Theatrical Citings and Bitings: Some References to Playhouses and Players in London Consistory Court Depositions, 1586–1611

The most often cited London Consistory Court record in relation to early modern London theatre history is the record of the playgoing of Marion Frith, or Moll Cutpurse. Among other references cited, Leslie Hotson refers to a deposition from this court that identifies a playhouse employee, William Strange, who, when testifying in a suit, recorded his occupation as one who 'attendeth the King's players at their plays, and goeth abroad of arrants'. In addition, Laura Gowing cites Joan Hewes, a gatherer at the Red Bull, from a deposition in a defamation suit brought in 1618. Gowing, when identifying the kinds of work women did in public, also refers to a defamation suit brought by another gatherer, Mary Phillipps, while Mark Eccles cites Thomas Greene's testimony from this case in his Notes and Queries series on actors. Yet the London Consistory Court depositions from 1586–1611 contain still more information about players and playgoers — information, as far as I have been able to determine, that has not yet appeared in print. These depositions in particular further confirm our understanding of contemporary attitudes towards women's playgoing, contribute to our knowledge of the duke of York's (Prince Charles') company, and provide extremely illuminating information concerning John Newton, both as a player and sharer in the duke of York's company and as the plaintiff in a matrimonial enforcement suit full of suspicious circumstances which suggest that the marriage contract was a confidence game.

Before turning to the specific contents of these records, I would first like to consider the importance of the London Consistory Court depositions in general as a source of information for early modern theatre. In early modern England, the London Consistory Court — as an ecclesiastical court — adjudicated a wide variety of cases: church discipline, defamation, matrimony, testament, and tithe cases. While the jurisdiction of this ecclesiastical court does not appear to be related directly to early modern playing, the specific kind of ecclesiastical court and the kinds of documents that have survived combine
to make it particularly informative. In terms of the ecclesiastical court system, the consistory courts are particularly valuable for insight into Elizabethan and Jacobean culture; as Martin Ingram points out, 'the most important forum was the bishop's consistory court ... [I]t formed the hub of diocesan administration and justice for early modern London'. More than half of the witnesses, for example, in the surviving, accessible documents of the period 1586–1611 came from metropolitan parishes. This consistory court handled cases from a wide range of social classes as well. Moreover, unlike those from the archdeaconsy courts and the Court of Arches, the depositions from this court are the most complete from London for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The kinds of records from this vital, active court contain information concerning early modern London theatre history. The act books, which set out procedures, contain some information concerning playing, without provocative details. For example, in a London Consistory Court Office Act Book for October 1610–November 1611, a player, Philip Rossiter, was 'presented for that he peremptorily affirmed in most vile spitefull speaches that a man might learne more good att one of their plaies or interludes then at twenty of our Rogishe sermons'. In a 20 May 1602 entry in an Office Act Book from the same court, John Spencer from Westham was 'Presented for teachinge his schollers playes & theatricall matters'. The deposition books (Liber examinationum), however, which record the testimony of plaintiffs, defendants, and witnesses to cases, are particularly rich sources of information about daily life, both for their full detail on matters at issue and for information in them given incidentally, and offer more information about women's playgoing and players.

The depositions, then, are legal records, which are meant to record what happened. The depositions are apparently verbatim transcriptions of responses by the witness to a series of questions, which were asked and answered in private without the presence of the litigants or proctors. The beginning of each deposition contains a brief biography of the witness. These biographies in particular are important in determining credibility since, while witnesses were not necessarily fully truthful about themselves, they had an interest in being perceived as such. The deposition books are not organized in terms of the litigants or the cause of a case but are, for the most part, chronologically arranged according to the date on which the deposition was repeated before the judge, who was a university-trained doctor of law. It is important to remember that these depositions represent the testimony as recorded by an intermediary, the court clerk, so that we cannot claim that these records represent the actual voices of the witnesses. Likewise, it is impossible to discern
whether the witnesses in these suits are accurate, think they are accurate, or manipulate the evidence to affect the outcome of the case.

