Fig. 1. This damaged image of Arbury Hall circa 1700 (WCRO CR1199/70) appears to be a sketch made by Henry Bright in preparation for his engraving, completed in 1708, at the behest of Sir Richard Newdigate. Bright's engraving was thought to be the only extant rendering of the hall before its gothic renovation in the eighteenth century. This sketch was recently discovered in a frame at the Warwickshire County Records Office. The charm and importance of this image is that, unlike the formal engraving, it is replete with many members of the Newdigate household involved in a wide variety of activities, as they must have been on the day that Bright did his sketch. See blow ups from the sketch on page 19.
Introduction

Circles and Circuits: Drama and Politics in the Midlands
MARY POLITO AND AMY SCOTT

This special issue provides readers with a sampling of the research that has been in development over the last five years following the ‘discovery’ of the anonymous, seventeenth-century manuscript play held in the University of Calgary’s Osborne Collection of rare books and manuscripts. While locating new manuscript dramas is always significant and exciting, the Calgary find was, as we learned, even more significant in that an earlier version of the same drama, also in manuscript and anonymous, is extant at Arbury Hall, Warwickshire (and had been named *The Humorous Magistrate* by Trevor Howard-Hill). The research already conducted on the Arbury miscellany plays offered our collaborative research team a foundation upon which to build our investigations of the plays themselves and the literary circles linked to them.¹ We determined that *The Humorous Magistrate* was composed during the personal rule of Charles I and that the play responds to debates in this period about corrupt local government and the inability of the Crown to keep the peace, despite the legislation and rule books on legal process to which the play refers. We learned that the Newdigates of Arbury Hall moved in a number of intriguing circles, at least one of which was deeply interested in drama and poetry. In the plays themselves, we found a debt to Shakespeare but also, in *The Humorous Magistrate*, a mirroring of plot, character, and some lines of dialogue found in Richard Brome’s *A Jovial Crew* (a play that we argue was composed after the revised version of *The Humorous Magistrate* that we find in the Osborne version). As we visited archives and presented our early findings, we found our domain of collaboration extending itself into an ever wider ‘circuit’ geographically and intellectually.²
The essays in this special issue extend the work of situating these plays and people historically, politically, and theatrically. They ‘people’ the Midlands with figures and families who constitute the ‘circles’ to which our title refers. In situating the geographical locations of the country homes of members of the ‘Newdigate circle’ across a number of midland counties, the ‘circuits’ they travelled to enjoy each other’s hospitality can now be plotted. The word ‘circuit’ refers to other kinds of movement represented in these essays, such as the journeys of assize judges to which characters refer in The Humorous Magistrate; the ‘Midlands’, where we find our networks of drama lovers, was one such ancient circuit. The issue brings to light both these literal circuits of individual mobility, as well as the rituals of justice and the figurative circuit of ideas that the archives demonstrate.

The community implied by the collective work of our contributors is clearly driven by both their love of the rhetorical arts and by their carefully guarded identities as ‘critical royalists’. Reading the plays along with other disparate items collected in the miscellany Arbury Hall 414 demonstrates that the circle is critical both in the sense of finding fault with particular actions of the crown (that they saw as in some cases as weakening the office) and in our contemporary sense of ‘critical’ as dialectical; the archive suggests that they are ready to wrestle rationally with the contradictions they find in their own positions on authority. An obsolete meaning for ‘circuit’ relates to speech that is indirect, to ‘circumlocution’. The dramas are one means for speaking in roundabout ways for these careful members of the gentry. This level of sophistication in the tone of the plays is certainly one of the most interesting things about them; not that they are without dramatic and theatrical charm.

