Walter Burre’s *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*
According to its publisher Walter Burre, when The Knight of the Burning Pestle was first staged by the Children of Blackfriars in 1607, the audience "utterly rejected it," and seemingly since then critics have debated the reasons for the play’s failure. But, surprisingly, no one has paused to wonder why it is that critics have a text to discuss in the first place. Considering that the natural market for printed plays must have consisted, at least in part, of those who had seen the play performed, what convinced Burre, six years later, to take the substantial financial risk of printing such an unpopular play? In a hypothetical print run of seven hundred copies, Burre would have had to lay out almost nine pounds and could have made a profit of six pounds if he sold out the entire run, with each copy of the play selling for seven pence retail. But no publisher of plays could expect a quick or guaranteed return on his money. Not one play in five, according to Peter Blayney, returned a publisher’s investment within five years, not one in twenty in the first year. Burre’s printing, then, was indeed a risk, but I believe it was a calculated one, based on his confidence, learned through the success of...
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2. As Peter Blayney notes, “the belief that all play quartos always cost 6d. is another common fallacy.” Peter Blayney, “The Publication of Playbooks,” in A New History of Early English Drama, ed. John Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York, 1997), p. 422 n.61. My calculations are based on the formula explained at length by Blayney (pp. 405–13). Where he uses a run of 800, I have chosen 700 given the questions about The Knight’s viability. A press run smaller than 700 for The Knight becomes less likely; one of 600 copies, for example, would have earned Burre half a pound less, while necessitating a retail price of 7½ pence, making it that much harder to sell. The profit of £6 is based on a ten-year sell-out and is determined by subtracting storage costs from the net profit of £6 18s. 3d. which Burre would have earned if the run sold out immediately. Print runs are of course notoriously difficult to determine, and my estimate is obviously only an educated guess, derived from the more educated guesses of Blayney. But the exact figures are not important here; I merely want to establish that a publication of The Knight, or any other play for that matter, was hardly the cash cow that earlier scholars may have assumed.
his earlier dramatic publications, that he could exploit a new and impor-
tant cultural division in the theatrical market. Print (as opposed to the
stage) allowed him more precisely to target his imagined audience, and
the techniques that enabled him to attract his buyers could turn a failed
stage play like The Knight into a successful publication.

While the theater audience may have spurned it, Robert Keysar, one
of the managers of the company and the dedicatee of Burre's publication,
seemingly thought the play worthy, for he evidently held onto his copy of
The Knight for four years after its failure on stage, until handing it over to
Burre in 1611. Perhaps Keysar was genuinely "moued both to relieue and
cheri~h" a play that he felt had been unfairly condemned in the theater,
but as a practical businessman he probably evaluated its worth more by
the pounds he could earn from its sale than by its aesthetic merits. But
why might he have thought Burre a likely buyer? Of course, Keysar may
have simply shopped the manuscript around until he happened upon a
willing publisher, but it is interesting to note that if he in fact paused to
consider his options, Burre would have seemed ideal.

For one thing, Burre published plays, and by contemporary standards
he published them regularly. Over his twenty-four-year career, Burre
published eight new plays, and given that on average in any one year only
six new plays were published, Burre's total is quite high. Further, 17% of

4. In his publisher's epistle to the 1613 first edition of the play, Burre writes that the play was
saved from oblivion by Keysar, who "sent it to mee, yet [the play] being an infant and somewhat
ragged, I have fostred it priuately in my bosome these two years" (sig. A2, emphasis mine). What no
one seems to have noticed is the striking coincidence that in the very year Burre reports receiving
the playbook for The Knight from him, Keysar seems to have abandoned the theater. William
Ingram reports a lawsuit from 1613 in which "Alexander Fryer, a mercer, claimed that for two years
he had been working with Keysar 'in the buyinge and sellinge of certen wares and Comodeties' out
of Keysar's shop in St. Bride's parish": William Ingram, "Robert Keysar, Playhouse Speculator," Shakes-
peare Quarterly 37 (1986), 482. The comment suggests that at least by 1611 Keysar had left
theatrical management to go into the cloth trade. Perhaps Keysar, who as manager of the company
would have had access to and at least some control over its dramatic copy, decided to earn a few
more pounds from this position by selling off the copy upon leaving the company.


6. Keysar was a goldsmith, well-known as a financier, and his interest in the Blackfriars com-
pany, as Ingram writes (p. 476), "seemed to be largely if not wholly financial."

7. Blayney, p. 412. Blayney derives the average of six new plays a year from Greg, excluding "all
masques, pageants and entertainments, closet and academic plays, Latin plays and translations pub-
lished as literary texts" (p. 384) but including such borderline cases as Summer's Last Will and
Testament (p. 416 n.2). All of Burre's plays would therefore be included in his count. Some impres-
sion of these numbers may be gotten by noting that, if all publishers in England brought out plays as
frequently as Burre, there would have to have been fewer than 18 publishers in the country, given the
total number of plays published. In fact, according to the index in the third volume of the STC, in
1605 there were around 70 people regularly appearing on imprints as having books printed "for"
them, the usual indication of publisher. Even given that some of the people in the STC index may
have been publishing items together, and that it is difficult in the period to distinguish between pub-
lishers and booksellers, Burre's rate of dramatic publication must still have been far above average.
his total publications were dramas, compared to the overall average for the two decades during which he was working of 1% to 2%. By the time the copy of The Knight had changed hands in 1611, Burre had published either four or five of his eight plays, depending on when that year his edition of Jonson’s Catiline his Conspiracy appeared.

If we can trust Burre’s epistle, Keysar believed that The Knight failed because those at the theater “for want of judgement, or not understanding the priy marke of Ironic about it . . . vitterely reiecte it.” Keysar, however, salvaged the play from “perpetually obliuion . . . out of [his] direct antipathy to ingratitude” and his “judgement, understanding, and singular loue to good wits.” The same hostility shown in the play toward the aesthetically naive George and Nell appears in the prefatory comments; the play is “priy,” not for “any vulgar braine” but rather for “good wits,” all pointing to a production that, in its producers’ minds at least, went over the heads of the multitude present at the theater (sig. A2).

