

Modern Humanities Research Association

Review

Author(s): W. W. Greg

Review by: W. W. Greg

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Jan., 1918), pp. 100-103

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3714313>

Accessed: 23-10-2015 00:35 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>

REVIEWS.

William Haughton's 'Englishmen for my Money.' Edited with introduction and notes by ALBERT CROLL BAUGH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1917. 8vo. 236 pp.

Haughton's story is that of a hack of Henslowe's. Indeed, apart from the seventy-five occasions on which his name appears in the old manager's diary and correspondence, the only certain record we have of him is the nuncupative will discovered by Mr C. W. Wallace and printed for the first time in the present volume. From this we learn that Haughton died between 6 June and 20 July 1605. The entries in the *Diary* extend from 5 Nov. 1597 to 8 Sept. 1602, thus covering a period of nearly five years from his first appearance as 'yonge horton' to a date within three years of his death. Outside these limits our knowledge of his life is a blank. He died in the parish of Allhallows Staining, London, leaving a widow and children. His colleague Wentworth Smith was witness to his will.

Haughton's dramatic activity falls into four periods: the first, the winter of 1597-8, to which belongs, so far as we know, only *Englishmen for my Money*; the second from the summer of 1599 to the spring of 1600, during which time, and chiefly between November and May, he was at work on no less than twelve plays; the third from Dec. 1600 to Nov. 1601, from which records of nine plays survive; the fourth a brief return in Sept. 1602 with a single piece. All the records are in connexion with the Admiral's men. In the intervals, it is reasonable to suppose, Haughton was exercising his talents for other companies.

Englishmen for my Money is the only play of Haughton's known to survive, which there is reason to suppose was an unaided effort. It is certainly a creditable achievement for a young writer. Mr Baugh would put the claim a good deal higher, and not altogether without cause shown. In the absence of any close parallels we must regard Haughton's plot as essentially original and the threads are skilfully woven. Our knowledge of dramatic chronology is far from complete, but, if the claim of *Englishmen for my Money* to be the first 'realistic comedy of London life' is well founded, it certainly gives its author a respectable place in the history of our drama. The originality of the conception is, however, a good deal discounted by the fact that several similar studies of provincial life appeared about the same time.

Of the nature of *Cox of Collumpton* we know nothing, for Collier's assertion that it concerned a murder committed at that place, though a plausible guess, appears to be devoid of foundation. *Beech's Tragedy* or the *Tragedy of Thomas Merry* raises the difficult question of its rela-

tion to Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies*. I think it must be taken as proved that the latter was written not later than 1598 and consequently that it cannot be an amalgamation of *Beech's Tragedy* and the *Orphans' Tragedy* of 1599–1600. But Mr Baugh's natural annoyance at finding this wretched stuff ascribed in part to his author, has led him to a quite unfair treatment of the arguments on which the identification has been based. If the plays in question are altogether unrelated, we have a very remarkable coincidence. Coincidences do occur, and there the discussion had probably best be left.

The payments for *Patient Grissel*, in which Haughton's share is probably small, are very perplexing, and Mr Baugh has not given a very clear account of them (incidentally omitting to mention the £6 paid 26 Dec. 1599). Apart from the 10s. which were probably in earnest of a second part never written, Henslowe certainly paid £10 (£1 and £3 in earnest, and £6 probably in full though not so marked). But it is not safe to argue that this really represents what the Admiral's men paid for the play: it only represents what they borrowed from Henslowe on the plea of paying for the play. The authors may have repaid the advances (though it was hardly their wont to do so!) or may have applied them to other work on hand. I can only repeat what I have said elsewhere that 'The confusion of these entries shews what caution is necessary in making elaborate inferences from Henslowe's accounts.' The entry of the play on the Stationers' Register ten days after £2 had been paid to stay the printing, a fact which once surprised me and evidently surprises Mr Baugh, is quite certainly to be explained, as he suggests, as a formal assertion of copyright. The play was not printed for fully three years.

Mr Baugh considers the identification of the *Spanish Moor's Tragedy* with *Lust's Dominion* as practically established. He regards II, iii–v and III, v as presumably Haughton's but does not discuss Day's or Dekker's shares or the possible Marlowan residue.

The *Seven Wise Masters* must have been one of those conglomerate performances in which a number of dramatic episodes are strung together as plays within a play, of which we have some knowledge from the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, and which may conceivably trace back their pedigree to the Pater Noster play of York.

Ferrex and Porrex, as Mr Baugh observes, is more likely to have been an original piece, possibly suggested by Sackville and Norton's famous play, than a revision of that work. As to the subject of the *English Fugitives* he forbears conjecture.

It is quite likely that the play mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary* which Haughton 'would call the *Devil and his Dame*' is connected with the extant *Grim the Collier of Croyden*, but the evidence that Haughton really was concerned in the writing or revision of the piece is slight. Still, as Mr Baugh is inclined to find some trace of his hand in the first scene, the latter at least is possible.

