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TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

The Sea Voyage (Greg, Bibliography, no. 656) was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert on 22 June 1622 and noted as acted at the Globe. In preparation for the Folio of 1647, where it occupies sigs. 5A1–5C2, it was entered in the Stationers’ Register on or around 4 September 1646. On 30 January 1673 it was re-entered in preparation for the 1679 Folio, where it is printed in sigs. 2U2–2Y3 of the second section.

The Sea Voyage was printed at the beginning of Section 5 of the 1647 Folio, the section assigned to Edward Griffin, where it occupies sigs. 5A1 to 5C2 (5C2v is blank). The text of the play was set by the same three compositors whose work is discussed elsewhere in this volume in the Introduction to The Double Marriage. The spelling habits that enable an editor to identify their work are familiar from the other plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon printed in Griffin’s shop. Compositor A prefers ‘I’le’, ‘tis’, ‘twas’, ‘twill’, ‘doe’. Compositor B prefers ‘Ile’, ‘tis’, ‘twas’, ‘twill’, ‘do’. Compositor C sets ‘tis’ (without apostrophe), but uses the apostrophe in ‘twas’ and ‘twill’. It is Compositor C who is responsible for the distinctive form ‘Ile’ that occurs on sigs. A4v, B1v, B2, C1v; and it is Compositor C who sets ‘lets’ (sigs. A4v, B1) while Compositors A and B set ‘let’s’.

Variations in the abbreviated forms of speech-prefixes also serve to differentiate compositors. Compositor A’s abbreviations for the speeches of Lamure are always La-m. Compositors B and C both designate these with the prefix Lam. Aminta’s speeches are headed Amin. by Compositor A, Amin. by Compositors B and C. Morillat’s speeches carry the prefix Morill. (or Moril.) when set by Compositor A, Mor. when set by Compositors B and C. Speech-prefixes for the ship’s Master are chiefly Mast. (sometimes Master.) when set by Compositor A; Ma. (Mast. on one occasion) when set by Compositor C; only Mast. when set by Compositor B. Compositor C is responsible for the fourteen occurrences of the abbreviation Ti. on sigs. B2 and C1v, the most distinctive departure in the text from the Tib. that is the form Tibal’s speech-prefixes normally take. The abbreviations Seba. and Sabast. for the Sebast. that elsewhere has
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headed Sebastian’s speeches occur on sigs. C1v, C2, set by Compositor C.

The names of characters when fully spelled out in the dialogue or in stage-directions or occasionally in a speech-prefix of the F1 text appear in a variety of forms that sometimes suggests distinct compositorial practices, but not always. At the outset, Compositor A had a good deal of trouble with the name that he first sets (in the stage-direction at I.i.32.1; sig. 5A1) as Tibalt de pont, but which appears as Talbat in the first speech-prefix he sets for this character (I.i.46), and as Tibat in the second speech-prefix he is given (I.i.53). The variant spellings of Hippolita’s name, however, seem to point to two different compositorial practices. Compositor B sets Hippolita (except for a single Hippolita on sig. A4 (II.i.16)); Compositor C gives us the more elaborate Hippollita of sig. B1v (III.i.223.1) and the even more extravagant Hippollita of sig. C1v (V.iv.5.1).

Composers B and C also appear to be responsible for the variant spellings of Rossella’s name. The name occurs ten times in unabridged form in the F1 text: six times in stage-directions, four times in the play’s dialogue. It is spelled in four different ways: Rossella on sig. A4 (II.i.186.1); Rossella on sig. B2v (IV.i.o.1, 28 s.d.), sig. B4v (V.i.o.1), and sig. C2 (V.iv.77); Rosellla on sig. B1v (III.i.223.1) and sig. C2 (V.iv.67, 88, 96); Rossillia on sig. C1v (V.iv.5.1). Compositor B set Rosella[Rossella, Compositor C set Rossellia/Rossillia, and on one occasion (V.iv.77) Rossella. The four occasions when the full form of the name appears in the play’s dialogue all occur within Compositor C’s setting of the last thirty lines of the text (Rossellia at V.iv.67, 88, 96; Rossella at V.iv.77). Elsewhere in the text, Rossella is found only once, in the stage-direction at III.i.223.1 (also set by Compositor C). Rossella, which Compositor C set at V.iv.77, is elsewhere to be found only in the stage-directions that Compositor B set at IV.i.o.1, IV.ii.28, and V.i.o.1. It seems clear that Compositor C preferred a form of the name ending in -ia, a preference that also included the variant form Rossillia which occurs in the stage direction at V.iv.5.1. Since Rossella is found in the work of both composers, and Rossella is apparently the peculiar property of Compositor C, Rossella seems more likely to be the form that stood in the F1 manuscript. On the few occasions when the name occurs in the dialogue, the three syllables of Rossella fit the verse better than the four
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syllables of *Rossellia*. *Rossella*, accordingly, is the form of the name adopted for that character’s speech-prefixes in this edition.

