

Shakespearian Biography and the Geography of Collaboration

Katherine Scheil
University of Minnesota (<kscheil@umn.edu>)

Abstract

The essay looks at the possibilities for reconciling two vibrant strands of Shakespeare studies. Many scholars have persuasively argued that Shakespeare's plays were created within the collaborative environment of the London playhouses, involving a variety of influences within the performance network of early modern London. Conversely, recent archaeological work at New Place, Shakespeare's home in Stratford, convincingly maintains that Shakespeare would have spent the majority of his time here, and not in London. Could Shakespeare have collaborated if he was not based in London? And if his primary residence was in Stratford, how could he have contributed as a collaborator with other playwrights? Resolving the contradictions between these two divergent models is particularly urgent for biographers, who have to chart a geography of Shakespeare's writing career amid his two locales.

Keywords: Biography, Collaboration, Shakespeare, Stratford-upon-Avon

1. *Introduction*

The growth of two recent strands in Shakespeare studies has opened up space to ask fruitful questions about the geography of Shakespeare's career as a writer, and about the relationship between collaboration, geographical space, and biography. In this essay, I examine the various options to explain some of Shakespeare's life events, inspired by developments on Shakespeare as a collaborative writer, and on recent archaeological discoveries at New Place, his last home in Stratford.

Most scholars now agree that Shakespeare was a collaborative writer, composing many of his plays with the influence of other playwrights, actors, musicians, theatre personnel, and various urban stimuli. Here, in the heart of the London literary scene, he was able to create some of the greatest works in the literary canon.¹ At the same time scholarship is expanding on Shakespeare

¹ Just such a scenario is the basis for the 1998 film *Shakespeare in Love*.



as a collaborative writer,² the Stratford components of Shakespeare's life have also come into closer focus. Archaeological findings at New Place, Shakespeare's Stratford home, suggest that this property should have a larger role in Shakespeare's life story. As Paul Edmondson puts it, 'New Place was too fine a house for Shakespeare to have been most of his time away from it' (2013, 98).

These two alternatives, Shakespeare as a collaborative dramatist in the heart of the London theatre scene, and Shakespeare as a Stratford-based writer living in a manor house, are difficult to reconcile. Models of collaboration as a process dependent on input from fellow playwrights, actors, theatre personnel, theatre space, political and social developments in London, are incompatible with a Warwickshire-based writer, isolated from the London literary scene, living in a manor house in which a brewing business and cottage industries likely took place, along with his wife, parents, town clerk and his family, children, and their families.

This essay explores the contradictions between these two models – how could Shakespeare have written collaboratively if he was based primarily in Stratford? Conversely, if Shakespeare was based in Stratford, in what ways could he have collaborated? This is a crucial issue for biographers, who have to chart a geography for Shakespeare's life between Stratford and London, and in the second part of this essay, I look at how biographers have negotiated between these possibilities. While I do not claim to have a magical solution to resolve these dissonances, it is nevertheless important to ask what's at stake in locating Shakespeare's creative space in either place, or in both, and to give closer attention to the geographical narratives that we construct about Shakespeare's life. The conclusion to this essay elucidates the crucial differences between a Shakespeare who lives primarily in London and only occasionally returns to Stratford to recharge his batteries, and a Shakespeare who resides mainly in Stratford and travels to London only when absolutely necessary.

2. The Case for Collaboration

In a recent essay on collaboration, Gary Taylor declares: 'Anyone interested in Shakespeare must care about collaboration' (2014, 1). Several recent contributions to Shakespeare studies have made persuasive arguments that this method of writing was the norm rather than the exception. Brian Vickers contends that 'Every major playwright in this period worked collaboratively at some point in his career', and 'it would have been remarkable had Shakespeare

² The majority of essays in the 2014 volume of *Shakespeare Survey*, for example, are devoted to the topic of 'Shakespeare's Collaborative Work' (Holland 2014).

not sometimes worked like this' (2002, 25, 18-19).³ Likewise, Paola Pugliatti points out that 'collaboration was so intrinsically inherent in the practice of playwriting (in all the phases of the process) that individual style markers cannot be extracted from the "finished" texts which we possess' (2012, 125).

Collaboration did not mean only writing with another playwright; it involved 'a host of associations that enabled literary production in the early modern period, not simply two or more writers working on one fictional text' (Hirschfeld 2001, 619). Thus, the environment for literary production is crucial for collaboration studies. Ton Hoenselaars has argued that Shakespeare's 'creativity' was dependent on the atmosphere of what he calls 'interactive collaboration' and was 'inseparable from his interaction with colleagues on the workfloor' (2012, 99). Julie Sanders also contends that the early modern theatre that shaped Shakespeare's writing was

a commercially driven, collaborative enterprise, not just between writers and the wider personnel of any theatre company or printshop (players, seamstresses, tirewomen, feathermakers, scribes, booksellers, to name just a few) ... but also frequently between the writers themselves who produced plays both with and in competition with each other in the hothouse environment of the public theatres. (2014, 153)

If Shakespeare's plays 'were realised as part of a concentrated process of interaction with others, in a profession that was and remains "radically collaborative"' (Hoenselaars 2012, 97), does that preclude Shakespeare from writing anywhere other than in the heart of the London theatre scene? Such a process would seem to rule out Stratford as a place of collaboration. After all, aside from the occasional touring players, there was no theatre space to test out, fine tune dialogue based on performance, or work with actors in Stratford, let alone other theatre personnel.⁴ Will Sharpe's description of the 'highly reciprocal creative relationship between Shakespeare and his company' is even harder to envision in Stratford: 'He was the company's principal writer, though his responsibilities also included acting, working with fellow sharers and actors on his and others' texts in what we might call rehearsals, not to mention the administrative responsibilities involved in the running of a business' (2014, 33, 32). Without modern technology to telecommute, these administrative tasks would also be nearly impossible to do long distance.

By Gary Taylor's count, twenty-eight plays survive written solely by Shakespeare, and these single-authored plays are more feasible to imagine

³ Gabriel Egan offers a caution 'to temper the recent enthusiasm for treating Shakespeare's plays as essentially collaborations made in the theatre' (2014, 23).

⁴ Bart van Es traces a new form of writing in Shakespeare around the mid to late 1590s, due to Shakespeare's 'new position as owner and controller of the dramatic life of his plays', where 'control over casting enabled the creation of psychological depth' (2013, 98).

being written outside of London (2014, 1-2).⁵ According to Henslowe's diary, plays took four to six weeks for completion (Vickers 2002, 43),⁶ which would have given Shakespeare enough time to travel to Stratford to write, and then return a play to London. Accounts of Shakespeare travelling back and forth from London to Stratford do survive, though none dates from the period of his own lifetime.⁷

Even if Shakespeare could have written single-authored plays in Stratford, it is hard to imagine how he could have been involved in a theatre process where dramatists 'appear to have had nearly continuous contact with the companies for which they worked' (Ioppolo 2006, 29).⁸ Similarly, it is hard to picture how, as Bart van Es (2013) and many others have contended, Shakespeare wrote for a particular company with particular actors and theatre spaces, and was immersed in the climate of early modern theatre world where 'in the small and intensely competitive arena of late Elizabethan theatre' playwrights like Jonson and Shakespeare 'were clearly observing each other's practice with a sharp eye' (Donaldson 2011, 158). While the evidence seems overwhelming that Shakespeare *did* collaborate, both Gary Taylor and Will

⁵ I have relied on Ton Hoenselaars' excellent survey of collaboration (2012, 105-107). *1 Henry VI* includes material by Thomas Nashe, *Titus Andronicus* was co-authored by George Peele, both *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* were co-authored with John Fletcher. Middleton had a hand in *Timon of Athens*, *Macbeth*, *Measure for Measure*, and possibly *All's Well that Ends Well* (Maguire and Smith 2012, 13-15). *Pericles* was co-authored with George Wilkins, and other plays not in the First Folio, typically *Arden of Faversham*, *Edward III*, *Sir Thomas More*, and *Cardenio*, are frequently attributed to Shakespeare and others. For an hypothesis of attribution as regards *Arden of Faversham*, see Marina Tarlinskaja's essay in this volume.

