

OTDK DOLGOZAT

The Henslowe Diary: Can Philip Henslowe's Diary Contribute to a Better Understanding of
Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*?

A Henslowe napló: Hozzájárulhat-e Philip Henslowe naplója Marlowe *Doctor Faustus*ának
jobb megértéséhez?

2022.09.26.

Table of Contents

Introduction: The Elizabethan Practice of Revising and Updating Dramas	3
Chapter 1 Clarifying Fundamental Concepts: <i>The Henslowe Diary</i> and the Dramaturgy of Marlowe's <i>Doctor Faustus</i>	6
1.1 The Henslowe's Diary – An Overview	6
1.2 Henslowe's Theatrical Affairs	7
1.3. 'Thunder and lightning' and the Supernatural on the Early Modern Stage	9
1.4. 'Thunder and Lightning' and the Supernatural in Marlowe's <i>Doctor Faustus</i>	10
Chapter 2. The 1597 Additions about <i>Doctor Faustus</i> and Henslowe's Mysterious Private Affairs	12
2.1. Henslowe's Theatrical Affairs and the Production of 'thunder and lightning'	12
2.2. Henslowe and the Supernatural: Secret Consultations with the Occult Philosopher, Simon Forman (1596-97)	13
Chapter 3. The 1602 Additions about <i>Doctor Faustus</i> and Henslowe's New Theatre	18
3.1. The Second Set of Additions	18
3.2. Building of The Fortune Theatre	20
Chapter 4 Staging <i>Doctor Faustus</i> and the Practice of Drama Touring	23
4.1. Contemporary Recollections on the Rose and Fortune Performances of <i>Doctor Faustus</i>	23
4.2. The Practice of Drama Touring in Early Modern England	26
4.3. Drama Touring and the 1597 additions of <i>Doctor Faustus</i>	27
Conclusion	30
Works Cited	33

Introduction: The Elizabethan Practice of Revising and Updating Dramas

Revising and updating dramas was one prominent feature of the early modern repertory system. Dramatists of the age put a significant amount of creative energy into freshening up old playbooks, hence they could maintain the popularity of these dramas, extend their afterlife to an audience of the upcoming years, additionally, reduce the expenses – reviving plays, of course, was less costly than buying new ones. As Knutson highlights, certain principles governed the selection of plays to be updated. For instance, the Admiral's men – Philip Henslowe's famous theatrical company of the Elizabethan and early Jacobean age – only updated those plays that had a "history of commercial success" (*Revival and Revision* 274). The company primarily bought comedies and histories, but, in the case of tragedies, they preferred long runs and frequent revivals instead of purchasing new pieces (*ibid.*). Another factor that urged dramatists to update dramas is when these pieces grew old not in "aesthetic", but "generic sense". In such a case, companies frequently ordered alterations that exaggerated those features of old plays that "had originally made them popular" (*ibid.*)

The hope of profit can also be considered as a powerful stimulus when it comes to reviving dramas. In the Renaissance era, there was a general assumption that "old playbooks cannot be considered as marketable unless they had been updated and improved" (Knutson *Revival and Revision* 257). Therefore, if there was the possibility that an old play could be revised with profit, dramatists added "new or special prologues and epilogues", scenes or stage directions to the pieces (Bentley 483).

Concerning the practice of reviving and refreshing Renaissance dramas, Philip Henslowe can be considered as a key figure. Although Henslowe was a prominent figure of the Early Modern period as an influential and wealthy theatrical impresario, his diary is the one he is most remembered for. The journal gives a deep insight into the nature of the Elizabethan theatre to modern-day scholars, additionally, it contains crucial pieces of information about the plays performed between 1592 and 1604 – Henslowe "recorded the date of each performance and the title of the play performed", thus enabling scholars to determine the frequency and the length of the stage run (Knutson *Play Revision* 2). Moreover, he kept a meticulous record of his payments, all the incomes and expenditures: his money spent on a wide range of props for theatrical performances, the numberless purchases of copper lace, which was common ornamentation of Elizabethan costumes, the vast amount of money that he devoted to the

enlargement of his theatre, The Rose, besides the updates and alternations of the dramas played there (Henslowe, *Diary*).

As Andrew Gurr highlights, the theatrical impresario was in a close relationship with several, as he calls, ‘hack-writers’ and Henslowe frequently employed them to “patch on additions to plays he had bought for his companies, or old plays which needed freshening up” (16). It is worth mentioning that, concerning Henslowe’s additions, he did not specify his reasons of updating the plays staged in his playhouse nor the nature of the changes – for instance, extra stage directions, more special effects, new scenes etc. only the amount of money, the name of the hired and the exact dates are indicated, thereby, leaving space for numberless possible explanations and the speculation for modern-day scholars.

Philip Henslowe’s diary is not only significant in terms of containing a meticulous list of plays performed between the period he kept a journal and providing an insight into the Renaissance theatrical culture, but it includes the first written records on the performance history of one of the most popular and, at the same time, the textually most problematic drama written in the Elizabethan age, Christopher Marlowe’s *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. At this point it is worth mentioning that Marlowe’s drama not only problematic because its original promptbook had been lost, but it exists in two texts that, rather than varying in small details, are markedly different from one another, not only in content but in dramaturgy: the drama “was published first in 1604 [A-text] and then again in a different guise in 1616 [B-text]” (Marcus 6).

Scholars have long recognised the alterations between the two texts, as numberless studies were and are being conducted in the field to find an explanation to the issue. In the critical history of the play, some of the most popular and recurring topics were the significance of the comic scenes and the depiction of the religious conflicts within the two quartos. The alterations in the dramaturgy, although recognised by many, have never been discussed in detail. Concerning the textual differences between the two publications of Marlowe’s piece, I consider Philip Henslowe’s diary as a crucial document as the journal mentions two dates, 1597 and 1602 when the drama was updated. The main objective of this paper is to argue that Philip Henslowe’s diary can contribute to a better understanding of the dramaturgy, more specifically the different occurrences of ‘thunder and lightning’, of Marlowe’s *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. In this paper, I propose the discussion that the B-text’s richer dramaturgy can be considered as the outcome of one of the updates ordered by Philip Henslowe. Through exploring the relationship between the supernatural-specific stage language of *Doctor Faustus*

and the Henslowe diary, my paper offers an entirely new perspective from which the drama could be examined.

To carry out this aim, this paper will first revolve around the main characteristic features of the *Henslowe Diary*, more specifically, the way the impresario kept his journal, his theatrical affairs, and the appearance of Marlowe's drama amongst his diary entries. In the first place, it is likewise necessary to briefly elaborate on the echo of the supernatural beliefs on the Early Modern stage, additionally, the alterations in the supernatural-related stage language of the two texts of *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, since these are crucial pieces of information concerning the arguments of this research. After clarifying these fundamental concepts, my paper shifts its focus to the updates of the drama. I devote separate chapters to the two sets of alterations: The 1597 additions are examined in light of Henslowe's relationship with the supernatural, whilst the 1602 additions are evaluated in light of the changes in the theatrical culture in the 17th century and the building of Henslowe's new theatre. Finally, chapter five will evaluate and reflect on the two updates considering two contemporary recollections on the staging of the drama in Henslowe's theatres.

Chapter 1

Clarifying Fundamental Concepts:

The Henslowe Diary and the Dramaturgy of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus

1.1 The Henslowe's Diary – An Overview

Philip Henslowe's diary can be considered as a fundamental source for scholars of the Renaissance stage as the journal gives an insight into the nature of contemporary theatrical culture and helps them reconstruct the way the Elizabethan theatre operated: the journal includes, among others, costume purchases, hundreds of transactions, receipts for plays and "payments to playwrights" (Jimenez no pag.). Henslowe's mainly used his diary to record his business- and occasionally private affairs – some entries reveal his "sideline businesses" and secret consultations (Cerasano *Curious diary* 72). Between 1592-1604, the impresario kept his journal quite frequently, however, from 1604 on, the format changed, and he had "infrequent jottings until 1609" inclusive (Foakes *Introduction* xi). Neil Carson, in his study, reflects on the inconsistency of the *Henslowe Diary*: he argues, given that it contains many "incomplete records" and unsystematic notes – sometimes, he leaves out certain details, for instance, the "names of the authors are not [necessarily] mentioned, or are entered later in questionable circumstances" (65) – he prefers to regard the diary as a "memorandum book" instead (13). Some observations of Foakes' further confirm Carlson's: He points out that it is a "Folio of 242 leaves", however, it is not its original scope as around 70 pages were lost in the early history of the manuscript, then several pages were partially cut out, or removed entirely (*Introduction* xi-xii). Therefore, analysing the text carries certain challenges.

To understand the content of *The Diary* in a better way, Foakes established four groups into which Henslowe's affairs could be categorised. The first type is the mining accounts; however, "they are not directly connected to Henslowe" (Greg xvii), but "belong to a time prior to [his] ownership and use of the volume" (Foakes *Introduction* xiv). Consequently, most publications omit these parts from the main text. Similarly, most editions leave out Henslowe's pawn accounts; Only Foakes' critical edition includes them. The third category is Henslowe's private affairs. These are notes ranging from buying property, payments on rents, loans given to family members to "receipts for the alleviation of various diseases". A major part of *The Diary* is devoted to the impresario's theatrical matters, "chiefly his financial connection with companies of players [...] accounts relating to [his theatres]" and the updates he paid for in the dramas he bought for his companies" (Foakes *Introduction* xiv-xxi).

