The Red Bull Repertory in Print, 1605–60

With remarkable consistency throughout the early modern period, Red Bull playgoers are characterized as unlettered, ignorant, or possessed of a crass literary sensibility. Interestingly, though, they are also imagined as avid readers: Webster’s well-known depiction, following the failure at the Red Bull of his *The White Devil*, declares that ‘most of the people that come to that Play-house, resemble those ignorant asses (who visiting Stationers shoppes their use is not to inquire for good bookes, but new bookes).’ Webster’s association of Red Bull spectators with book-buyers suggests that the persistent representations of the low literacy of this audience may obscure the extent to which the famously spectacle-driven Red Bull repertory intersects with early modern print culture. The number of Red Bull plays that were published with an explicit theatrical attribution, and more importantly the similarities in design and typography between them and plays belonging to the more elite indoor repertories, would seem to bear this out. As reading material, the Red Bull plays indicate that a seemingly ‘low’ or popular theatrical repertory is not sufficient evidence of the social or educational make-up of its audience.

It is crucial at the outset to confront the publication figures that have led scholars to assume that a Red Bull attribution on the title page of a play quarto did not have any meaningful currency in early modern print culture: of the roughly 400 editions of plays published between 1605, when the Red Bull opened, and the Restoration, 17 were marketed as products of the Red Bull theatre. By far the highest number of theatre attributions in this period was, not surprisingly, to the Blackfriars (112), a fact that appears to confirm the general sense we have of the indoor theatres as catering to a more select audience, one that would presumably comprise a larger proportion of readers and book-buyers than would the northern playhouses. But like any set of data, these publication figures tell more than one story. While the Red Bull clearly did not have anything like the profile of the Blackfriars in print, this does not mean that it had no profile; on the contrary, it is all the more important to consider why and how the Red Bull attribution was used on title pages when the primary audience for this repertory is assumed to have been, in Webster’s bitter phrase, ‘ignorant asses.’
With this objective in mind, it is worth considering the Red Bull attributions in relation to other outdoor theatre attributions, namely the Fortune and the Globe which were the Red Bull’s primary competitors in the outdoor market. In strictly numerical terms, Globe attributions outnumber the Red Bull by more than two-to-one. The vast majority of these, however, are either joint Globe-Blackfriars attributions or appear on editions of Shakespeare’s plays. In both cases, the Globe attribution is part of a broader, more complex promotional strategy that trades more on ideas of literariness and exclusivity than the public or popular nature of the outdoor venue. Only seven non-Shakespearean plays are advertised on title pages as exclusively Globe productions: *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (six editions between 1608 and 1660), *A Game at Chess* (three editions in 1625, capitalizing on the prohibition of the performance of this notorious play), *A King and No King and Philaster* (published in 1619 and 1620 respectively), *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634), Massinger’s *The Unnatural Combat* (1639), and two editions of *Albertus Wallenstein* by Henry Glapthorne (1639 and 1640). Notably, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* is the only play to have been published in successive editions with an exclusive Globe attribution, and this throughout the period when it was standard practice for printers to advertise the Blackfriars auspices of the King’s Men’s plays.

Compared with the surprisingly small figures for the Globe, the number of Red Bull attributions invites some reassessment. Twelve plays in seventeen editions were published as Red Bull productions between 1605 and the Restoration, and while statistically this is too small a group to support a meaningful account of the chronological distribution of the plays, it is striking that Red Bull attributions occur throughout the complex and tumultuous history of the theatre itself (including its use for clandestine performances after the closure of 1642). Perhaps most notable in this regard is that printers continue to advertise Red Bull auspices even after the Queen Anne’s Men began performing at the more prestigious, indoor Cockpit. Between the opening of the theatre in 1605 and the Queen Anne’s Men’s departure in 1617, seven editions of plays were published as having been performed at the Red Bull: Heywood’s *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608, 1609, 1614), *The Golden Age* (1611), *The Four Prentices of London* (1615); Dekker’s *If it be not Good, the Devil is in it* (1612) and a performance by ‘Young-men of this City’ of W. Smith’s *The Hector of Germany* (1615). After 1617, when publishers should, according to the marketing logic of the time, have been more inclined to displace the Red Bull with the Cockpit, ten more editions are published as Red Bull plays (seven of which are new attributions): the
anonymous *Swetnam the Woman Hater* (1620),¹² Marlowe’s *Edward II* in its fourth edition (1622),¹³ Markham and Sampson’s *Herod and Antipater* (1622),¹⁴ *The Rape of Lucrece* (1630, 1638),¹⁵ Dekker’s *Match Me in London* (1631),¹⁶ *The Four Prentices of London* (1632),¹⁷ W.R.’s *A Shoemaker a Gentleman* (1638),¹⁸ John Kirke’s *The Seven Champions of Christendom* (1638),¹⁹ and the second edition of Robert Cox’s *Acteon and Diana* (1656).²⁰ Of these, only *Match Me in London* and *The Seven Champions of Christendom* have joint Red-Bull/Phoenix or Red-Bull/Cockpit attributions, while *A Shoemaker a Gentleman* claims to have been ‘sundry Times Acted at the Red Bull and other Theaters.’ More important, two of these titles – *Edward II* and *Acteon and Diana* – are reprints that specifically add the Red Bull attribution to plays previously published with different or no auspices. Many other plays performed at the Red Bull were, of course, published without any notice of this fact, but there is no evidence that printers were deliberately ‘concealing their origin as Red Bull products.’²¹ On the contrary, the apparently selective use of the Red Bull attribution underscores the fact that this was a choice made in marketing individual plays.

