

Three Reluctant Patrons and Early Shakespeare

ANDREW GURR

IN THE YEARS UP TO MAY 1594 AND EARLY 1592 RESPECTIVELY, Henry Carey, the lord chamberlain, and Henry Herbert, the earl of Pembroke, seem to have spent a lot of their time not becoming patrons of major London playing companies. Their absence from the player-patronizing business up till then raises several questions. Some attention has been given, by Herbert Berry, Margot Heinemann, and others, to the possibility that patrons intervened to get specific plays staged¹ but little to how active they were in the practical business of getting companies set up and of keeping them going. Something about this can be learned from three men who for different reasons proved distinctly reluctant to be patrons: Henry Herbert, Henry Carey, and Charles Howard. The policies of different lords chamberlain toward the London companies come into that story. Most to the point, and with strong implications for Shakespeare's early career, is the question of what bearing those policies had on Carey's setting-up of a lord chamberlain's company in May 1594. There is also the question of how much of a joint operation was the establishment of Howard the lord admiral's new company of 1594 alongside Carey's company. The ultimate and most teasing question is what was in Herbert's mind when he set up his new company in 1592.

An early company in the livery of Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, is recorded at York on 8 September 1580 and at Exeter and Gloucester in 1582. It appeared at court on 27 December 1582. But after the then lord chamberlain, Sussex, died in the following year and the major companies were decapitated to make the Queen's Men, all the patrons of the remaining companies with a foothold in London seem to have backed or been fended off. J. Leeds Barroll has noted how the establishment of the royal company served to cut down on competition between great nobles advertising their own glory by getting their companies performances at court.² What should also be noted is how the establishment of the Queen's Men affected the lord chamberlain's subsequent policy toward playing companies. When Sussex died in 1583, the office of chamberlain was transferred first to Charles

¹ See for instance Herbert Berry, "The Globe Bewitched and *El Hombre Fiel*" in *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 1 (1984), 211-30; and Margot Heinemann, "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture: Notes on the Jacobean Patronage of the Earl of Southampton," *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 63-86, esp. pp. 71-72.

² J. Leeds Barroll, "Drama and the Court" in *The Revels History of Drama in English*, Lois Potter, Clifford Leech, and T. W. Craik, gen. eds., 8 vols. (London and New York: Methuen, 1975-83), Vol. 3, pp. 3-27. For an incisive account of the conditions in 1583, see Scott McMillin, "The Queen's Men and the London Theatre of 1583," *Elizabethan Theatre*, 10 (1988), 1-17, esp. p. 10.

Howard, the earl of Nottingham and later lord admiral, and then, in July 1585, to his father-in-law, Henry Carey. During the time these two men were in the office, no players wearing their livery were called to perform at court apart from a single joint appearance on 6 January 1586 by a group called "the servants of the lo: Admirall and the lo: Chamberlaine."³ With that one exception, Howard and his successor never drew on their own companies for court performances until Carey and Howard set up the two new companies in 1594. When in office as chamberlain, both men maintained a policy that favored the Queen's Men over all other companies.⁴

What happened in May 1594 to change that policy is open to several kinds of speculation. The three previous years had been very difficult for the London-based companies, with recurrent outbreaks of plague and the deaths of several of their patrons. The fourth earl of Sussex died in December of 1593; Lord Strange died on 16 April 1594, soon after he acceded to the earldom of Derby. The Queen's Men, who had split into two traveling groups in 1590, split again early in 1594, one section joining the bereaved Sussex's. Pembroke's Men, born in 1592, had collapsed in the summer of 1593, and it was four years before another of that lord's companies regained a foothold in London. These fluctuations in the fortunes of the leading companies seem to have influenced Carey in 1594. Their difficulties, which cannot have made the job of providing court entertainment any easier, along with renewed pressure from Guildhall to ban playing, seem to have generated Carey's decision to modify the policy his office had maintained through the 1580s. Herbert's short-lived run as a patron in 1592–93, and the drastic shifts in playing membership after his company collapsed that autumn, with its shake-out of some potent figures in the entertainment world, might have had something to do with this policy switch.

In 1592, Herbert had gone even longer than Carey without a major company. The only early record of any players wearing his livery dates back to a visit to Canterbury in 1575–76.⁵ All the other London companies of the time had longish pedigrees. By 1592 Herbert was spending most of his time in the Welsh Marches as lord president of the Council of Wales. Why he should have chosen to set up a new company in his old age is one of many questions about the role of the noble patrons in setting-up new playing companies through these years, questions to which there are no direct answers. In the cases of Howard and Carey, who worked together in the chamberlainship, the explanation must have something to do with their shared policy as Privy Council officers in charge of the revels. Why Carey should have reversed this policy in 1594 is a question linked in some way to

³ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), Vol. 2, p. 193. Evidence about the performing and traveling records of the companies is in this volume, augmented by the different volumes so far issued of *Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1978–). A survey of the work of Shakespeare's company from 1594 is given by Roslyn Lander Knutson in *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company 1594–1613* (Fayetteville: Univ. of Arkansas Press, 1991).

⁴ See Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: Univ. of Iowa Press, 1991), pp. 49–55. A generally meticulous account of the work of the Chamberlain's executive officer, it sets out in chapters 2 and 4 the context for the periodic interventions of the lord chamberlain and the great patrons in the activities of the companies. See also McMillin, p. 10.

⁵ Chambers, Vol. 2, p. 128.

the novelty of Herbert's action in 1592. Both may have a bearing on Shakespeare's own choice of a playing fellowship in his early years, and they certainly have a bearing on his selection for the new Chamberlain's company in 1594.

From the time the first commercial playhouses were set up in London in the 1560s and 1570s until 1594, the three successive holders of the office of lord chamberlain each maintained their own distinct policies. The principal duty, and the one best-recorded, of providing the court's entertainment for the long Christmas season was certainly enacted differently by the earl of Sussex than by Howard and Carey. The companies were rising rapidly in status, especially once the master of the revels, acting as the chamberlain's executive, had improved the frequency of their appearances at court by grasping the simple economic fact that it cost only one-third the sum to employ a company of public players for the royal pleasure that it cost to stage a masque.⁶ Sussex kept a company that performed at court every winter from 1576 to 1583. After his death they vanished for some years. By contrast Howard, who served as deputy chamberlain in 1575–77, never brought his own company to court while he occupied the chamberlain's office. Up to 1594, Carey did the same, with the sole exception of the joint performance in 1586.

