

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Henslowe's Diary

The Diary of Philip Henslowe, owner of the Rose Theatre in London during the 1590s, remains the most valuable source of information about the workings of the Elizabethan public theatres. Discussions of theatres and drama in the age of Shakespeare routinely refer to Henslowe, whose 'diary' touches on every aspect of the day-to-day operations of the Rose and the companies of actors who performed there, especially the Admiral's Men. The Diary preserves the account-book of an Elizabethan theatre owner who was also the father-in-law of the leading actor, Edward Alleyn. Besides many miscellaneous and personal entries, it includes records of the daily performances of plays and of negotiations with dramatists, as well as details of the purchase of costumes and properties for the stage. The first edition of *Henslowe's Diary*, published in 1961, has long been out of print. It provides a thorough introduction to the manuscript, a full transcription of the document itself and several helpful appendices and indexes. For this second edition one of the original editors, R. A. Foakes, has added a new preface and reading list.

The first edition of *Henslowe's Diary*, published in 1961, was edited by R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert. Rickert has since died and so this second edition has been prepared by R. A. Foakes alone.

R. A. FOAKES is Professor Emeritus at the Department of English, UCLA. His publications include editions of six of Shakespeare's plays, among them *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for the New Cambridge Shakespeare series (1984), *Illustrations of the English Stage 1580–1642* (1985), and *Hamlet versus Lear* (1993).

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

HENSLOWE'S DIARY

SECOND EDITION

EDITED BY
R. A. FOAKES



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
 The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
 The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
 Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
 and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
 no reproduction of any part may take place without
 the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1961
 Second edition 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Monotype Bembo 11/13pt [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Henslowe, Philip, d. 1616.

[Diary]

Henslowe's diary / edited with supplementary material; introduction and notes by
 R. A. Foakes – 2nd edn.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 81866 4 – ISBN 0 521 52402 4 (pbk.)

1. Henslowe, Philip, d. 1616 – Diaries. 2. Theatrical managers – Great Britain –
 Diaries. 3. Theater – England – History – 16th century. I. Foakes, R. A.
 II. Rickert, R. T. III. Title.

PN2589.H4 2002
 792'.0942-dc21

2002067210

ISBN 0 521 81866 4 hardback
 ISBN 0 521 52402 4 paperback

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>Preface to the first edition</i>	xiii

INTRODUCTION

1 History of the manuscript	xv
2 Description of the manuscript	xvi
3 Contents of the manuscript	xxiii
4 The mining accounts	xix
5 Philip Henslowe's private affairs	xxiv
6 The pawn accounts	xxv
7 The theatrical accounts	xxviii
8 Fragments and supplementary material	xliv
9 Henslowe's handwriting	xlviii
10 Other hands in the <i>Diary</i>	liv
11 Arrangement of the present edition	lvii
12 Conventions and usages	lviii
13 A note on the text	lxi
14 A note on forms of reference	lxii

THE DIARY

1 The vellum wrapper and the end pages	3
2 The text; ff. 1v–125v	5
3 Entries by Philip Henslowe made with the book reversed, ff. 238–126v	232
4 Fragments from the <i>Diary</i>	265

APPENDICES

1	Manuscripts at Dulwich relating to the <i>Diary</i>	page 273
2	Playhouse inventories now lost	316
3	Actors' names in dramatic plots	326

INDEXES AND GLOSSARY

1	Note on the indexes and glossary	337
2	Index of plays	338
3	General index and glossary	346
4	Index of year-dates	368

PLATES

Between pp. lvi and lvii

- | | |
|-----|--|
| I | (a) F. 3. List of sharers or members of the Admiral's Men |
| | (b) F. 26. Arrangements of the dialy entries of 1596–7 |
| II | F. 9v. The form of the daily entries, 1594 |
| III | F. 44v. Signatures of members of the Admiral's Men |
| IV | (a) F. 48. The form of weekly entries commencing July 1598 |
| | (b) F. 85v. The form of loan entries, 1600 |

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE

The Diary of Philip Henslowe, owner of the Rose Theatre in London, remains the most valuable and important source for information about the working arrangements of the Elizabethan public theatres, dealing as it does with the day-to-day activities of the companies of players performing there, especially the Admiral's Men, later Nottingham's and the Prince's Men, one of the two major companies operating between 1594 and 1604. Last transcribed and edited in 1961, it has long been out of print and unavailable. The present volume is a reprint of that edition, with a few corrections and this new preface contributed by one of the original editors; the other, R. T. Rickert, sadly died many years ago. All discussions of theatres and drama in the age of Shakespeare refer to Henslowe, whose 'diary' contains a lot of miscellaneous and personal entries, and is also, in effect, the account-book of a theatre owner who was the father-in-law of the leading actor of the 1590s, Edward Alleyn. In what now appears an unsystematic fashion, it provides records of plays performed daily and money taken at the Rose Theatre over a number of years, and documents the activities of the companies of players who acted there, their dealings with authors, and their negotiations with Henslowe as their banker. The Diary also contains substantial records of the pawnbroking business Henslowe conducted. Other related documents preserved at Dulwich in the college founded by Edward Alleyn are included in this edition, among them deeds, letters, lists of costumes, and the contract for the building of the Fortune Theatre in 1600.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Although historians of the stage and students of drama refer to the Diary frequently, interpretation of many of its aspects remains controversial, not least because of disagreements about the nature of Henslowe himself and his relationship with the companies of players. W. W. Greg, who published an edition of the Diary in 1904, perpetuated the idea he took over from earlier scholars who had assumed that Henslowe was illiterate, mercenary, and operated by a 'selfish hand-to-mouth policy' (see p. xxxv below). The idea of Henslowe as a kind of Scrooge, concerned only for profit, an unscrupulous mis-manager in the mould of a later theatre owner, Christopher Beeston, has survived, and inevitably affects the way the records in the Diary are interpreted. Was Henslowe controlling the players by forcing them to sign contracts and deeds that were to his advantage, or was he acting on their behalf in maintaining records of agreements, and in serving as their banker in paying their bills and lending them money? This alternative view of Henslowe, as concerned in all his dealings to maintain the stability of the acting companies who worked in his theatre, is vigorously argued by Carol Chillington Rutter in her *Documents of the Rose Playhouse* (revised edition, Manchester, 1999), pp. 5–9. As she points out, the significance of entries in the Diary is bound to vary according to one's impression of Henslowe as a person.

