Review

Author(s): W. W. Greg

Review by: W. W. Greg

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Apr., 1908), pp. 293-294

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713718>

Accessed: 01-03-2016 23:06 UTC

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>

this play with y^e dumb K^t:'. I so far disagree with Professor Bang that I do not think that the resemblance to which this entry points can be accidental, but a comparison of the *Queen* with Markham and Machin's play will bring out almost more than anything else its similarity with the minor works of John Ford.

W. W. GREG.

The Hector of Germanie or the Palsgrave Prime Elector. By WENTWORTH SMITH. Edited by L. W. PAYNE, jr. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania: Philology and Literature, vol. XI.) Philadelphia: J. C. Winston Co., 1906. 8vo. 146 pp.

The *Hector of Germany* was printed in quarto in 1615, with the name 'W. Smith' on the title-page and 'W. Smyth' at the end. It appears that, though there is only one edition, there are two distinct title-pages. The copy in the Library of the University of Pennsylvania has both, one of which agrees with the Boston Public Library and the other with the British Museum copy. Why Mr Payne has only reproduced one is not explained: happily he has chosen the American variety, so that English bibliographers can place the two side by side. The text has stood a partial but careful testing fairly well: l. 279, *for* to be a Gentleman Porter *read* to be Gentleman Porter; l. 1117, *for* *Frence* *read* *French*; l. 1556, *for* *hair* *read* *haire*; l. 1562, *for* *seldome* *read* *seeldome*. Such spellings as *Uandome* and *PALSGRAUE* are, of course, absurd. The notes are rather meagre. The printing, like so much American University printing is bad: dirty press-work and careless composition; for instance, why, in the list of characters, should the name *BRANDENBURGH* be favoured with a special type all to itself?

The chief point of interest in connection with the play is the identity of the author. We learn from the epistle dedicatory that an earlier play by the same writer, entitled the *Freeman's Honour*, had been acted by the King's men 'to dignifie the worthy Companie of the Marchantaylors,' while the present piece, written in honour of the Princess Elizabeth's suitor, was performed, not by any regular company, but 'by a Company of Young-men of this Citie.' The earlier bibliographers, from Edward Phillips to Stephen Jones, gave the author the Christian name of William. Two William Smiths are known to literature about this time (one familiar as the author of *Chloris*, the other an obscure heraldic writer), but neither is likely to have had anything to do with our play. Later bibliographers of the drama, including the compiler of the *List of English Plays* issued by the Bibliographical Society, ascribe the play to Wentworth Smith, and it is with these that Mr Payne finds himself in agreement. It is, however, doubtful whether this ascription has much more to recommend it than the others. Wentworth Smith is known as an industrious stage hack in the pay of the companies connected with Philip Henslowe, and his name appears as part author of fifteen plays between 1601 and 1603.

There is no reason to suppose that a single line of this work survives. The only other plays that come into consideration are *Saint George for England* mentioned in Warburton's very questionable list and there ascribed to William Smith, an attribution which may reasonably be regarded with suspicion in view of the consensus of early bibliographers; and the *Foul Fair One* licensed by Herbert, Nov. 28, 1623, as 'written by Smith.' Now the authority of the early bibliographers on the question of a Christian name, in such a case as the present, in which we are quite unable to discover the ground of the attribution, must be regarded as negligible, and Mr Payne is quite right in rejecting it. But his acceptance of the ascription to Wentworth Smith is less satisfactory. We have on the one hand a W. Smith who is a hack collaborator in plays written for the regular companies from 1601-3, and again a W. Smith, obviously closely connected with the City guilds, who produces two plays more than ten years later. I hardly think that, considering the frequency of the name, we can with any reasonable certainty assume their identity. Several other plays were published in the seventeenth century with the initials 'W. S.', but Mr Payne very rightly concludes that they have no connection with Smith whatever: the initials were certainly intended to suggest another.

The Introduction is open to a good deal of criticism in detail, for the editor's judgments are more fluent than his acquaintance with his subject quite justifies. A little more familiarity with bibliography would have saved him (p. 48) from manufacturing a printer out of the initials of the Stationers' Register; while a more careful study of Henslowe's Diary and the allied documents would have warned him against assuming (pp. 12 and 42) that recorded payments to collaborators are proportional to their shares in the work, and a less exclusive reliance on Collier's edition would have prevented his perpetuating (p. 14) the forgery of the 'Northern Man.' The remark (p. 17) that the property-entries show that the title of the *Black Dog of Newgate* is not metaphorical, suggests that Mr Payne is unacquainted with the extant chapbook upon which the play was doubtless founded. It may also be remarked that it has been habitual to suppose that the silk flag of Sept. 4, 1602 (p. 49) was for the playhouse-mast, not for the performance; also that *Alphonsus of Germany* was printed in 1654 not 1645 (p. 37). Lastly Mr Payne will do well to be more careful with classical names: he has *Casino* for *Casina*, *Clerumenæ* for *Clerumenoe* and *Diphilus* for *Diphilus* in three consecutive lines (p. 40).

W. W. GREG.

Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics. Edited by F. M. PADEFORD. (The Belles-Lettres Series: Section II.) Boston: D. C. Heath and Co.; London: G. G. Harrap, 1907. 12mo. lviii + 174 pp.

The texts in this dainty little volume consist of selections from Wyatt, Surrey, and the 'miscellaneous poets' of the court of Henry VIII.