Taken as a whole, the plays printed as Red Bull productions represent what was and still is taken as characteristic of this repertory: historical and mythological plays conceived on a grand imaginative canvas, dramas of national and civic heroism, and the non-satirical brand of citizen comedy. This general congruence between the Red Bull repertory in print and performance suggests that publishers (rather than dramatists, actors, or theatrical entrepreneurs) are largely responsible for the construction of an identifiable repertory: their decision to use this particular theatrical attribution for plays they deem to be of interest to readers as Red Bull productions in effect consolidated a group of plays that would otherwise not be strictly identifiable with the Red Bull.²² The reverse case can be made for other outdoor venues such as the Fortune and the Swan, where the paucity of attributions makes it impossible to speak meaningfully of a ‘Fortune repertory’ or a ‘Swan repertory.’ There is only a single Swan attribution for the entire period (*A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, 1630), and, while the Red Bull and Fortune theatres are often said to have provided the same kind of low-brow theatrical entertainment and are often linked in satirical jibes at unsophisticated playgoers, only two plays in the half-century of Red Bull attributions are identified on their title pages as having been performed at the Fortune (*The Roaring Girl*, 1611, and *The Knave in Grain*, 1640).²³ It is fitting, then, that one of the best-known parodies of the Red Bull repertory, Beaumont’s *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, refers explicitly to a play – *The Four Prentices of London* – that was not only
published with a Red Bull attribution but is identified by Beaumont’s otherwise unlettered grocer as a play he has read: dismissing the Boy’s concern that ‘it will shew ill-fauouredly to haue a Grocers prentice to court a kings daughter,’ George urges him to ‘read the play of the Foure Prentices of London, where they tosse their pikes so.’ It is possible that Beaumont is thinking here of a now-lost edition of the play, especially since the description of its action (‘where they tosse their pikes so’) accurately describes the title-page woodcut. But it may equally well be the case that Beaumont is more concerned to ridicule George’s literary taste than his theatrical allegiance and therefore simply slips on the matter of the play’s availability in print. In any event, the line is intriguing: what does it mean that as early as 1607, a year before the first of the Red Bull attributions and some seven years before the earliest surviving edition of The Four Prentices, the Red Bull repertory can be signaled by reference to a book? 

The cultural work performed by the Red Bull attribution on title pages of plays needs to be assessed, I think, in terms of two narrower questions: who read the Red Bull plays, and what correlation was there between them and the theatrical audience? The evidence for readership is, of course, extremely slight, but attending to publishers’ marketing strategies can help us approach the question in terms of who was at least imagined as an audience for the playbook. A general methodology for this kind of inquiry has been mapped out in some recent studies, most notably Zachary Lesser’s analysis of the cultural politics at work in the dramatic publications of Walter Burre. Working with the publisher – rather than the author or acting company – as his primary analytic category, Lesser reveals that playbooks could be rhetorically and typographically coded for a specific segment of the reading public. Although Burre’s play quartos did not cost more than any other playbook on the market, they appear to be designed for readers who would recognize and endorse the implied division between a “high” culture of drama and plays defined by opposition as ‘popular.’

A key typographic feature that could signal such a division was continuous printing, defined by W.W. Greg as any instance ‘in which each new speech, instead of (as is usual) beginning a fresh line of print, follows on from the last, with the speaker’s name ... within the line.’ Occasional use of this technique can be found in many plays, often as a simple space-saving device, but where it is used consistently to preserve the metrical unit of a line of verse it enhances the literary status of the play. Furthermore, by mimicking the typography of classical and academic drama, continuous printing could serve to distance the play from its theatrical origins and from the “vulgar” spectacles that win
the favor of audiences in the commercial theater.\textsuperscript{28} This is clearly the case with plays such as Jonson’s \textit{Catiline} and \textit{The Alchemist},\textsuperscript{29} Webster’s \textit{The White Devil}, Beaumont’s \textit{The Knight of the Burning Pestle}, and Thomas Tomkis’s \textit{Albumazar},\textsuperscript{30} where the heightened literariness produced by the technique of continuous printing is also rhetorically expressed in scoffs at ignorant theatrical audiences made in prefaces to the reader or in the play itself.

