Burghley, he was sent…still technically a prisoner…

---

[Harvey] made a Latine Oration to her Maiestie.” - Nashe actually berated Harvey on one other occasion about the incident.


The scene that was about to unfold on the maindeck of the prize ship is one of the less appreciated performances of Raleigh’s career. Greenblatt barely refers to it, treating its aftermath merely as a rationale for Raleigh’s subsequent depressive behaviour.\textsuperscript{1407}

Certainly it does not rank with his great declamation before his treason trial of 1603 where his oratory and demeanour totally turned the tables to his favour. “As Dudley Carleton [a diplomat and 1st Viscount Dorchester] put it a few days later, ‘never was a man so hated and so popular in so short a time’”.\textsuperscript{1408} Another man who heard Raleigh on that occasion was an unnamed Scotsman commissioned by the king to report on the trial. He stated that

\textit{…whereas, when he saw Sir Walter Raleigh first, he was so led with the common hatred that he would have gone a hundred miles to see him hanged, he would, ere they parted, have gone a thousand to save his life.}  

Greenblatt summarized Raleigh “for he was an actor, and at the great public moments of his career he performed unforgottably”.\textsuperscript{1410}

The Events

Even without their leader, Raleigh’s men had pressed ahead with his plan for a privateering venture to the Azores. There they saw success with the capture, among other ships), of the Lisbon bound Madre de Dios. At sixteen hundred tons the carrack would have been one of the largest ships in the world at the time. Fripp described her as a “great seven decker”.\textsuperscript{1411}

Peter Kirsch\textsuperscript{1412} called the Carrack design “the choice high seas beast of burden and [it] has been described as the ‘perfected transport ship’”. In summary he proposes that its chief advantage over other hull types was the high freeboard that made it easily defensible against the small craft used by pirates in the Far East. Its sheer size gave it considerable cargo carrying capacity as well as the ability to make extremely long

\textsuperscript{1407} Greenblatt, \textit{Ralegh} p.99  
\textsuperscript{1408} Bodl. Oxf., MS Carte 80, fol. 622v  
\textsuperscript{1409} Greenblatt, \textit{Ralegh} p.1 Here Greenblatt is quoting from William Stebbing’s \textit{Sir Walter Raleigh} (Oxford,1891) p.230.  
\textsuperscript{1410} Ibid. p.1  
\textsuperscript{1411} Fripp, Shakespeare p.301  
voyages. The rig of four main and two lateen sails proved handy for both main propulsion as well as providing some manoeuvrability. Size again came into play with bulk providing a stable mounting for main armament.  

However, as was demonstrated at the Armada in 1588, in battle carracks were no match for the smaller and more agile English fighting ships. The English vessels at around 300 tons could attack at long range with concerted canon fire and then outmanoeuvre their larger opponents. This latter ability prevented the much larger Spanish and Portuguese ships from either bringing their main armament to bear or successfully boarding the smaller vessels.

Tomaso Contarini, the Venetian Ambassador in Spain, in a letter dated the twelfth of September 1592, informed the Doge and Senate,

…news has come from Lisbon that nine Englishmen attacked the flagship of the East India fleet and another ship, which had cargoes worth three millions of gold. If this is true, it will bring great ruin chiefly on the city of Lisbon.

The carrack, under a prize crew, had been sailed back to England and had arrived in Dartmouth on the seventh of September 1592. Russell Miller described the net result of bringing in one of the richest prizes in history safe into an English port as "pandemonium".

Why Dartmouth?

Why was the Madre de Dios sailed into Dartmouth? It is of course possible that wind and weather dictated that this was the safest and easiest port to reach. Unquestionably Dartmouth was a major naval port at the time.

Gonzalo Gonzales del Castillo who had been captured at the Armada in 1588 was released and repatriated four years later. On his return home he was debriefed on what he had seen in England. Gonzales concluded his report: "I left Dartmouth and was at

1413 Ibid. First section 'carrack'
1414 A notable exception to this was the Ark Raleigh at about 800 tons. The Queen bought the ship from Raleigh for £5000 and renamed it Ark Royal. During the Spanish Armada it served as the English flagship.
1415 Horatio Brown, ed., Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Vol. 9 (1897).
1416 Ingram, London Life p.97
Plymouth on the 5th February 1592. These are the best harbours possessed by the Queen, and her fleets are usually gathered therein.” However, he goes on to note that both ports were at that time bereft of ships.\(^{1418}\)

But why bring her into Dartmouth over Plymouth? Possibly Sir John Burrough, the commander of the squadron, had an ulterior motive. Compton Castle, outside the village of Marldon, a few miles from Dartmouth, was the ancestral home of the Gilbert family, kindred of Sir Walter Raleigh.\(^{1419}\) The immediate area around Dartmouth could be accurately described as a stronghold of Raleigh and his extended family.

According to Miller\(^{1420}\)

At Dartmouth the pillage continued as the light-fingered sailors trafficked…A large share of the captured treasure was owed to Queen Elizabeth; when she heard what was happening she sent Sir Walter Raleigh down from London to retrieve her share of the booty and discipline the looters. “If I meet any of them coming up,” Raleigh swore “if it be upon the wildest heath in all the way, I mean to strip them as naked as ever they were born, for Her Majesty has been robbed and that of the most rare things…”

Miller’s summary while correct in outline misses some key points - such as the role played by Robert Cecil.

Extracts drawn from the Calendar of State Papers\(^{1421}\) relate that

Sept.16 1592 … Instructions delivered to Sir Robt. Cecil and Thomas Myddleton, appointed Commissioner and Treasurer for the carrack and other prizes come from seas this summer, lying at Dartmouth and Plymouth. Cecil is to repair to Dartmouth, and inquire in what…Commissioners lately sent there have proceeded for the surety of the carrack…to cause all the lading to be viewed and entered in registers, especially to search out all the precious things…

… On account of the contagion in London, the goods are to come to Greenwich for sale...The Mayor of Dartmouth and Sheriff of the county are to publish a strict prohibition to any to come from London, where the


\(^{1419}\) Sir Humphrey Gilbert was himself a noted explorer and soldier. Born in Greenway, near Dartmouth in 1537 he was the second son of Otho Gilbert of Compton and Katherine, daughter of Sir Philip Champernouf of Modbury itself a few miles west of Dartmouth. Following Otho's death Katherine married Walter Raleigh (1496? – 1581), a gentleman from Hayes Barton – about fifteen miles east of Dartmouth. Sir Walter Raleigh (1554 –1618) was a child of this second marriage and was therefore Humphrey (and his brother John) Gilbert's half-brother. The Raleigh name (whichever way one spells it, there is considerable debate) is tied to place names such as Colaton Raleigh, a hamlet a half mile to the east of Hayes Barton.


\(^{1421}\) Edited by Mary Everett Green [1869] in note form. CSP 1592
contagion is, to buy the goods, and to put in prison those who disobey. Cecil is to get to understand what persons pretend to any interest in the goods, so that the same may be duly examined, before any sale or distribution is made…[Draft, by Burleigh. 4 pages.]

No less a person than Lord Burleigh considered the situation involving this ship to be so important that he personally drafted the papers governing how matters were to be dealt with and then dispatched his son to take charge of the situation. Perhaps also significant is that, in the Calendar of State Papers (domestic), entries mentioning the Carrack are also heavily concerned with the cost of the English Army then in France (about 4000 strong). Expenses for the troops were running at £3500 a month and the arrival of a treasure ship proved very timely.

On the nineteenth of September at ten in the morning, Cecil wrote to his father from Exeter. By this time Raleigh had been released, under guard, from the Tower - the following are extracts from Cecil’s letter (again in note form)

Sir Robt. Cecil to Lord Burghley. Every one he [Cecil] met within seven miles of Exeter, that either had anything in a cloak, bag, or malle which did but smell of the prizes…(for he could well smell them almost, such has been the spoils of amber and musk amongst them…stayed any who might carry news to Dartmouth and Plymouth at the gates of the town; compelled them also to tell him where any trunks or malles were, and, finding the people stubborn, committed two innkeepers to prison, which example would have won the Queen £20,000 a week past. Has found, in a Londoner’s shop, a bag of seed pearl, pieces of damask, cipreses, and calicoes, a very great pot of musk, certain tassels of pearl, and divers other things, which have been registered in the presence of the Mayor…

…There never was such spoil; has intercepted letters written to friends in London to come down, promising what they will do for them. Keeps the letters to charge the parties at Dartmouth; the man who had all these things has gone back again for new booty; will take him by the way, and make as much benefit of him and of his knowledge as he can. Will suppress the confluence of these buyers, of which there are above 2,000…

…In the search…and a fork and spoon of crystal, with rubies, which he reserves for the Queen. Her Majesty’s captive [Raleigh] comes after the writer; [Cecil] has outrid him, and will be at Dartmouth first. In spite of his orders, one has ridden past to warn Dartmouth of his coming.

1422 In a related cost control measure the Queen chose that summer of 1592 to go on progress in the Midlands and thereby transfer a portion of the housekeeping bill for her court onto her various hosts as well as the much larger expense of the lavish entertainments.
1423 CSP 1592
1424 emphasis added
1425 CSP 1592
Ingram in his account of events is mistaken in suggesting that Raleigh “accompanied Cecil”. Certainly they were eventually together in Dartmouth - but they were not together when Cecil first arrived in Exeter [see above]. Where Ingram was on firmer ground was in his summation that:

…the greater part of the booty must have escaped…in particular the precious stones which alone were estimated variously from £100,000 to £250,000 above and beyond the rest of the cargo…there were persistent rumors that a great diamond had been aboard the ship…Cecil made it his special concern to trace it…prestige as well as money was involved.\[426\]

There are several points in Cecil’s letter of the nineteenth that merit careful review – ranked according to the availability of corroborating material

- Cecil was personally tracking down looted treasure.
- He was already estimating the potential loss to the Crown through theft at over £20,000.
- Goods have been found in “a Londoner’s shop”.
- The London criminal fraternity was being encouraged to join the treasure hunt.
- Cecil was picking out the choicest articles for the Queen for her own use – the jewel encrusted fork and spoon.
- Despite his orders “Dartmouth” (i.e. Raleigh’s men) knew that Raleigh was on his way before either of their arrivals.
- Prestige as well as money was now at stake.

