DRAMA

CRITICISM

VOLUME

50

DRAMA

CRITICISM

Criticism of the Most Significant and Widely Studied Dramatic Works from All the World's Literatures

VOLUME 50

Lawrence J. Trudeau
Editor

GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Detroit • New York • San Francisco • New Haven, Conn • Waterville, Maine • London

GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Drama Criticism, Vol. 50

Layman Poupard Publishing, LLC

Editorial Directors: Richard Layman, Dennis Poupard

Editorial Production Manager: Janet Hill

Permissions Manager: Kourtnay King

Quality Assurance Manager: Katherine Macedon

Production Technology Manager: Natalie Fulkerson

Content Conversion, Data Coding, Composition: Apex CoVantage, LLC

Advisors to LPP:
Ward W. Briggs
James Hardin
Joel Myerson

Volume Advisors:
Andrea R. Stevens, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (for "Richard Brome")
Douglas O'Keefe, Jacksonville State University (for "David Garrick")
Stephanie Byttebier, Boston University (for "Tony Kushner")

WCN: 01-100-101

Gale
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI, 48331-3535

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 76-46132

ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8521-8

ISSN 1056-4349

Printed in Mexico
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 18 17 16 15 14

Preface

Drama Criticism (*DC*) is principally intended for beginning students of literature and theater as well as the average playgoer. The series is therefore designed to introduce readers to the most frequently studied playwrights of all time periods and nationalities and to present discerning commentary on dramatic works of enduring interest. Furthermore, *DC* seeks to acquaint the reader with the uses and functions of criticism itself. Selected from a diverse body of commentary, the essays in *DC* offer insights into the authors and their works but do not require that the reader possess a wide background in literary studies. Where appropriate, reviews of important productions of the plays discussed are also included to give students a heightened awareness of drama as a dynamic art form, one that many claim is fully realized only in performance.

DC was created in response to suggestions by the staffs of high school, college, and public libraries. These librarians observed a need for a series that assembles critical commentary on the world's most renowned dramatists in the same manner as Gale's *Short Story Criticism* (*SSC*) and *Poetry Criticism* (*PC*), which present material on writers of short fiction and poetry. Although playwrights are covered in such Gale literary criticism series as *Contemporary Literary Criticism* (*CLC*), *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism* (*TCLC*), *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism* (*NCLC*), *Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800* (*LC*), and *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism* (*CMLC*), *DC* directs more concentrated attention on individual dramatists than is possible in the broader, survey-oriented entries in these Gale series. Commentary on the works of William Shakespeare may be found in *Shakespearean Criticism* (*SC*).

Scope of the Series

By collecting and organizing commentary on dramatists, *DC* assists students in their efforts to gain insight into literature, achieve better understanding of the texts, and formulate ideas for papers and assignments. A variety of interpretations and assessments is offered, allowing students to pursue their own interests and promoting awareness that literature is dynamic and responsive to many different opinions.

Approximately three to five entries are included in each volume, and each entry presents a historical survey of the critical response to a playwright's work, an individual play, or a literary topic pertinent to the study of drama. The length of an entry is intended to reflect the amount of critical attention the author has received from critics writing in English and from critics whose work has been translated into English. Every attempt has been made to identify and include the most significant essays on each author's work. In order to provide these important critical pieces, the editors sometimes reprint essays that have appeared elsewhere in Gale's literary criticism series. Such duplication, however, never exceeds twenty percent of a *DC* volume.

Organization of the Book

A *DC* entry consists of the following elements:

- The **Author Heading** cites the name under which the playwright most commonly wrote, followed by birth and death dates. Uncertain birth or death dates are indicated by question marks. If the author wrote consistently under a pseudonym, the pseudonym will be listed in the author heading and the author's actual name given in parentheses on the first line of the biographical and critical information. Also located here are any name variations under which a playwright wrote, including transliterated forms for authors whose native languages use nonroman alphabets.

- The **Introduction** contains background information that introduces the reader to the author and the critical debates surrounding his or her work.

- The list of **Principal Works** is ordered chronologically by date of first publication and lists the most important works by the author. The first section comprises dramatic works or works by the author about dramatic theory. The second section gives information on other major works by the author. In the case of authors who do not write in English, an English translation of the title is provided as an aid to the reader; the translation is a published translated

title or a free translation provided by the compiler of the entry. In the case of such authors whose works have been translated into English, the **Principal English Translations** focuses primarily on twentieth-century translations, selecting those works most commonly considered the best by critics.

- Essays offering **overviews of the dramatist's entire literary career** give the student broad perspectives on the writer's artistic development, themes, and concerns that recur in several of his or her works, the author's place in literary history, and other wide-ranging topics.
- **Criticism** of individual plays offers the reader in-depth discussions of a select number of the author's most important works. In some cases, the criticism is divided into two sections, each arranged chronologically. When a significant performance of a play can be identified (typically, the premier of a twentieth-century work), the first section of criticism will feature **production reviews** of this staging. Most entries include sections devoted to **critical commentary** that assesses the literary merit of the selected plays. When necessary, essays are carefully excerpted to focus on the work under consideration; usually, however, essays and reviews are reprinted in their entirety. The critic's name and the date of composition or publication of the critical work are given at the beginning of each piece of criticism. Unsigned criticism is preceded by the title of the source in which it appeared. All plays and works of dramatic theory by the author featured in the entry are printed in boldface type. Footnotes are reprinted at the end of each essay or excerpt. In the case of excerpted criticism, only those footnotes that pertain to the excerpted texts are included. Criticism in topic entries is arranged chronologically under a variety of subheadings to facilitate the study of different aspects of the topic.
- Critical essays are prefaced by brief **Annotations** describing each piece.
- A complete **Bibliographical Citation** of the original essay or book precedes each piece of criticism. Citations conform to recommendations set forth in the Modern Language Association of America's *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers,* 7th ed. (2009).
- An annotated bibliography of **Further Reading** appears at the end of each entry and suggests resources for additional study. In some cases, significant essays for which the editors could not obtain reprint rights are included here. Boxed material following the further reading list provides references to other biographical and critical sources on the author in series published by Gale.

