

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

## **Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime**

### **Introduction**

It has long been recognized that the story of *Perseus and Andromeda* closely matches the folk-tale of *St George and the Dragon*. In both, our hero slays a monster to free the King of Egypt's (or Ethiopia's) daughter, who has been chained to a rock as a sacrificial offering to the beast. The grateful King then grants our hero her hand in marriage. What is more difficult to show is any direct link between the Greek Myth and the Mummers' Play (in all its various guises). It is generally held that the earliest text of a folk-play performance is from 1780, the earliest chapbook text from the middle decades of the eighteenth century, while the earliest reliable description of a performance resembling the modern folk-play takes us back only as far as 1737<sup>1</sup>.

One possible connection that has yet to be explored is through the English pantomime tradition that originated on the London stage in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, but migrated from there to provincial fairs and other performance spaces later in the century. The pantomime of *Perseus and Andromeda* was one of the most successful shows of this period (with several hundred performances between 1730 and 1780). Furthermore, at fairs, pantomime performances were often to be found in association with quack medicine sellers, who employed *commedia* characters as front-men for their operations. This may be one plausible origin for the 'doctor' character of the folk-play. Another possibility lies with the extraordinary popularity of the *Harlequin Dr Faustus* pantomimes, such as *The Necromancer*.

It is not our intention here, however, to seek further direct evidence for any such connection. On the other hand, I feel it may be of considerable interest to explore the background to the development of pantomime in early 18<sup>th</sup> century England and the problems involved in its reconstruction today. My hope is that investigations of this kind may at least shed some light on the context within which the folk-plays developed in the 1730s and after.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

### **Background – emergence of the English pantomime**

The ‘pantomimes’ created by John Rich and others in the early part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century became one of the richest and most prolific theatrical formats of that whole period. They were not at this stage mere ‘children’s entertainment’ – that was a later 19<sup>th</sup> century development – but were a multimedia entertainment aimed at an adult audience. They included dance, instrumental music and song, along with very elaborate staging effects.

The idea of the pantomime was initially formulated by the dancing master John Weaver who wished to create ‘an entertainment in music, song and dance in imitation of the pantomimes of the ancient Greeks and Romans’<sup>2</sup>. His first production for the Drury Lane theatre was a mimed burlesque *The Tavern Bilkers* in 1702. This was followed by a more ‘serious’ danced entertainment called *The Loves of Mars and Venus* in 1716. This in turn led to a whole series of similar pieces on classical themes: *Perseus and Andromeda* (1716), *Orpheus and Eurydice* (1717), *Cupid and Bacchus* (1719), all performed at Drury Lane.

The rival company of John Rich at Lincoln’s Inn Fields took up Weaver’s idea but incorporated more *commedia dell’ arte* elements into the proceedings. Commedia interludes – featuring Harlequin, Pantelone, Columbine and the rest – had been a feature of the entr’act entertainments at London theatres for many years under the name of ‘Night Scenes’. In Rich’s pantomimes these were integrated with the serious ‘masque’ sections which usually played out a classical theme similar to those of Weaver at the rival theatre. Rich’s mixture of the comic and serious proved a more winning formula. John Rich himself was an accomplished performer in the role of Harlequin, which he played under the stage name of Lun<sup>3</sup>. These lines of David Garrick’s indicate the high regard others had for his physical skills:

When Lun appeared, with matchless art and whim,

He gave the power of speech to every limb:

Tho' masked and mute, conveyed his quick intent,

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

And told in frolic gesture what he meant.

Pantomimes were performed primarily as ‘afterpieces’ at the two patent theatres (that is, they followed the main play as an extra entertainment), but at the fairs and less formal venues they may have taken the place of the ‘drolls’ or traditional fairground plays. This was particularly the case after the passing of the 1737 Theatres Licensing Act which forbade spoken theatre unless passed by the censor – for pantomime was unspoken, depending solely on mime, dance, and song<sup>4</sup>.

