EDITING COLLABORATIVE DRAMA

SUZANNE GOSSETT

He was delated by S^r James Murray to the King for writting something against the Scots jn a play Eastward hoe & voluntarly Imprissonned himself w^t Chapman and Marston, who had written it amongst y^m.

Jonson, *Conversations with Drummond*[1]

No reading of the play can be satisfactory that does not also take account of its remarkable imaginative unity.

Lois Potter, Introduction to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*[2]

I have become, apparently, a specialist, if not an expert, on editing collaboratively written drama. Although I profess surprise, the path is not really difficult to trace. I began my professional life writing on Beaumont and Fletcher for G. E. Bentley; I was soon editing; and, as many scholars, usually citing Bentley, have reiterated, the majority of early modern plays were collaboratively written.[3] Ergo, to edit, logically enough, is to edit collaboration.

But no, not for most people, or at least not willingly. Most scholars want to edit Jonson, not *Eastward Ho!*, Middleton, not *A Fair Quarrel*, Shakespeare, not *Pericles*.[4] Although I was flattered when Gary Taylor asked me to write the Introduction to *The Spanish Gypsy* for the Oxford *Collected Middleton*, perhaps no one else was foolish enough to undertake 5,000 words on a play whose 1653 title-page names Middleton and Rowley as the authors but which has been convincingly attributed primarily to Ford and Dekker. And now I find myself, in a satisfying return to origins, editing *Philaster*. Partly on the basis of my own editing experience, but also because as a General Editor of Arden Early Modern Drama, I, and my co-General Editors John Jowett and Gordon McMullan, have been faced with the complications that arise in the collaborative editing of collaborations, I will here offer a meditation on the practical consequences, for the real and lonely editor, of the mantra we all now repeat. The English early modern theatre was a site of collaboration, from the composition of the drama through the unpredictable transmission, by a multitude of agents, of at least some of its plays through the printing process. But what do we *do* with that recognition?[5]

FRAMEWORKS

Today, and in fact since the Jonson Folio of 1616, the editing of most individual plays, especially plays from earlier periods, occurs as part of a 'collected works'. Jonson, Webster, Marston, Middleton and of course paradigmatically Shakespeare are edited, or re-edited, for the constantly receding 'modern

[1] *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford, 1925–52), 1: 140.

[2] Lois Potter , ed., *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (Walton-on-Thames, 1997), p. 101.

[3] Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time 1590–1642* (Princeton, 1971), p. 199.

[4] Douglas A. Brooks generalizes: 'for editors and scholars of Renaissance drama the desire is to reduce the multiple and dispersed intentions that shaped play-texts in the playhouse and the printing house into idealized, single-author works' (*From Playhouse to Printing House: Drama and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 153).

[5] In addition to the specific citations that follow, I wish to acknowledge gratefully the influence on my thinking of conversations over many years with Jeffrey Masten, Gordon McMullan, Gary Taylor and Paul Werstine.

reader'. But what that reader is assumed to want varies. In Shakespeare editions the tendency has been to move back and forth between purity and inclusiveness: *Pericles* was one of the seven plays added to the second issue of the Third Folio (1664) but, because it had been excluded from the First Folio, it did not appear in the successive Tonson collections and was only restored or admitted by Malone. Readers, of course, have no 'collected Wilkins' to make up the omission. But *Eastward Ho!*, published in 1605 with three authors on the title-page, appears, sometimes but not always, in collected works of Jonson, of Marston and of Chapman. And where will we look for *The Spanish Gypsy*? It appeared in A. H. Bullen's 1885 *Works of Thomas Middleton*, but was almost omitted from the forthcoming *Collected Middleton*, until Gary Taylor and MacDonald P. Jackson determined that Middleton was responsible for at least some lines and in all likelihood the plotting. However, you will not find the play in the last collected works of its primary authors: it does not appear in Alexander Dyce's 1869 *The Works of John Ford* or in Fredson Bowers's 1958–64 *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, although Dekker's less extensive contribution to *Sir Thomas More* is included there.

