

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher  
Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

THE WOMAN'S PRIZE  
OR  
THE TAMER TAMED

*edited by*

FREDSON BOWERS

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

*The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed* (Greg, no. 660) is generally regarded as the sole work of John Fletcher, composed early in his career and probably acted in 1611.<sup>1</sup> It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 4 September 1646 to H. Robinson and Humphrey Mosely, with numerous other plays for the 1647 Folio, and first appeared in this Folio, sigs. 5N1–5Q2, pp. 97–123 (sig. 5Q2<sup>v</sup> blank), in the section printed by Edward Griffin the Younger. After a transfer from Robinson to Martyn and Herringman on 13 May 1671, with other Folio plays, it was reprinted in the Folio of 1679, sigs. 2F3–1I3<sup>v</sup>, pp. 229–54. In the Folger Shakespeare Library is preserved a manuscript (J.b.3) once originally bound in the Lambarde volume.

Only two pre-Restoration references to the play are known. It was acted before 18 October 1633 in a form that caused Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, to call it in for censorship; subsequently, it was presented at court on 28 November 1633.

Herbert's interference is well documented although some important questions remain unanswered in the account from his Office Book:

1633, October 18. On friday the nineteenth [an error for 'eighteenth'] of October, 1633, I sent a warrant by a messenger of the chamber to suppress

<sup>1</sup> For the authorship, see Cyrus Hoy, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon', *Studies in Bibliography*, VIII (1956), 129–46. The evidence for the dating is considered by Baldwin Maxwell, 'The Woman's Prize, or the Tamer Tamed', *Modern Philology*, XXXII (1935), 353–63, utilized subsequently in his *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (1939, repr. London, 1966), and Clifford Leech, *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962). The earliest textual and historical study of the play is that by R. C. Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647* (London, 1938). The text has been edited by George P. Ferguson (*The Hague*, 1966); the text of the Lambarde manuscript alone has been edited, with a careful examination of all pertinent evidence bearing on the textual transmission, by Graham C. Adams (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Brunswick, Canada, 1974). Dr Adams generously made a copy of his dissertation available to me and I have laid it under heavy contribution. Any differences in our opinion about the textual situation are relatively minor.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

#### THE WOMAN'S PRIZE

*The Tamer Tamd*, to the Kings players, for that afternoone, and it was obeyd; upon complaints of foule and offensive matters conteyned therein.

They acted *The Scornful Lady* instead of it, I have entered the warrant here:

'These are to will and require you to forbear the actinge of your play called *The Tamer Tamd*, or *the Taming of the Tamer*, this afternoone, or any more till you have leave from mee: and this at your perill. On friday morninge the 18 Octob. 1633.

To Mr. Taylor, Mr. Lowins, or any of the Kings players at the Blackfryers.'

On saterday morninge followinge the book was brought mee, and at my lord of Hollands request I returned it to the players y<sup>e</sup> monday morninge after, purgd of oaths, prophaness, and ribaldrye, being y<sup>e</sup> 21 of Octob. 1633.

Herbert then continues in a vein that indicates that the suppression of *The Woman's Prize* was not an isolated incident but the institution of a new policy:

Because the stoppinge of the acting of this play for that afternoone, it being an ould play, hath raysed some discourse in the players, thogh no disobedience, I have thought fitt to insert here their submission upon a former disobedience, and to declare that it concerns the Master of the Revells to bee carefull of their ould revived playes, as of their new, since they may conteyne offensive matter, which ought not to be allowed in any time.

The Master ought to have copies of their new playes left with him, that he may be able to shew what he hath allowed or disallowed.

All ould plays ought to bee brought to the Master of the Revells, and have his allowance to them, for which he should have his fee, since they may be full of offensive things against church and state; y<sup>e</sup> rather that in former time the poetts tooke greater liberty than is allowed by mee.

The players ought not to study their parts till I have allowed of the booke.

When on the following Monday Herbert (evidently under some pressure to be expeditious) returned the censored manuscript to the company, he added the following letter to the book-keeper:

'Mr. Knight,

In many things you have saved mee labour; yet wher your judgement or penn fayld you, I have made boulde to use mine. Purge ther parts, as I have the booke. And I hope every hearer and player will thinke that I have done God good servise, and the quality no wronge; who hath no greater enemies than oaths, prophaness, and publique ribaldry, w<sup>ch</sup> for the future I doe absolutely forbid to bee presented unto mee in any playbooke, as you will answer it at your perill. 21 Octob. 1633.'