These essays, moreover, continue the work of moving, to paraphrase Diana Taylor, from the archive to the repertoire, from the written to embodied culture. One example reveals this movement well. Paul Faber provides a discussion of the many ways in which the libellous anti-Buckingham ballad with the chorus ‘the clean contrary way’ is linked to the archives we have been studying in that we have found copies of the ballad in members of the circle’s archives and allusions to the ballad in both The Humorous Magistrate and The Emperor’s Favourite. In a scene from the latter play, Faber finds the characters and stage directions seemingly alluding to and performing a gesture that apparently is meant to signify the same sense of irony, inversion, and coded insult as is found in the ballad. Perhaps the playwright was inventing a gesture for his Roman characters that he hoped might prove
amusing and/or useful for his audience. As was well known, performing the ballad might land one in jail; perhaps, therefore, the play is actually revealing a well-known local or even urban gesture designed to signal the inverse to a political stance taken by another or even by oneself. Such a gesture, in a play or an inn or indeed in an exchange between two people, is part of the physical repertoire of mobility in both body and sense. Within the dramaturgy of *The Emperor’s Favourite*, the gesture speaks to embodied dissent and in the process implicates its implied audience. Moving from the archive to the repertoire in early modern studies inevitably involves acts of speculation, critical and imaginative acts that have been discredited of late. Yet surely speculation also sends us back to the archive with new questions and hot curiosity. The manuscripts, the books, the letters, the trails of paper leading to more paper have not nearly been exhausted for this midland circle. Finally, the word ‘circuit’, the *oed* tells us, also signified the figurative idea of ‘Sphere of action’ in the early modern period. For critical royalists during this period of an ever more distant and absolutist crown, the political ‘circuit’ of loyal reformers was narrow indeed. But not so their forays into the world of the dramatic arts and onto the roadways of the Midlands of England and between the Midlands and London.

**Contributions**

This special issue begins at the level of the manuscript itself; it confronts the elegant, messy, maddening, and illuminating letters, words, papers, and texts that make up the materials of the Arbury plays. In “The Pen lookes to be canoniz’d: John Newdigate III, Author and Scribe”, Kirsten Inglis and Boyda Johnstone suggest that the diverse forms of handwriting detectable in the four Arbury plays and the Osborne *The Humorous Magistrate* do not point to multiple authors, as previous research has suggested, but rather can be attributed to John Newdigate’s evolving hand. The development of his hand from a strict secretary to a more flexible italic, they observe, illustrates the work of an author deeply invested in the art of transcribing and writing. Their vital paleographical work allows the other authors in this issue to consider the Arbury plays as the work of one man, a premise that has indeed inspired them to connect the plays to the Newdigate family more extensively and with more fruitful results than ever before. Most importantly, Inglis and Johnstone suggest that authorship is always a ‘collaborative endeavour’ and Newdigate’s writing itself was influenced by a wide circle of texts, contexts,
literary friends, and neighbours. In the very shapes of the letters they locate the effects of a wide sphere of influence that acted on the poetically and politically attuned gentleman.

Margaret Jane Kidnie’s ‘Trying to be Diplomatic: Editing The Humorous Magistrate’ addresses the challenges associated with producing a ‘diplomatic’ edition of a manuscript source, especially when that source is as heavily revised as the Arbury Humorous Magistrate. Her wise caution is that an accurate edition of a manuscript is an ideal that cannot be fully realized, even when editors attempt to replicate the text’s idiosyncrasies. Traditional notions of manuscripts contended that they could be divided between ‘fair’ and ‘foul’ copies; these notions have been challenged and Kidnie’s work thoughtfully extends this necessary critique by pointing out that even the simplest of editorial work done on the fairest of copies is subjective and interpretive. Citing the notion of the impenetrable ‘veil of manuscript’, as articulated by Leah Marcus, Kidnie illustrates the impossibility of transforming a manuscript to print in a way that retains the unique features of the manuscript. She quite rightly points out, however, that such editions, imperfect as they are, open up obscure or inaccessible plays to valuable scholarly attention. This issue itself is a product and continuation of this work.

