

THE LONDON THEATRE: A study of theatre attendance in the eighteenth century

This paper will examine the relationship between Parliamentary sessions and the emergence of the London theatre season in the eighteenth century. It will also access to what extent the middling to upper classes were participating in the theatre experience of the eighteenth century while supporting with numerical data that the peerage (upper classes) did not comprise the majority of the theatre audience in London in the eighteenth century. Secondly ticket pricing and affordability will comprise the second method of analysis to suggest the extent of both peerage and lower class participation. It's a fascinating insight into the foundations of theatre, as we know it.

THE LONDON THEATRE

This paper will examine the relationship between the timing of Parliamentary sessions and the emergence of the London theatre season in the eighteenth century. The paper will also access to what extent the middling to upper classes were participating in the theatre experience of the eighteenth century while supporting with numerical data that the peerage (upper classes) did not comprise the majority of the theatre audience in London in the eighteenth century. This investigation will involve formulating a pattern to peerage movement by observing the increases and decreases of theatre performances by month and then correlating these findings with the opening and closing of the Parliamentary sessions. The opening and closing of parliamentary sessions were important because politics, which was almost exclusively controlled by the peerage, indicated when the largest numbers of peerage were in London. Therefore the opening and closing of Parliaments will be used to measure peerage activity in London's theatre industry by demonstrating total monthly performances during the sessions, when the peerage were in London, compared to monthly totals when the sessions were closed and the peerage were not in London. This will then provide a numerical percentage of theatre performances that occurred outside of the core of peerage activity in London thus giving a fair assessment of none peerage activity.

Apart from observing monthly increases and decreases in theatre activity in correlation with parliament opening and closings, ticket pricing and affordability will comprise the second method of analysis to suggest the extent of both peerage

and lower class participation. Ticket pricing will be accessed through the observation as to where performances were held, and what dramatic category the piece belonged to. This information will provide valuable insight and will open new questions concerning peerage participation in the theatre industry during the eighteenth century by providing data that suggests that the peerage may have been a smaller portion of the theatre audience than previously thought.

This research paper consists of a statistical analysis of performance data in four volumes of the London Theatre Stage. The years that have been used are 1700-1717, 1729-1736, 1747-1755, and 1792-1800. These years were chosen in correspondence to the way the volumes were organised. These years will allow for peerage movement and theatre development to be studied from five different decades. Aside from attempting to isolate peerage participation in the theatre industry a number of topics, such as the commercialisation of leisure and a change in the formula of theatre nightly programs, will help explain the sharp rises and decreases within the data. In essence within the context of peerage participation this discussion will also bring to light a number of minor topics demonstrating how the theatre event experienced sharp increase and decreases in the eighteenth century. These minor topics, not directly associated with proving the extent of peerage participation, are important because they will give this research a context within which the central thesis is developing. These topics will also lead to new questions but many will remain unanswered as this essay is too broad and ranges too long a time period to answer all the questions that arise. The unanswered questions will be discussed simultaneously as the paper progresses.

The essay itself is composed of two parts. The first part is an overall look at the theatre experience in the eighteenth century analysing Parliamentary opening and closing dates and monthly total performances. The second part of this essay consists of looking at individual theatre pieces which will illustrate what elements influenced ticket pricing, where a piece was shown, what kind of piece was shown, and how often a piece was shown. This will provide figures to assess the affordability of tickets for non-peerage and the factors that changed ticket prices.

Table one provides a monthly compilation showing peak months and low months in numbers of performances selected in the theatre seasons for the century as a whole. The table demonstrates a drastic change in consistency between the teens, thirties, forties and the nineties where the most consistency can be observed. Table one suggests that January and May were most frequently the peak months, each comprising 25% of total peak months for the century as a whole. When these four time periods (1700-1717, 1729-1736, 1747-1755 and 1792-1800) were looked at separately, however, the peak months varied. The totals demonstrate that, between

1700-1717 the peak month is January 30% of the time, between 1729-1736 the peak month is November 37% of the time, between 1747-1755 the peak month is January 43% of the time, between 1792-1800 the peak month is May 88% of the time. The peak month totals demonstrate that a consistent pattern in the monthly rate of theatre performances only began to form in the last decade of the eighteenth century, when May became the peak month on a consistent pattern 88% of the time. Consistency is important when discussing peerage participation because a new question arises. If peerage participation made up the bulk of the London theatre audience in the eighteenth century, why were the peak months scattered in the first three decades as opposed to being consistent like the last decade, if theatre owners could expect a steady audience every year during Parliamentary sessions?