Thomas Radcliffe, the third earl of Sussex, was lord chamberlain from 1572 until his death in June 1583. When he assumed the post, Elizabeth had already established the policy, affirmed in a document of 3 January 1572, that broadly determined the chamberlain's control over the companies of players.⁷ The Statute of Retainers defined the license and limitations for players. It also set out the basic requirement that the chamberlain's office organize the annual court entertainments. The company that Radcliffe had sponsored through the late 1560s and 1570s was favored by him in his first winter as chamberlain with a performance at court, and it returned for almost every festive season thereafter. That company seems to have been called the Chamberlain's Men in provincial records up to 1583.⁸ At his death its patronage passed to his brother Henry, the fourth earl. It did not return to court as Sussex's Men until 1592.

Before Sussex died in June 1583, someone had already moved to change or possibly to amplify his policy by setting up a monopolistic royal company: The revels accounts have a note dated 10 March 1583 ordering the Master, Edmond Tilney, "To choose out a companie of players for her maiestie."⁹

⁶ W. R. Streitberger, Introduction, Vol. 13 (1986) of *The Malone Society Collections*, gen. ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1907–88), p. xviii.

⁷ Thomas Radcliffe was notable at Elizabeth's court as one of the chief opponents of the Leicester circle. Robert Naunton's retrospect on Elizabeth's court reported that "there was such an antipathy in [Sussex's] nature to that of Leicester's that being together in court and both in high employments, they grew to a direct feud and both in continual oppositions, the one setting the watch and the other the sentinel, each on other's actions and motions" (Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia or Observations on Queen Elizabeth, Her Times & Favorites*, ed. John S. Cerovski [Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library; London and Toronto: Associated Univ. Presses, 1985], p. 53). This antipathy between Sussex and Leicester, and Sussex's favoritism towards his company for court performances, may help to explain Leicester's exceptional interventions on behalf of his players in the years following Sussex's appointment to the chamberlainship. For discussion of Leicester's relationship to his company, see Sally-Beth MacLean, "The Politics of Patronage: Dramatic Records in Robert Dudley's Household Books," in this issue.

⁸ Chambers, Vol. 2, p. 93.

⁹ p. 104.

This move signalled a substantial innovation in Privy Council policy toward players. Sussex's final illness may have supplied the opportunity to change the policy he had followed through his eleven years in charge of the revels, and the change may be one reason why the office of chamberlain remained vacant after his death in June until the beginning of the following year. Then, on New Year's Day 1584, in the middle of the Christmas festivities, it passed to Lord Effingham, Charles Howard.

Howard's wife, Lord Hunsdon's eldest daughter, Katherine Carey, was the closest blood relative that Elizabeth had, though she had no claim to the succession. She became one of the queen's most intimate and reliable friends upon her arrival at court as maid of honor at the beginning of the 1560s. That relationship made her husband a suitable choice for such a quasi-domestic court office as the chamberlainship.¹⁰ The fact that he had deputized for Sussex during his illness and was therefore his obvious successor makes the delay in his appointment a mark of how delicate negotiations over the office must have been. Katherine Carey's father also shared the familial closeness to Elizabeth. A man with a distinctively frank personality, he was loyal to his queen, personally unambitious, and a regular ally of his son-in-law on the Privy Council. Robert Naunton described the first baron Hunsdon as

a fast man to his prince and firm to his friends and servants, and though he might speak big and therein would be borne out, yet was he not the more dreadful but less harmful and far from the practice of my Lord of Leicester's instructions, for he was downright. And I have heard those that both knew him well and had interest in him say merrily of him that his Latin and dissimulation [*sic*] were both alike and that his custom of swearing and obscenity in speaking made him seem a worse Christian than he was. . . .¹¹

Howard and Carey gave Elizabeth good reason to regard them as her closest and most loyal court servants.

After less than two years in the office, though, Howard moved on to become lord admiral, releasing the chamberlainship to his father-in-law, Carey, in July 1585. As chamberlain, Howard had presided over a commission on the navy, and that appointment may have been envisaged as no more than a stepping-stone to the higher office.¹² Conceivably his father-in-law always expected the chamberlainship to revert to himself. Judging from a Privy Council paper of 1584 quoted below, he seems to have been regarded as vice-chamberlain even though he did not actually hold the post while Howard was chamberlain.

However transient Howard's tenure, in two years as chamberlain he fulfilled his duties in the office by reorganizing support for the playing companies. In 1584 he fended off the latest city request for the suppression of playing, with backing in the Privy Council from Christopher Hatton. Howard continued the policy he had employed when he deputized for Sussex in the 1570s of supporting players and chiefly the Queen's Men

¹⁰ For a succinct account of Elizabeth's court, see Simon Adams, "Eliza Enthroned? The Court and its Politics" in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Christopher Haigh (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1985), pp. 55–77.

¹¹ Naunton, pp. 69–70.

¹² See Robert W. Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral: The Political Career of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham 1536–1624* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), pp. 28–29.

rather than any of the others, including his own. That seems to have been a deliberate choice. His own company was evidently not below standard. After he relinquished the deputy chamberlainship in 1575, his actors played at court twice in the 1576–77 season and again in the following year. As before, they did not perform while he was lord chamberlain in 1584–85, but they returned in the 1586–87 season and regularly thereafter. His father-in-law and successor similarly did not allow his own company to perform at court while he was chamberlain. Carey made one exception to that rule, apart from the joint court performance in 1586: before the chamberlainship passed to him from Howard, he allowed the wearing of his livery by James Burbage, formerly one of Leicester's players, who was then running the Theatre in Shoreditch.

As chamberlains, Howard and Carey seem to have worked closely together on the Privy Council. In June 1584, following a fracas in Shoreditch outside the Theatre and the Curtain, William Fleetwood reported to Lord Burleigh on the Privy Councillors' response to the incident. Fleetwood wrote:

Vpon Sonndaye my Lo. [Mayor] sent ij Aldermen to the Court for the suppressing and pulling downe of the Theatre and Curten. All the LL. agreed therevnto, saving my Lord Chamberlen and mr. Viz-chamberlen, but we obteyned a lettre to suppress theym all. Vpon the same night I sent for the quenes players and my Lo. of Arundel his players, and they all willinglie obeyed the LL. lettres. The chiefestes of her highnes players advised me to send for the owner of the Theater, who was a stubburne fellow, and to bynd hym. I dyd so; he sent me word that he was my Lo. of Hunsdons man, and that he wold not come at me, but he wold in the mornyng ride to my lord. . . .¹³

Burbage, a bellicose defender of his property and resources, was quick to invoke Carey's support. Fleetwood's account implies that Burbage at first refused to believe that his patron as Privy Councillor would have signed such an order. Only after witnessing Carey's signature and being warned about the consequences of disobedience did he comply. Carey, having joined Howard in openly disagreeing with the decision, may then have worked behind the scenes to preserve Burbage's playhouse, because the order was not carried out.