The division of the work of the three compositors in setting the text of *The Sea Voyage* seems to be as follows:

Compositor A: 5A1–5A3 (I.i.o–I.i.79); 5C1 (V.i.8–130)
Compositor B: 5A3v–5A4 (II.i.80–II.i.219); 5B2v–5B4v (III.i.433–V.i.7)
Compositor C: 5A4v–5B2 (II.i.220–III.i.434); 5C1v–5C2 (V.i.131–V.iv.116.1)

*The Sea Voyage* is the joint work of Fletcher and Massinger, and the basic nature of their collaboration is clear enough: Fletcher wrote Acts I and IV, Massinger wrote Acts II, III, and V. Unlike the usual Fletcher–Massinger collaboration, however, in which the presence of the pronoun ‘ye’ singles out certain scenes as the work of Fletcher, while its absence suggests the work of Massinger, ‘ye’ is present in some degree in virtually every scene of the F1 text of *The Sea Voyage*. This suggests that the manuscript from which F1 was printed represents a version of the text that had been worked over by Fletcher, who has given the play the form in which we have it, leaving as evidence of his presence a sprinkling of his characteristic ‘ye’s on scenes that are strongly stumped with Massinger’s verbal, syntactic and rhetorical practices. Act III provides the best example of this, where there are a number of verbal parallels with Fletcher’s work, notably in some of the speeches of Tibalt, but these are present in a dramatic context that is basically Massinger’s. The play as a whole exhibits a number of similarities to Massinger’s own work in the early 1620s, and A. H. Cruikshank was badly wrong when he announced that the plot of *The Sea Voyage* ‘does not recall [Massinger’s] work in any way.’ Croakel’s lascivious fantasies in *The Sea Voyage*, II.ii.37–70, have verbal parallels with Massinger’s *The Bondman*, I.ii.7–27 and II.ii.92–100. The grotesque degradation of the shipwrecked and famished trio of would-be gentlemen (Lamure, Franville, Morillat) early in Act III of *The Sea Voyage* is of a piece with the humiliations Massinger inflicts upon other fashionable but unworthy gentlemen in *extremis* (cf., e.g., *The Maid of Honour*, III.i.75ff; *The Picture*, V.i.40ff). Finally, *The Sea Voyage* is conceived very much in the manner of two previous Fletcher–Massinger collaborations: *The Custom of the Country* and *The Double Marriage*. All three plays turn on the adventures of a loving couple exposed to the menace of another
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woman who seeks to lay claim to the faithful lover. The similarity of the material of the sea scenes in The Double Marriage and The Sea Voyage has been noted by G. E. Bentley.4

If, however, the F1 text leaves us in no doubt that the play contains the work of both Fletcher and Massinger, and gives us a reasonably clear sense of which of the play’s five acts each dramatist was chiefly responsible for, the F1 text leaves us in considerable doubt as to just what state of the play it represents. It could possibly be a prompt-book, though the evidence for this is not strong. There are some stage-directions that could suggest a theatrical provenance: references to ‘above’ (I.v.12.1; II.i.63); ‘Hornes within’ (II.i.52); ‘this Curtaine’ (opened for a discovery scene at IV.ii.152); ‘A Table furnishi’ (V.ii.o.1); ‘horrid Musicke’ (V.iv.o.1, a direction typical of Massinger, though it can also be found in a Fletcher scene (at II.i.50) of The Queen of Corinth); ‘An alter prepar’d’ (V.iv.5.2). But along with these are directions that lack precision: ‘beats ’em out’ (I.iv.197); ‘he beats ’em off’ (I.iv.199); ‘Enter Tibalt and the rest’ (I.v.o.1); ‘Enter Albert, Tibalt, and the rest with treasure’ (III.i.396). A direction such as ‘La-m. and Franville goes up to see the Ship’ (I.v.19.1) does not convey the sort of detail a prompter would be likely to note.