Table one, apart from demonstrating peak months and consistency, is also important for demonstrating sharp increases and decreases within the theatre industry. These shifts were clearly demonstrated in the total column for each year. We can clearly see a dramatic 60% jump in the number of performances from 1713-1714 to 1714-1715 an increase of 60%, an increase of 65% from the teens to the thirties, a decrease of 52% from the thirties to the forties, and an increase from the forties to the nineties.

Most of these changes in rates of performances can be accounted for by the restructuring within the industry in the eighteenth century. The first increase, from 1714-1715, is unexplained and would require further investigation. The increases between 1717 and 1729 were explained by two factors. The first is the flood of Shakespearean plays which were being produced by the late 1720's, at one point accounting for 20% of Drury Lane's and 16% Covent Garden's theatre seasons. The second explanation is a wider phenomenon referred to by recent historians as the commercialisation of leisure, which had theatre owners catering to classes other than the peerage. The newly expanded audience created a boom which allowed theatres to maximise their theatre output, thereby increasing theatre pieces 51% between 1717 and 1729.

The decrease from the thirties to the forties can also be explained by a particular phenomenon. The industry in the forties seemed to be down sizing and increasing efficiency as two categories of theatre pieces were dropped and combined into the same night. Musicals, that is theatre pieces mostly composed of music and dancing, and concert series strictly composed of music, were dropped as separate performances and combined with plays. The theatre nights were thus reorganised to include a play, an afterpiece, prologue, and epilogue, with music and dancing and a musical concert as part of the after entertainments.

The final period, 1792-1800, provided the era when the theatre industry was finally stabilising it, demonstrating steady increases and decreases within a narrow range. The end of the century also no longer demonstrated a correlation between Parliamentary sessions and the theatre seasons because there were no more drastic peak months but only steady increases and decreases which remained the same when Parliament was opened or closed. This pattern suggests what the industry has been through, especially that of the commercialisation of leisure, which demonstrated that the industry no longer relied on the peerage for continued financial support. In fact table one provides a visual demonstration of how the industry catered to other classes apart from the peerage as there was a significant number of theatre activity that occurred outside of the parliamentary sessions' frame, that is the yellow coloured shaded areas, when most of the peerage were out of town. The answer as to whom exactly it catered to is unknown, as no records are known to exist of the ticket holders for these events. However the data used provides enough evidence for further analysis of exactly how much of the industry was or was not strictly peerage in nature and how much of it actually catered to the other classes in society.

Table two provides such evidence, demonstrating how important the theatre going audiences were outside of the parliamentary sessions. Table two essentially shows figures from table one in percentages for each month out of the total theatre season that year. The second total column in percentage signs demonstrates what percentages of theatre pieces were presented outside of the parliamentary sessions with averages varying from 7%-66%. These figures are important because of the nature of the theatre business. The nature of theatre business is one of risk where your entire investment is in jeopardy from the start of script writing to the opening night and though out the run of the piece. The return in the theatre business is low for the amount of work that is required year round. The figures in tables 9 and 10 demonstrate how little return on investment was in the end of the eighteenth century despite the theatre's commercialisation in the thirties and forties. Furthermore its season, by the nineties, had stabilised with steady increases and decreases. In fact tables 9-10 demonstrate that many seasons for both Drury Lane and Covent Garden, the most fashionable theatres in London at the time, lost money or broke even. The link to table two, however, is such that the large percentages of theatre activity occurred outside of parliamentary sessions, in an industry, which was supposedly frequented by a majority of peerage. The activity outside of parliamentary sessions provided the industry with averages of 40% for the first period, 44% for the second period, 31% for the third period, and finally 25% for the fourth period, of their profits. These profits according estimates from tables 9-10, could have economically indebted a theatre to the point of bankruptcy in the eighteenth century. This raises the suggestion that profits were so low and thus important every month of the year that theatre owners were forced to attract audiences other then the peerage outside of Parliament sessions. Furthermore, as the commercialisation of leisure's theory suggests making use of more people to

make money off of mass consumption, then it is only reasonable to think that theatre owners would make use of these crowds all year round and not just in the periods outside of the Parliament sessions.

