

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

LOVE'S CURE

edited by

GEORGE WALTON WILLIAMS

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

Love's Cure, or The Martial Maid (Greg, *Bibliography*, no. 661) was one in the list of plays by Beaumont and Fletcher entered to Humphrey Moseley in the Stationers' Register between 4 and 15 September 1646. The play was printed in the 1647 Folio, this text being the only one of authority.¹

The Prologue 'At the reviving of this Play' and the Epilogue give indication of being later additions. The Prologue (set in large type so as to fill page 5S6) speaks of the passage of some time between the writing of the play and its revival:²

The minds art has this preheminance,
She still retaineth her first excellence.

The Epilogue (page 5S5^v) concludes the play in a tone of general neutrality. It speaks of 'Our Author', and it sounds as if it might serve as epilogue to any comedy. Indeed, it does serve also as epilogue to Lodowick Carlell's *Deserving Favorite*, published in 1629, though perhaps written any time between 1622 and 1629.³ If the Epilogue was originally written for *Love's Cure*, its reference to the singular 'author' is puzzling, as it might be assumed that the value of double authorship was greater than that of single authorship.⁴ If, on the other hand, the Epilogue betokens a revival and the 'author' is in fact merely the reviser, another puzzle develops. In short, it seems wisest not to attempt to draw information from these two pieces, but to interpret them in the light of information drawn from less nebulous sources. Professor Bentley's hypothesis is prob-

¹ R. C. Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647* (Oxford, 1938).

² R. Warwick Bond ('On Six Plays in Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679', *R.E.S.*, xi (July, 1935), 267) suggests that the Prologue belongs to *The Queen of Corinth*, the play designed to follow *Love's Cure* in Moseley's original scheme, but the bibliographical evidence of the assignment of plays to Griffin vitiates this suggestion.

³ Charles H. Gray, *Lodowick Carlell [sic]* (Chicago, 1905).

⁴ Mr Hoy has pointed to other examples of this situation ('The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (vi)', *SB*, xiv (1961), 48).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

LOVE'S CURE

ably correct (for reasons that will appear below): 'The prologue and epilogue, therefore, indicate that *Love's Cure* was originally a collaboration by Beaumont and Fletcher, and was later revised by a single dramatist, presumably Philip Massinger.'¹

Mr Hoy's linguistic demonstration of the various shares of authorship sheds a clear light into one of the more confused and uncertain areas of the canon. He regards the play as originally a collaborative effort of Beaumont and Fletcher, Acts I, IV, and V being a revision by Massinger 'so extensive as to amount to re-writing'.²

I.i	Rewritten by Massinger
I.ii	Fletcher revised by Massinger
I.iii	Rewritten by Massinger
II.i	Beaumont and Fletcher ('essentially the work of Beaumont')
II.ii.1-120	Fletcher ('essentially, the unaided work of Fletcher')
121-68	Fletcher revised by Massinger
168-259	Beaumont and Fletcher ('essentially, unaided Beaumont')
III.i	Beaumont ('wholly [Beaumont's]')
III.ii	Fletcher revised by Massinger
III.iii.1-17	Fletcher
18-77	Beaumont
78-123	Fletcher revised by Massinger
III.iv	Fletcher revised by Massinger
III.v	Fletcher
IV.i	Rewritten by Massinger
IV.ii	Rewritten by Massinger
IV.iii.1-19	Rewritten by Massinger
20-71	Fletcher revised by Massinger ('basically the work of Fletcher')
71-132	Rewritten by Massinger
IV.iv	Rewritten by Massinger
V.i	Rewritten by Massinger
V.ii	Rewritten by Massinger
V.iii.1-194	Beaumont and Fletcher revised by Massinger
195-256	Beaumont and Fletcher
257-62	Massinger

¹ G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, III (Cambridge, 1954), 365. The thesis that the double title indicates two stages of the development of the text does not seem persuasive (cf. Baldwin Maxwell, *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1939), pp. 1-3).