⁶ In the Prologue to *Volpone* (1607), Jonson claims he 'five weeks fully penned it / From his own hand, without a coadjutor, / Novice, journeyman, or tutor' (16-18), though Grace Ioppolo remarks that Henslowe's records show a great variety in time allotted for dramatists to complete plays (2006, 25).

⁷ William Oldys reports that 'Shakespeare often baited at the Crown Inn or Tavern in Oxford, in his journey to and from London', and John Aubrey, in his *Brief Lives*, contends that Shakespeare 'was wont to goe into Warwickshire once a yeare, and did commonly in his journey lye at this house in Oxon' (Schoenbaum 1970, 101-103). Most biographers have assumed that Shakespeare returned to Stratford once a year at the end of the theatre season, and also during the plague when theatres were closed. Bate remarks that 'plague was a key factor in determining the frequency' of Shakespeare's travels between London and Stratford (2008, 7). See Barroll 1991 for a discussion of the consequences of London playhouse closings on Shakespeare.

⁸ Based on the Henslowe and Alleyn papers as well as letters of playwright Robert Daborne, Ioppolo contends that 'authors worked closely with the acting company during a play's composition', and that dramatists took into consideration factors including the acting company, number of actors, characteristics of audiences, and performance venues (2006, 42, 71). Will Sharpe argues that 'both writing alone and in collaboration were facts of Shakespeare's working life, and delineating between the two practices is a desirable outcome of studies of Shakespeare's material authorship' (2014, 34).

Sharpe pose the still unanswered question of *why* Shakespeare collaborated on some plays and not others, including an eleven year period in the middle of his career with no collaboration (Sharpe 2014, 40; Taylor 2014, 2).

3. *The Case for New Place*

Jonathan Bate has pointed out that ‘we cannot formally prove that Shakespeare was in London between autumn 1604 and early summer 1612’ and that ‘we tacitly assume that he was present to hand over his works and for script meetings regarding his collaborative plays, but this is no more than an assumption’ (2008, 358).⁹ If Shakespeare did spend more of his writing career in Stratford, New Place would merit closer attention as an environment for literary production.¹⁰ Recent archaeological work at New Place, connected to the ‘Dig for Shakespeare’, offers further indications of the need to rechart the geography of Shakespeare’s writing career, and for reinvigorating questions about the Stratford components of his life; with more than ten fireplaces, New Place would have housed a substantial community of family and friends.¹¹

In addition to a large circle of family members and friends, New Place was also the site of cottage industries. The discovery of ‘an oval pit, possible oven/kiln, brick storage pit and possible quarry pit’ that date from Shakespeare’s lifetime substantiates the fact that the grounds of New Place were ‘used for more than just gardens over an extended period of time’ (Mitchell and Colls 2012, 11). Stratford was well known for its brewing industry and in 1598 Shakespeare was hoarding malt at New Place, perhaps for a malt brewing business there (Greer 2007, 217). Shakespeare also paid for a load of stone in 1598, likely for repairs or renovations to New Place. Evidence from the archaeological dig also shows that several cottage industries were likely taking

⁹ See also van Es for discussion of Shakespeare’s ties to Stratford from 1608 on; he notes that Shakespeare’s 1613 purchase of Blackfriar’s Gatehouse located his residence in Stratford, and suggests that Shakespeare may have resembled Samuel Daniel, who ‘resided partly in the country while retaining contacts at court’ (2013, 260-261). The purchase of Blackfriar’s was likely an investment rather than a residence.

¹⁰ Paul Edmondson has argued that ‘some, most, or all of his work could have been written’ in New Place (2013, 98).

¹¹ In 1602 Shakespeare added two orchards to the original property, and there is evidence that two buildings were present. The inner house had an indoor fireplace; see Mitchell and Colls 2011 and 2012; for a brief summary of the 2011 excavations see also: <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/unearting-shakespeare-part-9>>, accessed 11 May 2015. Excavation on Shakespeare’s living quarters has just begun in early 2015. The ‘Dig for Shakespeare’ took place from 2010-2012 as a joint project between the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and the University of Birmingham. See <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/unearting-shakespeare-part-1>>, accessed 11 May 2015.

place there, including bone working, textile working, and brewing.¹² These activities probably occupied various members of the Shakespeare family; items from the cloth industry could have involved his brother Gilbert (d. 1612), who was a haberdasher, for example (Mitchell and Colls 2012, 55; Greer 2007, 175-177).

Other archaeological discoveries at New Place corroborate the affluent lifestyle of the occupants during Shakespeare's lifetime: pig bones from animals slaughtered before maturity probably derive from suckling pig prepared for a special feast; and venison was associated with the well-off (Bowsher and Miller 2009, 151; Joan Fitzpatrick, personal communication). Pottery remains that date from Shakespeare's time also confirm an upper-class status, and ceramic findings, including sixteenth-century Tudor Green wares, indicate 'reasonably prosperous bourgeois occupation' during Shakespeare's lifetime (Mitchell and Colls 2011, 33). These findings lend support to Bart van Es' argument that Shakespeare was unique in his financial security, and that his wealth set him apart from his fellow playwrights and gave him 'greater freedom' to write at a slower pace and to be more selective in his projects (2013, 125, 142, 161, 195). Will Sharpe has even attributed a 'patient and methodical manner' to Shakespeare's non-collaborative writing, based on his financial security, and such a writing process would have been ideally suited to New Place (2014, 40).¹³

Further, archaeological evidence suggests that there may have been two buildings at New Place, and it is possible that these outbuildings were related in some way to Shakespeare's literary production; this reinforces Paul Edmondson's argument that 'Shakespeare spent more time in Stratford than is usually thought and that he wrote there' (2013, 96). Lead archaeologist for the 'Dig for Shakespeare', Will Mitchell, confirms the existence of a 'large, long frontage or gatehouse along Chapel Street and, perhaps more importantly, the smaller house sitting behind, private and secluded', possibly where 'Shakespeare resided and wrote numerous plays including *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, or indeed any of the works from 1597 onwards'.¹⁴ Just as it was hard to imagine

¹² See Mitchell and Colls 2011 and 2012 (and <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/unearthing-shakespeare-part-8>>, accessed 11 May 2015).