By February 1597, the remaining cargo had been sold for £150,000 and was divided up:

**Table 87 - Madre de Dios, Division of the Cargo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Crown</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Earl of Cumberland</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Walter Raleigh</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of London</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mariners</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A private investor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who took part in the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Against an estimated investment of £26,000 | \[428\]
| Who had invested £6000 | \[429\]

\[426\] Ingram, *London Life* p.98
\[427\] Greenblatt, *Norton Shakespeare*. p.6. Greenblatt refers to “the queen had in fact privately invested £1800 for which she received about £80,000”
\[428\] Greenblatt, *Ralegh* p.99. – some sources suggest Raleigh lost £2000 on the venture while others maintain he made (only) £2000. Mark Nicholls and Penny Williams, “Ralegh, Sir Walter,” in Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: OUP, 2004). For example summarize his financial position as “Elizabeth allowed Ralegh only a small share of the spoils: a notional profit of £2000 on the £34,000 adventured by him and his associates”.
\[429\] Ingram, *London Life* p.97
Table 88 - Carrack vs. Modern Warship – to scale

Though it “was an exceeding great booty, and a heavy loss to the Portuguese, considering how, besides all this, the precious things that were in her were rifled before she came to land…”

Estimates of the Carrack’s fully laden value, ran much higher.  

Cecil received a report from one of his foreign agents simply known as the “Frenchman”

…I understood by Dom Jonay that the value of the vessel was some four million crusados, [about a million pounds]…one stone costing 500,000 ducats…and the whole loss did not grieve Dom Jonay or Captain More as much as the loss of this stone.

---

1430 CSP 1592 and CPH 22/1 as well as an official proclamation of September 23, 1592 stating anything stolen from the ship was to be “discover[ed] and deliver[ed]” i.e. returned. I have been unable to ascertain the level of actual “returns” though Ingram in London Life (p.97) comments on the crew estimating £28,500 being removed. There remain considerable inconsistencies between various scholars – Ingram for example refers to a final sale value of £141,200.


Raleigh The Player

It would be naïve to suggest that Raleigh’s men were not, on their own and their master’s account, helping themselves to the cargo long before Cecil arrived. Moreover, that the same mariners that took the prize in a sanguinary action could not have kept looters at bay remains improbable in the extreme given that the sheer size of the vessel would have dictated her being anchored well into the river. Large vessels (anything over 100 tons) in Dartmouth harbour do this even today.

Her high freeboard would have made any opposed boarding very problematic – the prize crew was commanded by John Bedford an experienced officer taken from the Roebuck, herself commanded by the leader of the expedition Sir John Burroughs.\footnote{1433}

The cargo weighed 540 tons\footnote{1434} (though some estimates go as high as 900) and though much of the value would have been in small items (jewels etc.) only with a willing prize crew’s cooperation could anything of any size have been unloaded into small craft – the bulk of the heavy (and lower value) materials were still on board when Cecil arrived.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{HMS_Somerset_in_the_River_Dart}
\caption{HMS Somerset in the River Dart}
\end{table}

Given the geographical nature of Dartmouth and its surrounding area (a very steep incised river valley) the only practical way to move heavy goods is by water. A short distance up the River Dart there is flat ground and two miles across the fields to the east

\footnote{1433 I was a naval officer myself and attended Britannia Royal Naval College in Dartmouth. Like all officers under training I was required to spend many days on the river in a variety of small craft. I am lost in admiration of the seamanship displayed in bringing the carrack into the Dart. The Madre de Dios under sail would have handled like a modern super tanker in the constricted entrance and river. This was an awesome piece of pilotage.}

\footnote{1434 See Madre de Dios in Glossary for further details re debate on likely tonnage and cargo.
sits Compton Castle. The image above shows H.M.S. Somerset in 2005 at anchor in Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{1435}

The sincerity of Raleigh’s ranting as the loyal subject enraged that anyone should steal from the Crown is, to say the least, questionable.

Describing Raleigh’s performance on the deck of the \textit{Madre de Dios}, Cecil wrote to Vice-Chamberlain Sir Thomas Heneage on the twenty-first of September 1592

\begin{quote}
\ldots Dartmouth…As soon as [Cecil] came on board the carrack Sir W. Raleigh arrived, with his keeper, Mr. Blount; his poor servants, to the number of 140 goodly men, and all the mariners came to him with shouts of joy; never saw a man more troubled to quiet them; but his heart is broken, as he is extremely pensive, unless he is busied, in which he can toil terribly.
\end{quote}

However, he continues somewhat more cynically

\begin{quote}
[Cecil] Cannot help laughing to hear him rage at the spoils. The meeting between him and Sir John Gilbert was with tears on Sir John’s part; but he, finding that it is known that he has a keeper, whenever he is saluted with congratulation for liberty, answers, “No, I am still the Queen of England's poor captive.” Wished him to conceal it, because it diminished his credit there, which is greater amongst the mariners than the writer thought. Graces him as much as possible, finding him greedy to do anything to recover the conceit of his brutish offence…
\end{quote}

Cecil then goes on, almost incredibly, to exonerate the Raleigh family\textsuperscript{1436}

\begin{quote}
\ldots Has examined on oath Sir John Gilbert, and all his; finds them, clear in the opinion of most men. His heart was so great, until his brother [Raleigh] was at liberty, that he only came once to the town, and never was aboard her; but now he is sworn, he sets all aboard to hunt out others, and informs the Commissioners daily by his spies, wherein he would not be so bold if he could have been touched. Thinks him wronged in this, however in others he may have done like a Devonshire man…\textsuperscript{1437}
\end{quote}

The proposition that Raleigh, a tough soldier, sailor and adventurer would be reduced to tears because the Queen was not getting her maximum possible share of the booty is highly questionable. However, in terms of courtly behaviour all this excessive grief and repentance before notable witnesses may have formed part of his public penance.

\textsuperscript{1435} The vessel alongside H.M.S. Somerset is a small tug – even a modern warship would be hard to board from a small boat – let alone one with the huge freeboard (height out of the water) of the \textit{Madre de Dios}. There is no possibility a ship of her size could have come alongside any jetty – then or now in Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{1436} Unless one takes the unproven view that Cecil himself was also being handsomely paid off, or was prudently assuming that eyes other than those of Heneage might read the letter’s contents.\textsuperscript{1437} CSP 1592
Just how much loot was “liberated” by the Raleigh family versus how much was handed out to the smokescreen of “looters” (some of whom were genuine criminals though most would probably have been citizens of Dartmouth) will never be known. Certainly the presence of “looters” offered one way of concealing any filching by the mariners on the return voyage. To the question of the total original value of the cargo, if there is an answer to be had, it must lie with the original Portuguese cargo manifests and comparing these with the final figure of £150,000. Peter Borschberg in response to this issue quoted details of another carrack, the *Santa Catarina*

The *Santa Catarina*‘s cargo (taken [by the Dutch] off the coast of Singapore) in 1603 was 3.5 million florins in market value (actual sales), but earlier estimates had been higher.

At dawn on February 25, 1603 three Dutch ships under the eventual command of Admiral Jakob Van Heemskerk spotted the carrack at anchor off the Eastern coast of Singapore. After a couple of hours of fighting, the Dutch managed to subdue the crew who forfeited the cargo and the ship, in return for the safety of their lives. The cargo was particularly valuable because it contained several hundred ounces of musk. The ship was laden with wares from China and Japan and was travelling from Macau to Melaka [Malacca].

Three and a half million Dutch florins in 1603 would have equated to £350,000 at then prevailing exchange rates. However this assumes that this ship’s captors were not helping themselves to some of the smaller, high value, items before the public sale. Borschberg describes the determination of the exact value of a laden Portuguese carrack as being ‘tricky’ in general and difficult in particular

…most gemstones were not brought as part of an official cargo, but brought along in the so-called caixa de liberdade (luggage allowance) of the different sailors and officers of a vessel. Empty nooks and crannies were often stuffed with compact, high value items such as diamonds, rubies, musk cogs, ambergris and bezoar stones that never show up on a cargo list (in order to avoid paying taxes, naturally). It would only have been featured on the official bill of lading if it was a) destined for a high functionary such as the viceroy or the king and b) if it was part of a high-ranking official’s personal belongings that were being taken to/out of the Indies at the beginning/end of his tenure

…see footnote [1026]

---

Doctor Borschberg is an expert in maritime affairs at the University of Singapore. I am also indebted to Doctor Martine Van Ittersum of the University of Dundee for her assistance on this question – see Attachment re Peter Borschberg, “Professor, University of Singapore” (April 2009).
Cecil proved to be tenacious in his pursuit of the “500,000” ducat diamond.

As Ingram noted

…the quest [for the diamond] was a personal one for Cecil; one finds records of its progress among his own papers, but not in any public documents, for he did not trouble the rest of the Privy Council with his efforts.\textsuperscript{1439}

To which must be added the observation that had he alone been successful in recovering the stone then the glory, as he presented the stone to Elizabeth, would have been all his.

The Nature of Diamonds and Cecil’s Hunt

My Crowne is in my heart, not on my head
Not deck'd with Diamonds, and Indian stones.
\textit{Henry VI, Part III}, I (1593)

…Owners don't just let go of these stones, not big ones, and not if they are thought to be magical…

Peter Borschberg, 2009\textsuperscript{1440}

Even into the late nineteenth century diamonds were still seen as giving a symbolic ‘halo’ effect to Royalty. Edwin Streeter writing of their “history and romance” noted the mystery which surrounds the diamond is accentuated even in the etymology of the word itself…diamond comes directly from the Greek…meaning literally the “unconquerable”.\textsuperscript{1441}

\begin{table}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{table90-dyamant.png}
\caption{Table 90 - Dyamant}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{1439} Ingram, \textit{London Life} p.124
\textsuperscript{1440} Peter Borschberg, “Professor, University of Singapore” (April 2009) – see note below.
\textsuperscript{1441} Even the frontispiece to Streeter’s book mentions female royalty and their diamonds – the account of the “Koh-I-Noor” diamond is described as having been “graciously read & approved by Her Majesty The Queen” [Victoria] as well as references to stones owned by “Her Majesty The Empress Eugenie” [consort
Initially the Portuguese controlled the diamond trade relying on alluvial diamonds from India and Borneo where they had established trading posts. That the *Madre de Dios* would have carried a large portion of her value in the stones, and other gems is, in expert opinion, a near certainty.\(^{1442}\)

Superstitions abounded around their purported power in a wide variety of circumstances. By 1650 the stone was still reputed to have a range of remarkable powers. One author advised that: “… a Diamond laid under the pillow, will betray the incontinency of a wife”. Divination of adultery was also joined by: invincibility in battle, temporal power, resistance to poisons and many other purported powers.

