

*The  
London Stage  
1660-1800*

Part 2: 1700-1729

A NEW VERSION  
COMPILED AND EDITED BY

Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume

Draft of the Calendar for Volume I

1700-1711

To be Published by

*Southern Illinois University Press*

## *Preface to the Current Printout*

July 2001

What follows is a work in progress. The first eleven seasons of this new version of Part 2 of *The London Stage* was made publicly available in hard-copy form in the Folger, the Harvard Theatre Collection, the Bodleian, and the Theatre Museum in 1996, and in the British Library in 1999. That version was done on the Penn State mainframe in CMS/Script, and when that computer was taken out of service we had laboriously to reconstitute 750 pages of complex formatting in a microcomputer environment. Mainframe draft versions of all seasons through 1716-17 remain to be converted and completed, and rough drafts of seasons from 1717-18 through 1721-22 have been done directly in Microsoft Word. We will make additional seasons available on this website in PDF form as quickly as feasible.

What the user will find here is basically a tidy draft. It is reasonably complete and it has been rough-proofed, but it has not been rigorously checked as it will have to be before it is put into "print" form. We are glad to make it available on this interim basis for any scholar in the field who may find it of use, but obviously even these early seasons are not as close to perfect as we hope eventually to make them. The season calendar for 1700 to 1711 will, we anticipate, constitute the text of the first printed volume, but the lengthy new "Introduction" which will precede it cannot be written until the calendar is complete.

The compilers will be extremely grateful to any user who communicates additions, corrections, or suggestions. They may be sent to:

Professor Judith Milhous  
Ph.D. Program in Theatre  
City University of New York, Graduate Center  
365 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10016-4309  
E-mail: [JMilhous@gc.cuny.edu](mailto:JMilhous@gc.cuny.edu)

or to:

Professor Robert D. Hume  
Department of English  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802  
E-mail: [Rob-Hume@psu.edu](mailto:Rob-Hume@psu.edu)

### ***What is The London Stage?***

The first published attempt at a performance calendar for the London theatre after the Restoration in 1660 was the Rev. John Genest's *Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, which appeared in 10 volumes in 1832. Considering the resources available to him, Genest's achievement was extraordinary, and his work remains useful. He had read a very large number of the plays, and his commentary is often astute. In the course of the next century, however, Genest's limitations became increasingly evident, and at the end of the Second World War several scholars had the idea of creating a new and better version of Genest's calendar. Pooling their efforts, they settled on a format and an editorial policy, working for some fifteen years before their first fruits saw print.

*The London Stage, 1660-1800* consists of five parts in eleven volumes which appeared in print (out of order) between 1960 and 1970, with a synoptic index that was completed nearly a decade later. Part 2 (1700-1729) appeared in 2 volumes in 1960, edited by Emmett L. Avery; Part 3 (1729-1747) in 2 volumes in 1961, edited by Arthur H. Scouten; Part 4 (1747-1776) in 1962 in 3 volumes, edited by George Winchester Stone, Jr.; Part 1 (1660-1700) in a single volume in 1965, with William Van Lennep's name on the title page, but both introduction and calendar done by Avery and Scouten; Part 5 (1776-1800) in 1970 (dated 1968) in 3 volumes, edited by Charles Beecher Hogan. The *London Stage Index*, compiled by Ben Ross Schneider, Jr., appeared in 1979. The publisher was Southern Illinois University Press, in 1960 still in its infancy. The founding Director, Vernon Sternberg, made a huge investment in the project, in which he took great pride.

*The London Stage* quickly became the basic tool in its field. The kinds of work that have been possible in the last generation have been vastly facilitated by the availability of an exhaustive, accurate calendar of the drama as it was actually performed. The existence of *The London Stage* has contributed not only to the study of plays, but to investigation of the lives and careers of the actors who performed them. The information it made available is fundamental to its notable successor and companion, *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*, by Philip H. Highfill, Jr., Kalman A. Burnim, and Edward A. Langhans, published by Southern Illinois in 16 volumes between 1973 and 1993. In a very real sense the existence of the *London Stage* made the *Biographical Dictionary* possible. Equally, however, we may now say that the existence of the *Biographical Dictionary* makes possible some fundamental improvements in *The London Stage*, most particularly in the identification and indexing of actors.

The original editors of *The London Stage* described their enterprise on their title pages as "A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment compiled from

the playbills, newspapers and theatrical diaries of the period.” Italian operas were included, and early in the period so were most concerts. Until the latter part of the eighteenth century, relatively few playbills survive, with the result that most performances (and casts) are derived from newspaper advertisements (which increase rapidly in frequency after the foundation of the *Daily Courant* in 1702, and become virtually complete about 1706). A high proportion of the original calendar after that time consists of condensed representation of the newspaper ads.

