"With much labour out of scattered papers": The Caroline reprints of Thomas Heywood's *1* and *2 If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*

Nostalgia can be a powerful and adaptable political idea that evokes a dislocation between past and present but, paradoxically, also collapses that temporal distinction by inscribing an idealized, selective past with the concerns of the present and announcing its contemporaneity. First performed and printed in the early Jacobean period, Thomas Heywood's *1* and *2 If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* recall significant events from Elizabeth I's reign and were among a number of new Foxean history plays that registered some anxiety about England's future under the new Stuart king, James I. Their nostalgia for the Elizabethan past acquired new urgency and application through printed editions – and, indeed, Heywood's plays proved to have, on the basis of edition numbers, lasting appeal in print. Part 1 was printed eight times between 1605 and 1639, and Part 2 was printed four times between 1606 and 1633, which makes the former among the period's most frequently reprinted plays.[1] This article concentrates on the Caroline editions of Part 1 (1632, 1639) and Part 2 (1633) to demonstrate how Heywood's plays became part of an emerging "counterpublic" during the 1630s that was sometimes at odds with royal policy and to highlight the potential of reprints to generate new interpretations, when the political, theatrical, and economic factors shaping a play's first performance and publication have changed.[2] It argues that the plays' nostalgia for Elizabethan histories and figureheads acquires a topical, transnational currency during the Thirty Years' War, particularly through the collaborative textual communities that oversaw the reprinted editions. While plays are often seen as participants in a period's political culture, there is a very real exchange between Heywood's plays and the political context of their Caroline publication,

because their publisher – Nathaniel Butter – was one of the main producers of news about the European wars.

While Butter regularly invested in plays from the commercial stages, he became known to his contemporaries as a publisher of news.[3] In 1621–22, he was involved in the production of the first serial newsbooks in England and, from 1624, worked in regular partnership with Nicholas Bourne, publishing quarto-format news pamphlets that were numbered, issued at frequent (although not regular) intervals, and reported primarily on events from the Thirty Years' War.[4] From his bookshop at the Sign of the Pied Bull in Paul's Churchyard, Butter became the public face of the enterprise and he acquired a popular – and sometimes unflattering – reputation as a news maker.[5] In *The Staple of News,* Ben Jonson alludes to him as a "decay'd Stationer" who "knows Newes well, can sort and ranke 'hem […] And for a need can make 'hem"; and in the "Continued Inquisition" appended to *A Scourge for Paper-Persecutors* (1625), Abraham Holland describes the walls of the churchyard as "Butter'd with weekely Newes compos'd in Pauls" that offer nothing more than "shamefull lies."[6] Jonson and Holland not only position Butter as a publisher and distributor of news, but also as a creator who has a formative role in the "Batter" of news that "besmeare[s] | Each publike post, and Church dore."[7] An animosity between Jonson and Butter continued during the 1630s. In a letter to Sir Thomas Puckering dated 20 September 1632, one of Butter's news writers, John Pory, remarks that "Jonson (who, I thought, had been dead) hath written a play against next terme called the Magnetick lady"; and it seems that Butter, Inigo Jones, and Alexander Gil the younger attended this production at the Blackfriars theatre, where they mocked Jonson's latest endeavor.[8] Gil's verse satire "Upon Ben Jonson's *Magnetic Lady*" captures the moment at the playhouse:

> O how thy friend Nat Butter 'gan to melt
> And Inigo with laughter there grew fat
> That there was nothing worth the laughing at.
> And yet thou crazily art confident

> Belching out full-mouthed oaths with foul intent,
> Calling us fools and rogues, unlettered men,
> Poor narrow souls that cannot judge of Ben.[9]

In the case of Butter, Jonson's ire was directed towards, as he saw it, the partial and unreliable nature of the "buttered news" that pandered to the tastes and political sympathies of readers in England.[10] By sourcing, compiling, and editing accounts of recent events, Butter was, in both senses, a *manufacturer* of news, investing materially and creatively in the process. While his newsbooks are certainly partisan and offer support for the Protestant cause in the ongoing European wars, the potential for accurate reporting was limited, as Jayne Boys discusses, by the technologies and practices of the news trade, in which manuscript and print reports written in different languages and often from unknown sources circulated across Europe, and were translated, transcribed, and edited by networks of (usually anonymous) individuals.[11]

This article is interested in the interplay between newsbooks and playbooks – both in terms of their material construction and their participation in the period's political culture.[12] The "Epistle to the Reader" featured in Butter's seventh volume of *The German History* (1634) – a digest of recent events from the Thirty Years' War – reflects on the process of news composition and was possibly written by Butter himself, given the evidence of his commentary in other publications and letters:

> I dare boldy say, I have deliuered truth unpartially; and although collected with much labour out of scattered papers, yet it is set downe so methodically, that a meane capacity may runne along with the History; apprehend by Imagination, what was done by Action.[13]

The epistle collapses any distinction between 'History' and news, using the former term to refer to events that have recently taken place. It explains that news/history is produced "with much labor out of scattered papers" and involves a process of collecting, evaluating, editing, and setting down methodically. This model of production has something in common with our understanding of playbook publication. Tiffany Stern has shown that a "play" arrived at the

printing house as a selection of fragments that were reassembled there. These different parts could include, in addition to the main text, a prologue, epilogue, playbill, songs, letters, and other materials that had been "read" on stage and/or kept as separate documents.[14] Both playbooks and newsbooks are therefore made up of a patchwork of different elements collected and presented together. We should consider them not only as participants in the same political culture, but also as part of similar textual economies and networks, an exchange that crystallizes when examining Butter's output.

By concentrating on the Caroline reprints of Heywood's plays, this article shows how the political context of their publication repositions the plays' nostalgia for Elizabethan figureheads and uses this context to evaluate the significant textual variants that are introduced in the final editions of each part. Part 2 (Q4 1633) offers a revised ending that is more aggressively Protestant and militaristic than the version featured in previous editions; Part 1 (Q8 1639) adds a prologue, epilogue, and act divisions, which advertise its "authority"; and both of these final editions contain numerous local changes that frustrate attempts at singularizing agency and suggest a number of different hands contributed to their textual variants. Butter's Caroline editions, while substantially derivative from the earlier printed quartos, are reassembled texts that incorporate changes and revisions arising from "scattered papers" that were brought together during publication. The first part of this article profiles Butter's investment practices to argue that the playbooks' nostalgia for an Elizabethan political past and a Jacobean theatrical past help to construct counterpublics in textual spaces where readers could imaginatively resist and oppose Charles I's vacillating pro-Habsburg policies during a period that David Norbrook memorably characterizes as "the king's peace and the people's war."[15] The second part evaluates the variants in the final editions of Heywood's plays to suggest that, while they enhance the plays' political and textual currency, they are presented

in a way that underscores the plays' status as older classics that recall an earlier theatrical and political past. The first part emphasizes Butter's agency as publisher – the "prime mover" who makes the decision to invest (and re-invest) in these plays.[16] The second part, in contrast, draws attention to the networks of agents who could contribute to the new editions and addresses the question of Heywood's involvement, especially in light of the dramatist's well-known objections to the publication of these plays. While book historians rightly concentrate on the role of the publisher when evaluating the reasons for investment, this case study draws attention to other agents who could shape the text in production. As part of his news business at the Sign of the Pied Bull, Butter worked with manuscript writers, collectors, transcribers, translators, and editors, which makes it difficult – if not impossible – to singularize agency and effectively transforms the name of the publisher into a shorthand or metonymy that stands in for a network of individuals.