Another notable change that was distinctive in table two was the rise in importance of the summer seasons. The change demonstrated how the summer theatre seasons became fashionable as opposed to the early eighteenth century. In the beginning of the eighteenth century summer seasons were not fashionable because the peerage did not like the summer smell of garbage in the city. Secondly, the closing of parliamentary sessions caused a migration of the peerage back to their country houses because the parliament's political and economical, kept the peerage in the city. Thirdly, the popularity of sports among the peerage, which, was practised especially in the summer time, kept most of the peerage on the countryside as opposed to inside cities like London. Despite these facts by the end of the eighteenth century the summer seasons, accounted for an average of 20% of the total theatre season, which again could make or break a theatre's profits, for that entire year. This trend could suggest that the peerage were now willing to remain in London outside of the Parliamentary sessions during the summers or it could suggest that evidence of lower class participation as the peerage still made the voyage out of London for the summer to their country houses.

Table three will further help clarify peerage participation by suggesting actual percentages of peerage participation by co-ordinating monthly increases with parliamentary openings and closings. Table three demonstrates increases and decrease month by month in four different colours in order to get a better visual of the patterns that occurred. The steady distinctions are as follows; We see a clear increase of over 50% in months of October, we see clear decreases in June and September of over 50%, we see a clear increase of less then 50% in January and finally we see a steady decrease in February. These distinctions may provide some figures as to what percentage of the theatre audience may well have been composed of peerage. The increases in November at a consistent rate of 93% for all forty years in the survey are misleading because the theatre season was just beginning and often figures showed increases from zero as table one demonstrates, i.e.; an increase of 4-5 to 25-26 for the years 1711-1714. However increases in January occurred in the peak of the season and correlated with 30% of the parliamentary openings suggesting participation figures for a surplus audience composed of peerage. For example the average increase in the month of January is 10.2%, which could represent a figure of added peerage participation in the theatre industry. Similarly the most frequent decrease in the industry in June, which account for 35% of parliamentary closings also showed a continuous decrease 88% of the time. These figures could also be correlated with individual parliament openings. If one looks at the boxed figures in table 3, which represented the opening and closing of parliament, only seven years (1707,1712,1714,1715,1716, 1732,1792) record a

decrease at the start of Parliament leaving the 33 years or 83% of openings reporting an increase. When taking all of those years that record an increase of less than 50% (20 years in all) the average adds up to 19% increase in theatre performances when Parliament opens. The remaining 13 years were discarded because the increases were often in the several hundreds of percents because the real numbers were low at the start. Similarly when parliaments closed, the theatre industry recorded a decrease of 25% for 20 years out of 40. Therefore, according to the numerical data based on table 3 one could estimate that the average increase in theatre performances when parliaments opened were 19% and the closings of parliament accounted for a decrease of 25% suggesting that peerage participation could average 22% of the theatre audience in London during the eighteenth century. This suggestion is formulated from the data of table three and, despite not having records of the people attending these performances, represents a good educated guess based on data.

Figures 1-13 are provided for the viewer to have a visual picture of the structural changes, mainly, the commercialisation of leisure and the introduction of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century. They do not add findings to the central theme of the degree of peerage participation in the London theatre industry. They will help raise questions that are out of the range of this research but nonetheless are worthwhile mentioning. So for purposes of clarity each noticeable change, not directly related in this essay, will be provided in Appendix 1 at the end of this essay so that the continuity of the essay shall remain in tact. Only the relevant changes selected from the Appendix will be mentioned if they raise suggestions relating to peerage participation.

Tables 1-3 illustrated the numbers of performances by month, however figures 1-5 are provided to give the reader a visual look at the theatre industry, that is, table 1 in its entirety. The most obvious change the figures demonstrate is the lines, which became more synchronised as the years progressed, with signs of stability in the nineties. Many increases and changes are noteworthy but could only be substantially explained with more research as they go into details that may involve looking into specific months (refer to Appendix 1). However among the other noteworthy changes are the increases in summer performances with the exceptions being the forties where the down sizing in the theatre industry seems to have taken a toll on the summer seasons for this period. We clearly see a dramatic increase in summer seasons in the nineties as the numbers indicate that summer performances have doubled. As already mentioned the summer seasons were important because we see an unquestionable sign that there were steady audiences as the eighteenth century progressed suggesting the presence of another audience other than the peerage. Another general trend was the increase in the number of performances at the start of the season, which suggests that there was an audience, which progressively supported the London theatre. Table 1 demonstrates the majority of

Parliaments, in the forty years of this study, opened in November, in fact mid November. These figures in essence allow for further analysis, which will raise new questions in future, research.