The imagined audience here is similar to the “select” audience that Michael Neill sees in the later Caroline indoor theater. This select group of Wits represents a cultural division, rather than a purely economic one, that sees itself as above and removed from the “vulgar braines” of ordinary English theatergoers and of English society at large. As such, it is part of the movement, which Keith Wrightson has traced, away from a definition of gentility based on military function, land ownership, or blood, and toward a gentility of “breeding,” a gentility of style rather than status. But once style becomes the criterion for gentility, gentility becomes a performance; mobility, therefore, becomes only more possible, and the delineation of the cultural boundaries of various social groups becomes even more necessary and more frantic. The group of “good wits” invoked in Burre’s epistle represents one of these new social cliques, seeking to redefine gentility in its own image and to ward off the incursions of those who would try to imitate its style (although in fact its very understanding

8. Blayney, p. 385. Blayney’s playbook figure includes only new plays, while the figure for total books printed includes reprints, but as he says “it should nevertheless be obvious that printed plays never accounted for a very significant fraction of the trade in English books.”

9. Michael Neill, “‘Wits most accomplished Senate’: The Audience of Caroline Private Theaters,” Studies in English Literature 18 (1978), 341–60. I have adopted Neill’s term because it lacks the class associations of “gentle” or “elite”—for this rift was not along strictly economic lines—although this select group would certainly see themselves as the true gentlemen. “Select” itself is not unproblematic, but on the whole it carries the connotations of “understanding,” “priy wit,” and “judgment” present in the Burre epistle without tying them to any specific class position.

of gentility permits it to be mimed). If Keysar felt, as he apparently did, that *The Knight* had failed because it had been "exposed to the wide world" (sig. A2), which at least on the whole did not have the "judgment" to appreciate it, he might have been looking for a select publisher as the most likely candidate to buy the play, one who had published other plays that could be considered "prive" and for "good wits," plays that catered to this division of the theatrical audience.

If Burre published *Catiline* before Keysar sold him his copy of *The Knight*, the choice might have seemed obvious, for *Catiline* like *The Knight* was a disaster in the theater; Edmund Gayton, for one, called it "a Play of excellent worth, but not of equall applause." Given the high-brow reputation Jonson was building in 1611 and the play's classical subject and style, Keysar might naturally have assumed that *Catiline*’s failure stemmed from the same source as *The Knight*’s, and that if Burre had seen fit to print one, he would likely print the other.

Even if *Catiline* had not yet been published, Burre's previous dramatic publications share those characteristics discussed in the epistle to Keysar. Prior to 1611, Burre had published Nashe’s *Summer's Last Will and Testament* in 1600, a play written for truly private performance, probably at the Croydon residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Next he published Jonson’s *Every Man in his Humor* in 1601, which would have carried the cachet of Jonson’s name by 1611, even though the title-page notes that it had been "sundry times publickly acted." Jonson’s *Cynthia’s Revels, privately acted in the Black-Friers,* appeared the same year under Burre’s imprint, followed by Middleton’s *A Mad World, My Masters* in 1608, a play that had "bin lately in Action by the Children Of Paules." Burre’s printing of children’s plays, privately-performed plays, and Jonson’s plays could have easily led Keysar to think Burre would be interested in *The Knight*, and he was apparently interested enough to buy it, although his delay of two years in printing perhaps implies he was somewhat unsure of its prospects. How can we account for Burre’s eventual decision to take the financial risk of publishing the failed stage play?

The usual answer is, as Andrew Gurr says, that by 1613 “Beaumont had become famous and his name made the play worth resurrecting.”

---

This, however, would be more convincing if Beaumont’s name appeared on the title-page. But it does not. Indeed, given the pre-publication history of the play copy, Burr may not even have known who wrote it. If Burr had expected Beaumont’s “name . . . to vent his worke” (as Thomas Walkley says of Shakespeare in his preface to the 1622 Othello17), he would no doubt have indicated that name prominently. Burr was certainly familiar with this marketing technique, as can be shown by an examination of the title-pages of his printings of Jonson. In the first two, Every Man In and Cynthia’s Revels, Jonson’s name appears on but does not dominate the title-page, set on one line in type as small as the imprint, and vying with the company attribution for authority. The next two, Catiline and The Alchemist, printed a decade later and a few years before the 1616 folio, heavily emphasize the playwright’s name.18 In both, the title appears in large majuscules, followed by ‘Written | by | BEN. IONSON.,’19 set off by spacing from the title above and a Latin quotation below; after a rule comes the imprint. The effect is a very clean title-page with the author’s name centered, in type second in size only to the title, with little else to contend with for attention. Clearly Burr had come to see the economic advantages of Jonson’s name.

The identical setting (mutatis mutandis) of the two later Jonson title-pages is significant as well because it points to an ongoing publishing strategy. Burr must have felt that the Catiline title-page had aided the sale of the failed play, for he repeated the style with his next dramatic publication. If he had felt, therefore, that Beaumont provided a saleable name as Jonson did, presumably he would have set up The Knight title-page similarly. The fact that neither an author nor company attribution appears, however, suggests that Burr had chosen to market the play based on a completely different appeal.

Nevertheless, the repetition of the Jonson title-page setting tells us that Burr had had some success selling these plays, for otherwise he would not have printed another Jonson play one year after the first, nor marketed it so similarly. This success, I believe, probably convinced Burr that there was a market for The Knight, since it could reasonably be expected to sell to the same segment of the buying public as Jonson’s plays. And there is in fact one similarity between the Jonson title-pages and The Knight’s. Like all four of the Jonson title-pages, The Knight bears a

---

18. Ben Jonson, Catiline his Conspiracy (1611), and The Alchemist (1612).
Latin quotation, a device that would be advantageous only if Burre felt his buyers would be able to read it, or at least not be put off by it, another signal that these plays were targeted at a select and educated social group.