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

This was subscribed to their play of *The Tamer Tamed*, and directed to Knight, their book-keeper (*Dramatic Records*, ed. J. Q. Adams (repr. New York, 1963), pp. 20–1).

There is general agreement that the Folger manuscript was copied from a prompt-book,<sup>1</sup> cut for acting before Herbert's interference with the text. The manuscript is a folio of fifty-two leaves written on both sides and bound irregularly in 6's. A slip with writing only on the verso side is found as fol. 22, containing a passage of eighteen written lines from II.vi.144 (second half) to II.vi.156. Whether the slip repairs an inadvertent omission (as Bald suggests, p. 52) or whether (as Adams thinks it possible, pp. xxvii–xxviii) the leaf had been normally copied but damaged parts cut away, is uncertain. The catchword on fol. 21<sup>v</sup> agrees with the first words of the slip, and the slip's catchword agrees with the following word at the top of fol. 23. On the whole, the writing on only one side of the paper suggests the repair of some accident in transcription, the nature of which can be subject only to speculation. Eighteen lines might seem to be too few to justify a hypothesis that the scribe inadvertently turned over two pages of his copy at a time; it may be that there was also some form of slip in the copy that caused the difficulty.

In the inscription the scribe wrote the speech-prefixes and stage-directions in a larger hand. Speeches or stage-directions are not marked off by rules, but most of the directions are preceded by a long dash. The manuscript is divided into acts but only the second scene of Act I is numbered although there is a generally observed custom of indicating scenes by centrally placed opening stage-directions. No title-page, prologue, or epilogue is present. A corrector, different from the transcriber, made fifteen definite and four probable alterations, apparently by reference to copy.<sup>2</sup> The date

<sup>1</sup> Bald, p. 60; Ferguson, p. 31; Adams, pp. xxiiiiff.

<sup>2</sup> These are recorded in the Historical Collation. Most correct such simple misreadings as at II.vi.92 where the 'o' of Ms 'bone' is altered to an 'a' to form the correct word 'bane'. Most substantive variants are fairly obvious alterations of the MS scribe's careless slips, yet they indicate some care in reading over the MS and ordinarily bring the variant into conformity with the F1 reading, as in the interlined 'yet' in II.vi.90 which for some reason had been deleted by the scribe in the course of his inscription, or in the wrong speech-prefix *Pedro* for *Rowland* at I.iv.6, or the addition of 'ly' to 'learned' at II.vi.64. The most puzzling variant is that at II.vi.104, in which 'recant' is deleted and 'recreant' interlined although the F1 reading is also

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE WOMAN'S PRIZE

of the manuscript is uncertain: the watermark of a five-pointed Foolscap with countermark RP or PR is, as usual, not to be dated with any precision.<sup>1</sup> That the transcript was made before the appearance of the 1647 Folio is clear on practical grounds, but the rest is subject only to conjecture. Like the scribal manuscript of *Beggars' Bush*, which we owe to a court performance, the performance in November 1633 before the king may have occasioned sufficient interest for a private transcript to be requested which came into the hands of the private collector whose papers were utilized in the preparation of *Beggars' Bush* and *The Woman's Prize* for the 1679 Folio. This Folio supplies some authoritative matter missing from the 1647 Folio but present in the manuscripts of both plays; and indeed the Lambarde manuscript itself of *The Woman's Prize* may have been the document that was collated with some occasional care against the 1647 text used as printer's copy for 1679.<sup>2</sup> The *Beggars' Bush* manuscript may be dated as late as 1637/8 but could be earlier. Whether the 1633 or some unknown later revival of *The Woman's Prize* occasioned its private transcription is not to be determined.

Griffin used three compositors to set the 1647 Folio text of the play, two working simultaneously on the two pages of each forme in rough alternation. These three workmen had sufficiently different spelling characteristics so that the pages (and sometimes columns) that each set may be distinguished with relative certainty.<sup>3</sup>

'recant'. The reading 'recreant' is almost certainly correct but how it could have been recovered from copy is difficult to imagine without the strain of hypothesizing double error by MS scribe and F 1 compositor misreading a perhaps unclear inscription. It may be, then, that this word is instead an inspired guess by the corrector. For a description of the correcting hand see Bald, pp. 51–2, modified and elaborated by Adams, pp. xxxii–xxxiii.