As clarified in the introductory chapter, updating and refreshing dramas were relatively common in the Renaissance age. Theatre owners frequently hired writers to add further scenes,

prologues, and special effects to old dramas, thereby they can preserve their publicity for an upcoming generation of audiences. Philip Henslowe was an exemplary figure in this respect, as his diary reveals that he frequently ordered alterations on the dramas staged in his playhouses¹ – some of his receipts show that “old playbooks [were] good commercial properties”, thereby by freshening up these playbooks, Henslowe could expand his incomes (Knutson *Play Revision* 1). Before constricting the focus to the impresario's drama updates – more specifically the alterations on *Doctor Faustus* – it is necessary to elaborate on his theatrical affairs in more details, thus establishing the necessary background for a thorough discussion in the upcoming chapters.

1.2 Henslowe's Theatrical Affairs

The most extensive section of the *Henslowe Diary* – and probably the most crucial concerning the Renaissance stage – is devoted to the impresario's theatrical affairs. These parts of *The Diary*, as Foakes puts it, “consist of four types of entries” (*Introduction* xxiv). These include his daily receipts, the payments on the expansion and building of his theatres, transactions concerning his theatrical companies as well as his miscellaneous notes, for instance, remarks on hiring actors, buying costumes etc. (*ibid.*) The prominence of that section of *The Diary*, as Knutson argues, is that it contains a meticulous list of records from 1592 to 97 with the “date of each performance, the title of the play performed and the receipts that were his share of profits” (*Play Revision* 2). Altogether 280 plays are mentioned in *The Diary*, and what is even more startling is that according to G. E. Bentley “about 60% of the plays would be totally unknown” if it not for their appearance in Henslowe's list (qtd. in Jimenez, no pag.). It should be noted that 1597 can be considered as a significant date in the way he documented theatrical performances: from that year on, there were “several breaks in the sequence of [the recorded] performances”: daily entries ceased and changed to weekly or monthly records (Foakes *Introduction* xxiv). Additionally, Henslowe changed the format of the entries too – he put more emphasis on the expenditures of his company rather than listing the performances (Knutson *Play Revision* 2). Furthermore, a difference can be noticed in the way he jotted down the name of the dramas performed: Henslowe, from the first records until 1597, marked certain plays as ‘ne’ but after that date, he stops using that abbreviation (Henslowe, *The Diary*). Although *The Diary* does not contain any explanation on the nature of that particular abbreviation, scholars share the same view that Henslowe marked those plays that were new

¹ The Diary mentions textual alterations on, among others, Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* with “new additions by Ben Johnson”, Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* “with Thomas Middleton's prologue” as well as Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the latter of which this research is concerned with. (Astington 130)

(Knutson *Play Revision* 1). However, Greg reminds the readers, the differentiation was used for relatively old plays as well, thus it can be assumed these plays were “new in a sense that [they were] revivals with alterations” (qtd. in Knutson *Play Revision* 1).

Based on Henslowe’s diary, Marlowe’s drama was first staged on 30th September 1594, one year after the playwright’s death, and was quite popular and performed with a great frequency² – even the entrance fees reflected that popularity as one had to pay £3 12s for each performance, which is a “large sum of money for a play not marked as ‘ne’” (Bowers 123). As Gill argues, it is mainly because Henslowe wanted to take advantage of the play’s publicity as a result of the recent death of Marlowe (Gill, *Introduction* xi). At first glance, the fact that Henslowe did not use the abridgement ‘ne’ when he jotted down the dates of the *Doctor Faustus* performances, does not seem to have any connotations. However, if that observation is examined in light of Greg’s arguments on the meaning of that particular abbreviation – ‘ne’ = old plays with alternations – the absence of that mark reveals its richer significance.

The original playbook of the drama had been lost. Therefore, we do not know how the drama was performed initially in the playwright’s lifetime. The fact that Henslowe does not differentiate this play with ‘ne’ can imply the possibility that, at that time, the original Marlowean drama was played in the impresario’s playhouse, not the revived versions – A- and B-texts – that modern-day readers are familiar with. Henslowe ordered alterations on *Doctor Faustus* twice, however, as highlighted above, he changed the format of the diary entries in 1597 and stopped using the abbreviation ‘ne’ – it happened in the same year he ordered the first set of alterations on *Doctor Faustus* – therefore, it is unknown from when did the refurbished edition of the drama was performed on the impresario’s stage.

It is likewise unknown what alterations Henslowe ordered on Marlowe’s *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* as he only indicated the date, the amount of money he paid and the name of the author entrusted with carrying out the changes: the two publications, the A-text from 1604 and the B-text from 1616, show a significant number of alterations. What further complicates the issue is that even scholars do not have a unified conceit on which text to consider closer to the original Marlowean drama – what parts can be regarded as the playwright’s work, or what are the additions, with certainty³ (Barta 166). The two publications not only vary in length – the 1604 Quarto is relatively shorter and “lacks many of the rather frivolous stunts

² Over 20 performances of *Doctor Faustus* were recorded in the Henslowe-Diary between 30th September 1594 and 5th January 1597 (Bowers 123)

³ For more detail on the textual difficulties and the different standpoints on which text to consider as more Marlowean, see: Barta 165–178.

that mark Faustus' progressive decline in the 1616 Quarto" (Marcus *Magic Books* 21) – but also in content. In short, the "main tragic elements of the drama", namely the beginning and end, can be found in both texts, however, "not without variation" (Duxifield 2). There are differences in the soliloquies of Faustus, in the conjuring scene, additionally, the "comic scenes in the middle of the play are dealt with much more elaborately in the B-text" (ibid.) Differences not only manifest themselves in content but in dramaturgy: the B-text is "fuller and more crowded in stage actions" (Marcus *Textual Indeterminacy* 6) –the stage direction of 'thunder and lightning' is used with a greater frequency, thereby the supernatural elements of the drama get more emphatic: the A-text, the sound cue is indicated only once, in contrast to the six cues of the 1616 Quarto.

Before discussing the dramaturgical alterations, namely the different usages of 'thunder and lightning', between the two publications of Marlowe's drama, it is necessary to briefly elaborate on the role of that stage direction, and its connections with the supernatural, since these are crucial pieces of information concerning the main arguments of this paper.

1.3. 'Thunder and lightning' and the Supernatural on the Early Modern Stage

The all-pervading conviction on the existence of the supernatural was a prominent feature of Early Modern England. The belief in witches, demons and other occult creatures not only determined the way people of the Renaissance lived their everyday lives but was likewise manifested in the era's theatrical culture. After reviewing more than 500 dramas from the period of 1580-1642, Thomson concludes that specific sound and visual effects were used to distinguish such creatures and activities on the stage: the representation of the supernatural almost invariably occurred in the form of 'thunder and lightning' (16)⁴. Thus, providing more satisfaction to the superstitious audience by exploiting their supernatural convictions: in case of hearing the sound, the "audience was invariably prompted to expect the supernatural, and in most cases, got what they expected" (Thomson 14).

As Thomson highlights, there are different variants in which the aforementioned stage direction exists: it can occur in both full and reduced forms. 'Thunder' calls for both effects, whilst 'lightning' refers to flashes of fire, exclusively. There are other effects that, at first glance, can remind the reader of the aforementioned sound combination, yet, they do not have any supernatural connotations – these are the directions for 'storm' and 'tempest' – as they only

⁴Amongst the 500 dramas examined by Thomson, 38 contained the sound cue 'thunder and lightning' and 20 plays indicated 'thunder' alone. The dramas containing these stage directions, invariably deployed supernatural elements. (Thomson 16)

refer to weather conditions, but still, they have significant effects on the audience, thereby playwrights frequently indicated these directions too (Thomson 16).

In Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the presence of the supernatural is, although, all-pervading, the stage direction, 'thunder and lightning' is not indicated with a "sufficient frequency" (Bevington 44). Even though supernatural activities and creatures appear on stage, there is only one appearance of the sound cue in the A-text, whilst in the B-text, it occurs merely six times. The following subchapter strives to highlight the differences in more detail, before providing a thorough discussion on the stage-directional mystery of *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* and Henslowe's possible role in the alterations between the two texts of the drama.

1.4. 'Thunder and Lightning' and the Supernatural in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*⁵

Considering the stage directions of *Doctor Faustus*, conspicuous differences can be witnessed in the usage of 'thunder and lightning' in the two publications. Such alternations of the two Quartos raise additional concerns around the role of the stage direction in question within the drama, as it is unknown whether Marlowe originally intended these cues within his play, or they were added later by editors.

Regarding the number of stage directions, 'thunder and lightning' is indicated only once in the A-text – at the final scene, after the 25 years passed and the contract signed with Mephistopheles expires, when the devils come back for the doomed scholar. In contrast, the B-text the sound cue is indicated with a greater frequency: exactly six times –twice before the soul-selling episode, and four times at the end of the play.

In greater lengths, the first conspicuous difference in stage language occurs just before Faustus makes his bargain with Lucifer, however, in the A-text, no specific sound cue accompanies Faustus' intention to invoke an occult entity; only "*Enter Faustus to Conjure*"⁶ is indicated. (A. 1.3) The B-text, on the other hand, enlarges this direction by the sound of thunder, additionally, calls for more characters on the stage: "*Thunder. Enter Lucifer and Four Devils. / Faustus to them with his speech*"⁷ (B. 1.3).