The preliminaries of these plays also indicate Burre's intended audience. For like *The Knight*, the two Jonson plays published in the two years prior contain prefatory matter condemning the lack of judgment and wit of the rude multitude. In the dedication of *Catiline* to William Earl of Pembroke, Jonson complains, perhaps because of the play's failure on the stage, of the "thicke, and darke... ignorance, as now almost couers the Age"; he is assured, however, that the Earl will "in these lig-giuen times... countenance a legitimate Poëme" (sigs. A2–A2v). Jonson distinguishes between the plays favored by the vulgar and the "legitimate" poems that the wise enjoy. Analogously, he offers two addresses to the reader, one to the "reader in ordinarie" who will "commend out of affection, selfe tickling, an easinesse, or imitation," and the other to the "Reader extraordinary" who can truly judge the work (sig. A3). A dedicatory poem by Fletcher claims the play failed because the audience, which did not "haue their wits about 'hem... lay you by, calling for mad Pasquill... or Greene's deare Groatsworth, or Tom Coryate," invoking well-known examples of what had come to be seen as low humor (sig. A3v). In the address to the reader of *The Alchemist*, Jonson similarly condemns the bombastic playwrights who "are esteem'd the more learned, and sufficient for this, by the Multitude, through their excellent vice of judgement" and warns that "it is onely the disease of the unskilfull, to thinke rude things greater then polish'd: or scatter'd more numerous than com-pos'd" (sigs. A3–A3v).

Certainly Jonson was responsible for much of the design of these preliminaries, but Burre tellingly picks up Jonson's language in writing his epistle to Keysar.20 Again it seems that from *Catiline* and *The Alchemist* the publisher learned that there was an audience for this sort of printed play and, further, how to market the plays for that audience. Significantly, in no other non-Jonson play does Burre include prefatory matter; if the two-year delay in publication indicates wariness about the play's prospects, the decision to include an epistle suggests Burre had discovered a

20. Jonson's direct involvement with the printing of his plays in quarto is shown by Herford and Simpson, who find many press corrections that can only have been made at Jonson's urging, and that are characteristic of him, including changes in spelling and punctuation that the printers would have left untouched. *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford, 1925–1952), IV, 11; V, 414.
potential market for the play and employed a strategy for reaching it that
was tried and true, an “emperor’s new clothes” trick to convince the
reader that he should buy and like the book if he is a man of good wit.

In this light, the absence of company attribution on the title-page of
*The Knight* looks like a Jonsonian attempt to erase the theatrical origins of
the play and create a wholly literary text. But what replaces the theater in
this instance is not, as with Jonson, the “Author,” but rather the play’s
status as select. Where one would expect company or authorial attribu-
tion on the title-page, directly below the title (where such attribution
appears on every other Burre dramatic publication), one finds only the
Latin epigram from Horace:

\[
\text{Quod si} \\
\text{Indicium subtile, videndis artibus illud} \\
\text{Ad libros et ad haec Musarum dona vocares:} \\
\text{Beotum in crasso iuraes aere natum.}
\]

(“But if you were calling that judgment, discriminating in the visual arts,
to books and to these gifts of the Muses, you would swear he had been
born in the dense air of Boeotia.”) The original passage describes Alex-
ander the Great,\(^2\) but taken out of context the quotation leaves the
impression, as does the epistle, that the Blackfriars audience as a whole,
preferring the spectacular to the literary and poetic, had breathed the
“dense air of Boeotia,” too unsophisticated to understand the play.\(^2\)

Jonson’s plays frequently carried Latin epigrams on their title-pages, as
all his plays published by Burre do, and they too comment on the literari-
ness of his plays and their suitability for those of rarefied taste and sophis-
tication. *Every Man In* and *Cynthia’s Revels* quote from Juvenal’s seventh
satire to excuse Jonson’s traffic with the stage: “Quod non dant proceres,
dabit Histrio. / Haud tamen inuideas vati, quem pulpita pascunt.” (“The actor
will give what the noblemen do not give. Yet you should by no means
begrudge the poet whom the boards nourish.”) Read in context, as
Jonson’s “extraordinary” readers, at least, would be expected to do, Juve-
nal is here lamenting that patronage and advancement now come not
from the nobility, who once supported true literature, but from players,

\(^2\) Philip J. Finkelpearl, *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Prince-
ton, 1990), p. 82.

\(^2\) Intriguingly, some copies have the plural *natos* instead of *natım*. Finkelpearl (p. 82) suggests
therefore that Beaumont wanted to imply that “the whole audience responded like insensitive
Philistines” rather than merely the “he” of the original quotation, although Greg believes the
change to be an ordinary case of press correction, in the opposite direction. W. W. Greg, *A
the favorites of the emperor; the poet who must turn to the theater for his living, therefore, should not be condemned. The title-page to Catiline similarly distinguishes its literary text from the low displays of theater with a quotation from Horace: “His non Plebecula gaudet. / Venum Equitis quoque, iam migravit ab aure voluptas, / Omnis, ad incertos oculos, & gaudia vana.” (“The rabble do not delight in these things. Indeed, all the satisfaction of the knights as well has now migrated from the ear to uncertain eyes and vain joys.”) Rather than the virtuous pleasures of the ear (presumably the access to the mind’s judgment for a “legitimate Poème” like Catiline), both the “rabble” and the upper classes now favor mere spectacle, delights for the eyes, which are “uncertain” guides to the worth of a play. Finally, The Alchemist makes explicit Jonson’s hope of finding a better audience in print than in the theater: “Neque, me ut miretur turba, labor: / Contentus paucis lectoribus.” (“Nor do I work so that the crowd might admire me: I am satisfied with a few readers.”) With its opposition between the multitudinous crowd that must be pleased in the playhouse and the few, implicitly more sophisticated, readers constructed as the purchasers of the printed text, the quotation could serve as a motto for Burre’s entire dramatic publishing enterprise.

II

Burre apparently appropriated from Jonson another important technique for signaling the literary status of his plays. Both Catiline and The Alchemist feature what Greg calls “continuous printing,” in which verse lines broken between two speakers are set on one line to create a full metrical unit. Jonson’s printed plays repeatedly display this technique, and it seems likely that Burre learned it from him, since Catiline and The Alchemist are the first of Burre’s plays so printed, and since Burre then used the strategy for his final two plays, The Knight and Thomas Tomkis’ Albumazar (1615).

