



## Philip Henslowe's Artificial Cow

STEGGLE, Matthew <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8958-8055>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/12957/>

---

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

### Published version

STEGGLE, Matthew (2016). Philip Henslowe's Artificial Cow. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 30. (In Press)

---

### Repository use policy

Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in SHURA to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

## Philip Henslowe's Artificial Cow

All scholars of early modern theatre history know Philip Henslowe's "Enventary taken of all the properties for my *Lord Admeralles* men, the 10 of Marche 1598".<sup>1</sup> This wonderfully evocative and much-discussed list of stage properties includes several objects which are linked to Thomas Dekker's lost play "Phaethon", and one which sounds particularly strange: "*Item, j hecfor for the playe of Faeton, the limes dead*".<sup>2</sup> The entry is a long-standing puzzle in theatre history, which has been variously called "mysterious", "unexplained", and even "inexplicable".<sup>3</sup> This paper is narrowly focussed on that single entry: it reopens the question of what this property was, and reconsiders what it was for.

### 1. The inventory

The "Enventary" is of a group of related lists left by Henslowe and first studied by Edmond Malone. The manuscript document, however, has been lost since Malone's time, with the result that we are exclusively dependent upon Malone's transcription of it. The list appears to represent the contents of some storage room, except that, as Michael J. Hirrel perceptively observes, that room is not the tiring-house of the Rose Theatre, since the most common properties - tables and chairs - are conspicuous by their absence. But whatever and wherever this room is, it is filled with props of different types and sizes, from small to large, and associated with several different named plays, all jumbled together.

Three lines of the inventory mention the play "Phaethon", and are therefore particularly relevant here. They run as follows:

*Item, viij lances, j payer of stayers for Fayeton...*

*Item, j hecfor for the playe of Faeton, the limes dead...*

*Item, j lyone skin; j beares skyne; & Faetones lymes, & Faeton charete; & Argosse heade.*

(319)

"Hecfor" is generally modernized as "heifer", that is, a young cow which has not yet calved.<sup>4</sup> A fresh look at this question, with the aid of EEBO-TCP, confirms that "hecfor" occurs in this sense in our period, and has no obvious possible other meanings.

It is occasionally suggested that Henslowe is describing a set of severed limbs from an actual dead heifer, to be used to represent severed human limbs when these were required in plays such as "Phaethon" and *Dr Faustus*.<sup>5</sup> But there are numerous problems with this idea. It would seem a tortured interpretation of Henslowe's word order; as a theatrical expedient, cow limbs are not obviously plausible representations of human ones; and to have such items decomposing in a storage room would surely be insanitary even by early modern standards. The idea is also incompatible with the rest of the listing, which, as seen above, identifies "Faetones lymes" as an item distinct from the heifer's limbs. This heifer, then, is unlikely to be

a real heifer. Instead, like everything else in this slippery document, it is a representation of the thing named: an artificial prop of some sort that depicts a heifer. "The limes dead" is a description of part of it, and we shall return later in the paper to the question of what this troubling phrase means.

## 2. "Phaethon"

What was this heifer used for? Several other records survive to do with the lost play to which it is attached, a play whose title is generally standardized as "Phaethon".

Payments to Thomas Dekker in connection with its writing are recorded by Henslowe on 8 and 15 January 1598. Its script is among those recorded by Henslowe in an inventory of play books, dating from summer or early autumn 1598. In records dating from December 1600 and January 1601, Henslowe paid Dekker a further £2 to revise the play, and spent another twenty shillings on "diverse things" for a performance of the play at court. Such a performance indeed took place, in front of an audience which "presumably included Elizabeth I", and for which Alleyn was paid £30.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to the properties already mentioned - a pair of stairs, a heifer, Phaeton's limbs and chariot - other properties associated with the play are preserved in Henslowe's various inventories. These include "ij leather anteckes cottes with basses, for Fayeton"; a "sewte for Phayeton"; a "whitte satten dublette"; and probably the "crown with a sone" mentioned later in the "Enventary", since that would seem to

correspond so well to the Ovidian source, where Phaeton's father Apollo at one point takes off his "crown of glittering rays".<sup>7</sup>