<sup>1</sup> It may be the twin of Churchill's no. 341 of 1644; see W. A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper* (1935, repr. Meppel, Netherlands, 1967), pp. 42–3, 81. But the moulds may have been in use earlier or the paper identified in 1644 may have been old stock.

<sup>2</sup> For the relationship of the Lambarde manuscript of *Beggars' Bush* to F 2, and its general textual and theatrical history, see the Textual Introduction in the present *Works*, vol. III (Cambridge, 1976). That MS itself may have been the collating agent for *The Woman's Prize* is suggested by the omission in F 2 of any variants from F 1 (except for normal compositorial error or sophistication) that are not present in MS except for the song. On the contrary, F 2 of *Beggars' Bush* may have some authorial readings that derive from the prompt-book from which the preserved MS was copied.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Professor Standish Henning's unpublished analysis of the fifth

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

COMPOSITOR <i>A</i>	COMPOSITOR <i>B</i>	COMPOSITOR <i>C</i>
I'le (Ile)	Ile	I'le (Ile)
i'le (ile)	ile	i'le (ile)
doe (do)	do (doe)	do
beleeve	believe	believe
Mistresse	Mistris	Mistris
Countrey	Countrey	Country
'tis	tis	tis
'twill <i>etc.</i>	twill <i>etc.</i>	'twill <i>etc.</i>

Compositor *A* is largely indifferent whether he set 'I'le' ('i'le') or 'Ile' ('ile'); Compositor *B* invariably set 'Ile' ('ile'); Compositor *C* has a preference for 'I'le' ('i'le') but will admit 'Ile' ('ile'). Compositor *A* has a strong preference for 'doe' but admits a few 'do' spellings, whereas Compositor *B*'s characteristic is precisely the opposite and Compositor *C* is invariable in setting 'do'. The other words are sufficiently indicated in the list as invariant spellings.

Compositor *A* set sigs. 5N3<sup>v</sup>–5O1<sup>r</sup> (I.iii.212–II.iv.20) and sigs. 5P1<sup>v</sup>–5P3<sup>r</sup> (IV.i.63–IV.v.97).

Compositor *B* set sigs. 5N1<sup>r</sup>–5N3<sup>r</sup> (I.i.0–I.iii.211), sigs. 5O1<sup>v</sup>–5O2<sup>va</sup> (II.iv.21–III.i.18), sig. 5O3<sup>rb</sup> (III.ii.23–III.iii.24), sigs. 5O4<sup>r</sup>–5P1<sup>r</sup> (III.iii.128 (*2nd half*))–IV.i.62) and sigs. 5P4<sup>v</sup>–5Q1<sup>v</sup> (V.i.70–V.iv.90.1).

Compositor *C* set sigs. 5O2<sup>vb</sup>–5O3<sup>ra</sup> (III.i.15–III.ii.22), sig. 5O3<sup>v</sup> (III.iii.25–128 (*1st half*)), sigs. 5P3<sup>v</sup>–4<sup>r</sup> (IV.v.98–V.i.69) and sig. 5Q2<sup>r</sup> (Prologue and Epilogue).

In all, Compositor *A* set in round numbers (taking account of prose) about 812 lines or 30.4% of the text; Compositor *B* set about 1415 lines or 53%; and Compositor *C* set 410 lines or 16.6%. Proofreading was casual. The inner forme of the outer sheet 5O (5O1<sup>v</sup>: 4) and the outer forme of the inner sheet (5O3<sup>v</sup>) had certain literals corrected in press but with no indication of reference to copy.

The main textual problem concerns first the nature of the copy behind both the Lambarde manuscript and F 1, and then the various

section of the 1647 Folio, which includes an identification of the three cases by types that provides valuable evidence for the compositorial identification in a few columns where the spelling is not wholly satisfactory as evidence. I have modified his account of the spellings in only minor detail.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE WOMAN'S PRIZE

authority of the two documents and their relationship. There is general agreement that MS is a favor copy made by permission of the players from a prompt-book that was at least comparatively uncensored since it contains various oaths and bawdry that have been modified in the F1 text.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, certain cuts for acting purposes had been made in comparison with the fuller text offered by F1. In brief, MS omits two scenes – II.i and IV.i – which do little or nothing to further the plot: other small omissions seem to be inadvertent mistakes in the copying or else minor improvements.<sup>2</sup> The staging of two scenes has been altered. In III.v lines 55–64 are omitted, a device that saves two characters, the Doctor and Apothecary; and instead of their report MS substitutes a general order by Petronius for a doctor to be summoned and if Petruchio remains uncured then for him to be transported to Bedlam. The ostensible reason is to reduce the number of actors (or of doubled parts), and this may well represent the central purpose. However, it should be remarked that as the fuller scene is found in F1 the circumstances of the Doctor's prior consultation with Petruchio are obscure, and thus the rewriting may have been as much for clarification as for reducing the requirements for actors.