It was at about this time too that Howard acted to protect the Queen's Men's monopoly on playing in London, granted by royal authority in 1583. The court *Remembrancia* from March 1584 to January 1587 are missing, but the Lansdowne papers have a partial record, including a petition that the Queen's Men sent to the Privy Council appealing for protection from pressure exerted on them by the city fathers, together with the responses from the lord mayor and the chamberlain. Howard's "remedies" for the city's grievances included setting limitations on the times for playing and, most specifically, declaring "That the Quenes players only be tolerated, and of them their number and certaine names to be notified in your Lps. lettres to the L. Maior and to the Iustices of Middlesex and Surrey. And those her players not to diuide themselues into seuerall companies."¹⁴ By keeping such a firmly announced policy in subsequent years, he would have had to disadvantage the company he himself patronized.

¹³ Chambers, Vol. 4, pp. 297–98.

¹⁴ Chambers, Vol. 4, p. 302.

For his first nine years as chamberlain, Carey followed the same broad policy as Howard. He protected the companies against the mayor of London, favored the Queen's Men, and with the one exception did not allow his own company to perform at court. Evidently he worked closely with his son-in-law, whose company became in the late 1580s one of the most frequent performers at court. Their alliance with Carey's own men for the 1586 entertainments may be evidence of collaboration between the two patrons rather than among the players. It is this long history of cooperation between the two men that makes sense of the decision in May 1594 to sponsor two London companies, one Howard's, the Admiral's Men, and the other Carey's, the Chamberlain's Men.

Nonetheless, what happened in 1594 was a distinct shift in policy. The absence of any Chamberlain's company in London and at court through the years up to then is striking. In office Carey, well aware of the principle that led to the establishment of the Queen's Men, was conscientious in supporting that company as the official one and refusing to promote any rival, except perhaps his son-in-law's company. The decline of the Queen's Men in the early 1590s freed him from that inhibition. But something more specific than the hectic rise and fall of the playing companies between 1590 and 1594 must have influenced him as well.

What the two men set up in May 1594 was a duopoly. The model behind the new policy is not far to seek. They had in mind the original establishment of the Queen's Men in 1583. That precedent is evidenced most clearly in subsequent attempts by the Privy Council to maintain the privileges given to these two companies to the exclusion of all others. Orders given in 1598 and 1600 by Carey's son George (who became chamberlain in 1597) to protect the Chamberlain's and Admiral's as the companies with sole rights to play in London parallel the Howard deal of 1584 that gave exclusive rights to the Queen's Men.

This scheme was not laid out, as the earlier one had been, to quell the competitive exhibitionism of the great lords at court. The lord chamberlain needed to create more stability and more durability among the companies that entertained the court than had existed in the previous years. From a Privy Council perspective, it renewed the rights of the old Queen's Men with the advantage of securing two strong companies rather than one. The most intriguing aspect of this rearrangement is how extensively the original and radical scheme of 1583, which systematically creamed off the best two or three players from each of the noblemen's companies around London, was incorporated into the 1594 design. Both the Admiral's and the Chamberlain's Men were, in effect, new creations. Who determined their membership?

The innovation certainly gave Henry Carey and his son-in-law a means to limit the competition among the companies. The Rose and the Theatre became the two allowed playhouses, their resident companies the allowed performers. As with Howard's deal in 1584, the lord mayor was appeased by an undertaking to forbid any more playing in the city inns. Carey had to make a special plea later in 1594 to get permission for his company to use one. He wrote to the lord mayor on 8 October asking that his "nowe companie" should be allowed to use the Cross Keys Inn.¹⁵ That performance, if allowed, was the last occasion on which the city inns were ever used

¹⁵ Chambers, Vol. 4, p. 316.

for playing. Suppression of playing inside the city must have been part of the duopolizing deal. Carey so actively upheld the duopoly that Thomas Nashe's comment after Carey's death that his players "in there old Lords tyme . . . thought there state settled"¹⁶ has a true ring to it. In effect, from May 1594 until July 1596 Shakespeare's company knew itself to be based in London as part of a government plan, with accompanying privileges. In the court season of 1594–95, only the Chamberlain's and the Admiral's performed, playing three times each. In 1595–96 the Chamberlain's played four times to the Admiral's three, with one joint performance. In 1596–97, when Cobham was chamberlain, only the Hunsdon company played, six times in all. In the next season, with the new Hunsdon, George Carey, as chamberlain from early 1597, the Chamberlain's played four times and the Admiral's two. No company besides these two performed at court from 1594 until Derby's returned for a performance on 5 February 1600, and the two boy companies arrived in 1601.

That settled state, of course, had strict limits. Henry Carey's priority had been to establish and maintain the new order, not just to support the two new companies of players. His heir's signature in November 1596 on the petition to prevent Burbage's use of his new Blackfriars playhouse may reflect the firmness with which the Careys held to that design, even when the chamberlainship had moved out of the family.¹⁷ Burbage had built the Blackfriars in a liberty to offset the loss of the city inns as winter playing places. Such a renewed intrusion into the city was no part of the deal made between the lord chamberlain and the lord mayor. The inhibition on Langley's Swan in 1597 was part of the same policy.

The deliberate lines of this policy can be seen in the official pronouncements on playing through the following years. A Privy Council order of 19 July 1598 stated that "licence hath bin graunted unto two companies of stage players retayned unto us, the Lord Admyral and Lord Chamberlain, to use and practise stage playes."¹⁸ The order was to suppress a third company, the new Pembroke's, which had been trying to establish itself in Southwark. Another order of 22 June 1600 tried to check new inroads by specifying not only the two companies but the two new playhouses, the Fortune and the Globe (which had replaced the Rose and the Theatre), as the only players and places authorized for London performances.¹⁹ The boy companies, both of which appeared at court in the 1600–1601 season, were apparently free of the chamberlain's control at this time.²⁰

¹⁶ *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London: A. H. Bullen, 1904–10), Vol. 5, p. 194 (letter to William Cotton, a follower of Carey's).

