

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE DRAMATIC WORKS IN
THE BEAUMONT AND
FLETCHER CANON

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE
DRAMATIC WORKS IN
THE BEAUMONT AND
FLETCHER CANON

GENERAL EDITOR
FREDSON BOWERS

Alumni Professor of English Literature, University of Virginia

VOLUME I

THE KNIGHT OF THE BURNING PESTLE
THE MASQUE OF THE INNER TEMPLE AND GRAY'S INN
THE WOMAN HATER THE COXCOMB
PHILASTER THE CAPTAIN



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1966

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I
Edited by Fredson Bowers
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521042895

© Cambridge University Press 1966

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1966
This digitally printed version 2008

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number: 66-10243

ISBN 978-0-521-04289-5 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-06052-3 paperback

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	page vii
<i>The Text of this Edition</i>	ix
<i>The Folio of 1647</i>	xxvii
THE KNIGHT OF THE BURNING PESTLE	I
<i>Edited by</i> CYRUS HOY, <i>Professor of English, University of Rochester</i>	
THE MASQUE OF THE INNER TEMPLE AND GRAY'S INN	111
<i>Edited by</i> FREDSON BOWERS, <i>Alumni Professor of English Literature, University of Virginia</i>	
THE WOMAN HATER	145
<i>Edited by</i> GEORGE WALTON WILLIAMS, <i>Associate Professor of English, Duke University</i>	
THE COXCOMB	261
<i>Edited by</i> IRBY B. CAUTHEN, JR., <i>Professor of English, University of Virginia</i>	
PHILASTER	367
<i>Edited by</i> ROBERT K. TURNER, <i>Professor of English, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee</i>	
THE CAPTAIN	541
<i>Edited by</i> L. A. BEAURLINE, <i>Associate Professor of English, University of Virginia</i>	

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

FOREWORD

These volumes contain the text and apparatus for the plays conventionally assigned to the Beaumont and Fletcher canon, although in fact Fletcher collaborated with dramatists other than Beaumont in numerous plays of the canon and some of the preserved texts also represent revision at a later date by various hands. The plays have been grouped chiefly by authors; this arrangement makes for an order that also conveniently approximates the probable date of original composition for most of the works.

The texts for the several plays have been edited by a group of scholars according to editorial procedures set by the general editor and under his close supervision in matters of substance as well as of detail. We hope that the intimate connexion of one individual, in this manner, with all the different editorial processes will lend to the results some uniformity not ordinarily found when diverse editors approach texts of such complexity. At the same time, the peculiar abilities of the several editors have had sufficient free play to ensure individuality of point of view its proper role; and thus, we hope, the deadness of compromise that may fasten on collaborative effort has been avoided.

Acknowledgements of specific acts of kindness would be premature here in view of the serial publication of this edition; they will be found in the separate introductions as occasion calls them forth. However, the general editor wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Frederick Sternfeld of Exeter College, Oxford, for his assistance in identifying manuscripts of songs, to Desmond Neill of the Bodleian Library, Dr L. A. Beurline of the University of Virginia, and the staffs of the Folger Shakespeare and the Henry E. Huntington Libraries for their aid in the identification and assembly of materials, and to the proof-readers of the Cambridge University Press for their extremely careful reading that has prevented more errors of omission and commission than we care to recall.

Charlottesville, Virginia

2 January 1965

F.B.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

This edition offers a critical old-spelling text of the plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher canon. Since the method of a critical edition differs from that of a reprint, whether in modified type-facsimile or in diplomatic form, the principles on which this present text has been constructed require brief explanation.

1. THE COPY-TEXT AND ITS TREATMENT

In most cases when manuscripts are wanting, the first editions—the only ones set from manuscript—furnish the copy-text. Ordinarily, later editions have no authority; but when evidence is present that variants in an edition subsequent to the first arise from consultation of fresh authority in other documents, the editor customarily employs the methods of recent textual theorists.¹ That is, the ‘accidentals’—the general texture of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization—of the first edition are preserved, since this would be the only text that had a direct and therefore authoritative relationship to the ‘accidentals’ in the manuscript that served as printer’s copy. Into this texture the editor introduces those revisions (chiefly ‘substantive’, or verbal) for which, in his opinion, neither the compositor nor the printing-house editor but the author was ultimately responsible. If the later text were set from an annotated copy of the earlier, as was the usual practice, the critical text thus derived comes as close as possible to reproducing the marked copy of the early edition given to the printer of the later.

Special circumstances may require flexibility of editorial treatment, however. It may be that the earlier edition was printed from

¹ Sir Walter Greg, ‘The Rationale of Copy-Text’, *Studies in Bibliography*, III (1950), 19–36, which refines upon the proposals of R. B. McKerrow in *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939). See also F. Bowers, ‘Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden’, *Modern Philology*, XLVIII (1950), 12–20; ‘Established Texts and Definitive Editions’, *Philological Quarterly*, XLI (1962), 10–17; and ‘Textual Criticism’ in *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures* (Modern Language Association of America, 1963), pp. 39–41.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

a manuscript that bore no direct transcriptional link with authorial holograph copy (i.e. a 'bad quarto'), in which case it would be mere pedantry to insist on following its accidentals instead of those of the revised edition printed from annotated copy, even though these accidentals are hardly more authoritative save where the annotator may have touched up his copy by reference to the manuscript he was consulting. It may be, also, that the revision in a later edition printed from annotated copy was so thoroughgoing as to defy the separation of authority as between accidentals and substantives, in which case the copy-text obviously becomes the later edition. When two different editions are printed from independent manuscripts, the choice of copy-text rests on the same principles of divided or of unified authority according to the estimated circumstances; and these principles also govern the choice of copy-text when a manuscript as well as a printed text may be available for any play, in whole or in part.

Collation of the early editions has been undertaken on two levels. For the edition chosen as copy-text, and for any other authoritative, or 'substantive', edition, the editors have compared multiple copies with a control text, letter by letter and point by point. When a quarto edition is the copy-text, collation will ordinarily include all copies in the great libraries of Great Britain and the United States as listed in Greg and in the Bishop supplement to the *Short-Title Catalogue* in America with a view to ascertaining the variants in a substantial number, if not all, of the recorded extant copies. Plays first printed in the 1647 folio have been collated in several copies. Usually only a single copy of an unauthoritative, or 'derived', edition has been used in order to construct the historical collation of variants. As a result, although the editors have made every effort to identify press-variants and to resolve doubtful readings in authoritative editions, the possible existence of internal variation in simple reprints has been ignored as of no substantive significance and as unnecessary for establishing the genetic relationship of these late editions.