In most respects, what the original editors set out to do, they did extremely well. By any standard, their calendar is close to exhaustive in its list of performances, and admirably accurate (if limited) in its presentation of casts. Box-receipts are faithfully reported when known. The introductions to each part (issued separately as paperback books) are wonderfully full, vivid, and detailed; they present a view of the London theatre by scholars who knew its nuts-and-bolts underside. What is perhaps best about *The London Stage* is simply that the user can see at a glance what plays were performed at each theatre on any given day. Consequently one can study competition and competitive devices as they evolved, day by day, week by week, month by month. This was Genest’s greatest failing: he presented a separate list for each theatre, making comparisons vastly more difficult. Someone studying (say) the Little Haymarket might prefer exclusive focus on that theatre’s repertory. But for most scholarly purposes, knowing what the competition was doing is vital, and that is what *The London Stage* is ideally designed to make clear.

### ***Why a New Version of Part 2?***

The present enterprise had its origin in 1971 as what was intended to be a pamphlet of additions and corrections to Parts 1 and 2. Because virtually no playbills or newspaper bills exist for the period 1660-1700, we know no more than about 7 per cent of the performances that were given in these years (versus nearly 100 per cent after 1706). Part 1, in consequence, presents quite different problems in compilation, and even in the concept of what that initial volume ought to be. Part 2 is very much closer to 3, 4, and 5 in most respects, at least after the regular appearance of daily ads in the newspapers. But admirable as it is in many ways, Emmett Avery’s Part 2 has some serious problems and deficiencies.

Part 2 was the first published, and like many initial installments of major reference works, it suffered from being the guinea pig. The whole calendar was cut to the bone to save space, with the result that very little contemporary commentary was included—though these are the years of the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the beginnings of arts coverage in newspapers. Avery did not even regularly quote or cite such obvious and important sources as John Downes’ *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708) or the anonymous *A Comparison Between the Two Stages* (1702). Nor did he include any of the important Lord Chamberlain’s documents concerning the theatre discovered in the 1920s and ex-

cerpted by Allardyce Nicoll in his *History of English Drama, 1660-1900*. Avery almost totally ignored the wealth of lawsuit information drawn on by Leslie Hotson in his classic account of *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (1928). The original editorial policy was heavily skewed towards *drama* history, with the result that a very large amount of *theatre* documentation was deliberately omitted.

Most readers will be aware that over the last thirty or forty years a substantial amount of new theatrical material has been discovered, much of it in MS. The most notable single addition to our knowledge of the period covered in the present enterprise is the "Coke Papers," a collection dispersed at auction in 1876. Many of those papers were presumed to have been destroyed in the bombing of Nagasaki, and the collection was reassembled and published only long after Avery's death as *Vice Chamberlain Coke's Theatrical Papers, 1706-1715*, ed. Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982). Only a few new performances of plays have been added to the calendar in this version, even for the years 1700-1706, but very large amounts of contextual and theatrical information have been included. On many points of editorial policy the original *London Stage* improved substantially in the course of its development. Avery does not identify authors of plays, does not clearly indicate premières, and presents no survey of each company's new offerings in his season headnotes—all things that had become standard by the time of Hogan's Part 5. Avery's index was recognized as a disaster from the earliest reviews: quite aside from major errors, it does not include performers, which makes any study of their careers exceedingly difficult. (In Avery's defense, we should say that lacking the *Biographical Dictionary*—as yet unconceived—he felt that full disentanglement of actors' roles was impossible, especially for a theatrical family like the Bullocks.) The Schneider *Index* is only a very limited improvement, as it has major conceptual and factual shortcomings of its own and is of necessity based on a text that *deliberately suppressed* most casts. One of the space-saving devices adopted in the early parts of the original enterprise was what the editors called the "ladder," a system of cross-references which allowed them to give a cast for a play only once in a season, after which they merely referred to an earlier date (e.g., "As 11 October") or noted differences (e.g., "As 13 Feb., but Prue-Miss Younger"). This did save space, but rendered any attempt to study the activity of the performers extremely difficult, whether via index or working directly with the text itself.

### ***Features of this Version***

This new version of the calendar covers the ground that Avery covered, but it does so far more inclusively and presents primary materials with far less editorial intervention and compression. We should emphasize that this is not a "new edition" but an entirely new version, created from scratch. Virtually all items listed in our *A Register of English Theatrical Documents, 1660-1737* (2

vols., Southern Illinois University Press, 1991) are cited, excerpted, or printed here. As a result, a smaller proportion of the calendar text is derived from newspaper ads than was true in the 1960 version. We have, naturally, checked our results against Avery's and tried to benefit from his admirable work. But we have returned to the primary materials in all cases because we have a radically different editorial policy: our aim is to present a vastly fuller window on theatre operations, not merely a performance calendar.

(1) *Pagination.* The pagination of the present printout is purely temporary; pagination changes every time we run off a new copy. Users are welcome to cite this interim version, but the only helpful way of doing so will be to cite dates (or Season headnotes when appropriate) rather than pages.

(2) *Changes in entry format.* We have preserved the basic page layout of the original London Stage calendar (a very clear and helpful one), but with refinements and improvements, some of them adopted from Parts 1 and 5.

—Premières of plays (both mainpieces and afterpieces) are signalled with a double-dagger (‡).

