

- Tuesday 6**
DL Mrs Cross, Miss Cole, Miss Wright. With Additional Reinforcements of Bayes's New Rais'd Troops.
COMMENT. [Not allowed to be performed. Macklin's faction rioted.] N.B.: This caused riot House taken [apart].—Winston MS. [See *The Case of Charles Macklin*. Macklin did not return to DL until 19 Dec. 1744.]
- CG SHE WOU'D AND SHE WOU'D NOT As 16 Nov. (*London Daily Post and General Advertiser*). Also THE SCHOOL BOY. As 21 Oct.
DANCING. *Scotch Dance*, as 24 Nov.
- King's ROXANA. *Cast not listed*, but see 15 Nov.
- Wednesday 7**
DL THE RECRUITING OFFICER. As 22 Nov. Also THE ANATOMIST. As 18 Nov.
DANCING. III: *Italian Masquerade*, as 26 Nov.
COMMENT. Tomorrow Morning will be publish'd A Full Answer to a False and scandalous Libel, entitled the *Case of Charles Macklin*, Comedian. In which will be inserted several original letters relating to that Dispute, by David Garrick.
- CG THE MISER. As 17 Nov., but without the Occasional Prologue. Also THE LOTTERY. As 25 Nov., but Chloe – Mrs Clive.
DANCING. *Les Paisans Moissonneurs*, as 26 Oct.
- Thursday 8**
DL THE REHEARSAL. As 6 Dec.
COMMENT. No Money will be taken behind the scenes, nor any money to be return'd after the Curtain is drawn up. The following Letter, signed A By-Stander was inserted in the *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*:
As I am absolutely unconcerned in all the now subsiding Theatrical Disputes, I hope the following observations upon what happened last Tuesday Night at Drury Lane will not be thought unworthy the Publick attention.
The Manager of a theatre is to regard the General sense of the Town, and not any Faction form'd thru pique or resentment; Such a Faction may be Noisy, it may be Insolent, but never can be Considerable enough to force either the Manager or the Publick into their terms. Their outrages are equally insults upon the Understanding of the Town, as they are injuries to the Property of the Manager. Therefore if the Manager shall at any time give way to such proceedings, Then and not till *Then*, the Publick has a right to find fault with him. The stage *Then* becomes a property to the insolence of a few misled people; and all theatrical diversions, which in this and other countries used to be directed by Decency and Publick Approbation are sacrificed to a pitiful Personal Resentment.
If the above propositions are undeniable, the following *Queries* are submitted to the Publick, and the answer to them will determine the Reasonableness of the Tuesday Night Riot: I. Whether the Rioters were not Inconsiderable in their numbers and Circumstances? II: Whether any Gentleman can answer to himself, for doing in a Body, a thing which no Gentleman can justify for doing by himself? III. Whether the Rioters can justify their breaking into the Boxes, and taking possession of the seats, which were taken by many persons of Quality and Distinction, at the same time refusing to pay anything; thereby robbing the Manager of all the money of the Boxes, and most part of the Pit? IV. Whether the Manager ought to suffer in his property for the private quarrel between any two actors, as was the case . . . ? V. Whether if such insolences are not discountenanced in the *most effectual manner* by the Town, any publick diversion can continue longer than a noisy inconsiderable Cabal pleases? VI. Whether any other motive than a regard to Public Decency would have hindered the Manager and Mr. Garrick's friends (who were treble the number) from treating the rioters as they deserved? I should be glad to see the above questions fairly and impartially answered.