"Phaethon", then, was a successful and high-profile late-Elizabethan play belonging to the Admiral's Men. It had a lifespan of at least three years, and required a considerable number of dedicated props and costumes. Todd A. Borlik, noting its apparently very high production budget, describes it as "one of the most spectacular plays ever produced at the Rose"; and suggests, very plausibly, that its special effects may have included flying in the form of Phaeton's chariot.<sup>8</sup> It has several more unusual claims on our attention, too. For instance, it is currently the first known work attributed to the prolific and chronically underrated Thomas Dekker. Also, chronologically speaking, it is a direct competitor to Shakespeare's late-1590s plays, and its relevance to Shakespeare is all the sharper because it was so clearly based upon Shakespeare's favourite author, Ovid. In assessing Shakespeare's multifarious uses of the *Metamorphoses* and other Ovidian texts, it would obviously be desirable to know as much as possible about other engagements with Ovid in the early modern commercial playhouse.<sup>9</sup>

Dekker's play was based directly or indirectly upon Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 1.747-2.400. Ovid's story, of course, runs as follows: Discovering that he is son of the sun-god, and egged on by his young friend Epaphus, Phaeton travels to heaven to see his father Apollo, who swears an oath to grant his son anything he asks for. Phaeton

asks to drive his father's chariot, and Apollo reluctantly consents. Phaeton at once loses control of the chariot, flying too high and causing chaos in the heavens: then he flies too low, and scorches the earth. Jove intervenes, destroying the chariot with a thunderbolt and causing Phaethon to fall dead to earth.

Ovid does not mention any form of cow anywhere in this story, and it is not known why the Admiral's Men required a heifer to perform a play based upon it. So far, there are three theories to explain the heifer's presence. F. G. Fleay and Andrew Gurr suggest that there may have been a scene of animal sacrifice introduced into the plot; G. Blakemore Evans and Martin Wiggins offer the possibility that the heifer may have appeared in a scene in which Phaeton's uncontrolled flight through the sky burns and kills the animals below; and most recently Borlik has suggested that they may mark an appearance in the play by the sacred cattle of Helios, whose killers in Homer were punished (like Phaeton) by death by thunderbolt.<sup>10</sup> However, none of these imagined scenes are closely related to the narrative in *Metamorphoses*. Ovid does not mention any scene of sacrifice, nor does he allude to Apollo's cattle, nor does he name land animals among Phaethon's victims, specifying only swans and seals.<sup>11</sup> None of these guesses is in principle impossible, but it is hard to adjudicate between them given that none of them are firmly rooted in the apparent source.

### **3. Jupiter and Io**

However, a more economical answer - and one which also links the heifer up with yet other items elsewhere on the same props list - may be found by taking a wider view of the material in Ovid. In the episode of the *Metamorphoses* which immediately precedes Phaeton's, a cow, and indeed specifically a heifer, has the starring role.

*Metamorphoses* 1.568-746 tells the story of the beautiful nymph Io, who is suddenly transformed into a heifer (*iuvencam*) by her lover Jupiter to conceal her from his jealous wife Juno. Juno, suspecting that this is the case, takes possession of the heifer, intending to spite Jupiter by sacrificing her in front of him.<sup>12</sup> In the meantime she appoints the hundred-eyed watchman Argus to guard her. Io, trapped in a cow's body, cannot communicate with anyone, even her own father, but Jupiter sends Mercury, disguised as a shepherd, to rescue her. Mercury first befriends Argus, lulling him to sleep with music until all of his hundred eyes are closed: at which point Mercury cuts his head off, and Io transforms back into her human shape, reluctant to speak lest she inadvertently moo. In time Io has a son, Epaphus, and Epaphus becomes friends with the young Phaeton. Thus the story of Io is, in Ovid, interlaced into that of Phaeton which follows on.

Dramatization of the Io story would accommodate and indeed would almost require a stage property in the shape of a heifer. It would also accommodate and almost require some costume for Mercury, such as the "Mercurus wings" and caduceus

mentioned later in the "Inventory". In addition, a possibly clinching detail is that the lines from the inventory quoted above also mention an "Argosse heade", an item which is found literally alongside Phaeton's limbs and Phaeton's chariot. As F. G. Fleay correctly observed long ago, the only plausible explanation for the Admiral's Men possessing a head of Argus is that they also had a play depicting Argus's beheading at the hands of Mercury in the rescue of Io.<sup>13</sup>