Every variant resulting from proof-correction has been considered on its individual merits: there has been no automatic and uncritical incorporation in the edited text either of all readings in corrected formes or of all in uncorrected formes. Some press-

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

variants seem to indicate that the corrector occasionally consulted copy in reading proof—but these are rare. The normal, routine corrections of the printing-house reader, therefore, lack authority for most texts. Hence the editors, in their discretion, may prefer the original, uncorrected readings when there is little to choose between variants or when the original setting seems to reproduce distinctive characteristics of the accidentals in the manuscript that one would wish to preserve. The readings of the corrected formes have been selected, of course, when they alter evident misprints or represent necessary repairs of compositorial or of manuscript lapses.

All reprint editions up to 1700 have been collated and their substantive variants recorded. Thereafter, a comprehensive selection has been made of edited texts from the eighteenth century to the present: all complete editions of Beaumont and Fletcher have been included (save for the Waller reprint of F 2, Colman's second edition of 1811, and Darley's editions of 1839 and 1862), and in addition such separately edited texts as appear to the editor of the play in question to be of historical or of critical interest.

The editors have attempted to avoid finical or sophisticating emendation; but when in an editor's opinion the copy-text was corrupt he has not hesitated to emend, with due regard for bibliographical and palaeographical probabilities. Substantive alterations incorporated in the copy-text are either revisions and corrections from early printed texts, or independent editorial emendations. The facts about this emendation of the copy-text are always provided in the footnotes: no substantive alteration has been made silently.

The treatment differs in one small respect, however, for alterations made in the text proper and in the stage-directions or the speech-prefixes. In the text proper, emendation that takes the form of substitution of one or more words for other readings is made conventionally, with record in the footnotes. This is also the procedure in the stage-directions and speech-prefixes for simple additions or alterations made from editions before 1700, but when additions in these have been adopted from any editor after 1700, or are the invention of the editors of the present texts, they are enclosed within square brackets and no indication is given by footnote as to their exact source. The brackets denote them as helpful

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

or necessary modern editorial intervention in the dramatic externals, and that is all the information that is necessary. The direction for an aside beginning a speech is always placed immediately following the speech-prefix. When the direction was found in the copy-text or is an emendation from an early edition, it is enclosed in parentheses. Editorial directions for asides are enclosed in square brackets. The end of an aside and the beginning of direct address within a speech may be indicated by a bracketed editorial direction in the same line or before an arbitrarily assigned new line. Or, the editor may choose to end the aside with a long dash and begin direct discourse on a fresh line, as sufficient indication, without a bracketed direction.

The old-spelling accidentals are those of the copy-text. A special list for each play details the facts of editorial emendation except for the few classes of silent alterations specified below. On the whole, the copy-text for any individual play has been followed with considerable fidelity. This practice necessarily involves the reproduction of various internal inconsistencies as well as of inconsistencies between the several plays.¹ The editors have accepted such irregularity in order to avoid excessive normalization of texts printed at widely separated dates and from manuscripts of manifestly diverse origin.

The editors have been conservative in alterations of the punctuation. With due regard for Elizabethan practice they have corrected the obvious compositorial errors of anticipation, reversal, and oversight; but in general they have interfered only when a modern reader accustomed to seventeenth-century usage might be more than momentarily misled, when the modification and syntax might be in legitimate doubt, or when the pointing, by its own standards in the copy-text in question, seemed indubitably wrong. The maintenance of absolutely consistent standards in such a process is a practical impossibility, of course, but most punctuation changes will prove to be advisable and unintrusive. In especial, exclamation and query marks have been inserted only when their omission might

¹ Abnormal internal inconsistency may result from the employment of more than one compositor within the copy-text, and for some plays from the variable characteristics of the manuscripts that were produced by collaborated authorship, revision by other hands, or inscription by more than one scribe.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

cause serious misunderstanding, although the editors have been more liberal in the use of queries for clear-cut questions than in the addition of exclamation marks for emphasis. When a copy-text query could represent either a question or an exclamation, it has not been emended. In general, however, copy-text question marks to indicate obvious exclamations have been altered to the exclamation mark for the convenience of the modern reader. When the originals have used commas which, from either the rhetorical or the syntactical point of view, might well be altered to heavier pointing, the editors have ordinarily allowed the commas to stand so long as the modification and the sense would not be in doubt to a reader familiar with Elizabethan usage.

Eccentricities of spelling have ordinarily been retained. Unless there were special circumstances, the editors have not changed the common *to* for *too*, *of* for *off*, *the* for *thee*, or *am* for *um* or *em*, and have left unemended such forms as *and* for *an*'. If there seems to be any difficulty as to which modern word is meant in an ambiguous Elizabethan spelling, a footnote provides the modern sense.

The names of places and of things follow the copy-text variant spellings so long as these are not actually in error according to the practice of the time. Under most circumstances in the text and stage-directions ordinary and casual variation in the characters' names is also reproduced without comment; but special conditions may call for special treatment in the discretion of the editor. Thus in *The Captain*, for example, the ordinary variation of *Lodowick*–*Lodowicke* has been followed as in the copy-text, but such variant forms as *Lodovico* have been normalized by emendation and noted in the list of altered accidentals. In *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* the editor preferred to follow such variant forms as *Rafe* and *Raph*, whereas in *Philaster*, which had a different problem, it seemed most logical to another editor to normalize the variant spellings of the names. Any alteration in such spellings in text or in stage-directions is always recorded in the accidentals list. *Dramatis personae* lists utilize the forms of names chosen for the speech-prefixes. Neutral abbreviations of names in the text or in stage-directions are expanded to the form dominant in the scene in question.

The editors have corrected, always with a record, clear-cut

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

mislineation in the text, and have as necessary reduced false verse to prose, or lined false prose as verse. However, no attempt has been made to enforce a metrical regularity that did not seem to be intended by the author. Problems of lineation in the plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon are peculiarly troublesome because the frequent practice of the authors was to write verse that was so loose as to approach the cadences of prose. Moreover, by reason of either scribal or compositorial confusion about the lining of the copy, the verse-lining of the prints is often in error.