Cumulative Indexes

A **Cumulative Author Index** lists all of the authors that appear in a wide variety of reference sources published by Gale, including *DC.* A complete list of these sources is found facing the first page of the Author Index. The index also includes birth and death dates and cross references between pseudonyms and actual names.

A **Cumulative Topic Index** lists the literary themes and topics treated in *DC* as well as in *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism, Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800, Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism, Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism, Contemporary Literary Criticism, Poetry Criticism, Short Story Criticism,* and *Children's Literature Review.*

A **Cumulative Nationality Index** lists all authors featured in *DC* by nationality, followed by the number of the *DC* volume in which their entry appears.

A **Cumulative Title Index** lists in alphabetical order the individual plays and works of dramatic theory discussed in the criticism contained in *DC.* Each title is followed by the author's last name and corresponding volume and page numbers where commentary on the work is located. English translations of titles published in other languages and variations of titles are cross-referenced to the title under which a work was originally published so that all references to discussion of a work are combined in one listing.

Citing *Drama Criticism*

When citing criticism reprinted in the Literary Criticism Series, students should provide complete bibliographic information so that the cited essay can be located in the original print or electronic source. Students who quote directly from reprinted

criticism may use any accepted bibliographic format, such as Modern Language Association (MLA) style or University of Chicago Press style. Both the MLA and the University of Chicago formats are acceptable and recognized as being the current standards for citations. It is important, however, to choose one format for all citations; do not mix the two formats within a list of citations.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a works cited list set forth in the Modern Language Association of America's *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers,* 7th ed. (New York: MLA, 2009); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Barker, Roberta. "The Circle Game: Gender, Time, and 'Revolution' in Tom Stoppard's *The Coast of Utopia.*" *Modern Drama* 48.4 (2005): 706-25. Rpt. in *Drama Criticism.* Ed. Thomas J. Schoenberg and Lawrence J. Trudeau. Vol. 30. Detroit: Gale, 2008. 356-66. Print.

Rocha, Mark William. "Black Madness in August Wilson's 'Down the Line' Cycle." *Madness in Drama.* Ed. James Redmond. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 191-201. Rpt. in *Drama Criticism.* Ed. Thomas J. Schoenberg and Lawrence J. Trudeau. Vol. 31. Detroit: Gale, 2008. 229-35. Print.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a bibliography set forth in *The Chicago Manual of Style,* 16th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Barker, Roberta. "The Circle Game: Gender, Time, and 'Revolution' in Tom Stoppard's *The Coast of Utopia.*" *Modern Drama* 48, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 706-25. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism,* Vol. 30, edited by Thomas J. Schoenberg and Lawrence J. Trudeau, 356-66. Detroit: Gale, 2008.

Rocha, Mark William. "Black Madness in August Wilson's 'Down the Line' Cycle." In *Madness in Drama,* edited by James Redmond, 191-20l. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism,* Vol. 31, edited by Thomas J. Schoenberg and Lawrence J. Trudeau, 229-35. Detroit: Gale, 2008.

Suggestions are Welcome

Readers who wish to suggest new features, topics, or authors to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions or comments are cordially invited to call, write, or fax the Product Manager:

Product Manager, Literary Criticism Series
Gale
Cengage Learning
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535
1-800-347-4253 (GALE)
Fax: 248-699-8884

Acknowledgments

The editors wish to thank the copyright holders of the excerpted criticism included in this volume and the permissions managers of many book and magazine publishing companies for assisting us in securing reproduction rights. Following is a list of the copyright holders who have granted us permission to reproduce material in this volume of *DC*. Every effort has been made to trace copyright, but if omissions have been made, please let us know.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *DC*, VOLUME 50, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS:

American Drama, v. 4.1, 1994. Copyright © 1994 American Drama Institute. Reproduced by permission of the publisher. —***Anglophonia,*** v. 3, 1998. Copyright © 1998 Presses Universitaires du Mirail. Reproduced by permission of *Anglophonia.* —***BOMB,*** v. 43, 1993. Copyright © 1993 *BOMB.* Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***British Magazine,*** v. 4, 1749. Public domain.—***Comparative Drama,*** v. 45.2, 2011. Copyright © 2011 *Comparative Drama.* Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Contemporary Literature,*** v. 50.3, 2009. Copyright © 2009 the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Reproduced by permission of University of Wisconsin Press.—***Drama Review,*** v. 56.1, 2012. Copyright © 2012 MIT Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Early Theatre,*** v. 10.2, 2007. Copyright © 2007 *Early Theatre.* Both reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Forum for Modern Language Studies,*** v. 47.1, 2010. Copyright © 2010 James Corby. Reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press.—***Journal of Men's Studies,*** v. 5.1, 1996. Copyright © 1996 Men's Studies Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Modern Language Notes,*** v. 36.2, 1921; v. 36.3, 1921; v. 72.4, 1957. All public domain.—***Modern Philology,*** v. 13.5, 1915. Public domain.—***More Books,*** v. 22.8, 1947. Public domain.—***Notes and Queries,*** v. 36.3, 1989. Copyright © 1989 Robert C. Evans; v. 53.1, 2006. Copyright © 2006 Brett D. Hirsch. Both reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press.—***PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America,*** v. 49.3, 1934; v. 74.3, 1959. Both public domain.—***Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research,*** v. 6.2, 1967; v. 11.2, 1972; v. 19.1, 2004; v. 19.2, 2004; v. 23.1, 2008. Copyright © 1967, 1972, 2004, 2008 University of Denver. All reproduced by permission of *Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research.*—***Review of English Studies,*** ns v. 29.114, 1978; ns v. 58.236, 2007. Copyright © 1978, 2007 Oxford University Press. Both reproduced by permission of the publisher. —***Shofar,*** v. 25.4, 2007. Copyright © 2007 Purdue University Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Tennessee Studies in Literature,*** v. 19, 1974. Copyright © 1974 University of Tennessee Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Theatre Notebook,*** v. 55.3, 2001. Copyright © 2001 the Society for Theatre Research. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *DC*, VOLUME 50, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