Figures 6-9 display a different image as only years that correspond from period to period, i.e. 1702,1712,1752. The thirties in these figures are presented as the period with the least consistency whereby the forties and nineties demonstrated the most similarity. These figures are especially practical to analyse growth from one decade to the other as figure 6 demonstrates a dramatic difference for 1732 as compared to two decades before 1712 or after 1752, when the industry was practically the same. In fact both 1702 and 1732 have a 900% difference, which can be explained by the commercialisation of leisure and the introduction of Shakespeare in the thirties. The same can be observed in figures 7-9 as the thirties always presented it as being the radical decade while all other years were more or less syncopated. There are no Appendixes for figures 6-9 because the differences are much more apparent and are a repeat of figures 1-5, which have been dealt with year by year in Appendix 1.

Figures 10-13 play a different role in that they provide all of table 1 in one figure. They provide the periods, months, and numbers of performances in two different versions with figures 10 and 11 presenting numbers and figures 12 and 13 presenting percentage signs. Figure 10 provide raw numbers by period and number of performances with the lines representing the months. Figure 11 the number of performances and the months with the lines representing the different time periods. Figures 12 and 13 are the same as figures 10 and 11 respectively with the only difference being that the values are presented in percentage signs. As this study is based entirely on tables and figures, figures 10-13 demonstrate how the same data could be manipulated and present four, in some respects, totally different images.

Tables 4-5 illustrate more statistical proof for the change in the theatre's nightly format in the forties. These two tables demonstrate the decreases in musicals and concerts as they were being incorporated into nightly performances. Table 4 demonstrates that the forties and nineties are missing because Musical as a category ceased to exist. Similarly table 5 demonstrated that there were only six concerts in the forties as opposed to over 120 in the thirties. However the concerts category made a triumphant return in the nineties because London's own musical genius, Haydn, began a series of concerts between February and April. Had it not been for Haydn the concert category would not have made a triumphant return.

Table 6 discusses the, by particular desire, category which adds weight to the argument of other classes' participation. The by particular desire category refers to the occasions when the peerage publicly requested a performance of a particular play. This category was often artificial and was used as a scheme to attract an

audience, which would attend a piece to be a part of the royalty and peerage. It was a marketing scheme, which suggests that the peerage in general played a part in attracting the middling and upper classes to theatre events. Furthermore the nineties saw the elimination of this category, which again suggests that the steady audience was available and that the need to publicise the royalty and the peerage's presence were no longer necessary. Table 6 is in fact another indication of the need and importance of all other classes for the theatre industry in the eighteenth century.

Tables 4-6 presented sub categories within the total numbers from table 1 to demonstrate a parallel between the elimination of these categories and the decrease in the number of performances in the over all totals. Figures 14-17 demonstrate the visual of tables 4-6 as they were graphed against the totals from table 1. The figures demonstrate the correlation between the categories and show how consistent the rises in the global totals are as compared with other categories. For example figure 15 demonstrates steady rises correlating between all of the categories even though the number and intervals from musicals, desires, and global totals are different. Figure 14 demonstrates all performances and shows musicals and by particular desire performances as following the general pattern of increase and decreases.

Finally the first part of the table's booklet is summarised by table 7, which shows all of the different totals from the various tables by period. This table essentially allows for all of the comparisons to be compared and looked at from the point of view of one table. It features tables 1,2,4,5, and 6 where the information was drawn from. Tables 1-7 and figures 1-17 complete the first part of this study, which aimed at presenting a broad look at the theatre industry in eighteenth century London. This broad look included two important conclusions. The first conclusion suggests that the theatre industry experienced a fair amount of restructuring brought on by the commercialisation of leisure. Furthermore the change in the nightly programs of performances also affected the theatre industry by adding or eliminating venues varying from theatre to theatre. This in essence left a lot of unanswered questions, which would require an in-depth look month by month to explain the changes, especially those demonstrated by figures 1-5. The second and more groundbreaking thesis is the degree of participation that the peerage donated to the London theatre industry in the eighteenth century. The data overwhelmingly supports to a much greater extent the amount of participation than the data on the changes in the theatre industry. Tables 1-3 play the dominating role in establishing the correlation of parliamentary openings and by monthly increases in theatre performances suggesting that the participation of the peerage in the theatre industry was 22% of the audiences. The most significant proof in the amount of theatre activity that occurs outside of the Parliamentary sessions, which suggests that same activity may continue and intensify with an added 22% of peerage. However a lot more work

needs to be done but if any this study raises doubt in the least about peerage participation in London theatre in the eighteenth century.