These rich depositions, nonetheless, with their references to players and playgoers, further confirm our understanding of contemporary attitudes concerning women’s playgoing. In an interrogatory repeated on 15 November 1610, for instance, an insult to a woman is intensified by connecting it to a player. After Anne Sawnders called Agnes Mewes ‘Bosse and drunkerd & sayd she kept bad company’, Agnes in turn called Anne ‘Plaiers punch’. In addition, the depositions further document the moral stigma on a woman who attends the theatre. In a deposition given on 3 January 1609/10 from a defamation case, a witness testified just how inappropriate the lord chief justice thought it was for a woman to attend a playhouse without her husband. Richard Dixon, a baker and also a serjeant from St Sepulchre Newgate, aged 36, explained what had happened:

this deponent being comming out of Thames streate articulat vp love lane in St Mary hell parishe articulat toward the articulat William Thurtrowkettles hovse vp on a sunday at night late in the evening & the articulat William Thurtrowkettle Henry Davy and Andrew Hawes and an other whose name he now remembereth not being gone vp the lane before this deponent they met with the articulat [ff] Mr ff Francis Curle & mres Watton & some of the company as it semed in the darke stummbled on1 or isseled mres Watton & thervpon mres watton sayd they were base fellowes in yat they would not suffer her to go quietly in the strete, or vsed suche like worder7 and mr Curle hearing her saye so turned backe and spake to them & bad language was given on bothe sydes wherevpon mr Curle being in a great fury drewe his rapier & ran at them114

In his testimony repeated on 13 November 1609 Hawes, a fishmonger, aged 32 or 33, who was one of the group, reported that ‘when Mr Curle ran at them with his rapier as aforesaid the sayd Dixon being an officer as aforesaid got holde of Mr Curle & tooke his rapier from him & kept it to the Shreifes vse to whome it was delievered the same night wherevpon the sayd [mr] Curle, for taking away his rapier1 had them all the next day before Sir John Watte’. The matter did not stop here for Curle sued Thorowkettle, Davy, Dixon, and Hawes for taking away his rapier, first in Common Pleas, ‘where he let his accon fall’ and then in the King’s Bench ‘where it still dependeth’. According to Hawes, ‘by reason of the suite depending [before t] in the kinges benche in this cause being argued or spoken in speaches before the Lord chiefe Iustice of England besides their being togethuer in love lane as aforesaid it was justified before the Lord chiefe Iustice that the sayd Mr Curle
& mres Watton had byn scene together at playes or at a playe whereupon the Lord chiefe Iustice wished Mr Watton to looke better to his wiffe. Based on Hawes' account, it was Mrs Watton's playgoing which motivated the lord chief justice to advise Master Watton 'to looke better to his wife', thus supporting further the contemporary belief that playhouses were places of sexual assignation or, as Stephen Gosson put it, a 'Market of bawdrie'. Andrew Gurr comments on how widespread a belief this was: 'the assumption that female playgoers were motivated by sex, whether for pleasure or money, remained a male prejudice throughout the period'. The lord chief justice's sentiments are in keeping with the anonymous author of *The Actor's Remonstrance* (1643) who maintains that for a woman to go 'lawfully' to a playhouse she is to be attended by her husband or near allies.

The depositions provide illuminating information about the duke of York's (Prince Charles') company and John Newton, player and sharer in that company. The extant testimony from a lawsuit in which Newton sued Joan Waters for matrimonial enforcement in the London Consistory Court includes the depositions from five witnesses and the personal responses from the plaintiff and defendant. Two witnesses were deposed on Newton's behalf (William Addison and George Ireland) and three on Water's behalf (Thomas Hackleton, Elizabeth Hattrell, and William Duke). Newton here tried to establish a valid contract of marriage, which would force the defendant to solemnize their vows and result in cohabitation. It is not unusual that Newton would sue Waters for the enforcement of a marital contract in this court, since ecclesiastical courts had wide jurisdiction concerning matrimonial matters: 'They adjudicated', as Ingram outlines, 'disputes over marriage contracts, issued marriage licences, heard petitions for separation and annulment, and brought prosecutions for irregular marriage, unlawful separation and similar offences'. Civil courts, on the other hand, usually litigated marriage suits in terms of remuneration for economic damages.

