Anthony Brewer's the Love-Sick King. Edited from the Quarto of 1655 by A. E. H. Swaen
Review by: G. C. Moore Smith
The Modern Language Review, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Jul., 1907), pp. 361-364
Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713668>
Accessed: 28/06/2014 19:06

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

the autumn of 1613, the former must be ascribed to the late thirties, a year or two before the dramatist's death. There is, of course, not a little speculation in the argument which reaches to these conclusions, and these may be found to be wrong, if, as Mr Greg allows, 'some entirely new and unsuspected evidence' comes to light. In the meantime, Mr Greg's statement is at once the fullest and the most reasonable which has been offered on this difficult question. We are glad to see that Mr Greg does not lay much stress on the so-called evidence of the first line of the Prologue,

He that hath feasted you these forty yeares,

though he calls it 'the only piece of direct testimony' to the date of the play. It should be unnecessary to argue against the literal interpretation of 'forty,' or to suggest that "twenty" or "thirty" would suit the line equally well.' Here, as in so many places in sixteenth and seventeenth century literature, the word signifies nothing but a 'large number' or 'many,' and must be taken in an indefinite sense.

The continuation by Waldron (1744—1818), who was associated with Garrick and was something of a playwright, is reprinted for the first time from the edition of 1783. Waldron's work is by no means contemptible, though it lacks the Jonsonian quality, and, as Mr Greg points out, fails occasionally in details in a way which Jonson would not have done.

G. GREGORY SMITH.

Anthony Brewer's The Love-Sick King. Edited from the Quarto of 1655. By A. E. H. SWAEN. (*Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, XVIII.) Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1907. xiv + 64 pp.

Professor Swaen of Groningen gives us not only a careful reprint of Brewer's play, but a valuable introduction to it in English (and excellent English), and notes on it. He points out that little or nothing is known of Brewer and that we have no certain knowledge of the date or place of production of the play. He makes it probable, however, that it was written early in the reign of James I, and he seems inclined to agree with Mr Fleay in thinking that it was probably produced rather at Newcastle than in London. Is it not, however, a little doubtful if Newcastle was a place of sufficient importance at that time to have a play specially written for its behoof, and, supposing this to have been the case, a little improbable that such a play should have secured such a vogue outside its place of origin as to have been printed fifty years later? Is it not likely that there was some prose romance dealing with the story of Thornton, the Newcastle Dick Whittington, and that this was the basis of Brewer's work? In this case it is not necessary to suppose that he had any special local knowledge, or that he wrote his play primarily for a Newcastle audience. The chief point on the other

side seems to me to be the manner in which the dramatist takes up the cause of Newcastle coal *versus* Croydon charcoal. This topic would be more effective in Newcastle than in London undoubtedly.

As for the evidence of date, Professor Swaen remarks, 'No undue importance should be attached to the fact that our play contains four lines of a song that also occur in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*: such songs were common property.' The reference is to lines 539—542 (see Professor Swaen's note):

I come not hither for to teach,
I have no Pulpit for to preach,
I woo'd th'adst kist me under the Breech,
As thou art a Lady gay. (*Knight*, &c., III, 5. 89—92.)

Professor Swaen does not seem, however, to have noticed that Act II of *The Love-Sick King* opens (ll. 435—7) with another scrap of a song which occurs in the same scene of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (III, 5. 54—58):

Be gone, be gone, my Juggy, my Puggy, be gone my Love, my Dear, my Money
is gone, and ware I have none, but one poor Lamb-skin here.

This is an adaptation to Thornton's case of the lines given in Beaumont's play:

Begone, begone, my juggy, my puggy,
Begone, my love, my dear!
The weather is warm,
'Twill do thee no harm:
Thou canst not be lodged here.

It seems very improbable that Brewer in a hundred lines of his play should quote by a purely accidental coincidence two verses of songs, both of which occur in the same scene of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. If the coincidence, however, is more than accidental, it is clear that Brewer is the borrower, and if *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* was not written till 1607 (Mr Macaulay's date) or 1610—11 (Professor Moorman's in the *Temple Dramatists'* edition), the date of composition of *The Love-Sick King* must be put a little later than Professor Swaen admits.

The notes are partly elucidatory, partly typographical. It would have been more convenient perhaps if the two classes had been kept distinct. One might too have been glad of a few more notes of the former class. For example, there is no note on 'puggy' in the lines quoted above. But compare Marston, Second Part of *Antonio and Mellida*, III, 2. 5: 'The first [husband] I called sweet duck: the second, dear heart: the third, pretty pug.'

There is no note on l. 303:

(It needs no Epithite t' express the Name)
For Cartesmunda is the worlds bright frame.