The Middle Ages had witnessed a rediscovery and reinterpretation of early writings on gemstones and lapidaries which set out the qualities of different stones and their attributes.\(^{1443}\)

The illustration above originally titled “Dyamant”, is from an anonymous early 15th-century French example. It sets out as fact that “Diamond is the first named stone fashioned by the lapidary as the gem only for kings.”

When diamonds first arrived from the East, European monarchs raced one another to acquire both the largest and rarest stones in order to enhance their image of temporal power and dynastic legitimacy. Henry VIII and Francis I had spent most of their reigns in an open contest to obtain the best and largest stones.

One tool used in the Early Modern Period to categorize and give structure to the world was to place everything within a “great chain of being” – the notion that everything had its allotted place on a hypothetical ladder of existence. E.M.W. Tillyard drew attention to the concept of “primacies”. In each broad category of existence one would be superior to all the others. He noted in *Richard II* that no fewer than four primacies are referred to in one scene: “in short space we have four of the traditional primacies

___

1442 Peter Borschberg, “Professor, University of Singapore” (April 2009) – see note below.
[referenced]: Fire among the elements, the Sun among the planets, the King among men, the Eagle among the birds.\textsuperscript{1444}

There was a fifth primacy that Shakespeare could have included, that of the Diamond - the primacy of the elements.

Today we recognize the rarity and beauty of the stones, but to Cecil in 1592 a large diamond presented to his Queen would have been a gift almost beyond price. In the eyes of her subjects it would have been a symbol of great power and would have surely prompted even a Queen as parsimonious as Elizabeth to grant the donor near limitless patronage. In the “chain of being” the monarch was, after all, God’s anointed.

Cecil had every possible incentive to find the stone and it can be safely implied that anyone who frustrated him in this goal would pay heavily.

The Hunt for the Diamond

In October 1592 a London merchant named Bradbank was arrested by Cecil’s men and found to be in possession of looted treasure from the carrack: “1300 diamond sparks, 150 rubies, sixteen ounces of ambergris\textsuperscript{1445}, jewels, gold in chains and some four ounces of pearls\textsuperscript{1446}. At his confession on the ninth of October he named Captain Merick of the Prudence, a vessel in the sub-squadron of the Earl of Cumberland, as the supplier of the goods as well as a London goldsmith named Shory as the buyer. Merick denied any knowledge of the booty.

Later in 1592, Shory in turn named a number of other Goldsmiths who had been handling the stolen items. Two of those named were Gammon and Howe both of whom were tenants at Francis Langley’s Saracen’s Head in Cheapside. However, as Ingram notes ‘no record remains’ that the pair were, at this time, interrogated let alone incarcerated.

\textsuperscript{1445} Ambergris is a secretion of the intestines of the sperm whale and is used as a fixative in manufacture of perfumes. The usage “worth its weight in gold” more than applied to this rare substance in the Early Modern Period.
\textsuperscript{1446} Ingram, London Life p.100
In late 1594 Cecil’s men had tracked down and imprisoned another goldsmith named Gilbert. He eventually admitted, after six months incarceration in the notorious Wood Street Counter prison, to purchasing a diamond of twenty-six and a half carats\textsuperscript{1447} for £500 which action had been his ‘utter undoing’. According to his story, he too met with the seller (a mariner) and the seller’s go-between at Langley’s \textit{Saracen’s Head}.\textsuperscript{1448}

However, after further inconclusive haggling between several other goldsmiths, the stone temporarily disappeared.

At this juncture, even a researcher as driven and expert as Ingram, gives up “trying to make the pieces [of the story] fit”, though he does add that in his opinion “the problems are all in the details, not in the substance”.

\textbf{The Isle of Dogs - 1596}

Anthony Ashley, like his father before him, was a follower of Sir Christopher Hatton the Lord Chamberlain. Through Hatton’s patronage Ashley acquired the post of Clerk to the Privy Council. His sister Jane married Francis Langley.

Langley,\textsuperscript{1449} unquestionably through the intervention of his brother-in-law, was able to deliver in 1594 to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen a Letter from the Privy Council attesting to his good character - ‘the said Francis is a very honest man’ - as part of his quest to obtain the position as alnager that his uncle had previously purchased for him. Burghley and the Earls of Lincoln, Warwick, Bedford and Leicester as well as Hatton and Walsingham had signed the letter.\textsuperscript{1450}

Fourteen years later, in April 1596, in a letter to his new master Burghley (Hatton having died in 1591) Ashley related how he had put his own money at risk in an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1447} A modern (but non-scientific) comparison in terms of size and possible worth - in 1664, King Philip IV of Spain bought a 36 carat blue diamond which came to be known as the ‘Wittelsbach’ - on 10 December 2008 it was sold at auction in London for a world record £16.4 million pounds.
  \item \textsuperscript{1448} Ingram, \textit{London Life} p.101
  \item \textsuperscript{1449} Alnager was a City position entitling the holder to certify woollen cloth as fit for sale in the City – Langley’s uncle had purchased a ‘reversion’ for him whereby when an Alnager’s post became available through the death of an incumbent Langley was entitled to the post.
  \item \textsuperscript{1450} This remarkable letter now resides in the Corporation of London Record Office: Corporation of London, Remembrancia I.439.
\end{itemize}
unnamed undertaking. As Ingram put it “…Ashley, by some strange devices of his own, had indeed become involved in the business of the diamond”. One possible sequence of events was that Cecil had learned that Ashley was somehow involved and Ashley, in a like manner to Raleigh’s protestations on the deck of the Madre de Dios, claimed to be attempting to recover the diamond for the Queen.

Cecil at this point pressured Ashley on the stone’s whereabouts and another, more explicit, letter was written in reply

... for the diamond, so heavily laid on me sithence my coming home, I have sent for the party, but cannot yet get him by reason of his absence ...

Cecil once again confronted Ashley who had no option but to reveal all he knew. On May 15th as he was leaving for Plymouth to join the Cadiz expedition as Secretary of War (and as Cecil’s spy on the Earl of Essex) he wrote to Cecil:

…One Terry a Goldsmith…is the party that first contracted with Mr. Francis Langley, and myself for the diamond, and took assurance by obligation for the sum of two thousand six hundred pounds in the name of one James Woolveridge…of purpose to conceal the true owner…one Howe. Myself with Francis Langley and Hannibal Gammon, were jointly bound…for the payment of this money ...

And again on May 16 while en route to Plymouth from Hartford Bridge, near Tavistock, .

...have spoken this morning at three o’clock (a.m.) with Langley…[he] faithfully promised that he would not fail forthwith to repair unto your honour (as so advised by me), and make offer of the thing unto you to be disposed of either privately to gain, or otherwise to good opinion,…

But by May 24 Ashley was panicking over his ‘investment’ in the proposed purchase

\[1451\] CPH 40/36
\[1452\] This was a reprisal of the role he played in the earlier 1589 failed expedition to Lisbon where he had been sent along this time by the Queen to spy on Drake. Ingram, London Life p.122.
\[1453\] CPH 40/88
\[1454\] In 1588 (see Michael Hicks, “Ashley, Sir Anthony,” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2008, www.oxforddnb.com.lib.) Ashley had been elected MP for Tavistock. Presumably he was writing from a ‘second home’ or the home of a constituent. And yet this letter itself makes little sense. London to Tavistock is 240 miles (on modern roads) and it is impossible that Ashley could have been in London at 3.00 a.m. and in Tavistock the same day. If the location is accurate the date is incorrect – either deliberately or accidentally.
\[1455\] Ibid. 40/89
...I may not lose or long time expect the repayment of my three hundred and fifteen pounds...write me how she [the Queen] accepteth the jewel.\textsuperscript{1456}

Langley did not ‘repair’ to Cecil. In the aftermath of his brother-in-law’s revelations to Cecil he simply unwound the proposed transaction, presumably returned the stone to Howe from its hiding place and pocketed not only his own share of the refund but Ashley’s as well.\textsuperscript{1457}

One interesting possibility is that Langley after the three a.m. meeting with Ashley decided to make himself scarce and absented himself to Croydon where the law in the shape of William Gardiner confronted him on the twenty-first of May.

The notion that Gardiner had been actively seeking Langley at the behest of Cecil or Topcliffe is an intriguing possibility – the timing alone is remarkably coincidental.

Langley as a resident of Bankside would have been under Gardiner’s jurisdiction and it would be logical for Gardiner to be sent to find Langley. It might also explain the extreme, possibly physical manner, in which Langley reacted to Gardiner’s challenge. This was the confrontation that resulted in Gardiner having the chance to strike at Langley in the lawsuit naming, as well as Langley, “William Shakspere, Dorothy Soer wife of John Soer, and Anne Lee” in October 1596.\textsuperscript{1458}

During the Cadiz expedition, “Cadiz pillage” might be a more accurate term, Ashley compounded a series of bad decisions by a lack of circumspection in his personal plundering.