All five witnesses and Newton himself identified him as a player, while two of the witnesses and the plaintiff pointed out the specific company to which he belonged. William Addison, a yeoman, aged 30, testified 'that the sayd John Newton is by his trade & course of lyfe a plaier &c of the company of the Dukes plaiers', and in his own personal response Newton testified that 'he this respondent is one of the duke of yorke sworne seruantes and a player'. In terms of playing, the testimony of four of the five witnesses provides information on when the duke of York's (Prince Charles') company was at the Boar's Head and Curtain playhouses, testimony that contributes to our understanding of where both Newton and the duke of York's company played.
Much speculation exists about the exact playing houses used by the duke of York's company before 1615. According to John Tucker Murray, the duke of York's company's first London playing-place seems to have been in Whitechapel, for in the summer of 1608 the Chamberlain of Leicester entered the following payment in his account book:

"Itm given to the Princes players of White Chapple, London...... xx s."

...There was no known theatre in Whitechapel at this time, so in all probability the reference is to some Inn yard, which Prince Charles's men used till they moved into the Curtain, in the liberty of Halliwell, Shoreditch, most likely about Dec., 1609, or early in 1610.²⁵

E.K. Chambers believes, 'During 1608—9 the company was also at Bath, and it is at least possible that it was "the Princes players of the White Chapple London" rewarded at Leicester in 1608. The Boar's Head (q.v.) may have been roughly spoken of as in Whitechapel, and although there is no proof that the Duke of York's men occupied it after the Queen's moved to the Red Bull, there is nothing to connect them during the earlier years of their career with any of the better-known London houses'.²⁶ Gerald Eades Bentley maintains, 'The wording of the reference to the Prince's men at Leicester in 1608—9 suggests that [the Boar's Head] was used for a time by the Duke of York's (Prince Charles's) company. This troupe might have played there a good deal, for no regular theatre for them is known until they were attached to the Hope in 1615'.²⁷ Herbert Berry also comments on the lack of evidence to connect this company with a London playhouse before 1615: 'Although they made extensive tours of the provinces, Prince Charles's men must have played often to ordinary audiences in London, at least during the five seasons from 1610 to 1615—16 when they were to play at court, but no playhouse in London is associated with them until the leases were running out at the Boar's Head in 1615'.²⁸

The London Consistory Court depositions from 1586—1611 inform this discussion. Four depositions given before 1615 (17 February 1610/11, 7 June 1611, and 14 June 1611) identify the Boar's Head and Curtain playhouses as those of the duke of York's (Prince Charles') company. George Ireland, aged 22, a gentleman from Gray's Inn, for instance, identified Newton as 'a plaier at the Boreshead without Aldgate of the duke of yorckes Company',²⁹ and William Duke, a haberdasher, aged over 27, dwelling in St Sepulchre parish, reported that Newton is 'one of the company of ye players yat vse to play their
partes on the stage at the Curtein & the bores head without Algate [().] in the
suburbs of London & for suche a one commonly knowne accompted and
taken'. The Curtain was cited in two other depositions as the playhouse
in which Newton played. Elizabeth Hattrell, a domestic serving girl of Waters,
aged 19 or 20, testified that Newton 'is a player at one of the common playe
howses & so [ac]comonly accompted of & she this deponent in Whitsone
holydayes last past was present at ye Curten in hallowell & sawe the sayd New-
ton publiquely vpon the stage there playe a parte in a [the] playe there'.31