The second alteration is more significant in that it reflects a change in the conditions of staging. In V.i in the stage-direction in F1 at line 68.1 the direction reads, '*Enter Livia discovered abed, and Moroso by her*', a clear-cut use of a discovery space, which at line 157 is confirmed by Byancha's 'draw all the Curtaines close',

<sup>1</sup> It has not been remarked that some censorship was also applied to MS, i.e. to the prompt-book underlying the present copy. For instance, in I.i.1, 21, I.iii.120 and V.ii.11 MS substitutes 'Heaven' for F1 'God' when an oath is not in question. (Many of the MS oaths invoking 'Heaven', which have milder F1 equivalents, may also be in the same category.) In I.ii.41 MS reads 'indeed' whereas 'Yfaith' slipped into F1; in I.iii.64 MS reads 'loves sake' for F1 'Heavens sake'; in I.iv.8 some oath (probably 'God') indicated by a dash in F1 is omitted in MS altogether. In II.vi.34 F1 'God' is MS 'long' (F2 'Heaven'). In IV.iv.7 both F1 'on my word' and MS 'I protest' are very likely softened paraphrases; but in V.iii.35 where MS reads 'I swear' and F1 'By —' there is clear evidence of the reduction in MS from a stronger original.

<sup>2</sup> The only omission in MS that could be another theatrical cut is Pedro's seven-line description at II.iv.78–85 of the revolted women's provisions, although the four missing lines at V.i.36–9 might also be argued for as a deliberate omission. The Historical Collation may be consulted for a record of the minor omissions that do not appear to have a theatrical origin, as for example in I.iii.132, I.iv.69, II.vi.134–5, III.v.102, IV.ii.101, V.i.72 and V.i.82.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

which corresponds to Livia's exit from the scene. On the contrary, the performance guided by the prompt-book underlying the MS was unable to utilize a discovery space. Instead, the MS direction reads, 'Enter Livia sick carried in a chaire by servants: Moroso by her', and Byancha's instructions to draw the curtains, later, is simply omitted.

That the manuscript derives from a prompt-book, therefore, is suggested not by indubitable internal evidence recognizable if it had been the only preserved text, but instead by comparison with the different form of the text as found in F 1. The presence of oaths and of bawdry in this acting version represented by the manuscript copy indicates quite clearly that the text is in a state prior to Herbert's operations on it in October 1633, and indeed it may well represent the form of the play about which the complaints were made that led Herbert to suppress further performance until it had been reformed. Whether this was the original prompt-book of *ca* 1611 or a later copy for a revival is not to be determined.

The nature of the copy behind the F 1 text is more conjectural, although some inferences may be drawn from the evidence that point towards a working hypothesis of some plausibility. It is generally agreed that the copy from which F 1 was set was the actual document worked over first by Knight (in an attempt no doubt to forestall as many of Herbert's objections as possible) and later by Herbert. Critics then part company. Taking Herbert's use of the word 'book' in its technical sense as prompt-book, and assuming that it would be the official prompt-copy that the players would supply to Herbert's requirement, Bald (p. 60) assumed that 'when a private transcript was allowed [i.e. MS] the scribe was given the older acting version, now supplanted, as his copy, instead of the more recently made prompt-book which had had to submit to Herbert's censorings'. On the other hand, Adams (pp. xxxviff) suggests that Knight brought to Herbert not the current prompt-book (whether or not represented by the text in its MS form) but, instead, some basic non-theatrical manuscript which could have been either the author's own papers or a scribal fair copy made from them at a pre-prompt-book stage. Some evidence of irregularities in the F 1 text would appear to support this position.