Differences likewise manifest themselves at the last act of *Doctor Faustus*. The 1604 Quarto opens with only Wagner's, one of Faustus's servant's entrance, whilst in the B-text, a

⁵ The following section (5 paragraphs) is adopted from Barta, Alexandra. "The Supernatural Through Stage Language: 'Thunder and Lightning' as the Representative of the Occult in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*." *A Benda Kálmán Szakkollégium Legjobb Hallgatói Munkái* (2017-2021), edited by Boros et al., Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem - L'Harmattan Kiadó, 2022, pp. 165–178.

⁶ All references to the A-text of *Doctor Faustus* are from the Oxford Critical Edition of 1990, edited by Roma Gill.

⁷ All references to the B-text are from the Cambridge Critical Edition of 1981, edited by Fredson Bowers

quite lengthy, complex and action-filled direction is given: “*Thunder and lightning. Enter devils with covered dishes. Mephistopheles leads them into Faustus’s study. Then enter Wagner*” (B.5.1) It should be highlighted that; it is possible that in the B-text the beginning of the second scene was added later as it is not part of the 1604 Quarto. That scene opens with the appearance of three devils as spectators of the scholar’s end, accompanied by a tempestuous voice of thunder. It not only emphasizes the presence of the supernatural but increases tension amongst the audience, additionally, reminds them that Faustus’s life is getting closer to its end: “*Thunder. Enter[above] Lucifer, Beelzebub, and Mephistopheles*” (B. 5.2)

Right before Faustus’s demise, in both texts, the full sound combination, ‘thunder and lightning’ accompanies “the arrival of Lucifer, Mephistopheles, and other devils to claim Faustus’s soul” (Bevington 43). Given that the sound effect is present in both publications , it might be suggested that it was originally indicated by Marlowe, not by the two editors, William Bride and Samuel Rowley, in 1602 when they were “asked to prepare the text for publication” (Marcus, *Textual Indeterminacy* 2). The same, however, cannot be assumed when the “impressive sound effect is reiterated”, and the devils take the doomed scholar to hell since it is indicated in the B-text, exclusively (Bevington 43).

As the discussion above suggests, the two editions differ significantly in the occurrences of the stage directions of ‘thunder and lightning’. Although the issue has long been recognised by scholars, the issue has never been discussed in detail nor in the relation to *The Henslowe Diary*. The following chapter will focus on the 1597 additions of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, exclusively. In the first place, some of Henslowe’s transactions will be considered, then, the second half of Chapter 3 will revolve around the impresario’s relationship with the supernatural and the possibility that his occult beliefs influenced the way the drama was dramaturgically updated.

Chapter 2. The 1597 Additions about *Doctor Faustus* and Henslowe's Mysterious Private Affairs

2.1. Henslowe's Theatrical Affairs and the Production of 'thunder and lightning'

The two publications of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, as previously discussed, differ not just in length but in content and dramaturgy. The B-text dazzles the audience with its elaborate representation of the supernatural throughout the frequent occurrence of 'thunder and lightning'. Playhouses strived to produce these wonders as realistically as possible to dazzle the audience. Thomson highlights that the production of 'thunder and lightning' required specific props: theatres created thunder with drums and used fireworks to imitate lightning (14). Years later, Gwilym Jones augments her observations by mentioning two additional methods of producing the effects in question, both involving cannonballs. Cannonballs could be "rolled on the floor of the heavens" –while they moved, they vibrated the wood and created a thundering sound –or dropped. The latter case requires specific circumstances: different levels had to be "built into the trough" so separate thunderclaps could be created when the ball fell (Ch 4). Andrew Gurr likewise elaborates on the production of the thunder, but he mentions one additional method, that is rolling bullets on a metal sheet (122).

The Henslowe Diary contains a meticulous list, not only of the plays performed in his theatres but his transactions on theatrical matters. Considering that, one may speculate whether the imp purchased any of the mentioned props around the time he ordered the first set of alterations on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. If so, it can offer some explanations of the dramaturgical mystery of the play. Henslowe purchased and first stages the drama in 1594, then after a series of successful performances, the impresario decided to update *Doctor Faustus* in December 1597:

pd vnto **Thomas dickers** the 20 of desembr 1597
for **adycyons to ffostus** twentie shellinges and fyve
shellinges more for a **prolog to Marloes tambelan**
so in all J saye payde twentye five shelling (Sig.F.19^V, 13-16)

The excerpt above highlights that Henslowe entrusted Thomas Decker with carrying out some changes on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. However, the amount of money paid suggests that these alterations must have been minor ones, for instance, additional stage directions. For more

extensive changes, one would have spent more. As the 1602 refreshments of the drama prove, discussed in the next chapter, £4 was the price for such alternations.

If one closely examines Henslowe's transactions around the time he ordered the alterations, with close attention to the props required for the production of thunder and lightning, one will realize that the impresario did not purchase any of these items (*The Diary*). Although he visited an ironmonger's shop, the 'Fryingpan' several times, where he could have easily gotten cannonballs, bullets or metal sheets, he merely purchased supplies for the renovation of his theatre, The Rose (Cerasano *Geography* 342). As Cerasano argues, the theatre was no longer sufficient in serving the growing interest of the Elizabethan in theatrical performances, thereby, reconstructions and enlargements were necessary to fit the playhouse to these increasing needs (ibid.)

If considering these arguments and the stage-directional mystery of *Doctor Faustus*, one may reach two conclusions. It is conceivable that the 1597 additions were not in dramaturgy, but content, hence, the additional cues of 'thunder and lightning' were not added yet. On the other hand, the fact that Henslowe did not buy any specific props required to produce the effect in question does not exclude the possibility that the directions were added that year, as it is possible that the Rose already had the necessary conditions and theatricals. Such a surmise seems to be supported by Gurr's arguments, as he points out that there were "standard accessories to performances from the early history of playing", for instance, drums, flutes and other instruments (97) – as highlighted earlier, the one way of producing the sound of thunder was through drums, thereby Henslowe did not have to buy these props again. To examine that possibility and to find evidence of Henslowe adding the effects in question in 1597, it is worth elaborating on his relationship with the supernatural around the year of the requested updates.

2.2. Henslowe and the Supernatural: Secret Consultations with the Occult Philosopher, Simon Forman (1596-97)

However, the majority of Henslowe's diary is concerned with his theatrical affairs, for instance, "his financial relationship with companies of players [...] accounts relating to [...] the maintenance of the theatres he was interested in" as well as updating and revising dramas, a considerable part of the journal is devoted to his transactions on more personal affairs (Foakes xv). These items include, as R.A. Foakes argues, loans to family members, payments on rents his investments in certain businesses. Furthermore, amongst these transactions, one can find some "horrificing remedies for diseases and hurts" too (xxi). These unusual entries of the journal are closely linked to Henslowe's relationship with the infamous occultist of the age, Simon Forman.

Simon Forman is mainly remembered as a physician, astrologer, occultist, and herbalist of the Elizabethan and early Jacobean ages. He had a rather questionable life given his engagement in occult sciences and his scandals; He was prosecuted and fined several times, and even “arrested on charges of practising magic or for some involvement with the occult” (Traister 17). Furthermore, after being accused of selling love portions to women who wanted to secure their love of specific men, he was even referred to as “the vendor of love portions” and “Oracle Forman” by Ben Jonson (Traister 3). Such a reference implies that Forman was not an unknown figure amongst the dramatist of the age: There is an assumption that Ben Johnson, besides giving the aforementioned nicknames to Forman, might have sought inspiration in his figure when he created Subtle, “the deceptive occultist in the Alchemist” (ibid.).

As Cerasano highlights, Forman’s significance concerning early modern theatrical culture lies not only in his possible influence on Ben Jonson, but the “members of the theatrical community [including Philip Henslowe] consulted with him concerning medical and astrological matters” (*Theatrical community* 146) He kept casebooks that contained his meticulous records on all his patients from mid-1596 to November 1601 – there were presumably more such books, however, only five of them survived and were preserved in the *Ashmole Manuscripts*. In these case notes, he usually jotted down the patient’s name, place of residence, astrological figures and symptoms besides his diagnosis and recommendations (Traister 57). At this point, it is worth mentioning that in, for instance, the 1597 casebook one can find 1819 consultations, 203 of which (11%) were on non-medical issues –similar figures apply to the majority of his books –presumably requiring Forman’s skills in occult sciences. (Traister 59.)

Forman’s casebooks shed light on his relationship with Philip Henslowe, as his name appears three times amongst the clients. Henslowe first visited Forman on 6 August 1596, presumably, to request advice concerning theft and loss. To provide an answer, Forman cast Henslowe an astrological chart, thereby he could read the possible solution to the impresario's concerns⁸. (MSS Ash.234 Sig.F85^R). It can be assumed, these consultations were held in secret, as Henslowe's diary does not mention Forman’s name, nor the amount of money paid for his advice. The journal, however, contains a list of receipts and a passage reminiscent of a magic spell or a ritual. Given the date and content of this entry, it can be assumed that these were the

⁸ The Ashmole Manuscripts preserving the *Forman Casebooks* are kept in the Cambridge University Library. Fortunately, the library has open access to certain pages and their transcription, including those I am referring to in this chapter. For more detail, see: <https://casebooks.lib.cam.ac.uk/search?name=Phillip%20Henslowe;name-type=name;smode=name-search>

occultist's instructions as the passage outlines a procedure that can help to regain the impresario's stolen possession: It suggests that to ascertain its whereabouts, Henslowe should write a message to parchment with special ink, put it under his pillows then sleep.