—The authorship of every play is given if known. If an attribution is made in a playbill or a newspaper advertisement, then the author's name appears in parentheses, usually reproducing the formula of the ad, for example: (Written by Beaumont and Fletcher). If we have supplied the attribution, then it appears in square brackets, thus: [Beaumont and Fletcher]. If the attribution in an ad is wrong or misleading, we have given it from our source in parentheses and offered a correction in brackets.

—If an original cast list separates male and female roles, we have divided them (as Hogan does) with a double slash (/).

—Every entry for a performance is explicitly tied to a source, most often a newspaper ad on the day of performance. We name the newspaper at the end of the main entry (before advertisement details). If the date of the source newspaper is different from that of performance, we give the date of the newspaper issue. We have used the EEN copy unless another is specified.

—The abandonment of the "ladder" (explained above) means that we repeat cast lists in full even on successive days. We regret the redundancy, but such duplication is unavoidable if we are to index all advertised appearances of each performer. Users should note that we index to pages rather than dates, and that more than one performance may be found on a page.

(3) *Editorial policy on "Entertainments."* We have reproduced far more of the advertisements than Avery did, and we have reproduced them far more literally. Especially for singing, dancing, and music, he saved space by summarizing (or omitting) many of the details specified in the original ads, and by simply saying "Singing" or "Singing as 15 November." To reproduce the total content of every bill for every day would be impractical, but we have tried to include all performer names and all substantive description of the ancillary

entertainments given with every performance, however formulaic. Users may wish to note that we have followed copy more literally than Avery did. We retain eighteenth-century spelling, though we have silently corrected flagrant typos in printed sources and have supplied minimal punctuation for MSS that do not even put periods at the ends of sentences. We have generally *not*, however, reproduced *italics* from our sources, since they are used so inconsistently by different printers in this period that the result of following copy blindly would be typographic chaos. Hence we have put titles in italics (however set in the original), but in most other cases have reduced italic type to roman.

(4) *Handling of printed editions.* Avery rarely used printed editions of plays unless he had no newspaper or playbill cast. Here we have given full bibliographic information on all known first editions (and on later editions if they contain new matter of use), reproduced the cast in full, noted the presence of prologue and epilogue, and specified the copy used. We have also quoted prefaces and dedications (sometimes at considerable length), if they contain critical commentary of import or discussion of acting and reception. We cannot claim to have obviated the need to consult front matter in the original editions, but we have tried to indicate which of them contain useful material.

(5) *Presentation of documents and commentary.* As with prefaces and dedications of plays, we have tried to steer a middle course. We have printed a large number of documents in full, especially when MSS are involved and there is no printed transcription available. In other cases we have printed extracts or summaries, and in some instances we have merely directed attention to material not included. Without attempting to reproduce all commentary in full, we have given at least excerpts from such sources as the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. Our aim has been to make plain to users what sources exist and what sort of material is to be found in each instance. Unmediated presentation of eighteenth-century material is generally introduced with the term “Contemporary Comment”; our own observations (or summary and analysis of primary sources) are usually introduced with “Comment.” The near-total lack of explanation of official “dark nights” is one of the more confusing deficiencies in Avery’s version. We have tried, therefore, systematically to indicate (generally in italic comments centered on the page) gaps in the calendar—for example, the annual fast day for the martyrdom of King Charles I on 30 January and the many fast days proclaimed by the pious Queen Anne, on which the theatres were forced to remain closed.

(6) *Music and Concerts.* We have added a significant number of concerts to the calendar, and all ads for concerts are given in full rather than merely summarized. Publication of theatre music is now reported, as is the existence of songs or act music. In the final form of this calendar we intend to list all

known songs for plays and scores for operas—something now done only very spottily.

(7) *Season introductions.* Season introductions are a good deal more analytic than Avery's. Company rosters are fuller, more accurate, and much more systematically documented. Any company roster entry that is not documentable from the text of the season via the index is given a parenthetical or footnote source. As in Hogan's Part 5, every season introduction provides a statistical overview of each company's operations and a list of its premières for the season.

(8) *The indexes.* There are two indexes—one of plays, the other comprising actors, other persons, and selected topics. Plays are normally entered under playwright (if known). If the playwright is not known, then the entry is under title. Every instance of a role played by an actor is indexed—an improvement made possible by the existence of the Highfill-Burnim-Langhans *Biographical Dictionary*. But because computer-sorted indexing does not accommodate wild variations in the spellings of roles, we have had to standardize designations of roles for each actor. The character name is entered in the calendar as given in our source (clarified or corrected [in brackets] if necessary), but in the index under either the commonest advertised form or that specified in the first edition. This is occasionally treacherous: be prepared to look for either "Worthy" or "Justice Worthy." Users should note that until we tidy up our programming and establish final page divisions, index references to people close to page breaks will occasionally be one page off. Users should note that the PDF file for each season contains a mini-index for that season alone (both Index of Plays and General Index), with title-to-author cross-references for those plays performed that year. The synoptic indexes for 1700-1711 contain all entries for all eleven seasons combined.