

Renters' Dividends 1852 - 1880

Dividends paid to debenture holders of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane

YEAR	DIVIDEND	IN 2018 VALUES	LESSEE
1852	NIL	NIL	Jullien and Gye
1853	£?	£?	E. T. Smith
1854	£3	£327	E. T. Smith
1855	£2	£212	E. T. Smith
1856	NIL	NIL	E. T. Smith
1857	£2	£222	E. T. Smith
1858	£3	£366	E. T. Smith
1859	£3 10s	£432	E. T. Smith
1860	£3	£358	E. T. Smith
1861	£3 10s	£409.24	E. T. Smith
1862	£3 15s	£448	E. T. Smith
1863	£4 15s	£586.25	E. T. Smith
1864	£6	£749	Edmund Falconer
1865	£6 6s	£777.55	Edmund Falconer
1866	£7	£818	Edmund Falconer
1867	£7 6s 8d	£807	F. B. Chatterton
1868	£7 10s	£833.10	F. B. Chatterton
1869	£8	£935	F. B. Chatterton
1870	£8 5s	£964.64	F. B. Chatterton
1871	£8 5s	£954.59	F. B. Chatterton
1872	£8 5s	£916.41	F. B. Chatterton
1873	£8 5s	£881.16	F. B. Chatterton
1874	£8 15s	£971.95	F. B. Chatterton
1875	£9 2s 6d	£1,034.28	F. B. Chatterton
1876	£11	£1,247	F. B. Chatterton
1877	£12 10s	£1,431.44	F. B. Chatterton
1878	£11 17s 6d	£1,388.50	F. B. Chatterton
1879	£7	£854	No lessee appointed
1880	£5	£591	Augustus Harris

Note: 2018 values taken from the [Bank of England Inflation Calculator](#)

As a result of its long and tumultuous history, the ownership of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, was more complicated than that of any other nineteenth century British theatre.¹ In 1791 Richard Brinsley Sheridan financed the rebuilding of Drury Lane by issuing 300 debenture shares costing £500 each. These debenture holders, known as the ‘new renters’, were entitled to free admission to all performances plus a dividend of 2s. 6d. for every night the theatre was open. On a typical season of 200 nights, the renters expected to receive a dividend of £25 per annum.

Sheridan’s Drury Lane opened in 1794 and burnt down in 1809. During that time Sheridan had created havoc with the theatre’s finances and the new renters received virtually nothing by way of dividends. Following the fire, a committee was formed – to be known as the committee of proprietors – with the aim of rebuilding the theatre. This committee was under the chairmanship of Samuel Whitbread, MP and heir to the brewing fortune, who had the unenviable task of establishing the true level of indebtedness into which Sheridan had run Drury Lane and reaching an accommodation with creditors that was a prerequisite for any programme of fundraising for a new theatre. It was essential to secure the support of the new renters for the rebuilding project, otherwise they could have claimed the insurance money in lieu of their unpaid dividends, which would have made rebuilding impossible. Whitbread therefore offered them extremely generous terms. They were promised that their rights of free admission would continue in the new theatre and that they would still receive a dividend, even though their investment had been in the old theatre destroyed by fire. In return, the renters accepted a halving of their dividend to 1s. 3d. per night, or £12 10s. per annum for a typical season of 200 nights. Crucially, the Act of Parliament which established the committee of proprietors and formalised the arrangements stated that the new renters had *first claim* on the theatre’s income: they had to be paid before anyone else.

The difficult decades of the 1820s and the 1830s saw many managements collapse with rent unpaid. As this rent was the source of the dividends, renters received dividends that were far below £12 10s. and sometimes nothing at all.

The relationship between the proprietors and the renters was characterised by poisonous mutual mistrust. Because the Act of Parliament for the rebuilding of Drury Lane had given the renters first claim, there were many years in which, after paying the renters’ dividend and paying the Duke of Bedford the rent, the proprietors received no dividend at all. They had the legal responsibility for running the theatre and maintaining the fabric; they were involved in

long and complex negotiations as management after management collapsed, making Drury Lane harder to let; and they were doing this effectively on a voluntary basis. Not unnaturally, the proprietors felt that the situation was unfair and it was often objected at their meetings that the renters, who had paid nothing towards the existing theatre, were receiving dividends while the proprietors, who had actually put up the money to build it, received nothing. The renters, on the other hand, were frustrated that their dividends depended on arrangements entered into by another body in which, by the terms of the Act, they could play no part. The proprietors criticised the proprietors for taking on unsuitable lessees, for not charging enough rent, for letting the theatre stay closed for long periods and for allowing unsuitable entertainments to take place such as concerts and wild beast shows.