Here let me comment on three charges that have often been made against him. First, the notion that he was illiterate: this is the easiest to dispose of, although his spellings are often strange, he evidently did not know much Latin ('assumpsit' he can turn into 'a somsette'), and he gets wrong the titles of some plays often as if he misheard them (e.g., 'tittus & ondronicus', f. 8v). We have to recognize that spellings were not fixed in the sixteenth century, and the Diary shows that Henslowe was capable of writing contracts, deeds and fluent letters. The second charge, that he was unsystematic, is based on assumptions about modern systems of accounting. It is disconcerting to find an entry of a purchase of costumes for the stage followed by a note of the rent paid by one Mrs Keyes for a house (f. 43), or a loan to a player followed by the notation 'sent my horse to grasse' (ff. 24–24v). Such sequences of unrelated entries seem, however, char-

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

acteristic of diaries and account-books of the period. I have examined several that are now in the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, and confirm S. P. Ceresano's findings that, like Henslowe, the compilers of them mingle accounts, always with the amounts recorded, like his, in Latin numerals, and other matters indiscriminately. So Richard Stonley, who kept a diary from 1581 to 1594, mixes business ('This day after morning prayer I rode to Est Ham'), accounts ('for a couple of rabbits.....xijd'), and biblical quotations on the same page. The third and most damaging charge against Henslowe is that of being an unscrupulous and grasping controller, squeezing as much money as he could out of his theatre. The accounts in the Diary do not, it seems to me, support such a view. Henslowe advanced money continually on behalf of the company to pay for plays, costumes and other needs, and they rarely if ever paid off their debts in full. It is possible, but I think not at all likely, that the accounts are incomplete, and that Henslowe recorded some receipts elsewhere. Much has been made of articles of grievance drawn up much later by a company in 1615 against Henslowe and his then partner, Jacob Meade, complaining that these partners had cheated the players in various ways during a period of three years, and imposed their will by threatening to 'break' the company and establish a new one. At this time, however, long after Henslowe's last entries in his Diary, the Rose had been replaced by the Fortune Theatre, and Henslowe was no longer operating as a theatre owner. He was still lending money to the players, who, as usual, remained in his debt, so that when he died early in 1616, the company owed him £400 and Alleyn discharged their debt for £200. All the time he seems to have acted as a banker for the players, negotiating business transactions on their behalf, keeping records and providing funds. The Diary can be seen rather as a memorandum book in which Henslowe recorded dealings for players with whom he had a warm relationship, and supported with 'as good & faythfull a harte as they shall desyer to haue comen a mongeste them', words he wrote in a letter of 1593 (p. 279).

The discovery of the remains of the Rose Theatre in 1988 gave new prominence to the Diary, for Henslowe's building accounts in 1592

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

could now be explained as relating to the northward expansion of the theatre in that year. There has recently been a growing interest in all aspects of performance in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatres, as well as more generally in the material culture of the age. Henslowe's Diary is a basic source for the study of such matters, and the implications of the information it contains are far from being exhausted, in spite of the valuable effort of Neil Carson to interpret the accounts in his *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1988), and the very useful chronological commentary provided by Carol Chillington Rutter in her *Documents of the Rose Playhouse*. The Diary is also illuminated by Julian Bowsher's *The Rose Theatre: an Archaeological Discovery* (Museum of London, 1998). Since Henslowe's records feature in some measure in all accounts of Elizabethan plays, dramatists and theatrical conditions, there is no point in attempting to provide a bibliography. Andrew Gurr has continued to present a less sympathetic view of Henslowe's activities, contrasting them with the management of the rival Chamberlain's Men for whom Shakespeare wrote, as in *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1996), and his interpretation should be compared with that of Carol Rutter. His debate with Roslyn Knutson in 1987–8 about interpreting the Diary is also relevant; see *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38 (1987), 189–200 and 39 (1988), 391–8. The significance of the pawn accounts in relation to the theatrical records is examined by Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass in *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000), Chapter 7. The articles of grievance of 1615 and other documents relating to matters outside the scope of the Diary can be found reprinted in W. W. Greg's edition of *The Henslowe Papers* (London, 1907), and in the facsimile edition by R. A. Foakes (2 vols., London, 1977).

A representative list of recent books and essays relating to aspects of *Henslowe's Diary* would include the following titles:

- Bernard Beckerman, 'Philip Henslowe', in *The Theatrical Manager in England and America*, ed. Joseph W. Donohue (Princeton, 1971), 19–62
 Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 383–422

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

- David Bradley, *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage* (Cambridge, 1992)
- Neil Carson, 'Literary Management in the Lord Admiral's Company, 1597–1603', *Theatre Research International*, 2 (1977), 186–97
- Neil Carson, *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1988)
- S. P. Cerasano, 'Philip Henslowe, Simon Forman and the Theatrical Community', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 44 (1993), 145–58
- S. P. Cerasano, 'Revising Philip Henslowe's Biography' *Notes & Queries*, 230 (1985), 66–71
- S. P. Cerasano, "'Borrowed Robes": Costume Prices and the Drawing of *Titus Andronicus*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 22 (1994), 45–57
- S. P. Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn: 1566–1626', in *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*, ed. Aileen Reid and Robert Maniura (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1994), 11–31
- S. P. Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn's "Retirement" 1597–1600', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 10 (1998), 98–112
- S. P. Cerasano, 'The Patronage Network of Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 13 (2001), 82–92
- Mary Edmond, 'Pembroke's Men', *Review of English Studies*, new series 25 (1974), 127–36
- R. B. Graves, *Lighting the Shakespearean Stage 1567–1642* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: University of Southern Illinois Press, 1999)
- Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage* (Cambridge, 1970, 3rd edition, 1996)
- Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford, 1996)
- Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000), especially Chapter 7, 'The Circulation of Clothes and the Making of the English Theater'
- Roslyn Lander Knutson, 'Henslowe's Diary and the Economics of Play Revision for Revival, 1592–1603', *Theatre Research International*, 10 (1985), 1–18
- Roslyn Lander Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594–1613* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991)
- Roslyn Lander Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge, 2001)

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

- Scott McMillin, 'Sussex's Men in 1594: the Evidence of *Titus Andronicus* and *The Jew of Malta*', *Theatre Survey*, 32 (1991), 214–23
- J. M. Nosworthy, 'Dornackes and Colysenes in Henslowe's Diary', *Notes & Queries*, 213 (1968), 247–8
- G. R. Proudfoot, 'A Note on "Titus and Vespasian"', *Notes & Queries*, 213 (1968), 131
- Carol Chillington Rutter, editor, *Documents of the Rose Playhouse* (Manchester University Press, 1984; revised 1999)
- Peter Stallybrass, 'Worn Worlds: Clothes and Identity on the Renaissance Stage' in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge, 1996)
- Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry and William Ingram, *English Professional Theatre 1530–1660* (Cambridge, 2000).