Anonymous. From **Lethe** ***Rehears'd; or, A Critical Discussion of the Beauties and Blemishes of That Performance.*** Roberts, 1749. Public domain.—Birkett, Audrey. From ***"Divining Thoughts": Future Directions in Shakespeare Studies.*** Ed. Pete Orford et al. Cambridge Scholars, 2007. Copyright © 2007 Pete Orford with Michael P. Jones, Lizz Ketterer, Joshua McEvilia, and contributors. Reproduced by permission of Cambridge Scholars Publishing.—Brooks, Douglas A. From ***The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England.*** Ed. Marta Straznicky. University Massachusetts Press, 2006. Copyright © 2006 University of Massachusetts Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher. —Cibber, Theophilus. From ***Theophilus Cibber, to David Garrick, Esq; with Dissertations on Theatrical Subjects.*** Reeves and Phipps, 1759. Public domain.—Davidson, Jenny. From ***Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century.*** Ed. Peter Sabor and Paul Yachnin. Ashgate, 2008. Copyright © 2008 Peter Sabor and Paul Yachnin. Reproduced by permission of Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.—Efstathiou-Lavabre, Athina. From ***Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama.*** Ed. Jean-Christophe Mayer. University of Delaware Press, 2008. Copyright © 2008 Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corporation. Reproduced by permission of Associated University Presses, Inc.—Frantzen, Allen J. From ***Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from*** **Beowulf** ***to*** **Angels in America.** University of Chicago Press, 1998. Copyright © 1998 University of Chicago. Reproduced by permission of University of Chicago Press.—Holland, Peter. From ***Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1660-1800.*** Ed. Michael Cordner and Holland. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Copyright © 2007 Peter Holland. Reproduced by permission of Palgrave Macmillan, Ltd.—Myhill, Nova. From ***Imagining the Audience in Early Modern Drama, 1558-1642.*** Ed. Jennifer A. Low and Myhill. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Copyright © 2011 Jennifer A. Low and

Nova Myhill. Reproduced by permission of Palgrave Macmillan, Ltd.—Smith, Dane Farnsworth, and M. L. Lawhon. From ***Plays about the Theatre in England, 1737-1800; or, The Self-Conscious Stage from Foote to Sheridan.*** Bucknell University Press, 1979. Copyright © 1979 Associated University Presses, Inc. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—Stein, Elizabeth P. From ***David Garrick, Dramatist.*** MLA, 1938. Public domain.—Vejdovsky, Boris. From ***American Secrets: The Politics and Poetics of Secrecy in the Literature and Culture of the United States.*** Ed. Eduardo Barros-Grela and José Liste-Noya. Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011. Copyright © 2011 Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.

Advisory Board

The members of the Advisory Board—reference librarians from public and academic library systems—represent a cross-section of our customer base and offer a variety of informed perspectives on both the presentation and content of our literature products. Advisory board members assess and define such quality issues as the relevance, currency, and usefulness of the author coverage, critical content, and literary topics included in our series; evaluate the layout, presentation, and general quality of our printed volumes; provide feedback on the criteria used for selecting authors and topics covered in our series; provide suggestions for potential enhancements to our series; identify any gaps in our coverage of authors or literary topics, recommending authors or topics for inclusion; analyze the appropriateness of our content and presentation for various user audiences, such as high school students, undergraduates, graduate students, librarians, and educators; and offer feedback on any proposed changes/enhancements to our series. We wish to thank the following advisors for their advice throughout the year.

Barbara M. Bibel
Librarian
Oakland Public Library
Oakland, California

Dr. Toby Burrows
Principal Librarian
The Scholars' Centre
University of Western Australia Library
Nedlands, Western Australia

Celia C. Daniel
Associate Reference Librarian
Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C.

David M. Durant
Reference Librarian
Joyner Library
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

Nancy T. Guidry
Librarian
Bakersfield Community College
Bakersfield, California

Heather Martin
Arts & Humanities Librarian
University of Alabama at Birmingham, Sterne Library
Birmingham, Alabama

Susan Mikula
Librarian
Indiana Free Library
Indiana, Pennsylvania

Thomas Nixon
Humanities Reference Librarian
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Davis Library
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mark Schumacher
Jackson Library
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina

Gwen Scott-Miller
Assistant Director
Sno-Isle Regional Library System
Marysville, Washington

Contents

Richard Brome
c. 1590-c. 1652

English playwright.

INTRODUCTION

Brome was a fixture of the London theatrical establishment during the 1630s and among the most popular playwrights of the Caroline period (1625-49) in English literature. He is best known for a succession of "city comedies" that depict various facets of London life and politics in the seventeenth century, such as the gradual expansion of the suburbs and the influx of immigrants and other foreign visitors. In his treatment of these subjects, Brome has often been compared to his onetime employer, the English playwright Ben Jonson. Both authors favored convoluted plots and large casts, and neither was likely to pass up the opportunity to satirize his detractors. During Brome's lifetime, *The Weeding of the Covent Garden* (1632) was his most celebrated work, although modern critics generally regarded his later plays, especially *The Antipodes* (1638) and *A Jovial Crew* (1641), as superior. Considered in aggregate, Brome's comedies address mounting political tensions during the reign of Charles I, documenting the unenviable position of the playwright in a culture increasingly hostile to public entertainment.

More generally, Brome's plays have been used as a source of information on Caroline England, containing commentary on such diverse topics as the real estate market and women's cosmetics. His plays continue to figure prominently in studies of early modern English drama, illustrating the evolution of the genre in the decades leading up to the English Civil Wars (1642-51). Brome's well-documented career has also provided scholars with information about the everyday realities of life as a seventeenth-century playwright. With the exceptions of a high-profile revival of *The Antipodes* in 2000 and an earlier Royal Shakespeare Company production of *A Jovial Crew* in 1992, Brome's work is rarely performed today. This may change, however, owing to the 2010 launch of the *Richard Brome Online* project, which makes Brome's collected works easily accessible to scholars and theater practitioners for the first time.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Few details of Brome's early life survive. He is thought to have been born around 1590, though there are no baptismal records or other concrete evidence to support this attribution. Before embarking on his career as a playwright, he worked as an assistant for Jonson, who mentioned Brome in this capacity in his 1614 comedy *Bartholomew Fair.* Their relationship was apparently one of mutual respect, and Jonson contributed a laudatory dedication to the 1632 printed edition of Brome's *The Northern Lass* (1629), while Brome's stylistic debt to Jonson is evident in nearly all of his surviving works. Although little is known about Brome's private life, his professional relationships are well documented. He wrote for several important London theater companies, including the King's Men and the Red Bull troupe, during the late 1620s and early 1630s, attaining some popularity with *The Northern Lass* and rising to prominence with the King's Revels production of *The Sparagus Garden* at the Salisbury Court Theatre in 1635. Following this success, Brome was hired as a house playwright with the King's Revels playing company. The arrangement was intended to last for three years, but an inconsistent salary soon led Brome to seek additional work with rival theaters. This sparked an ongoing legal battle between the playwright and his various employers that lasted until an outbreak of bubonic plague in 1636 closed down the city's theaters entirely.