¹⁷ After Hunsdon's death in July 1596, the post went first to William Brooke, Lord Cobham, with some awkward consequences for Shakespeare's portrayal of Sir John Oldcastle, Cobham's ancestor. But Cobham died in March 1597, and the chamberlainship was promptly transferred to Hunsdon's son George, then aged fifty. There were several court struggles over the post at this time, and George Carey may have been lucky to secure his father's former eminence. He had been in dispute with Pembroke, and Robert Sidney, Pembroke's nephew, was a keen candidate for the office of vice-chamberlain along with many others, including Raleigh and Sir John Stanhope (Millicent V. Hay, *The Life of Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester (1563–1626)* [Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library; London and Toronto: Associated Univ. Presses, 1984], p. 160).

¹⁸ Chambers, Vol. 4, p. 325.

¹⁹ pp. 329–31.

²⁰ I suspect that when the boy companies insisted on declaring that they played at "private" playhouses, they were in part protecting themselves from the licensing process that the master of the revels exercised over the "public" playhouses and players. Paul's Boys had *The Old Joiner*

The purposeful policy evident in these aspects of the management of playing seems clear. The question that remains is how active a part the two patrons took in the formation of their new companies. The companies' emergence involved a lot of regrouping. Though not so wholesale a decapitation of the existing companies as in 1583, this change was yet a broad sweep. The Admiral's was formed around Edward Alleyn, Philip Henslowe, and the Rose. Before its reorganization in May 1594, the Admiral's Men had split. Alleyn and James Tunstall worked with Strange's from 1591 onward, while the rest toured in the country under the Admiral's name without returning to London. Alleyn and Strange's were noted together as a traveling company in a Privy Council order of May 1593. But from 1594 the different members of this group went their own ways. Strange's, which became Derby's on 25 September 1593, did not appear at court the next Christmas, when the only company to perform was the Queen's; nor did they return to the Rose. Five of Derby's Men went to form the new Chamberlain's. Richard Jones, a former Admiral's man who had been traveling on the Continent in 1592–93, may have returned to rejoin the Admiral's before 1594, but several members of the new Admiral's company were drawn from other groups. Thomas Downton came from Derby's, and John Singer probably from the Queen's, of which he had been a founding member in 1583 and with which he was still associated in 1588. Richard Alleyn, Edward's brother, also in the Admiral's by 1597, was probably a Queen's man in 1594.²¹ Of the other post-1594 Admiral's Men, Edward Dutton, Edward Juby, Martin Slater, and Thomas Towne, there is no earlier record.

Whether Alleyn had much choice in the composition of the new company is doubtful. Singer's presence suggests strongly that the two Privy Councilors were doing what Walsingham had done with the Queen's, selecting a few men from each of several different groups. Alleyn might have been consulted, but he lacked the authority to select from other companies. Alleyn certainly would not have contributed directly to the equally wide-ranging selection of Carey's company.

The chamberlain's and his son-in-law's initiative in setting up two new companies makes the choice of the players who joined Carey's own company even more of a puzzle. Family connections probably influenced selection of the company's core members. Ferdinando Stanley, earl of Derby, died on 16 April 1594. His widow was sister to George Carey's wife. Derby's widow certainly took an interest in her husband's players because they are recorded at Winchester on 16 May 1594 under her name. From Strange's/ Derby's Men, whose credentials included court performances and a longish history of playing alongside Alleyn at Henslowe's Rose, the new company drew five of its sharers, George Bryan, John Heminges, Will Kemp, Augustine Phillips, and Thomas Pope, along with some others. These fellow

of Aldgate licensed for them by Tilney in 1603 (Dutton [cited in n. 4, above], p. 131), but the Blackfriars Boys, besides being under Daniel's control instead of Tilney's in 1603–04, made less use of the master. Not until after two of their plays had to be censored in 1605 and 1606 did they come under the master's control.

²¹ Evidence for the players is taken chiefly from Chambers and from Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors and of Other Persons Associated with the Public Representation of Plays in England before 1642* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1929), with additions from S. P. Cerasano, "New Renaissance Players' Wills," *Modern Philology*, 82 (1985), 299–304, and from Mark Eccles, "Elizabethan Actors I: A–D" and "Elizabethan Actors II: E–J," *Notes & Queries*, 236 (1991), 38–49 and 454–61.

players did not, however, constitute a full company. Downton and possibly others from Derby's split from their fellows and went with Alleyn into the Admiral's. Carey seems to have deliberately left room in his group for players drawn from other companies. The most notable of these were Richard Burbage and William Shakespeare. Where they came from is a mystery that brings back that other reluctant patron, the earl of Pembroke.

Near the beginning of the 1590s, players' names in the plots of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* and *The Dead Men's Fortune*, manuscripts prepared for Strange's or the "amalgamated" Strange's/Admiral's company, probably before 1592,²² indicate that Strange's Men included "Mr" George Bryan, Richard Burbage, Richard Cowley, John Duke, Thomas Goodale, John Holland, Robert Pallant, "Mr" Augustine Phillips, "Mr" Thomas Pope, Will Sly, John Sincler, plus a Harry, a Kitt, a Vincent, and several boys.²³ Those with "Mr" in front of their names are thought to be sharers. "Harry" may have been Henry Condell, and "Kitt" may have been Christopher Beeston, both later to appear in the Chamberlain's Men. Some of these players left the company in the changes of 1591–93, probably at Alleyn's break from the Theatre in May 1591. Sincler and Holland seem to have been in Pembroke's. Richard Burbage, too, was not in Strange's in the years when Pembroke's was active. On 6 May 1593 the players named by the Privy Council as Strange's, presumably all sharers, were "William Kemp, Thomas Pope, John Heminges, Augustine Phillips and Georg Brian."²⁴ All of these 1593 Strange's players joined the Chamberlain's in 1594. As previously noted, the mystery is where the other Chamberlain's Men came from.

Several companies had strong players to offer. Sussex's and one section of the Queen's in particular were available, playing first separately and then jointly at the Rose between December 1593 and April 1594. The Queen's Men had broken in two as early as 1590, and by 1594 its players were evidently ripe for reallocation. Apparently Sussex's was well-staffed in 1594 since it played *Titus* (inherited from Pembroke's according to the quarto title page), a play demanding at least twenty-six actors for the opening scene.²⁵

²² The most accessible transcription of the evidence from these manuscripts is in *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 327–28. An account questioning the standard reading of this evidence is Scott McMillin's "Building Stories: Greg, Fleay, and the Plot of *2 Seven Deadly Sins*," *MRDE*, 3 (1988), 53–89. I find his skepticism overstated.