However much the renters complained about the behaviour of the proprietors, there was little they could do about it until, in 1839, George Robins, one of London's leading auctioneers, decided to turn the renters into an activist body. Robins was both a renter and a proprietor and had served on the committee of the proprietors for a number of years until he resigned in protest at what he felt was the unjust treatment of the renters. He brought a case before the Court of Chancery requesting that trustees should be appointed to represent the interests of the renters and that these trustees should be given the power to inspect the books and see what was happening to the money. Three trustees were appointed, of whom Robins was one, and as a result of their inspection they brought an action against the proprietors demanding £14,941 for arrears of their dividends. Had they pursued this, it would have resulted in the closure of the theatre, which would have been in no one's interest. They therefore negotiated the amount down to £1,407 10s. 9d. which, after costs, came to £1,302. The renters added to this sum £200 from their own resources so that each renter – there were 300 shares – received a dividend of £5, the largest for many years. Moving forward, the proprietors agreed to hand over to the trustees of the renters £5 for every night the theatre was open.²

The annual meeting of the proprietors, which took place in the saloon of the theatre on Saturday 30 October 1841 was a stormy one. Proprietors were angry that this large sum of money had been handed over to the renters to pay them a handsome dividend when the proprietors were left with nothing at all. It was alleged that the proprietors had 'slipped through' the clause in the act of parliament that gave them first claim and that they had 'diddled' Samuel Whitbread into giving them an advantage over the proprietors. The result of this was that, since the opening of the theatre in 1812, the renters had received £63,082 in dividends while the proprietors, who had actually paid for the theatre, had received £18,691.

Most of these dividends to the proprietors had been paid in the early years when Edmund Kean's electrifying performances had packed Drury Lane night after night for a few seasons. One of those present said he had become a member of the company of proprietors in 1816 and hadn't received a single penny.

This view was robustly contested by George Robins who, as he was still a proprietor, could put the renters' point of view at proprietors' meetings. He compared the situation to that of a property on which there are two mortgages. (As an auctioneer, he was well acquainted with such arrangements.) Suppose, he said, that a mortgage of £100,000 had been raised against a property, and then a second mortgage was taken out for a further £100,000. The property burnt down and was found to have been worth only £100,000. Would the two mortgagors agree to share the £100,000 between them? Of course not! The holder of the first mortgage would get everything and the holder of the second mortgage nothing. The proprietors were unconvinced and pointed out that the renters had advanced no money at all towards the construction of the present building, so the case was not comparable.³

The renters continued to insist upon receiving £5 for every night the theatre was open, whether or not the season was making a profit, which meant that they took no share in the risk of running the theatre. The proprietors continued to object to the unfairness of the arrangement and came up with a proposal to share both the risk and dividends between proprietors and renters, on the basis that they were in the same boat and should share the rowing. The renters' trustees refused to even put this proposal forward for discussion.⁴

As the renters became more activist and more aggressive towards the proprietors, the latter realised that they needed to become better organised. Their annual meetings were sparsely attended, with usually no more than a dozen people present, most of whom were members of the committee. On two occasions there was a request for a full and up-to-date list of the proprietors so that these people could be encouraged to attend meetings and play an active part in the affairs of the body. The secretary said that this was impossible because the shares had been worthless for so long that people had ceased to register deaths and transfers. No one knew who most of the current proprietors were and they probably didn't know themselves. 'It [Drury Lane] is looked upon as a by-gone property, and nobody cares about it.'⁵

The decade of the 1840s was even more problematic for Drury Lane than the previous two decades had been, and after a series of disastrous and sometimes very short managements, the proprietors offered the lease to E. T. Smith at a very low rent, compared with what had been

asked in the past. However, Smith brought stability to Drury Lane and, with the exception of two years when things went badly for him, he paid the rent as agreed and on time for the next ten years. The renters received dividends, but not at the level they felt they had a right to expect. In most years the dividend amounted to £2 or £3, with nothing at all in 1852 and 1856. The agreement to giving the renters' trustees £5 for every night the theatre was open fell into disuse when there simply was not enough rent coming in to pay such sums. The dividend became unpredictable as the proprietors balanced income against expenditure for each season and transferred to the trustees of the renters whatever could be spared. One of the regular complaints made by the renters was that the proprietors held back unnecessarily large sums in reserves which should have been turned into dividends. In their defence, the proprietors argued that they had to hold enough in reserve to cover urgent repairs, especially in the case of fire. Fire was a frequent topic of conversation at annual meetings as Drury Lane had no fire insurance, the premiums being too high to be viable.