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The main purpose of this edition is to make available again the text of the chief source for theatrical history between 1590 and 1604, Henslowe's *Diary*, and the fragments and manuscripts associated with it, in as convenient a form as possible. The monumental edition of 1904–8 by Sir Walter Greg has long been out of print and unobtainable; but his interpretation of the *Diary*, has taken its place as the basis of all studies of the Elizabethan theatre in the last fifty years, and was used extensively by E. K. Chambers in his *Elizabethan Stage* (1923). Chambers modified a few of Greg's conclusions, but the only general attempt to reassess the evidence in the *Diary*, so far as it relates to the structure of the Admiral's Men as a company in the period 1590–4, was made by T. W. Baldwin in his ingenious and rather too schematic book, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (1927), pp. 321–31; Baldwin did not accept Greg's view that Henslowe's arrangements with his company were exceptional in the period (see below, pp. xxix–xxxii), and emphasised the similarities between the customs followed in the conduct of various theatres (pp. 1–45), so that his book has an important bearing on the broader implications of the *Diary*. It is time, however, to reconsider the meaning of Henslowe's entries and Greg's detailed interpretation of them, and we hope that this new edition, based on a fresh transcript of the material, will encourage further scrutiny of the evidence. Some new possibilities of interpreting difficult entries are examined in the Introduction to this edition.

We are grateful to the Governors of Dulwich College for giving us permission to complete this edition, and to use the facilities of the College library. Mr W. S. Wright, the Librarian, has been most kind in giving us all the help in his power. Our thanks go also to Professor Allardyce Nicoll, with whom the idea of the edition was first discussed, and who put the resources of the Shakespeare Institute at our disposal, to Professor C. J. Sisson for his advice, to Professor Thomas B. Stroup, who provided us with a transcript of the notes written by E. K. Chambers in his copy of

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
Edited by R. A. Foakes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Greg's edition of the *Diary*, and to Mr Remington Patterson, who kindly communicated to us his independent discovery of the correct date of a document discussed on p. 299 below, namely Manuscripts, Volume III, Article 1. The skill and patience of the printer and publisher who have contributed much to the final shape of the edition. The Durham Colleges have materially assisted the progress of this work over several years with grants from their Research Fund.

R. A. F.
R. T. R.

DURHAM
July 1960

INTRODUCTION

I. HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The history of the manuscript is well known from Sir Walter Greg's account,⁽¹⁾ to which the following summary is heavily indebted. The book was first used by John Henslowe, the brother of Philip, to enter accounts relating to mining and smelting operations in Ashdown Forest during the years 1576–81. Possibly upon the death of John, which occurred before 1592,⁽²⁾ the book passed to Philip, who used it to record business matters and occasionally more private affairs until 1604, and thereafter for infrequent jottings until 1609. Later, no doubt at his death in 1616, the volume passed to Edward Alleyn, who had married Philip's step-daughter, and so eventually became part of the library of the College of God's Gift which Alleyn founded at Dulwich.

The book seems to have been first used for scholarly purposes by Edmond Malone, who printed portions of a transcript made of those sections he thought important in his *Historical Account of the English Stage* in 1790.⁽³⁾ Malone's transcript, which he collated with the original, and which contains some notes and corrections he made, was acquired by Dulwich College in 1895, and now reposes in the same library as the original. The manuscript was later used by J. P. Collier in preparing his *History of Dramatic Poetry*, and he reprinted the theatrical material in a separate edition of *Henslowe's Diary* (1845). The volume was described and a list of forgeries given in G. F. Warner's *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Muniments of Alleyn's College of God's Gift* (1881).⁽⁴⁾ Finally, in 1902 Sir Walter Greg obtained permission to prepare a new edition, which appeared in

(1) *Diary*, I, xiii–xiv.

(2) He predeceased Edmond, who died before 23 May 1592; *Diary*, II, 16–17.

(3) It is in vol. I, part II, pp. 288–329.

(4) Pp. 157–63; it is listed as MS. no. VII.

1904, and which was followed in 1908 by a second volume containing a detailed commentary and an interpretation of the material in the account-book.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The manuscript is a folio of 242 leaves, measuring approximately $13\frac{1}{4} \times 8$ inches; it was originally bound in a limp vellum wrapper which was inserted at the beginning when the volume was rebound. It is very well preserved, but has suffered a certain amount of mutilation; the edges of some leaves are frayed or torn, and a number of pages have been removed or partially cut out. It seems likely that most of 69 or 70 missing leaves were lost early in the book's history, and, as Greg noted,⁽¹⁾ the fact that accounts span several of the gaps with no apparent omissions suggests that these were present when Philip Henslowe began to use it. Probably little theatrical material was lost in this way.⁽²⁾

The absence of leaves is indicated by the original foliation, written in ink, and numbering the leaves from that end of the book used by John Henslowe; possibly they represent his numeration. The numbers run from 1 through to 100, and from 102 (altered to 101, as 103 is altered to 102, but 104 left standing, so that 103 is simply omitted) to 308: and the following leaves are missing according to this numeration; the modern foliation is given in brackets: 3 leaves at the beginning, before 6 (f. 236v), where only two leaves (ff. 237, 238) remain, both lacking numbers; 8 (between f. 234 and f. 235); 33 (between f. 210 and f. 211); 40-2 (between f. 204 and f. 205); 47 (between f. 200 and f. 201); 63 (between f. 185 and f. 186); 72 (between f. 177 and f. 178); 78 (between f. 172 and f. 173); 80 (between f. 171 and f. 172); 87 (between f. 165 and f. 164); 98 (between f. 154 and f. 155); 111 (between f. 143 and f. 144); 116 (between f. 139 and f. 140); 124 (between f. 132 and f. 133); 128 (between f. 129 and f. 130); 132-3 (between f. 126 and f. 127); 135, 139-41, 143-4 (these blank leaves were not numbered by Warner); 147 (between f. 123

(1) *Loc. cit.* p. xvii.