² Hoy, 'Fletcher and his Collaborators', p. 49. The assignments are taken from pp. 48-56, *passim*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

These observations on authorship yield deductions on the date and the construction of the play. If the play contains the collaborative work of Beaumont and Fletcher, it must have been written prior to 1613, when Beaumont retired; and Mr Hoy has argued strongly that it probably is 'one of the earliest' of their collaborations, earlier even than *The Woman Hater*, written in the first half of 1606. Oliphant had already reached the same conclusion, arguing that Maurice (I.ii.33) would not have been titled 'Graf' after 1609 and that the character of Lazarillo in *Love's Cure* is a preliminary sketch of the character of the same name in *The Woman Hater*, a 'more complete and finished creation'.¹

The main situation of the play, involving the transvestite siblings, however, derives from the Spanish comedy *La fuerza de la costumbre* by Guillén de Castro y Bellris, published in 1625 in Valencia.² As this publication could not have reached England in time for Beaumont or Fletcher to have used it, the conclusion must be that the remarkable parallels between the Spanish comedy and *Love's Cure* are due to the reviser, Philip Massinger.³

An analysis of the play based on the authorship tests discloses that the sections for which Beaumont is primarily responsible are

¹ E. H. C. Oliphant, *Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), p. 418, and 'Three Beaumont and Fletcher Plays', *R.E.S.*, xii (April, 1936), 200; see below, p. 6, n. 2. The popularity of the name 'Lazarillo' on the English stage traces its appearance from *Blurt, Master Constable* (1602), where Lazarillo is a braggart soldier who has a hungry servant. The name then appears in *Love's Cure* and *The Woman Hater*, and in *Match Me in London* and *All's Lost by Lust*. See Thomas L. Berger, 'A Critical Old-spelling Edition of Thomas Dekker's *Blurt, Master Constable* (1602)' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, Durham, N.C., 1969). See also John Shirley, 'The Parasite, the Glutton, and the Hungry Knave in English Drama to 1625' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1937). Bond notices several verbal parallels between *Blurt* and *Love's Cure* (pp. 268–9).

² The comedy was probably written 1610–15(?), but it seems unnecessary to invent the thesis that a manuscript version had preceded the printed edition to England. See Courtney Bruerton, 'The Chronology of the "Comedias" of Guillén de Castro', *Hispanic Review*, xii (April, 1944), 89–151. See also Martin E. Erickson, 'A Review of Scholarship Dealing with the Problem of a Spanish Source for *Love's Cure*', in Waldo F. McNeir (ed.), *Studies in Comparative Literature*, Louisiana State University Studies, Humanities Series, no. 11 (Baton Rouge, 1962), pp. 102–19.

³ His biographers have concluded that Massinger was probably able to read Spanish (T. A. Dunn, *Philip Massinger* (London, 1957), p. 12; Donald S. Lawless, *Philip Massinger and His Associates* (Muncie, Ind., 1967), p. 7).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

LOVE'S CURE

those of Malroda and the Alguazier (III.i, iii) with the necessary associations of Vitelli and Piorato; Mr Hoy has described Beaumont's contribution in Malroda's 'finely extravagant speech' and in Vitelli's reply (III.iii.32–77) as 'the finest things in the play'. Beaumont also treats the romantic interest in material now assigned to Clara and Vitelli (II.ii.168–259). Fletcher's sections treat primarily of the four low-comedy figures – Pachieco, Mendoza, Metaldi, and Lazarillo (III.v; IV.iii.20–71) – though he seems to have joined with Beaumont in treating Vitelli and Malroda (III.iii.78–123), and Beaumont seems to have joined with him in depicting the four comics (II.i). Acts II and III contain, as Mr Hoy has said, 'much composite writing'. Fletcher is perhaps also responsible for the situations of Lucio and Bobadilla in I.ii and in II.ii (with Clara); his preferred 'ye' is found in the latter scene.