In addition, these depositions yield information about Newton's economic
earnings as a player and sharer. Concerning the economic value of shares,
Bentley comments, 'It would be interesting and useful to know how much a
share might be expected to produce in the course of a year. Until the last decade
of the period, however, the evidence is too scattered, too contradictory, and
too inferential to allow any sound generalizations for all companies'.32 While
we do not, unfortunately, learn what a share could earn in a year, witnesses
deposed on the amount Newton's daily share could be at the Boar's Head
Theatre, Ireland, who connects Newton with the Boar's Head Theatre, testi-
fied 'yet he hath heard him the said Newton say yat he can gette for his share
some 5 s. a day sometimes'.33 Other witnesses comment on Newton's financial
situation in their testimony; for example, Addison testified 'that he heard the
sayd Iohn Newton saye in the presence of the said Ioane yat [sh] he was noth-
ing worthe & that as he had nothing so she ought little or nothing'.34 Accord-
ing to Duke, Thomas Hackleton, and Hattrell, Ireland's account of Newton
indicated that he was in much better financial circumstances: all three wit-
tesses report that Ireland told Waters that 'if she were married to the sayd
Newton he the sayd Newton wold bring her in wekely and evry weke after
xx s. a weke for her maintenance ... & Newton him selfe did offer to make
her a joynture of an Inne in Burntwood yf she would become his wife'.35

More important, perhaps, is the amount of personal information that these
depositions reveal about Newton. Ireland recounted that he was present at a
conference that Duke had with Waters, and

Ad .1. articulum addicionalium predictorum ... he further saith yat he hath bin at 2
or 3 times besides present with [her] & 'him' the said duke & waters when he hath
heard the said duke move & sollicite the said Waters as afore, and shee did like well
of his said motion & desired yat shee might see & speake with him the said Newton
or worder to that effect aliter nescit

Ad 2 articulum deponit et dicit yat in one of the moneths aforesaid and 'as' he
nowe remembrith about a fortnight after Michaelmas last past that articule lohn
Newton and Ioane Waters by means of the said duke as this deponent taketh 
mette together at the signe of the Crowne and goat in 'west! Smithfield 
London being a taverner, whither [af] this deponent Came into theire Company 
hearing yet they then \ 'were\ ' there, for yet he was well acquainted with the said 
parties where he saith he sawe the said Ioane Waters & John Newton together in 
very loving & extraordinary kinde manner, [mak] making love & showing great 
kindnes ech to other by drincking one to another & kissing & embracing together 
very lovinglye [in so] & he verily beleueth yet the said Waters was then very 
much affected to him the said Newton in the way of marriage for yet shee the said 
Waters did then with her lips sucke his the said Newtons necke in a manner of 
kindenes whereby shee made 3 red spottes arise wherupon the said Newton asking 
her what shee ment by it shee answering said yet shee had marcked him for 
her owne. And after much kindenes & Conference then & there passed betwixt 
them shee the said Waters requested him the said Newton to goe home with her 
saying yet he should be very welcome, which this deponent thincketh he did aliter 
nescit for yet he this deponent then left their Company, then being present in 
their Company at the said taverne William duke, and the said Newtons sister & 
[be] besides the parties in sute and this deponent. / 

Ad 4 articulum deponit et dicit yat upon the same day yat the said meeting was at 
the signe of the Crowne and goat aforesaid vt supra deponit & 'after that said 
meeting\ ' they the said Newton & Waters about the evening of the said day mette 
againe together at the said tavern where the said Waters & Newton did showe 
great love & kindenes ech to other by kissing & kinde wordes ech to other, and 
saieth yat after sometime there spent they the said Newton & Waters together with 
this deponent & Gregory Saunders went to the said Waters house where they were 
kindely entertainned especially the said Newton by the said Ioane Waters, soe yat 
the said Sanders seeing their kinde behauiour ech to other said to them in these 
worder or the like in effect viz. Leave your kissing, and if you will accept one of 
another as man & wife then ioyn handes, which they seemed to be willing unto 
& [gave their handes tog] then he the said Sanders tooke both theires the said 
Newton & Waters handes & ioyned them together and said Thus I make you man 
& wife, and they seemed both to like well thereof & therupon kissed ech other, 
then \ ' & there\ ' being presente the said parties in sute this deponent & the said 
Sanders aliter nescit deponere vt dicit. / 