In assessing Ashley’s character Michael Hicks related how previously

> [for Ashley] Burghley was… not the patron that Hatton had been. Frank accusations of frauds, embezzlement, oppressions, and perversion of justice were made against Ashley to Burghley, some of which he evidently believed and for which Ashley was suspended late in Elizabeth's reign. If no more official rewards came Ashley's way, he nevertheless profited, perhaps from successful malpractices.\textsuperscript{1459}

\textsuperscript{1456} Ibid. 41/6
\textsuperscript{1457} Ingram, London Life p.131
\textsuperscript{1458} Leslie Hotson, Shakespeare versus Shallow (London: Nonesuch Press, 1931). p.322
On his return to England, he landed at Plymouth on July 28, it came to light that against the Expedition’s express orders against looting Ashley had acquired a gold chain that he subsequently sold to a goldsmith in Cheap [Cheapside] for £530 and a further £500-700 by ransoming prisoners.

Consigned to the Fleet prison, by early October he was willing to agree to anything Cecil proposed. He was released to “pursue the diamond matter.”

It is probable that by crossing Cecil, Langley had over-reached himself. The man that Ashley referred to Cecil, in writing, as being “my bad brother-in-law” was now vulnerable

…For Cecil, Langley was a man who made too many wrong moves. Imprisonment was not in order; but sooner or later an occasion for punishment would present itself…Cecil would bide his time.

While agreeing with Ingram, I would propose that Langley’s time came in 1597 and the casus belli - the Isle of Dogs - was the punishment engineered by Cecil.

Cecil’s Revenge on Langley

Le secret des grandes fortunes sans cause apparente est un crime oublié, parce qu’il a été proprement fait.
Honoré de Balzac, 1835

If Langley were to be compared to a criminal “Godfather” then Roger Topcliffe was, to use a similar twentieth century metaphor, the ultimate Elizabethan “enforcer”. William Richardson in his biographical entry for Topcliffe describes him as an “interrogator and torturer” but also notes the Catholic view of him as “the cruelest tyrant of all

---

1460 “Cheap” here could be being used to denote any individual market in London such as Eastcheap or Cheapside or it may be an abbreviation for Cheapside see OED.
1461 Ingram, London Life p.131
1462 Though Cecil was a major political figure his power was not limitless - there was enough of a judicial process to ensure that Langley as both a guild member and a servant of the Corporation (Ahnager) would have to have had some case against him i.e. no diamond, no cause.
1463 Ingram, London Life p.138
1464 The secret of the great fortunes without apparent cause is a crime forgot, because it has been properly done” - my own translation.
1465 Honoré de Balzac, Old Goriot (1835).
England.” In court circles in the mid-1590s the rack and other officially sanctioned instruments of torture were referred to as “our Topcliffian customs.”

Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney General in one state trial noted “Mr. Topcliffe has no need to go about to excuse his proceedings in the manner of his torturing.”

Topcliffe was most often in the service of Cecil or Walsingham though he retained, almost to the end of her life, a direct personal link to the Queen. In this situation Topcliffe was to be Cecil’s tool in bringing destruction on Langley.

Ingram summarizes the events leading up to the Privy Council letter to Topcliffe of the 15 August 1597 as follows

…The Council received its first detailed information about the play from its Secretary Sir Robert Cecil; Cecil had been told by his agent Topcliffe who had in turn been informed by a shadowy creature of his own, a man whose name has not been preserved for us, but whom Topcliffe described as being in “exceeding grief” because of heavy debts “for which he hath been arrested”. The man had come to Topcliffe perhaps on August 7 or 8 with the information about a seditious play called “The Isle of Dogs” which was “in his opinion venomous and mischievous”. Topcliffe heard all this with interest and as I interpret the evidence promptly went out and arrested a few of the players. He then wrote to Cecil at Greenwich probably on August 8 or 9 telling him of the informer and of the arrests. Cecil responded indicating that he was “well pleased with him.”

In essence, the “complaint” made to the Privy Council was brought about by Topcliffe who sourced the nominal and unnamed complainant and presented him to Cecil as a man who would say anything for Cecil’s favour.

---

1468 Terminology around Topcliffe’s name as a byword for cruelty and torture has been long referred to in *British History, Biography and Manners*, Vol. 2 (London: Chidley, 1838). Sir Anthony Standen, too, praising the Earl of Essex's agreeable manners, in a letter to Mr. Anthony Bacon, of the 3rd of March, 1593-4, in Dr. Birch's papers, says, “Contrary to our Topdiffian customs, he hath won more with words than others could do with racks.” It appears likewise, in another letter in that collection, that Topcltffizare, in the quaint language of the court, signified to hunt a recusant.”
1471 Ingram, *London Life* p.181
Accordingly, the only officially received evidence of the content of the play is a statement that, ("in his opinion" that is) in the sole unsubstantiated opinion of a man already held for debt and who will perjure himself for favour, the play is “venomous and mischievous”.

That Topcliffe became the inquisitor would have been, on its own, terrifying to those involved. Ian Donaldson summarized what actually took place

…Jonson and two of his fellow actors, Gabriel Spencer and Robert Shaa, were arrested and imprisoned at the instigation of Elizabeth's interrogator, the notorious Richard Topcliffe, and charged at Greenwich on 15 August with ‘Leude and mutynous behavior’... Nashe had fled to the safety of Great Yarmouth, but his rooms were raided and papers seized. Throughout this episode, as Jonson later [said], 'his judges could gett nothing of him to all their demands bot I and No’; though 'they plac'd two damn'd Villans to catch advantage of him, with him’, he was warned of their intentions by the prison keeper, and evaded their enquiries… The affair subsided as mysteriously as it had begun. Jonson and his companions were released on 2 October, and a few days later Henslowe's company, the Lord Admiral's Men, began to perform again at the Rose Theatre with impunity, in defiance of the closure order that was still officially in place. Pembroke's Men were effectively destroyed, however, by the closure, and several members of this company were recruited by Henslowe for the Admiral's Men…

“The affair subsided as mysteriously as it had begun” – this is surely a difficult position to support. The affair ended with exactly the desired result for Cecil and coincidentally Henslowe and Gardiner.

A Review of The Evidence – The Accepted vs. The Alternative

One of the most cogent summaries of the “Accepted View” came from Glynn Wickham in the form of a conference paper delivered in 1968. Wickham starts his presentation with the observation that:

Superficially, this paper is nothing more than a simple detective story – an answer to a puzzle which has so far defied solution: why the court order of 1597 for the destruction of all theatres in and about London was never carried out.

The crux of his argument is that the Privy Council’s order of 28 July 1597, while apparently meeting the full request of the City was, in actuality, a subterfuge to permit all parties a cooling-off period. He draws attention to some of the inherent inconsistencies, questions and implications that flow from the wording of the order, such as

…The short-term nature of the prohibition it only runs “until Allhallowtide next”. August, September and October as months of foreclosure coincided with the normal holiday season when the court and wealthier theater patrons would not be in London. Untangling the property and compensation arrangement would have been complex and (inevitably) very time consuming.1475

Where would the City have found the money to compensate the theatre owners, and landlords?

After this very precise introduction he lets his case wander by referring to Pembroke’s Men with the phrase “half the company were already in custody” which is incorrect given that only three individuals were incarcerated. He also seems keen to make the characters seem as morally positive as possible in his investigation. Francis Langley is referred to as a “financier by occupation, brother-in-law to one of the clerks to the Privy Council and himself a city official”. Factually true of course, but sadly lacking in any in-depth research on the character of the man. To be fair, Wickham in 1968 did not have the benefit of the later work of Thomson and Ingram, but he seemed content not to investigate the motives nor the sources of income of the participants.

Some conclusions and assertions are made on very flimsy evidence such as

…Langley must then have laid out additional monies on new building works at the Swan, for on May 1, 1598, the Church Wardens of St. Saviours, Southwark, were invited to view them.1476

Wickham proposes that the Wardens’ visit would have been an attempt by Langley to obtain a playing licence for the Swan. However a cursory examination of the vestry records would have revealed the long and acrimonious disagreement over tithes – the much more probable cause of the visit. Langley simply refused to pay tithes, notwithstanding the fact that Paris Garden was entirely within St. Saviour’s parish. Had Wickham examined the records rather than relying on the earlier work of E. K.

1475 Ibid.
1476 Wickham, Privy Council Order p.21-44.
Chambers\(^{1477}\) he would have gained useful insight into the character of Langley as well as avoiding a questionable conclusion.

A brief examination of what other business the Privy Council was engaged in at that time - situations such as Ireland and France - would have shown the improbability of the Council rushing to address the receipt of a routine complaint from the City fathers.

This is not to say that his paper is devoid of some very sharp observations, particularly as these apply to Henslowe and his ignoring of the Council’s instructions. Wickham saw Henslowe very much as the cautious “yes man” who would have been most unwilling to challenge authority without “inside information”.

Towards the end of this paper Wickham pointed out that in the wake of *The Isle of Dogs* fiasco, on 9 February 1598

\[\text{…an Act of Parliament governing both a citizen’s right to act professionally and a gentleman’s right to maintain a company of actors was drastically amended making it illegal for anyone other than a Baron \text{“or any honourable personage of greater degree”} to support an acting company.}\]

Though this legislation was never entirely successful in restricting playing companies to just the Lord Admiral’s and the Lord Chamberlain’s men as is specified in the legislation, it very neatly stopped any playing company from using the Swan Theatre.

In summary, Wickham makes a very creditable attempt to maintain the *status quo* created by earlier scholars in that he considered his paper as an investigation and accurately recognized the aftermath: i.e. who actually lost out - which was Langley.

However, I would suggest that by starting off with a particular solution in mind and in failing to consult original documentation he fell short of finding a satisfactory “answer to a puzzle”.

\(^{1477}\) He refers to “E.K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p.325, quoting vestry record”.
The Alternative

I would propose that the results post *Isle of Dogs* were as follows (in order of quality of proof):

- The Pembroke’s Men, at the Swan, were disbanded and coincidentally the evolution of the Early Modern Theatre diverted.
- Langley’s Swan had become a financial albatross despite its subsequent sporadic use for sporting events and performances.
- Henslowe reacquired the players that had been lured away by Langley and put a major competitor out of business just as the Swan was beginning to bite into the Rose’s earnings.\(^{1478}\)
- Gardiner’s enemy Langley suffered what was to become a mortal financial blow.\(^{1479}\)
- With the legislation in 1597 control of the theatres was now firmly vested in the Privy Council.