Strange News out of Poland introduces the mysterious 'Mr Pett,' who, it is now suggested, may possibly be a certain Peter Pett who ended a brief and idle London career by dying of small-pox about a month later

than the entry in the *Diary*. The identification is possible but no more: it is not pressed. A play of *Judas*, of which it is suggested that Haughton may have left a draft subsequently elaborated by Samuel Rowley and William Birde or Borne, closes the author's second period of activity in connexion with Henslowe.

In July 1600 the Admiral's men ceased playing at the Rose: they began again at the Fortune about the beginning of December. That month Haughton was engaged on *Robin Hood's Pen'orths*, a piece which Mr Baugh conjectures may have been on the subject of Robin Hood's adventure with the Potter as it appears in the May Games printed at the end of the *Geste* (see Malone Society's *Collections*, i. 132). The suggestion is again a possible one. This was followed the following spring by collaboration with Day in two continuations of the *Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*, a piece with which Day and Chettle had evidently made a hit the previous year. The first part only is extant (possibly in a later revision).

In the spring of 1601 we find Haughton collaborating for the first time with Wentworth Smith in the *Conquest of the West Indies*. This Mr Baugh would connect with a tract on the exploits of Cortes translated by Thomas Nicholas, which had been reprinted in 1596.

Both *Six Yeomen of the West* by Haughton and Day, and the two parts of the *Six Clothiers* by Haughton, Hathway and Smith, which belong to the summer and autumn of 1601, must have been based on Deloney's *Thomas of Reading*, and a 'second part' of *Tom Dough* by Haughton and Day of the same period was very likely a continuation of the first-named, and based on the same work. That a single novel should have furnished matter for four plays within a twelvemonth is perhaps a record.

Friar Rush and the Proud Woman of Antwerp has been conjectured by Creizenach to be a combination of the well-known devil story with a telling anecdote out of Stubbes' *Anatomy of Abuses*, also alluded to in Greene's *Tu Quoque*. I think the suggestion is more than 'rather plausible' as Mr Baugh styles it.

To the last period belongs *William Cartwright* alone. Mr Baugh calls this an 'unaided piece' and it is true that no other author is named in connexion with it. But we only have record of a payment of 50s. which cannot have been in full, so that it is quite possible that here again Haughton was working in collaboration. There is always a temptation to rely on Henslowe's entries for more than they are worth. They are so useful, and in a manner so authoritative, that one is apt to forget their limitations. It is worth while, therefore, to insist once more that they are not intended as records of authorship but merely of the names of those to whom Henslowe paid out certain sums by order of the company. That as a rule the money for plays was paid to the authors, hardly admits of doubt, but that in every particular case the recipient was the author, or that all collaborators are necessarily mentioned, there is no warrant to suppose. No document is more valuable for the history of the Elizabethan drama than Henslowe's *Diary*, but

none has been more misused. As a rule Mr Baugh is very judicious in his use of its evidence, but in this and a few other instances he is inclined to rely rather too implicitly thereon.

Haughton wrote for the most part in collaboration. *Englishmen for my Money*, which there is every reason to suppose is his unaided work, may be regarded as a diploma piece. Out of twenty-two other plays for which he received payments, only six are connected with his name alone. His most frequent and continuous collaborator was Day, who shared in nine pieces. In his second period he also joined forces with Chettle thrice, and with Dekker thrice; while in his third he thrice worked with Wentworth Smith and twice with Hathway. His connexion with Birde and Rowley is problematic, and his association with 'Mr Pett' may or may not have been literary.

The almost feverish activity of his two middle periods suggests a fertile brain and probably an empty pocket. The variety of the themes chosen is also remarkable. 'He apparently turned his hand with equal ease to almost any type of drama, and the number of types he tried is consequently large. He seems to have written in the fashion of the moment and to have changed as often as the fashion changed,' is the verdict of his editor. In style of work, to judge from the scanty remains extant, he may not unreasonably be regarded as a forerunner of Middleton. His work has some interest, if not very much attraction, of itself, but Haughton's chief claim on our attention is as a good example of the dramatic hack of the time.

Mr Baugh has handled his not very promising materials with skill and discretion, and has produced a work that will take its place as a permanent contribution to the history of the minor drama. There are few faults to find, but he should not speak of 'Lyly's *Maid's Metamorphosis*' (the authorship is far from proven), while to say that 'the daughter of Barabas enters a monastery' may be correct but suggests scandal.

Mr Baugh's text of *Englishmen for my Money* is a very careful piece of work. He charges nine errors against the Malone Society reprint. I regret to say that in six cases he is right, the other three are merely wrong-fount letters which it is not our custom to reproduce. A pleasant and novel feature of the notes is the attention given to the technical stage-construction of the play.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

A Study of the Plays of Thomas D'Urfey, with a Reprint of 'A Fool's Preferment.' Parts I and II. By ROBERT STANLEY FORSYTHE (Western Reserve University Bulletins. Vol. XIX, No. 5. May, 1916. Vol. XX, No. 5. May, 1917). Cleveland, Ohio: Western Reserve University Press. Part I, vi + 180 pp.; Part II, 100 pp.

When we consider how interesting a figure Tom D'Urfey makes, what real merit many of his comedies have, and how lengthy was his