It might have been worth while to suggest that 'Cartesmunda' seems here to be associated with 'carta mundi.'

l. 1365: 'your late dead husband has left you rich, and full Executrix to be over-seen by Mr Thornton.' A note seems to be required here, pointing out the sixteenth century custom by which a testator appointed not only an executor or executors but 'overseers' of his will. Thus Richard Forsett of Gray's Inn in his will made 15th July, 1561, and proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on 17th October, 1561, constituted Sir William Cecil, Kt, Gilbert Gerard, Esq., and Sir W. Garratt, Kt., 'overseers' of his will.

l. 1566: '*Mauburn hills*.' I suppose, 'Malvern hills,' but there is no note.

l. 1895: 'we get (=gain) by losing it.' l. 1958: 'have the upper shoulder of' (= 'have the advantage of'). These phrases seem worth notice.

A word may be said on some of the notes which Professor Swaen has given.

l. 1577: 'as for my seven hundred followers they are honest Tartarians, and whosoever deals with 'em shall find them grim fellows I assure you. *Thor*. Grim, thou wert always honest.'

Professor Swaen says with regard to 'Tartarians': 'Two words are here mixed up by Grim: (1) *Tartarean* pertaining to Tartarus; (2) *Tartarean* pertaining to Tartary.' He does not notice, however, the further point that, as Prof. Moorman remarks on *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, III, 8. 122, 'Tartarian' was a cant name for thief. (On *Merry Devil of Edmonton*, I, 1. 10, Mr Hugh Walker interprets the word as 'a stroller or gipsy' with a reference to *Merry Wives*, IV, 5. 18, 'A Bohemian-Tartar.') There is probably therefore some point in the addition '*honest Tartarians*.'

l. 1680: 'Phlegitan Acaron and Barrathrum.' On the first two words Professor Swaen remarks, 'Grim means Pyriphlegeton, Acheron.' It is not obvious, however, that Grim should mean 'Pyriphlegeton' rather than 'Phlegethon.' 'Barrathrum' ('barathrum,' the abyss, hell) is left unexplained.

l. 1934: 'and for your former Government of Poretereans we here establish it a Majoralty.' The note runs: '*Poretereans* = proletarians; no doubt a printer's error.' I do not feel convinced of the correctness of the emendation. In the first place 'Proletarians' would not scan in the verse (for the line *is* a verse, 'Government' being practically disyllabic as four lines lower 'with choice of Sheriffs to assist thy Government'). In the second place 'a Government of Proletarians' would be a rather strange phenomenon. I suggest, though doubtfully, 'and for your former Government of *Praetorians*.'

l. 1950: 'to provide Coals, Surreverence, for your Highness own tooth.' The note on 'Surreverence' says nothing of the not uncommon use of 'sir reverence' = 'saving your reverence,' in apology for words used afterwards. Cp. *New Custom* (Hazlitt-Dodsley, III, p. 9): 'It would almost for anger (sir reverence!) make a man to piss.' In the present passage the phrase is an apology for the rather familiar reference to 'your Highness own tooth.'

The play as printed in 1655 has the peculiarity that almost all the blank-verse appears as prose, while rimed lines are generally printed as verse. Professor Swaen says that 'the book of Dr van Dam and Dr Stoffel will frequently enable the student' to see how the blank-verse lines ought to be read. Possibly König's book *Der Vers in Shakespeares Dramen*, would be still more helpful: at any rate, I do not agree with some of the suggestions which are given by Professor Swaen.

Brewer, as I read him, frequently interposes an incomplete line in his blank verse. Thus I read the passage, l. 1752, *et seq.*:

Let's arm ourselves for shame.
Can. Traytor thou hast deserved death ere thou dyest;
 And this thy proud presume shall break thy neck,
 For chafing our high blood
 O love thou art unjust, I feel assaults
 Far sharper in my breast
 Then all the English Forces 'gainst this wall, &c.

Professor Swaen scans ll. 1752-4 as follows:

Let's arm | ourselves | for shame | Tray'th hast | deserved
 Death ere | thou dyest | and this | thy proud | presume |

Again on l. 1801: 'that broken with my wish is faln upon me.' Professor Swaen writes: 'In order to scan the line, we must substitute "on" or "pon" for "upon."' But it is a feature of Brewer's verse that he has a large percentage of feminine endings.

I hope that the criticisms I have ventured to make will not be taken as any sign of ingratitude to Professor Swaen for the really valuable gift which he has made to students in this edition of Brewer's play.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

John Fletcher. A Study in Dramatic Method. By O. L. HATCHER.
 (University of Chicago: Department of English.) Chicago: Scott,
 Foresman & Co. 1905. 8vo. 114 pp.

Mr Hatcher's study of what may be termed Fletcher's dramatic personality is clearly suggested by the brilliant essay in which Mr G. C. Macaulay defined the literary individuality of Fletcher's greater collaborator. Since, however, the present dissertation leaves on one side the still-vexed question of the division of work, and is, moreover, wanting in the power of acute literary perception which lent fascination to its predecessor, it cannot pretend to any very general interest. This by no means implies that it is not within its limits an honest and competent and therefore useful piece of work. The author takes a number of plays of undisputed Fletcherian authorship and attempts from a careful consideration of them to form some general idea of the dramatist's methods of work and powers of artistic construction. The