To know wher a thinge is y' Js stolen Take vergine waxe & **write vpon yt Jasper** + melchiser
+ [Beth] Balthasar + & **put yt vnder his head** to whom
the good partayneth & he **shall knowe in his sleape where**
the thinges is become (Sig F17 5-10)

The diary does not list any evidence if Henslowe's attempt was successful in regaining the stolen item, however, it reveals that he definitely "took Forman's advice to heart" (Cerasano, *Theatrical Community* 151). Not the afore-noted passage is the sole one concerned with occult subjects, but the following entries of the diary are likewise devoted to strange astrological and supernatural practices. For instance, later this year, Henslowe jotted down a set of instructions of a card trick that could enable one to read and predict certain things to others:

tacke xij cardes the knaue of clubes & laye them Round licke a
clocke turnynge them all ther faces downward but the knave of clubes
& laye hime vnder neth licke you[^] watche & laye them this
then aske the ptie at what ower he will Risse
[..]
l thes nvmbres that you poynte vpon bead him tell frome that w^{'''}
he thinketh in his mind (Sig. F18^v)

The passage above, although does not reveal if Forman taught the trick to Henslowe, perfectly illustrates that Henslowe "took a particular interest in occult sciences during this period of his life" (Cerasano, *Theatrical community* 151) Cerasano, furthermore, highlights that not only the impresario was involved in such things, but Forman frequently had consultations with the members of Henslowe's, and other companies, thereby it can be noted that the theatrical communities of the age were very much "tied into the culture of the occult" (145) At this point, it is necessary to mention that, Henslowe visited Forman a year later, in 1597, two more times. The first consultation occurred on 5 February and was only concerned with medical reasons (MMS *Ash.226* SigF13^v), however, the second occasion is more remarkable in terms of

theatrical history – Henslowe visited the astrologer the exact same day he ordered the first alterations on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, in the morning of 20 December 1597. (MMS Ash.226 SigF275^R)

What makes that visit even more interesting is that the casebook does not give any specific information on the nature of the consultation, only reveals that Henslowe asked a question, thereby leaving space for speculation on the possibility of that this rendezvous inspiring Henslowe to broaden the scale of special effects of *Doctor Faustus*. (ibid.) In his pioneering study, Cerasano elaborates on the link between Marlowe's main character and Simon Forman. He highlights that the occult philosopher visited the Rose several times⁹, even watched the performance of *Doctor Faustus*, thereby, considering the relationship of Henslowe and Forman, the scholar believes that Forman might have influenced the way Faustus was portrayed in the Rose-performances of the drama (*Theatrical community* 148) He supports his arguments with Forman's notes of the casebook: amongst his receipts concerning medical affairs "appears a long list of substances used to make fireworks" which, in a sense can reminiscent the firework scene of *Doctor Faustus* (ibid). Based on these observations, it is possible that Henslowe decided to add the stage directions of 'thunder and lightning' to the drama after consulting with Forman– as clarified in the introductory part of that chapter, one way of producing the effects in question was by fireworks – to emphasize the presence of the supernatural as well as to dazzle the audience with these spectacles.

When considering the influence of occult philosophers on the portrayal of the supernatural in Marlowe's *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, John Dee's infamous persona cannot be excluded from the discussion. Dee, as Deborah Harkness argues, was "Elizabethan England's most highly regarded natural philosopher" (1) A versatile figure of the era, who was not only the queen's confidant but an astrologer, a mathematician; a "Renaissance magus" concerned with acquiring knowledge in all fields of science. (Szönyi *Occult Philosophy* 1-4) Additionally, he was also known as the "collector of one of Elizabethan England's finest libraries" (Traister xv). However, at the middle of his career he "suffered a series of setbacks which have coloured his entire subsequent reputation" (Fenton viii) Dee "lost his faith in natural sciences" and then "he turned to necromancy and bizarre magical practices" – more specifically he wanted to converse directly to God by acquiring angelic languages (Szönyi *Occult Philosophy* 2) Such a turn, eventually, caused a "distortion in his overall

⁹ Forman, as Szönyi highlights, was a passionate theatregoer. He frequently jotted down the title of the dramas he watched –we have his written records of three Shakespearean dramas, *Macbeth*, *Cymbeline* and the *Winter's Tale*, that he saw – and incomplete plot summaries (Szönyi, *Reneszánsz tudomány és mágia* 88)

career” – he was even accused of being a conjurer, prosecuted, then he lived the rest of his life in poverty (Szönyi *Occult Philosophy* 4). Despite his dubious career, as Frances Yates argues, the Renaissance polymath had a huge impact on early modern dramatists, among others on Christopher Marlowe, who presumably sought inspiration in Dee’s persona when he created the character of *Doctor Faustus*. (ibid.)

If considering Dee’s possible influence, with a restricted focus exclusively on Henslowe and his updates of the drama, it should be noted that Dee, at the peak of his career, was a court figure and "primarily lived by patronage"(Traister 98), thus it can be suspected that he did not necessarily interact with people like Henslowe. The theatre manager was presumably familiar with John Dee’s, however, it is more likely that Henslowe learned about his occult practices by reading his works or word of mouth. Consequently, Dee’s influence could not have been as remarkable on him as if he had known him personally.

Forman, on the other hand, “was not a court figure”. He primarily made a living by “selling his knowledge directly” to people who needed his assistance in terms of astrology or had medical issues (Traister xvii). Forman had direct contact with the common people, including Henslowe. Hence, he presumably had a more significant impact on the impresario than Dee. Both the coursebooks and the diary illustrate the connection between Forman and Henslowe. Additionally, the frequency and nature of consultations in 1596-7 definitely highlight the impresario’s interest in the supernatural during this phase of his lifetime. Thus, it is probable that the stage directions were added in 1597.

Although the observations listed in that chapter, at this point, indeed suggest the possibility of Henslowe, inspired by Forman’s occultism, broadened the scale of the special effects of *Doctor Faustus* in 1597, one should not forget that the Diary mentions another date, 1602, when the drama was updated. Around 1602, fundamental changes occurred in the early modern theatrical culture and Henslowe’s playhouse. These changes could also influence the way Marlowe’s drama was dramaturgically updated. The following chapter will revolve around the nature of the 1602 additions and the in light of the cultural and theatrical changes of the 16th and 17th centuries. This section strives to find evidence if these developments could eventually result in adding more special effects to Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*. Unlike the previous chapters, this section does not restrict its focus to Henslowe’s diary exclusively, but some of the impresario’s correspondences and contracts will also be considered.

Chapter 3.

The 1602 Additions about *Doctor Faustus* and Henslowe's New Theatre

3.1. The Second Set of Additions

Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* was immensely successful until the end of the 16th century, as over 20 performances of the drama were recorded in the *Henslowe Diary* between 30th September 1594 and 5th January 1597 (Bowers 123). Then the play's popularity dropped and at the end of 1597, it was withdrawn entirely (Henslowe, *The Diary*). One may argue that the first set of alterations of the drama did not bring the expected results or even turned out to be counterproductive. Yet, a more feasible explanation arises if one looks at the cultural background. As Gurr explains, at the turn of the century, fundamental developments occurred in social and economic life, which eventually resulted in a change in the court's taste (9). Furthermore, the convictions on the supernatural likewise strengthened in the 17th century. Superstitions were already remarkable during the reign of Elizabeth I – Dee's precious role in her court demonstrates that¹⁰ – however, the turn of the century and James' succession gave a boost to these convictions and eventuated their more emphatic representation on the stage¹¹. To preserve the publicity of theatrical pieces and fit them into the changed expectations of the 17th-century audience, theatres strived to make the performances more spectacular (Gurr 9). One of Henslowe's diary entries appears to support these observations since, on 22nd November 1602, the impresario entrusted William Birde and Samuel Rowley with writing further additions to *Doctor Faustus*:

Lent vnto the companye the 22 of novmbr 1602
to paye vnto w" **Bvrde & Samwell Rowle**
for ther **adicyones in doctor fostes** (Sig. F.108^V 1-3)

In contrast to the first set of alterations, this time Henslowe invested a significant amount, £4¹², into the project. Thus, one may argue that more extensive changes – for instance,

¹⁰ For more details, see chapter 2

¹¹ Considering that argument, James' infamous volume, *Daemonologie* serves as evidence that at the turn of the 17th century, the beliefs in the supernatural indeed strengthened. The book was first published in late 1597 in Scotland and republished in 1603 in England -- however, by that date, it was already influential and relatively well known in the country. King James was immensely superstitious, and this book can be seen as an account of his, and basically of early modern people's, concerns on the supernatural. (King James I. *Daemonologie*).

¹² Based on the National Archives' Currency Calculator, the £4 paid by Henslowe would be worth £551.51 in 2017. For more details see: <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/>

extra scenes and stage directions – were made to the text. What further increases the significance of the amount of money the impresario spent are E. K. Chamber's observations. In his pioneering volume, *The Elizabethan Stage*, he surveys the data on Henslowe's payments and concludes that the "prices paid for [complete paybooks] between 1597 and 1603 ranged from 4£ to 10£" (qtd in Knutson "Commercial Significance" 117), thereby, this time the impresario paid more for the refreshment of one particular drama than he would for a new, complete playbook. The alterations ordered from Rowley and Birde is the "highest single payment for revision in Henslowe's records" (ibid.).