Part 1: Investing in news, politics, and playbooks at the Sign of the Pied Bull

The two parts of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* are typically discussed in the context of their first performance and publication in the early Jacobean period, but the plays acquire new political applications through each reprinted edition. As implied by their alternative title, *The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth* – which appeared as a second title in all editions of Part 1, a replacement title on the cancel title page of Part 2 Q1 (1606, STC 13336.5), and as the only title for Q2 (1609, STC 13337) – the plays dramatize difficulties from the life and reign of Elizabeth I, particularly those brought about by Catholic influences. Part 1 presents Elizabeth's plight and imprisonment during the reign of her Catholic sister, Mary I, and underscores the destructive machinations of the queen's Catholic advisors, especially Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Part 2 concentrates for most of its duration on a plot involving Thomas Gresham and the building of the Royal Exchange; but the final scenes show William Parry's

alleged assassination attempts on Elizabeth's life and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, one of the period's most celebrated Protestant victories over invading Catholic foes. When the plays were first performed, their nostalgic invocation, as Isabel Karremann discusses, of the late queen's reign reflects negatively on James I's policies of religious toleration and pacifism, and the plays "articulate an anxiety about a possible strengthening of the Catholic faith in Jacobean England."[17] Heywood's plays were also part of a wider trend or dramatic subgenre of Protestant-orientated histories that drew significantly on John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and which Judith Doolin Spikes has described as "Elect Nation" plays, owing to their promotion of an international Protestant agenda in which England takes on a central (and providentially determined) role in resisting the influence of the Roman Catholic Church.[18] Butter also invested in some of these plays: he published Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* in 1605 (first performed in *c.*1604) and Dekker's *Whore of Babylon* in 1607 (performed *c.*1606-07), which therefore make up a united group of printed Protestant histories.[19] Dekker's play only achieved one edition, but Butter continued to issue new editions of Heywood's and Rowley's plays at times of pointed political tension, including the death of Prince Henry in 1612, the unraveling of the Spanish Match in 1623, and the crises of the European wars during the 1630s.[20] In the case of the latter, the transnational reality of the ongoing wars, which could be framed as a binary Protestant-Catholic conflict, positions the plays' political nostalgia for Tudor monarchs on an international stage.

From 1618 to 1648, the (retrospectively named) Thirty Years' War was fought primarily across central Europe between shifting alliances of Protestant and Catholic states and involved a series of devastating conflicts, often leading to plummeting living conditions and outbreaks of disease and famine.[21] It began as a dispute over the succession of the staunchly Catholic Ferdinand II (of the House of Habsburg) to the throne of Bohemia in 1618, which prompted the Bohemian

Estates to offer the throne to Frederick, the (Protestant) Elector Palatine and James I's son-in-law. But what started as a conflict over Bohemia (a religiously pluralist state) and the expansion of Catholic Habsburg influence soon embroiled other issues, agendas, and nation-states. It became a struggle for European political and religious power, and the conflict did not take place along a clear or consistent confessional divide. Nation states shifted alliances to promote their own stability and/or expansion – England's foreign policy, for example, was sometimes pro-Habsburg and sometimes anti-Habsburg – but the war could be conveniently framed as a Protestant-Catholic dispute that, on religious grounds, offered a justification for hostilities.[22]

This binary shorthand was a feature of news reports that circulated across Europe and Britain in manuscript and print and which tended to offer partisan support for one "side" of the conflict. As Farmer argues, it is this partial reporting that Jonson takes aim at in *The Staple of News.*[23] In England, the European wars provoked great interest and concern, spurred on by the emergence of serial news publications that reported on these conflicts and which were, in turn, shaped by reader demand.[24] From 1624, Butter and Bourne monopolized the trade through their quarto-format newsbooks, which support Protestant, anti-Habsburg efforts, and attack, in particular, Spanish power.[25] Some of their newsbooks display the coat of arms of the Elector Palatine (the figurehead for the Protestant cause) on the verso of the title page, a visual shorthand that announces the venture's sympathies and which was also discussed explicitly in some newsbooks.[26] It is important not to collapse a distinction between the political sympathies of the newsbooks and Butter and Bourne's personal politics. As Farmer has demonstrated in his discussion of stationer John Norton, publishers were attentive to market demand and sometimes shifted their investment from one side of a debate to the other, or as Zachary Lesser has discussed in relation to Thomas Archer and the *querelle des femmes*, published opposing views at the same time.[27] Butter and Bourne's newsbooks likely reflect the appetites and

dominant religio-political sympathies of their main readers. As Boys explores, surviving reader responses reveal "a thoughtful and discerning readership with Protestant leanings and affection for Princess Elizabeth [James I's daughter, who was married to the Elector Palatine] and the Palatine cause." They held "anti-Spanish views before they started to read," which were carefully reinforced (rather than challenged) through the content and presentation of Butter and Bourne's publications.[28]

These newsbooks established a platform for public political engagement that was sometimes in conflict with royal policy and was certainly never effective as a mouthpiece for the crown. During the first years of the war, James maintained a pacificist position, particularly as he was pursuing marriage negotiations between the Spanish Infanta and his son and heir, Charles. Some of Butter's news publications that condemned the Habsburg Emperor led to censorship, including his 1620 pamphlet, *A Plain Demonstration of the Unlawful Succession of the now Emperor Ferdinand the Second* (STC 10814).[29] After the collapse of the Spanish Match in November 1623, James started to favor military intervention in Europe in support of Protestant, anti-Habsburg forces, a policy that was furthered by Charles I on his succession in 1626. Stuart policy continued to vacillate, however, and, in 1630, Charles signed the Treaty of Madrid which restored peace and ended Britain's official involvement in the European conflicts, although the Stuart king still held out for the restitution of the Palatinate.[30] Butter and Bourne maintained their investment, during the 1630s, in news that promoted military intervention in the Protestant cause, but encountered regular difficulties. Charles became more stringent in the press censorship of foreign news: on 17 October 1632, a Star Chamber decree, initiated by the king, prohibited the publication of corantos and serial news pamphlets and directly named both Butter and Bourne, forbidding them "henceforth to print publish, or sell any of the said Pamphletts."[31]At this time, reader demand was at its height: Butter and Bourne had published

record numbers of newsbooks between 29 November 1631 and 12 October 1632, and they objected immediately to the decree.[32] Butter visited Secretary Coke on 1 November 1632 to plead his case.[33] On 30 September 1633, he and Bourne jointly petitioned Charles, claiming they had "received some benefit and a great part of the King's subjects content by the Gazettes and weekly news," and promising they would "be careful in time to come that nothing dishonourable to princes in amity with his Majesty should pass the press."[34] Their petitions were unsuccessful, however, and the ban on weekly newsbooks remained in effect until 20 December 1638. During this interval, Butter and Bourne started to publish digest volumes of *The Swedish Intelligencer* (some of which were titled *The Continuation of the German History*), which offered less frequent (and therefore less "current") serial histories of the European conflicts that, probably because they allowed more time for editing prior to publication, seem to have met Georg Weckherlin's approval as news licenser.[35]