### **The popularity of Pantomime – examples**

Among the most successful of these early pantomime productions were versions of the Dr Faustus story. One of the earliest published comic versions was Mountfort’s *The Life and Death of Dr Faustus, Made into a Farce, with Harlequin and Scaramouche* (1697). This incorporation of *commedia dell’arte* characters continued with *The Necromancer or Harlequin Dr Faustus*, produced by John Rich at his Lincoln Inn Fields theatre in 1723 (with music by Johann Ernst Galliard) and John Thurmond’s *Harlequin Dr Faustus* (music by Henry Carey) at the rival Drury Lane theatre the same year. Several later pantomimes extend the story to include the doings of Faustus’ student apprentice (*The Miser or Wagner and Abericock* (1726), and *Harlequin’s Triumph* (1727), in both of which Harlequin appears as the student apprentice Wagner). This tradition of Faustus pantomimes continued well into the century, with performances recorded even in the 1770s, by which time pantomime itself had changed to more closely resemble its modern form (though the process of ‘infantilization’ by which pantomime was transformed into a Christmas entertainment for children was not really complete until the 19th century).

Another series of very popular productions were based on the Perseus and Andromeda legend. In this story, Perseus slays the snake-haired gorgon Medusa, flies off on the winged horse Pegasus (or on winged sandals) and rescues the maiden Andromeda, who has been tied to a rock as sacrificial victim of a sea monster threatening the kingdom of ‘Ethiopia’. Perseus slays the monster and Andromeda’s grateful father Cepheus gives her hand in marriage to Perseus and they live happily ever after – more or less. An additional

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

element in Ovid's version is that Perseus married Andromeda in spite of Phineus, to whom she had earlier been promised. At the wedding a quarrel took place between the rivals, and Phineus was turned to stone by the sight of Medusa's head that Perseus had kept to hand for just such occasions.

The version presented by John Rich at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1730 largely follows this traditional plot, as did the rival version shown earlier at Drury Lane (1728). What will be obvious to all is that the story is pretty much identical to that of St George and the Dragon. It only remains for the hapless Phineus to be slain by Perseus in some manly sword-play, then to be resurrected by a Doctor Faustus with magical powers of necromancy and we have all the ingredients of the standard Mummers' Play<sup>5</sup>. My intention here, however, is to look in detail at the problems of re-creating these early pantomimes, rather than to make a case for their being the originators of the folk play.

Rich's *Perseus and Andromeda* is unusual in that we have much of the script material available, together with the music for the comic section (though not that of the serious masque section). Furthermore, there is also a large amount of material from the rival production at Drury Lane as well as from later revivals at both theatres. *Perseus and Andromeda* was presented some 60 times in its first season and around 20 in each of several following years, the final documented performance being in 1780. It was one of the most popular pantomimes of this period<sup>6</sup>.

Much the same is true for the various *Faustus* pantomimes, though here the richness of resources is supplemented by the long tradition of *Faust* plays in both serious and comic form, going back to the Marlowe version of 1601, and indeed to the original *Faust Book* published in English in 1594 shortly after its appearance in Germany (1587).

Like *Perseus and Andromeda* it was extremely popular, with some 300 recorded performances during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. If we also include the productions not only of the two patent theatres but also those of the London fairs (such as Bartholomew and Southwark) and of provincial theatres, then performances of some version of this tale could well have run to many hundreds.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

### Source material

What material do we actually have on which to base a reconstruction of these typical pantomimes? Unlike the operas of this period, such as those of Handel, we have no full-score to serve as a definitive text. What we do get are published booklets outlining the plot or ‘libretto’ of the ‘serious’ part and also, occasionally, of the ‘comic’ part, together with the characters and performers that make up the cast list. Also published, in many cases, were the ‘comic tunes’ that made up the accompanying music and songs for the ‘commedia’ section. The music for the serious or ‘masque’ section, on the other hand, does not usually appear to have been published – except as occasional excerpts within other song collections, identifiable from the libretto. Some of the music does still exist in manuscript form<sup>7</sup>. Very little of the dance music, however, exists in any form. The reason may be that dance material was included from other sources, such as the Opera Ballets still current in Paris, from where many of the dancers were recruited<sup>8</sup>. Additional evidence may come from pictorial sources, inventories of stage props and costumes, eyewitness descriptions, and so on.

In the case of the two versions of *Dr Faustus*, we have very full descriptions of the comic scenes – these are, in fact, much the larger part of the work, the ‘serious’ sections being confined to a relatively brief *Masque of the Deities* (Drury Lane) or *Masque of Hero & Leander* (Lincolns Inn Fields) inserted at the conclusion of the comic proceedings<sup>9</sup>.

With *Perseus and Andromeda* the opposite holds: for both rival productions we have a full libretto of the serious section, a re-telling of the classic myth, but few details of the comic interludes; often the basic story must be gleaned from the subtitle, e.g. *Perseus and Andromeda with the Rape of Columbine* (in the case of Drury Lane’s production) indicates a stock commedia sketch of lovers thwarted by a scheming father who is trying to marry off his daughter to some rich monster.