²³ A notably small and skinny player, Sincler has been traced through the plays written later for the Chamberlain's in the parts of Nym, Slender, Aguecheek (a "manikin"), possibly Thersites (a "toadstool," "cob-loaf," and "fragment"), and probably Robert Faulconbridge, the Bastard's brother, in *King John*, where he is described in terms that fit the other characters. In Jonson's plays for the Chamberlain's Men, a markedly small player took Shift in *Every Man Out*. Nano, the dwarf in *Volpone*, has a larger speaking part than the eunuch and hermaphrodite. Sincler may also have been Asinius Bubo, a "small timbered gentleman" in *Satiromastix*. Again, there is "a very little man" in *The London Prodigal*, property of the King's Men in 1605. But who did he play in the Shakespeare plays of the early 1590s, particularly *Titus* itself and *Richard III*? There is no evidence of a part written especially for a thin man in the later *Henry VI* plays (for all that Sincler's name appears in one of them), or in *Richard III*, or in the early comedies. None of the *Henry VI* plays, if originally written for Strange's, features any special part for Sincler. His name in the Pembroke texts may indicate his late arrival in that playing company. *King John*, however, does have a part for him. But the disputed dating of *King John*, which is variously ascribed to 1590 or 1595, makes it no help in fixing the time he joined Shakespeare's company.

²⁴ Chambers, Vol. 2, p. 123.

²⁵ *Titus* and its 1594 title page have occasioned a lot of discussion. Paul E. Bennett has suggested that the play dates from 1593, and that its title page simply lists the three companies

Sussex's had played jointly with Laneham's section of the Queen's in 1590 and 1591. Possibly the same group augmented Sussex's numbers in their initial run at the Rose in December and January. Otherwise the fact that Sussex's joined up with the Queen's three months later must indicate a drastic loss of manpower in the interim, for which there is no evidence. Henslowe did not link the two companies by name in December and January as he did in April, but the later identification may merely indicate that he had by then become more familiar with the arrangements of the joint company and the name on its license. It is also possible that members of Pembroke's, disbanded by August 1593, had joined Sussex's. That might also explain the transfer of *Titus*.

The biggest mystery concerns the players in Pembroke's Men.²⁶ This company was oddly prominent in its London activities for a company of wholly new players. Besides performing several of Shakespeare's plays and having Marlowe's *Edward II* written for them, they were good enough to match Strange's at court in the season of 1592–93, with two performances to the other's three. They broke up under the pressures of the plague and a difficult tour in August 1593. Henslowe wrote about Pembroke's Men to Alleyn, then traveling with Strange's, on 28 September: "as for my lorde a penbrockes wch you desier to knowe whear they be they are all at home and hauffe ben this v or sixe weackes for they cane not save ther carges wth travell as I heare & weare fayne to pane ther parell for ther charge."²⁷ Their collapse precipitated the flow of their playbooks into print in 1593 and 1594.

The new Chamberlain's took up several former Pembroke's players, including John Sincler, named in *2 Seven Deadly Sins* as a Strange's man and cited by name at 3.1.1 in *3 Henry VI*, which (as *Richard Duke of Yorke*) was a Pembroke's play by 1593.²⁸ John Holland, also previously of Strange's, is

who shared its performance ("The Word 'Goths' in 'A Knack to Know a Knave'," *N&Q*, 200 [1955], 462–63). The demands of the opening scene might have suggested joint production, but there is no other title page that lists a group of the companies who performed the play in this form, whereas there are several who list a sequence of performing companies. It is also worth noting that several plays of the early 1590s demanded large casts. According to G. E. Bentley, fifteen appears to have been the usual number in a traveling group through the 1590s (*The Profession of Player in Shakespeare's Time, 1590–1642* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984], p. 213); but several plays demanding large numbers of actors started to appear in the early 1590s—*Tamar Cam* required twenty-nine, and *The Battle of Alcazar* twenty-four.

²⁶ Chambers thought that Pembroke's was an offshoot of the Strange's-Admiral's amalgamation (Vol. 2, p. 123). David George accepts this and assumes that the amalgamation's other playtexts reverted to Strange's ("Shakespeare and Pembroke's Men," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 32 [1981], 305–23, esp. p. 307). But that leaves the Admiral's out of account and ignores what happened to *Titus*. There is nothing in Henslowe's letter to Alleyn about Pembroke's to indicate any direct association. Henslowe was reporting business and social gossip to Alleyn, not matters of direct financial interest. G. M. Pinciss is doubtful about Pembroke's being a Strange's offshoot on the grounds that the amalgamated company split into its two component parts for touring during the plague closing of 1593, and that the numbers involved in traveling make it unlikely that three touring companies could have been formed from the original two. He suggests instead that Pembroke's was made up from one of the two Queen's companies ("The Queen's Men, 1583–1592," *Theatre Survey*, 11 [1970], 50–65).

²⁷ Foakes and Rickert, eds., p. 280.

²⁸ The naming of players is a vexed question that depends heavily on what sort of manuscript is identified as the source for the printed text and on when the names were inserted in the manuscript. See Scott McMillin, "Casting for Pembroke's Men: The *Henry VI* Quartos and *The Taming of A Shrew*," *SQ*, 23 (1972), 141–59. The early quartos of *2* and *3 Henry VI* both precede the Chamberlain's company, and the manuscript of *2 Seven Deadly Sins* can never have

named there along with him. Sincler is named again in *The Shrew's* Induction, most likely from its time as a Pembroke's play. What these two players did after Pembroke's collapsed in 1593 is conjectural, though there is one important clue: the track of Shakespeare's plays recorded on the title page of the 1594 quarto of *Titus Andronicus*—from Strange's to Pembroke's to Sussex's. Sincler and Holland certainly went from Strange's to Pembroke's and may have gone from there to Sussex's. Sussex's is recorded by Henslowe as performing *Titus* at the Rose early in 1594. When Pembroke's collapsed, Sincler and Holland might have accompanied the play to Sussex's, whence they were taken up for the Chamberlain's. Conceivably Richard Burbage took the same path. And Shakespeare? When Pembroke's disbanded, Shakespeare was writing his epyllions for Southampton. *The Rape of Lucrece* was entered for printing on 9 May 1594, less than four weeks before the combined performances of the new Chamberlain's and Admiral's Men recorded by Henslowe. Shakespeare must have had some interest in Sussex's since they acquired *Titus*, while the transfer of his entire early corpus of plays to the new Chamberlain's suggests that he had been in the habit of keeping ownership of the plays in his own hands as they shifted from one company to another. Whether or not he actually performed in the companies that had his plays, it seems likely that Sincler, Holland, and probably Burbage, too, stayed with the Shakespeare corpus on its travels until the lord chamberlain descended on them, players and plays, for his new company.