If the Rowley-Birde additions are likewise examined in light of Henslowe's transactions, one will reach to a similar conclusion as in the case of the 1597 ones. *The Diary* still does not contain purchases related to the production of 'thunder and lightning' around 1602, which supports the assumption that The Rose already had the necessary conditions and props. Still, one may argue that dramaturgical modernisations were made this time, as the impresario would have several reasons for doing so.

The interest in *Doctor Faustus* dropped so significantly that it was withdrawn in 1597 (Bowers 124). Therefore, Henslowe had to act if he wanted to regain the drama's place in his stage repertoire. One possible way is to entertain the audience with new and elaborate stage effects. At the turn of the century, not only *Doctor Faustus* but the Rose theatre too lost its popularity (Mabillard no pag). Based on that, one may consider the 1602 additions as Henslowe's attempt to regain the drama's but his playhouse's popularity. The Rowley-Birde additions can also be linked to Henslowe's new theatre, The Fortune, that he opened in 1600. It is possible that the impresario wanted to dazzle his fresh audience with a revived edition of a well-known and already celebrated piece.

The latter argument seems to be the most feasible considering the contents of the Henslowe diary. From 1597-on, Henslowe "changed the format of the diary entries" (Knutson "Play Revision" 11): the daily entries on the plays performed in playhouses changed to listing business transactions and his expenditures, more specifically, more of his transactions are connected to the erection of his new theatre, The Fortune (Henslowe, *The Diary*). If this argument is examined together with the observation above – that there is no sign that Henslowe bought props necessary for the production of 'thunder and lightning' around the 1602 additions – one would notice that the stage-directional mystery of *Doctor Faustus* is far more complicated than it seemed at first sight.

It can be observed that, even if Henslowe had bought any of these items, they would not occur amongst the transactions anymore, given the changes in the way he keeps his journal

from 1597. Therefore, in this chapter, a different approach is necessary to find evidence that the effects of ‘thunder and lightning’ could have been added in 1602 on Henslowe’s demand. Unlike the previous sections, the following subchapter will not restrict its focus to *The Henslowe Diary* exclusively – as it cannot provide the answers on its own – but other documents, for instance, contracts, correspondences and recollections about Henslowe’s new theatre will also be reviewed.

3.2. Building of The Fortune Theatre

Concerning Henslowe’s The Rose, reconstructing the way the playhouse operated in its flourishing days is relatively easier for scholars than in the case of The Fortune, as *The Diary* preserves a “mass of information” various aspects of the theatre – from the dramas played there till renovations, all kinds of data can be found (Gurr 151). Henslowe erected The Rose in 1587 and The Fortune 1600. There is 13 years gap between their building, and they fall into different generations of playhouses, thereby it can be suspected that there can be significant alterations in their construction. If so, such differences might bring one closer to the answers to the stage-directional mystery of *Doctor Faustus* – it can be possible that there were developments in the stagecraft in the 17th century that might enable more realistic reproductions of the effects of ‘thunder and lightning’ in Marlowe’s piece, thereby, Henslowe added these effects in 1602 to attain more success and profit in his new playhouse by dazzling his audience with special effects – in one of his correspondences on leases, he refers to The Fortune and mentions that it “was builte and of all the necessities”, but does not reveal more details on what exactly these ‘necessaries’ were¹³ (Greg, *The Henslowe Papers* 65). To find support for the feasibility of that assumption, it is necessary to briefly review the main attributes of the first-generation playhouses, before discussing the stagecraft of The Fortune theatre.

As Andrew Gurr puts it, considering the characteristics of the first-generation theatres, our information is “sparse and not entirely consistent” (150). Our knowledge is mainly derived from the recollections of the German merchant, Samuel Kircher, who visited the city of London in 1584 and jotted down his observations (ibid.). He described the playhouses as having “3 galleries over one another”, comments on their popularity – many people visited the performances – and the entrance fees – “when they act anything new [...] double prices are charged” (qtd. in Gurr 150). Concerning their shapes, early theatres could be both round and

¹³ The information provided by Henslowe is, although few and concise, the way he puts it might imply that the playhouse was built in a way that it could be used immediately after its completion. Thus, his theatrical company could use various staging techniques and produce a wide range of special effects right from its opening, as The Fortune had the necessary circumstances.

polygonal. The frame was built from timber, and it had a yard, galleries, changing rooms and a tiring-house, above which situated the so-called heavens where the “stagehands produce[d] thunder and lightning effects” (Gurr 150-51). The Rose as a first-generation playhouse had these attributes, hence, one of the assumptions introduced earlier –that it is possible that the Rose already had the necessary conditions for producing the effects in question and that is why Henslowe did not buy the necessary props around the time of the first set of additions– seems to be confirmed.

The Fortune, on the other hand, belonged to the second generation of playhouses, however, our knowledge of its construction and characteristics is not as circumstantial as in the case of the Rose. Although *The Diary* lists building materials for the new theatre, it does not reveal any specific information on Henslowe's actual plans on the design of The Fortune (Henslowe, *The Diary*). The details on the attributes of the theatre, a commission, can be found amongst Henslowe's correspondences, not in *The Diary*¹⁴. In this letter, he entrusted Peter Streete with the erection of his new playhouse. The contract itself is relatively detailed, and as Gurr puts it, it contains the “best information that we know” of the theatre, and basically about second-generation playhouses too (168).

[...]The frame of the saide **howse to be sett square** and to conteine ffowerscore foote of lawfull assize everye waie square wthoutt and fiftie fiue foote of like assize square everye waie wthin wth a good suer and stronge foundacon of pyles brick lyme [...] And the saide fframe to conteine **Three Stories in heighth** [...] **On the Banck in the saide pishe of Ste Saviors Called the Globe** Wth a Stadge and **Tyreinge howse to be made erected** & settupp within the saide **fframe wth a shadowe or cover** over the saide Stadge [...] (Greg, *Henslowe Papers* 5-6)

The excerpt above perfectly illustrates how detailed description Henslowe gave to Streete on the building of The Fortune. At this point, it should be mentioned that the theatre was built “in competition with the Globe” by the same builder who erected that theatre – basically, the contract “instructs [Streete] to copy the Globe” (Gurr 169). The impresario specified that he wants a three-storied square theatre instead of a round-shaped one. He

¹⁴ Given that studying the diary carries challenges, in 1907, W.W. Greg published a collection of papers, letters and documents (*Henslowe Papers*) written either by Henslowe or other contemporaries but closely connected to his theatrical affairs. These documents are not included in the diary, however, help us understand Henslowe's entries.

mentions the tiring-house with glass windows to be erected over the stage. Thus, the conditions for producing the effects of ‘thunder and lightning’ are likewise provided in *The Fortune*.

The only specific detail on the tiring-house is the windows, nothing else, thereby it can be assumed the effects in question were produced the same way as in *The Rose* and developments in stagecraft that could have enabled a more realistic production of the sound cue might not occur around these years. At this point, it seems that the answers to the stage-directional mystery should not be searched in the changes in the construction of Henslowe’s new theatre, still, Gurr’s arguments seems to give a very little chance to the feasibility of that assumption. He highlights that it is unknown whether the Streete built the theatre in the way they agreed with Henslowe after all, given that the building plan had been lost (168). Thus, it might be possible that the tiring-house was constructed differently in *The Fortune* than originally outlined in the contract, however, such a deduction should be treated with caution as there is no clear evidence to support nor oppose this claim.

Chapter 4

Staging *Doctor Faustus* and the Practice of Drama Touring

4.1. Contemporary Recollections on the Rose and Fortune Performances of *Doctor Faustus*

Modern-day scholars cannot know for sure, only assume and imagine how early modern dramas were performed in their age. In the attempt to reconstruct the possible ways they were staged, one will presumably face various obstacles. The most common obstacle is that many theatrical pieces survived in incomplete form, making it nearly impossible to get a comprehensive picture of their main message and plot, or their possible staging. Furthermore, the question of dramaturgy can likewise complicate these attempts. Stage directions are substantial parts of dramas – they not only meant special effects but marked the exits and entrances to the stage. The stage directions of Renaissance dramas, as Dustagheer and Woods highlight, were quite often spread in several different documents and were often preserved scantily (1-3). Contemporary recollections, however, can fill these gaps and help us gain a deeper understanding of the staging of Renaissance theatrical pieces. In the case of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, they might help us decide when the dramaturgical modernisations of the text occurred, as based on the contents of Henslowe's diary and the arguments of the previous chapters, both dates are feasible. Hence, in this chapter, a different perspective will be proposed. Namely, this section will look at two contemporary recollections – one from the Rose and one from the Fortune theatre – to explore which year, 1602 or 1597, Henslowe might have broadened the scale of the special effects of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

It should be mentioned that only a few recollections remained on *Doctor Faustus* in particular. As chapter three outlined, the infamous occultist, Simon Forman, frequently visited Henslowe's The Rose and took notes on the performances he saw – for instance, we have comments and short accounts on three Shakespearean dramas staged in Henslowe's theatre (Szőnyi, "Reneszánsz tudomány és mágia" 88). Although he watched *Doctor Faustus*, we do not have his comments on this piece.¹⁵ Thereby, we cannot reconstruct the way the drama was staged in the late 1590s. The first extant remark on the drama occurs in 1600 – presumably at the Rose theatre – in a pamphlet by Samuel Rowlands, entitled the *Knave of Clubbes* (Collier vi):

¹⁵ For more details see chapter 3

The Gull gets on a surplis ,
With a crosse upon his brest ,
Like **Allen playing Faustus** ;
In that **manner was he drest** (qtd. in Collier vi)

The quotation above illustrates that Rowlands only remarks on Alleyn's appearance and costume in *Doctor Faustus* while referring to the Icarus myth overarching Marlowe's drama. It should be highlighted that Rowlands does not mention anything about the special effects of the drama, thus – from our modern-day perspective – it can be surmised that these effects were not there in 1600. Given that the cues of 'thunder and lightning' were always sudden and dramatic, one may presume that if the spectator commented upon the performance of the drama containing these effects, he would supposedly mention them. Attila Atilla Kiss, however, reminds us that such conjectures should be made with caution as the so-called representational logic of the early modern age can be markedly different from our modern theatrical conventions (274). He argues that the contemporary audience cannot be put in parallel with modern spectators as people of the Renaissance might have found different aspects of the performances remarkable than we would today (ibid.). Allen Dessen likewise notes this and points out that "with our modern perspective we sometimes see things differently" thereby we "interpret [them] differently" (6). To support his claims, Kiss briefly elaborates on sceneries used by contemporary playhouses too. Theatrical companies preferred opulent costumes to sceneries (274), which, in a sense, explains why Rowlands remarks on Alleyn's costume in great lengths.