With Siobhan C. Keenan’s ‘Staging Roman History, Stuart Politics, and the Duke of Buckingham: The Example of The Emperor’s Favourite’, our issue turns to the content of the plays themselves. Keenan argues that the play about Crispinus, the favourite of Nero is a not very veiled critique of Charles’s relationship with the Duke of Buckingham and she links this play to the proliferation of anti-Buckingham literature in the Stuart period. In her close reading of The Emperor’s Favourite, Keenan reveals that a dramatist in the Midlands could turn to classical history to critique current political events as insistently as those in urban centres and that the former could approve of royal prerogative in theory while also critiquing tyranny and endorsing subjects’ sovereignty. The Emperor’s Favourite is not only a significant contribution to anti-Buckingham and anti-court literature of the period, Keenan observes, but also a play that was meant to be shared with a Midlands audience and was mostly likely intended to provoke debate among those in the literary circle in which Newdigate was a member. The play therefore articulates the overlap of local and national concerns and a meeting of urban and provincial literary minds.

Laura Estill’s ‘Politics, Poetry, and Performance: The Miscellaneous Contents of Arbury Hall ms 414’ takes a broader look at the Arbury plays by
mapping the form and content of the miscellaneous volume in which they are bound. She contextualizes the miscellany and the historical, political, and cultural forces that helped shape it. While considering the wide array of genres represented in the miscellany, Estill speculates about what might have compelled the Newdigates to gather such material and what this material can tell scholars about the Newdigates and their interests. What Estill finds is that the miscellany contains items that were popular and would have been circulated and collected by many but that these items often contain additions to or variations in the popular material that are unique to the Newdigate collection. Like many authors in this issue, Estill finds the Newdigates at the heart of a vigorous acquisition and circulation of literary work that speaks to their provincial, urban, and even international interests; as Estill says, the miscellany informs us about the ‘social and collective nature of textual transmission in the early modern period’.
The local and national interests of the Newdigates are also addressed by Vimala C. Pasupathi in ‘Jockeying Jony: The Politics of Horse-Racing and Regional Identity in The Humorous Magistrate’. According to Pasupathi, the removal of a character named Jony, associated with Scottish, or, at the very least, Northern English dialect and horse-racing, from the Osborne version of The Humorous Magistrate indicates the extent to which such regional affiliations were fraught with anxieties. Pasupathi identifies Newdigate as a playwright who was interested in the markers of regional identity in the writing of the Arbury version of the play and a playwright who might have discovered such markers too controversial in later revision. She maps the ‘literal and figurative landscapes’ of the play that inspired the early inclusion and later excision of this geographically distinct character from The Humorous Magistrate.

Pasupathi addresses cultural anxieties associated with Scotland and the horse-racing profession. In ‘The Magistrate — and Humorous Magistrates — in Early Seventeenth-Century England’, Louis A. Knafla turns to the anxieties caused by the legal and political turmoil at the time of the writing of the The Humorous Magistrate, turmoil that likely inspired the satire of the legal profession that Knafla describes at work in the play. The play, he demonstrates, is part of a much larger debate taking place in the 1630s and 1640s about how much and what kind of involvement the monarchy should have in rural legal practices. The play explores the extent of the corruption in urban and rural legal professionals due to ill-advised or unpopular monarchical interventions in the law. Knafla points out that John Newdigate was part of a circle that sought legal reform and his play is thus an invitation for his educated audience firstly to enjoy the satire of the JP, Master Thrifty, and secondly to consider the need to voice a challenge to the corrupt legal system. As in Keenan’s reading of The Emperor’s Favourite, in Knafla’s work we see a playwright who ‘rejects inherited values for the pursuit of personal liberty’. Knafla, like the other authors in this collection, argues that Newdigate engages with debates about the rights of the monarch and the rights of the individual that also preoccupied urban playwrights, but articulates these concerns in ways that would appeal and speak to the Midlands audience watching his plays.