An editor commissioned to prepare a collaborated, or allegedly collaborated, play, is likely to find that someone else, the general editor or an attribution scholar persuasive to that general editor, has previously determined on the inclusion. As the recent collected Shakespeares (e.g. second Riverside with *Edward III*, second Oxford with *Edward III* and *Sir Thomas More*) and the *Collected Middleton* with *Revenger's Tragedy* and *Spanish Gypsy* demonstrate, inclusion, sometimes to excess, is our current position: if a persuasive case can be made, even for a play where external evidence points to a different author or does not name the author in question, in it goes.[6] This contrasts with the usual nineteenth-century procedure. Dyce, for example, included *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in 1846 in his edition of *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, but then, despite the 1634 title-page attribution to Fletcher and Shakespeare, waited twenty years to take the radical step of editing it for the first time for a collected Shakespeare, and only then in deference to 'the opinion of more than one literary friend, who think that the works of the great dramatist can hardly be considered as complete without it'.[7] And which collected edition the editor participates in will inevitably affect how he or she approaches the play and the task at hand. David Kay and I were not asked to edit *Eastward Ho!* because of our previous work on Chapman and Marston, even though Percy Simpson himself suggested that the play was initiated by Marston.[8] A Jonson scholar and a previous Jonson editor sitting down to write about *Eastward Ho!* for the *Cambridge Works of Ben Jonson* implicitly assume that at least one part of the task is to fit the play into Jonson's *oeuvre*.

Thus it is not uncommon for plays of dubious provenance, sometimes another name for collaborative authorship, to be relegated to a final volume or the back of the book. Inclusion of a collaborated play in the collected works of a named author tends to create a hierarchy: Middleton *assisted by* Rowley; Jonson *bringing in* Chapman and Marston, Shakespeare and *the hack* Wilkins. Beaumont and Fletcher only appear to complicate this paradigm. No other collected edition that I am aware of has gone as far as the Bowers *Beaumont and Fletcher*, which arranges the canon according to Cyrus Hoy's division of the plays by authorship, but in fact the much-attested presence of unannounced authors from Jonson to Shirley in that canon again demonstrates hierarchy and singular dominance, in this case really Fletcher's.

Having agreed to the commission, editors are expected to fit their play into the general format of the edition or series, and here we reach the first paradox facing editors of collaborated plays. Most new editions of early modern dramatists, for example the *Collected Middleton*, the *Cambridge Works of Ben Jonson*, and the volumes commissioned for

[6] See Jeffrey Masten, '*More* or Less: Editing the Collaborative', *Shakespeare Studies*, 29 (2001), pp. 109–31.

[7] Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of William Shakespeare*, vol. 8 (London, 1876), p. 117.

[8] *Ben Jonson*, vol. 9, p. 637.

Arden Early Modern Drama, are being published in modernized texts. The goal of this format is to clear away the screen of old spellings and unfamiliar punctuation that obscures the material for potential readers and actors, and, in the case of the other dramatists, to level the playing field with Shakespeare, now always published, even by the Oxford *Shakespeare*, in this way. Yet modernizing tends to mask or remove precisely the evidence employed to determine authorship and/or collaboration. Some of the information pertinent to the methods of attribution scholars – the proportions of function words or a preference for certain interjections, for instance – survives the modernization process, but much, like spellings or variant elisions (*'um/'em*), is likely to be erased. When, as in the case of *The Spanish Gypsy*, an editor believes that the play has also been expurgated, the resulting edition can end up arguing for unannounced collaboration demonstrated by internal evidence even while erasing some of the fragile evidence that has survived various interventions.

The second paradox for the editor of a collaborated play is that she is charged with being an advocate for her play (a goal sometimes overtly encouraged in editorial guidelines) while simultaneously expected to describe the effects of, or present the evidence for, collaboration, depending upon whether the collaboration is accepted or still contested. The keywords that emerge from her first charge are coherence and unity. From M. C. Bradbrook demonstrating that the connection between the plots of *The Changeling* is 'very carefully worked out', to Lois Potter arguing that in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 'complex as the collaboration process was, the end product can be discussed as a coherent work', to David Gunby finding that in *A Cure for a Cuckold* 'The story of Compass . . . is related significantly, both in theme and language, to the main action', to my own description of *Pericles* as 'complete in outline and carefully structured by repetition, parallel and contrast of characters and events', editors have not abandoned the traditional view that a successful work of art, no matter how many persons participated in its creation, is ultimately singular.[9] In other words, a collaborated play, to be worthy of our attention, must conceal or override its own multiplicity. Deconstruction, for most editors of collaboration, refers to 'disintegrating' authorship, not to finding '*aporia* or impasses of meaning, where texts get into trouble, come unstuck'.[10]