2. SILENT ALTERATIONS

A critical edition is neither a diplomatic nor a facsimile reprint addressed principally to those who need to make a close study of the most minute formal characteristics of a text, and hence some degree of silent alteration has been admitted in order to improve the presentation of what has been designed as an old-spelling reading edition. A distinction is here made between matters of textual concern and such extrinsic characteristics as typographical detail and the forms adopted for speech-prefixes and stage-directions. Alterations in the first are always recorded; but alterations in the externals may be made silently.

The intent is to provide the textual critic with the means to reconstruct the authentic readings of the copy-text in all essential detail, but not to attempt to offer such purely bibliographical facts as only a photographic facsimile could usefully furnish.

Roman type is used for all parts of the text proper except for the songs, which are set in italic. Stage-directions and speech-prefixes are set in italic. Indication is not made of the typography of any part of the copy-text unless some significance may be attached, as for example whether a line of a song or a stage-direction is part of the dialogue. The old long *f* is modernized, and so is the Elizabethan use of *i* for *j*, of initial *v* for *u*, and of medial *u* for *v*. Only in the listing of press-variants are these conventions of the copy-text retained.

No attempt is made to reproduce display capitals, ornamental initials, factotums, or ornaments, or to note the fact of their

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

existence; their disappearance is accompanied by the silent reduction to lower-case of the capital that customarily follows display or ornamental letters. Lower-case letters at the start of a sentence following a full stop, or of a heading, the name of a person or place, or a line of verse, are silently capitalized.¹ The spacing of lines, sections, words, contractions, and elisions is consistently normalized. The usual practice in carefully printed dramatic texts of the time has been followed, silently, in certain formal matters such as the italicizing of names and places.² On the other hand, copy-text inconsistency has been followed in the italicizing or not italicizing of words that at the time were felt to have a technical or foreign connotation. *Dramatis personae* lists have been made uniform in typography and in pointing. All wrong-fount type is corrected. The fount of type chosen for punctuation, roman or italic, is normalized without relation to the variable original. A genitive -'s added to a word in italics is silently italicized; when the -'s attached to an italicized word is, instead, the contraction for the word *is*, it is silently put into roman. This convention is reversed in italic speech.

Faulty punctuation at the end of a complete speech is silently emended to a full stop.³ Abbreviations in the text like *M^r* for *Master*, *gent.* for *gentleman*, *w^{ch}* for *which*, *y^e* for *the*, or the tilde for a nasal like *remōstrate*, are all silently expanded to the prevailing form in the scene in question, and so are ampersands, arabic numbers, pound-shilling-pence signs and abbreviations. If an editor wishes to call attention to the form he has chosen for expansion, like *Maister* for *M^r*, he will note the facts in the accidentals list.

¹ An exception is the retention of a lower-case letter beginning a clause after a query or exclamation mark.

² In accord with early custom, only the names of countries and cities are italicized, as well as church names. The names of areas within a city or town are printed in roman unless found consistently italicized in the copy-text. Whenever italic words have been changed to roman, the fact is noted in the list of alterations to the accidentals, but the alteration of roman to italic is not ordinarily recorded.

³ By 'faulty punctuation' is meant only the omission of a full stop or the substitution therefor of a comma, semicolon, or colon, when a suspension is not intended. When the incompleteness of a speech is clearly intended, a long dash is inserted regardless of the terminal punctuation and a record is made in the list of alterations in the accidentals.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

Turned letters in the copy-text are silently set right unless by their turning they form a new word.

When prose or faulty verse has been relined, proper heading capitals for each line are silently supplied and the capitals resulting from the mislineation are silently reduced. In any case of doubt, the facts are noted. When a line of correct verse inadvertently begins with a lower-case letter, a capital is silently substituted.

In order to simplify reference to verse-lines the editors have adopted the convention, traditional since Capell, of indenting a part-line that continues or completes a full line of verse. The practice of the copy-text is ordinarily followed in the matter of the indentation or non-indentation of prose lines that begin a change of address.

The externals, or formal presentation of the dramatic text, may consist of the act- and scene-headings, the stage-directions, and the speech-prefixes.

In order to simulate in the reading the free flow of the action on the Elizabethan stage from scene to scene, the conventional act- and scene-headings of the copy-text are provided only in the footnotes, and the indication of act and scene is placed to the right of the opening stage-direction. Unbracketed editorial notations of act and scene replace directions in the copy-text; bracketed notations are editorially supplied in the absence of information from the copy-text. Undivided plays are separated into acts and scenes according to conventional principles and without further comment unless a record is provided of editorial disagreement about the division in the history of the text. Line-numbers for the text, but not for the act- and scene-headings or for the stage-directions, have been added on the basis of the scene as a unit. Unnumbered directions are indicated by adding an appropriate figure to that of the preceding line of the text; thus 29.2 would refer to the second line of a direction placed below line 29 of the dialogue.

Stage-directions are silently normalized to italic, with names of characters in roman. Unnamed characters, like Servant, Boy, or Officer, if they have speaking parts in the play, are also silently placed in roman and capitalized when necessary. Directions for entrances are silently centred; directions for exits and for general

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

stage-business are placed to the right. The position of stage-directions in relation to the lines of the dialogue is that of the copy-text in so far as typographically possible. Minor variation is ordinarily unrecorded; otherwise the record of the positioning in the copy-text will be found in the accidentals list or, in highly significant cases, in the footnotes. Abbreviated names are expanded to the prevailing form in the scene, and such necessary punctuation as commas in a series of abbreviations is silently supplied in the stage-directions.¹ Full stops after *Exit* or *Exeunt* beginning a direction are silently removed. Terminal punctuation to directions is supplied without record. The emendation of *Exit* to *Exeunt*, and the reverse, is recorded in the alterations in the accidentals, not in the footnotes. As a result, variants in this matter do not appear in the historical collation. In the stage-directions characters are uniformly identified, if necessary by recorded emendation or by the addition of editorial description within brackets. Bracketed additions to stage-directions are not listed as variants in the apparatus and may appear in the historical collation only when questions of interpretation in other editions arise, as with directions for asides that might be in doubt. In general the editorial addition of directions has been held to a minimum, especially when the action is sufficiently indicated in the text itself. No directions for place or setting are ever supplied by the editors.