Ad 5 articulum deponit et dicit, yat [about some 2 or] within one two or 3 daies 
after the foresaid meeting by him last mentioned they thatarticulate Newton & 
Waters mette together againe at the signe of the Queenes head articulate, and after 
much speech & Conference then between them had in the way of marriage at the 
last thatarticulate Newton did desire this deponent to make & drawe the forme of 
a Contract of marriage between him & the said Waters in writing which he this
deponent having had some foreknowledge of their said meeting & intent had drawne & provided afore, & thervpon this deponent drewe out 2 papers in one whereof was written these wordes viz. I lohn take the Ioane to my wedded wife &c. verbatim as in the article is sette downe wordes of matrimony in the booke of Common prayers is sette downe & in the other paper were written these wordes for the woman viz. I lone take the lohn to my wedded husband &c as in the said booke of Common prair out of which this deponent had wrot[h] the wordes verbatim is sette downe, & then he this deponent deliuered thone paper for the man to him the said Newton who after he had read the same did subscribe it with his owne hand & the other paper wherein was written I lone (...) &c. he Read over & also his Contest William Addison did read it over to the said Waters as the wordes were therin sette downe, [war] he warning her to take heed what shee did & to Consider well before shee sette her hand to the said l writing for it was a contract which was not for a day or a moneth but for terme of life and shee answered shee knewe what shee did for it was but by Confirmation of that shee had done before & thervpon sette her marcke vnder the writing [of] of the said Contract vpon the said paper for her parte, & then he [the said Newton] this deponent taking both those said papers deliuered the paper subscribed with his the said Newtons hand to her the said Waters & that subscribed with her hand to him the said Newton which they gladly received and thervpon kissed eac other, then & there being present besides the said parties in sure & this deponent his precontest William Addison alter nescit/

... Ad 7 deponent yst after the premisses as afore & about a weeke therafter this deponent being againe together with the said Newton & Waters at her foresaid house, they having then speech [of] about marriage to be solemnized betwixt them did both intreat this deponent to procure a license for the solemnization of their said marriage [& willed him to] α, and did appoint the place for their said marriage to be at Burntwood in Essex alter nescit

Ad 8 respondet yst after the premisses this deponent divers times resorting to the said Waters said house hath once or twice [in the morning] [twice] found the said Newton in her chamber lying vpon her bed & familiar with her shee being then in her naked bed [alter nescit] & noe body els there but [they], α, them, two, alter nescit.36

Ireland's deposition in particular is revealing, not only for the personal information it provides about Newton but also for the way in which it shows that the contract took place. In the extant London Consistory Court depositions for 1586–1611 it is very unusual to have a written contract. The manner in which, according to Ireland's testimony, Waters demonstrated her good will
to Newton is extraordinary not only in the depositions but also in contemporary literary texts as well. That is, to give Newton '3 red spottes' or love bites in order to 'marck him for her owne', she literally and symbolically marked his body as her territory, as her property. Peter Stallybrass comments on the long and widespread belief of considering the female body as property: 'The conceptualization of woman as land or possession has, of course, a long history ... In early modern England, "woman" was articulated as property not only in legal discourse ... but also in economic and political discourse'. Waters here reversed this ideology, since she enclosed or put a boundary on Newton's body as her property while she unenclosed her own. One can apply Stallybrass' observation on the female 'gaping mouth' to this case to see that through Waters' open mouth she 'negates all those boundaries without which property could not be constituted'. Unfortunately, none of the other witnesses corroborate Ireland's account of how Joan 'marcked' John. According to Ireland, this 'sucking' occurred at a meeting at which Duke, Newton's sister, Newton, Waters, and himself were present. Duke, Newton, and Waters do not mention this incident in their depositions and the testimony of Newton's sister — as far as I have been able to determine — has not survived. The accuracy of Ireland's account is then impossible to determine; however, the unusual particularity with which he describes the contracting can be seen to strongly suggest that he gave an accurate account of events. It is also significant that such details could be told in the expectation that they would be believed.