It seems, then, that "Phaethon"'s "hector" was part of a scene or scenes dramatizing Io's captivity with Argus; and her rescue by Mercury; and, presumably, her transformation back to human form [in order to become in time the mother of Phaeton's friend Epaphus](#). This has obvious implications for our sense of the genre of "Phaethon". While Phaeton's own story is very much the stuff of Aristotelian tragedy in its movement from hubris to death, Io's is comic, in that a trickster-hero rescues a beautiful young woman from mortal peril, and especially comic in that her predicament involves being transformed into a cow. Also, it portrays the gods, and Jupiter in particular, in a very comic light. Dekker's "Phaethon", then, was not an entirely serious and gloomy tragedy. Instead, it covered material from more than one related Ovidian myth in a way which makes it seem more like Thomas Heywood's *Ages* plays, performed at the Red Bull around 1609-13, which handle several myths in a play. These texts seem to have origins in, or at least strong connections to, plays recorded, like "Phaethon", in Henslowe's *Diary* in the 1590s: their complex interrelations and possible precursors have been considered in recent



work by Douglas Arrell.<sup>14</sup> Thus, this heifer changes our sense of the whole genre and tone of "Phaethon".

#### **4. Heywood's "Jupiter and Io"**

But the heifer also changes the picture around another Thomas Heywood text, the playlet "Jupiter and Io", first recorded in Heywood's *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's* of 1637. Briefly: seeing the reference to "Argosse heade", but missing the possible link to the "hecfor", F. G. Fleay proposed that Henslowe's Argus head was for "Jupiter and Io", which could therefore be identified as a Rose Theatre play of c.1598. With this as a starting-point, Fleay further argued that the very short "Jupiter and Io" was one of the "Five Plays in One" which Henslowe states was performed at the Rose on 7 April 1597, and he went on to build further conjectural identifications upon the back of that proposition. Fleay's arguments have not met with universal favour, and G. E. Bentley, for instance, calls them "highly dubious". Yet they received the backing of W. W. Greg, and were accepted as fact by, for instance, Ernest L. Rhodes in his book on staging at the Rose. Even Foakes mentions them with cautious respect.<sup>15</sup> But if, as is argued here, the Argus head can convincingly be linked to a known play other than "Jupiter and Io", then that removes at a stroke the basis for considering "Jupiter and Io" (and therefore all the rest) as necessarily Rose Theatre plays at all.

Nevertheless, "Jupiter and Io" is worth further attention here, since it has illustrative value in that it shows an early modern dramatist taking on the challenge of writing an Ovidian drama starring a cow. Heywood dramatizes the story in seven scenes, with a cast including Daphne, Jupiter, Juno, Argos, Mercury, Io's father Inachus, numerous supporting nymphs, and Io herself, in both human and bovine form. The tone is pastoral, and also distinctly arch throughout. This, for instance, is Juno's appalled examination of the Io-cow: "Are these lips fitting for a god to kisse? / These hoofes apt palms to gripe? these teats fit pillowes?".<sup>16</sup> And similarly comic is Io's second entrance as a cow, in the custody of the yokellish Argus:

*Enter Argus leading in Io.*

*Arg.* How now, curst Cow? What, start you at that name?

I'lle make your long hornes shorter....

I thinke the beast hath breezes in her taile,

She cannot keepe her still.<sup>17</sup>

There is, then, some physical representation of Io on stage. There are a couple of references to Io's "collar" or "halter", by which Argus is said to drag her around, but it is intrinsically impossible to infer the exact nature of properties from intra-diegetic references, especially for a text with no known performance history.<sup>18</sup> What we can say with more certainty is that Argus's dialogue with the mute cow is absurd in a way that reminds one of Lance and Crab in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

As this snatch of dialogue also shows, although Io has no lines as a cow, various other characters report her moving: whether Heywood envisages that these movements be represented in the prop at all, it is impossible to tell. And, in a sense, she does have one line. On her exit, led away by Argus, she lows, since only this can explain Amphrisus's comment: "With what a pitteous action, wailing tongue, / She gave a loving, but a loath farewell."<sup>19</sup>

Argus later returns with Io, still addressing a stream of sarcastic remarks to "Madam Cow", and leads her up to

Yon craggy mountain top, a prospect fit  
For Argus only, who (not moving) can  
Behold at once from whence the foure winds blow,  
And there with her I'll like a Beacon stand,  
To watch and to give warning.