This leaves an editor needing to correlate two kinds of evidence and two views of authorship. The first looks for stylistic and linguistic markers and assumes that dramatic documents were composed by individuals with discoverable histories, habits and canons. The second stresses that collaboration was a different kind of composition, blurring distinctions and constricting the agency of the individual subject. In this view collaboration led to something more like a chemical melding than a simple accumulation of parts, undermining analysis that begins from the presumption of identifiable personal work. An editor's attitude towards these issues will affect every part of her edition: the introduction, both in its account of the play's composition and in the 'reading' offered; the text, in such matters as lineation and punctuation; and the commentary, where the case for collaboration can be subtly supported or weakened.

COLLABORATION AND THE TEXT

Although the ordinary reader hardly notices the text or understands the decisions that go into making it, editors know that this is the heart of their work. And the extent to which the text itself is

[9] M. C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 213; Potter, p. 1; *The Works of John Webster*, ed. David Gunby, David Carnegie, MacDonald P. Jackson, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 2003), p. 277; Suzanne Gossett, ed., *Pericles* (London, 2004), p. 9. All references to *Pericles* are from this edition.

[10] Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory* (Minneapolis, 1984), pp. 133–4. Even in '*The Witch of Edmonton*: A Model for Teaching Collaboration in the Renaissance', in *Approaches to Teaching English Renaissance Drama*, ed. Karen Bamford and Alexander Leggatt (New York, 2002), pp. 59–64, the aim of the authors, Jayson B. Brown, William W. E. Slights and Reta Terry, is to show students how 'theatrical cooperation and integration, not authorial individuality and competition', drive a collaborated play.

altered by the presence of collaboration varies considerably. The underlying issue, only sometimes addressed directly, is one of circularity: once we decide that *Pericles* is by Shakespeare and Wilkins, how much do we alter, or not alter, the text because a peculiarity, an incoherence, even an 'error', is a stylistic tic of Wilkins? If we make our determination on that basis and adjust the text accordingly, we strengthen the Wilkins 'case'; if we return to a more 'Shakespearian' formulation, we weaken it. The editor, even when she claims not to participate in attribution scholarship, is inevitably drawn into the argument

The extent, of course, varies. Dyce, editing *The Two Noble Kinsmen* for his *Shakespeare*, makes only a few alterations in the text that had appeared in his *Beaumont and Fletcher*. These changes fall into two major categories. First, over two decades he simply changes his mind, sometimes in places where he had earlier played with a second possibility (e.g., in 1.4. the Herald's 'Wi' leave' becomes 'We learn' in the transition between editions, but in the notes to the *Beaumont and Fletcher* Dyce writes, 'Heath would read "We learn", and rightly perhaps.')[11] But other changes seem to be based on Dyce's reading of William Sidney Walker's *Critical Examination of the Works of Shakespeare*. (This was apparently not published until 1860, although Walker died in 1846.) Thinking of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as Shakespeare's evidently encouraged Dyce to accept new suggestions based on that author's works. In any case, even when the words and their arrangement are little changed, the text looks different in its new environment. It brings up the rear in the final volume, after, of course, *Pericles*.

Modern editions of collaborated plays do tend to alter words and their arrangement based on beliefs about the authorship. For example, Lois Potter, after careful consideration of the lineation problem in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, decides to 'retain a basic blank-verse shape' where other editors have printed certain scenes as prose, because 'Both Shakespeare and Fletcher . . . were blank-verse virtuosos who seem to have enjoyed creating smooth lines out of apparently disparate elements'.[12] Her text, therefore, implicitly strengthens the case for their virtuosity, although it does not distinguish between them on these grounds. In our forthcoming edition of *Eastward Ho!* David Kay and I change the placement of a number of the 1605 Quarto's entries. We are the first to do so at the beginning of the second act. The Quarto opens the scene with '*Touchstone, Quickesiluer, Goulding and Mildred, sitting on eyther side of the stall*'; it gives a second entrance direction for Quicksilver at line 2. We believe that Touchstone enters alone, Quicksilver thereafter, and Golding and Mildred forty lines later. We support our change partly by looking at the play's other massed entries, noted by previous editors (at 4.2.88, '*Touchstone, Mistresse Touchstone, Gyrtrude, Golding, Mildred, Syndefie*', where Golding and Touchstone are already on the stage; 5.3.1, '*Holdfast. Bramble. Security*', where Security is called out from his prison cell at line 4; and 5.3.54, '*Enter Petronel, Bramble, Quickesiluer, Woolfe*', where Wolf has another, correct entrance at 67), and our argument is sustained by our understanding of how the collaboration proceeded. Similar massed entrances are common in the plays of Jonson, and although *Eastward Ho!* scenes with massed entries probably vary in their authorship – 2.1 being primarily by Marston – Jonson, we believe, as shown also by the distribution of certain elisions, was in control of the copy for the play and inclined to write mass entries even when these occlude the actual order of the action.