I have located 72 plays whose first editions are printed continuously,

---

23. Here we see the same antipathy towards both the “rabble” and the gentry that, as I will discuss below, appears in the plays themselves.

24. Greg actually uses the term with its widest possible meaning, to indicate any instance in which “each new speech, instead of (as is usual) beginning a fresh line of print, follows on from the last, with the speaker’s name (or prefix) within the line.” Greg, I, xvii. This would include cases of space-saving due to problems with casting-off, of one- or two-word reactions from another speaker, and of prose uses. I want to restrict the term here to cases in which it is clearly used to create a full verse line.
from the beginning of printed drama until 1640 (see Table 1). These plays are twice as likely as the average printed play to contain Latin on their title-pages, with those published after 1580 having an even higher likelihood. Over a third of them contain some indication of the author’s social status on the title-page, from university student, fellow, or Master of Arts, to “Gent.” and “Servant to her Majesty,” and including one countess (Pembroke); again, this is twice the percentage of overall plays. Fewer than a quarter of these plays were performed at outdoor theaters, far below the general rate, and they are over-represented for “closet” drama, or drama intended purely for the study rather than the stage.

The practice of continuous printing began in the universities and with translations from classical drama, and for this reason, I would argue, the technique came to seem “literary” and classical, serving to distance the play from its theatrical origins and from the “vulgar” plays that win the favor of audiences in the theater. Of the first twenty plays printed continuously, dating from around 1530 to 1604, all but four are either university drama, literary translations, or closet drama (the categories, of course, are not mutually exclusive). It is not surprising, therefore, that of all playwrights Jonson uses the technique most consistently and prominently, for continuous printing marks the very difference between play and “legitimate Poème” that he is so eager to mark in the dedication to Catiline. Continuous printing values the literary and poetic in the playwright’s lines—their meter and form—over the theatrical necessity of clearly identifying the speaker of those lines, turning a stage play into a printed poem. As drama began to become more acceptably literary matter, the number of continuously printed plays increased, and no decade in the period saw more plays thus printed than the 1630s. But even here the plays are over-represented for indications of the author’s gentle or university status and for Latin on the title-page.

25. I arrived as this number by searching through Greg for all items recorded as being printed continuously; from these I excluded masques, pageants, triumphs, entertainments, and Latin plays. Then I examined each item to determine the type of continuous printing used. I excluded cases where the technique was clearly used for space-saving, or exclusively in prose, or only once or twice in the entire play. Where a case seemed borderline, I have erred toward inclusion. I have only catalogued first editions in order to make the sample as analogous to The Knight as possible; often, however, later editions of plays follow the first in printing continuously.

26. Latin on the title-page: 28 out of 72 (39%) for continuously printed plays; excluding those plays by John Ford that have the anagram “Fide Honor” as the only Latin on the title-page, 26 out of 72 (36%). In general, 89 first editions listed in Greg have Latin on the title-page, out of 490 total (18%). Indication of status: excluding those in collections, 22 out of 63 (35%) for continuously printed plays. Overall and excluding collections, 83 first editions (17%) have some indication of the author’s status on the title-page. Outdoor theaters: 16 out of 72 (22%). These statistics exclude from Greg’s bibliography all masques, triumphs, pageants, entertainments, Latin plays, and lost plays.
Of course, it is unlikely that a potential buyer would notice continuous printing while browsing through plays in a book shop, and so unlike the other strategies discussed above, this marking probably could not have been expected to aid the sale of a play to select buyers, although it is possible that experienced readers of such plays would have looked for it before buying. Rather, like the black-letter font frequently used for the speeches of Dutch characters in printed drama, continuous printing may have come to seem a “necessary” convention for this type of play. Such typographical “inevitability” highlights the fact that these plays came to be seen as clearly different from others, and as part of the interwoven relationship between publishers and purchasers, it is both a response to the desires of select readers and a means of creating a group of select plays. The technique probably also added cultural capital to a play, and while not obvious to a buyer, a reader would surely have remarked it, since the change of speaker in mid-line inevitably jars. Once bought and read, then, continuous printing, marking the play as literary, may have made it more valuable to its owner, thereby making it more desirable for others.

Albumazar, Burre’s final printed play, shows the publisher continuing his marketing strategy. The play is printed continuously and bears on its title-page the attribution: “A Comedy presented before the Kings Maieste at Cambridge, the ninth of March. 1614. By the Gentlemen of Trinitie Colledge.” Interestingly, of the four plays performed before the King during his visit, Albumazar was the only one in English. Burre had in fact registered another of the four, Ruggle’s Ignoramus, ten days before he entered Albumazar (April 18, 1615; April 28, 1615). Given that Burre had a consistent policy of not printing Latin texts of any kind (see note 29), perhaps he decided to print a play performed during the King’s visit to Cambridge, since such a play would fit nicely with his other publications, but was initially unaware that Ignoramus was a Latin play; after he discovered it, he may have gone looking for the English one. But this is all speculation, and it is unclear whether a publisher could register a play without producing the physical copy (and therefore possibly not know the language in which it was written); what is clear is that Burre’s final play employs the same techniques used in his other dramatic publications to signal the select nature of the work to the buyer. Whatever his reason for not printing Ignoramus, Burre was more interested in the type of play he was buying than in its specific content, and he easily substituted Albumazar. Like Catiline and The Knight, Albumazar when performed was a

27. Thomas Tomkis, Albumazar (1615).
failure, but in print it succeeded, the only one of Burre's plays to reach a second edition during his career, which it did the same year.

III

Unlike some of his large folio publications (like Ralegh's *History of the World* and Donne's *Pseudo-Martyr*) Burre's play quartos were within the price range of most of the middling sort; he sought to exploit a cultural, not an economic, division in the book-buying public. This cultural division, however, does not align with the "great" and "little" traditions as Peter Burke represents them, for Burke's bifurcated schema cannot account for Burre's plays, which clearly reject the culture of the middling and lower classes while staking their claim elsewhere than in the universities, classical tradition, or high philosophy and theology. These plays are not classical translations or Latin plays, nor are they particularly abstruse in their subject matter; rather, they suggest the beginnings of a "high" culture of drama written in English.