Speech-prefixes have been silently expanded and made consistent in form and typography throughout each play. The different degrees of abbreviation in the copy-text are ignored, but abbreviations that reflect a variant spelling of the name are noted either by a general footnote statement concerning the scene as a whole or, in default of this, by separate listing in the accidentals apparatus. For instance, if within a scene the normalized speech-prefix for a character is *Dorathy* but the abbreviations vary between *Do.*, *Dor.*, *Dora.*, and *Dori.*, a footnote statement for a scene might be made about the *Dora.*–*Dori.* difference in the prefixes without further record, whereas isolated examples would be more conveniently listed in the apparatus for the accidentals. On the other hand, when the prefix differs not in its spelling but in its form from the norma-

¹ In the text, however, punctuation supplied after abbreviations would be recorded.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

lized version adopted for uniformity, a footnote statement is always made, as, for instance, that in a particular scene the character with a normalized prefix *Maria* was given the prefix *Wife* in the copy-text. When in the copy-text the name of the character in an immediately preceding entrance direction takes the place of a speech-prefix in the ensuing speech, the required prefix is silently supplied. The addition or excision of prefixes, or the substitution of one for another, is otherwise a matter for recorded emendation. This procedure holds, also, when a character is in disguise and his prefix changes from the normalized established form to another that reflects his disguise. In the present texts a disguised character retains his true name in the speech-prefixes without regard for the variable practice of the copy-text, and a footnote for each scene details the facts without further record. Of course, a character like Euphrasia in *Philaster*, whose disguise is not revealed until late in the action, is given the disguised name of Bellario in the prefixes from the start.

3. APPARATUS

The textual apparatus for each play consists of (1) a brief textual introduction, (2) footnotes to the text, (3) explanatory notes on the more important or debatable emendations or examples of refusals to emend, (4) details of the press-variant formes in authoritative editions, (5) a list of the readings in the accidentals altered from the copy-text except for those silently normalized, (6) a historical collation of the substantive and semi-substantive variants in editions before 1700 and in later selected edited texts.

The general intent of the textual introduction is to make available in condensed form the pertinent information on the sources for the text of the present edition, their authority and relationship, the history of the transmission of the text, and the method by which the present critical text has been derived from all pertinent material. Details of the printing that could have some bearing on the text are also discussed.

The essential feature of the textual footnotes is that they have been held to a minimum in order to avoid constantly distracting the reader by inviting his attention to matters not directly concerned

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

with the editorial treatment of the wording, or substantives, of the copy-text. Thus the editors have maintained a strict division between the function of the footnotes and the function of the list of altered accidentals and, on occasion, of the historical collation provided in the appendix. The footnotes have only one purpose: to list all substantive departures in the present edition from that early edition or manuscript chosen as copy-text. These notes bear on the editorial treatment of the copy-text only in respect of substantive emendation.¹ They are not designed to offer a historical account of variants in early or late editions, when the present text has not been changed in favour of such variants. Finally, they are not intended to inform the reader of every minor alteration not affecting meaning. This information will be found in the list of altered accidentals.

The basic footnote provides a lemma drawn from the precise form of the emended reading in the edited text. If no siglum is present following the square bracket, the emendation is the editor's own. Otherwise, the editor prints the siglum of the earliest immediate source from which the alteration was drawn in the list of editions collated. The rejected reading of the copy-text concludes the note, with an account of the history of the rejected variant in the pre-1700 editions (not in later edited texts) up to the point of emendation, but not beyond. Since the footnote is designed only to identify the earliest source of a substantive emendation, the readings of editions later than this earliest source may be ascertained from the historical collation. The normal assumption is that the present edited text reproduces the corrected readings when press-variation is present if no contrary record is made. Non-substantive press-variants are ignored in the footnotes; but since the acceptance or rejection of a substantive proof-alteration is technically allied to emendation, in the present edition the footnotes record not only the choice of uncorrected over corrected substantives, but also (in contrast to the treatment of press-altered accidentals) the choice of

¹ The decision of what constitutes a 'substantive' has been made on pragmatic grounds; thus some semi-substantives are footnoted, as when an editorial change in the punctuation so vitally affects the sense or the modification as to warrant calling the reader's attention to the alteration instead of requiring him to sift through the list of altered accidentals to inform himself of editorial intervention in a matter that may be as important as the emendation of wording.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

corrected over uncorrected. An asterisk prefixed to a footnote line-number indicates that the reading is discussed in an explanatory textual note, whether or not the occasion is an actual emendation of the copy-text. In the footnotes, as in all collation lists, the accidentals of the recorded variants to the right, as well as to the left, of the bracket conform to the system of silent alteration adopted for the edited text. For instance, a note recording the adoption of a capital would read

89 *Honour*] F 2; *honour* Q 1-3

in order to preserve the copy-text Q 1 spelling reproduced in the edited text even though the actual spelling of F 2 was 'Honor'.

The explanatory textual notes in these volumes are not intended as elucidations of meaning except as this relates directly to the discussion of specific emendation, or of refusal to emend. They bear no relation to commentary notes, therefore.

Whatever the choice made in the text from among known press-variants, the full facts of press-correction in the collated copies, arranged by formes, are listed separately in the appendix. The typography there is that of the copy-text.

The listing of alterations in the accidentals in the copy-text is removed to a separate appendix in order to avoid obscuring in the footnotes the only matter of immediate interest to a reader—the record of substantive departure from the copy-text. Since basic meaning is seldom affected by ordinary accidentals changes, only a close student of the text is concerned with them and he can reconstruct the copy-text as necessary from the separate list. As already stated, however, when an alteration in the accidentals achieves semi-substantive status as affecting meaning in an important manner, it has been transferred to the footnotes and will not be duplicated in the list of changed accidentals. In this list the immediate source of the emendation is given when it is found in an edition before 1700 but not when it is editorial, whether the present editor's or one of his predecessors. This procedure is adopted not because the accidentals of an early reprint edition have an authority greater than that of a modern editor¹ but because the early editions of each play

¹ In fact, the present editors have been instructed to emend the pointing in accord with the system of the copy-text and without regard for the source of emendation. No

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

will have the same general system of rhetorical pointing, and hence their alterations may be meaningful in a manner denied to the syntactical pointing of modernized editions. The transmission of the rejected copy-text reading up to the point of emendation in any early edition is also recorded, but in the case of an editorial emendation only the record of transmission through the editions to 1700 is provided. Moreover, no indication is given of the source for these editorial revisions and corrections but only the fact that they are editorial and are not present in the emended form in any early edition. Finally, the variants noted in this accidentals list are not recorded in the historical collation.