More typical, and more extensive, consequences of believing a text is collaborated and adjusting to what is known or believed about the collaborators' styles are found throughout my Arden3 *Pericles*. Sometimes my attitude towards the authorship leads me *not* to emend. For example, where editors from Steevens to Taylor and Jackson have rearranged several of Antiochus's speeches to make them rhyme – changing 1.1.11–12 to conclude *sit/knit* instead of *sit/perfections*, and 1.1.120–1 to conclude *be/degree* instead of *be/worth* – I follow the Quarto, noting that Wilkins's 'erratic use of rhyme

[11] Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher* (London, 1846), vol. 11, p. 350, note d.

[12] Potter, 122.

is visible throughout the scene'. I also do not emend the often changed 3.0.7–8, 'And crickets sing at the oven's mouth / Are the blither for their drouth' because the source of the trouble 'is a zero relative typical of Wilkins, *sing* = which sing. Thus *Are*, not *sing*, is the main verb'. At 1.2.119, a line that is a syllable short, I adopt F3's emendation, 'will sure crack', over other suggestions because, 'as Taylor and Jackson say, the alliteration of shuns and sure seems characteristic of Wilkins'. And I could certainly be accused of inconsistency by someone who rejected collaborative authorship for this play. My emendations to 2.1.161 and 2.4.29–32 are justified on the grounds that Wilkins tends to repeat himself. Yet, in emending Gower's *Where* to *Whence* at 5.0.14, I cite Taylor and Jackson on the 'clutter of repetition' in the surrounding lines and conclude 'Undoubtedly some comes from the reporter'. Wilkins, who I do not believe participated in this chorus, for once is not scapegoated.

The circularity of my methodology is not unusual: modern editors who believe that they have identified the author of passages needing adjustment will naturally proceed in this way. For example, in the 'General Textual Preface' to the second volume of *The Works of John Webster*, MacDonald P. Jackson writes, 'Some of our decisions on how to arrange the verse have been affected by our attributions of authorship in collaborative plays. *A Cure for a Cuckold* was published as by John Webster and William Rowley, but our own investigations have confirmed . . . that Thomas Heywood contributed . . . Heywood's blank verse is more regular than Webster's, and Rowley's habit of at times dealing out ten-syllable lines with scant regard for patterns of stress has influenced our lineation in *A Cure for a Cuckold*'.[13]

A more radical example of textual intervention comes from Gary Taylor's editing of *The Spanish Gypsy*.[14] Taylor argues that Q, 1653, represents a censored text, as shown, for example, by the absence of the oaths *faith* and *marry*. The absence of *faith* is 'unparalleled in the Dekker or Rowley canon, found in Middleton only in the censored texts of *Game at Chess*, and in only three plays of Ford'. *Marry* is found in 'every other tabulated play of the four canons except Middleton's very short *Yorkshire Tragedy* and Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*'. Taylor acknowledges that some editors would accept the statistical evidence that the text 'has been censored, without wishing to restore the expurgated oaths conjecturally' but objects that such apparently cautious editing will be 'globally injudicious, in offering readers a text which certainly contains too little profanity'. Consequently, decisions on whether and how to emend must be based on 'analysis of authorial practice elsewhere'.[15]