The playhouses reopened more than a year later, and while the King's Revels had by then disbanded, Brome soon found work with Queen Henrietta's Men, another Salisbury Court troupe. In spite of his prolific output, Brome is believed to have struggled financially. The dedication to *A Jovial Crew* identifies the author as one of the "harmless beggars" whose lives are the subject of the play. Brome's poverty was almost certainly exacerbated by the outbreak of the English Civil Wars. The Puritan faction, who were opposed to theatergoing as a matter of policy, seized control of the city of London in 1642 and closed its theaters. They would not reopen during Brome's lifetime. On the basis of a posthumous dedication by the English poet Alexander Brome (no relation), Brome is generally believed to have died in late 1652 or early 1653. However, Robert C. Evans (1989) provided evidence that the playwright was admitted in 1650 to an almshouse, or poorhouse, in the Smithfield area of London. He reports that the register of that institution gives Brome's date of death as 24 September 1652.

MAJOR DRAMATIC WORKS

Highly regarded in their time, Brome's plays are virtually unknown today outside of academic scholarship, where his comedies are generally regarded as historically significant works of uneven craftsmanship. Brome established his characteristic style in *The Novella,* an early play first performed in 1632. In the play, the young Venetian nobleman

Fabritio schemes to avoid an arranged marriage to the wealthy Flavia so that the two will be free to elope with lovers of their own choosing. The unwilling couple must avoid the wrath of their parents through disguise, deceit, and cross-dressing—one of Brome's favorite dramatic devices. Brome's later comedies draw on similarly complicated plots of trickery and romance, but nearly all of them are set in London. *The Weeding of the Covent Garden* satirizes the development of the city's Covent Garden district, which was hastily built as a prospective home for wealthy Londoners. Brome's play shows the fruitless efforts of ambitious builders and promoters to preserve the neighborhood's image by "weeding" it of prostitutes, outlaws, and upwardly mobile commoners. The forces of law and order are represented by the buffoonish constable Cockbrain, who claims to be a descendant of Justice Adam Overdo (a judge from Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*) but who is even more naively self-righteous than his ancestor. Cockbrain's major adversaries are the "Brothers of the Blade," a gang of cowardly ruffians who are eventually rounded up and expelled from the neighborhood.

Brome's first big success, *The Sparagus Garden,* contains a similar mixture of well-worn comedic tropes and contemporary social commentary. Its story of forbidden love and feigned pregnancy unfolds against the backdrop of the asparagus gardens once located in the Lambeth district of London, a popular meeting place for couples wishing to make use of the vegetable's supposed aphrodisiacal properties. In modern scholarship, *The Antipodes* and *A Jovial Crew* have received special praise for their literary merit. In the former, a bookish and travel-obsessed young man named Peregrine is "cured" of his disinterest in sex through an elaborate dramatic ruse that convinces him he has been transported to a faraway land. *A Jovial Crew,* which likewise makes use of the play-within-the-play motif, presents the misadventures of two well-born young women who chafe at the restrictions of their genteel lifestyle and decide to embark on a life of vagabondage. Posthumous collections of Brome's plays appeared in 1653 and 1659 and were followed in the twentieth century by a succession of individual critical editions. Brome's collected works are available via *Richard Brome Online,* a scholarly electronic edition.

CRITICAL RECEPTION

Brome's works are most valuable to modern critics for capturing the spirit of his times. *The Weeding of the Covent Garden* and *The Sparagus Garden* have been characterized as reactions to the rapid changes that took place in the London landscape as early modern capitalists and celebrity architects transformed formerly communal lands into homes and pleasure grounds for the wealthy. Mimi Yiu (2007) interpreted *The Weeding of the Covent Garden* as an uneasy reflection on the "alien" architectural style employed in these fashionable districts, which were envisioned by their builders as zones that excluded common tradespeople. For Denys Van Renen (2011), Brome's plays are somewhat more explicit in their social commentary in that they charge London's new neighborhoods with displaying the mismanagement and lawlessness characteristic of Britain's overseas colonies. Other critics have commented on how Brome's works capture the anxieties and mixed allegiances of theater practitioners in the years leading up to the English Civil Wars. Julie Sanders (2002; see Further Reading) discussed how *A Jovial Crew* deftly illustrates this double bind in its portrayal of a troupe of beggar-actors who are economically disenfranchised by the policies of an "over-demanding absolutist monarch." Likewise, Michel Bitot (1995; see Further Reading) commented on the play's depiction of Britain's increasingly powerful Puritans, whose disapproval of public entertainment was a direct threat to London's theater groups.

Brome's works have also been consulted to clarify various aspects of the professional workings of Caroline theater. Tiffany Stern (2001) looked to Brome's plays to understand the duties of the prompter, or "book-holder," in Shakespearean theater, while Eleanor Collins (2007) used Brome's agreement with the King's Revels to explore early modern contracts between playwrights and theater companies. Audrey Birkett (2007) saw *The Antipodes* as a reflection of "the lack of control that was fundamental to the commercial theatrical community" in Brome's day. According to Birkett, the play's overbearing poets try unsuccessfully to set themselves up as petty tyrants who dictate the exact terms under which their works will be produced. Some scholars have discussed Brome's use of various devices typical of Caroline drama in his comedies, including an attempt by the playwright to establish authority over the audience with a view toward placating potential critics. Nova Myhill (2011) argued that Brome used "inductions," or introductory scenes, to directly address spectators, instilling an element of "self-consciousness" in his sophisticated and judgmental viewers. Brome's plays also display a shrewd awareness of contemporary Londoners' prejudices and stereotypes. Athina Efstathiou-Lavabre (2008) pointed out that while Brome saw little truth in the English depiction of the "false Frenchman," he repeatedly used the supposed deceitfulness of the French as a plot device.