¹³ In Edward Bond's play *Bingo*, Jonson visits Shakespeare in Stratford, where they go for a drink together. Jonson asks Shakespeare, 'Down here for the peace and quiet? Find inspiration—look for it, anyway. Work up something spiritual. Refined. Can't get by with scrabbling it off in noisy corners any more. New young men. Competition. Your recent stuff's been pretty peculiar. What was *The Winter's Tale* about? I ask to be polite'. Shakespeare tells Jonson that he's not writing: 'There's the house. People I'm responsible for. The garden's too big. Time goes. I'm surprised how old I've got' (1987, 44-45).

¹⁴ <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/unearthing-shakespeare-part-3>>, accessed 11 May 2015. Around 1602 Shakespeare purchased a barn and cottages to add to his estate here.

some of the writing scenarios for Shakespeare taking place outside of London, it is equally difficult to explain why Shakespeare would not have resided primarily in the extensive space of New Place with his family.

There are two examples of material remnants that potentially connect Shakespeare's Stratford home to the London theatre scene and to literary activity. Archaeological work at the 'Dig' has recovered 'several lead trade tokens (such as have been found at the site of Elizabethan theatres in London)', which date from Shakespeare's occupancy.¹⁵ While it is impossible to know their provenance, the lead trade tokens found at New Place offer material evidence to link the London theatre world to Shakespeare's Stratford home during his lifetime.

Items recorded at New Place not long after Shakespeare's death also offer a possible glimpse of literary activity there. In 1637, Shakespeare's daughter Susannah filed a bill against Baldwin Brookes, Mayor of Stratford in 1640-1641, and other bailiffs, for taking 'divers books boxes desks monyes bondes bills and other goodes of greate value' from New Place (Fox 1951, 70-71). It is possible that the books, boxes, and desks were part of Shakespeare's personal writing space. Stanley Wells imagines just such a scenario at New Place, with 'a comfortable, book-lined study situated in the quietest part of the house to which Shakespeare retreated from London at every possible opportunity, and which members of the household approached at their peril when the master was at work' (2002, 38).¹⁶

Given the evidence of an affluent lifestyle, an active domestic scene, and likely literary activity at New Place, the predominant narrative of Shakespeare living in London full time and returning to Stratford only in 'retirement' from the London theatre scene at the end of his life seems less convincing.¹⁷ Nicholas Rowe, in his seminal 1709 biography, was the first to describe Shakespeare's time in Stratford as a 'retirement':

The latter Part of his Life was spent, as all Men of good Sense will wish theirs may be, in Ease, Retirement, and the Conversation of his Friends. He had the good Fortune to gather an Estate equal to his Occasion, and, in that, to his Wish; and is said to have spent some Years before his Death at his native *Stratford*. His pleasurable Wit, and good Nature, engag'd him in the Acquaintance, and entitled him to the Friendship of the Gentlemen of the Neighbourhood. (xxxv-xxxvi)

¹⁵ <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/unearthing-shakespeare-part-9>>, accessed 11 May 2015.

¹⁶ The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust underlined the idea of Shakespeare as a writer in New Place by exhibiting a mannequin of Shakespeare 'sitting at a desk writing with books around him' (Edmondson 2013, 92).

¹⁷ Paul Edmondson points out that 'a glance through some of the major Shakespeare biographies in the twenty-first century confirms that this trope of retirement is alive and well' (2013, 94).

It is not clear that Rowe meant 'retirement' in the modern sense of giving up one's career, but rather in connection with the other terms he uses for leisure and sociability ('ease' and 'conversation'). Even so, the myth of Shakespeare leaving the London stage for the country life of Stratford has proven irresistible for many critics and biographers alike, and the appeal of seeing *The Tempest* as Shakespeare's farewell to the stage, his 'self-fashioned retirement party' in the words of one critic (Bevington 2007, 523), has further entrenched this story.¹⁸ The tale of Shakespeare retiring from the London theatre scene to the bucolic setting of Stratford has been remarkably persistent, to the degree that it has overshadowed other possible narratives for the geography of Shakespeare's writing career.

4. *Possibilities for Reconciliation*

So far this essay has pursued two different paths: Shakespeare as a collaborator in London, and Shakespeare as a writer in Stratford. In the remainder, I will explore the possibilities for reconciling these two narratives, analyze the implications for biography in particular, and examine what's at stake in charting the geography of Shakespeare's life. Evidence from the journals of John Ward (1629-1681), vicar of Stratford and medical aficionado, testifies to the possibility that Shakespeare wrote plays from Stratford, and that he met with fellow dramatists there. While Ward's entries related to Shakespeare were all written after Shakespeare's death (in the 1660s), there is no reason to doubt their accuracy. Ward collected 16 notebooks over the course of 33 years and was highly respected among his fellow Stratfordians, who noted that he 'performeth his ministeriall office with much care and diligence, & is a person of good sober life and sivell conversation' (Fogg 2014, 93).

Ward was ordained in 1660, and was a medical student at Oxford until 1661. In 1661 and 1662 he spent time in London hospitals but eventually set himself up as a vicar in Stratford until his death in 1681. Not only was Ward a clergymen, he also travelled to London and attended dissections, vivisections, autopsies, and operations, writing about them amid other annotations taken from historical, religious, and philosophical documents, and from unusual medical cases (Payne 2007, 61-63). Ward was based in Stratford from roughly 1662-1669, and he frequently travelled to Oxford and to London to 'maintain contacts with his medical and intellectual colleagues' (Frank 1974, 149). As one scholar puts it, Ward 'was a well educated man with scientific proclivities who had no other interest than to record details with

¹⁸ Bate similarly maintains that the story that Shakespeare 'retired' to Stratford, 'settled down to property dealing, minor litigation, and the life of the complacent country gentleman' is a 'myth' (2008, 352-353).

disinterested accuracy'.¹⁹ From about 1658 on, Ward was preoccupied with medicine in his diary, including 'notes from readings, observations made in the field or at the bedside, comments and dicta by contemporary physicians, and pre-eminently countless pages of "receipts" to cure any and every ailment' (Frank 1974, 152). His diaries from the period he was in Stratford, throughout the 1660s, reflect his intense interest in medicine, history, theology, and in treatment of local citizens. Ward had little investment in local gossip that did not involve medical conditions.²⁰

Two entries in Ward's diaries locate Shakespeare as a writer in Stratford, and place fellow playwrights there for a 'meeting'. In the first, Ward offers a scenario where Shakespeare began in the London playhouses but then returned to Stratford for the rest of his playwriting career:

'I haue heard y^t. M^r. Shakespear was a natural wit without any art at all. hee frequented y^e plays all his younger time, but in his elder days liud at Stratford: and supplied y^e stage with 2 plays euery year and for y^t. had an allowance so large y^t. hee spent at y^e Rate of a 1000^l a yeer as I haue heard:...'.²¹

If we give credence to Ward's account, Shakespeare wrote from Stratford, not as a retirement from the stage, but as part of his writing process.²² Ward's account of two plays per year matches Will Sharpe's estimation of 'roughly two well-laboured works a year over a twenty-year period' (2014, 41). Ward's diaries were written when many Stratford residents were still alive who would have known Shakespeare; perhaps more weight should be given to Ward's details rather than to Nicholas Rowe's story of Shakespeare's 'retirement', which relied on material gathered by actor Thomas Betterton on a trip to Warwickshire sometime around 1708, nearly fifty years later than Ward's account.