Ireland's deposition is also interesting in that he interpreted Waters' pregnancy as evidence of her good will. His testimony first suggests the threat her position as a pregnant widow poses to the social order of early modern England. Ireland reported that his acts to 'sollicite the said Ioane in honest sorte to take likying of the said Newton in the way of marriage \(^{1}\) which shee at first and before their said meeting at the queenes head as afore [refused] said shee wold not marry with any till shee was delivered of the childe shee then went with being her late husbandes \(^{2}\) Childes deceased for avoyding scandal'. By not wanting to marry until after the child is born in order to 'avoyd scandal', she maintains her reputation as the obedient chaste wife of her former husband. However, we may observe that she simultaneously protects her autonomy since she controls her own means in her own interest. She could be seen, then, to disrupt patriarchal control since she would be creating a family without a male head. Barbara Todd explains the threat of an ungoverned woman to the theoretical order: 'English patriarchal society required that, like the state, the household should be headed by a man. The woman heading her own household contradicted the patriarchal theory'. Yet Ireland's
testimony contains Waters' implicit challenge to the social order since Ireland reported that during and after the meeting at the Queen's Head tavern 'shee seemed to be very willing to marry with him the said Newton & desired this deponent to gette a license for her'. Thus, he cited her desire to marry while pregnant – a desire that can be seen to suggest her willingness to accept her place in the patriarchal order – as evidence of her good will.

The plaintiff and defendant themselves told differing stories, Waters focusing on deception and Newton on intention. In her personal response given on 17 April 1611, Waters admitted she drank and spoke with Newton 'but not towchinge marriage', and though she 'sett her hand to ye said noate', she 'knewe not the contente thereof' 'vntill ij or iij dayes after yat she found' the note at home & caused her boye to reade it & then she perceyving they had deceived her was muche greved & burnt the note'. She also noted that Newton had been in her bedchamber 'once or twice' but was 'in the Companie of other persons'. She in fact explained the circumstances further: 'being big with child & not well & the sayd Newtons brother & sister were there with him & stayed there & supped with this respondent in her chamber she being in her bed & they sate or by the bed syde & eate their meate vppon the bed'.

Newton's own testimony given on 8 June 1611 emphasized Joan's state of mind and awareness at their contracting and the public knowledge of their marriage, which served as important evidence when determining whether a couple were married:

he this respondent is one of the duke of yorkes sworne servantes and a player and he further anwereth & beleeveth that the said loane waters at the tyme of the subscribique of her name or marke to the contracte alledged in this suite in the behalfe of this Respondent was in verie good sence reason and temper [at (...) as he beleeveth And he [told] verily beleeveth that she did well knowe & understend the contentes of the said noate and what she then did by reason that dyvers weekes or daies after that she the said loane did sundry tymes confessed both to his this Respondentes freander and to her owne freindes and others that she had soc subscribed her name or marke to the fore said noate and that she purposed to be married to him this respondent or to that effecte as he beleeveth.

Newton's response focused on the exact kinds of evidence a judge would have looked for to determine whether the contract were legal. For in addition to the kind of contract, the depositions from the London Consistory Court indicate that goodwill, tokens, the intentions of the man and woman, and public fame were proof of a contract. In the depositions from the suit thus far, it
is unclear what Waters' intentions were and how many people considered
them as husband and wife; Newton focused his response on these two issues
concerning knowledge, stressing that Waters knew what she was doing since she
herself told people of their contracting.

Along with the particular focus of Newton's personal response, several sus-
picious circumstances exist in this suit to make it look as if the contracting
were a confidence game. In terms of property, Waters as a widow with a house
and at least two servants of her own would be an attractive match for New-
ton, whose own financial circumstances, as cited earlier, vary according to the
witness. Duke's assessment of Ireland's motivation for what he told Waters
about Newton's income may account for the differences in the two reports of
Ireland's income. According to Duke, Ireland was 'using those speeches as a
reason the rather to persuade her to lyke & affect him'.47 In addition, Ireland
provided no explanation as to why he offered Waters a house from his father's
estate if she were to marry Newton. However, Elizabeth Hattrell imputes his
reason as protecting the couple from want: 'rather then they the sayd Newton
and her sayd mistres should want maintenance after they were married together
he the sayd George Ireland would procure them a howse of his the sayd Irelandes
fathers to dwell in'.48 Perhaps, as Duke noted about Ireland's account of New-
ton's income, Ireland tried to make Newton appear more attractive to Waters.