Brome is generally numbered among the "Sons of Ben," a group of Jacobean and Caroline authors who shared Jonson's preference for satirical comedies with urban settings and labyrinthine plots. Elizabeth Cook (1947) gave an overview of other Jonsonian traits that Brome seems to have inherited, not all of them positive. She claimed, for example, that Brome sometimes "pushed" otherwise tragicomic plays "within the borders of comedy by the addition of a 'humorous' character or a 'humorous' by-plot." Cook also argued that English playwright John Fletcher influenced Brome's efforts at tragicomedy, although she called the clearest example of such inspiration, *The Love-Sick Court* (1639), a "dull play, lacking all the ethereal

hyperbole that carries heroic contests of love and friendship into a favorable climate." Other critics have found more to appreciate in Brome's interpretation of earlier playwrights' characteristic styles. John W. Crowther (1962; see Further Reading) found an example of such reappropriation in *A Jovial Crew,* which he described as both a romantic comedy in the tradition of William Shakespeare and as a comedy of humors in the spirit of Jonson. For Crowther, this eclectic approach successfully distinguished Brome from his predecessors, allowing him to draw on popular playwriting strategies of the past while catering to the tastes of a new generation of London theatergoers.

Michael J. Hartwell

PRINCIPAL WORKS

Plays

The Northern Lass. Blackfriars Theatre, London. 1629. Pub. as *The Northern Lasse.* London: Vavasour, 1632.

The City Wit. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. c. 1630.

The Queen's Exchange. Blackfriars Theatre, London. c. 1631. Pub. as *The Queenes Exchange: A Comedy.* London: Brome, 1657.

The Novella. Blackfriars Theatre, London. 1632.

The Weeding of the Covent Garden. Blackfriars Theatre, London. 1632.

The Late Lancashire Witches. With Thomas Heywood. Globe Theatre, London. 1634. London: Fisher, 1634.

The Queen and Concubine. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1635.

The Sparagus Garden. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1635. Pub. as *The Sparagus Garden: A Comedie.* London: Constable, 1640.

The New Academy. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. c. 1635.

The English Moor. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1637. Pub. as *The English Moore; or, The Mock-Mariage.* Ed. Sara Jayne Steen. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1983.

The Antipodes. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1638. Pub. as *The Antipodes: A Comedie.* London: Constable, 1640.

The Damoiselle. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1638.

The Love-Sick Court. Salisbury Court Theatre, London. 1639.

A Mad Couple Well Match'd. Cockpit Theatre, London. 1639.

The Court Beggar. Cockpit Theatre, London. 1640.

A Jovial Crew. Cockpit Theatre, London. 1641. Pub. as *A Joviall Crew; or, The Merry Beggars.* London: E. D. and N. E., 1652.

**Five New Playes.* London: Moseley, Marriot, and Dring, 1653.

†*Five New Playes.* London: Crook and Brome, 1659.

The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome. 3 vols. London: Pearson, 1873.

The Antipodes. Ed. Ann Haaker. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1966.

A Jovial Crew. Ed. Haaker. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1968.

A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of Richard Brome's A Mad Couple Well Match'd. Ed. Steen H. Spove. New York: Garland, 1979.

An Edition of The Late Lancashire Witches. With Heywood. Ed. Laird H. Barber. New York: Garland, 1979.

A Critical Edition of Brome's A Northern Lasse. Ed. Harvey Fried. New York: Garland, 1980.

A Critical Edition of Richard Brome's The Weeding of Covent Garden and The Sparagus Garden. Ed. Donald S. McClure. New York: Garland, 1980.

The Witches of Lancashire. Ed. Gabriel Egan. New York: Routledge, 2003.

‡*Richard Brome Online.* Ed. Richard Cave. Royal Holloway, U of London, 2010.

*Includes *The Madd Couple Well Matcht, The Novella, The Court Begger, The City Witt,* and *The Damoiselle.*

†Includes *The English Moor; or, The Mock-Marriage*; *The Love-Sick Court; or, The Ambitious Politique*; *Covent Garden Weeded*; *The New Academy; or, The New Exchange*; and *The Queen and Concubine.*

‡Contains Brome's collected works.

CRITICISM

Robert Grant Martin (essay date 1915)

SOURCE: Martin, Robert Grant. "Is *The Late Lancashire Witches* a Revision?" *Modern Philology* 13.5 (1915): 253-65. Print.

[*In the following essay, Martin considers the evidence for the claim that* The Late Lancashire Witches *(1634), a melodramatic collaboration between Brome and Thomas Heywood, is a reworking of earlier material by Heywood rather than a wholly new play. Martin finds little support for this view and concludes that the play was composed in the summer of 1634.*]

An article by Professor C. E. Andrews in *Modern Language Notes* of June, 1913,[1] brings up for renewed consideration the question of the authorship, and incidentally the date, of Heywood and Brome's play, ***The Late Lancashire Witches.*** In *A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718*[2] Professor Wallace Notestein has taken issue with historians of the drama as to the history of this play. It is well known that it was put upon the stage in 1634 to take advantage of the excitement caused in London by the bringing to the city of certain women from Lancashire who had been tried for witchcraft in 1633, and that a considerable portion of the play is based upon the depositions of witnesses and defendants in the case. In chapter vii of his scholarly and extremely interesting book Notestein gives the history of the affair. He had, in the preceding chapter, given an account of another Lancashire witchcraft delusion taking place in 1612, as a result of which eleven persons had been condemned to death. Of this trial we possess a contemporary account, *The Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches in the Countie of Lancaster,* by Thomas Potts.[3] The later disturbance was directly connected with the earlier, both occurring in the Forest of Pendle. Early in 1633 charges of witchcraft were brought against a group of women who were tried at the Lancaster assizes, the principal witness against them being an eleven-year-old boy, Edmund Robinson. Of the accused a large number were found guilty. The judges apparently suspected a miscarriage of justice, for they reported the case to the Privy Council. Dr. Bridgman, Bishop of Chester, was deputed to investigate the case, and as a result of his work four of the women were, in June, 1634, sent up to London for examination by the king's surgeons and a committee of midwives. The boy Edmund Robinson and his father were likewise summoned to London, and presently confessed that the witchcraft charge was an imposture pure and simple. Notestein goes on to say:

> Before final judgment had been given on the Lancashire women Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome, well-known dramatists, had written a play on the subject which was at once published and "acted at the Globe on the Bankside by His Majesty's Actors." By some it has been supposed that this play was an older play founded on the Lancashire affair of 1612 and warmed over in 1634; but the main incidents and the characters of the play are so fully copied from the depositions of the young Robinson and from the charges preferred against Mary Spencer, Frances Dickonson, and Margaret Johnson that a layman would at once pronounce it a play written entirely to order from the affair of 1634.[4]

For the theory that the present play is a reworking by Brome, or by Heywood and Brome, of an earlier play by Heywood, Fleay is responsible. His opinion may be summarized as follows. The story of Mrs. Generous, I, i; II, ii, v; III, ii; IV, ii, iv, v; V, ii, iii, iv, v (part), is Heywood's, "considerably accommodated by Brome," and "is founded on *The Witches of Lancaster* by T. Potts, 1613." Brome contributes the Seely story, I, ii; III, i, iii; IV, iii; V, i, v (part). The witch scenes, II, i, iii*a,* iv; IV, i, are Heywood's, with alterations by Brome. In brief, then, this is an old play of Heywood's, from which a very considerable portion was excised and replaced by Brome's story of the troubles of the Seely family, while the rest was subjected to revision by Brome.

This opinion is echoed by Ward in his *English Dramatic Literature*[5] and in his chapter on Heywood in the *Cambridge History of English Literature,* where he says:

> ***The Late Lancashire Witches*** was printed in 1634 as the joint work of Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome. But the story of the play was based, in part, upon an account, published in 1613, of the doings of certain Lancashire women, of whom twelve had suffered death as witches in the previous year; and it is possible that Heywood was the author of a play much earlier than that put upon the stage in 1634.[6]

Schelling does not mention the theory of an older play, finds the source in "the notorious trials for witchcraft of 1633," adds that "the composition of the play must have followed so close on the events that its influence in forestalling the judgment of the courts which tried these unfortunate creatures can scarcely be considered as negligible,"[7] and then misdates the play 1633. Andrews brings forward additional evidence for the revision theory, but takes from Brome a large portion of the play which has heretofore been credited to him. That Notestein is right in his assumption that ***The Late Lancashire Witches*** was an entirely new play, the product of the joint authorship, of Heywood and Brome, written in 1634, it is the purpose of this paper to show.

Deferring for the present any discussion of authorship, let us consider the question of source. Is there any use of material older than 1633 which would give ground for assuming that we have a 1634 revision of an older play? The account of the play in the *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*[8] presents some sound reasoning by Fleay, but is marred by an unusual number of Fleavian errors, inconsistencies, and contradictions. Fleay, followed by Ward, asserts that the story of Mrs. Generous is founded upon Potts's account of the 1612 affair. So far from being accurate is this statement that there can be found but two points of similarity between the play and Potts's narrative. (*a*) In each case a woman of good birth and social standing is found guilty of witchcraft; otherwise Mrs. Generous has no points of resemblance to unfortunate Alice Nutter. (*b*) In IV, ii, after Mrs. Generous has confessed that she has made a contract with the devil, occur these lines:

GEN.:

> Resolve me, how farre doth that contract stretch?

MRS.:

> What interest in this Soule, my selfe coo'd claime
> I freely gave him, but his part that made it
> I still reserve, not being mine to give.

GEN.:

> O cunning Divell, foolish woman know
> Where he can clayme but the least little part,
> He will usurpe the whole; th'art a lost woman.[9]

In the examination of James Device, one of the accused in the trial of 1612, he deposed that there appeared to him

> a thing like a browne Dogge, who asked this Examinate to giue him his Soule, and he should be reuenged of any whom hee would: whereunto this Examinate answered, that his Soule was not his to giue, but was his Sauiour Iesus Christ's, but as much as was in him this Examinate to giue, he was contented he should haue it.[10]

Again in his confession:

> that the said Spirit did appeare vnto him after sundrie times, in the likenesse of a Dogge, and at euery time most earnestly perswaded him to giue him his Soule absolutely: who answered as before, that he would giue him his owne part and no further. And hee saith, that at the last time that the said Spirit was with him, which was the Tuesday next before his apprehension; when as hee could not preuaile with him to haue his Soule absolutely granted vnto him, as aforesaid; the said Spirit departed from him, then giuing a most feareful crie and yell, etc.[11]

The verbal likeness is not so close as to be striking, and the parallel loses most of its force when we remember that the belief voiced by James Device was common at the time, and may be found in various contemporary treatises on witchcraft.[12] For the delusion that the play is "founded on" Potts, Crossley, the editor of Potts's narrative, may be inadvertently responsible. In his notes he says: "Alice Nutter was doubtless the original of the story of which Heywood availed himself . . . which is frequently noticed by the writers of the 17th century—that the wife of a Lancashire gentleman had been detected in practising witchcraft and unlawful acts, and condemned and executed."[13] Now note that Crossley does not state that Heywood used Potts, but only a story frequently referred to, one version of which may be found in Potts's account. The plain fact is, of course, that so much of the play as can be traced to any recognizable source is not based upon Potts's narrative at all, but upon the depositions, etc., quoted by Crossley in his introduction. The characters of the play who were taken from real life are the witches Moll Spencer, Mawd (Hargrave), Meg or Peg (Johnson), Gill (Dickison), and the boy, evidently the young rascal Edmund Robinson, who caused all the trouble. The incidents borrowed are those of the boy and the greyhounds (II, iii, iv), the boy's ride through the air with Goody Dickison (II, iv), the milk pail which obeys Moll's summons[14] (II, vi), the witches' feast (IV, i), the boy's story of his fight with a devil (V, i), Peg's confession (V, v). In these incidents the authors, as has been noted by all critics, kept very close to the terms of the depositions.