Part two essentially looks into individual theatre performances 402 in all and attempts to access the different factors, which influenced ticket pricing. This part will help access whether ticket prices were affordable for the middling to upper classes presenting figures suggesting actual percentages, as in table 12-16, of affordable tickets for middling to upper classes. This part will only deal with the question of peerage participation by observing ticket prices to access whether or not they were accessible to middling to upper classes.

The three pie charts, figures 18-20, represent a break down of the survey of 402 theatre pieces from table 8, chosen for the second part of the study. The charts demonstrate the most commonly attended theatres within the survey. They demonstrate how many pieces were chosen from each of the four periods according to the availability of ticket prices in the London Stage Volumes. The figures also divide the plays into four categories, Desire, benefit, both desire and benefit, and none, desire or benefit. The four categories are based on the following criteria; by particular desire represents those pieces that are desired by the peerage in particular or by people of quality. Benefit represents those performances that are presented as benefits to raise money. None refers to those performances that were neither desired or benefits, and finally both refer to the performances that were both desired and benefits at the same time. These categories along with the places where the performances were presented influenced ticket prices to change.

The classification of the pieces along these four categories is important because these categories change the ticket prices considerably. For example, none would be standard ticket prices in that they were no foreign influences to change ticket prices so for purposes of clarity, the category none will be considered as the standard ticket price. When the pieces are both desired and benefits the ticket pricing may still has a tendency to remain the same because both categories cancel themselves out. When a piece is desired, as mentioned above its publicised "by particular desire" is artificial and therefore aims to attract more people making ticket prices lower. Benefit pieces are more expensive because they were meant to raise money, therefore when by desire and benefits were both involved in the same performance, that is, the same performance was desired by the peerage and was a benefit and was meant to raise money, ticket prices remained the same. However the exception to this rule is when royalty attended these theatre performances then the opposite is true ticket prices will tend to be higher because people wanted to surround themselves with royalty and were willing to pay the price to do so. Finally when a piece is a benefit, which was usually intended for actors, house servants, authors

and charities, ticket prices would tend to be higher because the performances aim was to raise money. Therefore ticket prices were gravely affected by what the performance's category on any given night.

Table 8 is the raw data, that is, the survey of 402 pieces that were selected from the London Stage volumes. The method of selection was simple all the performances that provided ticket prices were selected from the forty years in this study. However one must realise that the survey represents a good portion of pieces from the forty years because the volumes would usually only list the ticket prices once at the start of the season with occasional changes varying according to the status, that is the four categories mentioned above (benefit, desire, none, both). Finally all the information from here on end is all compiled from the survey of table 28.

Figures 21-24 were compiled by selecting performances that appeared more than once in the raw data, with the goal of seeing ticket prices change according to the place where the performance was presented and its category. The figures represent ticket prices in decimal points with the various years in which the performances were shown. One note that is worth mentioning is that when the ticket prices for a year is 0.00, as 1732 from figure 21 demonstrates, it means that either the theatre in question did not have an upper gallery or that no ticket were sold in the upper gallery. The first observation that was made were the differences in ticket prices according to the places where the performances were presented with the only exception being figure 21 and especially figure 24 because Operas were more expensive than other performances and that is clearly demonstrated by the number of box prices at 5s. Or 0.25 in figure 21 not to mention tickets at half a guinea or 0.50 in figure 24. We can see how figures 21-24 demonstrate the differences in ticket prices especially when HAY, CG, DL, and Queen's are concerned. These were the most fashionable theatres and rightly so the tickets were much more expensive. These figures do demonstrate the differences in tickets as far as the influence of the theatre where the performance is presented. However the prices that were charged are justified by tables 9 and 10 which demonstrate that theatre owners were making just enough money to break even and often lost money on the theatre seasons. Therefore the prices that were charged were justified and not a way for theatre owners to keep middling to upper classes out of their theatres.