A later deictic remark again stresses that Argus is now standing in "this high watch-tower".<sup>20</sup> Again, it is impossible to tell from the intra-diegetic references how Heywood envisages the location as being represented on the stage, but in this respect Heywood follows faithfully the detail of Ovid, who has Argus take up a position on a *sublime cacumen*, a high summit (1.666).

Heywood's Mercury then climbs up "this descending hill", carrying his caduceus disguised as a sheepphook, and worms his way into the confidence of the foolish Argus, who boasts to him about the cow's intelligence. Mercury sings Argus to sleep with a long song about Syrinx; causes his hundred eyes to close; and then, according to the SD, "*cuts off his head*".<sup>21</sup> Io returns in human form, her offstage metamorphosis having been narrated by Mercury.

The distinctive feature of Io's story, then, is that it is inevitably comic and bathetic. It is absurd in the Ovid, and it is even more absurd on stage, given the need to have a cow (of some sort) present in order to tell it. Also, it is striking that the scene of Argus's beheading depends, in Ovid and in Heywood, upon music, suggesting that this episode in "Phaethon" would showcase the Admiral's Men's musical talent.

If "Phaethon" treated the story as expansively as Heywood did, then uses could be found for a number of the other properties in Henslowe's inventories. These include "Juno's cote"; and "ij fanes of feathers", which might well come in handy for the moment, mentioned by Heywood, when Juno transforms the dead Argus's eyes into peacock feathers.<sup>22</sup> However, Dekker's version need not have been as extended as Heywood's. Compare Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, performed by the Children of the Chapel in 1600, which opens with a single almost stand-alone scene in which Mercury interacts with characters from another Ovidian metamorphosis, this time

Echo and Narcissus.<sup>23</sup> "Jupiter and Io", then, may well be a fallible guide to the exact shape of scenes in "Phaethon", but all the same, it provides a clue to the tonal palette available to Dekker.

## 5. The limbs dead

Armed now with a more exact sense of the story that the prop was to tell, we can return to the puzzling description of its "dead" limbs. The only scholar so far to venture a specific interpretation of this phrase is G. Blakemore Evans, who comments that "'the limbs dead', one may suppose, suggests that it was not made to stand upright".<sup>24</sup>

This idea that "dead" connotes "limp" may be the common-sense interpretation, but there are technical senses of "dead" which relate specifically to the business of constructing complex objects. "Dead", according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, can be "[s]aid of parts of machines or apparatus which do not themselves rotate or move". A clearly related usage occurs in architecture, where "dead" can mean "[f]alse; as of imitation doors and windows, put in as architectural devices to balance parts".<sup>25</sup> *OED*'s illustrations of both senses are nineteenth-century, but some of the related phrases cited can be traced back earlier.

Indeed, these technical senses of "dead" are those required by two early mentions of "dead limbs", the specific objects under discussion here. The first is, conveniently, by

Thomas Dekker himself, when describing the arches erected for James I's royal entrance, and the dramatic material he wrote to be performed on those arches. First Dekker describes the architecture and external decoration of the structure, before adding: "These were the mechanicall and dead limmes of this carued bodie. As touching those that had the vse of motion in it..." - a phrase which leads into description of the actors who stood upon the arch. That is, Dekker is describing the whole entertainment as if it were a complex theatrical prop, a carved body with fixed limbs and some moving parts. The same metaphor is used in the same context by the designer himself, Stephen Harrison, distinguishing the "dead limmes" of the arches' stonework and decoration from the "the liuely and stirring parts", that is, the living actors, which together made a "Mechanicke body".<sup>26</sup> In these uses, close in time and milieu to Henslowe's, "dead" limbs are distinguished by their solidity, rigidity, and inflexibility. For Dekker and Harrison, "dead limbs" is almost precisely a prop-builder's term. This heifer's "dead" limbs, then, may well simply be stiff and fixed, a feature which would enable the property to stand on its own feet.

Interestingly, one other animal prop in the same inventory is also specified in terms of its limbs: "j great horse with his leages." The nature of this prop is too uncertain to do much with, especially since it is just possible that it represents, as W. W. Greg suggested, not a normal horse at all but the Wooden Horse of Troy.<sup>27</sup> But Henslowe is certainly concerned with the legs of his large animal properties.