There is some evidence to suggest that copy for F1 was not all of a piece. The text contains no scene divisions, but Acts I, IV, and V are conventionally headed Actus Primus——Scena Prima, Actus quartus, Scena prima, and Actus quintus, Scena prima. Acts II and III, however, are headed simply Actus Secundus and Actus Tertius. These are parts of the play that were basically Massinger’s, but Fletcher’s additions and/or alterations to them are evident from the noticeable occurrence in them of ‘ye’. F1 copy for Acts I and IV was probably Fletcher’s fool papers. F1 copy for Acts II and III was either Fletcher’s revision of Massinger’s fool papers or (more probably) a scribal transcript of his revision of these. Act V is certainly the work of Massinger, but it too has undergone some revision by Fletcher (though not on the scale of Acts II and III), and it has been severely cut (which may account for some of the numerous details of the plot that have not been satisfactorily accounted for by the time the play ends). The cutting could have been done either by Fletcher or by a theatrical adapter. F1 copy for Act V is most likely to have been a scribal transcript of this revised and abridged version of Massinger’s fool papers.
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Conjectures about the state of the text of *The Sea Voyage* raise questions about the dramatists’ treatment of their material. By the usual efficient standards of Fletcher and Massinger’s dramatic craftsmanship, *The Sea Voyage* is a poorly organized play. The opening scene of a storm at sea ending in a shipwreck is obviously intended to launch the play with a *coup de théâtre* in the manner of Shakespeare’s *Tempest*, and in the action that follows something of a Shakespearean design can be dimly discerned: the principal members of the shipwrecked party find themselves on a desolate island inhabited by persons whom they have wronged in the past; they thereby become subject to the revenge of their former victims. Much depends in this sort of plot on the revelation of the past events that have brought both parties to their present condition, and even Shakespeare’s Prospero must be allowed some lengthy narrations early in *The Tempest* in the interest of dramatic exposition. In *The Sea Voyage*, the action antecedent to the play is so very complicated that explanations about who was separated from whom, by whose agency and under what circumstances and with what consequences, virtually strangle the dramatic life not only of the opening scenes but of the entire play. Motive and impulse are seldom dramatized; they are simply announced, and the resolution of the complex action that the final scenes of the play attempt is managed not by dramatic means but by extended feats of narration. The speeches of Albert (V.ii.63–83), Raymond (V.ii.86–125), Rossella (V.iv.7–49), and Sebastian (V.iv.78–96) are Massinger’s dutiful efforts to give credence to the events of a dramatic plot that have not been coherently dramatized. While acknowledging the possibility that the F1 text of *The Sea Voyage* has been cut, or that it represents something less than the finished state that the play was eventually given, one ought also to be prepared to consider the possibility that in many respects the F1 text gives us the play pretty much as Fletcher and Massinger left it: one of their hestier, less considered, less considerable performances. The hand of Fletcher, here discernible throughout the play in a way uncharacteristic of most Fletcher–Massinger collaborations, may represent a salvage effort on his part. The highly irregular verse of the F1 text – which has been frequently relined in the present edition – suggests a similarly ambiguous feature about the manuscript from which the F1 text of the play was set: on the one hand, a good deal of the faulty lineation may be attributed to an indifferent scribe, or to a
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manuscript made difficult for a compositor by revision and cutting; on the other hand, much of the irregular verse is inherent in the writing and is not the result of inept typesetting or of cutting for the stage. Much of the verse suggests hasty and unrevised composition.

The fact that The Sea Voyage is not included in the list of plays that the Lord Chamberlain protected for the King’s men in August 1641 may indicate, as Bentley has suggested, that the play was not then in the company’s active repertory. After the restoration, however, the King’s company is known to have revived The Sea Voyage under the title The Storm. Pepys, who attended the first performance of the revival on 25 September 1667 (the house ‘ininitely full: the King and all the Court almost there’), pronounced it ‘but so-so’ and only approved of ‘a most admirable dance at the end, of the ladies, in a military manner, which indeed did plese me mightily’. He returned to the theatre on the following day to show the play to his wife; his view of it remained unchanged, ‘the principal thing extraordinary being the dance, which is very good’. A few weeks later (7 November 1667), the rival Duke’s company brought out its answer to The Storm when it produced Dryden and Davenant’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s The Tempest. In the Preface to The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island, Dryden, anxious to prove that Shakespeare’s Tempest was worth imitating, pointed out that ‘our excellent Fletcher had so great a value for it, that he thought fit to make use of the same Design . . . Those who have seen his Sea-Voyage, may easily discern that it was a Copy of Shakespeare’s Tempest: the Storm, the desert Island, and the woman who had never seen a Man, are all sufficient testimonies of it.’ This exaggerates the similarities between the two plays, though it is probably true enough to say, as Dryden goes on to say in the Prologue to his and Davenant’s Tempest, that