However there still remains the question of the influence of categories on ticket prices. Figures 21-24 demonstrate that for CG and DL the categories that are neither benefit nor desire remain the same at 5s. 3s., 2s., and 1s.. We do see DL and its 60% increase in prices however this finding is inconclusive because the performance that was being presented was an Opera, which automatically made ticket, prices more expensive. The same can be said for Queen's figures in figures 24, which also shows

no change when the category of the performance changes. The changes arise when the performances are performed in smaller theatres. The problem when trying to prove the influence which change ticket prices one experiences difficulties because so many factors come into play such as the place, the actual performance, category. Additional research and a lot more manipulation of the data, which would demand for an additional set of tables to further, manipulate the data from table 8. However the importance is that new questions have arisen which cannot be sufficiently supported as far as proving the ticket changes due to categories. The influencing factors to the changes in ticket prices are important to this study because this data would have built a theory of expensive ticket prices because of the type/category of event rather than to keep the middling to upper classes out of these events. They would have lent support to tables 9-10, which justify ticket prices.

Tables 9-10 justified ticket prices and serve as proof that theatre was a very risky business in that Covent Garden and Drury Lane were the most fashionable theatres in London and still managed to break even or lose money on several occasions. Table 11 is a subcategory because it represents the opera theatres and the most expensive ticket prices in London. This table is perhaps the clearest indication of peerage control as tickets were always over 5s, and justifiably so. But then again these theatres represent about 20% of the yearly totals as compiled in table 1 for the years 1792-1800. However tables 12-16 will demonstrate some more precise numbers for ticket pricing and their availability to middling to upper classes.

Tables 12-16 was presented to give the reader range of ticket prices in different circumstances such as the theatre where performances were presented which often dictate what ticket prices were. Furthermore tables of this sort often present an endless array of possibilities and only the most obvious were presented focusing on the broad scope of this research. Tables 12-16 offer the average price of tickets for all of the survey of table 28. The first four tables look at individual theatres and table 40 looks at all 402 theatres in the survey. The reason for these tables is to access how many tickets were available at what different prices. They are also very conclusive to support the dominant argument of whether or not the theatres in London in the eighteenth century were open to lower classes. To access this the average mid point of 3s. was established as being reasonable for middling to upper classes to attend theatre performances. One will find that the findings are conclusive.

Table 12 is based on the ticket prices of 27 theatre outings at Covent Garden from the survey of 402 pieces. Added to this is the seating capacity of 3013: 632 in boxes, 1200 in the pit, 820 in the first gallery and 361 in the second gallery. Table 12 establishes that 74.07% of upper gallery seats were priced at less than 3s. Which sat

361 people or 12% of the people, 81.47% of first gallery seats were priced at 2s. which sat 820 or another 27% of the people, 67.03% of pit seats were available at 3s. or less which sat 1200 or 40% of the people. This means those 267 seats in the upper gallery, 668 seats in the first gallery, and 804 seats in the pit were affordable to middling and upper classes, totalling 1,739 seats out of 3013. All this keeping in mind that 40.74% more seats in the pit were also available at just 3s.6d. half a pence more adding another 489 possibilities. Table 13 is based on the ticket prices of 37 theatre outings at Drury Lane from the survey of 402 pieces. The figures are very similar in that, 70.27% of upper gallery seats, 75.67% of first gallery seats, 56.75% of pit seats are available at 3s. or less. Table 14 is based on the ticket prices of 27 theatre outings at King's from the survey of 402 pieces. They reveal a totally different picture no tickets are available in the upper gallery, 40.74% of first gallery tickets, and none in the pit, are available at 3s. or less. Table 15 is based on the ticket prices of 32 theatre outings at Queen's from the survey of 402 pieces. They reveal that 56.26% of tickets in the upper gallery, 68.75% in the first gallery, and 21.88% of pit tickets are available at 3s. or less. These numbers help pin point a figure, which helps to establish a rate of middling to upper class participation as compared to the peerage. However based on this research these numbers can only be a reasonable guess based on the data that was presented. The above data looked at the ticket prices of the most fashionable and understandably most expensive theatres, which shows some fairly good figures for ticket prices at 3s. or less. However the above prices only account for 123 pieces or 31% of the total.