It is evident then that the two groups of characters consisting on the one hand of Malroda, Vitelli, Piorato, and the Alguazier and on the other of Mendoza, Metaldi, Pachieco, and Lazarillo constitute the vestigial remains of a Beaumont and Fletcher collaboration, dating from the early years of the century, probably between 1602 (the publication of *Blurt, Master Constable*) and 1606 (the date of *The Woman Hater*). It is possible also that these characters formed plots and/or subplots of a play the main plot of which turned on reversals of the sexes and transvestitism involving Clara, Lucio, and Bobadillo. Amazonian maidens were known from classical times, but Bond has noticed the presence of martial maids on both warring sides during the siege of Ostend.¹ It may be suggested further that twenty years later, Massinger undertook to refurbish this old and apparently not popular² comedy by revising it in light of his knowledge of *La fuerza de la costumbre*, another play referring to the Spanish wars in Flanders, and of Leonard Digges' translation

¹ Bond, 'Six Plays', p. 266. Bentley dates the 'historic setting of the play' during the years following the Spanish siege of Ostend (which took place 1601–4), to which conspicuous reference is made in the opening scene (p. 364). If Beaumont and Fletcher are responsible for this historic setting, they were writing of a contemporary moment.

² If *Love's Cure* had not been popular when presented in its *ur*-version, Beaumont and Fletcher might have felt no qualms in extracting from it what of merit could be rescued – the character of Lazarillo – and in re-using it almost immediately, consigning the rest of their work to the files.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

of the Spanish romance *Gerardo*, published in 1622.¹ To the latter source Massinger had already turned in preparing with Fletcher *The Spanish Curate*, and he used it again for the situation involving Vitelli and Malroda (IV.ii). From it he may have taken the names Sayavedra and Mendoza (though neither is uncommon); in historical materials on the Siege of Ostend he could have found the names of Spinola, Alvarez, Vitelli, Pacheco, and Lamoral. No names derive from *La fuerza de la costumbre*, but twice in the opening scenes of *Love's Cure* does Bobadilla mention the force of custom (I.ii.47; II.ii.95; in the latter instance the Fletcherian 'ye' is immediately adjacent). The most reasonable conclusion is that already advanced by Mr Hoy: the Folio text presents a composite play the sub-plots of which, joint efforts of Beaumont and Fletcher in ca. 1605, have been revised, rewritten, reordered, and fitted into a main plot by Philip Massinger after 1625. Original material in this reworking has been assigned to new characters, all names have been made uniform, and the whole has been given a final integrity surprising in light of its fragmented composition. 'The play has been re-worked, in some degree, from beginning to end, but it has been re-worked much more extensively in some places than in others. Massinger's revision of the first and the last two acts has been so extensive as to amount to re-writing. . . His handling of Acts II and III was much less thoroughgoing; there he had been content to stitch some of his favorite turns of phrase on to a textual fabric clearly not of his own devising.'²

There is little evidence on which to found a description of the manuscript that served as printer's copy for the Folio, but what there is would suggest that the copy was itself, or was based on, a prompt book. Many critics have noted the marginal stage direction '2 *Torches | ready*' (beside III.iv.76), anticipating by 60 lines their use; this clearly derives from actual prompt condition. Mr Hoy adds that 'The long final scene has apparently been marked for two theatrical cuts. . . which were never actually made in the prompt book, but the cues for which survive in the folio text in the otherwise inexplicable repetition of two speeches. Genevora's line:

¹ Bond, 'Six Plays', pp. 266–7.

² Hoy, 'Fletcher and his Collaborators', p. 49.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

LOVE'S CURE

'*Lamorall*: you have often sworne | You'd be commanded by me" [V.iii. after line 137*a*] is repeated. . . later [V.iii.150–1], where following *Lamorall*'s answer, her reply "Your hearing for six words" [after 'in me.', line 153] anticipates. . . [line 174] at which it is repeated, this time in a speech of *Eugenia*'s.¹ Another indication of prompt origin is the appearance of entry directions a few lines in advance of the moment of actual entry (as marked by the speech of the entering character). This phenomenon is so frequent as to constitute almost a policy on the matter. Yet another example of this sort of anticipation occurs at I.iii.40 where the 'Musick' presumably accompanying *Eugenia*'s entrance at line 40 is cited in a direction at line 38.² The copy can hardly have served as a thoroughly acceptable prompt book, however, for it lacks many exit directions and a few entry directions; regularity in these matters one would have assumed a prerequisite for intelligent prompting.