Although the way we conceive of theatrical performances may be significantly different from contemporary audiences, examining and reconstructing the possible, original staging of Renaissance dramas is still fundamental in the study of the early modern stage. However, our conjectures on the reception of dramas should be articulated carefully, while considering other contemporary documents. Yet, in the case of *Doctor Faustus*, *The Henslowe Diary* cannot provide guidance concerning the reception of the drama, as it only indicates the frequency of the stage run (Henslowe, *The Diary*).

The other extant contemporary recollection of the staging of *Doctor Faustus* seems to fulfil our modern-day expectations concerning the special effects of the drama: While discussing the "methods of production" at the Fortune theatre, John Jump briefly mentions John Melton's recollection of the 1620 performance of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (42). In his work entitled *Astrologaster, or, The figure-caster*, Melton remarks on the special effects of the drama in great lengths:

[...] Another will fore-tell of **Lightning and Thunder** that shall happen in such a day, when there is no such Inflammations seene, except men goe to the **Fortune** in Golding Lane, to see the **Tragedie of Doctor Faustus**. [...] Deuils runne roaring ouer the Stage with Squibs in their mouthes, while **Drummers make Thunder in the Tying-houfe**, and the twelue-penny Hirelings make **artificall Lightning in their Heuens** [...] (Melton 31)

The excerpt above reveals that in 1620, Marlowe's drama was quite spectacular and indeed contained the effects in question. Melton argues that in The Fortune theatre, the cues of 'thunder and lightning' were produced in the tiring house by drums and devils were running on the stage. From Melton's remark, one can surmise that the special effects in question were presumably added in 1602 than in 1597, given that 1600 remark does not mention the stage directions at all. This performance, however, occurred years after Henslowe's death and Alleyn's retirement, hence the possibility that the staging was based on the 1616 publication of the drama – already containing the additional stage directions – cannot be excluded entirely. Yet, based on the recollections introduced above and the thorough discussion of Henslowe's private and theatrical affairs, the cultural and theatrical changes around the two drama updates and considering our modern-day perspective, it can be ascertained with reasonable certainty that it is more probable that the stage directions of 'thunder and lightning' were added in 1602 on the impresario's demand.

Following this line of argument, although these conjectures provide answers to the possible nature of the Rowley-Birde additions, they likewise raise several questions considering the 1597 alterations of the drama – if the supernatural-related dramaturgical modernisations have not occurred yet, in 1597, Henslowe presumably had other intentions for updating the text. In the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages, drama-touring was a relatively common practice – there is evidence in *The Diary* that Henslowe's theatrical company was not an exception. Given that *Doctor Faustus* was withdrawn at the end of the year when Henslowe ordered the first set of alterations, it can be argued that the updates might have been carried out on the text to prepare it for the tour. To explore the possibility of this claim, the following subchapter will briefly elaborate on the practice of drama touring in the early modern times, as well as the main attributes of touring copies. Then, the focus will be shifted back to *The Henslowe Diary* find to support to the claim that the 1597 alterations on *Doctor Faustus* can also be viewed as preparation of the text for the tour.

4.2. The Practice of Drama Touring in Early Modern England

Although London can be considered the centre of early modern theatrical culture, companies frequently performed outside London, in the provincial regions of the British Isles, and even in continental Europe. Rural tours were relatively common and the “expected practice of even the most successful companies” – it was a tradition inherited from medieval predecessors (Greenfield 298). Kiséry also observes this and adds that not the whole company attended these tours, but only a smaller group of their professional actors (288). The companies that went on tour most often “used large yards of court inns to stage their plays” (Gurr 12), however, town halls, church buildings and houses of “prominent citizens” likewise proved to be appropriate locations (Greenfield 298).

As Szőnyi points out, professional English theatres were usually three-level buildings, that “enabled a symbolic reproduction of the early modern cosmos” on the stage, thereby supernatural creatures could be aligned besides earthly characters (“Színházi jelenség” 270). Given that the locations chosen for touring performances do not necessarily have such attributes, companies had limited possibilities considering staging techniques in the case of dramas containing supernatural elements and their related stage directions.

As Greenfield points out other factors too aggravated these performances: the “touring repertoire was shaped by the props needed for certain performances” as “it was limited what a company could carry (301). He argues that companies could have easily “handled dramas like *King Lear*” but not necessarily those plays that required specific props (300). To support his claim, the Greenfield brings the example of Robert Greene’s *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* – which requires theatricals like the brazen head– since this drama alone can “tax a company’s ability” to carry the necessary props on the road (ibid.). Drama tours usually took place during the summer and lasted for only a couple of weeks – Henslowe’s theatrical company in 1595 went on tour for 8 weeks, then, for 35 days when the Rose Theatre was under reconstruction (Gurr 57) – thereby the time spent travelling between the different locations and cities was crucial. By bringing fewer props, companies could move faster, save time, consequently, perform and profit more. In short, the “pragmatics of travelling was limited the amount of props a company could carry”, therefore not every play was suitable for tour performances (Keenan 14).

Kiséry explains how early modern theatrical companies could bridge those difficulties. Plays taken to the tour were frequently abridged and altered, hence, companies could perform them in an environment where the conditions to produce special effects or use specific theatricals were not provided (290). Kiséry also highlights that our knowledge is limited

concerning the touring practices, the dramas performed, and the ways texts were altered as we do not have as meticulous records on them as in the case of London performances, thereby these observations should be treated with caution (ibid.). Keenen's study reaffirms these observations. He points out that theatrical companies "do not appear to have kept such records [...] and the plays performed are rarely named in contemporary notices" (13).

The same observation can be applied to the *Henslowe Diary*. Even though the impresario kept a meticulous record on each drama performed in his theatre until 1597 and he lists his theatrical and private affairs, he does not explicitly mention his touring practices: "we do not know which plays they took on tour in the summertime, how those plays were selected and whether abridged texts were made for some or all of the touring-pieces" (Knutson "Revival and Revision" 274). Nevertheless, *The Diary* contains some traces of Henslowe's extensive touring practices. The following subchapter strives to elaborate on these aspects of Henslowe's diary, additionally, explores if the first set of alterations on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* could be interpreted as preparations of the text to the tour.

4.3. Drama Touring and the 1597 additions of *Doctor Faustus*

As for theatrical companies connected to Philip Henslowe, the Admiral's Men, his famous theatrical company, is the one that he is most often associated with, however, *The Diary* sheds light on his relationship with other playing companies as well. Henslowe likewise worked with the Pembroke's Men and the Strange's Men – they "frequently performed for Henslowe" around the early 1590s (Gurr 51), and both "appear amongst [his] lists" (Knutson "Touring Schedule" 129). From my perspective, the former company deserves more attention for various reasons. The Pembroke's Men often went on tour during the summertime – Henslowe even remarks on one of their rural tours – and several Marlowean dramas were on their stage repertoire. As Knutson argues, Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* and *Doctor Faustus* were "probably owned by the Admiral's Men, though there is no specific proof" ("Company Ownership" 37). The scholar, however, introduces a different standpoint as well: according to W.W. Greg, for instance, these dramas could also be linked to the Pembroke's Men (ibid.: 47). Similarly to the Henslowe Diary, there is few textual evidence on which pieces the company took to the tour (Knutson "Touring Schedule" 132). Therefore, conjecturing the "theatrical appeal of plays in the repertory of the Pembroke's Men" is risky (ibid.) Although Knutson is sceptical about the presence of *Doctor Faustus* amongst their chosen dramas, based on Karl P. Wentersdorf's viewpoint, Marlowe's piece could have been staged outside London – Knutson mentions that Wentersdorf, in his 1977 article entitled "The Repertory and Size of Pembroke's

Company”, compiled a conjectural reportorial list of the Pembroke’s Men that includes *Doctor Faustus* (“Touring Schedule” 135).