Accepting Taylor's emendations requires previous acceptance of the arguments for multiple authorship and of the attributions proposed. For example, the note to 4.3.52 explains the insertion of *'Swounds* thus: 'A "rake-hell" should employ lots of offensive oaths; the extant text gives [Roderigo] none. This is a particularly strong oath, which immediately establishes his character, and is relevant to the rest of the sentence; it is used elsewhere by Rowley (who probably wrote this scene)'. This procedure is even more striking in the case of the authors whose names do not appear on the title-page: to justify the insertion of *faith* at 5.1.68, Taylor writes, 'Metrically the line is awkward, as editors have recognized . . . such irregularity is particularly suspicious in a passage apparently written by Ford. A word like "here" might have been omitted by simple eyeskip, but given other evidence that the text has been expurgated the problem may be censorship. . . Ford uses *faith* as an expletive at least fifteen times elsewhere'. Even a reader who accepts Taylor's argument for Ford's presence, his analysis of Ford's metrics and the statistics suggesting expurgation – as I do – may wonder whether any other one syllable oath could have been omitted here. Taylor's response is that, 'An editor is better placed to point

[13] Gunby, Carnegie and Jackson, vol. 2, p. xiv.

[14] I am grateful to Gary Taylor for permitting me to use quotations from the latest version of the proofs of this edition, which is not yet published.

[15] Taylor has a fuller discussion of his method in ''Swounds Revisited: Theatrical, Editorial, and Literary Expurgation', in Gary Taylor and John Jowett, *Shakespeare Reshaped 1606–1623* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 51–106.

to probable expurgation, and probable solutions, than any unassisted reader.' He thus reveals a general challenge to the editor of any collaborated play. To ignore the consequences of collaboration in the text may not elicit objection, but it can be a failure of courage. If editors do not follow through on what they believe about the collaboration, no one else can be expected to do so. Nevertheless, as the differences between my *Pericles* edition and the Taylor and Jackson 'reconstruction' of that play reveal, there will always be differences regarding how and how much editors embody their knowledge in their texts.

The modernized text, as already mentioned, is likely to eliminate some or all of the traces of collaboration that the editor believes she recognizes. Good examples come from *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Sir Thomas More*. In the former case Potter convincingly identifies the role of one of Paul Werstine's 'close contrivers' or 'playhouse functionaries' in the creation of a text.[16] She suggests that the colons separating the characters in the first stage direction in the 1634 Quarto, '*Enter* Hymen: *a Boy, in a white Robe before singing, and strewing Flowres*:' indicate an insertion, and that their form specifically 'corresponds to the manner of Edward Knight, the book-keeper for the King's Men from 1625 to 1633'.[17] These colons, of course, disappear in modernized punctuation, concealing traces of this diachronic collaboration. A more complex example concerns the *Jailor* of Q's 2.1, who becomes Q's *Keeper* in 2.2. Arguing that it is in the discrepancies between these two scenes 'that the change from one writer to the other shows most clearly', Potter suggests that Fletcher refers to the *Keeper* of the prison in 2.2. but 'in the rest of the play he calls him "Jailor" – presumably because he discovered that this was what Shakespeare had already called him in 2.1'.[18] This sequence is an important piece of the evidence for Potter's theory that the two collaborators worked separately and 'did not expect to have much opportunity to talk about the work in progress'.[19] Yet the reader of her edition who does not study the introduction and textual notes finds only a consistent *Jailor* in the stage directions and speech prefixes of 2.2: such a reader is unlikely to consider Palamon and Arcite's use of the term *keeper* at 2.2.221, 223, and 225 significant. Perhaps it merely marks them as Thebans in Athens.

For Potter, variant spellings of Pirithous's name 'are one of the clearest indicators of dual authorship';[20] such spelling distinctions also vanish in modernized texts. To some theorists this doesn't matter. Jeffrey Masten, objecting to the fundamental attributional procedure of taking 'textual habits' as conveying 'individual identities', asserts that 'the difficulty of linking spelling and "identity" is suggested by the fact that nearly a fifth of the words Hand D [in the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript] writes more than once are spelled in more than one way'.[21] His stunning example, 'Shreiue moor moor more Shreue moore', is meant to undermine 'old historicist' methods of editing. Masten proposes replacing these with newly historicized 'models of "agency", "individuality", "style", corporate effort, contention, influence and so forth'. He does mention that such new models will require 'the invention of new kinds of editorial apparatuses, criteria for and modes of emendation, etc.', but unfortunately he tosses this acknowledgement into a parenthesis, offering no methodological specifics.[22] Thus the editor is left to her own devices, usually determined by the series, which no doubt requires characters to have one designation, consistently spelled. It will be interesting to see in what ways the texts of *Sir Thomas More* in the Oxford Shakespeare second edition and that in the Arden3 series vary. They are both entrusted to John Jowett.