Burre's plays exhibit some important similarities that can help to chart this cultural rift. While not every one of these features appears in every play, and while there are certainly real differences among these plays that I do not want to erase, taken as a whole they do show common tendencies in their representation of English society. Like many city comedies, these plays stress the importance of wit as a sign of gentility, while mocking...
gallants or “new knights” who have a plentiful lack of wit and locate gentility in wealth, fashion, and a tendency to swear fantastically and to quarrel. *The Knight*’s Humphrey, the prospective match for Venturewell’s daughter, claims he is “of gentle bloud and gentle seeme,” but his ridiculous doggerel verse marks him as a “new knight,” lacking the wit of true gentility and achieving his knighthood through wealth alone (sig. B4). In *The Alchemist*, Mammon dreams of being so rich that he can knight his cook with “There’s gold,/Goe forth, and be a Knight,” collapsing the distinction between wealth and rank, and Kastril, the gallant newly come to London from the country, aspires to swear and quarrel his way into gentility (sig. D3). *Every Man In* has the three gallant gulls—Stephano, Bobadilla, and Matheo—who practice their improbable oaths, write doggerel verse, and strive to be melancholy. Hedon and Anaides in *Cynthia’s Revels* employ rote gallantry, displaying an ignorance and witlessness that make them, in the authoritative words of Mercury, “but the *Zani* to an exact Courtier” (sig. D3). Albumazar’s Trincalo is transformed, or so he thinks, into a gentleman and immediately claims he will “turne my Cart into a Caroch . . . my mistress *Arnellina* to a Lady, my Plow-boy *Dick* to two guarded foot-men,” taking on the style and accouterments of gentility but lacking the wit to realize he has not in fact been changed at all.31

Equally scorned are merchants and citizens, who like the gallants are the nouveau riche of the dramatic world of the Burre plays. In *The Knight*, of course, the guildsman George and his wife Nell embody these plays’ view of citizens, with their poor taste, naive dramatic sensibility, and ostentatious dispensing of money (to both the players and the characters). Venturewell too is a citizen, a venturing merchant who tries to augment his wealth and social status by marrying his daughter to the “gentle” Humphrey. And throughout Burre’s plays, merchants are mocked for their covetousness of money and status, their attempts to marry into the gentry, and their jealousy and fear of cuckolding: Thorello in *Every Man In*, Harebrain in *Mad World*, Drugger in *The Alchemist*, Asotus in *Cynthia’s Revels*.

While merchants, new knights, and gallants are mocked, apprentices and servants are somewhat surprisingly well-treated. In *The Knight*, Rafe may utilize outmoded and overblown language in his roles as chivalric hero, May Day morris dancer, King addressing his troops, and ghost, but his ability to suit his language to the occasion nevertheless displays his

mastery over dramatic conventions, the very contrary of George's and Nell's naïveté. In *Albumazar*, it is the servant Cricca whose plan works the play toward its comic ending and in whom the gentlemen sons put their trust. In *The Alchemist*, Face succeeds in gulling all the wealthy knights, gallants, and merchants who come to his door, and when his master returns, he is not punished but rather, like Cricca, helps his master to find a wife. Musco in *Every Man In can*, like Rafe, play any role and speak its appropriate language; “this *Heroick spirite*” (sig. M2v) deceives almost all the other characters, helps reconcile Lorenzo senior and junior, and becomes Lord of Misrule for the final comic revelry. Even Mercury and Cupid in *Cynthia's Revels* are able to comment authoritatively on the action only after disguising themselves as pages.

Finally, just as George and Nell are ridiculed for their love of the “huffing part,” the didactic play “notably in honour of the Commons of the City,” and, in general, “stale” material that “has beene had before at the red Bull,” the mockery of new knights, gallants, and citizens in the other Burre plays is specifically linked to dramatic taste. Will Summer, in *Summer's Last Will*, mocks the author for penning him a prologue worse than “the ligge of Rowlands God-sonne” and promises to “sit as a Chorus, and flowte the Actors and him at the end of euery Sceane” (sig. Bz). By 1600 when Nashe’s play was published, jigs were out of fashion, performed only at the northern playhouses, which were seen by theatrical polemicians as low theaters appealing only to the dullest spectators. The mockery of northern playhouse repertory is even more explicit in *Albumazar*, where Trincalo’s true status is displayed through his wooing of Armellina with “complements drawne from the Plaies I see at the Fortune, and Red Bull, where I learne all the words I speake and vnderstand not” and through his constant (mis)quoting of *The Spanish Tragedy*, which in 1615 was in revival at the Fortune and in print in yet another

32. Lee Bliss similarly notes that Rafe “brings more theatrical experience and sense of narrative shape to his task than do George and Nell” and calls him “The Knight's farcial figure of the dramatist and his plight.” Lee Bliss, “'Plot Mee No Plots': The Life of Drama and the Drama of Life in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*,” *Modern Language Quarterly* 45 (1984), 13.


34. Gurr comments that “it is probably significant of the divergence in taste and fashion that after 1600 (or to be precise, after Kemp left the Chamberlain's Men in 1599) the only playhouses that were named as presenting jigs were the three to the north of the city, the Fortune, Curtain and Red Bull” and notes that “in the seventeenth century the word [jig] became conspicuous chiefly as a term of contempt used by one type of playgoer against another.” Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574–1642* (New York, 1992), p. 175.


36. Tomkis, sigs. D1v, H3v.
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quarto edition. Matheo and Bobadilla also quote approvingly from Kyd's play, and the competing prologues in Cynthia's Revels mock the gallants in the audience who will hold "That the olde Hieronimo, (as it was first acted) was the onely best, and Iudiciously-pend Play, of Europe" (sig. A4v), where the parenthetical phrase only emphasizes the outdated style of the play, which Jonson himself had tried to update with additions.