The relationship between the proprietors and the renters continued to be toxic. Renters were frequently encouraged to purchase proprietors' shares (which were worth very little) so that they could attend meetings and put their point of view. At one stage there was even talk of introducing a bill in parliament to have the proprietors stripped of their powers and the management of the theatre vested in the renters, although this came to nothing.⁶ Nevertheless, the proprietors seemed to accept the renters as a sort of official opposition, and they were allowed to hold their general meetings in the saloon at Drury Lane, rather than in George Robins's auction rooms, usually a few weeks after the general meeting of the proprietors.

It was against this background of low dividends and enmity between proprietors and renters that Chatterton's achievement should be assessed. He took the dividends on a remarkable upward trajectory until, in 1877, the dividend came to £12 10s. – the original level that had been agreed so many years before when the renters were promised 1s. 3d. a night on a season of 200 nights, and which had long been regarded as unattainable.

The dividends listed in the table above are based on newspaper reports of the annual meetings of both proprietors and renters plus (in some years) announcements of the dividend for the year in the classified columns of *The Times*, usually towards the end of January. The amount transferred by the proprietors to the trustees of the new renters was almost always given in reports of the proprietors' meetings, but the actual dividend was not always given. This was more likely to be announced at renters' meetings, particularly as it climbed each year under

Chatterton's management and the chairman of the meeting would congratulate the renters on receiving the highest dividends for many years. However there are some years for which we do not have the exact amount in any reports. As there were 300 renters' shares, and the amount allocated is often exactly divisible by 300, it is tempting to assume that this simple division will provide the dividend for years when it is not specified. However, the renters had their own running costs that had to be paid out of the amount they received from the proprietors. For example, they paid James Robins, their secretary, a salary of 70 guineas a year until 1874, when it went up to 100 guineas.⁷ This meant that the amount of the dividend was reduced by a few shillings for each share. The financial statement for 1871 shows how a potential dividend of £8 10s. was reduced to £8 5s. after disbursements.⁸

Financial Statement of the Trustees for the Renters or Debenture Holders of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane

Dr.	£	s.	d.	Cr.	£	s.	d.
1871				1871			
January. Balance brought forward from former account	37	13	3	Jan. 10. Dividend of £8 5s. Declared	2,475	0	0
Dec. 31. Cash received from the Committee of Proprietors	2,550	0	0	Secretary's salary and disbursements for the year	72	9	4
				Balance	40	3	11
	2,587	13	3		2,587	13	3

However, there were years in which the renters appear to have been holding sufficient reserves not to have to make any deductions. For example, in 1858 the sum transferred by the proprietors was £900 and this did result in a dividend of £3.⁹ In years for which the sum transferred was exactly divisible by 300 and we have no other confirmation of the dividend (e.g. 1857), I have assumed that no running costs were deducted. Even if this were not the case, it would make a difference of only a few shillings per share, and would not affect the remarkable upwards trajectory of dividends under Chatterton's management.

There are a few years in which do not know the amount transferred by the proprietors to the renters or else we lack the actual dividend, but the dividend was referred to by the chairman

of a subsequent meeting. In the absence of further evidence, these back-announcements have been inserted in the table, e.g. 1879.

Sources for the table of dividends

1852: There is no surviving report of any meeting of the proprietors or renters for 1852. However, at the 1853 meeting of proprietors there was reference to the year that has passed since the last meeting. The chairman of the 1864 proprietors' meeting announced that there had been no dividends between 1836 and 1852.¹⁰ This was an exaggeration as there had been some dividends paid in the period, but it suggests that there was an 1852 meeting although there was no dividend.

1853/1854: The general meeting was held on 9 July 1853. According to *The Daily News*, there was a dividend but: 'The payment already made to the renters is only an instalment on the present season, and, although small in amount, it is hoped that it may be augmented from time to time, as funds come into the hands of the committee, from the resources of their lessee, and otherwise, to enable them to make further payments to the renters.'¹¹ No sum is stated. The chairman of the 1863 proprietors' meeting gave £2 as the dividend for this year, but £2 would not have been described as 'small' after many years of no dividends at all. There was no general meeting of the proprietors in 1854, but James Robins, secretary to the renters, placed a classified advertisement in *The Times* of 23 January 1854 announcing a dividend of £3.00. It looks as if this was the dividend on which a small first instalment had been made in the previous July.