One other factor may have had a bearing on the transfer of players from Pembroke's to Carey's company. After the 1593 break-up, a Pembroke's company does reappear in the records as a traveling group, for instance in the Ipswich records on 7 April 1595 and again the following year. They are also in that city's records for 1592–93; so very likely the 1595 company was the residual group following its familiar touring route.²⁹ They had certainly been reduced in status by the losses following their 1593 troubles, whether some of them went to Sussex's in 1593 or directly to the Chamberlain's in 1594. And there may have been another reason why they did not get back to London. Carey's son George was engaged in hostile wrangles with Henry Herbert from the autumn of 1593 until 1595 over a possible marriage of the earl's fifteen-year-old son William (later dedicatee of the First Folio) to George Carey's daughter. The hot-blooded Henry Carey might have seasoned the family animus against Pembroke either by using his office to keep

been in their hands; so both kinds of evidence are sound indications as to where the named players worked before joining the Chamberlain's. The story of the texts of the *Henry VI* plays, and in particular of the relation between the quarto of *The Contention* and the Folio *2 Henry VI*, and between *Richard Duke of Yorke* and *3 Henry VI*, is a complex matter. Some weight has to be attached to the circumstantial evidence for the two quartos being Pembroke's plays and Pembroke's breaking up and selling their playtexts in 1593, shortly before *The Contention* and *Richard Duke of Yorke* were published in 1594 and 1595. That supports the case made by textual scholars who claim that the two quartos are reported texts deriving from a version of the manuscript that eventually was used to print the Folio text. With some help from the evidently memorial character of much of the transcription in the two quartos, not to mention their incorrect versions of the Latin tags, I am inclined to accept that reading of the evidence.

Quotations of *3 Henry VI* and *Richard III* are taken from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 4th ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 1992); quotations from quartos follow Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir, eds., *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981). Line numbers all refer to Bevington.

²⁹ *The Malone Society Collections* (cited in n. 6, above), Vol. 2, Pt. 3 (1931), pp. 276–79.

his enemy's playing company out of town or by taking its best players for his new company. That is sheer speculation, but the evidence for Carey's direct intervention in playing matters does give it some credibility.

Very likely it was Carey's original policy of not giving his name to any company while he was chamberlain that had driven James Burbage to Pembroke in late 1591, when he needed a patron for his new company. Burbage wore Carey's livery in 1584; but once Carey became lord chamberlain, his reading of his duties would have precluded his patronage of a new company. So after Burbage quarreled with the Alleyns in May 1591 and lost Alleyn along with Strange's Men to the Rose, he may well have arranged to form a new company, installing his son Richard as its leader, by applying to Pembroke for sponsorship. What makes that idea plausible is Pembroke's long intimacy with Leicester.

Pembroke and Leicester shared many activities through the 1570s and 1580s. Pembroke was married to Leicester's niece, Mary Sidney, in 1577. Leicester visited Wilton early that year, and Pembroke and Leicester took the Buxton spa waters together a few months later. On 20 September 1578, Pembroke was present at Leicester's house in Wanstead when Francis Knollys came to settle the marriage of his daughter, the widow of the earl of Essex, then pregnant with Leicester's child. Baynard's Castle, Pembroke's London base, was used by Leicester for his discussions with Pembroke and Philip Sidney over Queen Elizabeth's proposed Alençon marriage in 1579. Throughout this time Leicester and his brother Warwick kept companies; Pembroke, however, after his patronage of the apparently short-lived traveling group in 1575–76, did not. Yet, like Leicester, Pembroke was a playgoer. They attended William Gager's play *Meleager* at Oxford together in 1585.³⁰

James Burbage had been a Leicester's man up to the formation of the Queen's Men in 1583. Pembroke may have been present at performances by Leicester's Men for their patron. He was the obvious choice for a former Leicester's player to turn to as a new patron, a senior noble not currently patronizing any company. And there are perhaps other reasons for Burbage to have gone that way. After Leicester's death in 1588, the Leicester circle had migrated to the countess of Pembroke. She herself was writing plays in 1591–92. An appeal to her husband might well have been the best way to secure the highest level of patronage for the new company. Whether Mary Herbert, Sidney's sister, did intervene to add the new company, playing Marlowe and Shakespeare, to her already long list of creditable literary patronage, it is impossible to say.³¹ Pembroke himself was not often

³⁰ Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London and New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 98.

³¹ There has been a lot of debate about Mary Sidney's interest in reforming the drama, but none of it has suggested that she prompted her husband's patronage of the new company in 1592. She became the second earl's second wife in 1586, when she was twenty-five. Mary Ellen Lamb tried with some success to demolish the widely held view that Mary Sidney helped a circle of playwrights to introduce French and Senecan drama in an attempt to "purify" the common English style ("The Myth of the Countess of Pembroke: The Dramatic Circle," *YES*, 11 [1981], 194–202). David Bergeron is a little more positive, noting that thirty books were dedicated to her, the highest number to a woman after Lucy Bedford and Queen Elizabeth ("Women as Patrons of English Renaissance Drama" in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, eds. [Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library; London and Toronto: Associated Univ. Presses, 1981], pp. 274–90). But only one hint links Mary Herbert to her husband's playing company. Pembroke's Men are not mentioned as participants in the

in London, in part because of ill health. He was in fact beginning the long decline that led to his death in 1601. A letter from 1595 survives in which he writes that he dreams of death and desires it.³² Yet late in 1591 or early in 1592, he had chosen to change his long-held practice by giving his name as patron to a new London company. His wife's intervention cannot be discounted. If we judge by the connections of patrons alone, no other great lord would have been more likely as the patron of a new Burbage company in 1592.