¹⁹ '[Illustration]: The Diary of the Reverend John Ward' (1957), *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8, 4, 460.

²⁰ Ward's notebooks were first published in extracts by Charles Severn in 1839; rather than offering the Shakespeare references in the context of the rest of the diary, Severn clumps all of the entries that mention Shakespeare together. Later scholars have done the same; see, for example, Pogue (2008, 189, n. 24). As R.G. Frank Jr. describes the diaries, they are a mix of 'extracts from anatomical, physiological, medical, and chemical texts, with herbal lore, with descriptions of dissections and experiments, with endless transcriptions "of receipts" used by prominent practitioners, with comments and dicta from dozens of contemporary physicians, and with Ward's own observations on health and disease' (1974, 149).

²¹ Folger MS V a 292, 140r.

²² Jonathan Bate endorses the view that 'Shakespeare immersed himself in the life of the theater in the early part of his career, but later lived back home in Stratford' and 'actually lived and wrote in Stratford, supplying his later plays to the actors but, by implication, not being involved in actually putting them on' (2008, 357).

In his diary, Ward adds a comment to his entry on Shakespeare as a writer in Stratford: 'Rememb^r. to peruse Shakespeares plays and bee versd in y^e. y^e. I may not bee ignorant in y^e. matter.'²³ Ward's diaries frequently include notes about what to read or what to study, often beginning 'Remember to...'²⁴ Some have dismissed his reminder to read Shakespeare's plays as the efforts of a tourist-hungry local vicar, eager to capitalize on Shakespeare's reputation, but when read within the context of the sixteen notebooks that comprise the thirty-three year period, a different picture emerges.²⁵ It is more likely that Ward's desire to read Shakespeare's plays was part of his self-education, which encompassed other texts in science, history, and philosophy.

A second entry in Ward's diary locates fellow playwrights in a sociable gathering with Shakespeare. Ward writes: 'Shakespear Drayton and Ben Jhonson had a merry meeting and it seems drank too hard for Shakespear died of a feavour there contracted'.²⁶ While there is no way to verify Ward's version, it is significant that he chose to locate Ben Jonson and Michael Drayton, fellow playwrights, in Stratford. Although Shakespeare died in 1616, Drayton did not die until 1631, and Ben Jonson not until 1637, much closer to the time when Ward wrote this entry (1662-1663). Throughout Ward's diaries, his dominant interest is in medical conditions, so it is likely that he recorded the details of Shakespeare's death because of the unusual circumstances rather than the potential for gossip. According to Ben Jonson's biographer Ian Donaldson, the idea of a meeting between Jonson, Drayton, and Shakespeare in Stratford is tenable; he notes that Jonson and Drayton 'had a stormy but sometimes amicable relationship', and Drayton often travelled to the nearby village of Clifford Chambers, and was from Warwickshire (2011, 323).²⁷ Even in the unlikely event that Ward's account was fabricated or that it derived from local stories, it is still significant that Ward thought it would be believable to construct a story about fellow playwrights Ben Jonson and Michael Drayton 'meeting' Shakespeare just before he died in Stratford.

The life of fellow playwright and Warwickshire native Michael Drayton, described as the 'closest parallel' to Shakespeare (Andrews 2014, 273), offers further possibilities for the geography of Shakespeare's writing.²⁸ Like

²³ Folger MS V a 292, 140r.

²⁴ See the entries in Folger MS V.a.292, 172r and 177v, for example.

²⁵ Greenblatt remarks that 'Ward's brief note is probably not to be trusted' (2004, 387); see also Schoenbaum 1970, 77-78.

²⁶ Folger MS V a 292, 150r.

²⁷ Bart van Es agrees that 'it is quite possible that Drayton and other poet-playwrights came to visit New Place over the years' (2013, 263).

²⁸ Printer Richard Field was a native of Stratford but there is no evidence that he invested in Stratford or that he returned to Stratford throughout his publishing career in London. Adam G. Hooks has argued that while Field may have given Shakespeare his start by printing his early poetry, he never followed through on printing Shakespeare's later works, and

Shakespeare, Drayton was a collaborative writer and a shareholder in a theatre company (Children of the King's Revels). He was treated by Shakespeare's son-in-law John Hall, and had connections with Thomas Greene, who wrote a sonnet to him in 1603, and who lived in Shakespeare's Stratford home for a period of time (Newdigate 1941, 113, 116, 200).

Meghan C. Andrews has argued that Drayton may have had access to Shakespeare's works in manuscript, and that 'manuscript circulation might indicate that Shakespeare's writing practice was more collective than we have imagined, reflecting his partaking in intellectual engagement and conversational exchange' (2014, 293). Andrews maintains that Shakespeare and Drayton shared the same social network at Middle Temple, including Shakespeare's lodger Thomas Greene, and they may have also shared a network in Stratford.²⁹ It is also possible that they shared manuscripts in Stratford; Greene lived at New Place at least in 1609 but probably longer. Most importantly, Drayton made regular visits from London to Warwickshire. Near the end of his life, he recounts that he used to visit the area every year, 'I Yearly use to come, in the Summer Time, to recreate my self, and to spend some Two or Three Months in the Country' (Newdigate 1941, 187).³⁰ It is conceivable that Drayton may have connected with Shakespeare outside of London, though there is no evidence that the two collaborated on a playtext.

References to Stratford and to Warwickshire are prevalent in Shakespeare's work, and perhaps this stems from Shakespeare's proximity to Warwickshire while he was writing, rather than to his memory from childhood and from the odd trip back to Stratford for an annual visit or to escape the plague. Jonathan Bate remarks that 'Shakespeare was unique among the dramatists of his age in locating scenes in Warwickshire and Gloucestershire' (2008, 31). Likewise, David Kathman persuasively demonstrates that Shakespeare's plays provide extensive evidence that he was 'intimately familiar with Warwickshire' and that they 'suggest an author who was at home in the area around Stratford'

Shakespeare's fellow townsman's 'documented association with Shakespeare was strikingly brief', and he 'seems to have had little to do with his hometown after becoming a successful London businessman' (2011, 267, 263).

²⁹ Other Stratford connections exist between Drayton, Greene, and Shakespeare, including Sir Henry Rainsford, who also knew John Hall and was mentioned with Shakespeare in John Combe's will of 1614, and who lived just a few miles outside of Stratford (Andrews 2014, 297). Further, Greene was also connected with dramatist John Marston, who sponsored his admission to Middle Temple (Bearman 2012b, 291). Dramatist John Ford was also associated with Middle Temple in 1602, and John Manningham, who recorded his reaction to Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* that same year, was a friend of Greene (Bearman 2012b, 293). Shakespeare, Greene, Ford, Marston, and Drayton were thus part of the same network, and all but Ford and Marston had connections with Stratford.

³⁰ Newdigate dates the letter from 1631, and assumes that this is around the time that John Hall treated Drayton (1941, 50).

(2013, 129). Might it be possible that Shakespeare was literally at home at New Place while writing?