Other pantomimes produced by the two patent theatres in this period (i.e. prior to 1730) fare no better, and for most the resources are even more scant. One exception is *The Rape of Proserpine* where a libretto and full collections of the music for both the serious and

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

comic sections were published at the time (but again no dance music, choreographies, or text description of the comic section). From the subtitle, however, we can again reconstruct the comic story – *The Rape of Proserpine with the Birth and Adventures of Harlequin*. Eyewitness descriptions abound of John Rich's performance as Harlequin emerging from a giant egg, enabling us to at least get some idea of how the plot begins.

Additional material can be gleaned from paintings and other illustrations which show the general environment in which pantomime took place, along with details of theatres and playhouses, particularly of interiors (both back-stage and from the auditorium). Of particular value are the engravings of William Hogarth, which capture much of the spirit of theatre at this time (see, for example, *Southwark Fair* or *Actresses Dressing in a Barn*, both of which date from the 1730s).

Finally there is the material to be found in account books, inventories, diaries, etc. From these we can learn the cost of mounting a pantomime production (high) and also the likely financial return (again high). Prop and costume lists give an idea of their complexity, while diaries, particularly of the theatre managers, show how the running of pantomimes merged with other stage productions<sup>10</sup>.

### **Problems of reconstruction**

Even when a full text description of the comic section exists, reconstruction may be difficult. The text of the Faustus pantomimes is so complex that the descriptions do not help much in trying to reconstruct the work – they are simply unrealisable without enormous technical and financial resources. Here, for example is the text description of Faustus/Harlequin fleeing the Miller (whose wife he has been attempting to seduce):

#### **Scene VI: A Mill**

The Millers Wife comes down the stairs from the Mill and dances. In the Interim her husband enters and in a very angry manner is for driving her up again; she endeavours to persuade him from it but he persisting, she in a very obsequious manner leaves him

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

and is going up; he mollified at her behaviour calls her back, is reconciled and dances with her.

He then goes up, and is accosted by the Doctor who, wanting an opportunity to get rid of him in order to come at his wife, entreats him to carry a Letter for him to a House a little distant; but the Miller entirely declines it. After the Doctor has made use of several arguments to no purpose whilst the Miller is directing him to the House he trips him up and runs up the Stairs to his Wife who is looking out of a little Window.

The Miller recovering himself gets up and looks about for the Doctor. At last he sees him making love to his wife at the Window and in the utmost rage makes up after him. Upon this the Doctor gets up to the top of the Mill; the Miller pursues him and courses him round it several times; at last the Doctor slips away and runs down the Stairs. The Miller after searching for him above to no purpose looks down perceives him and makes after him; the Doctor finding the Miller at his heels catches hold of one of the Sails of the Windmill and climbs up to the top where he makes several Mockeries at the Miller who enraged at that and his former ill-treatment follows him up the sail and endeavours to come at him. The Doctor by his Art immediately sets the Mill a-going and the poor Miller fix'd to the Sail keeps continually turning round during which the Doctor makes his escape with his Wife. The Miller's Man entering with a sack of Corn on his back, seeing his Master in that whimsical Posture puts down his Burden and goes to his assistance. After some difficulty he gets him loose, brings him to the front of the Stage and by several applications brings him to Himself.

That is scarce done when a Person in a frightful out-of-the-way Dress enters and dances: they soon perceive 'tis the Doctor and drawing their Knives resolve to despatch him. Accordingly they seize him and cut off his arms: he regardless continues dancing: they then take off his Head and finding him still alive resolve to make a sure end of him by ripping up his Belly: which is no sooner completed but out jumps the Doctor whole and entire. They, affrighted to the last Degree, run away. The Miller's Wife comes down at the Instant and goes off with the Doctor; who at his exit touches the Sack of Corn with his Wand and it follows him out. Immediately the Doctor appears above in the Air, seated in an open Chariot drawn by the Miller and his Man, with the Wife by his side and the sack behind him; he whips 'em along and drives across.