1855: The 1855 general meeting of the proprietors, held on 30 January, was the first meeting since July 1853 and published accounts for 18 months. The sum transferred to the renters was given as £650: £350 on 30 December 1854 and £300 on 27 January 1855. Divided by 300, would have provided a dividend of £2 3s. However, the actual dividend was announced in *The Times* of 31 January 1855 as £2.¹²

1856: At the general meeting of the proprietors, held on 31 January, it was announced that no dividend was payable and no arrears of rent had been paid to the Duke of Bedford.¹³ At the general meeting of the new renters on 31 March the situation was described as being so bad that the original £500 shares were scarcely saleable at 30 guineas, and rights to free admission, formerly saleable at £4 to £5 for the season, were changing hands at £1. The meeting was adjourned until July to receive a report.¹⁴

1857: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 29 January it was announced that £600 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. A dividend of £2 has been assumed in the absence of any evidence that costs were deducted.¹⁵

1858: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 28 January it was announced that £900 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. A dividend of £3 had already been announced in *The Times* on 31 December 1857.¹⁶

1859: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 27 January it was announced that £1,050 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would give a dividend of £3 10s. In accepting a vote of thanks, E. T. Smith congratulated himself on increasing the dividend from £3 last year to £3 14s. this year.¹⁷ Either this is a reporting error

or Smith himself made a mistake, because the dividend could not have been more than £3 10s. It was reported as such by the chairman of the 1863 meeting (see below).

1860: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 26 January it was announced that £900 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. A dividend of £3 had already been announced in *The Times* of 2 January. The chairman of the meeting referred to the dividend as ‘larger in amount than many that had been paid within the last eight or nine years, and equal to the highest of all except that of last year’.¹⁸

1861: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 26 January it was announced that £1,050 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £3 10s. and James Robins, secretary to the renters, confirmed the dividend as £3 10s. when he was auctioning a renter’s share in February.¹⁹

1862: The dividend was announced in a classified advertisement in *The Times* of 9 January 1862 as £3 15s. At the meeting of the proprietors on 25 January it was announced that £1,250 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £4 3s. so costs had been deducted to the amount of 8s. per share.²⁰

1863: The dividend was announced in a classified advertisement placed in *The Times* on 8 January 1863 as £4 15s. At the meeting of the proprietors on 31 January it was announced that £1,550 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £5 3s. so costs had been deducted to the value of 8s. per share.²¹

The chairman of the 1863 meeting responded to a complaint that the proprietors were withholding money in reserves that should have gone towards dividends by listing the dividends over the previous decade, showing how they had risen. The figures he gave [with the actual figure for each year in square brackets] were:

1853: £2 [?]; 1854: £2 [£3]; 1855: £1 [£2]; 1856: £2 [nil]; 1857: £3 [£2]; 1858: £3 10s [£3]; 1859: £3 [£3 10s]; 1860: £3 10s [£3]; 1861: no figure given [£3 10s]; 1862: £4 [£3 15s.]

Either the chairman forgot, or the journalist reporting the meeting missed the fact, that there had been no dividend in 1856. If this adjustment is made, and all amounts from 1856 onwards are moved on by one year, then the figures correspond to the dividends that were paid in each year from 1857 to 1860.²²

1864: At the meeting of the proprietors on 30 January it was announced that £1,850 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £6 3s. The actual dividend was £6.²³

1865: The dividend was announced in a classified advertisement in *The Times* of 6 January 1865 as £6 6s. (six guineas). At the general meeting of the proprietors on 28 January it was announced that £1,950 had been transferred to the renters.²⁴ Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £6 10s. so costs had been deducted to the amount of 4s. per share.

1866: At the annual meeting of the renters on 21 February 1866 it was announced that £2,100 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters and that this had resulted in a dividend of £7, so no costs had been deducted.²⁵

1867: At the annual meeting of the renters on 20 February it was reported that £2,200 had been transferred to the trustees of the new renters.²⁶ Divided by 300, this would give £7 6s. 8d. Although this sounds like an odd amount, in the days of pre-decimal currency payments often involved multiples of 6s. 8d. which represented one-third of a pound. It has therefore been assumed that no costs were deducted in this year.