Further, it is not unheard of for a writer to write a play outside of London and then bring it to the London theatre. Arthur Wilson's play *Inconstant Lady* was written while he was at Oxford, and then brought to the King's Men at Blackfriars, where it was performed after slight additions of staging details; Bart van Es notes that the final performed work 'did not differ significantly from the play that Wilson wrote while alone in Oxford, where he could have had little thought as to the performing company' (2013, 129).

The dating of Shakespeare's plays is notoriously difficult, but a number of scholars have argued that the collaborative plays seem to date from earlier or later in his career rather than in the middle period, such as the 1604-1612 time frame when Bate maintains that Shakespeare may not have been in London (2008, 358).³¹ It is possible that Shakespeare's single-authored plays dominated his Stratford residency, but it is also possible to imagine scenarios where he could have been a collaborator without being in residence in London full time.³² Recent work on the history of Stratford has uncovered a literate climate that would have been conducive to literary production. Alan H. Nelson identified several individuals who had substantial libraries in Stratford; curate John Marshall, for example, owned 271 books. Nelson concludes that 'if Shakespeare spent periods of time in Stratford during his years as a playwright, he would have had no trouble finding books to support his creative labours' (2005, 52).³³

Surviving evidence about the collaborative process suggests that it involved a combination of in-person meetings and isolated writing time.³⁴ When Nathan Field discussed the process of plotting with Robert Daborne

³¹ Stanley Wells has argued that collaboration took place 'especially early and late in his career' (2006, 25-26). Likewise, van Es argues that from 1594 to 1605 'there is no respectable evidence that Shakespeare co-authored his playtexts', and that the middle period of his career 'is bookended by several years in which co-authorship was common' (2013, 287, 288). He contends that Shakespeare's pre-1594 work was 'the product of his close contact with fellow poet-playwrights' but that in 1594 he 'became less focused on other writing professionals' (311). See also Ioppolo 2006, 34.

³² Shakespeare's collaborations near the end of his career, with Wilkins, Fletcher, and possibly Middleton, would need to be incorporated in such a narrative of playwriting, possibly in Stratford.

³³ Phil Withington points out that urban culture 'was not restricted, as certain critics have assumed, to London, but also characterised the expanding network of cities, boroughs and corporate towns across provincial England' (2009, 199).

³⁴ As Grace Ioppolo describes it, 'collaborators appear to have portioned off sections of the play by acts or scenes to complete alone and then found a way together or separately to join the scenes (with marginal additions of cue lines, for example) rather than sitting in the same room and composing the entire play together' (2006, 32).

in a letter to Philip Henslowe (probably in June 1613), he remarks that he and Daborne 'haue spent a great deale of time in conference about this plott' (Greg 1907, 84).³⁵ As Paola Pugliatti notes, this could mean jotting down, perusing, or revising, but Daborne's description of ironing out the 'plott' clearly implies a person-to-person engagement, and not a scenario that could take place long distance (Stratford to London). The writing process, however, did not necessarily involve close proximity to other collaborators, since once a play had been accepted in advance, 'the finished acts were handed in by instalments' (2012, 122-123). This method would enable a playwright like Shakespeare to travel to Stratford and work on his instalments.³⁶

Some of the inconsistencies in Shakespeare's collaborative works may corroborate such alternative circumstances for composition.³⁷ The manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* offers suggestive material for charting the geography of Shakespeare's collaborative writing. It is generally agreed that *More* was the work of four playwrights: Chettle, Dekker, Heywood, and Shakespeare, who was Hand D. The play is usually dated from spring 1603 to the end of 1604, though arguments have been made for an earlier date.³⁸ The process of writing *More* could offer alternative geographical options for composition.³⁹

Several features of Shakespeare's contributions to *More* imply a more detached relationship with the other contributors and with the intricacy of the theatre space and personnel. According to Ton Hoenselaars, Shakespeare was 'apparently unfamiliar with the rest of the play' and his part has to be

³⁵ Tiffany Stern maintains that 'plays from the start were written patchily' and 'were parceled out to be written in segments'. She notes that 'each patch, however, had a separate home, a separate circulation and, as often as not, a separate writer' (2009, 2-3).

³⁶ Vickers argues that two or more dramatists working together 'would surely need to spend even more "time in conference" to ensure a properly organized play' than Field and Daborne record (2002, 433). Bart van Es comments that Daborne 'sees the players only occasionally and is unwilling to read to the company until the entire play is done' (2013, 44).

³⁷ Taylor notes that there are 'many inconsistencies in *all* Shakespeare's plays' (2014, 15). Hoenselaars points out that Shakespeare's 'plays and poems only rarely comment on the contemporary theatre in such explicit terms as one finds in *Hamlet*', and underlines 'the dearth of explicit allusions to the contemporary theatre or Elizabethan society and politics at large in Shakespeare's work' (2012, 102-103). In *Pericles*, Shakespeare and George Wilkins each wrote 'a self-contained section of the play' (Vickers 2002, 445). In *Titus Andronicus*, Peele and Shakespeare 'neatly divided their writing assignments, the older dramatist setting the play in motion', but the inconsistencies in the play 'indicate some problems that Shakespeare and Peele had in unifying their joint labour' (Vickers 2002, 470, 473). *Henry VIII*, which Shakespeare wrote with Fletcher, was a less successful collaboration, and 'unlike the neater separation of energies he had negotiated with Peele and Wilkins, may have cost him more than he had expected' (Vickers 2002, 490).

³⁸ Peter W.M. Blayney (1972, 16) argues for an earlier date in the mid-1590s.

³⁹ On the attribution of Hand D, see Diana Price's essay in this volume.

improved by Hand C, whose task appears to have been coordinating the manuscript and preparing it for the stage (2012, 108-109). John Jowett similarly agrees that 'one aspect of Shakespeare's contribution is his willingness to collaborate by way of deferring some matters to Hand C' and proposes that Shakespeare deliberately left extra marginal space for Hand C to add stage directions. According to Jowett's account, Shakespeare and the other playwrights 'work[ed] in physical isolation one from another', and the result is 'an immediate consequence of the fragmented process of the revision' (2012, 258-259).⁴⁰ On a purely speculative note, this 'fragmented process' opens up the possibility that Shakespeare could have been writing from afar (in Stratford), and his lack of engagement with the day-to-day details of the theatre scene could be a result of his absence from London.⁴¹

Gary Taylor also supports the conclusion that Shakespeare's contributions to *Sir Thomas More* needed to be altered by Hand C 'thirteen times', and each of these instances is related to 'the necessary business of performing a play: telling actors when to enter, identifying which lines are spoken by which actors' (2014, 6). It could be that Shakespeare wrote this section of the play from Stratford, where he was not in contact with actors and with the practical business of the theatre, and thus his contribution had to be adjusted by Hand C, who John Jowett calls 'the theatrical annotator demonstrably thinking about acting personnel' (2012, 267). Taylor points out that Shakespeare's work was 'not well connected to the work of the three other adapters' and at the time 'he was not intensely interacting with Chettle, Dekker, or Heywood' (2014, 7).⁴² Could this be attributed to the fact that 'Shakespeare had more economic and artistic freedom than any other professional playwright in

⁴⁰ Jowett points out that another passage likely entailed 'initial drafting by Shakespeare and revision by Heywood' (2012, 263). He concludes that Addition V was likely written by both Shakespeare and Heywood, with Shakespeare 'knowingly and responsibly shaping the action', but not 'the key player in the overall inception of the revisions', which was Hand C, who worked to 'rein in the textual dispersal and co-ordinate the components'. Hand C also engaged in a final 'late-stage adjustment' of the script 'for performance' with an eye particularly for casting (265). John Jones describes Shakespeare's process as 'called in, as if out of the cold, to do a specific job, to fulfil a one-off assignment' (1995, 13).