It should be mentioned in passing that there is evidence that the play was written to be performed with an interval between Acts IV and V (and thus presumably between the other acts as well), for the text requires a character's exit at the end of one scene and his immediate re-entry at the beginning of the succeeding scene. Such going and coming are meaningless unless an interval (of music?) intervenes. (This particular interval, according to *Lamorall* (V.i.1), represents the passing of six hours.)

The text as preserved in the 1647 Folio frequently prints a dash (—) to indicate, presumably, the deletion of an oath or asseveration. Such spaces, variously filled by editors ('Heav'n', 'pox'), have been reprinted as dashes in the present edition. No reconstruction suggests itself immediately for the two dashes at IV.ii.37.

Love's Cure, or The Martial Maid was printed in the 1647 Folio in Section 5, the section assigned to Edward Griffin.³ The play was

¹ Hoy, 'Fletcher and his Collaborators', pp. 55–6. See Textual Notes.

² Dyce was the first editor to notice this anticipation. For another of his comments on the music of the play, see the Textual Note to III.ii.118.

³ The comments that follow on the printing and press-work of *Love's Cure* are much indebted to Professor Standish Henning, whose unpublished analysis of Section 5, kindly made available to me, has confirmed some of my own findings and illuminated others. I have also benefited from the insights of Mr (now Dr) Thomas L. Berger in compositor analysis.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

originally intended by Moseley to conclude the section, for it bears on the last page the catchword 'Queene of *Corinth.*', the title of the first play in section 6 following. In fact, it is followed by *The Honest Man's Fortune*, a play evidently added to Griffin's share after the original assignments had been made and perhaps after *Love's Cure* had been completely printed off.

The play occupies signatures 5Q3 through 5S6 (5S6^v is blank); quires 5Q and 5R are in fours, the normal pattern of the folio, but quire 5S is in sixes, another indication that it was designed to conclude the section.

The running-title analysis suggests three-skeleton work for the three quires, with three verso titles and three recto titles appearing in a reasonable sequence.

Verso:	I	Q3 ^v , R4 ^v , S5 ^v	<i>Loves Cure, or</i> ¹
	III	Q4 ^v , R1 ^v , S2 ^v , S4 ^v	<i>Loves Cure, or</i> ²
	V	R2 ^v , R3 ^v , S1 ^v , S3 ^v	<i>Loves Cure, or</i>
Recto:	II	Q4, R4, S3, S5	<i>the Martiall Mayde.</i>
	IV	R1, S1, S2	<i>The Martiall Maid.</i>
	VI	R2, R3, S4	<i>The Martiall Maid.</i>

The inner and outer formes of the outer sheet of 5S are each printed in a skeleton from which one running title has been removed (i.e., from 5S6 and 6^v). As both these skeletons appear complete in the middle or inner sheets of the quire, it must follow that the middle and inner sheets were imposed before the outer sheet.³ (To suppose that two skeletons were dismantled for the outer sheet and then reassembled for the middle and inner sheets, both of them correctly, would be to strain conjecture.) In consequence it should follow that printing began, as is now thought customary, from the innermost sheet (probably the innermost forme) of quires 5S and proceeded to the outermost. The same method obtained probably for 5Q and 5R.

¹ Title I is changed on S5^v to read '*Loves Cure, &c.*'

² Title III is pied between quires Q and R, '*Loves*' only remaining constant.