The list of alterations in the accidentals also contains information about hyphenated compounds that will lead to an accurate reconstruction of the copy-text. The reader may take it that any word hyphenated at the end of a line in the present text has been broken by the modern printer and that the hyphenation is not present in the copy-text unless it is separately listed and confirmed in the accidentals appendix. Correspondingly, when a word is hyphenated at the end of a line in the copy-text, the editor has been charged with ascertaining whether it is a true hyphenated compound or else an unhyphenated word in the text in question; and if the word is indeed a hyphenated compound, an entry will be found in the accidentals list noting the fact that a hyphenated word within the line in the present edition was broken and hyphenated at the line-ending in the copy-text.

The accidentals list is based on the readings of the corrected formes in the copy-text; thus press-variants will be noted in this list only when the uncorrected reading has been chosen instead of the corrected, or when both readings have been rejected in favour of an emendation from another source.

The historical collation of early editions and of selected modern editions of a play is keyed to the present edited Cambridge text and not to the precise readings of the copy-text. This collation contains,

preference, therefore, is given to the exact punctuation mark chosen merely because it is present in an early edition: if, for instance, a colon is thought more desirable than a semicolon as an emendation of a copy-text comma, a colon will be substituted even though some or all early editions contain a semicolon.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

therefore, (1) all rejected copy-text substantive and semi-substantive readings as listed in the footnotes, (2) all semi-substantive variants from the present text in early editions to 1700, and (3) all substantive variants from the present text in the early and modern editions collated.

(1) Since the footnote record of the transmission of the copy-text reading stops with the first immediate source of the emendation, the historical collation completes the history of the reading within the full roster of the editions collated, together with all its variants that are not mere accidentals.

(2) Semi-substantive variants from the present text in early editions to 1700 usually are errors of punctuation that markedly alter the sense; spelling errors, typographical errors, or errors of spacing, all of which make some sense or which (though without sense) produce new substantives in the attempts of later editions to correct the errors; metrical elisions or expansions, as well as contractions of full forms in the copy-text or expansions of copy-text contractions. These are sometimes of real interest for the history of the transmission of the text since they may reveal the dissatisfaction with some of its features felt by editors or composers roughly contemporaneous with the original, and so may be of concern to the editor as well as to students of language and its changes. If, instead, they represent only inadvertent and careless error, they offer a useful object lesson in the deterioration of texts in certain specific respects that increases scholarly knowledge of textual criticism. In this classification edited texts after 1700 have been excluded, in part because the interest in the history of the language revealed by textual variation is of lesser consequence, and in part because the considerable sophistication caused by modernizing eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editors would create an intolerable burden to record and one that would have little corresponding significance. Thus variants like the following examples are noted for editions before 1700 but not after: *them-’em*, *thoroughly-throughly*, *the other-th’other*, *over-o’er*, *never-ne’er*, *she will-she’ll*, *and-an’*, et cetera. The one exception is that if a variant of this nature begins in an edition before 1700, its history is continued through the register of collated editions; but no such variant, arbitrarily assigned to this

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

semi-substantive category, that originates in an edition after 1700 is listed in the historical collation. The collation may note, however, marked differences in meaning from that of the present text caused by punctuation variants, not inadvertent errors, in the later editions. The orthographic differences between modern and old forms of words like *murder*–*murther* do not constitute variants noticed in the apparatus.

(3) True substantive variation in the text itself is always recorded in editions of any date. An exception is made, however, in respect of the minutiae of stage-directions in later edited texts. The freedom with which modernizing editors invent or rearrange stage-directions has little interest for the history of the transmission of the copy-text as a document. Hence added directions after 1700 are usually ignored unless they illuminate some misconception. If they are useful and meaningful, they will have been adopted by the present editors in bracketed form. Correspondingly, variation is usually ignored after 1700, and no record is made how later editors reword or rearrange the original directions unless some specific point appears to be of interest.

The spelling or typography of any word in the collations (as it has been in the footnotes) is that of the first text from which the recorded variant is drawn. When the exact form of the accidentals is not the concern of the record, differences in the form of the variant in the later editions listed are ignored. Thus in such an entry as

123 *Naiades*] maides F 1–2, P, L, S

‘maides’ is the reading of F 1, but any of the other editions recorded could have read *maids*, *Maides*, or *Maids*. Similarly, in all editions which agree with the lemma to the left of the bracket, the exact form of the concurrence is not in question.

The shorthand symbols advocated by R. B. McKerrow, such as the wavy dash, the plus sign, the minus sign, and the inferior caret, are freely employed in the apparatus.¹ The wavy dash in the listing of punctuation variants takes the place of the repeated word associated with the pointing. Whether or not this word is in the same spelling in the later editions being noticed is of no consequence when

¹ See *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939), especially pp. 73–89.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

the matter being recorded is the punctuation variant alone. The plus sign indicates the concurrence in the noted readings (again without reference to the forms of the accidentals that are not in question) of all collated editions later than that indicated by the siglum. A minus sign shows that the editions so indicated do not conform to whatever variation is being recorded but instead agree with the form of the lemma. A combination plus and minus sign reflects general concurrence, though not exact, and is therefore useful for condensing a long list where the internal variation has little pertinence to the matter recorded. For instance, the editor may have adopted the stronger pause of a colon for the copy-text comma in a matter of semi-substantive modification. If he records the variant in the Historical Collation as

good:] Q₂-8±; ~, Q₁

he is indicating that the only point of importance in Q₃-8, say, is not the concurrence with the Q₂ colon but with some stronger stop than a comma. The point being noted is that this stronger stop in Q₃-8, whatever its kind, has altered the modification like the colon of Q₂. That some quartos may have utilized a semicolon, and others even a full stop, is not worth recording in detail.¹

An inferior caret calls attention to the absence of pointing either in the copy-text or in the early editions being collated. A vertical stroke indicates a line-ending.

4. SONGS, PROLOGUES, EPILOGUES, *DRAMATIS PERSONAE*

An effort has been made to secure manuscript versions of the various songs in the plays and to record their rejected variant readings in the historical collation, with occasional references in the

¹ If, however, Q₃ had chosen a semicolon, and all subsequent recorded editions had followed this semicolon, the entry would read

good:] ~, Q₁; ~; Q₃-8

If of eight collated quartos the last two had reverted to the Q₁ comma, but the readings of Q₃-6 varied between a colon and one or more other strong stops, the note would read

good:] Q₂-6±; ~, Q₁, 7-8

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE TEXT OF THIS EDITION

explanatory notes. Some editors have found that the manuscripts could provide superior readings to the printed versions, and have emended the copy-text accordingly. In the lack of a comprehensive catalogue of first-lines of songs, the editors can scarcely claim to have been complete in their notice of these manuscripts despite some earnestness of search.