(2) It is possible that some pawn accounts are lost, before f. 55, where they begin abruptly; in the original foliation f. 54v is 20045, f. 55v is 20041, so some leaves are missing here.

and f. 124); 150–2 (between f. 121 and f. 122); 154–6 (between f. 120 and f. 121); 167–8 (between f. 110 and f. 111); 175–7 (between f. 104 and f. 105); 181–2 (between f. 101 and f. 102); 185–6 (between f. 99 and f. 100); 188 (between f. 98 and f. 99); 196–7 (between f. 91 and f. 92); 1 leaf between 205 and 208 (between f. 82 and f. 84; the numbered corner is missing from f. 83); 213 (between f. 77 and f. 78); 218 (between f. 73 and f. 74); 221 (between f. 71 and f. 72); 236–8 (between f. 57 and f. 58); 242–4 (between f. 54 and f. 55); 251 (between f. 48 and f. 49); 255 (between f. 45 and f. 46); 1 leaf between 269 and 273 (f. 29 and f. 32), where the remaining leaves (ff. 30, 31) have lost numbered corners; 277 (between f. 25 and f. 26); 281 (between f. 22 and f. 23); 285 (between f. 19 and f. 20); 288 (between f. 17 and f. 18); 295 (between f. 11 and f. 12); 300–1 (between f. 7 and f. 8); 306 (between f. 3 and f. 4). A leaf may also be missing after the last numbered one (308; f. 2), for if, as Greg suggests,⁽¹⁾ f. 1, which has lost its old number, is the original last leaf, as the scrawls on it may indicate, then it should have an even number (?310), and at least one leaf must be lacking here. One other leaf, f. 167, is not so far accounted for; this was at some time inserted in the volume, and since it is rather larger than the other leaves, so that one edge has had to be folded in, it cannot ever have been part of the book. But, as Greg notes, it may always have lain folded inside the *Diary*, for it contains on one side mining accounts, and on the other, some words in Philip Henslowe's hand.

The numbering is a little strange, for when the scribe reached 100, he simply retained this figure, and began again at 1, so that pages have numbers like 10025 or 20078. These numbers appear upside down in the bottom left corner of each leaf as the manuscript was used for his main entries by Philip Henslowe. The present transcript follows the modern foliation inserted in pencil in accordance with his use of the book, but for this main sequence of theatrical entries (section 2), the original foliation is given too, as evidence of what leaves are missing.

A number of mutilations are comparatively recent, and have

(1) *Diary*, I, xvii.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

probably occurred since Malone had possession of the book. Several scholars have worked with it, and doubtless many people have had access to it. It is clear that several excisions have been made for the sake of the signatures on them of well-known dramatists, and eleven fragments of the account-book have been traced.⁽¹⁾ Perhaps more are in existence; excisions from the following leaves remain unaccounted for: ff. 5, 12, 29, 30, 31, 33, 60, 83, 88, 111, 114, 132, 187, 189, 190, 191, 199, 200, 206, 207, 208, 209, 228, 229, 231, 236.

3. CONTENTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

It seems most convenient to divide the contents into four groups of items for the purpose of this Introduction, and to consider them not in the order in which they are printed in this edition, but in such a way that comments on the theatrical accounts are not separated from the introductory note on the other theatrical entries (in fragments from the *Diary*, and supplementary manuscripts) which are included in the edition. For this reason, the theatrical accounts are dealt with last of all. First are the mining accounts, which belong to a time prior to Philip Henslowe's ownership and use of the volume; these, which Greg described as forestry accounts, were omitted from his reprint of the manuscript, and although they are not included here, a description of them is given because of their intrinsic interest as a detailed record of operations in iron-smelting at an early period, and also because they provide further knowledge of the Henslowe family, and of Philip's background. Secondly, there are Philip's notes of private matters of various kinds, ranging from the buying of property to recipes for the alleviation of various diseases. Like the mining accounts, these have much intrinsic interest, and also throw light on Henslowe's personal relationships. A third group consists of the pawn accounts, which relate to a business carried on, it seems, largely through agents, though most of the transactions are recorded in the book in Philip Henslowe's hand. Most of these accounts were omitted from Greg's reprint, and are now given in full for the first time. Again, they have an interest in their own right, but may, in

(1) See below, pp. 265-9.

addition, have a relation to the theatre; their significance is discussed further below. Finally, the major part of Philip's entries concern his theatrical affairs, chiefly his financial relationship with companies of players, principally the Admiral's Men, and accounts relating to the building and maintenance of the theatres in which he was interested.

4. THE MINING ACCOUNTS

These accounts occupy chiefly what, in Warner's foliation, are the verso pages from f. 237v to f. 137v, though there are many blank leaves; as John Henslowe used the book, these would, of course, have been recto pages. Since f. 137v is numbered 10019 (i.e. 119), it can be inferred that eighteen leaves are missing from this section, but it is very doubtful whether anything of consequence is lost. Philip Henslowe occasionally used blank pages, or spaces between old entries, to add items of his business, and also entered various theatrical reckonings on the first few versos (rectos for him) at this end of the book.

The mining accounts extend in time from January 1576 to 10 December 1580 or 1581. However, there are only twelve entries dated specifically in 1576, none in 1579, one in 1580, and one in 1581, which may be 1580. The bulk of the dated accounts relate to 1577 and 1578, and it may be conjectured that most of the undated entries belong also to this period. They are concerned mainly with operations in the Ashdown Forest in Sussex, particularly in the area extending for some miles around Buxted and Maresfield, north of Lewes and south-east of East Grinstead. The father of John and Philip Henslowe was master of the game in the forest and at Brill Park,⁽¹⁾ and it was perhaps natural for one of the sons at least to find an occupation in that area. In the earliest accounts of 1576 and in 1577 John seems to be acting as an agent for his brother-in-law Ralph Hogg, who had married his sister Margaret; for he is to be found reckoning up moneys which he has delivered to 'my bryther hogg', and assessing the debts to him of a miner, Gilbert Ford. Later on this relationship may have been modified, for while John Henslowe continues, as it

(1) *Diary*, II, 1-2.

seems, to act as general payee of miners and cutters, and receiver of their goods, Hogg himself, at times, becomes the intermediary in payments, and in 1578 entries appear of the form, 'More my bryther payd ffor hem. . . Mor my bryther must Anser for hem'. Perhaps by this time John had achieved a partnership with Ralph Hogg; or possibly he remained a kind of financial manager for the latter, who was a large-scale ironfounder,⁽¹⁾ in his dealings with his employees and customers.