If John Newdigate was indeed part of a literary circle in the Midlands, then the likely centre of that circle was Lady Jane Burdett of Bramcote Hall. Mary Polito’s ‘This rare Poetesse: The Remains of Lady Jane Burdett’ considers Burdett in the context of a collection of verses and a sermon compiled
after her death by Thomas Calvert. Polito observes that the sermon, written by Calvert, joins an increasing number of published funeral sermons. Calvert’s sermon fits neatly with this tradition, as it addresses not only the particular sorrow provoked by Burdett’s death but also the broad sorrow occasioned by national political upheaval. In describing Calvert’s sermon as an expression of a ‘vexed’ perspective on the state of the commonwealth in the 1640s and 1650s, Polito follows Keenan, Pasupathi and Knafla in detecting a more conflicted, even ambivalent, view of the political turmoil of the period on the part of Newdigate and those of his acquaintance. The poems, written by Burdett’s friends and family (including John Newdigate himself), describe a fiercely intelligent poet and an influential patron of the arts. These elegies, Polito observes, are part of a larger tradition of composing verses for public funerals that circulated among friends and family after the funeral. The poems repeatedly emphasize Burdett’s reputation for hospitality; this hospitality is of a piece with the literary circle that has been the focus of this issue.

Amy Scott suggests that Newdigate made the most of the non-urban setting of his audience by consciously evoking a domestic location for performance and a group of friends for an audience. The site of performance in the country manor, she suggests, helps shape the prologues and epilogues of all four Arbury plays. These framing speeches are conventional and match the speeches that bookend many professional printed plays. Their references to a particular occasion for performance support the idea of prologues and epilogues as temporary speeches, designed for a particular performance and audience. But these same speeches also draw attention the words of the play and invite audience members to read them as if they were poems. Newdigate’s emphasis on the textuality of the play, according to Scott, points to his involvement in a lively literary community of the kind described by Polito and Owen Stockden. The references to hosting and feasting in some of the speeches, moreover, link literary creation to hospitality, a connection Polito describes in relation to the Lady Jane Burdett.

Newdigate’s intended audience is considered further in Owen Stockden’s essay, ‘John Newdigate III, Gilbert Sheldon, and ms A414 106r’. Stockden takes up a marginal comment in the Arbury Humorous Magistrate that has been considered evidence of a lively circulation of texts in the Midlands circle of literary-minded elite. The editorial comment on the style of a speech in the play, attributed to ‘Dr. S.’ and written most likely in John Newdigate’s hand, becomes the focal point of a larger discussion of the friendship between John Newdigate and Gilbert Sheldon; the relationship, Stockden argues, was
defined by both men’s interest in the collecting, sharing, and writing of literary works: Sheldon was something of a mentor to Newdigate. The editorial comment helps contextualize the revisions to the speech evident in the later Osborne manuscript. Stockden’s work ultimately helps us argue that playwriting beyond urban centres was as conscious of the need to perfect the craft as that of London playwrights who have dominated early modern scholars’ attention.

The Arbury plays reveal that their author was conscious of the freedom offered by his Midlands location, an author who could incorporate controversial material in his plays because he operated beyond the London censors. In ‘Imported Popular Song in The Humorous Magistrate: “The Noble Acts of Arthur of the Round Table” and “Come heare, Lady Muses”’, Paul Faber draws our attention to a reference to a popular anti-Buckingham ballad in the Osborne Humorous Magistrate. The mention of the ballad is significant not just because it shows Newdigate’s interest in incorporating popular trends in his plays. The reference is also notable because it joins a long line of texts, stretching back to the 1550s, that embed irony into a song or poem with a key refrain that reverses the meaning of everything expressed: the ‘clean contrary way’. These forms of irony conveyed a subversive message without offending censors. Faber goes on to demonstrate that this key signalling inversion is not only mentioned but also incorporated into the dramatic action of The Emperor’s Favourite. The allusion to ‘the clean contrary way’ not only links two of the Arbury plays but also incorporates those plays into a wider circle of literature that managed to express controversial ideas without explicitly critiquing powerful political figures. The ‘clean contrary way’, a ballad that challenges authority, is therefore an ‘evocative verbal trick in a work of socio-political censure’, according to Faber. Newdigate was able to use this trope of irony and incorporate it into the performance gestures of his characters because he wrote in the Midlands and for a provincial audience that was outside the scope of London censors but by no means incapable of appreciating political satire and subversive humour.