There is, then, nothing in the source material which would suggest a date earlier than 1633. Fleay[15] brought forward as a bit of external evidence confirming the existence of an early play a reference in Field's *A Woman Is a Weathercock,* 1612, to Lawrence of Lancashire.[16] Now Lawrence, according to Fleay's own theory, is one of Brome's characters, appears only in those scenes of the play ascribed to Brome, and must therefore belong to the 1634 revision; how, then, can Field have been referring to a character who made his first entrance upon the stage twenty-two years after Field's play was written? As a matter of fact, the name seems to have been proverbially applied to a man of vigorous physique, "Lusty Lawrence" being the more common variant.[17] It may be found in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Captain* (IV, iii):

> Lusty Lawrence,
> See what a gentlewoman you have saluted;

and its origin is thus explained by Dyce: "This expression occurs again in *Woman's Prize,* I, iii, and is found in other early dramas. It is explained by the following passage of a rare tract: 'This late *Lusty Lawrence,* that Lancashire Lad, who had 17 bastards in one year, if we believe his Ballad, &c.' *A Brown Dozen of Drunkards,* &c, 1648, sig. C."[18] Thus the use of the name by Field in 1612, instead of glancing at an old play of Heywood's, looks the other way: to the probability that Brome chose the name of a rather well-known local hero in order to give more point to the vulgar situation of which Parnell complains so bitterly.

The play was entered in the Stationer's Register October 28, 1634, and was brought to its present form in the summer of that year. In the prologue there is a reference to the arrival for examination in London of the women charged with witchcraft:

> The Project unto many here well knowne;
> Those Witches the fat Iaylor brought to Towne.

From the *Calendar of State Papers*[19] we learn that they were brought to town some time between June 15, when the Bishop of Chester sent on the results of his examination of Margaret Johnson, Mary Spencer, and Frances Dickonson, and June 29, when the Privy Council passed an order for midwives to "inspect and search the bodies of those women lately brought up by the Sheriff of Co. Lancaster" (the fat jailer); from the same order we learn that the women were lodged at the Ship Tavern in Greenwich. There are two or three pieces of corroborative internal evidence. Fleay noted the allusion to Prynne's punishment. Whetstone says to Bantam, "if thou, Bantam, dost not heare of this with both thine eares, if thou hast them still, and not lost them by scribbling. . . ."[20] Prynne was sentenced on February 17, 1634, to lose his ears and be pilloried, and the sentence was carried into effect on May 7 and 10.

There are two references to a recent issue of farthing coins, which apparently was making some stir in London: "no longer agoe than last holiday evening he gam'd away eight double ring'd tokens on a rubbers at bowles. . . ." (I, ii);[21] "from the last Farthings with the double rings, to the late Coy'ned peeces which they say are all counterfeit" (II, iv).[22] Legal farthings of copper were first coined in 1613, and the lead farthing tokens up to that time issued by merchants and tradesmen were declared illegal. The authorities had great difficulty in getting the new coins into circulation and protecting them from counterfeiting. We find frequent references to the matter in the state papers during the remainder of the reign of James and that of Charles I.[23] Finally to defeat the counterfeiters a new coinage was issued.

> In 1634, at a time when Lord Maltravers had a share in the patent, the patentees were allowed to decry all the old farthings, and a new farthing of better make was introduced, distinguishable by an inner beaded circle, the so-called double-rings.[24]

> So serious had the counterfeiting of the farthing tokens become, that the patentees were allowed to introduce a token slightly different in design. The general design continued in accordance with the terms of the original patent, but all the details were altered, and as a mark to distinguish the new issue, a second beaded circle was placed on the obverse and reverse, whence the farthings were known as "double rings."[25]

There is, finally, one other passage which seems to carry on its face evidence of having been written in the summer of 1634. This is in the speech of Generous in IV, ii, a scene surely from the hand of Heywood. Generous is speaking of his wife, whom he is beginning to suspect of some criminal practice, though the idea of witchcraft has not yet occurred to him.

> The Gentile fashion sometimes we observe
> To sunder beds; but most in these hot monthes
> Iune, Iuly, August. . . .

The specific mention of present time seems to me to possess some corroborative value; at any rate, I set it down for what it may be worth. To sum up, common-sense would point to a date of composition in July or August, while the excitement over the near presence of the supposed witches would be at its height, and all the time indications that we have are in agreement with that inference.

In proof of the revision theory Andrews in his article presents three pieces of internal evidence: "the obvious interpolation of an episode, and an omission of one or two incidents that we are led to expect, and a mention in two places of names of witches or spirits inconsistent with the names in the rest of the play."

The episode which Andrews considers to be interpolated is that of the boy and the greyhounds on pp. 196-97, 199-201. The boy comes upon a brace of greyhounds, which he takes to have strayed from their owner, to whom he decides to restore them in hope of reward. On the way the dogs start a hare, but refuse to give chase. The boy, angered by their apparent laziness, beats them, whereupon one of the dogs turns into Goody Dickison and the other into a boy. Mrs. Dickison changes the second boy into a horse, catches the first boy up in her arms, and they ride off on the horse. Andrews asserts that this episode has no connection with any of the threads of interest. On the contrary, ample preparation has been made for it. In the first scene of Act II (pp. 187-89) the witches are gathered to discuss what new deviltry they will play in order to throw their neighbors into confusion. They refer to the hunting party that is in progress, and Meg proposes to change herself into a hare to lead the dogs astray, while Gill says:

> I and my puckling will a brace
> Of Greyhounds be, fit for the race;
> And linger where we may be tane
> Up for the course in the by-lane.

The boy's experience is the obvious sequel of these plans; the dogs are Gill and her Puckling, and the hare is Meg. The boy next appears at the witches' feast, IV, i (pp. 220-21), whither he has been carried by Gill, and whence he escapes, to appear again in the final scene to give his evidence against the witches. The episode then, far from being interpolated, has a very definite connection with what precedes and what follows, and its dramatic purpose is plain—to show the witches in action. The part played by the boy Edmund Robinson in the actual Lancashire delusion was well known in London, he had been brought up to London for examination, and to omit him from the play would have been well-nigh impossible.