Table 16 reveals that 40.06% of upper gallery seats, 67.17% of first galleries, 52.24% of pit seat, 21.40% of box seats, and finally .5% of stage seats were available at 3s. or less. These figures would be a lot higher because the large number of concerts that are included in the survey, most of which were benefits, with all tickets, regardless of where they were located in the theatre, at 5s. Therefore the concert formula helps in distorting the survey quite significantly. Furthermore these figures are based on the assumption that 3s. is an accurate affordable price for middling to upper classes. Another doubt arises out of the assumption of 3s. in correlation of population figures of London at the time. The peerage was a very small minority in the total population as compared to all the other classes, which raises a new question. The peerage being a very small minority could afford to go to theatre performances several times a week and therefore the peerage numbers had to be mobilised several times a week or month to supply a booming theatre industry in London. The lower classes on the other hand, could not afford these theatres performances as often but could have been able to save and see the theatre once, maybe twice a year. This does not take into account the middling to upper classes, which could go more often to these performances maybe once a month. The question is this: if the lower classes could have been able to see one performance a year their sheer numbers could have made up a significant number of the theatre audience apart from the middling to upper classes.

In conclusion as the above demonstrates many questions remain unanswered and or open to further research. The data suggests that there is room for more research to solidify the findings. However some new questions have been raised as to what role the peerage played in the London theatre industry in the eighteenth century. This study suggests, however, that the role of the peerage was a lot smaller than originally thought. Furthermore the role of the lower classes has been proved with enough relevant data to reassess their role in the theatre audience. However the much-needed data of who attended these pieces in specific may or may not be available. The other question of the changes in the theatre industry on the other hand suggests that the changes came from within the industry as opposed from outside intervention. The changes in the theatre industry in the eighteenth century are not linked politically, or socially but rather on the question of the mechanics of the industry. That is to say the profitability, efficiency, and organisation of the industry was organised in such a way so as to produce the biggest profit possible. Taking into account the risk factor in any entertainment industry, its no accident that the commercialisation of leisure took effect in the mid eighteenth century as a device to attract the largest amount of audiences available, by making it available to all, therefore making a bigger return through volume thus linking the participation of all the classes as opposed to just the peerage. This actually opens another question, the question of economics and considering its part in the commercialisation of leisure. Summing up, however, the risky business of theatre, calling for a regimented structure within an era of commercialisation, stressed that only large volumes of people could keep such an industry alive which lead theatres to aim at attracting large quantities of people as opposed to an acute minority.

These sections should go with the tables!

APPENDIX 1

These are a listing of notable changes that occur within figures 1-5.

Figure 1

1700-1701 experiences a seesaw of peaks and decreases starting in January.

1701-1702 experiences a break in the season from February to April.

1702-1703 experiences a steady rise from March into summer with a drastic increase in June.

1703-1704 experiences a steady increase but also two sudden decreases from February to March and from April to May.

1704-1705 experiences a seesaw of changes similar to 1700-1701.

1705-1706 experiences the greatest increase from Sept to November and the greatest decrease from April to May.

1706-1707 experiences steady increases and decreases.

1707-1708 experiences its peak month in November, then steadily decreases.

1708-1709 experiences a break in its season from October to December.

1709-1710 experiences the highest peak in this figure, experiences a sharp decrease from May to June, and has the longest season.

Figure 2

1710-1711 experiences a sharp decrease from May to June.

1711-1712 experiences a similar decrease as 1710-1711.

1712-1713 experiences the shortest season in figure 2 ending in June.

1713-1714 experiences steady decline from April to June.

1714-1715 experiences steady rises and decreases.

1715-1716 and 1716-1717 were the same in that the both begin their seasons identically. However 1716-1717 continues to peak whereas 1715-1716 declines. They both decline from their peak peak again and then experience similar declines.

Figure 3

1729-1730 is the unstable of seasons in figure 3

1730-1731 experiences a normal pattern, an increase, a decrease, and a steady season.

1731-1732 experiences a very sharp drop from May to June.

1732-1733 experiences a very sharp drop from May to June.

1733-1734 experiences the highest peak for this figure.

1734-1735 experiences a very sharp decrease from May to June.

1735-1736 experiences steady increase and a very sharp decrease from May to June.

Figure 4

All seasons with the exception of 1747,1748 and 1754 end in May. Only 1749 and 1753 start again in July. 1754 ends in June and starts again in August. 1748 experiences the greatest increase in entire study, in a summer season.