[16] See Paul Werstine, 'Close Contrivers: Nameless Collaborators in Early Modern London Plays', in *The Elizabethan Theatre XV*, ed. C. E. McGee and A. L. Magnusson (Toronto, 2002), pp. 3–20.
[17] Potter, p. 26.
[18] Potter, p. 26–7.
[19] Potter, p. 25.
[20] Potter, p. 133.
[21] Masten, '*More* or Less', p. 115–16; pp. 130–1, note 74.
[22] Masten, p. 116.

COLLABORATION AND THE INTRODUCTION

It is in the introduction that the editor will directly confront the question of authorship and collaboration. For editors it is normally impractical to operate as if there were no author, especially if that author has given his name to the commissioning series. Yet discomfort with, and the elimination of, collaboration is not an invention of modern editorial practice. Notoriously, Jonson eliminated the second hand in *Sejanus*; Marlowe's printer may have done something similar with *Tamburlaine*.[23] In deciding how to present *The Spanish Tragedy* as a volume in Arden Early Modern Drama, the General Editors found themselves facing the question of diachronic collaboration. Should we publish an historical artefact of the Elizabethan drama – whereby the additions belong in an appendix – or the play in its more interesting later adaptation – whereby the additions can be treated as part of the text? Is this play by Kyd, or by Kyd and Jonson, or by Kyd and Anon? Should it appear in the *Cambridge Works of Ben Jonson*? But whether the authorship question is put first, as in R. A. Foakes's 1957 Arden2 *King Henry VIII*, or last, as in Gordon McMullan's 2000 Arden3 edition of the same play, the topic is inescapable. The reader, rightly or wrongly, wants an explanation of why, for example, the jacket blurb for Foakes's *King Henry VIII* promises 'new arguments . . . to support the attribution to Shakespeare' and the only title-page identification offered is 'The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare. *King Henry VIII*', while McMullan's title-page lists the authors as William Shakespeare and John Fletcher. No matter what the final decision is about *The Spanish Tragedy*, our readers will expect the Introduction to discuss how the play came to be.

The editor of a collaborated play who maintains a traditional attitude towards authorship is nevertheless likely to realize the inappropriateness or, at least, the uncertain applicability of biographical and psychological paradigms to her material.[24] Even if all critics agree on the distribution of attributions, the presence of a second writer in any section complicates a one-to-one connection between 'life' and 'text', between individual intention and dramatic result, throughout. It seems that everyone is willing to give the splendid recognition scene of *Pericles* (5.1) to Shakespeare, but no matter how pertinent the lost child motif was to the older author, could he, or the scene, have been entirely unaffected by the presence of Wilkins, who had recently become a father himself? Political and religiously inflected readings can be as problematic in this context as psychoanalytic ones: if Fletcher, as McMullan and Finkelpearl agree, is 'country', but Shakespeare is by some readings the 'King's playwright, or Fletcher is the Anglican bishop's son and Shakespeare perhaps secretly longs for the old religion, should these distinctions be invoked in a discussion of, for example, the three long prayer scenes towards the end of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*?[25] Or when two men who disagree about such matters write a play set in ancient Athens, do they put their differences aside and, by Venus, Mars and Diana, mean merely Venus, Mars and Diana?

In writing about collaborated drama, studies of individual psychology can be usefully replaced with accounts of interpersonal relations and theatrical developments. *Eastward Ho!* seems to be the product of a brief interval of peace in the ongoing hostilities between Jonson and Marston, and Marston's flight from London while Chapman

[23] See 'To the Gentlemen Readers', where R[ichard] I[ones] Printer explains that he has 'omitted and left out some fond and friuolous Iestures, digressing (and in my poore opinion) far vnmeet for the matter' although they have been 'greatly gaped at, what times they were shewed vpon the stage in their graced deformities' (1590, A2).

[24] These difficulties also affect feminist and 'queer' approaches. See Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1997), for fuller discussion.