Employees is not an accurate term by which to describe the 190 or so people mentioned in these accounts, for they were nearly all free agents as far as the evidence shows, being paid by piece-rates for work actually performed, or deliveries made. Five main trades are involved, though many of the workmen seem to have been adept at more than one. First, as perhaps occupying more space than the others, is that of cutting wood in various parts of the forest, chiefly at Log Hill, the Swynfall, names which seem to have fallen out of use, at Harne Gate, probably the modern Horney Gate and Common just outside Maresfield, Echen Wood, the modern Etchingwood, a mile from Buxted, and 'Ryes Bryge', perhaps to be identified with Rice Bridge, about ten miles west of Buxted. The wood cut is described specifically on occasion by one of six names, 'log wood', 'top wood', 'stub' or 'stubble' wood, 'chux', 'bronds', and 'chepes'. It seems clear that log wood and top wood were used to make charcoal, as payments for 'Collynge at loge heyll tope wodd' and 'colling in the Swynffall of logge wodd' indicate. It seems likely that where the kind of wood is not specified, it is one of these two that is meant, and that it was used to make charcoal, the main fuel of the smelting furnaces. The 'chux', presumably chucks or chipped logs, 'bronds', and 'chepes' or chippings were probably used directly as fuel, since the accounts suggest that these were brought to the furnaces in the same way as coals.

The second trade, also a forest occupation, is 'collyng', or coaling, making charcoal from cut wood. The third, the trade of mining, produced the other raw material necessary for making iron goods,

(1) See Ernest Straker, *Walden Iron* (1931), especially pp. 147–52, 398–9.

the ore. The main areas of mining were in Etchingwood, at the 'Baye', that is, Oldlands, about four miles north of Buxted, and on the land of a certain Angell. One or two of the miners had their own ground to work. The next trade, that of hauling, was involved with the other three, cutting (for though charcoal was often made on the site where the wood was cut, there are payments for transport of wood, especially to Log Hill, which seems to have been a centre of charcoal-making), coaling, and mining. In consequence, a large part of the accounts record payments made for the carriage of materials, usually to the furnaces of Langley, Marshalls, the name of a manor-house owned by Hogg, and Hyndoll, which may be a person, or perhaps identifiable with the place known as Hendall Wood. Lastly, John Henslowe records payments for the founding of iron, making moulds, blowing the furnace, pulling the bellows, filling the founds, cleaning the chimneys, beating shot, and other tasks connected with the furnaces.

There are some indications of the way in which the workmen operated. A number combined two or more trades, cutting and hauling, or mining and hauling, but certain men seem to have specialised in their trade. So James Alcock, 'Alcoke the collier', and a certain Gyllat, were charcoal makers who sent their coals out of the forest by a number of different carriers. These two were perhaps fairly important and prosperous men, and in one entry is noted the delivery of a ton of iron to them; Alcoke had a partner, Giles the collier, and there is mention of Gyllat's son, so that they were not working alone. Other partnerships are indicated; Gilbert Ford, a miner, had at least two partners, William Collin and John Paccom, and Andrew Humphreys and Harry Curd were partners in cutting wood. Possibly a more complicated partnership is revealed occasionally; Thomas Bartlet, a cutter, had two associates: Thomas Sanders, who is also named as John a Ford's partner, and 'Parssons man', who may be connected with John Parson, partner of Thomas Penfold. It is clear that the colliers, miners and cutters worked in small groups, partnerships of two or more.

Many of them were free agents, selling their services and goods, and, as noted above, some miners owned their own workings. But

there is one entry recording payment of a half year's wages to Peter Bartholomew of Lewes, and there may have been other hired servants. Occasionally, too, there is reference to more powerful figures in the background; so John Paccom, named as partner in mining with Gilbert Ford, is elsewhere described as 'S^ruant to M^r John Warunte', possibly a landowner. Several men are paid for mining in Angell's land, and Lord Buckhurst is mentioned as the owner of Ashdown Forest, so that some of the men may have been dependents of these in some sense. However, they are paid for the work they do, generally by John Henslowe.

Further connections between workmen can be traced in the frequent payments to one on behalf of another; the most complicated of these transactions is the payment to 'Symans yemans wyddow' on behalf of Giles, James Alcock's partner. Sometimes wives or fathers are paid on behalf of men, and once there is specific mention of the wife of the founder, Peter Bartholomew, being employed in carrying coals, so that the womenfolk sometimes worked also at what must have been heavy labour.

Among the peripheral figures who enter into John Henslowe's dealings are a number of tradesmen of a different kind. One or two, like John a Wood the miller, who passes payment for John Henslowe to John Geffere, a charcoal-maker, or John a Smith, the carpenter of Blackboys, who turned his hand to haulage, perhaps while business was slack, enter very briefly. Several are specialist tradesmen, whose work was connected with mining and smelting, like Alcock the smith, Roger Sherman the 'hamar man', and John Dyne the 'ffyller' of founds. Among others named are Paris, a butcher, William Wallington the butcher and Elliot the mercer of Uckfield, and the miller at Barkham. It is just possible that butchers and millers had to do with the occasional payments in kind for work; meat is not mentioned in this connection, but payment sometimes takes the form of a hundredweight or a barrel of herring, or a quarter of wheat. Other payments in kind include a load of hay, and amounts of iron, ranging from a hundredweight to a ton.