The Pembroke’s Men was relatively thriving concerning their performances, however, a change occurred in 1593. They went on tour that year, but it was so unsuccessful that the company eventually went bankrupt. In his letter to Edward Alleyn, Philip Henslowe remarks on this unprecedented turn in great lengths:

[...] **my lorde a penbrockes** w^{ch} you desier to knowe wheare they be **they ar all at home** and hausse ben t[his] v **or sixe weackes for they cane not saue ther carges** [w]th trauell as J heare & weare fayne to pane the[r] **parell for ther carge** [&j when J wasse in smythfell a **selling of your h[orsse] J meate wth owld** [...] (Greg, *Henslowe Papers* 40)

The excerpt above highlights that Henslowe complains about the Pembroke’s Men’s failed summer tour. He tells Alleyn that six weeks passed since their return, and the company could not earn enough to support their operation anymore. Therefore, Henslowe had to sell their costumes and props. Yet, as it turned out later, more radical steps had to be taken to pay their debts. As George highlights, in the first half of 1594, the company “began selling plays to publishers” (306). These plays were, however, “cut altered and corrupted versions of longer texts” (ibid.).

The year 1594 is quite significant concerning the relationship between Henslowe’s theatrical affairs and Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* as he bought and first staged the drama in this particular year (Henslowe, *The Diary*). In light of the arguments listed above, one can speculate if Henslowe could have bought the touring copy of Marlowe’s drama from the Pembroke’s Men. Following that line of argument, in 1597, he might have ordered the first set of alterations on the text to make it fit more to his stage repertoire. Such an assumption is the least possible amongst the perspectives introduced in this paper.

A more feasible explanation arises if the possible connection between drama touring and the 1597 additions are examined in light of the reception of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*. As chapter 4 highlighted, the popularity of the drama dropped in 1597. Gurr argues that Henslowe’s own company, the Admiral’s Men frequently toured. Their practice, however, was slightly different from other theatrical groups: companies generally went on tours during the summer whilst the Admiral’s men “used to tour mid-winter” (51). Their preferred touring period corresponds with the date Henslowe ordered the alterations – 20 December 1597 – thereby, one

can argue that the first set of additions was meant to preserve the drama's publicity by preparing the text for the tour.

As clarified at the beginning of this chapter, the locations chosen for performances had limited possibilities concerning staging techniques – companies could not necessarily produce the special effects of ‘thunder and lightning’, for instance, as the conditions were not provided. The props required also complicated rural performances since companies could not carry enormous and specific theatricals to the tours. Concerning *Doctor Faustus*, one would immediately notice that the drama, in its original form, could not have been staged as it contains both specific stage directions and props. Although the A-text of *Doctor Faustus* contains fewer special effects than the B-text, it still calls for one cue of ‘thunder and lightning’, additionally, both editions of the drama require a throne as a specific prop. Therefore, to perform the drama outside London, minor alterations are needed.

It is possible that the throne was replaced by a smaller prop or eliminated. The stage direction too, could have been changed or omitted. Henslowe’s note from 1599 seems to offer some explanations:

Lent vnto the company the 6 of febreary 1599 for to

By a **drome when to go into the country**

Receaved of Mr Henslowe this 7th of februiay

1 599 the some of xxij" to **buy 2 trumpetts** (Sig. F. 67^v 1-4).

The impresario bought two trumpets and a drum for his company, the Admiral’s Men when they go to the country to perform. These instruments, as Keenan argues, could be used to “provide music and sound effects” as well as attract attention “when players advertised performances in regional communities” (15). Drums, on the other hand, could have been used to produce the effects of ‘thunder’, thus it is possible that the changes ordered did not cover dramaturgical alterations.

It is necessary to highlight that, in light of these arguments, it is indeed possible that the 1597 alterations were preparations of the text to the tour, however, such alterations could not manifest themselves on the printed editions of Marlowe’s drama. As Kiséry highlights, drama publishing was based on the promptbook for London performances, not touring copies (290). In light of this, the arguments of this chapter could not provide concrete information on the nature of the 1597 alterations, only offering one last perspective from which the alterations of Marlowe’s drama could be examined.

Conclusion

Altering and refreshing dramas was a relatively common practice of the early modern era. Playwrights of the age were quite concerned about keeping their dramas up to date, thus preserving their publicity to the upcoming generations of audiences. Various factors determined the selection of dramas for revisions: the hope of profit, saving money by altering old playbooks instead of buying new textbooks, exaggerating features of dramas that initially made them successful can also be considered as such. As evidence from revived dramas suggests, the most frequent alterations were, as Bentley highlights, additional prologues, epilogues, scenes or special sound and visual effects (483). Considering the practice of revising and updating dramas, Philip Henslowe cannot be excluded from the discussion. Henslowe was a wealthy impresario of the Elizabethan and early Jacobean ages; however, his diary is the document he is most remembered for. His journal not only gives modern-day scholars an insight into the nature of the Renaissance theatrical culture but contains the first written records on the performance history of Marlowe's *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, one of the most popular, and at the same time, the textually most problematic dramas of the age: Marlowe's drama exists in two texts which show significant number of alterations, both in content and dramaturgy. In my paper, I considered the Henslowe diary as a crucial source in this respect, as it mentions two dates – 1597 and 1602 – when *Doctor Faustus* was updated. I argued that through *The Henslowe Diary* we can gain a deeper understanding of the dramaturgy – more specifically, the different occurrences of 'thunder and lightning' – of the two publications of Marlowe's drama. I also tried to find evidence that the B-text's richer dramaturgy can be interpreted as the result of one of the updates ordered by Philip Henslowe. In doing so, the two sets of alterations requested by the impresario were examined from various perspectives.

After providing the grounding for the paper's main arguments – by elaborating on the main characteristic features of the *Henslowe Diary*, the ways the impresario kept his journal, the relationship of the supernatural and stage dramaturgy as well as the dramaturgical alterations of *Doctor Faustus* – my paper shifted its focus to Henslowe's motivations and possible reasons for updating Marlowe's drama. The main focus of chapter 2 was the 1597 alterations of *Doctor Faustus*. The first half of chapter 3 evaluated the production of 'thunder and lightning' in light of Henslowe's theatrical affairs. By closely examining Henslowe's transactions, I tried to find evidence that he purchased any specific items, required for the production of 'thunder and lightning' around 1597 when he paid for the rerun of Marlowe's drama. Given that there are no such purchases amongst Henslowe entries, it can be surmised

that his theatre already has the conditions to produce these effects. In the second half of that chapter, I likewise touched upon Henslowe's relationship with the supernatural and the possibility that his occult beliefs could have influenced him to broaden the scale of special effects of the drama. Amongst the impresario's theatrical affairs, one could find rather unusual entries that link him to the infamous occultist of the age, Simon Forman. Both *The Diary* and Forman's casebook imply their close relationship and Henslowe's interests in the supernatural. As I argued above, they frequently had consultations, one of which occurred on the very same day the impresario ordered the first set of alterations of *Doctor Faustus*. Although *The Diary* does not reveal the nature of the changes requested in 1597, my observations in this chapter do not exclude the possibility that influenced by Forman's occultism, Henslowe decided to emphasise the presence of the supernatural in *Doctor Faustus* by additional cues of 'thunder and lightning'.

The next chapter revolved around the 1602 additions of the drama, however, this time, the drama-alterations were approached from a broader perspective as *The Diary* contains less textual evidence than in the case of the first set of alterations. The reason behind that, as I argued, is that Henslowe changed the format of the journal in late 1597 – he changed the daily entries to monthly records and they were centred around his new theatre, The Fortune. Therefore, I likewise considered some of his correspondences and contracts to reconstruct his aims of updating the drama in 1602. The arguments of this chapter were centred around the erection of the Fortune. After examining the cultural-historical background of the additions, the building contract of the Fortune Theatre as well as and the differences between Henslowe's playhouses – The Rose and the Fortune – it can be concluded that 1602 might also be considered as a possible date for dramaturgical modernisations of *Doctor Faustus*.

Given that both dates are feasible concerning dramaturgical modernisations of the drama, in the final chapter a markedly different approach was necessary to explore which year, 1602 or 1597, Henslowe might have added the stage directions of 'thunder and lightning' to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. As I have pointed out, given the lack of textual evidence provided by the *Henslowe Diary*, this time, the focus was not restricted to the journal. Instead, the arguments of this chapter were mainly based on two contemporary recollections – one from the Rose and one from the Fortune Theatre. In assuming that the dramaturgical modernisations occurred in 1602, the final section of my research briefly elaborated on Henslowe's reasons for updating the drama in 1597. I examined the possible relationship between the practice of drama touring and the first alterations ordered by the impresario.

As these final thoughts reveal, it is nearly impossible to present one clear explanation of Henslowe's reasons for updating the drama, as *The Diary* offers a variety of possibilities. Still, I believe, considering the contemporary recollections introduced in the final chapter, the most reasonable explanation is that Philip Henslowe added the stage directions to the B-text in 1602. However, to arrive at this conclusion, it is not enough to consider the *Diary* exclusively as a cultural-historical reflection is essential to understand the impresario's reasons for doing so. I believe, Henslowe's occult convictions and his relationship with the infamous occultist presumably had a considerable role in how the drama was dramaturgically updated. I presume, it is likewise possible that Henslowe ordered additional cues of 'thunder and lightning' in 1602 because he wanted to dazzle his new audience at the Fortune theatre with a revived version of an already celebrated drama, increase the popularity of his new playhouse, as well as his incomes.