[Scene quoted from *The Necromancer*<sup>11</sup>]

For many of the 'classical' pantomimes, however, the absence of any definitive text makes the problem of recreating the comic sections rather easier. Generally speaking they

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

are stock *commedia dell'arte* stories, which in many cases create a parallel narrative to the serious part. The comic scenes of *Perseus & Andromeda*, for example, mirror those of the main story. In the Lincolns Inn Field version, Columbine is unwillingly betrothed by her father (The Doctor) to an ancient, ugly but rich Spaniard (paralleling the imminent sacrifice of Andromeda to the sea monster by her father Cephaeus). She is then rescued by her young lover Harlequin (in the Lincolns Inn Fields case) after some entertaining tricks, transformations and devices (probably involving mirrors, etc.) to hoodwink and dispose of the unattractive Spaniard. They marry and live (perhaps) happily ever after, just as in the 'serious' section.

A more general approach to this problem of reconstruction, and one that was adopted by the Chalemie theatre company in its own creations, is to use these stock *commedia* routines as a way of re-telling the comic story, while employing the music of the 'serious' section in a fairly straightforward way to present the classical tale. This works well for *Perseus & Andromeda*, for example.

*Faustus* presents a somewhat more difficult problem. The serious sections – *Masque of the Deities* and *Masque of Hero & Leander* – could be played straight from their respective libretti. The comic (and much larger) section, however, requires considerable ingenuity to create a plausible narrative. Our approach here was to use a series of disjoint *commedia* routines to draw out the character of Faustus while also placing the pantomime itself into a plausible context. An outline of this approach follows:

**Synopsis:** The context in which the pantomime takes place is Southwark Fair<sup>12</sup>. The Faustus figure is a quack medicine seller who is plying his trade at the fair, assisted by a Harlequin to act as his stooge and front-man<sup>13</sup>. The role of 'quack' is combined with that of 'theatre manager' – a quite plausible combination at the time, particularly at provincial fairs. To gather a crowd, he offers a pantomime: *The Siege of Troy*. This serves to introduce the legend of the Judgement of Paris, the character Helen of Troy, a fight between Ulysses and Paris, and several other classical references<sup>14</sup>. From there it slips into a reconstruction of the Dr Faustus legend – parts are re-assigned, including the designation of Harlequin as Wagner, Faustus's apprentice, rather than the man himself

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

(as happens in the later ‘Faust’ pantomimes, such as *The Miser or Wagner & Abericock* of 1726).

Faustus makes his pact with Mephistopheles, and in return is given power to create an aphrodisiac brew to seduce Helen (who has already fallen in love with the young apprentice, Harlequin) – this is the stock commedia ‘seduction of maiden by old man’ routine again.

The next scene returns to the fairground, where ‘Faustus’ is now the quack medicine seller (it is imagined as an ‘interval’ in the theatrical performance). Harlequin, now disguised as Isabella, a crippled girl, acts as stooge for Faustus, pretending a miraculous recovery. Calling for further ill people from the audience, Helen staggers forward clutching her belly. There follows the scene of ‘the operation’, upon which Helen likewise is miraculously cured. After further exhortations to the audience to purchase this magical elixir, on receiving a complaint from the crowd, the Constable moves to arrest the pair – but they escape.

In the ‘Masque of the Deities’ which follows, the gods express their displeasure at Faustus’s daring to dabble in the magical realm – which is strictly their domain alone. They grab him and drag him off to Hades, which ends the ‘play within a play’.

The quack medicine seller next re-appears being dragged off-stage by the Constable, under arrest for false representation. Threatened with hanging, he relies on the skill of his assistant Harlequin to free him, which he manages by tricking the Constable. All ends happily, except for the Constable deprived of his favourite pastime – a good hanging!

### **Pantomime as an amalgam of theatrical ‘memes’**

The elements that made up the pantomime afterpieces of the early 1700s can be viewed as a collection of re-usable modules. The same scenes or stories in slightly different disguises occur again and again in different shows. This was, of course, characteristic of the *commedia dell’arte* style of playing in general, with its various *lazzi* or more extended ‘stock routines’.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

It may be useful to view the modules that make up a pantomime in terms of ‘theatrical memes’, elements which are identifiably unique, but which evolve over time or adapt themselves to fit changing circumstances. A list of such memes might include:

Classical myths: e.g. *Perseus & Andromeda*, *Hero & Leander*

Sword fights: with spectacular effects

Faustus/Harlequin the magician

Quack Doctor or Mock Doctor and his cures

Extravagant surgical operations

Executions – hangings or beheadings

Young Lovers thwarted by mean Father

Seduction of young Maiden by Monster (human or otherwise)

This was very much the approach we took in Chalemie’s attempt to reconstruct these early 18<sup>th</sup> century English pantomimes – as shown by the outline of Dr Faustus above. Such memes allow of endless variation which may evolve over time and context. They may also be represented either in comic or serious mode. The order in which they are presented can also be somewhat random but in general are contrived to fit the over-riding narrative.