Pembroke's name, plus the other circumstantial evidence, strongly supports the view that Richard Burbage, after a start with Strange's in 1590 and 1591, separated from that company at the time of Alleyn's quarrel with Richard's father, James. When Alleyn and Strange's moved to the Rose, Richard helped to set up the new Pembroke's to occupy the Theatre. Only a year or so younger than Alleyn,³³ in 1591 he lacked Alleyn's stature both literally and figuratively. But he did have similar familial advantages. After Pembroke's collapsed, he may have gone to the Rose with Sussex's for a few months before setting up as the leader of the new Chamberlain's back at his father's Theatre in 1594. Both Alleyn and Burbage used parental property as the London base for their two companies from 1594 onwards.

Shakespeare's place in any of the early companies is uncertain. The case for his belonging to the Queen's has been made as strongly, and on much the same grounds, as for his membership in Pembroke's. He was certainly known to Greene as a player when Greene complained about him in August 1592, with his allusion to the "tyger's heart" from *3 Henry VI* (1.4.137). That play, not in Henslowe's lists for 1592, must have taken Greene's attention at one of the Shoreditch playhouses (there would be little point in Greene making the allusion if the play was not being performed often enough for the reference to be recognizable). I am almost convinced that Shakespeare was with those plays in Pembroke's company at the Theatre in 1592 and 1593. My reasons are not just the number of his plays showing evidence that some Pembroke's players were in them (*2 and 3 Henry VI* in the versions known as *The Contention* and *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *Titus*) but the evidence in the early printed versions of *2 and 3 Henry VI* that he was on hand when they were staged. Two details of the early staging, one in *The Contention* and one in *Richard Duke of Yorke*, indicate an influence that most probably came from a reader closely familiar with Holinshed. In the Folio text of *2 Henry VI*, the entry direction at 5.2 reads "Enter Richard and Somerset to fight." In *The Contention* the stage direction reads: ". . . enter the Duke of Somerset, and Richard fighting, and Richard kills him under the signe of the Castle in saint Albones." Richard then explains the point of the "alehouse paltry signe," reminding the audience of the prophecy that Somerset would die beside a castle. That connection is

"Astraea" entertainment, probably at Ramsbury, for Elizabeth's visit on 27–29 August 1592, but Simon Jewell, a player in Pembroke's or the Queen's Men, mentions her as a patron in his will. J.A.B. Somerset sees that as evidence for his membership and her sponsorship of Pembroke's ("The Lords President, Their Activities and Companies: Evidence from Shropshire," *Elizabethan Theatre*, 10 [1988], 93–111, esp. p. 109). Margaret P. Hannay also sees her intervening in the patronage of players (*Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* [New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990], pp. 124–26).

³² Brennan, p. 101.

³³ Alleyn was born in 1566, Burbage in 1567 (Mark Eccles [cited in n. 21, above], "Elizabethan Actors I: A-D," p. 43).

made in both versions, although in *The Contention* Richard makes it more explicit, saying "Whats here, the signe of the Castle? / Then the prophesie is come to passe." The players might have taken the hint about a hanging sign from the text, but it would have helped if the author were on hand to confirm the detail. Another detail in the later play offers quite direct evidence. The Folio entry at 2.6 of *3 Henry VI* simply reports "*Enter Clifford wounded.*" The Pembroke's version has "*Enter Clifford wounded, with an arrow in his necke.*" Holinshed specified the type and the location of Clifford's wound, and the Pembroke's text of the play records that the company got it right. This replication of visual details from the play's sources, another instance of which appeared in the staging of *Richard III*,³⁴ makes it extremely unlikely that Shakespeare was very far from Pembroke's in 1592–93.

The biggest question of all remains. How active a part did Carey and Howard play in the reorganization of the old companies in 1594? Was it left to the master of the revels to allocate the resources? And most to the point, what allowance was made for the resources that each group commanded? The players were collected and redistributed from the resources of several companies. What about the stock of playtexts that each of the decapitated companies had been performing? Was it an accident that Marlowe's plays were all allocated to one company and Shakespeare's to the other? It is not difficult to see how Alleyn's group secured most of their stock, given their chosen playhouse and their financier. But whether the Chamberlain's acquisition of the large run of Shakespeare's plays that eventually found their way into the First Folio had any influence on the composition of Carey's group is a more teasing question. Strange's had played *1 Henry VI* at the Rose in 1592 if Henslowe's notes about "harey the vj" relate to it, as recent scholarship indicates.³⁵ Pembroke's, which had been disbanded for nearly a year when the Chamberlain's were formed in 1594, had played the later parts of the first Henriad in 1592 plus *The Taming of the Shrew* and possibly others from the same pen. More recently Sussex's company had taken on *Titus* from Pembroke's, which had got it from Strange's. Did some of Sussex's players add it to the Chamberlain's stock? If so, who had the later Henriad plays and *The Shrew*?

The best answer may lie in the reason why *Edward II*, another Pembroke's play, did not also join the Chamberlain's. It turns up much later with Queen Anne's at the Red Bull along with other plays from the Henslowe repertory, even though it is not in the records as being played at the Rose up to 1603.³⁶ That some of the Pembroke's stock of plays went to Henslowe while others went to the Chamberlain's suggests that the plays were dispersed when the company disbanded in 1593. But it may equally be that someone took care to set up a parity of sorts between the two components of the 1594 duopoly. What makes the Chamberlain's stock of plays most distinctive, and very

³⁴ See Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), p. 210.

³⁵ Roslyn L. Knutson has pointed out that Henslowe was scrupulous in recording multi-part plays or plays with sequels, like *Tamburlaine*, Parts 1 and 2 ("Henslowe's Naming of Parts: Entries in the *Diary for Tamar Cham*, 1592–3, and *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, 1594–5," *N&Q*, 30 [1983], 157–60). The absence of any such notation for "harey the vj" indicates that it was a single play, presumably just the first part of the Henry VI sequence, and that Henslowe never had the subsequent plays, two of which went into the Pembroke repertoire. See also Hanspeter Born, "The Date of 2, 3 *Henry VI*," *SQ*, 25 (1974), 324–26.

³⁶ See Roslyn L. Knutson, "Evidence for the Assignment of Plays to the Repertory of Shakespeare's Company," *MRDE*, 4 (1989), 75–89.

likely determined one component in the fellowship of the new company, was the poet who wrote most of it. Somebody, possibly Carey himself, knew enough about the repertory of popular plays in 1594 to see that both companies had a good share. One company got the Henslowe resources, including the Marlowe plays, the other got Shakespeare.