1868: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 29 January it was announced that £2,250 had been paid to the trustees of the new renters. As the figure is divisible by 300, and there is no evidence of costs being deducted, a dividend of £7 10s. has been assumed.²⁷ At the renters' meeting on 26 February, the dividend was described as larger than any for many years past.²⁸

1869: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 2 February it was announced that £2,400 had been paid to the trustees of the new renters. At the meeting of renters on 25 February, the dividend was confirmed as £8, the largest since 1842.²⁹

1870: The reports of the general meeting of the proprietors on 7 February contain no reference to the sum transferred to the new renters and there are no reports of the renters' meeting. However, it was confirmed at the renters' meeting in following year that the dividend for both 1870 and 1871 was £8 5s.³⁰

1871: At the meeting of the proprietors on 2 February the amount transferred to the renters was given as £2,550. Divided by 300, this would have provided a dividend of £8 10s. However, at the renters' meeting on 23 February, the dividend was given as £8 5s., the same as in the previous year, which was the largest dividend since 1836 when £25 5s. 6d. had been paid.³¹

1872: The annual meeting of the renters was held on 22 February, before the general meeting of proprietors had taken place. This was so unusual that there were complaints from renters, as they received no financial statement. However, the dividend had been announced as £8 5s.³² At general meeting of the proprietors on 15 July it was announced that £2,550 had been paid to the trustees of the new renters.³³ Divided by 300, this would have given a dividend of £8 10s., so the dividend had been reduced by 5s. per share to contribute towards renters' funds.

1873: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 19 July it was announced that £2,600 had been paid to the trustees of the new renters.³⁴ Divided by 300, this would give a dividend of £8 13s 4d. However, at the annual meeting of renters on 21 August, it was stated that the actual dividend had been £8 5s., as it had been 'for the four years last past'.³⁵

1874: On 14 January James Robins, secretary of the trustees of the new renters, placed a classified advertisement in *The Times* (p.8) advising renters that the dividend payable was £8 15s. The dividend was confirmed at the renters' meeting on 22 August, at which it was reiterated that the dividend for 1870, 1871, 1872 and 1873 had been £8 5s. It was also confirmed at this meeting that the total amount transferred to the trustees of the new renters had been £2,675. Divided by 300, this would have yielded a dividend of £8 18s. so some funds were held back for the reserve.³⁶

1875: The dividend announced at the annual meeting of the renters on 31 July 1875 was £9 2s. 6d., the largest for forty years.³⁷

1876: At the annual meeting of the proprietors on 15 July 1876, the amount transferred to the trustees of the new renters was given as £3,500, which, divided by 300, would have yielded £11 13s 4d per share. However, at the annual meeting of the renters on 1 August 1876, the actual dividend was announced as £11.³⁸

1877: At the annual meeting of the proprietors on 21 July 1877, the amount transferred to the trustees of the renters was given as £3,800. Divided by 300, this would have yielded a dividend of £12 13s 4d. However, at the annual meeting of the renters on 4 August 1877, the actual dividend as given as £12 10s.³⁹

1878: At the general meeting of the proprietors on 25 July 1878 it was announced that £3,600 had been given to the trustees of the new renters. Divided by 300, this would have come to £12 per share, but the actual dividend awarded was £11 17s. 6d.⁴⁰

1879: At the annual meeting of renters it was reported that £2,150 had been paid to the trustees of the new renters. The reason for the lower amount (compared with recent years) was that Chatterton had fallen so far behind with his rent by December 1878, the committee anticipated (correctly) that they might soon be facing the prospect of paying the theatre's running costs. Divided by 300 the amount would have yielded £7 3s. per share, but a report in *The Times* the following year gave the actual dividend as £7.⁴¹

1880: A report in *The Times* gave the dividend as £5.⁴²

¹ Tracy C. Davis (2000) *The Economics of the British Stage 1800 – 1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 256

² 'Drury Lane Theatre: The New Renters', *The Times*, Thursday 9 December 1841, 3

³ *The Times*, 1 November 1841, 6; *Morning Chronicle*, 2 November 1841; *Morning Post*, 1 November 1841

⁴ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *Morning Post*, 29 July 1847; 'Drury Lane Theatre: Meeting of Proprietors', *London Daily News*, 29 July 1847; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 1 August 1847

⁵ 'Drury Lane Theatre: Meeting of the Proprietors', *Morning Chronicle*, 21 August 1848; *Morning Post* 21 August 48; *Morning Advertiser*, 21 August 48; *The Era*, 20 August 1848. See also the reports of the 1841 meeting, above, note 3

⁶ *The Era*, 6 August 1876

⁷ 'Drury Lane Renters', *The Era*, 30 August 1874

⁸ 'Meeting of Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 26 February 1871

⁹ 'Drury Lane Theatre – Meeting of Proprietors', *The Era*, Sunday 31 January 1858 and classified advertisement in *The Times* giving the dividend as £3 on 31 December 1857.