³ Though the running title was removed to print page 5S6, the page number was not; in consequence, '143' appears on page 5S4 and again, erroneously, on page 5S6. The error demonstrates that 5S4 was printed before 5S6. Another error in pagination, '128' for '127' on 5Q4 (University of Texas, copy 2), is an error of verso for recto, occasioned perhaps by changing from one play to another.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

LOVE'S CURE

Compositorial analysis suggests that three compositors set the type for *Love's Cure*; their stints are as follows:

Comp. <i>A</i> :	Q4 ^v , R1, 1 ^v , 2,	4 ^v , S1, 1 ^v ,
<i>B</i> :		R2 ^v , 3, 3 ^v , 4,
<i>C</i> :	Q3, 3 ^v , 4,	
<i>A</i> :		S5, 5 ^v , 6
<i>B</i> :	S3 ^v , 4, 4 ^v ,	
<i>C</i> :	S2, 2 ^v , 3,	

The indifference to distinctions of forme or quire argues for assignments based primarily on time and availability; it suggests successive (not simultaneous) work and points to seriatim setting as the method of composition used.¹

The linguistic preferences that distinguish the compositors from one another are these:

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
P'le (Ile)	Ile	P'le (Ile)
i'le	ile	i'le
'tis, 'twas, 'twill, <i>etc.</i>	tis, twas, twill	'tis, 'twas, 'twill
beleeve	believe	believe
Country	Countrey	Country
Mistresse	Mistris	Mistris
doe (do)	do (doe)	do
goe	go (goe)	go
will	will (wil)	wil (will)

Attempts to relate these distinctions to the authorial divisions have not been fruitful; apparently the manuscript underlying the printed edition is in the hand of a single writer which yet preserves the varying linguistic formations of the several authors.

¹ The seeming random succession of stints of varying length in the *Love's Cure* quires is thoroughly consistent with the 'pattern' in the rest of Griffin's section, as Mr Henning's analysis makes clear. Though this pattern does not preclude the possibility of setting by formes in the play, it renders it unlikely; normally, that method of setting should reveal itself (one would suppose) in a pattern of shared work based on formes. The actual pattern here seems to be based on time, without regard to formes or quires.

Mr Henning notes (privately) that, as a general rule, types do not recur within the same quire; from this negative evidence he concludes tentatively that many pages were left standing (waiting to be printed or distributed) as the composition proceeded. Such a thesis is congruent with the proposition of seriatim setting and with the observation already advanced that printing proceeded from innermost forme (i.e., the first available) to outermost.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06037-0 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,
Volume III

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

Though it is likely that *Love's Cure* was performed in its original condition – perhaps by the Children of Paul's – there is no record of a performance by the Children and no record of its ever having been licensed for the stage. It must be supposed, however, that it did enjoy a performance in its revised form, for a Prologue was written for the occasion (1626?). In a warrant issued by the Lord Chamberlain on 7 August 1641, prohibiting the publication of sixty plays the property of the King's Men,¹ *Love's Cure* was included as in their repertory. It was not performed between 1660 and 1710, and 'the 1778 editors stated that it had not been acted "for many years past." On May 22, 1793, the Drury Lane Company, performing in the Haymarket Theater, gave *The Female Duellist*, "never acted before."² This 'poor farce' seems to have been inspired by *Love's Cure*.

The present text is based on a collation of sixteen copies of the 1647 Folio. In addition, four copies now at the Library of the University of Illinois and five copies (as well as the one fully collated) in the Library of the University of Texas have been sporadically examined for variants.

The Historical Collation includes the two seventeenth-century folio editions, the eighteenth-century collected editions, and the sole separate quarto edition (reprinting F2) of the play: 'Love's Cure: or, the Martial Maid. A Comedy. Written by Mr. Francis Beaumont, and Mr. John Fletcher. London, Printed for J. T. And Sold by J. Brown at the Black Swan without Temple-Bar. 1718.'

The only modern edition of the play of which I am aware is that of Professor Guy A. Battle, submitted as a master's thesis at Duke University in 1947, but the edition has not been published. Though I have not included this edition in the Historical Collation, I have profited much by its suggestions. I am indebted also to Mr L. A. Beaurline who has called to my attention the various manuscripts and musical settings of the song at III.ii.119–26; of the five settings, only one (Rosenbach) is without the music of John Wilson.

¹ Bald, *Bibliographical Studies*, pp. 5–8.

² Guy A. Battle (ed.), 'Loves Cure, or the Martiall Maid. . . A Critical Text with Comment' (unpublished master's thesis, Duke University, Durham, N.C., 1947), pp. 178, 177–80.