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE WOMAN'S PRIZE

An immediate derivation of the MS text from the F I manuscript text (in its pre-Herbert state) is impossible to demonstrate although some close connection of the two is indicated by the various examples of identical mislining of the verse or treatment of prose as verse. On the other hand, significant differences occur that are odd if one prompt-book copied another. The two cut scenes might impose no insuperable difficulty, but the rearrangement of the other two scenes would require a special hypothesis of a prompt-copy made up for performance under circumstances different from those governing the original. It is even odder to find that the stage-directions in the two documents differ ordinarily in their form and content: one prompt-book made up from another might be expected to retain more of the original directions, whereas they might be in part rewritten if a non-theatrical copy were being made into a prompt-book.<sup>1</sup> If oaths were satisfactory in one prompt-copy, they should be in another; yet some of the purged oaths represented by dashes in F I when normally filled out are stronger than the bland form found in MS and sometimes quite clearly had been written at first in a different form. Some disruptions in the text of F I appear that are not necessarily representative of copy in a prompt-book state. The most prominent of these is the brief duplicated scene of the three maids which appears first, improperly, in F I as II.iii and is then hitched without scene number or other indication to the end of what is called II.v (properly II.iv), after which the next scene is misnumbered '*Scena tertia*'. The manuscript, with slightly different text and assignment of speeches (the final one being due, it would seem, to a misreading of a speech-prefix as text), places the scene

<sup>1</sup> For example, F I adds '*with Rosemary*' in I.i.o.1, wanting in MS. The direction for I.iv.o.1 in MS reads '*Enter Rowland at one doore. Pedro hastily at the other*' but in F I '*Enter Rowland, and Pedro, at severall doores*'. In this same scene at line 40 the MS direction reads '*Enter Livia and Moroso as unseene by her*' whereas F I has '*Enter Livia at one doore, and Moroso at another harkning*'. In the entry at II.iv.o.1 Sophocles precedes Moroso but in F I he follows Moroso. In the same scene at 57.1 MS reads '*Enter above Maria, Bianca, a Citty wife, a Country wife, and 3 Women*'; in F I the only direction is '*All women above*'. At V.i.o.1 a trunk is specified in the MS direction, but a chest in F I (the text calls for a trunk). The entry for V.iv.o.1 in MS reads '*Enter Petronius, Sophocles, Moroso, Petruchio in a Coffin, carried by Servants*', whereas F I reads simply '*Petruchio born in a coffin*'. A line later F I omits Pedro's necessary entrance with Maria and Jaques, and at 65.1 the phrase '*as from marriage*' in MS is wanting in the F I entrance.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06039-4 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume IV

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

correctly. (Without authority F2 reprints the first scene but omits the second.) In F1 the stage-directions differ in the two versions and there is one easy substantive variant 'your' and 'the' in the first line. Whatever the explanation for the duplication in the copy behind F1, it seems clear that the text of the same scene was indeed repeated, whether or not deleted in its first appearance, a sign of revision more probably to be found in the reworking of a pre-prompt-copy than in the prompt-book itself. This hypothesis is the more likely if the reason for the transfer was to provide an intervening scene between II.iv and II.vi which would otherwise have violated the principle of the open stage by permitting the entrance in scene vi of the same characters who had previously made their last exeunt in the preceding scene, now numbered iv.

Finally, in F1 appear certain disruptions of the text that may perhaps be assignable to alteration, addition or revision of the original that was incompletely carried out or was misunderstood by the compositor. One example occurs in II.iii.3-4, where in F1 (but not in MS) Rowland's speech begins with 'Thou has heard I am sure of *Esculapius*.' before transferring abruptly to 'So were they not well acquainted?', a line concerned with the relation of women to the devil that begins the scene in MS, whereas the line about *Æsculapius* is repeated in its proper context in F1 (as in MS for the first time) as lines 13-14. Another comes in II.iv.85-6 as in MS where the speech '*Sophocles*. Lo ye fierce *Petruchio*, | This comes of your impatience.' appears instead after line 67 in F1, where according to the present fuller text it is out of place. A third, of some significance, comes at III.v.124. Here in F1 'I could raile twenty daies' completes the line begun by 'Can ever stop againe:' and this line is then followed by a short line 'Out on 'em hedge-hogs,' whereas in F1 and MS line 141 reads 'I could raile twenty daies together now.' This last is a perfect pentameter, but in the F1 original position at line 124 'I could raile twenty daies' produces a hexameter and it is 'Out on 'em hedge-hogs' that should complete the line after 'Can ever stop againe'. Once more, only the hypothesis of expanded text in the copy misunderstood by the F1 compositor can explain these anomalies.

Another disruption in the text, but one that in an inexplicable