Butter's involvement in the news trade coupled with increasing reader demand for accounts of Protestant successes motivated his new editions of Heywood's plays in 1632 (Part 1, Q7) and 1633 (Part 2, Q4) – although other factors likely contributed as well, including a stage revival at the Cockpit, the availability of new material for Part 2, and the publication of Heywood's prose account of Elizabeth's life in 1631 (*Englands Elizabeth*, STC 13313). The fact that Butter also published a new edition of Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* in 1632 (Q4), which similarly reinforces the importance of Protestant leadership, further clinches my argument that the wartime context was a critical influence that prompted the new editions and reshaped their nostalgia for the Tudor past. As Caroline playbooks, Heywood's histories insist upon a global application that reads events from Elizabeth's life and reign in light of the ongoing European wars and repositions a national history as a transnational one about religio-political deliverance. Heywood's plays acquire greater urgency because an international conflict that

could be drawn up along Protestant-Catholic lines was taking place on a huge scale. Indeed, from the start of the Thirty Years' War, Protestant leaders from England's past had been invoked to encourage military intervention in Europe: the pamphlet *Robert Earl of Essex, His Ghost* (1624), which carries its imprint into the fictive world of the text by describing it as "Printed in Paradise," offers a call to arms in which Essex's ghost, residing in "Elizian," condemns the "two Houses of Spaine and Austria" which have "made themselves in the blood of Christians" and urges readers in England to offer a "free and cheerefull contribution to the Warres," giving a number of examples from Elizabeth's reign as models for emulation.[36]

Elizabeth was, of course, a central figure in this mobilization of Tudor nostalgia. Heywood's plays relate key moments of Catholic persecution followed by Protestant triumph, which are reinforced through the conclusions of each part: Elizabeth succeeds to the English throne and receives an *English* bible at the end of Part 1, while the defeat of the Spanish Armada, which not only threatened national stability but also the global balance of religio-political power, concludes Part 2.[37] Butter's Caroline editions underline Elizabeth's position as an international figurehead – one who is part of a transhistorical, cosmopolitan community of Protestant leaders. Their publication timing encourages a connection with recent Protestant victories (such as the Battle of Breitenfeld in 1631) and, in particular, establishes an interpretative parallel between Elizabeth and the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, who brought his forces into the conflict in 1630 and emerged as the most prominent monarchical figurehead for the Protestant cause during the Caroline period. Gustavus's leadership spurred on widespread interest in the European conflicts during the early 1630s and his wartime engagements feature in Butter and Bourne's *Swedish Intelligencer* (which, through its title, alludes to the importance of Swedish contributions to the war effort).[38] Gustavus's death at the Battle of Lützen on 6 November 1632

was widely reported and mourned, and accounts memorialized him, for readers in England, as "an honorary Englishman" and an ideal Protestant hero alongside Elizabeth I.[39]

Through their publication context, Heywood's plays take on new global application and urgency. Andrew Griffin has insightfully shown how the subplot involving Thomas Gresham and the building of the Royal Exchange in Part 2 disrupts "London exceptionalism": Heywood foregrounds cooperative exchanges between the city's capital and the rest of the country to construct a cohesive history that unites England as a nation, rather than positioning London as a cosmopolitan city on the world stage, dislocated from the communities that surround it.[40] As part of a Caroline publication, however, this displacement appears less vital. The Royal Exchange is a center for international trade. It brings to mind Butter's (by now well-known) news networks and the spread of information and goods across Europe and the rest of the world. Indeed, a reference to the Exchange features as part of the extended title for Heywood's play: "If you know not me, | You know no body. | The Second part. | With the building of the Royall Exchange. |AND | The famous Victory of Queene Elizabeth: Anno 1588."[41] In the playbook, the pairing of the Exchange with the "famous Victory" of 1588 seems to unite economic and wartime successes and underline their international significance. The context of Butter's final edition of Part 2 redirects the project of (insular) nation-building towards the recognition of a global community of exchange and Protestant leadership, where national histories can authorize transnational connections – both in terms of cooperative wartime alliances, but also economic expansion.

Part 2's heightened militarism on behalf of the Protestant cause is demonstrated most clearly through a revised ending that expands the episodes involving the defeat of the Spanish Armada and registers greater anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish sentiment than the previous editions of

both parts. As critics including Sandra Clark have noted, the expected Hispanophobia in these early editions seems rather muted when read alongside other "Elect Nation" plays, such as Dekker's *Whore of Babylon,* or those that present a Spanish threat or adversary, including Peele's *Edward I* (1593) and the anonymous *A Larum for London, or the Siege of Antwerp* (1602).[42] In Part 1, Philip II of Spain (royal consort of Mary I, and the historical instigator of the Spanish Armada) is shown as a staunch defender of Elizabeth, while, in Part 2, no reference is made to Philip in connection with the Armada attack, and descriptions of the invading Spanish forces lack the vituperative rhetoric and hostility that frequently characterized such accounts.[43] One of the reasons for this absence, as Clark discusses, can be found in Heywood's main source – Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* – which gives Philip a pivotal position in Elizabeth's preservation and frames it as divinely ordained.[44] The political context of the plays' first performance and publication in 1604-05 provides another: James signed the Treaty of London in August 1604, which ended the ongoing hostilities with Spain and made explicit Hispanophobia vulnerable to censorship. The alternative ending in the Caroline edition of Part 2 (the origins of which are considered in the next section) alters this position through two new scenes and a revised version of the final scene, in which Elizabeth and the English troops at Tilbury await news of the naval battle and greet the victorious English commanders.[45]

One of the most significant changes in the expanded ending of Part 2 is the addition of a new scene featuring a Chorus figure – not otherwise present in either part – who condemns the Spanish attack. The Chorus's twenty-seven-line speech describes the preparation of the Spanish fleet, and recalls events from earlier in Elizabeth's reign, including her refusal to marry Philip II:

> […] This Queene inaugurated,
> And strongly planted in her peoples heart,
> Was in her youth solicited in Marriage
> By many princely heires of Christendome,

> Especially by Philip King of Spaine,
> Her Sisters husband; who to atchiue his ends,
> Had got a dispensation from the Pope:
> But after many Treats and Embassies,
> Finding all his hopes in her quite frustrated,
> Aimes all his strategems, plots and designes
> Both to the vtter ruine of our Land,
> And our Religion […]
> […] The proud Spaniard
> Inraged at this Affront, sends forth a Fleet
> Three whole yeeres in preparing, to subuert,
> Ruine, and quite depopulate this Land.
> Imagine you now see them vnder sayle,
> Swel'd vp with many a proud vaine-glorious boast,
> And newly entred in our English coast.
> (I3v)

The Chorus revises Part 1's sympathetic presentation of Philip as a benevolent supporter of Elizabeth and paves the way for a new ending that features a degree of anti-Spanish sentiment not present in either of the two parts as they were previously printed. Philip, who in Part 1 was a defender of Elizabeth who rescued "Innocence so soone betray'd," is now "the proud Spaniard" who "aimes all his strategems, plots and designes […] to the vtter ruine of our Land, | And our Religion."[46] Significantly, Q1–3 of Part 2 make no mention of the Spanish king at any point; the Chorus in Q4 (on I3r-v) offers the *first* reference to Philip in Part 2, where he is portrayed as the central figure responsible for the Armada attack. The Chorus, which seems to echo Shakespeare's *Henry V* (as printed in 1623) in asking the audience to imagine the Spanish fleet "vnder sayle," prepares readers for the next scene featuring the Spanish "swel'd vp with many a proud vaine-glorious boast."[47]

This second new scene in Q4 outlines the Spanish threat of political and religious domination over England. The Duke of Medina, Don Pedro, and John Martinus Ricaldus are assured of an easy victory "against a petty Iland gouern'd by a woman" (I4r), predicting they will find the English unprepared and weak:

> [Duke of Medina]: All their hearts,

> Are dead within 'em, wee I feare shall finde
> Their Seas vnguarded, and their shoares vnman'd,
> And conquer without battaile.
> (I4v)

The earlier editions of Part 2, in contrast, present the Armada attack entirely from the perspective of the English fleet, who promise that the Spanish prisoners will "[taste] our English mercie" – a comment which is tellingly absent from the corresponding, but heavily revised, final scene in Q4.[48] The Caroline edition establishes the Spanish as inept, hyperbolic villains who are closely allied with the pope: it describes their forces as the "great Armado | Christned by th'Pope, the Nauy invincible" (I4v), a phrase that is repeated heavy-handedly (even formulaically) in this scene and the one that follows. During the 1630s, the ascendency of the English Armenians led to efforts, as Farmer points out, to limit attacks on the pope and the identification of the pope as Antichrist, which had been a hallmark of Protestant propaganda.[49] Part 2's new ending, however, emphasizes the pope's role in a range of stratagems that aim to curtail England's political power: Philip received "a dispensation from the Pope" to marry Elizabeth; the Armada is "Christned by th'Pope"; and the Spanish forces invoke the pope's authority when they claim to "Christen [England] New Spaine" (K1r). The ending therefore resists the Armenian drive for "less divisive relations between the Church of England and the Church of Rome", reinforcing, instead, a militant rhetoric of opposition to both Spain and the Catholic Church.[50]

The revised final scene reactivates the play's Tudor nostalgia by incorporating new dialogue that emphasizes the achievements of Elizabethan forces in ways that secure its Caroline currency. It offers an extended celebration of England's defense against the Armada, including a catalogue of the English fleet (K4r), a long account of Francis Drake's triumphs (K2r–v), and Elizabeth's battle address at Tilbury (K1v), all of which are new additions. Indeed, Drake was another Elizabethan figurehead who was invoked during the Thirty Years' War as a model for

Protestant forces, particularly on account of his exploits against the Spanish.[51] In 1626, Bourne published *Sir Francis Drake Revived,* a pamphlet that explicitly promotes "service of our King and Countrey by [Drake's] example" in its main text and dedications to Charles I, Elizabeth I, and the "Curteous Reader."[52] Similarly, Butter and Bourne's newsbooks praised military preparation and regularly contained lists of the forces involved in skirmishes on the continent, as well as celebratory accounts of Protestant leaders, in particular, Gustavus Adolphus. Their *Continuation of our Weekly News* dated 25 June 1631 reports on "the great Preparation of the King of Sweden for the performance of some great Designe" and describes the Imperial forces (including the Spanish) who were also preparing for imminent military engagement.[53]

While the availability of new material was one factor that likely motivated Butter's Caroline reprint, the revised ending is not advertised on the playbook's title page, which creates the impression that it was always part of the play. The title page reproduces the prominent woodcuts of Elizabeth that featured on Butter's editions of both parts in 1623 (STC 13333 and 13338) and mostly follows previous editions in its title-page description. In contrast, the fourth quarto of Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1608) advertises its "new additions of the Parliament Sceane, and deposing of King Richard."[54] Because Part 2's updated ending silently replaces the original one, its heightened political hostility towards Spain is made to seem an integral part of the play. During the early 1630s, Butter and Bourne's newsbooks also register growing Hispanophobia and a concern over the nation's political and naval strength: one newsbook, dated 12 January 1632, describes the "cruel and barbarous behaviour of the Spanish towards all the townes which they doe forsake," and another, dated 17 December 1631, features an account of "the late fight at Sea, betwixt the Spanish Armado vnder the command of Generall Don Anthonio Oequendo, and the Holland Armado."[55] While Spain, as Clark argues, could be positioned as an exotic "other" in non-adversarial terms during the early modern period, the

nation's representation in history plays was most often as a political and religious threat.[56] This anti-Spanish nationalism is also a dependable feature in Butter and Bourne's newsbooks, which delineated the ongoing European wars along clear binary lines and identified Spain as a consistent adversary, a classic "other" against which Britain's forces should be aimed. Seen in this context, Part 2's unannounced new ending seems, in effect, to rewrite the play's textual history, leading Caroline readers to assume that its prominent Hispanophobia was a feature of the original. By not advertising the new ending, the Caroline edition updates the play's nostalgia for the militarism of Elizabethan leaders: not only does it underline the importance of decisive and aggressive action against political and religious adversaries, it also constructs a theatrical nostalgia for the early Jacobean stage in which the play's pointed anti-Spanish sentiment is falsely remembered.

Part 2: (Re)constructing textual networks

Butter's news business not only helps us to understand the updated political import of his Caroline editions of Heywood's plays, it also helps us to consider how they were compiled, edited, and prepared for publication in their final editions. The first part of this article has concentrated on Butter as the "prime mover" who makes the decision to invest in new editions in 1632–33 and it furthers the work of book historians including Lesser, Sonia Massai, and Kirk Melnikoff who look to the publisher to "access" readings of a text and evaluate how this agent anticipates the experiences of others readers.[57] However, determining responsibility for textual variants, corrections, and other aspects of a playbook's printed presentation is much more difficult because of the number of individuals who were involved in the production process. Butter's news networks offer a useful point of comparison: he and Bourne worked with translators, manuscript news writers, intelligencers (such as John Pory) and editors, including Thomas Gainsford (1622–24) and William Watts (1631–32), whom they hired to

lightly "improve" their news sources and provide their publications with an identifiable style.[58] It is difficult – if not impossible – to determine the specific contributions made by individuals within the news network. Even paratexts attributed to a newsbook's "printer" (meaning, in practice, the publisher) pose a problem, because these materials could be translations of the addresses featured in a continental source and not, therefore, indicate the current edition's publisher.[59] The final Caroline editions of Heywood's plays contain numerous textual variants, ranging from local word and line changes to the new ending of Part 2 (1633) and the inclusion of a prologue, epilogue, and act divisions in Part 1 (1639). In this section of the article, I argue that Butter's news networks help us to understand the intensely collaborative and intimate textual exchanges that take place in the book trade where "scattered papers" are brought together, assembled, and edited, while also making it possible to hypothesize about the agency behind some variants.

With the exception of the paratextual additions in Part 1 and the revised ending in Part 2, Butter's Caroline playbooks are derivative from their earlier printed editions (i.e., Part 1 Q8 from Q7; Part 2 Q4 from Q3).[60] However, both parts contain numerous minor textual variants scattered throughout, indicating that previously printed copies had been marked up in order to prepare the new editions. Some errors and textual cruxes are left unattended, which implies that Heywood did not oversee their publication. For example, in Part 1, Henry Bedingfield's confused and unmetrical description of Wyatt's rebellion, which is set as verse in all editions of the play, remains unaltered in Q8:

> Concerning Wiatt and the Kentish rebels,
> Their ouer-throw is past: The rebell Dukes that fought
> By all meanes to proclaime queen Iane chiefly Northumberland
> For Gilfords sake, he for'st his brother Duke vnto that warre,
> But each one had his merite.[61]

Some changes introduce new error. The incorporation of act breaks in Part 1, for example, implies the work of a non-authorial publication agent, who has made, with the exception of one division, intelligible choices. As Heywood's plays were first performed at outdoor amphitheaters, they did not include act intervals. The dumb shows that feature throughout Part 1 provide logical locations for these breaks that could be adopted for theatrical revivals at indoor playhouses and in printed editions. The division for Act 4 in Q8, however, introduces confusion: it appears at the top of E3r and interrupts the middle of a scene. A more reasonable location for this division would be on the previous page, E2v, just before the dumb show that features Elizabeth receiving a Bible from two angels. The individual responsible perhaps sought to position the act breaks at the tops of pages for visual impact. All but one of the Latin divisions appear beneath the head or running title as the first line of the page (see A3r, D1r, E3r, and F3v; the division for Act 2 on B3v is the exception). They also contain superfluous references to scene divisions that are not maintained beyond the act headings (as in "*Act. Prim. Scae. Prim*," A3r), which adds to the impression that the inclusion and position of these divisions were designed as typographical and literary embellishments by non-authorial agents during the publication process.