Figure 5

Figure five as already mentioned is the most consistent of periods with steady increase and decrease for all seasons. 1793 experiences the highest peak in October. 1799 experiences a sharp increase from March to April.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations

Introduction

Table 01: Total number of Theatre performances per month (raw data)

Table 02: Percentages of Annual Theatre Performances per month and Percentages of Performances when Parliament was not sitting

Table 03: Monthly Percentages Increase/Decrease in Total Theatre Performances

Table 04: Total Number of Musicals per Month

Table 05: Total Number of Concerts per Month

Table 06: Total Number of Theatre Performances by Particular Desire

Table 07: Summary of Tables 1,2 and 4-6

Table 08: Raw Data – All Sample Performances

Table 09: Covent Garden – Receipts/Expenses

Table 10: Drury Lane – Receipts/Expenses

Table 11: Hay Market & King’s – Number of Plays per Year

Table 12: The Distribution of Tickets by Price and Seating Location for the 27 Sample Performances at Covent Garden

Table 13: The Distribution of Tickets by Price and Seating Location for the 37 Sample Performances at Drury Lane

Table 14: The Distribution of Tickets by Price and Seating Location for the 27 Sample Performances at King’s

Table 15: The Distribution of Tickets by Price and Seating Location for the 32 Sample Performances at Queen’s

Table 16: The Distribution of Tickets by Price and Seating Location for the 402 Sample Performances from Raw Data

Figure 01: Total Number of Theatre performances (1700 – 1710)

Figure 02: Total Number of Theatre performances (1710 – 1717)

Figure 03: Total Number of Theatre performances (1729 – 1736)

Figure 04: Total Number of Theatre performances (1747 – 1755)

Figure 05: Total Number of Theatre performances (1792 – 1800)

Figure 06: Total Number of Theatre performances – Selected Years

Figure 07: Total Number of Theatre performances – Selected Years

Figure 08: Total Number of Theatre performances – Selected Years

Figure 09: Total Number of Theatre performances – Selected Years

Figure 10: Average Number of Theatre Performances in Each Month (Raw Data)

Figure 11: Average Number of Theatre Performances in Each Month (Raw Data)

Figure 12: Average Number of Theatre Performances in Each Month (Raw Data)

Figure 13: Average Number of Theatre Performances in Each Month (Raw Data)

Figure 14: Comparison of Performances by Desire, Musicals, Concerts, and All Performances by Year (1700 – 1717)

Figure 15: Comparison of Performances by Desire, Musicals, and All Performances by Year (1729 – 1736)

Figure 16: Comparison of Performances by Desire, Musicals, Concerts and All Performances by Year (1747 – 1755)

Figure 17: Comparison of Concerts and All Performances by Year (1792 – 1800)

Figure 18: Distribution of Performances Among Theatres

Figure 19: Percentage of Theatres Performances per Time Period

Figure 20: Categories of Theatre performances

Figure 21: The Beggars' Opera

Figure 22: The Recruiting Officer

Figure 23: Old Woman's Oratory

Figure 24: Camilla

ABBREVIATIONS

BF	Bartholemew Fair
BHB	The Tiled Booth Blackheath
BLO	Bloomsbury
CC	Chelsea College
CG	Covent Garden
CHL	Clothworker's Hall
CL	Chancery Lane
CORH	Corner House
CT	The Castle Tavern
DL	Theatre Royal, Drury Lane

DR	Dancing Room
DT	Devil Tavern
FE	Mr. Fearnley's
GF	Goodman's Fields
GR	Greenwich
GRT	Great Room
H&P	Hand and Pen
HAW	Hampstead Wells
HAY	Theatre Royal, Haymarket
HDR	Hill's Dancing Room
HDS	Home's Dancing School
HIC	Hickford's
JS	The New Theatre in St. James Street
KING'S	King's Opera House, Haymarket
LIF	Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre
LS	Loe's School
NTW	The New Theatre, Mr. Bradley's Distiller, Old gravel Lane
NWC	The New Wells, London Spa, Clerkenwell
NWLS	The New Wells, Lemon Street
NWSM	The New Wells, South Market
PCGR	Great Room, Peter's Court
PH	Pewterer's
PR	Powlet's Room
QUEEN'S	Queen's Theatre
RIW	Richmond Wells
SF	Southwark Fair
SH	Station's Hall

SHG	Somerset House Garden
SOU	Southwark
TB	Temple Bar
TEC	Tennis Court
TGB	Two Golden balls
TTT	Three Tuns and Bull Head
WH	Whitehead
YB	York Buildings

by Pierre Hobson