This issue establishes that the book of plays at Arbury Hall and their Osborne Collection counterpart are more sophisticated than their provincial origins might suggest; though likely written and performed in the Midlands, they address many of the charged political, legal, and cultural tensions that are most often associated with the content of urban professional plays. This is not to say, however, that these plays do not make reference to rural locations, specifically rural problems and rural anxieties. Each contributor notes
the ways in which a provincial location informed or even made possible John Newdigate’s work. The Newdigate plays, then, emerge as important markers of a circuit of friendship, dramatic performance, and literary exchange in the Midlands.

Plays and Manuscripts

*Osborne 132.27, University of Calgary Special Collections
Arbury Hall A414, Warwickshire*

The play named by Howard-Hill *The Humorous Magistrate* is a comedy set in rural England. Constance, daughter of corrupt Justice Thrifty, loves Christopher Spruce, son of the comically deaf widow, Mistress Mumble. Facing Thrifty’s opposition to their marriage, Spruce, assisted by Master Wild, anesthetizes chaperone Jenet and the lovers flee into the countryside. Accosted by thieves, they are separated. While Spruce searches in vain, Constance encounters a company of shepherds whose king of misrule guides her to the house of Master Welcome, where the couple eventually reunites. Meanwhile, Mistress Mumble and daughter Sophia entertain suitors in Thrifty and Wild respectively. The play closes with Thrifty holding a court session (in which he takes bribes in the form of chickens), the lovers’ return and reconciliation with Thrifty, and triple marriages.

*The Emperor’s Favourite
Arbury A414, Arbury Hall, Warwickshire*

The play named by Howard-Hill *The Emperor’s Favourite* is a historical tragedy set during the reign of Nero. The play recounts the rise and fall of Crispinus, a man of low social standing whose eloquence and charisma enable him to become a prominent courtier and favourite to the emperor Nero. Crispinus initially enjoys great success, allowing his manipulative mother Locusta, along with the rest of his family, to enjoy the wealth and prestige afforded by his newfound station. Crispinus’s appropriation of the emperor’s power quickly alienates the other lords and governors in Nero’s entourage and he is stabbed to death by his fellow vassal Tigranes. The discussions between Nero and his advisor, an actor named Datus, establish a metatheatrical dialogue on the nature of power and sovereignty.
The Twice Chang’d Friar

Arbury A414, Arbury Hall Warwickshire

Named by its author or authors, this play establishes Lisetta as the ideal Renaissance wife. Obedient and consummately chaste, she is a moral beacon set against the decadent and amoral sensibilities of the Venetian court. That is until her husband Caquirino leaves the city for state affairs. Free from her husband’s supervision, Lisetta is initiated into a world of high fashion, sleeping in late, and flirting by two Venetian courtesans cum agents provocateurs, Dianora and Oretta. Lisetta’s transgression reaches its peak when she is cozened by an unscrupulous Franciscan Friar, Albert, who, masquerading as Cupid, seduces her into adultery. When news of her affair spreads, Dianora, Oretta, and Lisetta’s brothers all conspire to keep the affair a secret from Caquirino in order to safeguard Lisetta’s honour and her husband’s reputation. Albert is publicly shamed as he attempts an escape in a bear costume, and Lisetta is reunited with an unsuspecting Caquirino in a comedic, though unsettling, conclusion.