There were two further probable consequences:

As Ingram suggests, Howard and Hunsdon were put on their guard by Cecil. If Shakespeare had ever been tempted to join Langley’s incarnation of Pembroke’s Men at the Swan (and this must surely be a possibility given the inclusion of his name in the lawsuit), this was now very firmly ended.

Ashley, despite his many faults, lived out a comfortable and nefarious life buying titles and manor houses in a style akin to William Shakespeare. At nearly seventy he married into the extended family of the Duke of Buckingham hoping this would lead to a return to public office. In the event, it did not and, in a twist of fate, his young widow, who outlived him by 46 years, remarried Walter Raleigh’s third son Carew.\(^{1480}\)

\(^{1479}\) Though he did not have much time to enjoy his victory; he died in November 1597.
Cecil had his ‘pound of flesh’ through the mechanism of *The Isle of Dogs*. However, like Shylock, he was ultimately unsuccessful in his quest - the diamond was never recovered.

**Conclusion**

To paraphrase Nash, the “naked truth” remains that, without the discovery of additional documents, it may never be possible to determine with complete certainty the truth behind the “scandalous” play *The Isle of Dogs*. The question still stands - was the play truly “lewd and mutinous” or merely a convenient justification for Cecil’s reprisals against Francis Langley, or indeed could it have been both?

Edmund Tilney, the *de facto* Government censor, held the post of Master of the Revels between 1579 and 1610. These are dates that straddle the opening of the Swan and the play’s performance. The notion that the experienced Tilney would have approved so scandalous a piece that would on its own justify the tearing down of theatres (and the effective end of Tilney’s lucrative employment) is difficult to imagine. If he had not approved the play, then why was Topcliffe’s highly suspicious “witness” necessary? And if Tilney had somehow “missed” the implicit scandal in the piece then why was he allowed to continue in the role for another 15 years? It is possible that no other records remain of the nature of the play. However, if it were truly outrageous surely some commentary would have survived.

Complex as the whole “*Madre de Dios, diamond, Cecil’s revenge*” explanation is, it alone has the merit of making sound commercial sense and fitting in with the characters of the principal “real world” players.

Mafia ‘Godfathers’ in the United States have usually been identified for years before arrest or incarceration. The difficulty for the law is proving their criminality. That Langley was notorious is well documented. That there is hearsay evidence of his possession of the diamond is sure. But perhaps the best proof of all is to look at the economic outcome – only Langley really lost out.

The other theme that emerges from examining this “alternative” interpretation of *The Isle of Dogs* is the essential theatricality of the time. Raleigh lived, prospered and died
based on oratory that, I would propose, must have rivalled the fictional Mark Anthony’s speech after the death of Caesar. The Courtly society with its chilling Italian-style rectitude and love of pageant stood as a backdrop to all the plays of the Early Modern Period.

The more one reads the correspondence of Raleigh, Cecil and Topcliffe with its flowery prose and grovelling to the monarch and the more one reads of histrionic feigned emotions to express horror having given offence, such as Raleigh’s on the Madre de Dios, then the more one is driven to the conclusion that the “courtly” minority population “acted out” a series of exaggerated mannerisms. Moreover, these patterns of behaviour were not merely expected but demanded.

Conformity was and is demanded in every autocracy, from life under the Roman Emperors to the tyranny of the Chief Executive Officer of a modern U.S. Corporation. It can be postulated that how actors behaved on the Early Modern stage actually mirrored what was going on around them. The audience was pre-programmed to respond to certain behavioural patterns and stereotypes – very much as if they were in church. Just as the priest could conjure up the body and blood of Christ based on conditioned responses, so the playwright could play on his audience’s established patterns of knowledge. Even if a play’s setting were in another time or place, characters acted within the behavioural matrix existing outside and inside the theatre. Therefore, if one were seeking to stage a play today as it would truly have appeared in, say, 1597 in London, then the more the performers and audience are aware of the social conventions of the time, the greater the tendency towards authenticity. Raleigh, one of the most powerful men in the realm, had been locked up for an offence almost incomprehensible in a modern libertarian society. If an actor were playing Raleigh in a hypothetical play called “The Madre de Dios” then to achieve greater authenticity to the original staging, specialist knowledge of the behavioural norms for a man such as he, in these particular circumstances, would be vital for the production to succeed. Indeed the modern actor’s feigned distress might look to an uninformed spectator as being merely “ham” acting if the player had not been primed to bring the audience into the secret that this was, in reality, a form of ritual penance.

1481 Julius Caesar III, ii
The Duke in *Measure for Measure* may be behaving in what to us was an underhand manner in his testing of Isabella, but the patriarchy of the Early Modern Period and then prevalent social attitudes would mean his actions would probably have been taken for granted, if not actually expected. Even if a present day director were to shun historical authenticity in favour of another artistic approach, only by grasping the inherent social mores being tested by the playwright could there be adequate comprehension of the playwright’s original dramatic intentions.

One can see in Stephen Greenblatt’s study of Raleigh’s “roles” the beginnings of what subsequently developed into the doctrine of New Historicism: i.e. to understand past drama it must be framed in its socio-political context. He considered the *Madre de Dios* of historical consequence and so he only waited until page five to name the ship in his own seventy-six page introduction to the most recent edition of *The Norton Shakespeare* of which he is the General Editor.

Notes

Advice from Professor Borschberg – These are extracts from a series of e-mails from Borschberg to Fallow:

April 14, 2009 Subject: RE: Madre de Dios - Capture of the Santa Catarina: The closest we get is the Sta. Catarina and the Santo Antonio. The Santa Catarina's cargo (taken off the coast of Singapore) in 1603 was 3.5 million florins in market value (actual sales), but earlier estimates had been higher. The Santo Antonio was less, about 1.5-2 million….as I understand your question, you are specifically interested in a particular item, namely, a diamond that belonged to the cargo of the Madre de Dios. This is very tricky, as most gemstones were not brought as part of an official cargo, but brought along in the so-called caixa de liberdade (luggage allowance) of the different sailors and officers of a vessel. Empty nooks and crannies were often stuffed with compact, high value items such as diamonds, rubies, musk cods, ambergris and bezoar stones that never show up on a cargo list (in order to avoid paying taxes, naturally). It would only have been featured on the official bill of lading if it was a) destined for a high functionary such as the viceroy or the king and b) if it was part of a high-ranking official's personal belongings that were being taken to/out of the Indies at the beginning/end of his tenure. By the way, most of the diamonds purchased by the Portuguese were rough diamonds, in other words uncut and unpolished diamonds. The vast majority were sold not to Europe, but to the Moghul court, to the Persians and also the Arabs. The principal cutting centres were in India at

---

1482 Sir Walter Ralegh (New Haven: Yale University, 1973) is itself based on Greenblatt’s own doctoral thesis.
the time and rivalled, if not surpassed, Antwerp in both the number of
diamonds cut as well as in ability and techniques. Diamonds polished in
India fetched a much higher price than those polished in Europe. The
highest quality diamonds were panned in the rivers of Borneo (Sambas,
Sukodana) which also explains why the English East India Company
maintained a presence in Sukodana for much of the early 17th century.
The Portuguese also buy from Sukodana. The Dutch company procured
most of its diamonds from Sambas, a political dependency of Johor,
which also serves to explain why the third highest person in command at
the VOC factory in Batu Sawar (Johor's capital) was a gemstone expert.

April 15, 2009…First, are we really sure we are dealing with a diamond
here, or is it possibly something else? The price quoted seems a bit high
to me (relative to other prices, say of bezoars on which I have also
written, that is why I know about the diamond trade), or did popular
imagination and gossip just go wild?…in Hindu and Buddhist Asia,
diamonds are very special stones that go beyond the decorative. The
refraction of light (from a properly cut stone) ward off evil (the powers
of darkness hate light) and in some cases even bestow on their owner
magical powers, such as to pacify a volcano or other forces of nature.
The bigger the stone, the more such a stone would have been regarded as
unusual and exceptional. Similar things hold true for bezoars which are
never cut and only exist in their raw natural form, but unlike gemstones
such as diamonds, bezoars were believed to possess medicinal healing
power in addition to all the magic mentioned above. Owners don't just let
go of these stones, not big ones, and not if they are thought to be magical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alderman</strong> (elder man.)</td>
<td>One of a certain select number of the senior members of a Borough Council, next to the Mayor in civic dignity; generally elected by the Council to hold office for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aletaster</strong></td>
<td>A municipal officer charged with the testing of the ale and beer brewed and sold within the borough, to ensure its purity and wholesomeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allhalontide</strong></td>
<td>The festival of All Hallows, or All Saints (1 November), with the eve and the octave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alnager</strong></td>
<td>A sworn officer appointed to examine and attest the measurement and quality of woollen goods. The office was abolished by 11 &amp; 12 Will. III. c. 20. [Even in the early nineteenth century the office was a valuable one].1838 J. HOLT in Mem. II. 32, I was deputy alnager…which produced me from £80 to £100 a year. OED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amercement</strong></td>
<td>A fine assessed by a Jury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amerciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amorites</strong></td>
<td>A member of any of a group of Semitic tribes who dwelt in Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Syria in the second and third millennium B.C., and who are described in Biblical texts as inhabiting the land of Canaan before the arrival of the Israelites. OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apparitor</strong></td>
<td>The process-server of an ecclesiastical Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apprise</strong></td>
<td>To estimate the value of an article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraise</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approvement</strong></td>
<td>Improved value of lands or tenements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appurtenance</strong></td>
<td>What belongs to and goes with the enjoyment of a tenement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulate</strong></td>
<td>Mentioned in an Article of the Interrogatories in Star Chamber proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assign</strong></td>
<td>A person to whom personal property is made over by its owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assize</strong></td>
<td>The regulation of the weight, measure and price of certain common articles of food, particularly bread and ale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atchievement</strong> (heraldry)</td>
<td>A complete set of the heraldic insignia of an individual, consisting of the shield or coat-of-arms, with helmet, mantlings, wreath, crest, scroll and motto; and, in certain cases, garter or chain, coronet, supporters, second crest, badge and war-cry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment</strong></td>
<td>Arrest effected by a writ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney</strong></td>
<td>A person appointed to act in another's place in some formal transaction. An obsolete name for a Solicitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Augmentation Papers</strong></td>
<td>Documents relating to proceedings in the Court of Augmentation of the Revenues of the Crown, established by King Henry VIII. to deal with the confiscated Church property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossary of Words, Terms and Additional Explanatory Notes
Bailiff (Latin Bailivus.) A land-steward. A high officer representing the lord's civil jurisdiction over a borough. The chief magistrate of a municipality, and the head of the corporation. This office, which in some towns was held by two persons jointly, has in most cases been changed for that of mayor.