IV

Tying all of these strands together yields some idea of the intended audience for these plays. I would suggest that they were aimed at Inns of Court students or those like them, typically the younger sons of gentry, lacking the wealth of inheritance and hence scornful of the prosperous merchants and new knights around them. Such men were forced to redefine gentility during James's reign—when titles were bought and sold, and social mobility became available to more segments of society—in light of what David Scott Kastan calls "the vulnerability of the traditional culture based on hierarchy and deference to the transformative entrepreneurial energies of a nascent capitalism." With traditional designations of status such as land, wealth, clothes, and titles no longer theirs or exclusively theirs, such men saw wit and taste as the signifiers of their gentility, and it is wit and taste that all the new knights, gallants, and merchants in these plays significantly lack. This scorn for the power of the new money economy also accounts for the role of apprentices and servants in these plays. Such people are granted at least some wit, if not

38. Neill points out (p. 342) that later Ford and Massinger both dedicated plays to the Inns of Court, acknowledging the "so frequent bounties" of their members, that in the dedication to Every Man Out Jonson called these students the "borne . . . Judges of these studies [i.e., plays]," and that "a striking number of individual dedicators (as well as contributors of encomiastic verses) can be linked with one or other of the Inns." But Neill also comments that "the chief characteristic of the young lawyers in matters of taste seems to have been an obsessive aping of the fashions of the court" (p. 343). Burre's plays do not bear this out, displaying instead, as discussed above, a scorn of the courtier and gallant for their ostentation and crude sensibility.
39. David Scott Kastan, "Is There a Class in This (Shakespearean) Text?", Renaissance Drama 24 (1993), 106.
40. In addition to Inns of Court men, university students, disillusioned with their prospects in London, might form a part of the intended audience for these plays; Albumazar, after all, is a university play, and the hero of Catiline is Cicero. We might also see evidence of younger brothers in the intended audience in the generational warfare that figures prominently in some of the plays. Merrythought in The Knight and Sir Bounteous Progress in Mad World are both prodigal fathers wasting the money they could leave to their sons. In Albumazar, Pandolfo competes with his son for Flavia, always holding the threat of disinheritance over his head. Lorenzo Senior is at odds with his son in Every Man In, and this is one of the driving forces of the play, although the question of money and inheritance does not surface.
taste, for unlike all those who are mocked in the plays, they are outside of the new economy, mastered, working not for money but for room, board, and the acquiring of skills; their status is clearly marked and for the most part immobile.

Burre's plays are not unique in constructing the Wit as the ideal spectator, and critics like Brian Gibbons and Theodore Leinwand have seen in city comedy many of the features I have described here, contrasting them with plays such as those by Heywood that are, as Beaumont's George wishes, "notably in honour of the Commons of the City," plays to which he and Nell allude throughout The Knight. But Burre's plays are not all city comedies; they are tied together not by genre but by the audience Burre imagined buying them. More importantly, Burre's dramatic enterprise could only have been accomplished through print, for it was print that allowed Burre to market his plays to his audience and so turn even failed staged plays into successful printed ones.

The Inns of Court, which provided at least part of this audience, were not, however, the exclusive domain of impoverished gentry. They also offered, in the words of Lawrence Stone, a "fast elevator" up the scale of social status, and many sons of yeomen and others of the middling sort who attended the Inns must also have seen themselves as witty and select; as discussed above, it is precisely these incursions, these imitations, that provide the energy with which cultural boundaries are drawn. A key element of wit is its naturalness: Stephano, Bobadilla, Hedon are mocked for their practiced and learned courtesy. Wit resembles Castiglione's sprezzatura, an effortless expression of one's true self, and as such it can separate

41. Brian Gibbons, Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); Theodore B. Leinwand, The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603–1613 (Madison, 1986). Gibbons' is the classic study of city comedy; see especially ch. 6. See Leinwand (pp. 14–20) for a good discussion of the scholarship on the genre. In a suggestive note Leinwand (p. 200 n.4) contrasts city comedy with comedies set in London that do not share the defining traits of the genre, citing Heywood's If You Know Not Me and Dekker's The Shoemaker's Holiday, both authors whose work lies behind George and Nell's theatrical taste. But Leinwand (pp. 99ff) interprets the city comedies as endorsing the gallants they portray, while Burre's plays, as I read them, mock the gallant along with the citizen and merchant, generally leaving the normative role to be filled by the spectator or reader.

42. George refers to "the life & death of sir Thomas Gresham" (sig. B1), who appears in Heywood's If You Know Not Me; Nell wants to see "Bold Beauchams," a lost Heywood play, and "lane Shore" (sig. B1v), perhaps her title for Heywood's Edward IV or a lost play by Chettle and Day cited in Henslowe's diary, and there are repeated allusions to The Four Prentices of London. For the Chettle and Day play, see The Knight of the Burning Pestle, by Francis Beaumont, ed. Michael Hattaway (New York, 1989), p. 140. Other authors whose work the couple seems to enjoy include Dekker (Old Fortunatus), Greene (Orlando Furioso), Peele (Edward I), and Day, Rowley, and Wilkins (The Travels of the Three English Brothers). See Hattaway, pp. xiv–xvii.

the truly select from those who merely seek to imitate their taste and style.44

This suspicion of imitation may account for the fact that in many of these plays, above all in The Knight, there is no normative character on stage. Rather than mimic a character—which, after all, is what the buffoonish Trincalo does—the audience is invited to place itself in the normative position, to censure and judge the onstage characters. The Boy of The Knight repeatedly refers to the “Gentlemen” of the audience, urging them to “rule” George and Nell and prevent them from ruining the play, or excusing the outmoded features George asks for, which “will not doe so well” with a witty audience whose tastes are au courant: “it is not our fault gentlemen” (sigs. F4v, H1–H1v). Similarly, serving as epilogue to The Alchemist, Lovewit excuses himself to the “Gentlemen” in the theater since he has “out stript/An old mans grauitie, or strict canon” through his socially-climbing marriage (sig. M4v). Mad World’s Follywit may at first appear to be this normative character, but by the end it becomes clear that the spectators, allowed at the beginning to revel vicariously in his coney-catching, are meant to lord it over him when he ultimately becomes the coney, knowing that they themselves possess wit unmixed with folly. Throughout Burre’s plays, the audience is enjoined to take up the role of Wit and censure all the characters. By placing the imagined spectator in this subject position, these plays follow the pattern of their prefatory matter, implying that if a spectator or reader does not like the play, he must not be a true Wit.