The controller of all these operations seems to have been Ralph Hogg, who dealt in iron, and more specifically in guns or 'pesses'

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

(pieces) and shot. John Henslowe was his financial manager or partner, and kept accounts. Two other men, George Kenyon and Samson Colstokes, also kept account-books. The first may have shared some of John Henslowe's labours; his book seems to have duplicated John's occasionally, and once he is recorded as acting as payee on behalf of John Henslowe. The second appears to have been an agent for Lord Buckhurst. Although Ralph Hogg dealt directly in iron, presumably pig-iron, his large-scale business was in shot and guns. The biggest transaction listed is the sale to Sir Thomas Griffin and Mr Turberville at Lewes of 41 tons of demi-cannon shot at a price of over £300; these two were acting for the Earl of Warwick, who was Master of the Ordnance at this time (1576). A buyer on a smaller scale was a Mr Harman of Lewes, who paid for 'pesses wth Rynges Appon ther nosse', guns with rings presumably at the muzzle.⁽¹⁾ Other deals involve a certain Sharples, agent for Turberville, Thomas Jansson of London, and a Mr Leche. The last-named was an agent of Lord Buckhurst, and it is not clear why John Henslowe carried money to him in London at one time, and took delivery of wood from him in Ashdown Forest at another. One interesting note in connection with Hogg's business is a stocktaking of March 1577 which lists all the round shot of his remaining with his brother, Brian Hogg, a total of 2338 cannon balls of various sizes. His dealings in London took there not only John Henslowe, but some of the hauliers too, who were evidently not all mere country labourers, although some local Sussex names, such as Sleche, do appear.

Two miscellaneous items among these accounts have connections with material in the *Diary*. An undated note of the sale of some sheep to 'M^r Langworth' almost certainly belongs to the period of the mining accounts, for it contains a reference to 'my Bryther', Ralph Hogg; it provides a link between the Henslowes and the Langworths of Brill, Sussex, at this early time. Philip Henslowe later had many dealings with Arthur Langworth, who seems to have been his close friend. In 1578 John Henslowe recorded the payment of

(1) *O.E.D.* records 'nose' (*sb.* 12b) as meaning only the muzzle of a gun; the first example cited is of 1598. For Harman, who shipped ordnance to London, see Straker, *op. cit.* p. 150.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

rent to a Mr Welles; this is perhaps the same person as the Robert Wells who was later, in 1592–3, to cause so much trouble over the transfer of a property called Lockyers (*Diary*, ff. 41, 122v–124, 127v, and Dulwich MSS., vol. III, article 6). Eventually Philip Henslowe was driven to seek an interview with Lord Buckhurst about the matter (*Diary*, ff. 41, 123). A further personal note among these accounts lists the prices of shoes for members of Ralph Hogg's family; beside it is written the following snatch of verse:

The mi'ors of mighte
 & patterns of Loue
 Reste heare day & nyghte
 and Can not remoue

5. PHILIP HENSLOWE'S PRIVATE AFFAIRS

The majority of the miscellaneous items concern loans made by Henslowe to many people, friends like Arthur Langworth, family, for instance his nephew Francis Henslowe, players and a variety of other people. Occasionally the purpose of the loan is specified, and this can be of interest; so, for instance, he lent money to Thomas Heywood to buy silk garters (f. 114), provided funds to enable Mrs Birde to release her husband from gaol, and to release Chettle from arrest (f. 62). There are also records of payments of rent, and some lists of his tenants in 1602 (ff. 177v–178). Of the more personal transactions recorded, several relate to affairs or property in Sussex: evidently Philip kept up his connections there, acquiring the property of 'Locyers' in Buxted in 1593⁽¹⁾ (f. 128; see also below, p. xli), selling the property of his dead sister-in-law to Langworth, and having dealings with Thomas Chaloner (ff. 19, 124), who became the uncle by marriage of Arthur Langworth's son John, and left him his property as his heir and nephew.⁽²⁾ Philip also acted as executor

(1) In the *Sussex Manors, Advowsons, Etc. Recorded in the Feet of Fines* (Sussex Record Society, vol. xx, 1915), 2 vols., II, 335, is recorded a suit of 1592 between Arthur Langworth, Rose his wife, and John Langworth on the one party, and John and Robert Welles on the other, relating to tenements in Buxted; perhaps Henslowe and Langworth, who is known to have lived at Ringmer, had mutual interests in Buxted. As noted above, John Henslowe had paid rent to a Mr Welles.

(2) When Arthur died his son John intended to marry Mary Chaloner, which he evidently did; see *Notes of Post Mortem Inquisitions*, ed. F. W. T. Attree (Sussex Record Society, vol. xiv, 1912), pp. 139, 49.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition

Edited by R. A. Foakes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

on behalf of Edmund Henslowe's children in Sussex (f. 72). A few entries reflect interests of Philip's outside the normal range of his dealings; so, for instance, he considered buying a farm in Gloucestershire (f. 111 v), and invested in a starch business (f. 204). Other items include some rather horrifying remedies for diseases and hurts, and miscellaneous notes concerning such matters as sending his horse out to grass, and paying the charges for his soldier Peter, including fitting him out with equipment and with drinking money (ff. 20, 21). The curious item on f. 159, relating to a bargain between E. Alleyn and T. Lawrence regarding the bringing by water of the wood of eleven trees, may relate to one of the two wharfs connected with Henslowe's name,⁽¹⁾ but whether the wood came from Sussex property it is impossible to say.

6. THE PAWN ACCOUNTS

There are three sets of pawn accounts, on ff. 55–61, 73–81 and 133–6. The first extend from 16 January 1593 to 19 December 1593 on f. 60, and are followed by two additional entries of 14 February and 18 May 1594. In most cases the form of entry is 'Lent unto Frances Hensley upon a . . .', indicating that he was acting as an intermediary, and that Philip advanced money to him on goods deposited by customers. The second set, comprising entries from 10 December 1593 to 22 January 1595, is clearly a continuation of the first; but Francis Henslowe drops out after December 1593, and Philip Henslowe records elsewhere (f. 2v) the loan of £15 to him in May 1594⁽²⁾ to buy a share in the Queen's Men, so presumably Francis took up acting at this time. Another entry, on f. 6, noting loans totalling 55s. to Francis in January 1593 may have recorded money advanced to set him up in the pawn business, in which his career seems to have lasted a little more than a year. Thereafter Philip may have carried on the business himself for a time, but the evidence is uncertain. A Goody Watson becomes prominent midway through this set of entries, and may have been an agent for him, but many entries continue to list names of customers with whom he possibly

(1) Greg, *Diary*, II, 28.