¹⁰ 'Meeting of the Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, 1 February 1864

¹¹ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Daily News*, Monday 11 July 1853

¹² *The Morning Post*, Wednesday 31 January 1855, 3; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 31 January 1855 9; *The Standard*, 31 January 1855; 'Meeting of Drury Lane Proprietors', *The Era*, 4 February 1855

¹³ *The Morning Chronicle*, 2 February 1856

¹⁴ 'Meeting of Drury Lane Renters', *The Morning Post*, Thursday 3 April 1856, 5

¹⁵ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, Sunday 1 February 1857; *The Times*, Friday 30 January 1857, 6

¹⁶ 'Drury Lane Theatre – Meeting of Proprietors', *The Era*, 31 January 1858. 'Theatre Royal, Drury Lane', classified advertisement *The Times*, 31 December 1857, 6

¹⁷ 'Meeting of the Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 30 January 1859

¹⁸ 'Meeting of Drury Lane Proprietors', *The Era*, 29 January 1860

¹⁹ 'Sale of Renters' and Proprietors' Shares in the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane', *The Morning Post*, 28 February 1861, 3

-
- ²⁰ 'Theatre Royal, Drury Lane', *The Morning Post*, 27 January 1862
- ²¹ 'Meeting of the Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era* (Town Edition) 1 Feb 1863, 15; 'Drury Lane Theatre Proprietors', *The Morning Post*, 2 February 1863, 3
- ²² 'Meeting of the Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 1 Feb 1863, 15
- ²³ 'Meeting of the Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *Morning Post*, 1 February 1864; 'The Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 31 January 1864
- ²⁴ 'Drury Lane Company of Proprietors (Yesterday)', *The Era*, 29 January 1865, 15
- ²⁵ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 22 February 1866, 6; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, 22 February 1866, 2; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Standard*, 22 February 1866, 2
- ²⁶ 'Debenture Holders and Renters of Drury Lane', *The Era*, 24 February 1867
- ²⁷ 'Annual Meeting of Drury Lane Proprietors', *The Era*, 2 Feb 1868; 'Meeting of Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, 30 January 1868, 8
- ²⁸ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Standard*, 27 February 1868
- ²⁹ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 7 February 1869; 'Meeting of the Debenture Holders of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, Sunday 28 February 1869
- ³⁰ 'Drury Lane Theatre Company', *The Era*, 13 February 1870; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 8 February 1870, 5; 'Drury Lane Theatre Company', *The Morning Post*, 8 February 1870; 'Meeting of Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, Sunday 26 February 1871
- ³¹ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 3 February 1871, 3; 'Meeting of Proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 5 February 1871; 'Meeting of Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, Sunday 26 February 1871
- ³² 'The Drury Lane Debenture Holders', *The Era*, 25 February 1872, 13
- ³³ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, Thu 18 July 72, 8
- ³⁴ 'Railway and Other Companies', *The Times*, 21 July 1873, 8
- ³⁵ 'Drury Lane Renters', *The Era*, 24 August 1873; see also 'Railway and Other Companies', *The Times*, 22 August 1873 5; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, Friday 22 August 1873, 3
- ³⁶ 'Drury Lane Renters', *The Era*, 30 August 1874
- ³⁷ 'Report of the Renters' Committee to the Debenture Holders of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane', *The Era*, 1 August 1875; 'The Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, 2 August 1875, 8; 'The Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 8 August 1875
- ³⁸ *The Times*, 17 July 1876, 7; *The Era*, 6 August 1876
- ³⁹ *The Times*, 23 July 1877, 6; 'Meeting of Drury Lane Proprietors', *The Era*, 29 July 1877, 5; 'Report of the Renters' Committee', *The Era*, 5 August 1877, 7; 'Meeting of the Renters of Drury Lane Theatre', *The Era*, 12 August 1877, 10
- ⁴⁰ 'Theatre Royal, Drury Lane', *The Era*, Sunday 28 July 1878, 5; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *Touchstone*, 27 July 1878, 4; 'Drury Lane Renters', *The Era*, 4 August 1878, 5; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 7 August 1878, 5; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *Touchstone*, 10 August 1878, 6
- ⁴¹ 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Morning Post*, 28 July 1879; 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 31 July 1880, 10
- ⁴² 'Drury Lane Theatre', *The Times*, 31 July 1880, 10