Other emendations are sporadic and do not seem to demonstrate consistent playscript revision. Some changes involve rather perfunctory sections of dialogue (replacing an unnamed lord's short exclamation – "Admirable!" – with "Very admirable, and worthy of praise"), while others could be aimed at enhancing the text for readers.[62] Both parts contain new printed marginalia and expanded stage directions that do not necessarily indicate recourse to a playhouse manuscript or authority. Q4 Part 2 adds the marginal gloss "*Meaning | his cash*" (A3r) to clarify the line that Gresham has "a friend | Would not see you stand out for twice the summe." Similarly, Gresham's claim that he treads "on a kings present" is glossed by the annotation

"*Meaning the | slippers*" (F2v). These glosses do not direct stage action, but offer an explanation of the accompanying dialogue, functioning largely as an interpretative guide for readers. Butter had an extensive network of textual agents working for him and he may have arranged for one of them to lightly edit and "correct" the plays in preparation for the Caroline editions.[63]

It does not follow that all of the variants had the same source, however, and given Heywood's interest in the publication of his plays during the 1630s, he may have been involved – although the continuation of some errors suggests he did not oversee the process. At this time, Heywood became, as many critics have considered, a prolific writer of prefatory materials that evaluate the merits of playbook publication and typically employ a modesty topos that expresses reluctance towards print circulation and anxiety about the "double sale" of his plays.[64] The fact that Heywood supplied signed paratexts to seven first-edition commercial plays between 1631 and 1638 *and* was planning a collected edition of his "Workes" makes it difficult to accept his professed diffidence and, at times, opposition to publication at face value.[65] As David Bergeron argues, Heywood's paratexts perhaps trace his own changing evaluation of the shortcomings, disappointments, strategies, and benefits of publication.[66]

Butter's editions of *1* and *2 If You Know Not Me* are, however, exceptional and differ in presentation from the other Caroline playbooks in which Heywood was clearly involved. The evidence of their textual history seems to underline the primacy of publication agents in their transmission and preparation for print. None of Butter's editions are attributed to Heywood, nor do they contain paratexts signed by the dramatist. Indeed, Heywood seems to have objected to Butter's first editions of these plays, which appeared shortly after the stationer secured their

rights in 1605.[67] In a signed address to readers in *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608), Heywood condemns the previous publications of his plays as unauthorized:

> Yet since some of my plaies haue (vnknown to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the Printers handes, and therfore so corrupt and mangled, (copied onely by the eare) that I haue bene as vnable to know them, as ashamde to chalenge them.
> (A2r)

Aside from *1* and *2 If You Know Not Me,* the only plays of Heywood's to have been printed by this time were *1* and *2 Edward IV* (1599), *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* (1602), and *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1607), all of which appeared without any paratextual materials and, with the exception of *A Woman Killed,* were issued anonymously.[68] It seems likely that Heywood's attack was aimed at least partly at Butter's early editions of *If You Know Not Me:* they had been printed relatively recently and therefore would have been fresh in Heywood's and other readers' minds, and the textual state of these plays does lend *some* support to the accusations.[69] Heywood claims that the plays have been printed without his knowledge and in a "corrupt and mangled" form because they were "copied onely by the eare." Part 1 shows some signs of textual corruption in the form of lexical repetition, mislineation, and confused lines – although a method of transmission involving memorial reconstruction or shorthand are not the only possibilities. Most of the problems appear in the opening and closing scenes of the play, which could indicate, as Laurie Maguire suggests, that the outer leaves of the manuscript – the most vulnerable part – had been damaged and later re-created.[70] Reinforcing the plays' publication as "unauthorized" – from Heywood's perspective – is the fact that the dramatist reiterated his earlier criticism through a stage prologue and epilogue prepared for a Caroline revival at the Cockpit. These theatrical paratexts were printed in 1637 as part of Heywood's *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas,* a publication that he oversaw.[71] Here, they are described as the "introduction" to "the Play of Queen Elizabeth as it was last

revived at the Cock-pit," where "the Author taxeth the most corrupted copy now imprinted, which was published without his consent":

> And in that lamenesse it hath limp't so long,
> The Author now to vindicate that wrong
> Hath took the paines, upright upon its feete
> To teach it walke, so please you sit, and see't.[72]

Heywood claims that the printed play had been drawn through "Stenography" (a form of shorthand) and contains "scarce one word trew" (R5r) whereas the new version provided for the theatrical revival, probably in *c.*1632, contains a corrected text.[73]

This prologue and epilogue reappear, with minor variants, in Butter's final edition of Part 1 (1639, A2r), raising the question of Heywood's involvement in the edition. As part of the playbook, these theatrical paratexts are repurposed and, in effect, they advertise Butter's new printed edition as a restored and authoritative one. As already discussed, I am not convinced that the 1639 quarto reveals this wholescale revision.[74] Aside from the addition of the prologue and epilogue, Q8 is clearly derivative from Q7, and it only displays an attempt at light correction. This situation suggests several explanations. First, Heywood may have supplied Butter with the prologue and epilogue, but could not prevail upon him to print a revised edition of the main play. The two printed witnesses of these theatrical paratexts (*Pleasant Dialogues* and Q8) do not necessarily indicate different underlying sources; but there are a few variants, such as "Regall Throne" (1639, A2r) for "royall Throne" (1637, R5r), that could point to an alternative manuscript or a marked-up copy of the 1637 text. Second, Heywood's claims about revision could be exaggerated, designed, as Joseph Loewenstein argues, as "a way of puffing the performance" at the Cockpit.[75] They were also a way of puffing the new edition, as the prologue appears on the second leaf of the playbook, in a position that could attract the notice of bookshop browsers. Third, Heywood may not have been involved in the publication of Q8 at all. Butter or one of his agents could have directly sourced the theatrical paratexts from

Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas and added them to the 1639 edition to make readers believe that the text was newly corrected.[76] It should be emphasized that, despite Heywood's objections to the earlier editions, Butter owned the rights to both parts of *If You Know Not Me* and there would have been nothing atypical, underhand, or piratical about compiling and reassembling the "scattered papers" that could be linked to Heywood's plays.[77] Indeed, this practice was commonplace within Butter's news networks, which lends further support to this theory of Q8's construction.