Bailiwick The office of bailiff. The district over which the bailiff's jurisdiction extends.

Band A bond.

Bank Initiative Of 1576 The plan for a public bank in 1576 was buttressed by the argument that it would serve for the “prousshon of munisshons and other things appertaining for the defence in time of warren thinges in theise trobbelsomme days thought very necessary.”

Bank of England “The Bank was founded in 1694 as a commercial enterprise. The Committee of Finance and Industry 1931 (Macmillan Report) description of the founding of Bank of England - Its foundation in 1694 arose out the difficulties of the Government of the day in securing subscriptions to State loans. Its primary purpose was to raise and lend money to the State and in consideration of this service it received under its Charter and various Act of Parliament, certain privileges of issuing bank notes. The corporation commenced, with an assured life of twelve years after which the Government had the right to annul its Charter on giving one year's notice. Subsequent extensions of this period coincided generally with the grant of additional loans to the State.”

Banneret (heraldry) A little square, fringed banner, upheld by one or both the supporters of the shield. It bears usually the paternal coat-of-arms in miniature.

Bar, Pleas in Pleadings which, if allowed, barred an action. There were two of these, viz., Non culpabilis and Autrefois acquit. The former was "not guilty"; the latter meant that the accused had been previously tried and acquitted on the present charge.

Barm To mix with yeast; to leaven, ferment. 1616 SURFL. & MARKH. Countr. Farm 589 “Your best ale must be barmed as soone as it is coold.” OED – barmy - Of, full of, or covered with barm; frothing – Full of ferment, excitedly active, flighty. In Measure for Measure Shakespeare gives us the “barmy” Master Froth who is easily led astray by Pompey. 'Froth’ is also listed by Pauline Kiernan as one in a galaxy of words with a secondary meaning of sexual intercourse: Pauline Kiernan, Filthy Shakespeare (London: Quercus, 2006) p.206. Also: A Midsummer Night’s Dream:2.1 “And sometime make the drink to bear no barm; Mislead night-wanderers, laughing at their harm?”

Barrator An encourager of litigation, one who goes to law with his neighbour on the smallest provocation.

Bawd Someone employed in pandering to sexual debauchery; a procurer or procuress; orig. in a more general sense, and in the majority of passages masculine, a 'go-between,’ a pander.

Bedelry The district within the jurisdiction of a beadle.

Betroth To contract two persons to each other in order to marriage; to affiance. (More usually, but not exclusively, said of contracting the female to her future husband.)

Bill Military weapon used chiefly by infantry; varying in form from a simple concave blade

---

with a long wooden handle, to a kind of concave axe with a spike at the back and its
shaft terminating in a spear-head; a halberd. 1593 Shakespeare Richard. II, III. ii.
“Distaffe-Women manage rustic Bills”. OED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill of Complaint</td>
<td>The formulated written statement of a Complainant, in the Star Chamber and some other Courts of Justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondsman</td>
<td>A serf, a villein, an unfree tenant of the lord of a manor, bound to the soil and to a periodical performance of bodily labour on the lord's demesne. A surety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carabinieri (Italian Para-Military Police)</td>
<td>A member of an Italian Army Corps which serves as a police force – OED. Popularly berated for their supposed stupidity the following is a representative story: There was this peasant who lived up in the mountains on a narrow road. One day, he saw a carload of carabinieri driving backwards up the mountain. “Why are you driving backwards” he asked. Came the reply “Because we’re not sure well be able to turn around up ahead”. Later, the peasant saw the carabinieri driving backwards down the mountain. “How come you’re still driving backwards” the peasant asked. “Well” the driver replied, “We found a place to turn around.” See <a href="http://www.theflorentine.net/articles/">http://www.theflorentine.net/articles/</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrack</td>
<td>“Carrack” had a specific meaning in northern Europe but not elsewhere. In southern Europe a ship of this type and period was known as a nao. Nao = Spanish: the Nau = Portuguese. “The English were more inclined to apply the term galleon to foreign ships than to their own.”1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Whitefriars</td>
<td>This Company of child actors performed under a variety of names at different times - The Children of the Chapel, the Children of Her Majesty's Chapel Royal, the Children of the Chapel Royal, the Children of the Queen's Rebels, the Children of the Revels, the Children of the Blackfriars Theatre or Children of the Blackfriars, and finally the Children of the Whitefriars Theatre or Children of the Whitefriars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Admiralty</td>
<td>The tribunal for the trial and decision of such causes, formerly presided over by the Lord High Admiral, whose jurisdiction was transferred to the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division of the High Court of Justice from 1873-1970.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Arches, or Arches</td>
<td>The ecclesiastical court of appeal for the province of Canterbury, formerly held at the church of St. Mary-le-Bow (or ‘of the Arches’), so named from the arches that supported its steeple – see “Peculiars” below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Chancery</td>
<td>The court of the Lord Chancellor of England, the highest court of judicature next to the House of Lords; but, since the Judicature Act of 1873, a division of the High Court of Justice. It formerly consisted of two distinct tribunals, one ordinary, being a court of common law, the other extraordinary, being a court of equity. To the former belonged the issuing of writs for a new parliament, and of all original writs. The second proceeded upon rules of equity and conscience, moderating the rigour of the common law, and giving relief in cases where there was no remedy in the common-law courts. Its functions in this respect are now transferred to the Court of Appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Common Pleas</td>
<td>A court for the trial of civil causes, formerly one of the three superior courts of common law in England. This court, long seated at Westminster, was abolished in 1875; it was represented by the Common Pleas Division of the High Court of Justice until 1880, when that division was merged in the King's (or Queen's) Bench Division.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Court of Exchequer: Originated as a court representing the Anglo-Norman exchequer in its judicial capacity. By the Judicature Act of 1873 it was converted into “The Exchequer Division” of the High Court of Justice, and by Order in Council in 1881 this was merged in the Queen's Bench Division. The jurisdiction of the court was theoretically confined to matters of revenue, but in practice was gradually extended to all kinds of cases (except “real actions”) by means of the legal fiction that the wrong suffered by the plaintiff had rendered him unable to pay his debts to the king. In addition to its jurisdiction at common law, the court had a jurisdiction in equity, abolished in 1841.

Court of Requests: Formerly a court of record, technically forming part of the king's council, held by the Lord Privy Seal and the Masters of Requests for the relief of persons petitioning the king; also, in later use, the hall at Westminster in which the court was held.

Coventry Doom: In 2003 a medieval fresco of the Last Judgment [was] uncovered in a church in Coventry. Known as the "Coventry Doom", it depicted a wealth of detail, including damned souls licked by the flames of hellfire, a group of nervous cardinals fearing the worst as they await judgment, and a naked man rising from the tomb with wide, startled eyes. The costumes worn by the figures, in particular the heart-shaped headdresses of three ale-wives [otherwise naked] consigned to damnation, suggest the fresco was painted in the early 1430s. According to church records, it was lime washed in the 1560s as part of a drive to remove "popish" imagery following the accession of Elizabeth I. - Extract from an article by Elizabeth Day, 21 Dec 2003.

Cymbeline: “So children temporal fathers do appease” variations in positioning of this quotation between editors: Bate and Rasmussen, have it in V.iii. Orgel and Braunmuller position it in V.iv. Wells and Taylor place it in V.v as does Greenblatt.

DEF

Distringas: A writ to compel appearance in court

English Heritage: English Heritage is a non-departmental public body of the government of the United Kingdom and functions under the National Heritage Act (1983). It functions as the Government's statutory adviser on the historic environment, and its commentaries on historic sites are taken to be authoritative.

Espousal: The formal “plighting of troth” between a man and a woman; the whole of the ceremonies constituting or accompanying this. The celebration of a betrothal.

Feoff, feoffments: To invest with the legal estate, subject to an obligation to allow the use to (the other person). Until 1535 this proceeding was very commonly resorted to evade the burdens incident to ownership of land. The Statute of Uses passed in that year provided that in all cases of feoffment to uses the cestui que use should have the legal estate.

Fines (judicial): Where fines were imposed the legal mechanism was based on the bishopric in which the person being fined resided. Where sureties were required for payment the system soon began to break down if the party providing the surety lived outside the diocese. Multiple sureties in different dioceses compounded the problem – there is no central mail system. Where multiple parties in multiple dioceses all cross-guaranteed each other, then the situation descended into chaos as the diocese themselves would have to agree who got paid first. Individuals

could therefore “beat” the system by using its own bureaucracy against it if they could coordinate co-sureties over a large enough geographical area spanning multiple dioceses.

**Forty Shilling Freeholder Act**

1429 Statutes of the Realm, II, 243, also "forty-shilling freeholder." *The Oxford Companion to Irish History*, Oxford University Press. 2007. The Act of 1429 (8 Henry VI c7), reciting that elections “have now of late been made by very great, outrageous, and excessive Number of People ... of the which most Part was of People of small Substance, and of no Value ... whereby Manslaughters, Riots, Batteries, and Divisions among the Gentlemen, and other People of the same Counties, shall very likely rise and be,” provided that knights of the shire were to be elected by persons “dwelling and resident in the same Counties, whereof every one of them shall have free Land or Tenement to the Value of Forty Shillings by the Year at least, above all Charges.” A clarifying Act of 1432 (10 Henry VI c2) stated that the qualifying land must be “within the same county where such chooser [elector] will meddle of any such election.” See also http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/

**G to M**

“The use of once serious religious terms, such as this one, became corrupted into rhyming slang – here the ‘Goat and Compasses’. In this case used as the sign of a public-house at [321] Euston Road, London. The particular pub Fripp refers to in his introduction to Savage’s Volume I of the Minutes and Accounts survived at least until 1950 (it was noted as the venue for RAF reunion functions) but appears to have been renamed at some point thereafter. It is now a block of flats (2011).”