Moreover, the involvement of Ireland and Addison in the negotiations and
contract is also suspect. Addison and especially Ireland are convenient people
to have at a contract. Though Addison reported his status as a yeoman in the
brief biography at the beginning of his deposition, in his interrogatory we
discover that 'he is a Clerke & serveth one Mr Bryars a Counsellor of Graies
Inne & so hath done about 3 yeares'.49 Addison's association with Gray's Inn
made him a compelling witness in terms of the legality of the contract. It is
not surprising, then, that he testified as to the particular kind of contract that
allegedly occurred – 'the contract was simple & not condicionall' – testi-
mony indicating it was the more binding 'simple' contract. In terms of the
actual contract itself, Ireland copied the contract and his knowledge of the
form and language of the more binding 'simple' contract would also aid
Newton in his suit. Ireland's involvement can be seen as even more suspect in
Duke's testimony, since Duke reported that he 'advised her to be well advised
before she made any suche promise whereupon the sayd Ireland was offended'.
Duke commented further on Ireland's bias in this suit: 'the sayd Ireland was
a great friend of the sayd Newtons & very jealous that this [respondent or]
deponent or any of the widowes frendes should be with her who might advise
her in the matter of contract they went about to make'.50
Waters’ mental state at the time of contracting further suggests a confidence game. The question of how much alcohol was consumed before the contract was a key issue in the case, since several witnesses testified on the amount consumed, especially on the amount drunk by Waters herself. Addison cited her pregnancy as evidence of her sobriety:

there was wine drunke bothe before the contractes were read & afterwards also amongst them but how muche he cannot tell. 

...yet for his parte he verily beleueth the sayd Iaene waters at the tym of contracting her selfe to the sayd John Newton was not drunken nor overtaken or distempered with drinke but was sober & of as good judgement as before or after & did well understand what she did as appeared by her awnswere when this respondent advised her to be carefull what she did neyther did she drinke muche wine nor was urged thereto in respect she was with child.54

However, her servant Hackleton, who testified on her behalf, told a different story: ‘they had muche wine at the Taverne ... & she came home with a good colour & not in so good case as she went out’.55 This account of having ‘much wine at the Taverne’ is in keeping with her own: ‘after they had byn drinckinge wyne in the said taverne three howers ,...or [&] more one in the company shewed forthe a little noate or writing’.56 Ireland, however, admitted that though they ‘carried there about 2 or three houres’, he suffered a memory lapse since ‘how much wine was droncke or money spent he cannot remember’.57 Yet his memory was clear on Waters’ sobriety: he ‘could not perceiue’ that Waters ‘be droncken or overcome with wine, neither did any of the Company perceiue her so to be that this deponent heard of, but saith he taketh it that she was then of good capacitie & understandeing & knewe well what shee did and what shee sette her hand vnto as it seemed to this deponent’.58

The judge, however, did not see the contracting as a confidence game. While no sentence remains in this series of records to indicate whether the judge ruled the contract between Newton and Waters as valid,59 a parish register for St James Clerkenwell indicates the sentence: ‘John Newton and Joan Walters were married by lic the 22 of August 1611’.60 But while the parish register confirms the validity of the contract, the depositions themselves provide the rich personal and social details.

The extant London Consistory Court depositions for 1586–1611 offer much more information and possible implications about players and playgoers than we have previously understood. Two deposition books from the middle of this period (October 1597–June 1603), which are currently being conserved and will soon be ready for consultation, may provide still more theatrical citings
and bitings, thereby enriching even further our understanding of early modern London theatre history.

Notes

1 I would like to dedicate this article to Professors S.P. Cerasano and Anne Lanca-shire.


6 I have concentrated my research on the twenty-five-year period of 1586–1611 for two reasons: (1) within this period there were sharp increases in the population of London and in the number of cases coming to the consistory court, and (2) important changes occurred in canon law (1597 and 1604) and also in the monarchy. In addition, these twenty-five years are of great interest to literary scholars, given the important developments in poetry and drama during this time, especially since this is the period when Shakespeare was in London and drama was at a high point.
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