⁴¹ A more tenuous piece of evidence in *More* is the preference for England over London, and the absence of London references altogether in Shakespeare's contribution. Gary Taylor points out that in the second act of the play, 'twenty specific London localities are mentioned by name. But not in Shakespeare's three pages, which do not even contain the word "London" ... His three pages echo, instead, with the names "Surrey" and "Shrewsbury", and evocations of "the majesty of England"'. Shakespeare also takes his imagery from 'the natural world' rather than from the 'urban' world (2014, 9). Jowett underscores this: 'Shakespeare, unlike Heywood, did not engage in celebration of London's civic dignity' (2012, 264). Could this also be because he was based in Stratford, not London?

⁴² Jowett similarly notes that Shakespeare wrote 'as if without full awareness of the work of his fellow revisers' (2012, 267).

London' (Taylor 2014, 7), and thus could have written in Stratford rather than in London when he chose to do so:⁴³

5. *Implications for Shakespearian Biography*

The question of *what* Shakespeare wrote *where* is a fundamental crux for biographers, who have to reconcile these two spaces and chart a geography for Shakespeare between London and Stratford. Biographers who have an investment in locating Shakespeare primarily in London need to account for the substantial evidence related to the significance of New Place, while biographers committed to a more Stratford-centred geography need to explain how Shakespeare worked in a profession that was 'radically collaborative' (Hoenselaars 2012, 97).⁴⁴

Even for the biographers most resistant to locating Shakespeare in Stratford during his writing career, one life event seems to necessitate bringing these two worlds together: the death of Hamnet Shakespeare. Stephen Greenblatt, perhaps the biographer most reluctant to place Shakespeare in Stratford any more than absolutely necessary, writes that in the summer of 1596 Shakespeare 'must have learned that Hamnet's condition had worsened and that it was necessary to drop everything and hurry home. By the time he reached Stratford the eleven-year-old boy—whom, apart from brief returns, Shakespeare had in effect abandoned in his infancy—may have already died' (2004, 289). The result of this tragic Stratford event in Greenblatt's version was a surge of London-based writing: 'Whether in the wake of Hamnet's death Shakespeare was suicidal or serene, he threw himself into his work' and entered an 'amazingly busy and productive period in his life' with only 'one or more visits home a year' (2004, 291, 330-331).

Because of his determination to confine the majority of Shakespeare's life to London, for Greenblatt the intersection of Stratford events with London events remains on the level of the mysterious and inexplicable: 'somehow, in the midst of this frenzy of activity—the relocation of the Globe; the adjustment to the new Scottish regime; the recruitment of new actors; the rush of court performances; the learning of new roles; the exhausting provincial

⁴³ Ioppolo points out that Shakespeare was unique among his contemporaries in investing in both theatres and in acting companies, giving him a financial incentive to 'help prepare the texts to the best advantage for production and later for publication, from which as a company-sharer he also derived income' (2006, 141).

⁴⁴ Edmondson (2013) discusses the various biographical narratives about the Shakespeares at New Place, from Katherine Duncan-Jones's depiction of Shakespeare 'begrudgingly' returning to Stratford at the end of his life (2001), to Stephen Greenblatt's story of a neglected wife (2004), to Germaine Greer's depiction of a hard-working Anne Hathaway who supervised renovations at New Place and ran a business (2007).

tours; the harried negotiations over the reopening of Blackfriars; and the hurried trips back to Stratford to see his wife and children, bury his mother, celebrate the marriage of his daughter, purchase real estate, and conduct petty lawsuits—Shakespeare also found time to write’ (2004, 368-369). Greenblatt’s inability to reconcile these two worlds forces him to abandon explanation and defer to the dubious circumstances of ‘somehow’.

Greenblatt’s reluctance to locate Shakespeare in Stratford is part of his larger agenda of denying importance to the Stratford components of Shakespeare’s life, most obviously his wife who was a ‘disastrous mistake’ and from whom he sought to ‘escape from Stratford’ (2004, 118, 209) by finding love and creativity in the metropolis of London. The end of Shakespeare’s career is thus a decline, where Shakespeare ‘retired from London and returned to Stratford, to his neglected wife in New Place’, resigned to face ‘a sense of constriction and loss’, and ‘[submit] himself to the crushing, glacial weight of the everyday’ and confront his ‘sour anger toward his wife’. Stratford held nothing positive for Shakespeare, who ‘had fashioned a place for himself in the wild world of the London stage’ and only reluctantly ‘embrace[d] ordinariness’ by returning to Stratford (144, 379, 387). This is hardly the picture of a playwright who invested in his large family home in Stratford and flourished as a writer in a domestic milieu, made possible by his financial independence. Instead, this Shakespeare is a man who felt ‘the strange, ineradicable distaste for her that he felt deep within him’ and who ‘found his trust, his happiness, his capacity for intimacy, his best bed elsewhere’ (145, 146). It would be difficult, if not impossible, to locate such a miserably married Shakespeare primarily in Stratford; this Shakespeare requires both a London-based life, and vilification of his wife Anne Hathaway.

Greenblatt’s grim and soul-crushing depiction of Stratford is vastly different from Jonathan Bate who, in his 2008 biography, maintains that Stratford, ‘in contrast to London, was associated with stability, community, garden field and health’ (54).⁴⁵ Bate is among the most amenable biographers to locating Shakespeare in Stratford for a majority of his time, even proposing that *Cymbeline* and *The Winter’s Tale* were ‘written back home in Stratford’ (2008, 48).⁴⁶ Conversely, in this account, Shakespeare’s commitment to Stratford was far stronger than to London: ‘the only occasion on which

⁴⁵ Graham Holderness discusses the role of various biographers’ lives in their shaping of Shakespeare’s life geography; he remarks that Bate displays a strong personal investment in this Midland ‘heart of England’ and in this rustic Shakespeare (2011, 10).

⁴⁶ David Bevington has argued just the opposite: ‘we might well be tempted to wonder if this dreamwork fantasy has something to do with Shakespeare’s own story of long separation from wife and family, his continuing interest in a precious relationship between the father and a favorite daughter, and the prospect of reunion with that family as the dramatist prepared to retire from his professional life’ (2007, 528). Bevington clearly equates ‘professional life’ with ‘London life’.