**Glossators**

A sixteenth century term for continental legal scholars of the eleventh and twelfth centuries who interpreted Roman law especially the “Digesta” and the works of the Emperor Justinian. The Digest (Digesta), or Pandects (Pandectae), was a part of the great collection of Roman laws known as the Corpus Iuris Civilis. The Digest was issued in AD 533 under the direction of the imperial quaestor Tribonian. It compiled the writings of the great Roman jurists such as Ulpian along with current edicts. It constituted both the current law of the time, and a turning point in Roman Law: from then on the sometimes contradictory case law of the past was subsumed into an ordered legal system.

**Husbandman**

A man who tills or cultivates the soil; a farmer. In earlier northern use, app., the holder of a husbandland: An old Northumbrian and Lowland Scotch term for the holding of a ‘husband’ or manorial tenant, = yardland, virgate; the land occupied and tilled by the tenants of a manor, in contradistinction to the demesne (freehold) lands.

**Ireland, Samuel**

Samuel Ireland (1744 –1800) an author, engraver and Shakespeare admirer was himself duped by his son William Henry with forged documents that purported to relate to William Shakespeare.

**Investment Volatility**

The relative rate at which the price of an investment moves up or down. Volatility is found by calculating the annualized standard deviation of changes in price. If the price of an investment moves up and down rapidly over short time periods, it has high volatility. If the price almost never changes, it has low volatility – see http://www.investorwords.com/5256/volatility.

**John Shakespeare’s Brothers**

Anthony see: http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~shakespeare/pedigrees/warks/hampton_lucy/anthony_igi.htm re a marriage on 14 March 1573, at Budbrooke, of Anthony Shakespeare and Joan Whitrefe. Anthony Shakespeare, of Snitterfield, and later Hampton Lucy, where he and Joan are buried.

---

1487 Savage, Minutes and Accounts I xlvii
Earlier Richard French in 1869 had proposed re Richard Shakespeare “it is believed, three sons, viz. John, the Poet's father, Thomas, and Henry. The two last are identified with Snitterfield, and we have no account of other Shakspeares in connection with that place.”

Jury (medieval) - evidence

Expanded from footnote: Kathy Laster, *Law as Culture*, 2nd, revised (Annandale, NSW: Federation Press, 2001). See Section the Origins of the Adversarial System by Stephan Landsman, 1994, page 288. “The early juries were not the passive fact-finding mechanism they eventually became plain in Inc. with in the adversary system. At first, the jury was little more than another sort of formal or inscrutable trial, like ordeal or wager of law. In its early days the jury had no evidence and rendered its decision on no rational basis. Apparently, divine guidance was relied upon to produce the proper results… jurors were selected from the locality in which the dispute arose and almost always included among their number some persons with knowledge of the events that were the focus of the litigation. As the jury mechanisms matured, jurors were allowed as much as two weeks notice before jury trials. During the peak between notice and trial, jurors were allied to certify themselves of the facts in dispute by talking to the litigants and making private inquiries in the community”.

Knight Service

Paris Garden, had been transferred under the archaic “knight service” that by this date would be paid in cash. “…to be held “de nobisili…in libero” etc. …a Tudor device designed to facilitate the holding of lands from the Crown other than in chief. Paris Garden, however was to be held in chief; that is, by knight service.1489 “By far the greater part of England [in the 13th century] is held of the king by knight's service. . . . In order to understand this tenure we must form the conception of a unit of military service. That unit seems to be the service of one knight or fully armed horseman (servitium unius militiae) to be done to the king in his army for forty days in the year, if it be called for. - (Pollock and Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I,1898*) ‘knight service’ originally required the physical performance of services to the Crown. By this method a property could be conveyed but the person disposing of the property (the seller of record) could still retain a slice of its economic value.

Langrake


Leet, Court Leet Book

The Court-Leet was a court of record held periodically in a hundred, lordship, or manor, before the lord or his steward, and attended by the residents of the district. Records of its activities were recorded in the Leet Book. See OED Court-Leet. In Boroughs, the Borough’s own Court of Record generally supplanted the older style medieval leet.

Madre de Dios (tonnage)

The Norton Shakespeare, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997).p.5. Greenblatt lists the cargo at 536 tons including “pepper, cloves, cinnamon, cochineal, mace, civet, musk, ambergris and nutmeg as well as jewels, gold, ebony, carpets and silks. Where one might take issue with him is in his flat assertion that she was ‘the largest that had ever entered any English port. Certainly “one of the largest” might be more accurate. Roger Smith (Institute of Nautical Archaeology) writing for the Newberry Library in Chicago in 1986 commented - *Madre de Dios*, was rated at 1600 tons; carried 900 tons of merchandise and had a crew of 600 or 700 men. As measured by her captors, the vessel's keel was 100 ft.; her overall length, 165 ft.; and her beam, 47 ft. She drew 31 ft. of water, had a mainmast 121 ft. high, and a main yard 106 ft. in length. Aside from her high forecastle, she had four complete decks, not including a poop and topgallant poop. At sea, her helm required the efforts of 12 to 14 men to keep her on course.

---

1489 Ingram, *London Life* p.299
Marginal Cost
The marginal cost of access to cash is the essence of what in the late twentieth century became known as the “Swap” market. Banks within their own balance sheets have always functioned as intermediaries between depositors and borrowers changing short-term deposits into long-term loans (and vice versa). The Swap takes the Bank’s own financial resources out of the equation and seeks to connect the depositor and borrower through a legal document. Thus a party with a high access to cash but no need for cash can effectively rent its name in the market as long as it trusts the counterparty (which has poor or to put it another way costly access to cash) to perform under the agreement. By trading in these perceptions of credit worthiness it is possible to achieve better (cheaper) financial execution for the borrower. The lender earns fees by using up its unused borrowing capacity. Swaps are not reserved for cash alone (also known as interest rate swaps) but are used between a variety of instruments such as foreign exchange agreements (i.e. changing currencies).

Michaelmas
The feast of Saint Michael the Archangel - 29 September. A Quarter Day one of four a year often used in legal agreements, rents, hiring of servants Etc.

N to R
Occam’s or Ockham’s Razor
“The principle (attributed to the English philosopher and Franciscan friar William of Occam, c.1285-1349) that in explaining a thing no more assumptions should be made than are necessary.” See: A Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. Edited by Elizabeth Knowles. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Peculiar
In the Church of England: a parish, church, chapel, or ecclesiastical court exempt from the jurisdiction of the diocese in which it is physically located. royal peculiar n. a chapel exempt from any jurisdiction but that of the sovereign. court of peculiar n. [compare post-classical Latin curia peculiarum (1586 in a British source) now hist. a branch of the Court of Arches with jurisdiction over the peculiar of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Piepowders (Court of)
These courts had unlimited jurisdiction over personal actions for events taking place in the market, including disputes between merchants, theft, and acts of violence. In the Middle Ages, there were many hundreds of such courts, and a small number continued to existed even into modern times. Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England in 1768 described them as "the lowest, and at the same time the most expeditious, court of justice known to the law of England" Halsbury's Laws of England: volume 12(1), paragraph 662, note 10; and volume 10, section titled "Inferior courts and tribunals and ancient courts", paragraph 851 and following. Originally, it referred to the dusty feet (in French, pieds poudrés) of travellers and vagabonds, and was only later applied to the courts who might have dealings with such people. Ben Jonson's Bartholomew Fair, in which Justice Adam Overdo patrols the fair in disguise (Act 2, Scene 1) "Many are the yeerly enormities [wrongdoings] of this Fayre, in whose Courts of Pye-pouldres I have had the honour during the three dayes sometimes to sit as Judge".

Private & Public Theatres (distinction between)

Quote
The year 1576 is doubly important in the history of the English stage. In that year Richard Farrant established the First Blackfriars Playhouse, and in that year James Burbage built the Theater. Farrant's Blackfriars was the first of the theatres later to be known as “private” houses. Burbage's Theater was the first of those later to be called “public.” The two types of playhouse came into existence simultaneously, and coexisted until the Puritan revolution.

The distinction between the two types was real, but was not based upon anything
that the words “private” and “public” imply; both kinds were public in the sense that any person could enter either upon payment of the required admission fee. The origin of the term “private house” or “private playhouse” is not fully understood. W. J. Lawrence explained it as being an attempt by theatre managers to take advantage of a loophole in a 1574 Act of the Common Council, which, while seeking to restrict plays and acting, made an exception of “any plays, interludes, comedies, tragedies or shows to be played or showed in the private house, dwelling or lodging of any nobleman, Citizen, or gentleman, . . . without public or common collection of money of the auditory or be-holders thereof.”

But this attractive theory fails to take account of certain relevant facts. For one thing, all the early private playhouses were established in Liberties, and thus had no need to fear the Common Council's restrictions. For another thing, they produced their plays under the pretence of readying them for performance before the Queen, and thus acquired an exemption more effective than either a Liberty or a private dwelling could provide. And finally, the term “private house,” as designation for a play-house, does not appear in print until thirty years after the Common Councils Act of 1574. It was first used by Webster in 1604, in his Induction for the Globe performance of Marston's Malcontent, when he had Sly say “Why, we may sit upon the stage at the private house.” The term “private playhouse” first appeared in 1606, in Dekker's Seven Deadly Sinnes of London.

But even though private playhouses were not distinguished from public playhouses in respect of privacy, they were distinguished from them in several other respects. Many of the private houses were located in Liberties inside the City walls; all the public houses were built in London's suburbs. The private houses were roofed over and probably heated in winter; the public houses were open to the sky and the weather. The private houses gave their performances by candlelight the public gave theirs by the light of the sun. The private houses were relatively small they charged admission fees ranging from sixpence to half a crown, and they provided seats for all their patrons; the public play-houses had a far greater capacity, charged fees ranging from a penny to a shilling, and furnished no seats in the pit. Finally, the first private houses were occupied only by companies of child actors; all public playhouses were occupied by men.