In contrast, the alternative ending of Part 2, printed for the first time in 1633, clearly indicates recourse to a separate manuscript. This ending displays convincing signs of being a Caroline revision prepared for a performance at the Cockpit, rather than representing an earlier or restored version. Some of the changes to the ending indicate the use of Caroline source texts, including, as Madeleine Doran identifies, Abraham Darcie's English translation of Camden's *Annales,* which was first published in 1625.[78] Q4 incorporates a description of the English fleet during the Armada attack, which closely follows Darcie's catalogue of ships and reproduces some of its errors. When giving the names of English ships, Q4 lists "The *Mary, Rose,* the *Bonauenture, Hope*" (K4r), which replicates Darcie's mistaken description of the "ships called the Mary and the Rose."[79] The Mary Rose was the name of one battleship, not two, which Darcie elsewhere renders correctly. No comparable error appears in Camden's Latin original (1615), or the 1624 French translation by Pierre de Bellegent on which Darcie's text was based, suggesting that the source of Q4's error was the 1625 English translation. This pattern of error recurs elsewhere. In his summary of the ships, Darcie describes "the Fleete of Vrcas," which implies a proper name; "Urcas" is, however, the plural of urca, a small vessel.[80] Q4 mistakes "Urcas" for a place name when listing "The ships of Vrcas, Zaibras, Naples" (I4v), making it probable that the author of the Q4 additions – most likely Heywood – was misled by Darcie's

ambiguous use of the noun. This transfer of error between a Caroline source and the two new scenes in Q4 indicates a date of composition after 1625, while the changes to the play's final scene suggest that the compositors were working from copy that contained heavy revisions and rewriting, possibly the author's papers. A misplaced stage direction for the entry of "Sir Anthony Browe" – a new character who is absent from Q1–3 – is given in the margins of K1r, and, alongside similar misreadings, implies that the copy underlying Q4's ending was difficult to decipher and contained marginal annotations that confused the compositors.[81]

Like the 1639 edition of Part 1, Q4 Part 2 could have been assembled in several ways. The expanded ending may have arrived at the printing house as a separate document, which was then used, alongside a marked up copy of Q3, to set the new edition. Alternatively, Butter may have received a complete text of the play, either as a revised manuscript, which was then only used for the new ending, or as a copy of Q3, marked for performance and containing a separate manuscript ending. As Leslie Thomson demonstrates through the Folger's (incomplete) quarto edition of *Two Merry Milkmaids* (1620), theatre companies sometimes used printed playbooks as prompt copies, a practice that may have been particularly relevant in the case of Heywood's plays given the length of time that had elapsed since their first performances.[82] Heywood's address to the reader in *The English Traveler* (1633) reinforces this point: he complains that many of his plays, "by shifting and change of Companies, haue beene negligently lost."[83] Indeed, this claim offers another explanation for the scattered, patchwork revision displayed in Butter's Caroline editions: that the early Jacobean playhouse prompt copies had been lost and Heywood was unable to restore his original script either on stage or in print. Under this theory, Heywood may even have drawn on Butter's printed editions for the revival at the Cockpit.

The production of Butter's newsbooks, which involved editing and compiling different materials and printing updated accounts whenever they became available, provides a useful model for evaluating his revised playbook editions. Because of the variety of news sources, their fluctuating quality, and the haphazard process of their transmission, newsbooks often contained conflicting reports, which was a frequent point of criticism for detractors, including Jonson. In an address "To the Impartiall Reader," prefacing the *Continuation of our Foreign Avisoes* from 2 September 1631, Butter and Bourne refute the ongoing accusations that "all was lyes" in their newsbooks and assert that the reports "from forreine parts" are "published by us without addition or subtraction."[84] They go on to claim that their new issue features information "from better hands" and offers "a confirmation of the Truth therof with some circumstances not in our former [issue], and against which, let the most barking curre open his mouth and say as formerly." This address shows news publication to be a continual process of revising, updating, and replacing old accounts with more (seemingly) authoritative ones. It demonstrates the stationers' desire to convince readers of the factual and textual integrity of their newsbooks, an aim that can also be witnessed through Butter's investment in Heywood's plays. In the 1639 edition of Part 1, the prologue and epilogue advertise the authority of the new edition – indeed, their inclusion assigns it this authority, regardless of the textual state of the main play and how the new materials were incorporated. And the fourth edition of Part 2 offers an updated performance text that intensifies its political contemporaneity and recalls the religio-political partiality of Butter's news publications. Moreover, by not advertising the new ending to Part 2 and only claiming the restoration of an original text through the Prologue to Part 1, the Caroline editions create the impression that they faithfully reproduce early Jacobean plays and that they are part of the emerging canon of classic plays that Farmer and Lesser identify and which typically lack the newfangled discursive paratexts that feature prominently in most first editions from the 1630s.[85] In effect, the conservative printed design of Butter's

Caroline editions enhances the plays' nostalgia – for both an Elizabethan political past that positioned England on a world stage and for a Jacobean theatrical past that recalled a "golden age" of the stage.

The patched-up, reassembled Caroline reprints of Heywood's histories admit different interpretations of their political application and textual construction; but this article has aimed to show that the practices and strategies of Butter's news business are instructive and provide a useful model. Heywood's plays are not only concerned with England's future as a Protestant nation; their Tudor nostalgia can be repositioned as part of a transnational and transhistorical project of Protestant military intervention that has immediate application to the European wars. The textual practices of newsbook publication where "scattered papers" are assembled to create new or updated editions also sheds light on the preparation of Heywood's plays for their Caroline reprints. Newsbooks and playbooks involve networks of contributors that destabilize the idea of single agency or authorship in their production. There could be an overlap – as Butter's business at the Sign of the Pied Bull suggests – between the individuals taking part in the news trade and the publication of commercial drama. Readers may also have been attentive to this connection: the playbooks and newsbooks stocked in Butter's bookshop could be used to reflect on and ignite debate about contemporary political issues and would have required a similar level of investment from buyers. While Butter's practices help us to understand why Heywood's plays were reprinted and how they may have been revised and reassembled, they also caution against assigning exclusive control to the publisher. Butter owned the rights to the plays, but other publication and theatrical agents (possibly including Heywood) contributed to their final printed presentation. The Caroline editions of *If You Know Not Me* promote a critical model where the authorship of text and the authority to publish are conceptually linked and

where the ability to "authorize" a play incorporates processes of textual change, transmission, and publication involving networks of different agents.

---

1. Part 1 was printed in 1605 (Q1, STC 13328), 1606 (Q2, STC 13329), 1608 (Q3, STC 13330/13330a), 1610 (Q4, STC 13331), 1613 (Q5, STC 13332), 1623 (Q6, STC 13333), 1632 (Q7, 13334), and 1639 (Q8, STC 13335). Part 2, demonstrably less successful with readers, was printed in 1606 (Q1, 13336/13336.5), 1609 (Q2, STC 13337), 1623 (Q3, STC 13338), and 1633 (Q4, STC 13339). On the basis of edition numbers up to 1641, the anonymous *Mucedorus* (at fourteen editions) was the most frequently reprinted commercial play, followed by Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (at ten editions), and Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV* (at nine). See Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser, "Canons and Classics: Publishing Drama in Caroline England," in *Localizing Caroline Drama: Politics and Economics of the Early Modern English Stage, 1625-1642,* ed. Adam Zucker and Alan Farmer (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 17–41 (p.31).

2. See Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002).

3. Butter's first entry in the Stationers' Register was for a play, *The Trial of Chivalry* (entered as "The life & Deathe of Cavaliero Dick Boyer") on 4 December 1604 (SRO4915), and he continued to invest in first-edition playbooks during the early part of his career, before shifting his focus to reprint editions of his most successful plays.

4. See Folke Dahl, *A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks, 1620–1642* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1952), 86–87; Leona Rostenberg, "Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne, First 'Masters of the Staple,'" *The Library*, 1 (1957): 23–33.

5. Amy Lidster, "Publishing *King Lear* (1608) at the Sign of the Pied Bull," in *Old St Paul's and Culture,* ed. Shanyn Altman and Jonathan Buckner (Palgrave, forthcoming 2021).