Prologues, epilogues, and *dramatis personae* lists present in later editions but not in the copy-text, or varying from the copy-text version, have been reprinted separately or as part of the textual introductions.

FREDSON BOWERS

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

In early September 1646 the copies of twenty-seven plays identified as the work of 'mr. Beaumont & mr. fflesher' were entered in the Stationers' Register along with sixteen plays by other writers, to two London book dealers, Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley. At a later time the entry was altered: one title, *Mounsieur Perrollis*, was deleted and marked 'mistaken' and six others, including four in the Beaumont and Fletcher canon (*The Mad Lover*, *The Laws of Candy*, *The Sea Voyage*, and *The Women Pleas'd*), were added to make a net total of thirty 'Beaumont and Fletcher' titles.¹ The entry represents an important step in Humphrey Moseley's efforts to assemble a sufficient number of texts to publish a collected edition of the plays commonly attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher. The gathering of this material seems to have begun several years before, possibly as early as 1641, when the Lord Chamberlain forbade the Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company to print plays belonging to the King's Men without their knowledge and consent, appending a list of sixty plays which included twenty-seven by Beaumont and Fletcher in almost precisely the order adopted in the entry of 1646. Hence it is likely that this entry was made soon after Moseley reached an agreement with the King's Men that gave him the right to print those plays of the canon which were under their control.² The list from which the titles in the entry

¹ W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, III (1957), 1013, and R. C. Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647* (1938), pp. 7–9. The exact date of the entry was probably 4 September, but as this date is written on the preceding page of the Register it is possible that a later date which should have been added to the page upon which the entry appears was inadvertently omitted. See Bald, p. 9, n. 2. Greg indicates that the additions to the Stationers' Register list were made before the fee was calculated; hence they apparently were made before much time had passed, and it would seem possible that the original entry was left incomplete deliberately, perhaps until further entries of Beaumont and Fletcher material were made to Moseley nearly two months later (see p. xxx). The words 'Saluo iure cuiuscunq' in the original entry were also deleted later.

² Bald, pp. 4–5. The Lord Chamberlain's warrant was first printed in the Malone Society's *Collections I* (1911), pp. 364–369.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

were copied may have been made up by the company rather than by Moseley himself, for it included not only the incorrect *Monsieur Perrollis* (a lost or non-existent play which would seem to have borne some relationship to *All's Well That Ends Well*) but also *The Wild Goose Chase*, the text of which did not reach Moseley for some five years.¹

The volume which was published pursuant to this entry may be described as follows:

[within double rules]
 COMEDIES | AND | TRAGEDIES
 Written by { FRANCIS BEAUMONT
 AND
 JOHN FLETCHER } Gentlemen.

Never printed before, | And now published by the Authours |
 Originall Copies. || *Si quid habent veri Vatum præfagia, vivam.* ||
 LONDON, | Printed for *Humphrey Robinson*, at the three *Pidgeons*,
 and for | *Humphrey Moseley* at the *Princes Armes* in *S^t Pauls* |
Church-yard. 1647.

The preliminary section consists of an unpagged engraved portrait of Fletcher and five separately signed, unpagged sub-sections of addresses and commendatory verses; it collates π I A⁴ a-c⁴ d-e² f⁴ g² [misprinting e I as E I (e 2 not signed)]. The body of the book consists of eight sections of differing length, separately signed and pagged, collating B-K⁴ L², 2A-2S⁴, 3A-3X⁴, 4A-4I⁴, 5A-5R⁴ 5S⁶ 5T-5X⁴, 6A-6K⁴ 6L⁶, 7A-7C⁴ 7D² 7E-7G⁴, 8A-8C⁴ *8D² 8D-8F⁴ [misprinting 2B3 as B3, 2C3 as C3, (2H3 as H3), 3M2 as 3M3, 4A2 as A2, (4B1 as B1), 5L2 as 5L3, 5S2 as 4S2], 44I leaves, pagged (B I) 1-75 [26 for 28, 50 for 62], (2A I) 1-143 [08 for 80], (3A I) 1-165 [92 for 90, 80-81 for 100-101], (4A I) 1-71 [2 for 6], (5A I) 1-172 [25 for 17, 63 for 65, 107 for 117, 143 for 147, 253 for 153, 56 for 156], (6A I) 1-92 [(85 for 81), 85 for 83], (7A I) 1-52 [50 for 52], (8A I) 1-48 [25-28 repeated].

¹ Bald, pp. 9-10. *The Wild Goose Chase* was first published, in folio, in 1652.

² Greg, *Bibliography*, III, 1013-1014, with slight changes.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher
Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

Preliminaries apart, its contents are the following:

Sigs.	Title	Printer
1B1-1D4 (1D4 ^v blank)	<i>The Mad Lover</i>	T. Warren
1E1-1H1 ^v	<i>The Spanish Curate</i>	T. Warren
1H2-1L2 (1L2 ^v blank)	<i>The Little French Lawyer</i>	T. Warren
2A1-2D1 (2D1 ^v blank)	<i>The Custom of the Country</i>	W. Wilson
2D2-2F3 ^v	<i>The Noble Gentleman</i>	W. Wilson
2F4-2K1 (2K1 ^v blank)	<i>The Captain</i>	W. Wilson
2K2-2M4 ^v	<i>Beggars' Bush</i>	W. Wilson
2N1-2P4 (2P4 ^v blank)	<i>The Coxcomb</i>	W. Wilson
2Q1-2S4 (2S4 ^v blank)	<i>The False One</i>	W. Wilson
3A1-3C3 (3C3 ^v blank)	<i>The Chances</i>	S. Islip
3C4-3G1 ^v	<i>The Loyal Subject</i>	S. Islip
3G2-3I3 (3I3 ^v blank)	<i>The Laws of Candy</i>	S. Islip
3I4-3M3 ^v	<i>The Lovers' Progress</i>	S. Islip
3M4-3P4 (3P4 ^v blank)	<i>The Island Princess</i>	S. Islip
3Q1-3T2 (3T2 ^v blank)	<i>The Humorous Lieutenant</i>	S. Islip
3T3-3X3	<i>The Nice Valour</i>	S. Islip
3X3 ^v -3X4 (3X4 ^v blank)	'M. Francis Beaumonts Letter to Ben Johnson'	S. Islip
4A1-4C4 (4C4 ^v blank)	<i>The Maid in the Mill</i>	R. Raworth
4D1-4F3 ^v	<i>The Prophetess</i>	R. Raworth
4F4-4I4 (4I4 ^v blank)	<i>The Tragedy of Bonduca</i>	R. Raworth
5A1-5C2 (5C2 ^v blank)	<i>The Sea Voyage</i>	E. Griffin
5C3-5F3 ^v	<i>The Double Marriage</i>	E. Griffin
5F4-5I3 ^v	<i>The Pilgrim</i>	E. Griffin
5I4-5M4 (5M4 ^v blank)	<i>The Knight of Malta</i>	E. Griffin
5N1-5Q2 (5Q2 ^v blank)	<i>The Woman's Prize</i>	E. Griffin
5Q3-5S6 (5S6 ^v blank)	<i>Love's Cure</i>	E. Griffin
5T1-5X4 ^v	<i>The Honest Man's Fortune</i>	E. Griffin
6A1-6C4 (6C4 ^v blank)	<i>The Queen of Corinth</i>	?
6D1-6F3 ^v	<i>Women Pleas'd</i>	?
6F4-6I2 ^v	<i>A Wife for a Month</i>	?
6I3-6L6 ^v	<i>Wit at Several Weapons</i>	?
7A1-7D2 ^v	<i>The Tragedy of Valentinian</i>	S. Islip (?)
7E1-7G4 ^v	<i>The Fair Maid of the Inn</i>	S. Islip (?)
8A1-*8D1 ^v	<i>Love's Pilgrimage</i>	?
*8D2-*8D2 ^v	<i>The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn</i>	E. Griffin
8D1-8F4 ^v	<i>Four Plays or Moral Representations in One</i>	R. Raworth

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

All the plays listed in the Register entry were included but *The Wild Goose Chase*, for which, Moseley says in 'The Stationer to the Readers', no text could be found. In addition, six pieces not entered were printed: Beaumont's masque, *The False One*, *The Nice Valour*, *Wit at Several Weapons*, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, and *Four Plays in One*. Moseley evidently was not content with the collection of texts which seems to have been provided him by the King's Men but sought to gather other plays in which either Beaumont or Fletcher had a hand. He makes two somewhat contradictory remarks on the subject: 'I had the Originalls from such as received them from the *Authours* themselves' (the actors, presumably) and 'the *Care & Pains* was wholly mine, which I found to be more than you'l easily imagine, unlesse you knew into how many hands the Originalls were dispersed' (A4, A4^v). Perhaps this may mean that in some instances the King's Men sold him only the right to publish rather than the manuscripts themselves and that Moseley then took on the task of searching out unpublished texts which had come into the possession of private people. In addition, he may have tried to gain control of texts owned and previously printed by other stationers.¹ The Register shows that he had obtained rights by the end of October 1646 to *The Elder Brother* (half from John Benson and half from John Waterson) and to *Monsieur Thomas* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (from Waterson), and by 4 March 1646/47 to *The Scornful Lady* and *Cupid's Revenge* (from Ruth Raworth).² If, however, he had hoped to buy all the Beaumont and Fletcher copies held by other publishers, he was disappointed, and, doubtless making a virtue of necessity, he announced in his preface to the Folio:

Some *Playes* (you know) written by these *Authors* were heretofore Printed: I thought not convenient to mixe them with this *Volume*, which of it selfe is

¹ Beaumont's masque had previously appeared in an undated quarto, evidently shortly after its entry in the Stationers' Register to George Norton on 27 January (for February?) 1612/13 (see Greg, *Bibliography*, 1, 28). Of this edition, however, Moseley seems to have been unaware, for the Folio version was printed from manuscript rather than from it (Bald, p. 1 n.).

² Greg, *Bibliography*, 1, 57–58. Moseley also had secured the copy of *Thierry and Theodoret* from Thomas Walkley by 22 February 1647/48 (*ibid.* p. 59), but by this time the Folio probably had been published, for Moseley dated his preface 14 February 1646 (i.e. 46/47).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

entirely New. And indeed it would have rendred the Booke so Voluminous, that *Ladies* and *Gentlewomen* would have found it scarce manageable, who in Workes of this nature must first be remembred. Besides, I considered those former Pieces had been so long printed and re-printed, that many Gentlemen were already furnished; and I would have none say, they pay twice for the same Booke. (A4)

Thus the following plays were excluded and were not to appear in collection until the Second Folio of 1679:

<i>The Bloody Brother</i>	<i>Monsieur Thomas</i>
<i>The Coronation</i>	<i>The Night Walker</i>
<i>Cupid's Revenge</i>	<i>Philaster</i>
<i>The Elder Brother</i>	<i>Rule a Wife and Have a Wife</i>
<i>The Faithful Shepherdess</i>	<i>The Scornful Lady</i>
<i>A King and No King</i>	<i>Thierry and Theodoret</i>
<i>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</i>	<i>The Two Noble Kinsmen</i>
<i>The Maid's Tragedy</i>	<i>Wit Without Money</i>
	<i>The Woman Hater</i>

And, in spite of his apparent efforts, Moseley seems to have failed ever to obtain or at least to publish texts of five plays, which, if they ever existed, are now known only by their titles:

Cardenio (a possible collaboration between Fletcher and Shakespeare, acted in 1612/13 and on 8 June 1613 and entered to Moseley on 9 September 1653. Perhaps *Double Falsehood*, published by Lewis Theobald in 1728).

A Right Woman (entered to Moseley as by Beaumont and Fletcher on 29 June 1660).

The Wandering Lovers (licensed by Herbert as by Fletcher on 6 December 1623 and presented at court on 1 January 1624. Entered to Moseley on 9 September 1653. Possibly an early play revised by Massinger as *The Lover's Progress*, alias *Cleander* [?]).

The Jeweller of Amsterdam (entered to Moseley on 8 April 1654 as by Fletcher, Field, and Massinger).