Interestingly, in the division of taste that emerges in these published plays – a division, that is, between ‘unskilfull’ playgoers who ‘thinke rude things greater than polish’d,’ and the ‘Reader extraordinary’ who can recognize and appreciate the literary merit of drama – the Red Bull audience figures prominently (and here again it is worth noting that the Fortune audience could have served just as well, but did not nearly so frequently come to mind).\textsuperscript{31} The publication of Webster’s \textit{The White Devil}, a play that failed dismally in Clerkenwell, is overtly presented as a rebuke of the ‘vncapable multitude’ who patronize the Red Bull and know nothing of what constitutes a ‘true Drammaticke Poem’: ‘should a man present to such an Auditory, the most sententious Tragedy that euer was written, obseruing all the criticall lawes, as heighth of stile; and grauety of person; inrich it with the sententious Chorus, and as it were life’n Death, in the passionate and weighty Nuntius: yet after all this diuine rapture, O dura Messorum ilia, the breath that comes fro the vncapable multitude, is able to poison it’ (A2–A2v). In \textit{The Knight of the Burning Pestle}, which failed – ironically – at Blackfriars, the ignorant and aesthetically naïve multitude is represented by a guildsman and his apprentice who are regular patrons of the Red Bull and thoroughly familiar with its repertory. And the clown in the university play \textit{Albumazar}, which was also published by Burre and features continuous printing, is ridiculed for wooing a lady in language drawn from Red Bull (and Fortune, in this case) plays: ‘O ’tis Armellina: now if she have the wit to beginne, as I meane shee should, then will I confound her with complements drawne from the Plaies I see at the Fortune, and Red Bull, where I learne all the words I speake and vnderstand not’ (C4v–D1). In all three instances, the Red Bull audience represents the general vulgarity of the playgoing public, meaning specifically lack of wit, learning, or mental acuity.

The physical evidence of the Red Bull playbooks thoroughly undermines this construction. In terms of typographic design and the use of marketing devices, all of the plays published with a Red Bull attribution are no less self-conscious about their status as literary works than plays like \textit{The Knight of the Burning Pestle}, \textit{The White Devil}, or \textit{Albumazar}. In addition to continuous printing, features that signal an awareness of drama as a literary genre
include author attribution, Latin on the title page, a dedicatory or other prefatory epistle, a list of speakers or dramatis personae, and regular division into acts. Heywood’s *The Golden Age*, for example, is frequently taken as typical of the vulgar fare preferred by the Red Bull’s citizen and apprentice audiences, but in print it carries many of the ‘formal, classical accoutrements of the well-dressed English play’: author attribution, prefatory epistle (A2), a list of ‘Persons presented in the Play’ (A2v), division into acts, and continuously printed verse. In addition, there are many rhetorical and typographic elements in this playbook that bespeak a careful orchestration of the text for aesthetic effect and ease of reading. Sententiae are in a contrasting font (eg, on B3v), the dumb shows are visually distinguished from Homer’s speech, including one instance in which the dumb show is arranged on the page with symmetrically graduated margins (C4), and the many descriptive stage directions are unusually reader-oriented (eg, ‘Enter Sibilla lying in child-bed, with her child lying by her,’ C2). Other Red Bull plays seem to have been not only printed, but—as Heywood says of *The Golden Age*—‘judged to the Presse’ (A2), including *The Four Prentices of London* which in its earliest printing (1615) sports the author’s name, a prefatory epistle ‘To the honest and hie-spirited Prentises The Readers’ (A2), a list of dramatis personae, and regular division into acts. In the second edition of 1632, these literary designs are complemented by ‘a tendency to print speeches continuously.’ One might be tempted to think that these typographic features reflect the preferences of the author or printer (Nicholas Okes printed *The Golden Age* and both editions of *The Four Prentices*, along with *The White Devil*, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, and *Albumazar*), but every other play with a Red Bull attribution has some combination of elements that imply literary distinction. Of course one could not claim that there is anything like a coherent or organized agency behind this phenomenon, but perhaps this is the more remarkable point: over a period of some fifty years, nineteen printers and publishers choose a printform that contradicts verbal representations of the Red Bull repertory as sub-literary and its audience as uncultured.