And that is perhaps the most striking thing about this heifer *qua* prop: whether its legs are stiff or limp, whether it has moving parts or not, whether it is fully 3-D or merely flat pasteboard, it is one of a group of large animal properties on the 1598 inventory. The inventory mentions a bear skin; a lion skin; a boar's head; Cerberus's three heads; a snake; a chain of dragons; a dragon in *Faustus*; a lion; two lions' heads; and a black dog, as well as the heifer and the "great horse". Even if only some of these props are what they seem to be, the "Inventory" implies a stage which is quite used to using props to represent large animals.

Shakespeare, in a play very closely contemporary to this record, offers a rival aesthetic when it comes to large animals: "Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them / Planting their proud hooves i'th' receiving earth". That is, the Lord Chamberlain's Men at the Globe seem to distance themselves from actually representing horses, and much has been written about Shakespeare's seeming reluctance to stage scenes in which horses would be required.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, perhaps the most famous performance crux in Shakespeare is the case of the bear in *The Winter's Tale*, where it is often assumed that this is an effect outside the usual vocabulary of Shakespeare's theatre.<sup>29</sup> But the Rose, at least, seems to have a very different approach in this respect: it has quite a large group of properties which represent animals on stage, and this is a group which would repay further investigation.

## 6. Conclusion

All this, then, requires a revision of previous ideas about Dekker's "Phaethon", Heywood's "Jupiter and Io", and the role of large animal properties on the early modern stage.

"Phaethon" is likely to have required a heifer, not for a scene of slaughter or disaster, but to be rescued and transformed into a beautiful young woman. This affects our sense of the play's genre, which was clearly not unremittingly tragic, but rather, in a classically Ovidian way, mixed and contradictory. This is especially so since Io's story is, as Ovid and Heywood demonstrate, so fundamentally comic in its set-up and bathetic in practice. "Phaethon" has been seen as a tragedy in a Marlovian tradition of violence, aspiration, and destruction, and that perception remains partially valid. But the material presented here pushes it more in the direction of mixed-genre texts including Heywood's *Ages* plays; "Jupiter and Io"; and Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, a surprising turn of events for the earliest play of an author often defined in opposition to Jonson. As for Heywood's "Jupiter and Io", that is now a text unmoored from the Rose Theatre, and open to question again in terms of its date and provenance. Study of props, then, continues to provide new clues not just to the general theatrical environment but also to the provenance and content of specific lost plays.



"Phaethon" used an artificial cow with "dead" limbs - probably rigid, possibly limp - to represent the transformed Io. Heywood, in writing "Jupiter and Io", clearly envisaged using something similar that could be dragged on and off stage by Argus. Henslowe's artificial cow is one of a set of props representing large animals which is contained in his "Inventory", and one in a line of animals on the English stage which goes from Crab in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* to the bear in *The Winter's Tale* to *War Horse's* Joey. We have another reference point in thinking about representations of large animals on the early modern stage. And, metaphorically at least, Henslowe's properties room is a little tidier.

---

This article arises out of research conducted in connection with the Lost Plays Database, <http://www.lostplays.org>. Thanks to David McInnis and Roslyn L. Knutson for valuable discussions about this material.

<sup>1</sup> R. A. Foakes, ed., *Henslowe's Diary*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 319; the list as a whole is reproduced and briefly discussed by Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574–1642*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009), 229-30; for a review of recent scholarship on the various related inventories, and a fresh argument about the date, see Michael J. Hirrel, "Alcazar, the Lord Admiral's, and

---

Aspects of Performance," *Review of English Studies* 66 (2015): 40–59; for a review of approaches to the *Diary* as a whole, see S. P. Cerasano, "Henslowe's Curious Diary", *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 17 (2005): 72-85.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary*, 319. Following custom, I call the lost play "Phaethon", but refer to the classical character using the standardized spelling "Phaeton". On the practicalities and problems of writing about lost plays, see David McInnis and Matthew Steggle, eds., *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> John Payne Collier, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare* (London: John Murray, 1831), 3.354; Foakes's note at 319; Lena Cowen Orlin, "Things with Little Social Life (Henslowe's Theatrical Properties and Elizabethan Household Fittings)" in Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda, eds., *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 99-128, qtn from 116. (Gil Harris and Korda's book is the best current starting-point for theorizations of work on early modern theatre props).

<sup>4</sup> *OED*, heifer *n.*, records a number of spelling variants with medial "c" or "ck"; EEBO-TCP confirms that "hecfor" occurs in this sense in our period, and has no obvious possible other meanings.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. Thomas Rist, *Revenge Tragedy and the Drama of Commemoration in Reformation England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 10n.