### **Touring companies and fairs**

Puppet versions were one way of overcoming the technical deficiencies of fairground theatres, and made a very portable version that could be moved to anywhere in the country (or abroad – the Faust puppet plays were taken to Germany very early on and became the most probable source for the Goethe and Lessing versions of this story). A puppet version of *Perseus & Andromeda* was shown at Tottenham Court fair in 1730.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

The most successful fair-ground droll, however, was *The Siege of Troy*, which was regularly performed at Southwark Fair over many years<sup>15</sup>.

Actors from the London theatres did also travel to perform in other places, particularly in the off-season. Thus, the *London Journal* of June 20, 1724, records that “a select Company of Comedians from the Theatre Royal design to perform Saturdays and Mondays at Mr. Penkethman’s Theatre in Richmond. They begin on Monday next, with a play of Sir John Vanbrugh's called *The False Friend*, with a Choice Band of Musick, and Entertainments of Dancing”.

Not only were these trips generally profitable, but they brought home to the whole country the great actors and the new plays, along with pantomimes – either as afterpieces or as full productions in their own right. In this way the provinces saw the new plays, such as they were, almost as soon as did London. Many of the best actors also performed at the fairs:

In 1689 Tom Dogget, later Colley Cibber's fellow-patentee at Drury Lane, played at Bartholomew Fair, and at Bartholomew and Southwark Fairs the best and the worst of the players disported themselves now and again for fifty years to come. Bullock and Penkethman, Anthony Aston, Booth, Quin, the Spillers, Mrs. Cibber and Mrs. Pritchard, Shuter, Yates, Ryan, Mills, Hippisley, and Theophilus Cibber,-these are but a few of the names one meets in the checkered pages that tell the story of the great fairs. Churchill, in *The Rosciad* (1761) laughed at the city comedians in the fair booths. Shuter, he says:

Keeps open house at Southwark Fair

And hopes the friends of humour will be there;

In Smithfield, Yates prepares the rival treat

For those who laughter love instead of meat<sup>16</sup>.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

The problem confronted by touring players in mounting pantomimes, however, was much greater than for straight plays. The technical demands were generally far beyond the means of a travelling theatre group. In *Spence's Anecdotes* there appears a "Prologue for the Blandford Strollers" in which those gentlemen lament their lack of the equipment: needed to mount a lavish pantomime such as *Dr Faustus*:

To aggravate the case we have not one  
Of all the new Refinements of the Town.  
No moving Statue, no lewd harlequins,  
No pasteboard play'rs, no Actors in machines,  
No rosin to make lightning; ('twould exhaust us  
To buy a Devil and a Doctor Faustus);  
No Millers, Windmills, Dragons, Conjurers,  
To exercise your eyes and spare your ears,  
No Witches to descend, no stage to rise,-  
Scarce one for us, the actors. We can set  
Nothing before you but mere sense and wit <sup>17</sup>.

Had they been able to afford it (or manage the not insignificant logistics) we may be reasonably sure that no company would have hesitated to supplement 'sense and wit' with expensive costumes and properties.

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, when a number of provincial towns began to boast playhouses of their own, and the players' barn gradually fell out of favour, there arose certain astute managers who controlled entire theatrical circuits of their own. One

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

important circuit was that of the Richmond Theatre in Yorkshire (recently restored by English Heritage and the scene of one of Chalemie's early recreations of 18<sup>th</sup>-century pantomime *The Hotchpotch*). The ever-ready barn, however, was much more generally used, since it could be had without appeal to the public authorities. Even after the establishment of a number of duly licensed "theatres royal" in certain of the larger towns, the strollers' barn still held its own. The musician and theatrical impresario Charles Dibdin informs us that when his company played at Eastbourne as late as 1789, "the theatre was formed in a very large barn and adjoining stables"<sup>18</sup>.