It would seem, then, that the Red Bull repertory was in some sense understood as a literary product, distinct enough to be of enduring interest to readers, and even to readers who made up the market for the most elite forms of dramatic writing. Clearly this sense of audience for the Red Bull plays in print differs considerably from the kind of reception the plays are said to have had in performance, where an audience of apprentices, artisans, and citizens gaped at and cheered an impressive array of special effects, if—that is—they weren’t involved in one of the ‘dayly Tumults’ in the yard.
the silence and, as it were, civility of print, however, the playtext itself – without the adornment of voice, action, costume, or sound – is the main event. These seemingly conflicting reception contexts demand that we expand our sense of the social range of Red Bull playgoers. Would an audience of London tradesmen be the sole or even primary market for the Red Bull playbooks? While the price of a printed play – around six pence – would not necessarily be prohibitive to this sector, and the evidence for literacy in the London guilds suggests a market large enough to support play publication, the typographical coding of the plays indicates an imagined readership familiar with the conventions of literary drama and could, therefore, include the ‘select’ audiences who otherwise (or also?) preferred the indoor repertoires.39

Addresses to readers (which occur in all the Red Bull quartos except Edward II) reveal an imagined audience of unusually broad social and occupational range: shoemakers, apprentices, prominent members of London’s major trade guilds, women, actors, playwrights, nobility, along with the ‘Curteous Gentlemen’ who were, as Cynthia Clegg has shown, understood by authors and publishers to be elite males.40 What evidence we have of the ownership of Red Bull playbooks confirms, too, that gentry were among the patrons of this repertory, although in most cases it is impossible to determine whether they had ever seen the plays at the Red Bull or the indoor Cockpit (where many Red Bull plays would also have been performed after 1617). Six Red Bull plays (including The Golden Age and The Four Prentices, both of which have the theatrical attribution) are listed in the commonplace book of Henry Oxinden of Barham, Kent, as belonging to his library, and Frances Wolfreston, an avid playgoer in Caroline London, owned a copy of Heywood’s The Iron Age in which she wrote a detailed plot summary suggesting that she saw the play performed and purchased the quarto as a commemorative edition.41 Oxinden, by contrast, appears to have been a play-collector rather than a playgoer, so his ownership of Red Bull quartos signals a more strictly bibliographic interest in the drama. The social elite evidently did make up some proportion of the print audience for plays that were originally staged at the Red Bull, just as we can infer that they attended the theatre itself.42 In this connection, it’s worth noting that the one reference we have from the period to a Red Bull playbook being purchased refers to a ‘City-gallant,’ an ambiguous social group to be sure, but certainly not one of the ‘meaner sort’ typically associated with the Red Bull playhouse.43

Approaching the Red Bull repertory in the context of print thus involves a reassessment both of the social and educational make-up of the audience
for these plays and of the intersection of drama and literary culture at this supposedly sub-literary theatre. From this perspective, it is striking how many of the jibes against the Red Bull audience involve the appropriation and re-circulation of dramatic language – playgoers are mocked for ‘culling,’ ‘gathering,’ or ‘drawing’ words from the stage plays and using them in inappropriate contexts outside the theatre. In one sense, this might be testimony of the kind of literary ignorance denounced by Webster; but it also reveals that, along with its famous spectacles, the language of the Red Bull plays was part of the theatre’s ‘brand’ in the entertainment marketplace. Indeed, the play quartos with Red Bull attributions, taken as a group, reveal that text and performance are complementary rather than conflicting elements of the repertory. Unlike the anti-theatrical slant of many of the plays published as literary drama, the Red Bull quartos promote their status as stage plays and many of them preserve elements of performance that are superfluous to a strictly literary enjoyment: in The Golden Age, as noted above, the dumb shows and stage directions are unusually detailed and reader-oriented, Dekker’s *If it be not Good* is warmly dedicated to ‘my louing, and loued friends and fellows,’ the Queen Anne’s Men (A3), and in the most popular of them all, Heywood’s *The Rape of Lucrece*, special care is taken (and advertised) over several editions to set songs in the correct sequence of performance rather than as separate text.

It is likely, then, that the Red Bull quartos are intended to serve as replicas of the stage play rather than displacements of it, as was the case with anti-theatrical publications such as *Catiline*, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, and *The White Devil*. Whether this is just smart cross-marketing on the part of the Queen Anne’s Men and publishers is difficult to determine, but given what we know of the financial risks of dramatic publication it would be highly irregular if these particular playbooks were produced without some sense that a significant proportion of the audience for the Red Bull repertory was not only literate but actively interested in reading editions of the plays. Heywood’s testimony that the staging of history plays ‘instructed such as ca~not reade in the discouery of all our English Chronicles’ needs to be balanced, then, against the evidence of typography, book ownership, and addresses to readers, all of which indicates that illiterate spectators were by no means the only audience for the ‘drum and trumpet’ repertory of the Red Bull.
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