The Storm which vanish’d on the Neighb’ring shore,  
Was taught by Shakespeare’s Tempest first to roar.*

The neighboring shore was, of course, the Theatre Royal in Bridges Street where the King’s company’s production of The Sea Voyage, now known as The Storm, had expired after a run of, apparently, only three days. The play was revived briefly in the following spring. Pepys attended the performance of 25 March 1668, ‘but without much pleasure, it being but a mean play compared with ‘The Tempest,’ at
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the Duke of York’s house’. All he found to commend in this and a later performance on 16 May was the actress Elizabeth Knepp, in the role of Aminta, doing ‘her part of sorrow’.

An adaptation of The Sea Voyage, titled A Commonwealth of Women, by Thomas D’Urfey, was performed by the United Company at the Theatre Royal in the late summer of 1685; a printed text was published in 1686.

NOTES

1 Evidence for the authorial division is set forth by Cyrus Hoy in ‘The shares of Fletcher and his collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher canon (II)’, Studies in Bibliography, IX (1917), 153, 160–1.
5 See the Introduction to my edition of The Double Marriage elsewhere in the present volume (p. 102, note 6).
6 The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, III, 414.
9 Ibid. X, 6.
10 Ibid. X, 320.
12 Ibid. p. 338.
THE PERSONS REPRESENTED IN THE PLAY

[Men]
Albert, a French Pirat, in love with Aminta.
Tibalt du Pont, a merry Gentleman, friend to Albert.
Master of the Ship, an honest merry man.
Lamure, an usuring Merchant.
Franville, a vain-glorious gallant.
Morillat, a shallow-brain’d Gentleman.
Boatswain, an honest man.
Sebastian, a noble Gentleman of Portugal, Husband to Rosellia.
Nicusa, Nephew to Sebastian, both cast upon a desert Island.
Raymond, brother to Aminta.
Surgeon.
Sailors.

[ Gentlemen. ]

Women
Aminta, Mistress to Albert, a noble French Virgin.
Rosellia, Governess of the Amazonian Portugals.
Clarinda, Daughter to Rosellia, in love with Albert.
Hippolita,
Crocale,
Juletta.
 three Ladies, Members of the Female Common-wealth.
The Scene, First at Sea, then in the desert Islands.

The Principal Actors were

 Joseph Taylor,  John Lowin.
 William Egestone,  John Underwood.
 Nich. Tootie.

The Persons . . . in the Play.] adapted from F3; omit F1
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A Tempest, Thunder and Lightning. Enter Master and two Saylors.  

Master. Lay her aloofe, the Sea grows dangerous,  
How it spits against the clouds, how it capers,  
And how the fiery Element frights it back!  
There be devils dancing in the aire, I think;  
I saw a Dolphin hang ith hornes of the moone  
Shot from a wave: hey day, hey day,  
How she kicks and yerks?  
Down with'e main Mast, lay her at hull,  
Farle up all her Linnens, and let her ride it out.  
Shees so deep laden, that sheele buldge.  

Master. Hang her.  
Can she not buffet with a storm a little?  
How it tosses her! she reeles like a Drunkard.  
2. Saylor. We have discovered the Land Sir,  
Pray let's make in, shee's so drunke; else,  
She may chance to cast up all her Lading.  
1. Saylor. Stand in, stand in, we are all lost els,  
Lost and perisht.  

Master. Steer her a Star-boord there.  
2. Saylor. Beare in with all the Sayle we can, see Master  
See, What a clap of Thunder there is,  
What a face of heaven, how dreadfully it looks?  
Master. Thou rascal, thou fearfull rogue, thou hast bin praying;  
I see't in thy face, thou hast been mumbling,  
When we are split you slave; is this a time,  
To discourage our friends with your cold orrizons?  
Call up the Boatswaine; how it storms; holla.  

[Enter Boatswaine.]