## **Conclusions**

The 1730s and 40s appear to have been a time of great ferment in the world of English theatre, not only in the broadening audience for traditional forms, but also in the new, such as the ballad opera (following the extraordinary success of *The Beggars' Opera*) and pantomime (including *Dr Faustus* and *Perseus and Andromeda*). Touring companies, puppet theatres, fairs and festivities, all were open to the exploitation of these new forms. Even the 1737 *Theatres Licensing Act* may have led unwittingly to the growth and wider dispersion of this more subversive style of 'unwritten' theatre. It is hardly surprising that from within this ferment of experimentation a new form of 'folk play' should also emerge. Although lacking the resources of the big London theatres, the provincial touring companies would try to recreate these successful productions in barns and fairgrounds throughout the country. In a similar way (and under similar resource restrictions) the Chalemie theatre company has sought to re-construct and present the early pantomimes of Weaver and Rich to a modern audience. In doing so it has found many parallels to the process by which 'high art' may be transformed into 'folk art', not least in the exploitation of 'theatrical memes' or commedia *lazzi*, stock routines that can be infinitely recycled to fit different stories or circumstances.

## **Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Pettitt: "To whatever source one seeks to trace the English folk-play, the absence of early texts and records is a serious obstacle. The earliest text of a folk-play performance is from 1780, the earliest chapbook text from the middle decades of the eighteenth century, while the earliest reliable description of a performance resembling the

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

modern folk-play takes us back only as far as 1737. Beyond this there is a baffling silence.” The Folk-Play in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, *Folklore*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (1980), pp. 72-77.

<sup>2</sup> The published texts of all John Weaver’s pantomimes are prefaced (more or less) with these words: “... an Entertainment in Dancing and Singing after the manner of the Pantomimes of the Ancient Greeks and Romans”. See, for example, Richard Ralph *The Life and Works of John Weaver*, Dance Books, 1985.

<sup>3</sup> The life and character of John Rich is explored in the volume by Berta Joncus & Jeremy Barlow (eds), *The Stage’s Glory: John Rich (1692-1761)*, Delaware 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Sybil Rosenfeld, *Theatre of the London Fairs*, Cambridge UP 1960.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Millington [\*The Origins and Development of English Folk Plays\*](#), Ph.D. Thesis. Sheffield University 2002.

<sup>6</sup> John O’Brien, *Harlequin Britain: pantomime and entertainment, 1690-1760*, The Johns Hopkins University Press (Illustrated edition) 2004.

<sup>7</sup> Transcriptions for most of the extant music for these early pantomimes is to be found in Clive G. Chapman, *English Pantomime and its Music, 1700-1730*, PhD Dissertation University of London 1981.

<sup>8</sup> Moira Goff, *The Incomparable Hester Santlow: A Dancer-Actress on the Georgian Stage*, Ashgate Publishing, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Leander fell in love with Hero and would swim every night across the Hellespont to be with her. Hero would light a lamp at the top of her tower to guide his way. Succumbing to Leander’s soft words, and to his argument that Aphrodite, as goddess of love, would scorn the worship of a virgin, Hero allowed him to make love to her. This routine lasted through the warm summer. But one stormy winter night, the waves tossed Leander in the sea and the breezes blew out Her’s light, and Leander lost his way, and was drowned. Hero threw herself from the tower in grief and died as well.

<sup>10</sup> Much of this detail is to be found in Judith Milhouse’s work on theatre account books. See, for example, Judith Milhouse, Reading theatre history from account books, in Corder and Holland (eds) *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses*, Palgrave Macmillan 2007.

<sup>11</sup> The text for *Dr Faustus* and many other pantomimes are transcribed in Clive G. Chapman, *English Pantomime and its Music, 1700-1730*, PhD Dissertation University of London, 1981.

<sup>12</sup> There are records of performances of various versions of *Dr Faustus* at the London Fairs from 1720s onwards.

Bill Tuck, *Experiments in the reconstruction of early 18th century English pantomime*, Mummers Unconvention, Bath, 2011.

<sup>13</sup> Many quack doctors were from abroad – usually the German regions – and their command of English was not always adequate to present the products convincingly. Besides there was a certain aura of mystery and magic to be gained from their silence. See, for example, Roy Porter, *Quacks: Fakers and Charlatans in English Medicine* (Illustrated edition) Tempus publishers, 2000.

<sup>14</sup> Bringing the classics to the masses was one of the avowed aims of the early pantomime producers – that it was also profitable was an extra bonus.

<sup>15</sup> Sybil Rosenfeld, op.cit.

<sup>16</sup> Alwin Thaler, Strolling Players and Provincial Drama after Shakespeare, *PMLA*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (June 1922), pp. 243-280 (quoted on p254).

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Thaler, op.cit. p269.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted in Thaler, op.cit. p274.