Andrews' second point, the omission of one or two incidents which we might expect, has some basis. It is true that the connection between the mortgage transaction (p. 178) and the incident of the receipt (p. 210) is not clear, and the business of the mortgage is dropped rather unceremoniously after the last reference to it (p. 182). It is to be noted, however, that the mortgage affair has served its dramatic purpose of bringing Generous and Arthur together, and thus furnishing a bond of connection between the plots. The reason for Arthur's appeal to Generous is the refusal of Arthur's uncle Seely to assist him with a loan, and the refusal, in turn, is occasioned by the confusion wrought by the witches in the Seely household. Such a knitting-together of plots is considerably closer than is the case in several others of Heywood's plays, e.g., *Woman Killed with Kindness* and *English Traveller.* Moreover, the granting of the loan has characterized Generous, and Robin's presentation of the receipt proves to Generous that Robin has actually been in London, as he alleges. The failure to connect the two incidents more clearly and to refer again to the mortgage does not necessarily point to revision. It should be remembered that the play was composed, probably in some haste, to take advantage of a passing

excitement, and any failure on the part of the authors to bring to a logical conclusion all the minor interests of the play may be laid more readily to haste of composition than to a supposed revision. This is particularly true since we have to deal with Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome, both of whom were somewhat rough-and-ready workmen, not distinguished for the careful finish of their plays.[26]

For the other so-called revision Andrews points to the abrupt ending of II, iv (p. 199), where a betting scene terminates "without the interference of witchcraft which we are led to expect." The scene ends with a reference to a hare which has just been started. At the opening of the next scene the boy enters with the greyhounds, crying, "A Hare, a Hare, halloe, halloe!" and beats the dogs for not giving chase, whereupon the dogs are transformed into Gill and a boy. This, surely, is a display of the expected witchcraft, although the hunters are not present to witness the transformation. The betting scene, however, like the mortgage episode, has served its dramatic purpose. The main interest of the scene is not in the betting, but in the foolish behavior of Whetstone, and when he makes his exit we are interested more in his threatened revenge for the baiting to which he has been subjected than in the comparative speed of the brown dog and the pied. The failure to provide a logical termination for the betting episode may again, I think, be laid to hasty composition, especially since the following scene does provide a display of witchcraft which accounts for the hare mentioned at the end of scene iv.

Andrews' third evidence of revision is the one suggested by Fleay, that in two instances there seems to be a confusion in the naming of the witches. Thus, at the end of Act IV, Mrs. Generous, calling a convocation of witches at the mill, says:

> Call *Meg,* and *Doll, Tib, Nab,* and *Jug,*
> Let none appeare without her Pug,

while Moll, Nab, Jug, and Peg are named in V, ii (p. 244). There is a tendency toward looseness in the names of the witches, anyway; thus Mrs. Johnson is called Meg or Peg indiscriminately (cf. p. 189, and V, v, where she is called Peg throughout). In IV, v, Mrs. Generous says: "Summon the Sisterhood together"; that is, she is giving directions for a general convocation. May not the sisterhood have comprised more than the four who are brought upon the stage, as it did in real life? Fleay thinks that before alteration V, ii, must have been Doll, Nab, Jug, and Tib. Why must we discard Moll and Peg, whom we know, because we have Nab and Jug whom we do not know? Fleay and Andrews want the names to be perfectly consistent; I think that they are loosely and carelessly used, and that the inconsistency is evidence only of haste of composition.

Having thus accounted for the evidence presented in behalf of the revision theory, let us consider the respective shares of Heywood and Brome. Andrews argues against collaboration in revision (and hence, inferentially, in actual composition) because "Heywood was writing for the Queen's Company in 1633 and the ***Lancashire Witches*** [***The Late Lancashire Witches***] was brought out by the King's Men, the company for which Brome was writing in 1633 and 1634." Supposing for the moment that Heywood was writing for the Queen's Men at the time ***The Late Lancashire Witches*** was produced—has it been proved that a playwright in the employ of one company never did any work for another company? In fact, Andrews refutes his own argument when he states that Brome was connected in 1634 with both the King's Men and the Red Bull Company, and that while he was under contract to the King's Revels Company at Salisbury Court he had written a play or two for the Cockpit.[27] Such general argument, however, is in this case not necessary to meet Andrews' objection. ***The Late Lancashire Witches*** was written in 1634, not in 1633, and Fleay on the basis of our play infers that at some time between the date of *Love's Mistress,* produced at court by the Queen's Men in 1633 and ***The Late Lancashire Witches*** Heywood transferred his services to the King's Men. Andrews cites the 1634 title-page of *Maidenhead Well Lost,* date of composition being probably 1633, but what would he say of the 1636 title-page of *Challenge for Beauty,* a play performed in 1635 by the King's Men, which, therefore, supports Fleay's theory?

Andrews accepts Fleay's assignment of the main plot—the Generous story—to Heywood. The first of his reasons, that the story is based upon the 1612 trial, is untenable. The second, that the general handling of the story, particularly in the treatment of the erring wife by her husband, is in Heywood's manner, is sufficient. The hunting scenes, also, may be compared with the first scene of *Woman Killed with Kindness.*

The attribution to Brome of the Seely story Andrews rejects because he can find no good reason for the assignment. Yet Andrews, when he accepts the Generous story as Heywood's because of its likeness to the Frankford story of *Woman Killed with Kindness,* has used precisely the kind of reasoning that Fleay did when he gave the Seely story to Brome because of its general resemblance to the inverted situation in ***Antipodes.*** Why the distinction?

That part of the story of the Seely household which concerns the servants Lawrence and Parnell is given by Andrews to Heywood because, as he says, "it is so involved with all the different interests that I have mentioned that I cannot see any possibility of a separate authorship for it." Truly, the best reason for assigning the Lawrence-Parnell story to the same hand that wrote the Seely story is that the former is an integral and essential part of the latter. But the hand is Brome's, not Heywood's. The mere fact that certain characters of the main plot, Heywood's, e.g., Bantam, Shakstone, Whetstone, are present at the Parnell-Lawrence wedding is very slender evidence upon which to assign the