[25] See Gordon McMullan, *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher* (Amherst, MA, 1994); Philip Finkelpearl, *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton, 1990); Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, The King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court, 1603–1613* (New Haven, 1995).

and Jonson were imprisoned – a flight that Jonson occludes in his recollections to Drummond – may well have something to do with the later failure of the relationship. Similarly, Leeds Barroll argues that Shakespeare was unwilling to start new projects when the theatres were closed by plague, but could the eagerness of Wilkins, frustrated because he had finally had his own play produced by the King's Men only to see the theatres shut down, explain how the *Pericles* project began?[26] Especially if, as Katherine Duncan-Jones suggests, Shakespeare ate regularly with Wilkins?[27] Proposing that we must see dramatic collaboration as 'historically embedded but personally inflected', Heather Hirschfeld cogently examines the institutional frameworks, including competition between the public and private theatres, in which these plays developed.[28]

Even traditional sections of an introduction, such as analysis of a play's use of its sources, may in the case of collaborated drama be affected by possible circularity in the use of evidence. McMullan points out that in *Henry VIII*, where the 'Shakespeare' scenes depend on Holinshed but the 'Fletcher' scenes also use Speed, 'a convincing narrative can be created in which the younger man uses the fashionable new history book where his older colleague carries on using the tried-and-trusted chronicle'. But, McMullan objects, since analysts disagree about whether collaboration was done by entire scenes or collaborators revised each other's works, and since statistical methods can't be trusted on scenes of fewer than about a hundred lines, we risk using this observation about the distribution of source material to confirm a predetermined division, rather than creating new evidence.[29]

Finally, it is in the introduction that an editor's conflicting charges are most likely to reveal themselves. Even such brief pages as Richard Dutton's introduction to *The Changeling* in the Oxford World's Classics try to emphasize both the significant presence of separate authors and the coherence of the resulting text: 'Rowley deserves at least an equal billing with Middleton . . . the castle plot and the madhouse plot [are] closely integrated.'[30] To an editor less comfortable with the concept of collaboration, or one wedded to a vision of hermetically sealed separations between scenes, the result is more likely to be a variation on, 'despite collaboration, play xxx is aesthetically satisfying'. Of course, if the editor believes, as I do, that collaboration of various kinds, and thus an inevitable complexity in the trajectory between inspiration, creation and production was the norm, the caveat is unnecessary.

COLLABORATION AND THE COMMENTARY

There are numerous ways in which the commentary notes to any edition can support a view of the play in question. The first question for the editor of a collaborated, or allegedly collaborated, text, is whether to include a running annotation on the authorship. Such 'information' as there is has presumably already found a place in the introduction, but one never knows whether the reader will have consulted the introduction or plunged in at Act 1, Scene 1. A typical note is found at the beginning of 3.1 in my edition of *Pericles*: 'The opening speech of this scene is generally taken to be the moment when Shakespeare's poetic force and form becomes apparent.' When authorship alternates, one finds, for example, McMullan's first note to *Henry VIII* 2.2, 'generally considered a Fletcher scene, though Hoy thought it Shakespeare's writing reworked by Fletcher' and his opening note to 2.3, 'Generally considered a Shakespeare scene'.[31] Our variants on 'generally taken to be', 'generally considered', acknowledge the possibility of

[26] Leeds Barroll, *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater* (Ithaca, NY, 1991), pp. 17–19.

[27] Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from his Life* (London, 2001), p. 208.

[28] Heather Anne Hirschfeld, *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater* (Amherst, MA, 2004), p. 1.

[29] McMullan, private communication.

[30] Richard Dutton, ed., *Thomas Middleton, Women Beware Women and Other Plays* (Oxford, 1999), pp. xxvii–xxviii.

[31] Gordon McMullan, ed., William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII* (London, 2000), pp. 279, 289.

disagreement, but the very presence of these attributions in the commentary indicates the editor's endorsement of the authorship suggested, as well as a belief that the reader may wish to track changes in authorship while reading the play.

Potter apparently believes that such notes are detrimental to the editor's charge to demonstrate coherence. Concluding that *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is neither confused nor contradictory, she explains that her edition will reflect the consequences of this evaluation in its format: 'that is why, having "deconstructed" the play in this section [of the introduction], I have chosen not to do so in the text or the notes, which, as far as possible, will refrain from identifying the assumed author of each scene'.[32] Although no similar justification is offered, in Dutton's edition of *The Changeling* the reader who actively wants to follow the alleged authorship changes must keep turning back to the introduction.