<sup>6</sup> All these details from Martin Wiggins, in association with Catherine Richardson, *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2012-), item 1103.

---

This paper stands on the shoulders of Wiggins's summary of all the relevant detail.

See also Richard Dutton's valuable work on the play in *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*

(Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016), 101, 103; and for an overview of the Admiral's Men,

Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company 1594-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009).

<sup>7</sup> A. S. Kline's translation of *genitor circum caput omne micantes deposit radios*: Ovid,

*Metamorphoses* 2.40-41. Ovid's text and Kline's translation are cited from the

University of Virginia's Ovid Collection, <http://ovid.lib.virginia.edu/>. Wiggins, item

1103; *Diary*, 86, 319, 321.

<sup>8</sup> Todd A. Borlik, "Hellish Falls: Faustus's Dismemberment, Phaeton's Limbs and

Other Renaissance Aviation Disasters ", *English Studies* 97 (2016), forthcoming.

<sup>9</sup> For a starting-point in the rich critical work in this area, see A. B. Taylor, ed.,

*Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008).

<sup>10</sup> F. G. Fleay, *A Chronicle History of the London Stage* (London: Reeves and Turner,

1890), 115; Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*, 229; G. Blakemore Evans, ed., *Elizabethan-*

*Jacobean Drama: The Theatre in Its Time* (London: A & C Black, 1988), 77; Wiggins, item

1103; Borlik, "Hellish Falls".

<sup>11</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 2.253, 267.

<sup>12</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.568-746, qtn from 611.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Diary*, 319, 320; Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols (London: Reeves and Turner, 1891), 1.286-7.

<sup>14</sup> Douglas Arrell, "Heywood, Henslowe and Hercules: Tracking 1 and 2 Hercules in Heywood's *Silver and Brazen Ages*", *Early Modern Literary Studies* 17.1 (2014) n.p. Additionally, "Phaethon" also required the "two anteckes cottess", which would suggest it contained another subplot again: *Diary*, 319.

<sup>15</sup> Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle*, 1.286-7; G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942-68), 4.571-2, 574; Ernest L. Rhodes, *Henslowe's Rose: The Stage and Staging* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1976); *Diary*, 319n, 320n. Fleay, ever-alert to the possibilities of "lumping", might now suggest that "Jupiter and Io" could preserve some version of material written for Dekker's "Phaethon". However, that proposition remains untestable.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's* (London: R. O., 1637), 163.

<sup>17</sup> Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's*, 165-6.

<sup>18</sup> For examples of animals in extant plays from the early modern stage, many of which are "led" in various ways, see Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 258, s.v. "animals", and 129, s.v. "lead, leading, led".

<sup>19</sup> Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's*, 167.

<sup>20</sup> Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's*, 167, 170.

<sup>21</sup> Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's*, 170, 174.

---

<sup>22</sup> *Diary*, 320, 321.

<sup>23</sup> *Cynthia's Revels*, which may like "Phaethon" have been played at court in the winter 1600-01 season, has of course extensive engagements with several Ovidian metamorphoses besides Echo and Narcissus: see Ben Jonson, *The Cambridge Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. Martin Butler, David Bevington and Ian Donaldson, 7 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012) 1.431-8.

<sup>24</sup> Blakemore Evans, ed., *Elizabethan-Jacobean Drama*, 77.

<sup>25</sup> *OED*, *Dead* *adj.* 15, 23.

<sup>26</sup> Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment* (London: T[homas] C[reede], 1604), H3r; Stephen Harrison, *The Arch's of Triumph* [London: John Windet, 1604], I1r.

These passages were located using EEBO-TCP searches.

<sup>27</sup> *Diary*, 320; W. W. Greg, ed., *Henslowe Papers: Being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary* (London: A. H. Bullen, 1907), 118.

<sup>28</sup> *Henry V*, Prologue 26-7; Gabriel Egan, "Horses in Early-modern Drama," *Indian Journal of Ecocriticism* 2 (2009): 61-72; similarly to the Rose, the Red Bull of 1609-13 must have used animal properties, since it staged Heywood's *Ages* plays, which often call for them.

<sup>29</sup> There are competing suggestions that it would have been done with a real bear, an actor in a suit, or a prop; see, for instance, Tom Rooney, "Who 'Plaid' the Bear in *Mucedorus*?" *Notes and Queries* 54 (2007): 259-262.