Ghismonda and Guiscardo

Arbury A414, Arbury Hall Warwickshire

There are actually three dramas in manuscript linked to the Newdigates of Arbury Hall that represent adaptations of Boccaccio’s Decameron day four, novel one. In Boccaccio’s tale King Tancredi is so pleased to have his widowed daughter Ghismonda at court again that he neglects his paternal duty to find her a new husband. Ghismonda takes as her lover Guiscardo, a courtier well below her own social status. Tancredi observes them in bed together and orders that Guiscardo be killed and his heart brought to Ghismonda in a golden cup. The princess, who has offered Tancredi a reasoned and passionate defense of her actions, kills herself by adding her tears and poison to the cup. After Ghismonda’s suicide Tancredi repents his harsh punishment of the lovers and decrees that they be buried together in one grave.

The manuscript named by T. Howard-Hill Ghismonda and Guiscardo is the version bound in A414. A second, stand alone manuscript, named Glausamond and Fidelia by Howard-Hill, is also extant in the Newdigate archives (wcro CR136 B766). Both follow the trajectory of Boccaccio’s tale, though Ghismonda and Guiscardo is substantially revised. An extremely clean scribal copy of Ghismonda and Guiscardo is held at the British Library (bl ms 34312) and among this ‘Ghismonda Group’ can be distinguished as the ‘British Library Ghismonda’. Also in this group of documents is an edited and
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Notes

1 As this issue of *Early Theatre* appears, three editions of the manuscript dramas with which we are concerned will have been published by The Malone Society. Two editions of *The Humorous Magistrate* (Osborne 132.27, Jenkins and Polito; and Arbury Hall 414, Margaret Jane Kidnie) and an edition of the play in Arbury 414 named by Howard-Hill *The Emperor’s Favourite* (Siobhan C. Keenan) are in press. Lest readers have not had a chance to read the Malone editions and for all readers in terms of the unpublished play manuscripts in the Arbury Hall miscellany (A414), we provide at the end of this introduction short descriptions and/or summaries of the four plays to which some reference will be made in the essays that follow.

2 Early publications include: Jean-Sébastien Windle, *Dating Osborne ms C132.27*, University of Calgary Master’s Thesis (Calgary, 2006); Margaret Jane Kidnie, ‘Near Neighbours: Another Early Seventeenth-Century Manuscript of *The Humorous Magistrate*, *English Manuscript Studies* 13 (2007); and Mary Polito and Jean-Sébastien Windle, “‘You see the times are dangerous’: The Political and Theatrical Situation of *The Humorous Magistrate* (1637),” *Early Theatre* 12 (2009). For further information about the provenance of the Osborne Collection version of *The Humorous Magistrate*, see the Introduction to the Malone Society edition of the play.

3 ‘circuit’, *oed* 8 a, ‘of speech or expression: circumlocution. Obs.’


5 Taken from Boccaccio’s *Decameron* (fourth day, novel 2).

6 Thanks to John Siddons, Owen Stockden, and Paul Faber for the summaries of *The Humorous Magistrate*, *The Emperor’s Favourite*, and *The Twice Chang’d Friar*.

7 Thanks to Kirsten Inglis for her description of what she sensibly names ‘The Ghismonda Group’ of manuscripts and one printed work linked to the Newdigate archive.
Plate 2. From Arbury Hall 414.
To the Right Worshipfull Sir Francis Burdett, Baronet, High-Sheriff for the Countie of Derby, Honour, and Happinesse in Christ.

HONOURED SIR,

Your is this by strict relation, being the worthy Heir to the honour and vertues of this Name. Not doth the Writer of this and the ensuing meditation strive to guild his name, more then to publish yours: had not the voice of some of your friends called it out, it had stood still in the lap of the mother of it, and would not have taken so much front and boldnesse, as to have called you for a Nurle. It is true often what he said, Nemo vestit latere quod didicit, gaudet exam quisquis provocatur ad dohrinam suam in medium preferendam. But had not this been more to shew gratitude and obligations to your Name, then to seek any credit to the Authors name, it had still lurked in its private Cradle, and not gone forth to be dandled on publique knees. The wish of the Psalmist is now become from perforce.