(2) The text has '1593', but see Chambers, *E.S.* II, 114.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition

Edited by R. A. Foakes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

dealt directly. The third set is headed 'm^s grantes Recknyng 1593', and the first page contains accounts dating from 17 January 1593/4 to March 1594. The second page goes back to 26 March 1593, and thenceforward the entries record loans made at intervals of from two days to several months, until 12 April 1596. The first page possibly refers to dealings by an agent, Mrs Grant, whom Philip employed in addition to Francis; she is not mentioned in the second set, which extends through and beyond the same period of time. The remainder of this third set, which overlaps both the first and second sets in time, frequently mentions Anne No(c)kes, who also seems to have acted as an agent. It would therefore appear that Philip Henslowe carried on a pawn business employing several agents from January 1593 until April 1596. There is no certain evidence that it ceased at this time; it is conceivable that it began in 1593 as a means of finding employment for Francis, his nephew.⁽¹⁾

The pawn accounts have considerable human interest. The objects pawned range from clothes and household linen to a set of silver buttons, a pint pot, a lease, a silver whistle, an 'edward angell', and one odd collection of objects: a looking-glass, a comb, a pair of scissors, three ear-pickers and a pair of small compasses. Several women were reduced to pawning wedding-rings, and there is a note at once pathetic and ironic about the posies or mottoes recorded as being on some of them, for instance, on f. 59, 'hope helpeth hevenes' (i.e. heaviness), on f. 77v, 'as thow haste vowed vnto me so ame I thine vntell I die', and on f. 80v, 'god hath Apoynted I ame content'.

The names of a considerable number of customers are given, most of them women. Occasionally there is an indication of their social standing, in descriptions such as butchers' wives, the woman who sells raisins, a tailor's wife, the midwife's daughter. A number of men also figure in the accounts, and one or two of these were of higher rank. The most interesting name is that of 'my lord Burte' (f. 76v, 77v), by whom Greg thinks Henslowe may just possibly

(1) A letter from him to Philip asking for assistance in order to obtain his release from the Wood Street Counter (MSS. III, 5; see below, p. 300) must have been written before 23 May 1592, and is the only earlier notice of him so far found.

have meant Baron Willoughby, whose family name was Bertie.⁽¹⁾ An alternative identification might be William Herbert, later Earl of Pembroke; this may seem a remote possibility, since he was born in 1580, but he was old enough to be betrothed in 1595, and E. K. Chambers is inclined to regard him as the likeliest candidate for identification with 'W.H.', the only begetter of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*.⁽²⁾ In March and June 1593 doublets and hose of 'w^m harbutes', or 'William harbarte' were pawned, and in both cases a marginal entry records payment of interest up to 16 December 1593 (ff. 55v, 58). In January 1593/4 a loan was made on articles of clothing, two of which were redeemed as 'my lords' on 18 May (f. 74v); further loans on a doublet of 'my lord Burtes man' and a cloak of 'my lord Burtes' were made in March and April 1594 (ff. 76v, 77v). The entries make no connection between William Herbert and my lord 'Burte', but it is possible that the same person is meant.⁽³⁾

Two loans are made on a lease and a pair of venetians of Mr Dorington (ff. 73v, 134), who may be the same John Dorrington, later Sir John, who was to become Master of the Game of Bears, Bulls and Mastiff Dogs in August 1598, and a tenant of Henslowe's (f. 151),⁽⁴⁾ though in 1598 Henslowe referred to him as 'one M^r Dorington'.⁽⁵⁾ Other interesting names include those of a ship's captain, Captain Swan, who pawned his sea-gown, and a certain Captain Hannam, who deposited sheets and other linen in January and February 1593/4 (ff. 75, 76). This provides a tenuous and early link between the financier of the Admiral's Men, for whom both Jonson and Dekker were to write, and a Captain Hannam, and it is quite conceivable that this is the same 'honest Captain *Hannam*' whom Dekker accused Jonson of imitating as *Tucca* in his *Poetaster*.⁽⁶⁾

(1) *Diary*, II, 246–7.

(2) *William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems* (2 vols., 1930), I, 565–7.

(3) 'My lord Burte' also appears in the *Diary* (f. 3v) as owing money to Francis Henslowe in June 1595.

(4) See *Diary*, II, 261–2.

(5) See Warner, *Catalogue*, p. 65.

(6) 'To the World', preface to *Satiromastix* (1602), in *Dramatic Works*, ed. Fredson Bowers, vol. I (1953), pp. 309–10.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

7. THE THEATRICAL ACCOUNTS

These consist of four types of entries.⁽¹⁾ The first lists the daily receipts, or that portion of the daily receipts, which Henslowe took from performances at his theatres between 19 February 1591/2 and 5 November 1597. There are several breaks in the sequence of performances, and the form of entry was twice changed. The following are typical forms:

Until 16 May 1594:
 ne—Rd at harey the vj the 3 of marche 1591. iij^{li} xvj^s 8^d
3 June 1594 until 22 January 1596/7:
 ¶28 of novemb3 1595 ne—Rd at harey the v iij^{li} vjs
24 January 1596/7 until 5 November 1597:
 Aprelle 1597 1 tt at blinde beger 00 05 03 – 00 – 00

After this time daily entries cease, and there are records for various periods of time of weekly receipts from the galleries and payments received from the company; these continue until July 1600 (f. 62v).⁽²⁾

The second type of entry relates to expenditure on behalf of the companies of Admiral's or Worcester's Men from 21 October 1597, and continues with many breaks until 1604; these accounts are closed out with a final reckoning casting up 'all the acowntes from the begininge of the world' on 14 March 1604 (f. 110). The form of entry, typically 'Lent (Paid) unto...at the appointment of the company (or some officer of the company)', shows that these were loans made on behalf of the company, for which Henslowe was acting as banker and moneylender, and periodically he totals up their debt to him. A third group of entries affords detailed lists of payments Henslowe made in connection with the building and repair of two theatres in which he had an interest, successively the Rose and the Fortune. Lastly, there remains a mass of notes of many kinds, relating to such matters as the hiring of actors, payments to the

(1) *Diary*, I, xxii–xxiii.

(2) There are, however, just two entries of October 1600 (f. 83) which repeat the form of the earlier daily entries. With these the notes of takings for three days at the Fortune and Beargarden in 1608 (ff. 127, 126v) should perhaps be listed.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Master of the Revels, various legal proceedings and other miscellaneous transactions.