These are highly ironic plays (excluding, perhaps, Catiline and Cynthia’s Revels), mocking virtually all aspects of contemporary life and lacking allegiance to any character or values expressed in the play. Indeed, to be serious seems to be the greatest sin of all; characters become gulls as soon as they become earnest, for such earnestness is the opposite of wit, which stands removed from and mocks ordinary human values and desires. Neill sees the later theater of Fletcher and Shirley as mannerist because of its emphasis on “the control of emotion by witty self-consciousness,” but this ironic detachment is already apparent two decades earlier in Burre’s plays (p. 359). The Wits in these plays are those who are able, in Pierre Bourdieu’s words, “to play the games of culture with . . . playful seriousness” through a “neutralizing distance” that involves a “systematic refusal of all that is ‘human,’ the passions, emotions

44. Leinwand (p. 89) also sees sprezzatura and the conduct books behind the behavior of the Wit, but for him “self-confidence” is the crucial aspect of style, rather than effortlessness.
and feelings which ordinary people put into their ordinary existence." For Bourdieu, this refusal is the hallmark of high culture, and Burre’s plays begin to put it into effect.

The plays Burre published form a corpus as much as any author’s work does. Of all of them, only Summer’s Last Will and Catiline do not contain significant elements in common with the others. Nashe’s play was the first Burre published, and thus cannot be expected to follow a pattern he later developed; it does, however, resemble The Knight in that it shares with court masques “not only a dramatic structure that involves singing and dancing but also a peculiarly intimate relationship between actors and audience, fiction and the real lives of those watching.” The play’s unique stage history further casts it as a coterie or select work. And while Nashe’s play began Burre’s dramatic career, Catiline seems to provide the turning point, for with Catiline Burre began regularly to use prefatory matter and continuous printing to market his plays to “wity young masters o’the Innes o’Court.” I have argued that the success of Burre’s printing of this failed stage play convinced him that he could do the same with The Knight. To know exactly when Burre decided to specialize in this sort of play is impossible, but the evidence suggests strongly that he did specialize in them, and as such it necessitates a reevaluation of traditional theories about drama and “literary” print.

Critics have generally argued that drama did not become literature until well after the publication of Jonson’s 1616 Works, which was greeted with no small contempt from those who felt he had forgotten the distinction between “work” and “play.” But Burre’s plays tell us that even earlier there was a market for plays targeted at select buyers, and that in fact such plays more easily found a market in print than on the stage. There is a basic economic rationale for Burre’s confidence in printing failed stage plays like Catiline, The Knight, and Albumazar. On a low estimate, the Blackfriars playhouse could probably hold around 500 people. Roslyn Knutson has recently calculated that “by the eighth perfor-

47. Ben Jonson, Bartholomew Fayre (1631), sig. A4v.
mance [of a play] . . . the company probably had recovered its costs of production and even made some profit. Even if the playhouse need not have been filled to capacity at these performances, a production of *The Knight* would have had to draw about three thousand spectators to begin earning money for its company. Burre, however, could expect to turn a profit after selling 60% of his edition; in a run of 700 copies for *The Knight*, this would amount to 420 copies. The profit Burre might earn was surely less than the theatrical company would hope for, but then so was the risk.

The difference in the economies of scale for the two modes of play production is staggering. My seven-pence estimate for a retail copy of *The Knight* is roughly equivalent to the cost of entrance to Blackfriars, slightly higher than the lowest admission price of six pence but probably somewhat lower than the average price, since many would have paid considerably more to sit closer to the stage or even on it. But while the cost to the consumer of an indoor stage play and a printed play are about the same, an utter disaster in the theater—a play, for example, that sold out its first night but then failed ever to attract another spectator—would be a fair success if the same number of people bought the play as saw it. If a publisher considered this difference, he might feel justified in taking a risk on a failed stage play, in spite of the low rates of success for printed plays that Blayney documents. Burre took this risk throughout his career, printing two plays that had failed on the London stage (*Catiline, The Knight*), and two that had never appeared on that stage (*Summer’s Last Will, Albumazar*), evidence that the risk was paying off. His profits may have been moderate, since only *Albumazar* was reprinted, but they must have been enough to make the effort worth continuing.

The critical tradition that locates the beginning of “literary” respectability for printed drama in the Jonson folio ties this shift to the rise of the modern conception of the author who owns his work. Joseph Loewenstein and Sara van den Berg both see Jonson’s ability to fashion a persona for the dramatist based on classical authors as crucial, comparing Jonson’s

---

50. Roslyn Knutson, “The Repertory,” in Cox and Kastan, eds., p. 468. Knutson’s comments are based on the records of the Rose playhouse in Henslowe’s diary. The Rose could hold far more people than an indoor theater, but the much higher average admission price for Blackfriars would probably have made its capacity takings roughly equivalent to those at an outdoor theater. In any case, as with the Blackfriars capacity, the exact figures are not important here.

Works with the classical Opera.52 But the Burre plays provide an earlier example of literary, classicized, and “select” printed drama and, more importantly, an alternative means of fashioning them. For this corpus, unlike Jonson's works, was created by publisher and purchaser; Burre chose the plays he wanted to publish, and those who bought his books encouraged him to continue the trend. Certainly Jonson had a role in this—half of Burre's dramatic publications are by Jonson—although perhaps not quite the role he imagined for himself, considering his condemnation of the bookseller’s “vile arts” of marketing and his allegorizing attempt in Cynthia's Revels to “extricate himself from the confused literary market . . . and to insert himself into what might be called a neoconservative patronage market.”54 Instead, Jonson became firmly enmeshed in Burre's publishing and marketing enterprise.55 And if, as Kastan has recently argued, the playwright is inevitably “deconstructed and decentered . . . in the necessary collaborations of play and book production,” only to be “effectively reconstructed in the early-modern bookshop, firmly established by and for commerce,” it is nevertheless important to recognize Burre's alternate commercial strategy.56 In Burre’s enterprise the author was of secondary importance, and Burre could feel confident in publishing his final two plays without authorial attribution, relying only on his time-tested marketing techniques to reach his buyers. In the end the Author would assert his control, but it was not by his name alone that literary, “high” drama was created.57