Shakespeare bought as opposed to rented a property in London was in March 1613, when he purchased a substantial gatehouse close to the Blackfriars Theatre' (334). Bate notes that in the first decade of the seventeenth century, Shakespeare 'had already made enough money from his shareholding in the company to purchase a large house, together with farmland and other properties back in Stratford. He no longer needed to endure the discomfort of touring. In all probability, he spent the greater proportion of these long plague years at home' (335). Bate also notes that there is evidence to suggest that Shakespeare gave up acting in the first decade of the seventeenth century, since he is listed as an actor in *Every Man in his Humour* (1598) and *Sejanus* (1603) but not in the later plays of Jonson. Likewise, Shakespeare is not listed in the 1607 'Players of Interludes', which includes the major members of the King's Company (335-336). Bate points out that there is no firm evidence of Shakespeare in London between autumn of 1604 and May of 1612, 'when he was sworn in at the Westminster Court of Requests under the denomination "William Shakespeare of Stratford upon Avon in the county of Warwick, gentleman of the age of 48 years or thereabouts"' (337). Bate's conclusion is that 'Shakespeare may never have fully retired, but he may well have semi-retired much earlier than we suppose' (359). This version of Shakespeare gives credence to the Stratford components of his life, as a stable and beneficial locale where he was able to write and invest his financial resources.

Other biographers align on a less extreme scale between London and Stratford. Katherine Duncan Jones sees Stratford as 'an excellent nursery for a player and a poet, but for a man of Shakespeare's abundant talents yet lowly fortunes it was also a deadend', and she reluctantly admits his return to Stratford at the end of his life 'of necessity rather than choice' (2001, 25). René Weis allows a more generous span of time in Stratford to the poet: 'In New Place Shakespeare would be comfortable, warm in front of his many large fires, with time enough despite the calls on it to play with his daughters, go for walks, and generally enjoy the life of a country gentleman'. He offers a sentimental image of Shakespeare's life in Stratford, moving into New Place shortly after the death of Hamnet and enjoying the lush variety of his garden: 'It is possible to imagine him here, writing more plays, including all the great tragedies, perhaps in a study of his own, with a window, looking out over his orchard of apples, quinces, pears, and cherries, and particularly vines' (2007, 261, 219). Lois Potter takes a middle stance between locating Shakespeare's writing in Stratford or in London, imagining Shakespeare going back and forth between London and Stratford: 'it is tempting to think that a revised *Twelfth Night* manuscript was fetched at the last moment from Stratford, since this play ... feels exceptionally "finished"' (2012, 417). Potter doubts that New Place was 'the quiet retreat that is sometimes imagined' (403), and she sees Shakespeare as a collaborative playwright working in the heart of London, where his fellows actors and authors 'were the most important people in his life' (79).

In the end, we have no way of knowing for certain how long Shakespeare lived in London, or Stratford, or which pieces of his writing were written where, but it is unrealistic to assume that Shakespeare wrote only in London, and did no creative work at his large house in Stratford.⁴⁷ Even so, we might ask why it matters. What is the difference between a Shakespeare who writes in the heart of the London theatre world, amidst the Bankside community of brothels and bearbaiting, or one who writes in his Stratford manor house amid his extended family, wife and children, and parents in his home town? What might it mean to relocate artistic production, and the practice of collaborative writing in particular, outside of London?

6. *Conclusion*

The more Shakespeare wrote in Stratford, the more his work would be intertwined with domestic and family life in the New Place setting; conversely, the more his writing took place in London, the clearer the separation between Shakespeare the writer and Shakespeare the family man. Narratives of Shakespeare's writing career that depend exclusively on the London theatre setting as a backdrop for writing would be nearly impossible to sustain. To cite only one example, Jeffrey Masten's argument that collaboration was 'a mode of homoerotic textual production' and that Shakespeare 'wrote within a paradigm that insistently figured writing as mutual imitation, collaboration, and homoerotic exchange' (1997, 60, 9) is less convincing if some of that writing took place in the domestic setting of a manor house in Stratford, with his wife, parents, children, and family friends in residence.⁴⁸

Locating Shakespeare in Stratford for a majority of his life would give a larger role to the domestic scene at New Place as a context for his writing. New Place would have been a bustling, busy space of twenty to thirty rooms, likely with servants, extended family and friends, and cottage industries taking place. It is unclear exactly what motivated Shakespeare in 1597 to purchase New Place, almost midway through his playwriting career, but it would have been a significant manor house that Shakespeare 'must have known from boyhood, walked past every day on his way to and from' grammar school (Edmondson 2013, 97).

It is likely that the Shakespeare family home on Henley Street was damaged by fire in 1594-1595, and Shakespeare's purchase of New Place may have been 'an effort by a man conscious of family obligations to provide a suitable home

⁴⁷ Leeds Barroll cautions against 'privileging of supposed events as basic facts' which results in 'not the expansion but the freezing of a number of available viewpoints that might otherwise be brought to bear' (1991, 7). Similarly, John Jones describes deciphering the process by which Shakespeare wrote and revised his plays as 'a world not of proof but of probability maturing towards a certainty that is beyond reasonable doubt' (1995, 2).

⁴⁸ For an extended critique of Masten, see Vickers 2002, 528-541.

for his dependents in the wake of misfortune' (Bearman 2012a, 485).⁴⁹ New Place probably housed a number of Shakespeare family members, including John Shakespeare until his death in 1601; Mary Arden until her death in 1608; and Shakespeare's brothers Gilbert and Richard until their deaths in 1612 and 1613 respectively. It is likely that Shakespeare's elder daughter Susanna and her husband John Hall lived in New Place from their marriage in 1607 until after Shakespeare's death, and that his younger daughter Judith lived there until her marriage to Thomas Quiney in 1616. Stratford town clerk Thomas Greene and his wife Lettice lived at New Place at least in 1609 but probably longer.⁵⁰ Greene was a frequent traveller to London and was well-connected with the theatre community there; he would have kept the New Place community apprised of news from London.⁵¹ Thus, a relatively large Shakespeare family (plus family friends) probably occupied New Place from the start of Shakespeare's ownership through the end of his life. This population would not necessarily have provided a quiet retreat from busy London life, but the greater concentration of Shakespeare family members in New Place makes a persuasive case that Shakespeare himself would have been part of this community as often as possible.

In the end, none of these highly speculative ways to reconcile the models of collaboration and Stratford residency offers a perfect solution to how Shakespeare could have carried out his career as an early modern dramatist and as a resident in a manor house in Stratford. Either option, locating more of Shakespeare's writing in Stratford or in London, gives a larger role to his wife Anne Hathaway because of the size and activities of New Place. If Shakespeare resided primarily in Stratford, she would likely have been part of his daily life, and would likely have had a greater influence on his creative output. If Shakespeare left New Place and its cottage industries to be run by someone else while he was in London, the most likely person would have been his wife Anne.⁵² The latter scenario would give her more autonomy and responsibility than she is often granted in accounts of Shakespeare's life. Either alternative suggests that Anne was an active part of life at New Place, taking charge of the cottage industries and family logistics at his Stratford home if he was absent, or accompanying him in the running of the household

⁴⁹ van Es argues that around the time Shakespeare purchased New Place, an 'alteration in his daily patterns of work' also occurred (2013, 255).

⁵⁰ Bearman point out that Greene had moved to St. Mary's, a house next to the Stratford churchyard, in 1611 with his family (2012b, 297). Bearman notes that Greene and Shakespeare 'clearly knew each other well', and that 'more evidence exists to document Shakespeare's dealings with Greene than with any other of his contemporaries' (2012b, 304).

⁵¹ Greene was involved with Shakespeare in various legal dealings, particularly related to the Welcombe enclosure acts in 1610 (Greer 2007, 234).