So, what can we answer to the question posed in the title? It may be concluded that Philip Henslowe's diary, indeed, contributes to a better understanding of *Doctor Faustus*. Even though the journal does not provide exact answers to the dramaturgical mystery, it reveals a richer significance of such an aspect of Marlowe's piece; *The Diary* offers the possibility of new interpretations as well as new perspectives through which the drama could be approached, and it also helps modern readers imagine the cultural context of Marlowe's play. The unanswered questions around *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* certainly increase the allure of the play for modern readers since they open space for scholarly speculation and creativity. As my research has demonstrated, Henslowe's diary is one of the most important early modern documents which can be fruitfully explored in this process.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Forman, Simon. "The Forman Casebooks." Ashmole 226, Online Source, <https://casebooks.lib.cam.ac.uk/search?name=Phillip%20henslow;name-type=name;smode=name-search> Last accessed 16 March 2022.
- Forman, Simon. "The Forman Casebooks." Ashmole 234, Online Source, <https://casebooks.lib.cam.ac.uk/search?name=Phillip%20henslow;name-type=name;smode=name-search> Last accessed 16 March 2022.
- Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe's Diary*. Edited by W. W. Greg, A.H. Bullen, 1904.
- Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe's Diary: Edited with Supplementary Material Introduction and Notes*. Edited by R. A. Foakes, Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Dr Faustus*. Edited by Roma Gill. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe: Volume 2, Edward II, Doctor Faustus, The First Book of Lucan, Ovid's Elegies, Hero and Leander, Miscellaneous Pieces*. Edited by Fredson Bowers, Second Edition., Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Secondary Sources

- Astington, John H. "Playing the Man: Acting at the Red Bull and the Fortune." *Early Theatre*, vol. 9, no. 2, [Early Theatre: A Journal Associated with the Records of Early English Drama, Becker Associates], 2006, pp. 130–43, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43500659>.
- Barta, Alexandra. "The Supernatural Through Stage Language: 'Thunder and Lightning' as the Representative of the Occult in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*." „*Non est Volentis*": *A Benda Kálmán Szakkollégium Legjobb Hallgatói Munkái (2017-2021)*, edited by Boros Gábor et al., Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem - L'Harmattan Kiadó, 2022, pp. 165–178.
- Bartels C. Emily, and Emma Smith. "Introduction." *Christopher Marlowe in Context*, edited by Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp.. 1-3

- Bentley, Gerald Eades. "The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 115, no. 6, American Philosophical Society, 1971, pp. 480–83, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/985840>.
- Bevington, David. "The Performance History." *Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide*, edited by Sarah Munson Deats, Continuum, 2010, pp. 41–72
- Bowers, Fredson. "Textual Introduction." *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe: Volume 2, Edward II, Doctor Faustus, The First Book of Lucan, Ovid's Elegies, Hero and Leander, Miscellaneous Pieces*, by Christopher Marlowe, Second Edition., Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp. 123–150.
- Carson, Neil. *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary*. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Cerasano, S. P. "Henslowe's 'Curious' Diary." *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 17, Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp DBA Associated University Presses, 2005, pp. 72–85, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24322721>.
- . "Philip Henslowe, Simon Forman, and the Theatrical Community of the 1590s." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, [Folger Shakespeare Library, The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., Johns Hopkins University Press, George Washington University], 1993, pp. 145–58, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2871136>.
- . "The Geography of Henslowe's Diary." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2005, pp. 328–353. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3844083. Accessed 20 Dec. 2020.
- Collier, Payne. *The Alleyn Papers: A Collection of Original Documents, Illustrative of the Life and Times of Edw. Alleyn, and of the Early English Stage and Drama*. Shakespeare Society, 1843.
- "Currency Converter: 1270–2017." *The National Archives*, Online Source, www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency-converter. Last Accessed: 27 March 2022
- Dekker, Thomas, et al. *The Witch of Edmonton*. Edited by Rowland Wymer, 2017.
- Dessen, Alan C. *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Dustagheer, Sarah., and Woods, Gillian. *Stage Directions and Shakespearean Theatre*. First published ed., Bloomsbury, 2018.

Duxfield, Andrew, *Modern Problems of Editing: The Two Texts of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus*. Literature Compass, 2005.

Fenton, Edward. "Introduction" *The Diaries of John Dee*., Day Books, 2000. pp vii-xi.

Foakes, R. A, "Introduction." *Henslowe's Diary: Edited with Supplementary Material Introduction and Notes*, by Philip Henslowe Cambridge University Press, 1961, pp. xi-lviii.

George, David. "Shakespeare and Pembroke's Men." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3, [Folger Shakespeare Library, The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., Johns Hopkins University Press, George Washington University], 1981, pp. 305–23, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2870248>.

Gill, Roma, "Introduction". *Dr Faustus. The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, by Christopher Marlowe, Vol. 2. Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. xv-xxii.

Greenfield, Peter. "Touring." *Oxford Handbooks Online*, 13 Oct. 2011, www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697861.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199697861-e-18#oxfordhb-9780199697861-div1-81 .

Greg, W. W., and Philip Henslowe. *Henslowe Papers: Being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary*, 1907

Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Harkness, Deborah E. *John Dee's Conversations with Angels: Cabala, Alchemy, and the End of Nature*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Jimenez, Ramon. "An Oxfordian Looks into Henslowe's Diary." *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, vol. 54, no. 2, spring 2018, pp. 15+. Gale Academic OneFile, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A541287796/AONE?u=anon~df461995&sid=googleScholar&xid=d4b51e74. Accessed 16 Mar. 2022

Jump, John. "Introduction." *Doctor Faustus*, by Christopher Marlowe, Routledge, 1965, pp. 1–46.

Keenan, Siobhan. *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

King James I. *Daemonologie*. The Project Gutenberg, www.gutenberg.org/files/25929/25929-pdf.pdf.

Kiséry, András, “A város és a színház: Színjátszás Londonban és Londonon kívül” *Az Angol Irodalom Története 2. A Kora Újkor Irodalma Az 1480-as Évektől Az 1640-Es Évekig*, edited by Kiss Attila Atilla and Szőnyi György E. 1st ed., vol. 2, Kijárat Kiadó , 2021, pp. 288-290.

Kiss, Attila, Atilla, “Látványosságok a társadalom interaktív mezsgyéin” *Az Angol Irodalom Története 2. A Kora Újkor Irodalma Az 1480-as Évektől Az 1640-Es Évekig*, edited by Kiss Attila Atilla and Szőnyi György E. 1st ed., vol. 2, Kijárat Kiadó , 2021, pp. 262-267.

Knutson, Roslyn L. “Henslowe's Diary and the Economics of Play Revision for Revival, 1592–1603.” *Theatre Research International*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1985, pp. 1–18., doi:10.1017/S0307883300010452.

---. “Influence of the Repertory System on the Revival and Revision of the Spanish Tragedy and Dr. Faustus.” *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1988, pp. 257–274., doi:10.1111/j.1475-6757.1988.tb00955.x.

---. “Marlowe, Company Ownership, and the Role of Edward II.” *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 18, Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp DBA Associated University Presses, 2005, pp. 37–46, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24322602>.

---. “Pembroke’s Men in 1592-3, Their Repertory and Touring Schedule.” *Early Theatre*, vol. 4, [Early Theatre: A Journal Associated with the Records of Early English Drama, Becker Associates], 2001, pp. 129–38, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43502090>.

--- “The Commercial Significance of the Payments for Playtexts in ‘Henslowe’s Diary’, 1597–1603.” *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 5, Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp DBA Associated University Presses, 1991, pp. 117–63, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24322093>.

Mabillard, Amanda. *Shakespeare's Theatres: The Rose*. *Shakespeare Online*. 20 Aug. 2000. <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/theatres/therose.html> Last accessed 16 March 2022

Marcus, Leah. "Marlowe's Magic Books: The Material Text." *Christopher Marlowe in Context*, edited by Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 15–26.

---. "Textual Indeterminacy and Ideological Difference: The Case of 'Doctor Faustus.'" *Renaissance Drama*, vol. 20, 1989, pp. 1–29. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41917246. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020.

Melton, John. *Astrologaster, or the Figure-Caster. Rather the Arraignment of Artlesse Astrologers, and Fortune Tellers, That Cheat Many Ignorant People ... Once Againe Brought to the Barre*. London: B. Alsop for E. Blackmore, 1620, <https://wellcomecollection.org/works/vsaya7g8>.

Szőnyi, György E. "John Dee and Early Modern Occult Philosophy." *Literature Compass*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2004, doi:10.1111/j.1741-4113.2004.00110.x.

---. "Reneszánsz tudomány és mágia." *Az Angol Irodalom Története 2. A Kora Újkor Irodalma Az 1480-as Évektől Az 1640-Es Évekig*, edited by Kiss Attila Atilla and Szőnyi György E. 1st ed., vol. 2, Kijarat Kiadó, 2021, pp. 85–91.

---. "Színházi jelenség" *Az Angol Irodalom Története 2. A Kora Újkor Irodalma Az 1480-as Évektől Az 1640-Es Évekig*, edited by Kiss Attila Atilla and Szőnyi György E. 1st ed., vol. 2, Kijarat Kiadó, 2021, pp. 268–270.

Thomson, Leslie. "The Meaning of 'Thunder and Lightning': Stage Directions and Audience Expectations." *Early Theatre*, vol. 2, 1999, pp. 11–24. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43499089.

Traister, Barbara Howard. *The Notorious Astrological Physician of London: Works and Days of Simon Forman*. University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Last edited: 2022.09.26.