Harbage’s view that the indoor theater's repertoire differed drastically from that of the outdoor theaters, and that this difference marked a high/low distinction in drama, has been attacked, and rightly so, by a variety of critics in the past few decades.58 But if differences in theatrical repertories have been exaggerated, few critics have investigated a publisher's work with a view toward identifying cultural divisions. As I have

52. Loewenstein, pp. 109–10; van den Berg, p. 115.
53. Ben Jonson, “To My Booke-seller,” in Workes (1616), sigs. 3T1–3T1v, line 11.
54. Loewenstein, p. 106.
55. Without Burre, Jonson would not have been able to put his Works together. Burre still held the copy for many of his plays, not merely the ones he actually published, and Jonson and Stansby had to work out a deal with Burre for the wholesale transfer of rights in these plays. James K. Bracken, “William Stansby and Jonson’s Folio, 1616,” The Library, 6th ser. 10 (1988), 18–20.
57. Burre may have paved the way for Jonson in another way, if my analysis of Burre's audience is correct, for these same Inns of Court students were among the main purchasers of Jonson's folio, and according to Francis Lenton's The Young Gallants Whirligig (1629), they preferred "Ben: Johnson booke of Playes" to their law books. Sig. B2v.
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argued, the different economies of the printing house and the theater would have made it far easier in print to target specific social groups, tailor one's choice of plays to suit their interests, and market those plays so as to get their attention. Perhaps, then, it is in the corpuses of people like Burre, in the commercial motives of the publishing house, that we should look for the schism that produced a "high" dramatic culture and enabled the play—or rather, a certain kind of play—to be imagined as a literary form.59
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TABLE I
First Edition Plays with Continuous Printing, to 1640
(Excludes Masques, Pageants, Triumphs, Entertainments, and Latin plays)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latin on t.p.?</th>
<th>Th./Lang</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Andria</td>
<td>c. 1530</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Johan Johan</td>
<td>c. 1533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Troas</td>
<td>c. 1559</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thyestes</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hercules Furens</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Yes (w/trans.)</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oedipus</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Agamemnon</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Medea</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Octavia</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ralph Roister Doister</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Thesbaïs*</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hippolytus*</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hercules Oetaeus*</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>U/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Antonius</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Cl/F</td>
<td>Cts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The Virtuous Octavia</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Two Angry Women of Abingdon</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. By the 1630s, the theatrical world had caught up to Burre, and The Knight was a stage success. Where Burre had first printed the play in response to its theatrical failure, its later success would yield two more printings around 1635; this hope of cashing in on a theatrical success must have been a frequent reason for printing. But Burre's 1613 quarto and his entire dramatic corpus illustrate that print could take the lead, creating a market for a failed play. By targeting Wits, such printings would have served to solidify their identity, and to expand the boundaries of their group as these plays were read and reread. Ironically, Burre's quarto of The Knight, printed in spite, or even because, of the play's failure on stage, may have helped create the conditions necessary for its eventual theatrical success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latin on t.p.?</th>
<th>Th./Lang</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Two Lamentable Tragedies</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. <em>Il Pastor Fido</em></td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>—/I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. <em>Darius</em></td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. <em>Croesus</em></td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sejanus his Fall</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. <em>The Gentleman Usher</em></td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. <em>The Wonder of Women</em></td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. <em>The Whore of Babylon</em></td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. <em>The Revenger's Tragedy</em></td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. <em>Volpone</em></td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. <em>The Alexandrean Tragedy</em></td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. <em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. <em>King Lear</em></td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. <em>The Case Is Altered</em></td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. <em>Ram Alley</em></td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. <em>The Golden Age</em></td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. <em>Catiline His Conspiracy</em></td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. <em>The Alchemist</em></td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. <em>The White Devil</em></td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. <em>The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois</em></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. <em>The Brazen Age</em></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. <em>Cynthia's Revenge</em></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. <em>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</em></td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. <em>Albumazar</em></td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. <em>The Honest Lawyer</em></td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. <em>Amends for Ladies</em></td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. <em>Herod and Antipater</em></td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. <em>The Heire</em></td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. <em>The Devil's Law Case</em></td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. <em>The Duchess of Malfy</em></td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. <em>Aminta</em></td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>—/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. <em>The New Inn</em></td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. <em>The Staple of News</em></td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. <em>The Devil is an Ass</em></td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. <em>Changes</em></td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. <em>The Rival Friends</em></td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. <em>The Jealous Lovers</em></td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. <em>The Bird in a Cage</em></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. <em>The Broken Heart</em></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. <em>The English Traveller</em></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. <em>Orestes</em></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. <em>Alaham</em></td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. <em>Perkin Warbeck</em></td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latin on t.p.?</th>
<th>Th./Lang</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60. <em>The Platonic Lovers</em></td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. <em>The Wits</em></td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. <em>The Wonder of a Kingdom</em></td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. <em>The Elder Brother</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. <em>The Lady of Pleasure</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. <em>The Young Admiral</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. <em>The Example</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. <em>The Gamester</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. <em>The Lost Lady</em></td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. <em>A New Trick to Cheat the Devil</em></td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. <em>The City Match</em></td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>WH,BF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. <em>The Night Walker</em></td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. <em>The Opportunity</em></td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key:

**Th./Lang.** Shows the theater at which the play was performed, followed after a slash by the language from which the play was translated, where necessary, according to these symbols:

- **BFC** = Blackfriars, children
- **BF** = Blackfriars, adult
- **C1** = Closet
- **F** = Fortune
- **G** = Globe
- **KM** = King's Men
- **SC** = Salisbury Court
- **U** = University
- **WH** = Whitehall
- **WF** = Whitefriars, children
- **—** = unknown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status** Gives indication of author's status on title page, according to these symbols:

- **Cts** = Countess
- **M** = Master of Arts
- **F** = Fellow at university
- **St** = Student at university
- **G** = Gentleman
- **Sv** = “Servant to her Majesty”


*These plays by John Ford bear the anagram “Fide Honor” as the only Latin on the title-page.