⁵² Lena Orlin (2014) uses the life of Elizabeth Quiney, who was essentially a successful businesswoman in Stratford, to argue a parallel life for Anne Hathaway.

activities if it was his primary residence. The idea of Shakespeare's wife Anne 'remaining silent and invisible' (Greer 2007, 4) is impossible to sustain, and she deserves more attention and significance than she usually gets in accounts of Shakespeare's life and writing.

As two components of Shakespeare studies outlined in this essay progress, perhaps traces of how and where Shakespeare collaborated, or how and where his home of New Places figures in his writing career, will offer a solution to how these two divergent paths can be reconciled. Until then, any account of collaboration that does not provide an explanation for Shakespeare's life at New Place, or any account of New Place that does not offer an explanation for Shakespeare's collaborative writing, can only be part of an untold story.

Works Cited

Manuscript Source

Washington (DC), Folger Shakespeare Library
Ward John (ca. 1647-ca. 1680), *Notebooks*, MS V a 284-299.

Online Source

Blogging Shakespeare. Embracing Shakespearean Conversation in a Digital Age, <<http://bloggingshakespeare.com/>>, accessed 11 May 2015.

Printed Sources

- Andrews M.C. (2014), 'Michael Drayton, Shakespeare's Shadow', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65, 3, 273-306.
- Barroll Leeds (1991), *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years*, Ithaca-London, Cornell University Press.
- Bate Jonathan (2008), *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*, London, Viking.
- Bearman Robert (2012a), 'Shakespeare's Purchase of New Place', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 63, 4, 65-486.
- Bearman Robert (2012b), 'Thomas Greene: Stratford-Upon-Avon's Town Clerk and Shakespeare's Lodger', *Shakespeare Survey* 65, 290-305.
- Bevington David (2007), 'Shakespeare's Dream of Retirement', in J.J. Martin, ed., *The Renaissance World*, London, Routledge, 517-532.
- Blayney P.W.M. (1972), 'The Booke of Sir Thomas More Re-Examined', *Studies in Philology* 69, 167-191.
- Bond Edward (1987 [1974]), *Bingo*, in E. Bond, *Plays: three*, with introductory material by the author, London, Methuen, 3-66.
- Bowsher Julian and Pat Miller (2009), *The Rose and the Globe—Playhouses of Shakespeare's Bankside, Southwark, Excavations 1988-91*, London, Museum of London Archaeology.

- Donaldson Ian (2011), *Ben Jonson: A Life*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Duncan-Jones Katherine (2001), *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from his Life*, London, The Arden Shakespeare.
- Edmondson Paul (2013), 'A Renaissance for New Place in Shakespearean Biography?', *Critical Survey* 25, 1, 90-98.
- Egan Gabriel (2014), 'What is not Collaborative about Early Modern Drama in Performance and Print', *Shakespeare Survey* 67, 18-28.
- Fogg Nicholas (2014), *Stratford-upon-Avon: The Biography*, Stroud, Amberley Publishing.
- Fox Levi (1951), 'An Early Copy of Shakespeare's Will', *Shakespeare Survey* 4, 69-77.
- Frank R.G. Jr. (1974), 'The John Ward Diaries: Mirror of Seventeenth Century Science and Medicine', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 29, 2, 147-179.
- Greenblatt Stephen (2004), *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*, New York, W.W. Norton.
- Greer Germaine (2007), *Shakespeare's Wife*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Greg W.W., ed. (1907), *The Henslowe Papers*, London, A.H. Bullen.
- Hirschfeld Heather (2001), 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship', *PMLA* 116, 3, 609-622.
- Hoenselaars Ton (2012), 'Shakespeare: Colleagues, Collaborators, Co-authors', in T. Hoenselaars, ed., *Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 97-119.
- Holderness Graham (2011), *Nine Lives of William Shakespeare*, London, Continuum.
- Holland Peter, ed. (2014), *Shakespeare's Collaborative Work*, *Shakespeare Survey* 67.
- Hooks A.G. (2011), 'Shakespeare at the White Greyhound', *Shakespeare Survey* 64, 260-275.
- Ioppolo Grace (2006), *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood: Authorship, Authority and the Playhouse*, London, Routledge.
- Jones John (1995), *Shakespeare At Work*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Jowett John (2012), 'A Collaboration: Shakespeare and Hand C in *Sir Thomas More*', *Shakespeare Survey* 65, 255-268.
- Kathman David (2013), 'Shakespeare and Warwickshire', in P. Edmondson and S. Wells, eds, *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 121-132.
- Maguire Laurie and Emma Smith (2012), 'Many Hands. A New Shakespeare Collaboration?', *Times Literary Supplement*, 20 April, 13-15.
- Masten Jeffrey (1997), *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell William and Kevin Colls (2011), 'Dig for Shakespeare': New Place, Season 2, Birmingham Archaeology.
- Mitchell William and Kevin Colls (2012), 'Dig for Shakespeare': New Place, Season 3, Birmingham Archaeology.
- Nelson A.H. (2005), 'Shakespeare and the Bibliophiles: From the Earliest Years to 1616', in R. Myers, M. Harris and G. Mandelbrote, eds, *Owners, Annotators and The Signs of Reading*, London, Oak Knoll Press and the British Library, 49-73.
- Newdigate B.H. (1941), *Michael Drayton and His Circle*, Oxford, Shakespeare Head Press, St. Aldates.

- Orlin L.C. (2014), 'Anne by Indirection', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65, 4, 421-454.
- Payne Lynda (2007), *With Words and Knives: Learning Medical Dispassion in Early Modern England*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Pogue K.E. (2008), *Shakespeare's Family*, Westport, Praeger Publishing.
- Potter Lois (2012), *The Life Of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pugliatti Paola (2012), 'The Anonymous Plotter in the Routines of Renaissance Theatre and Drama', *Journal of Early Modern Studies* 1, 117-136, <<http://www.fupress.net/index.php/bsfm-jems>>, accessed 11 May 2015.
- Rowe Nicholas (1709), 'Some Account of the Life &c. of Mr. William Shakespear', in N. Rowe, ed., *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear, in six Volumes*, vol. I, London, printed for Jacob Tonson, 6 vols, i-xl.
- Sanders Julie (2014), *The Cambridge Introduction to Early Modern Drama, 1576-1642*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Schoenbaum Samuel (1970), *Shakespeare's Lives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Sharpe Will (2014), 'Framing Shakespeare's Collaborative Authorship', *Shakespeare Survey* 67, 29-43.
- Stern Tiffany (2009), *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor Gary (2014), 'Why Did Shakespeare Collaborate?', *Shakespeare Survey* 67, 1-17.
- van Es Bart (2013), *Shakespeare in Company*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Vickers Brian (2002), *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Weis René (2007), *Shakespeare Revealed: A Biography*, London, John Murray.
- Wells Stanley (2002), *Shakespeare for All Time*, London, Macmillan.
- Wells Stanley (2006), *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher, and the Other Players in His Story*, London, Penguin.
- Withington Phil (2009), 'Putting the City into Shakespeare's City Comedy', in D. Armitage, C. Condren and A. Fitzmaurice, eds, *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 197-216.