The Queen (attributed, probably in error, to Fletcher in a catalogue appended to Archer's 1656 edition of *The Old Law*).¹

The acquisition of as many copies as he did obtain and the manufacturing costs of the Folio itself must have required an expenditure which any businessman would want to recapture as soon as possible,

¹ The information relating to each of these titles is drawn from Greg, *Bibliography* (s.v.).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

and Moseley took what steps he could to avoid delay in getting the Folio on the market. Instead of sending all the manuscripts to a single printer, he divided them among several houses to speed production through simultaneous printing. To each printer he assigned a different signature alphabet, and to each he delivered the manuscripts of the plays which were to occupy the sections of the book so designated, having written as a catchword on the last page of the last play in each section the title of the play beginning the next. That all did not go as originally planned may be seen by an examination of the table on page xxxiii.¹ It would seem that *The False One* was a late addition to Section 2, *The Honest Man's Fortune* to Section 5, and *Four Plays in One* (originally intended to follow *The Honest Man's Fortune* in Section 5) to Section 8. In addition, as the collational formula shows, there was an aberration in the printing of Section 7: *Valentinian* occupies 7A–D, concluding on 7D 2^v, the last page of a unique internal one-sheet gathering analogous to the extra sheet in the three-sheet gathering with which *Love's Cure* ends. It is probable, then, that *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, which occupies 7E–G, was added to that section in much the same way that *The Honest Man's Fortune* was added to Section 5.² It cannot be coincidental that the plays which bibliographical evidence indicates to have been added to the original allocations to the printers are, except for *The Honest Man's Fortune*, among the six which appeared in the Folio but were not entered by Moseley in 1646.³ It seems

¹ The attributions to the printers of the preliminaries and the various sections of the text are Bald's (pp. 15–19 and 38–39) as modified by The Carl H. Pforzheimer Library's *Catalogue of English Books and Manuscripts 1475–1700* (1940), p. 60; Johan Gerritsen, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 5th ser., III (1949), 243 ff.; and Greg, *Bibliography*, III, 1016. The Pforzheimer *Catalogue* suggests the possibility that quires d and e of the preliminaries were printed in the same shop. If this is so and if Wilson printed quire e, Wilson would also have been the printer of Section 6, but the matter has not yet been thoroughly investigated.

² These discrepancies were originally discussed by Greg, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th ser., II (1921–22), 109–115. His observations were supplemented and modified by Bald and Gerritsen, *op. cit.*

³ *The False One*, *The Nice Valour*, *Wit at Several Weapons*, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, Beaumont's masque, and *Four Plays in One* were finally entered to Moseley and Robinson on 29 June 1660. *The Honest Man's Fortune* was part of the entry of 1646.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Printer	Prelims	Section	Catchword	On last page of	Last play	Section	First play
Thomas Warren	b	1	<i>Custom of the Country</i>	<i>Little French Lawyer</i>	<i>Little French Lawyer</i>	2	<i>Custom of the Country</i>
William Wilson	A, e, f	2	<i>The Chances</i>	<i>The Coxcomb</i>	<i>The False One</i> ^b	3	<i>The Chances</i>
Susan Islip	c	3	<i>Maid in the Mill</i>	'Ltr to Jonson'	'Ltr to Jonson'	4	<i>Maid in the Mill</i>
Ruth Raworth	[none]	4	[none]	—	<i>Bonduca</i>	5	<i>Sea Voyage</i>
Edward Griffin	a, g	5	<i>Queen of Corinth</i>	<i>Love's Cure</i>	<i>Honest Man's Fortune</i> ^b	6	<i>Queen of Corinth</i>
?	d	6	<i>Valentinian</i>	<i>Wit at Several Weapons</i>	<i>Wit at Several Weapons</i>	7	<i>Valentinian</i>
Susan Islip (?)	[none]	7	<i>Love's Pilgrimage</i>	<i>Fair Maid of the Inn</i>	<i>Fair Maid of the Inn</i>	8	<i>Love's Pilgrimage</i>
?	[none]	8A-C	[contains all of <i>Love's Pilgrimage</i> but final leaf]				
Edward Griffin	[none]	*8D	[contains last leaf of <i>Love's Pilgrimage</i> and Beaumont's masque] ^c				
Ruth Raworth	[none]	8D-F	[contains <i>Four Plays in One</i>] ^d				

^a Last leaf bears as catchword *The Chances*.^c Begins correctly with page no. 25, continuing 8C.^b Last leaf bears as catchword *Four Plays in One*.^d Begins incorrectly with page no. 25, continuing 8C.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-06052-3 - The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Volume I

Edited by Fredson Bowers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOLIO OF 1647

evident that four of these plays, and probably *The Nice Valour* and *Wit at Several Weapons* (which was printed at the end of Section 6) as well, were acquired by Moseley after the entry and after the original allocation, and the manufacture of the volume was likely to have been complicated further by the failure of some of the printers to progress satisfactorily in their shares of the work. It is suspicious not only that the sections are of uneven length but also that Section 4 ends without the usual catchword, and there are further bibliographical indications that some of the plays had to be reallocated to different printers.¹

Moseley insists that 'though another joyn'd with me in the *Purchase* and Printing, yet the *Care & Pains* was wholly mine' (A4^v). Robinson would, of course, be the financial partner to whom this statement alludes; the care and pains apparently are to be associated chiefly with the problems of securing texts and supervising the publication of the volume. Whether Moseley also means that he had a part in editing the texts is unknown, but this would seem unlikely in view of the apparent participation in the undertaking of Charles Cotton the elder, an old friend of Fletcher's. In a poem entitled 'To my Cousin Mr. Charles Cotton' (in *Small Poems*, 1658–59), Sir Aston Cokayne charges that Cotton had permitted 'an injury to Fletcher's wit' by placing Beaumont's name before plays of Fletcher's or Fletcher's and Massinger's composition, and in the Apology to the same work he speaks of Cotton's having commanded from him and printed in the Folio some verses originally written in praise of *The Mad Lover* for a projected single edition of that play. It thus seems that Cotton had 'some official responsibility' in connexion with the Folio, even though the address 'To the Reader' which prefaces the collection was signed by James Shirley.²

Someone, whether Moseley or Cotton, must have been rather precise in specifications for the work. All plays begin on a recto, and for the text, set in double columns, all the printers employed ordinary romans of similar design. Speech-prefixes throughout were set in italics and indented. Six rules usually appear on every

¹ Bald, pp. 35–40.² Greg, *Bibliography*, III, 1017.