Elizabethans seem to have felt that this last difference was the essential distinction between the two types of playhouse. This is suggested by the complaint against the Blackfriars Playhouse that some inhabitants of the precinct addressed to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London in 1619. In it they charged that “the owner of the said playhouse doth, under the name of a private house, . . . convert the said house to a public playhouse” (27:4). The City Corporation agreed that the conversion from private to public had taken place (29:2) but, as will be seen later, the only important change that had in fact occurred was the substitution of adult actors for children. After 1610, when that substitution took place, child actors were no longer a distinguishing mark of the private theatre, but the cleavage between the two types persisted. Thus The Duchess of Malfi was “Presented privately, at the Black-Friers; and publiquely at the Globe,” according to the title page of its 1623 Quarto and the 1629 Quarto of The Lovers' Melancholy says of that play that it was “Acted at the Private House in the Black Friers, and publiquely at the Globe.” As has been said, the distinction between the private playhouse and the public was not recognized in print until the turn of the century.

End Quote

Ramsay

Ramsay’s place in history is marked for being part of the Lordship of Henry Cromwell and his son Oliver. The DeWint’s work concerning the town is especially valuable as it is nearly always tied to the relevant historical manuscripts and records.

Recusant

A person, esp. a Roman Catholic, who refused to attend the services of the Church of England. The Act of Uniformity of 1558 first imposed fines on all
non-attenders of a parish church, but Roman Catholics were the specific target of the Act against Popish Recusants of 1592; subsequent acts through the 17th century imposed heavy penalties on Catholic recusants, the exaction of which persisted up to the Second Relief Act of 1791. Recusancy amongst Catholics was not common until 1570, when the papal bull ‘Regnans in Excelsis’ excommunicated Elizabeth I. In historical use, recusant is occasionally used to refer to Catholics before 1558 who refused the Oath of Supremacy. Sectary recusant: a Protestant or other non-Catholic recusant. Source: OED Obstinate in refusal; specifically, in English history, refusing to acknowledge the supremacy of the king in the church, or to conform to the established rites of the church. Source: [1913 Webster]

Red Light District A locality identified as an occupational site for prostitution, whether legalized and regulated, unregulated and illegal, or on the fringe of local laws and regulations. Red light districts are often the setting for other criminal activity, such as drug trafficking. In jurisdictions where prostitution is legal and regulated, medical examinations of sex workers and patrolling by police to enhance their safety from harm by violent clients may help to ensure that this otherwise marginal occupation is less hazardous and unhealthy than in the absence of legality. A Dictionary of Public Health. Ed. John M. Last, Oxford University Press, 2007.1849 C. Bronte Shirley III. iii. 44 ‘He is one of Mrs. Yorke's warning-examples one of the blood-red lights she hangs out to scare young ladies from matrimony’.

Reversion A position made possible by the death or incapacity of a previous incumbent

Richard II (Performance of Essex) “The afternoone before the rebellion, Merricke, with a great company of others, that afterwards were all in the action, had procured to bee played before them, the play of deposing King Richard the second. Neither was it, casuall, but a playbespoken by Merrick. And not so onely, but when it was told him by one of the players, that the play was olde, and they should haue losse in playing it because fewe would come to it: there was forty shillings extraordinarie giuen to play it, and so thereupon playd it was. So earnest hee was to satisfie his eyes with the sight of that tragedie which hee thought soone after his lord should bring from the stage to the state, but that God turned it vpon their owne heads.”

S to Y

Sale and Leaseback See link: http://www.bankingtimes.co.uk/15112009-hsbc-sells-canary-wharf-headquarters/ - in 2009 Bank HSBC sold but immediately leased back its London headquarters from “National Pension Service of Korea, one of Asia’s largest sovereign investors [the] new landlord. The article carefully sets out the rationale for this type of which could equally be applied to the Blackfriar’s gatehouse.

Sin City slang, a title applied jocularly or otherwise to a city considered to be a place of vice – OED

Sinatra In brief, in “1961, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sent a pointed memo to [the] Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, regarding singer Frank Sinatra's extensive connections to organized crime figures. Special agents had been keeping tabs on the singer since 1947” Giancana and Luciano were both notorious mob leaders. “Chicago boss Sam Giancana was known to wear a pinkie ring that was a gift from Sinatra…when Giancana had been arrested in 1958, the police found Sinatra's private telephone number in [his] wallet.” In connection with Luciano, “When police searched Lucky Luciano's home… they found a gold cigarette case with the inscription, “To my dear pal Lucky, from his friend, Frank Sinatra.”” Extracts from “Frank Sinatra and The Mob” by Anthony Bruno. http://www.trutv.com/library/crime/gangsters_outlaws/cops_others/frank_sinatra/1.html

Tawney’s “…Lady Hungerford pays 19%... Edward Willoughby complains to his brother that lenders refuse accommodation under 20%...” SPD Elizabeth additional 1566 to 1579,
x ref. 18, number 53.

footnote 74 “…a correspondent of Cecil's can only raise £800 on land producing £1000 a year and with a capital value presumably 20 times that figure…MSS Marquis of Salisbury, part eight, pages 190 – 191.

 “…A grocer who did business as a money lender gets a country gentleman into his clutches, discounts his bills at 25%, renews them at compound interest, and finally having sold up the debtor, becomes Lord of the Manor”…Hubert Hall, Society in the Elizabethan Age (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1887).

Tiger’s Heart

Extract from The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare

By Margreta De Grazia, Stanley W. Wells (Eds.) Page 4 - E.A.J. Honigmann:

“In his groats worth of wit Robert Green addressed three gentlemen his quondam acquaintance, that spent their wits in making plays (Marlowe, Peele, Nashe) and denounced an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his “Tiger's heart wrapped in a player's hide” supposes he is as well able to bombast out (write) a blank verse as the best of you: and, being an absolute Johannes factotum, is in his own conceit the only shake-seen in a country. The pun in Shake scene and ridicule of a line from 3 henry six period to period leaves us in no doubt as to Greene's target.”

Token Money - Eccl. The payment made or contribution given (by way of Easter Offering) by persons on receiving their token that they were duly prepared to make their Easter communion. “1546 Churchw. Acc. St. Martin in the Fields 101 In primis receued and gathered of the Paryshyons ffor the pascall and tokyn money at Easter in the Church xlis. vjd. 216 It'm Receyued the ixth of Aprile 1564 for the halfe of the token monneye at Easter xxvjs viijd. 1572 Ludlow Churchw. Acc. (Camen) 153 Imprimis receaved of the parishenars for the token money at Easter...xlis. 1573 Ibid. 156 Receavede at Easter of token money..xlvs. xd. 1611 Churchw. Acc. St. Margaret's Westm. (Nichols 1797) 29 Received for the token-money for the whole year, ended the 11th day of May, 1611 £6. 5.” OED Token Book – Record of the above.

Turnmill Street

The actual street name was Turnmill in Clerkenwell. Stow explains that Turnmill Street was so called from its proximity to the Fleet, or Turnmill or Tremil Brook, because mills were erected upon it [John Stow, Survey of London (1598), 2nd Edition of reprint (London: Everyman, 1929) P.14] …long vulgarly called Turnbull and Trunball Street.

Tyllings

See Thomas Blout (1618-1679) in his Glossographia of 1656 [the OED refers inexplicably to 1670 – the second edition appears to have been published in 1719] “Tigh or Teage..a Close or Enclosure, a Croft... The word Tigh is still used in Kent in the same sense”

Universal Magazine

See http://18thcenturyreadingroom.wordpress.com/2007/08/17/item-of-the-day-the-universal-magazine-of-knowledge-and-pleasure-1777/. This excellent website gives the full title which as a most detailed description surely eclipses THE Sun “The Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure: Containing News, Letters, Debates, Poetry, Musick, Biography, History, Geography, Voyages, Criticism, Translations, Philosophy, Mathematicks, Husbandry, Gardening, Cookery, Chemistry, Mechanicks, Trade, Navigation Architecture and Other Arts and Sciences, which may render it Instructive and Entertaining to Gentry, Merchants, Farmers, and Tradesmen: to which occasionally will be added An Impartial Account of Books in several Languages and of the Store of Learning in Europe Also of the Stage, New Operas Plays and Oratorios. Vol. LXI. Published Monthly according to Act of Parliament, by John Hinton, at the King’s Arms in Paternoster Row, near Warwick-Lane, London. [1777]…”

Whittington (Dick)

Whittington, Richard [Dick] (c.1350–1423), merchant and mayor of London, was born at Pauntley, Gloucestershire, the third son of Sir William Whittington (d. 1358), a lesser landowner of Gloucestershire, and his wife, Joan Maunsell. He was apprenticed to a London mercer and was sufficiently established in London by 1379 to contribute 5 marks towards a civic gift to the nobles of the realm. At this date a mercer of London dealt in silk, linen, fustian, worsted, and luxury small goods, and the wealthiest of the trade expected to participate in the export of English wool, woollen cloth, and worsted, and to import the other merceries.
Wither (George) A man who enjoyed a long and remarkable life encompassing scholar, writer, soldier, judge, politician etc. He also could be described as a self-interested turncoat who twisted whichever way the political wind happened to be blowing. He started by fawning over royalty for patronage, then attacked the Stationers for protecting their own monopolies before himself seeking and obtaining his own (50 year) monopoly for his Psalter. Come the Civil War, he switched sides and was by turns pro-Essex, Cromwell, and the Levellers. Over a period of decades he was imprisoned for libelling almost every political group. At the Restoration he immediately switched back to pro-Royalist writing. Like many others of the period he spent decades litigating over ill-gotten gains. See: Michelle O'Callaghan, “Wither, George (1588-1667),” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: OUP, 2004).

Yeoman A man holding a small landed estate; a freeholder under the rank of a gentleman; hence vaguely, a commoner or countryman of respectable standing, esp. one who cultivates his own land. OED
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