6. Ben Jonson, *The Staple of Newes* (London, 1631; STC 14753.5), Bb1v. Abraham Holland, "A Continued Inquisition Against Paper-Persecutors" in John Davies, *A Scourge for Paper-Persecutors* (London, 1625; STC 6340), A3v-A4r.

7. Holland, A4r.

8. British Library, Harley MS 7000, ff. 336r-337v. Quoted in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C.H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925-52), IX, 253.

9. See the transcription in Ben Jonson, *The Magnetic Lady,* ed. Peter Happé (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 215-17, modernized from Bodleian MS Ashmole 38, p.15.

10. Jonson, *Magnetic,* ed. by Happé, 3.7.13. For Jonson's criticism of the news trade, see also Alan B. Farmer, "Play-Reading, News-Reading, and Ben Jonson's *The Staple of News",* in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England,* ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 127-58.

11. Jayne E. E. Boys, *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), 58-61. See also Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

12. To clarify, I use the term "playbook" to refer exclusively to the book of the play produced through the publication process, and not in reference to any playhouse manuscripts, including the promptbook.

13. *The German History Continved: The Seventh Part* (London, 1634; STC 23525.7), A3v. For other paratexts potentially written by Butter, see *The certaine Newes of the present Weeke [23 August 1622]* (London, 1622; STC 18507.72), A2v; *The Continvation of our forraine Avisoes [2 September 1631]* (London, 1631; STC 18507.221), A1v, and "The Printer to the Reader" in *The Continvation of the Forraine Occurents [11 January 1641]* (London, 1641; STC 18507.343), Mmmmm1v.

14. Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). See especially chapters 2, 4, and 5.

15. David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1699* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 63.

16. See Peter W. M. Blayney, "The Publication of Playbooks," in *A New History of Early English Drama,* ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 382–422 (p.391).

17. Isabel Karremann, "A Passion for the Past: The Politics of Nostalgia on the Early Jacobean Stage," in *Passions and Subjectivity in Early Modern Culture,* ed. Brian Cummings and Freya Sierhuis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 149-64 (p.161).

18. Judith Doolin Spikes, "The Jacobean History Play and the Myth of the Elect Nation," *Renaissance Drama,* 8 (1977): 117–49 (135–39). Spikes sees the subgenre as beginning with Bale's *King Johan* (staged *c.*1530s) and ending in the late Jacobean period with plays such as *A Game at Chess*; but she identifies the first decade of the seventeenth century as its peak. See also Gina M. Di Salvo, "'A Virgine and a Martyr both': The Turn to Hagiography in Heywood's Reformation History Play," *Renaissance and Reformation,* 41.4 (2018): 133-67.

19. See Amy Lidster, *Publishing the History Play in the Time of Shakespeare: Stationers Shaping a Genre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), chp. 3.

20. For example, Butter published *When You See Me* (Q2, STC 21418) and *1 If You Know Not Me* (Q5, STC 13332) in 1613, and both parts of *If You Know Not Me* (1: Q6, STC 13333 and 2: Q3, STC 13338) in 1623.

21. For a summary, see Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years' War,* 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1997), 42–73. For news reporting and propaganda see Boys, *London's News Press and the Thirty Years' War.*

22. Boys, 229.

23. Farmer, "Play-Reading," 134-35.

24. The earliest example of a coranto series in England was published on 24 September 1621 by "N.B.", which indicates either Butter or Bourne. From 1622, Butter and the other stationers involved in serial news publication (including Bourne, Thomas Archer, Nathaniel Newbery, William Sheffard, and Bartholomew Downes) seem to have favored quarto publications (newsbooks), as opposed to the single broadsheets. See Dahl, *Bibliography*, 51–55.

25. Many of their sources, as Farmer observes ("Play-Reading," 141), were Dutch corantos, which also sided with the Protestant cause.

26. See, for example, *The certaine newes of this present weeke [23 August 1622]* (London, 1622; STC 18507.72), C4r.

27. Alan B. Farmer, "John Norton and the Politics of Shakespeare's History Plays in Caroline England," in *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography,* ed. Marta Straznicky (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 147-76; Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), chp.4.

28. Boys, 153.

29. Both Butter and his printer, William Stansby, were imprisoned. See Boys, 75-76, and Cyndia Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 172.

30. Butter was also imprisoned in August 1627, probably for his newsbook issued on 1 August (STC 18507.186). See Boys, 218-20, as well as Butter's petition of 4 August 1627 in British Library, Add. MS 64892, fo.59.

31. Privy Council Register May 1632–April 1633 P.R.O. PC 2/24; transcribed in Folke Dahl, "Amsterdam – Cradle of English Newspapers", *The Library,* s5-IV.3 (1949): 166-78 (173-74).

32. As Dahl observes, fifty newsbooks were published during this ten-month period; on three occasions, two newsbooks were printed on the same day, and, on another three occasions, three newsbooks were printed within the space of only seven days (*Bibliography,* 162, 187). Readers' interest in the European conflicts seems to be linked to the success of the Protestant cause. A sharp drop in the numbers of newsbooks can be witnessed between

March 1628 and August 1629, when the news was dominated by reports of Protestant losses and false rumors of victories.

33. Rostenberg, "Masters," 28–29.

34. Ibid., 29.

35. Boys, 229.

36. [Thomas Scott], *Robert Earle of Essex His Ghost* ("Paradise" [London], 1624; STC 22084), A1r, C1v, C2r.

37. See also Teresa Grant, "Drama Queen: Staging Elizabeth in *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*," in *The Myth of Elizabeth,* ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2003), 120–42.

38. See *The Swedish Intelligencer: The Second Part* (London, 1632; STC 23524), which concentrates on "the famous Actions of that warlike Prince," who ("though arm'd but in Paper [in this book]) cannot but Conquer" (¶2r-¶3v).

39. Simon McKeown, "The Reception of Gustavus Adolphus in English Literary Culture: The Case of George Tooke," *Renaissance Studies,* 23.2 (2009): 200-20 (204). See George Hakewill, *An Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Gouernment of the World* (London, 1635; STC 12613), 546.

40. Andrew Griffin, "Thomas Heywood and London Exceptionalism," *Studies in Philology*, 110, no.1 (2013): 85–114. (98-99). Much critical debate has surrounded the divided focus of Part 2. Some critics, including Madeleine Doran propose that the Gresham scenes were originally part of a separate play, while the Parry/Armada episodes concluded Part 1; see *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody Part II*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), xvii–xix. Other critics, including Martin Wiggins, doubt the composite-play hypothesis; see Wiggins in association with Catherine Richardson, *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue,* 8 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011–), *Volume 5: 1603-1608* (2015), 114. Griffin also shows how the thematic interests of the Gresham plot clearly relate to the final scenes of Part 2.

41. Thomas Heywood, *If you know not me, You know no body: The Second Part* (London, 1633; STC 13339), A1r.

42. See Sandra Clark, "Spanish characters and English nationalism in English drama of the early seventeenth century," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies,* 84:2 (2007): 131-44.

43. See, for example, Robert Greene's *The Spanish Masquerado* (London, 1589; STC 12310).

44. See Clark, 137-40.

45. The new scenes are printed from I3r to K1r, while the revised scene appears on K1r-K4v. Doran's edition for The Malone Society presents this final long scene as two separate scenes (xix and xx), with the division at the entry of Drake and Frobisher.