This material, supplemented by other items from among the papers and muniments in the collection at Dulwich, enabled W. W. Greg to reconstruct a detailed history of Henslowe's relations with theatrical companies and the theatres they worked in, and so to amplify considerably the history of the stage between 1584 and 1613. Indeed, Greg's account in the *Diary*, II (1908), has remained one of the main bases for the discussion of the theatrical history of this period, and his findings were used throughout E. K. Chambers's *Elizabethan Stage* (1923), and in particular, were embodied in the sections on the Admiral's Men, the theatres, and the economics of acting.⁽¹⁾ This is not the place to attempt further analysis of the material, except so much as is necessary to draw attention to the need for further close scrutiny of the evidence the volume offers. For brilliant as is Greg's commentary, it includes some doubtful assumptions and dubious interpretations, and has come to be treated not merely with the great respect it deserves, but as an ultimate authority on matters relating to the Admiral's Men.⁽²⁾

One assumption, which Greg took over from Fleay and passed on, was the view of Henslowe as 'an illiterate moneyed man... who regarded art as a subject for exploitation', and who was ignorant of stage management and of dramatic literature; his company was contrasted with the Chamberlain's Men, who were 'managed by the housekeepers or principal sharers, whose interest was that of the whole company'.⁽³⁾ It might be supposed that the Chamberlain's Men were also interested in making money out of art, but the view stemming from Fleay and Greg was taken up and developed at length by R. B. Sharpe in his *The Real War of the Theatres* (Boston, 1935). He analysed the repertory of the Admiral's Men between 1594 and 1603, compared it with that of the Chamberlain's Men, and sought to show that the former company chose to make a 'prole-

(1) See especially I, 358 ff.; II, 128–240 and 405 ff.

(2) It should be noted that E. K. Chambers did not accept all Greg's conclusions, and stated his main differences in a review of the *Diary*, *Modern Language Rev.* IV (1909), 407–13; and that Greg has revised some of his views, as may be best seen in his *Dramatic Documents* (1931).

(3) *Diary*, II, 112, 113, citing Fleay.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

tarian appeal' to a lower-class audience, purveying romance, plays on biblical themes, domestic crime plays, and other kinds alien to the fashionable gallants and ladies whom he supposes to have frequented the Globe in anticipation of a kind of Third Programme. The difficulty with his argument is twofold; the known repertory of the Chamberlain's Men, apart from Shakespeare's plays, is very slight and affords no sufficient body of evidence for comparison; and the whole thesis is based on a conception of Henslowe as 'an ignorant man, whose spelling bears witness to a complete lack of acquaintance with literature'.⁽¹⁾ It is true that Henslowe's spellings are sometimes odd, but they are little stranger than those of many Elizabethan writers.

The question of Henslowe's literacy would not be important if it had not led to other beliefs. Greg noted some irregularities on Henslowe's part, for instance, that he occasionally carried over old-style year-dates well after 25 March, writing for example April 1591 when the true date was 1592 (ff. 7–7v). He also observed some errors of dating, especially in the daily entries of receipts,⁽²⁾ and having once caught Henslowe out, he, and other scholars since, have been the more ready to accuse him of other mistakes; the belief in Henslowe's illiteracy has made it easier to regard discrepancies in the accounts as errors on his part. Greg, for instance, claimed that whenever the lines dividing daily receipts into weekly groups do not show performances on weekdays and the omission of Sunday there is a mistake, and also, that when the letters 'ne' appear against a play known to be old and not newly revived, 'the one or two cases not thus covered are apparently slips on Henslowe's part'.⁽³⁾ He may be right about both points, but it is worth drawing attention to other possible interpretations of the evidence.

His correction of dates makes sense, but it should be observed that the 'weekly' groups range from one to ten performances, and though the norm is six (108 groups), there are twenty-five groups of five performances, nine of four, and eleven of three. As the accounts now stand, at least one lined entry appears against every day of the

(1) *The Real War of the Theatres*, p. 5.

(2) See *Diary*, II, 116, 46–7, 324–7.

(3) *Diary*, II, 324–7 and 148.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-52402-5 - Henslowe's Diary, Second Edition
 Edited by R. A. Foakes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

week; and again, while the norm is Monday (ninety-one times), lines appear against Sunday dates on thirty occasions. In some instances, as where there is a duplication of a date or dates, for example the repetition of 6 October on f. 13, an error on Henslowe's part is almost certain; but Greg's corrections also include the emendation of a date at the head of a sequence, as on f. 8 v, where Henslowe wrote 'begninge the 27 of desembꝝ', a date which Greg thinks should be 26 December; the correction of dates in straightforward runs, such as 19 December (f. 25 v), which he claims should be 18 December; and one or two corrections of dates revised by Henslowe himself, such as a Sunday, 28 September 1595 (f. 13), altered by Henslowe from 27 September, which Greg would correct to Monday, 29 September. It is true that from about 1583 onwards the performance of plays on Sundays seems to have been prohibited, but the regulation was certainly neglected in 1587 and 1591,⁽¹⁾ and Greg's claim that his 'corrections are to all practical intents certain'⁽²⁾ should not perhaps be accepted too easily. It assumes, in any case, what is perhaps not certain, that Henslowe made his entries regularly from day to day.

Two other factors, which Greg did not consider, need to be taken into account here. First, Henslowe sometimes seems to have written a column of dates before entering titles and receipts opposite them (cf. f. 9 v, note 2, p. 23, and f. 12 v, note 5, p. 30); on f. 9 v dates and titles eventually fall completely out of alignment, and after trying to restore order by drawing a connecting line between dates and entries, he gave up at 5 August, and simply levelled off the entries at this point; two titles, *galiaso* and *the Jewe of malta* are both connected by lines to this date.⁽³⁾ If this is a correct interpretation of what Henslowe did on this page, it suggests that individual dates may not have been of much significance to him, and also that entries may not necessarily have been made from day to day on the dates written, but possibly in batches. In other words, the date opposite a title may not

(1) Chambers, *E.S.* I, 314–15.

(2) *Diary*, II, 324; they were accepted by Chambers, *E.S.* II, 142; I, 314–15.

(3) Greg printed the second of these plays as unattached to a date, and merely noted, 'There is some confusion among the entries at this point' (*Diary*, I, 18, 220); see Plate II.