The plays that Henslowe recorded in his diary during the first half of 1594 give some indication of the particular repertoire that the early companies performed and (at the risk of some circular argument) also hint at the composition of the two later companies, the Admiral's and the Chamberlain's.³⁷ In its run between 27 December 1593 and 6 February 1594, Sussex's performed nine plays that appear only in that run of the diary, including *George a Greene*, printed in 1599 as a Sussex's play, and *Friar Francis*, which Heywood in his *Apology* reported as belonging to Sussex's. *Titus Andronicus* also appeared for the first time, if, as I believe, the earlier "Titus" that Henslowe records in the entries preceding those for the Sussex company was *Titus and Vespasian*. *The Fair Maid of Italy* also appears for the first time as a Sussex's play. Only *The Jew of Malta*, a regular in the diary since the first Strange's entries at the beginning of 1592, seems not to have been a new introduction by Sussex's. Henslowe appears to have given Marlowe's play to all the companies that performed at the Rose or at Newington Butts.

In the brief period during which Sussex's joined up with the Queen's Men at Easter 1594, the amalgamated company is noted with five titles. Two, *The Jew* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, came from Henslowe; one was a Sussex's title, *The Fair Maid*; and one other, *King Leir*, must have come from the other side of the amalgamation since it later appeared in print as a Queen's Men's play. Another new play, *The Ranger's Comedy*, also appeared for the first time. It later reappeared in the Admiral's repertory; so it may have been a new title purchased by Henslowe rather than a play imported by the Queen's Men.

For their three-day run between 14 and 16 May, the Admiral's offered one play definitely Henslowe's, *The Jew*, plus one play that was probably his, *The Ranger's Comedy*, and a new title, *Cutlack*, which Everard Guilpin identified as having belonged to Alleyn in 1598 and which must have come from his personal stock. The most intriguing and possibly most revealing list of plays is one that records joint or alternate performances by the new Admiral's Men and the Chamberlain's for their brief run at the same playhouse.³⁸ This list is the only extant record of the original play-stock of the Chamberlain's Men. The two companies offered seven plays between 3 and 13 June 1594. The seven of course included Henslowe's *The Jew of Malta*, probably current then because of the Lopez trial.³⁹ But the others came from elsewhere, almost certainly from the companies where Carey and Howard found the players to staff their new companies. Besides Alleyn's *Cutlack*, *Titus Andronicus* reappeared, presumably with some players from

³⁷ Henslowe's play-lists for 1594 appear on pages 20–22 of Foakes and Rickert's edition of the diary (cited in n. 22, above).

³⁸ Carol Chillington Rutter reckons that since *Bellendon* appeared in the Admiral's list shortly after appearing in the list of the joint companies, each play must have been performed separately by each company (*Documents of the Rose Playhouse* [Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1984], p. 83). There seems no reason to doubt this interpretation of the evidence.

³⁹ Lopez was at risk from February to July 1594, when he was beheaded. Revivals of *The Jew of Malta* coincided with his trials. See Margaret Hotine's "The Politics of Anti-Semitism: *The Jew of Malta* and *The Merchant of Venice*," *N&Q*, 236 (1991), 35–38.

Sussex's. Four new plays appeared, *Hester and Ahasuerus*, *Bellendon*, *Hamlet*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*. The last of these had once been a Pembroke's play, like *Titus*. Where the *Hamlet* came from is uncertain. References to a play of that name had been appearing since 1589, which means that it belonged to one of the older companies then appearing in London, most likely the Queen's.

It is possible to guess more specifically about that from the later history of the seven titles. *Bellendon*, *Cutlack*, and *The Jew of Malta* appear subsequently in the Admiral's lists made by Henslowe. *Titus* and *The Shrew* were part of the Chamberlain's play-stock, to judge from their reappearance in the First Folio. *Hamlet* and *Hester* may also have belonged to the Chamberlain's since these plays never reappear in the Admiral's lists. Possibly the *Hamlet*, like *King Lear*, *The Troublesome Raigne of King John*, and *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, was a Queen's Men's play that passed at this time to the Chamberlain's, to be rewritten sometime later by their resident playwright. The two approved companies did get into the habit of matching their plays, Falstaff with Oldcastle, *Richard III* with *Richard Crookback*, *The Jew of Malta* with *The Merchant of Venice*, and others.⁴⁰ Henslowe's addition of a play about Henry V to his list in November 1595 was conceivably to counter the Chamberlain's Men's use of the older play. For Shakespeare's *King John* the favored date of composition, or even revision, in 1595 would make sense if the company had recently acquired the old play and wanted a quick rewrite for its fresh repertoire. Rewriting *The Famous Victories* had to wait until after the first play of the second Henriad, *Richard II*, in 1595; rewriting *Hamlet* and *Lear* took longer still. Apart from the ascriptions to the Queen's on their title pages, there is no evidence that any of these old plays reappeared in their original form on the stage after 1594. But the presence of vestiges from the old Queen's Men in the Chamberlain's does call for some explanation. From the tracking of playtexts, it seems that some players from the Queen's and some from Pembroke's contributed themselves along with their plays to the new Chamberlain's company.

Based with Alleyn's father-in-law, Henslowe, at the Rose, the new Admiral's had a good repertoire. They could add to the Rose's staples, like *The Jew of Malta* and *Friar Bacon*, Alleyn's own stock, which now included *Tamburlaine*, *Doctor Faustus*, and *Cutlack*. They used some plays once performed at the Rose by Strange's and some by the Queen's. Since these plays passed through several companies, they must all have been Henslowe's own property. On the other hand, none of the Sussex's plays in Henslowe's lists for 1594 and none of the Queen's Men's plays brought to their amalgamation with Sussex's in 1594 reappear in the diary. Nor does "harey the vj." Most likely these were all taken by the new Chamberlain's. The evidence that Henslowe's lists supply about the short run of the joined companies suggests that to the five-man core of Strange's/Derby's Men, Carey added some of the old Pembroke's (who may later have gone into Sussex's) and a substantial share of the Queen's. Redisposing the Queen's Men in itself helped to endorse his decision to replace the old monopoly with the duopoly. Shakespeare, presumably casting off his allegiance to Southampton in the process, went with his plays to the Lord Chamberlain's Men, which replaced the old Queen's. The plays went with their players. Carey gave his company a rich start.

⁴⁰ See Knutson, "Evidence for the Assignment of Plays to the Repertory of Shakespeare's Company," p. 83.