46. Heywood, *If you know not me, You know no bodie* (London, 1605; STC 13328), F1v.

47. The use of the Chorus in Part 2 Q4 recalls Shakespeare's Chorus in *Henry V,* especially in Act 2:

> Suppose, that you haue seene
> […] his braue Fleet,
> With silken Streamers, the young Phebus fayning;
> […] behold the threaden Sayles,
> Borne with th'inuisible and creeping Wind,
> Draw the huge Bottomes through the furrowed Sea.

Shakespeare, *Comedies, Histories & Tragedies* (London, 1623; STC 22273), H5r. That the earlier quartos also reveal an indebtedness to *Henry V* indicates stylistic and source continuities between the early and late versions that help to confirm Heywood's involvement in the revised ending. See Charles R. Forker, "Shakespeare's Histories and Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen,* 66.2 (1965): 166-78 (173-75).

48. Compare the corresponding scenes in Part 2 Q1 (1606; STC 13336), K1v and Q4 (1633), K4r, the latter lacking any reference to "English mercie."

49. Farmer, "Play-Reading," 147-49.

50. Farmer, "Play-Reading," 148. Butter also had to defend himself over the publication of anti-Armenian pamphlets; see Boys, 223.

51. See Bruce Wathen, *Sir Francis Drake: The Construction of a Hero* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2009), 33-47.

52. *Sir Francis Drake Reuiued: Calling vpon this Dull or Effeminate Age, to folowe his Noble Steps for Golde & Siluer* (London, 1626; STC 18544), A2r-A4v.

53. *The Continvation of our weekly Newes from Forraine parts [25 June 1631]* (London, 1631; STC 18507.218), A1r.

54. Shakespeare, *The Tragedie of King Richard the Second* (London, 1608; STC 22311), A1r.

55. *The Continvation of ovr Weekely Avisoes [12 January 1632]* (London, 1632; STC 18507.237), A1r; *The Continvation of ovr Weekely Newes [17 December 1631]* (London, 1631; STC 18507.235), A4r-v.

56. Clark, 143.

57. Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*; Massai, *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Melnikoff, *Elizabethan Publishing and the Makings of Literary Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018).

58. Boys, chp. 5; Sabrina A. Baron, "The Guises of Dissemination in Early Seventeenth-Century England: News in Manuscript and Print," in *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe,* ed. Sabrina A. Baron and Brendan Dooley (London: Routledge, 2001), 41-56.

59. See also Boys, 58.

60. See Doran, *Nobody Part I,* ix-xi: Q2 and Q6 were printed from Q1; Q3 began as a reprint of Q1 but continued with Q2; and Q4, Q5, Q7, and Q8 follow their immediate predecessor. For Part 2, see Doran, *Nobody Part II,* viii-x.

61. *If you know not mee, You know no body* (London, 1639; STC 13335), A3v. Cf. Q1 (1605), A3v.

62. Cf. Part 2: 1606, E4v and 1633, E4v.

63. For publication agents as "correctors" and "annotating readers", see Massai, *Rise of the Editor* and Anthony Grafton, *The Culture of Correction in Renaissance Europe* (London: British Library, 2011).

64. Heywood, *The Rape of Lucrece* (London, 1608; STC 13360), A2r. For Heywood's paratexts and interest in publication, see: Joseph Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 50-68; Benedict Scott Robinson, "Thomas Heywood and the Cultural Politics of Play Collection," *SEL,* 42.2 (2002): 361-380; Max W. Thomas, "Eschewing Credit: Heywood, Shakespeare, and Plagiarism before Copyright," *New Literary History,* 31.2 (2000): 277-93.

65. The seven first editions with signed paratexts are: *1* and *2 The Fair Maid of the West* (1631), *1* and *2 The Iron Age* (1632), *The English Traveler* (1633), *A Maidenhead Well Lost* (1634), and *Love's Mistress, or The Queen's Masque* (1636). In *2 The Iron Age* (London, 1632; STC 13340), Heywood claims that he has been "promised" a "handsome Volumne" of the four Ages plays and that he will contribute "an Explanation" for the collection (A2r-v). His address in *The English Traveler* (London, 1633; STC 13315) implies that the now-aborted collection would have been a complete volume "to beare the title of Workes" (A3r). See also Robinson, 362-64.

66. David Bergeron, *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570-1640* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 159-81 (esp. p.160).

67. Butter entered Part 1 in the Stationers' Register on 5 July 1605 and Part 2 on 14 September 1605. He published all four editions of Part 2 and seven of the eight editions of Part 1 (Q4 Part 1 seems to have been published by Thomas Pavier in 1610, although no transfer of rights took place). Pavier was also involved in the publication of

Q3 in 1608: there are two issues of this edition, which vary in the imprint. STC 13330 lists Butter as the publisher, while STC 13330a lists Pavier.

68. See also Massai, *Rise of the Editor*, 1165-67.

69. See also Lidster, *Publishing the History Play*, chp. 3.

70. Maguire observes that these scenes are stylistically different from the rest of the play, which may be a result of damage to the outer leaves of the manuscript. See *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 263. Wiggins (*Catalogue*, V, 99), however, suggests that the entire play was memorially reconstructed by actors. William Proctor Williams also supports this verdict: see "'Stolne and Surreptitious': Heywood as a Test Case", *Early Theatre*, 17.2 (2014): 134-45.

71. *Pleasant Dialogues* does not give either of the titles by which these plays were known (*The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth* or *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*), but it is reasonable to conclude that "the Play of Queen Elizabeth" refers to these early Jacobean plays and indicates a theatrical revival at the Cockpit, presumably by Queen Henrietta Maria's Men, who performed there between 1625 and 1636. See Wiggins, *Catalogue*, V, 105.

72. Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogves and Drammas* (London, 1637; STC 13358), R4v-R5r.

73. For a discussion of shorthand as a means of taking down sermons and plays, see Tiffany Stern, "Sermons, Plays and Note-Takers: *Hamlet* Q1 as a 'Noted' Text," *Shakespeare Survey 66* (2013): 1–23.

74. See also Richard Dutton, "Thomas Heywood and the Publishing of *The Jew of Malta*," in *Christopher Marlowe: Theatrical Commerce and the Book Trade*, ed. Kirk Melnikoff and Roslyn L. Knutson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 182-94 (p.192). In contrast, William Proctor Williams suggests that Q8 does represent Heywood's revision of the play ("'Stolne,'" 136-37).

75. Loewenstein, 25.

76. William Jaggard did something similar when he excerpted epistles from Heywood's *Troia Britanica* (1609) and added them to his reprinted edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* (1612), under an attribution to Shakespeare, which prompted Heywood's attack in *An Apology for Actors* (London, 1612; STC 13309), G4r-v. See also Thomas, "Eschewing Credit," 280-87.

77. The Stationers' Company protected the rights of its members: no dramatist could enter texts in the Register or claim publication rights to them.

78. Doran, *Nobody Part II*, xiv–xvi.

79. William Camden, *Annales*, trans. Abraham Darcie (London, 1625; STC 4497), Cccc3r.

80. Camden, *Annales*, Cccc3r.

81. Doran, *Nobody Part II,* xv–xvi.

82. Leslie Thomson, "A Quarto 'Marked for Performance': Evidence of What?", *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England,* 8 (1996): 176-210.

83. *English Traveler,* A3r.

84. *The Continvation of our forraine Avisoes [2 September 1631]* (London, 1631; STC 18507.221), A1v.

85. Farmer and Lesser, "Canons," 28-37.