Even without repeated attributions, the notes may consciously or unconsciously reflect the editor's views on the nature of the collaboration or of the collaborators. An amusing example of the latter emerges from Dyce's notes in his two editions of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. One striking difference is the omission, in the Shakespeare edition, of quite a few notes that explicate the more sexual material. Although he continued to assign the scenes of the country dance to Fletcher, Dyce omitted from the Shakespeare volume explications of *bavian*, *long tool* and *dowcets*. Similarly, in the first scene, usually conceded to be by Shakespeare, when the First Queen asks Theseus how he will think of 'rotten kings and blubber'd queens' while making love to Hippolyta, in the Beaumont and Fletcher volume a note on *blubber'd* admonishes, 'The reader ought to recollect that formerly this word did not convey the somewhat ludicrous idea which it does at present.'[33] When the play appears among the works of Shakespeare, the note disappears, one suspects because merely to suggest the 'ludicrous' in the presence of 'the great dramatist' was unacceptable.

Parallel passages, even if ostensibly selected only to demonstrate similar usage or attitude, will inevitably influence the reader's view of the likelihood of composition by one author or another. The availability of the Shakespeare concordance, first in print and now online, as well as the disproportionate citation of Shakespeare in the *OED*, creates an easy trap for editors, who can most conveniently identify parallels in those reference works. But if one really believes that collaboration could override hierarchy, the temptation must be resisted. In my note to *Pericles* 2.1.1–4, I attempt to complicate the tendency to refer only to the 'major' collaborator. 'These lines are frequently compared to *King Lear* 3.2.14–19 . . . The lines also anticipate the "Shakespearean" opening of 3.1. However, Wilkins too paralleled danger at sea to the vicissitudes of life. Compare Katherine's lines in *Miseries*.' The advent of new electronic sources, particularly *LION*, makes it more possible to search easily for parallels in Beaumont and Fletcher for *Philaster* or in Chapman, Marston and Jonson for *Eastward Ho!*, which may in future mean that parallels do not unintentionally give unbalanced attention to one author.

Often, however, parallel passages are invoked explicitly to support the editor's theory of authorship. In the case of *Eastward Ho!* David Kay and I are persuaded that many scenes of the play, at least by the time they reached their final form, had been worked on by more than one author. Some, like 3.2, appear to combine sections composed separately. These hypotheses are not irreconcilable: assuming that the men planned the play together (or perhaps agreed to work from one of 'Benjamin's' plots) and each then made a preliminary draft of his assigned sections, they might nevertheless have had meetings at which they improved each others' drafts. Consequently, as much as possible we disturb the tendency to cite only parallels to the 'primary' author of each scene. For example, we point out that Marstonian elements and echoes in the acts usually claimed for Chapman and Jonson run the gamut from a

[32] Potter, p. 34.

[33] Dyce, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, vol. 11, p. 338.

paradoxical praise of usury, to favourite words, proverbs and Shakespearian echoes, to a cluster of his preferred form, 'them', in 'Chapman's' 3.3.[34] Again, the staging of the 'Jonson' prison scenes (5.3 and 5.5), in which Security, heard but not seen, tells Bramble that his case 'is stone walls, and iron grates', seems to be based on Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, where Mellida, imprisoned, 'goes from the grate', and it is Chapman who had previously used the proverbial 'cut your thongs unto your leather', found at 5.5.110. On the other hand, in 'Marston's' Act 1 there are conspicuous echoes of Chapman and Jonson, including Golding calling Quicksilver a 'common shot-clog', a Jonsonian coinage (see *OED*), first found in *Every Man Out Of His Humour* (1599) and again in *Poetaster* (1601). A vivid manifestation of the collaborative theatrical and authorial milieu occurs when the drunken Quicksilver, in this 'Marston' act, quotes a line from Chapman's *Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (1596); the line had already been quoted by Jonson in *Poetaster*.

One can, of course, use parallels selectively to spin any kind of interpretation, not just one about authorship. For example, one could imagine editions of *The Maid's Tragedy* with different notes to the scenes between Melantius and Amintor depending upon whether the editor believed Beaumont and Fletcher slept with each other or took turns with the wench. Indeed it is difficult to write notes longer than mere glosses that do not in some way reflect the editor's intellectual positions about authorship, as well as his or her view of the play's cultural and theatrical environment. Potter, who rejects listing authors scene by scene, includes parallels to the plays of Shakespeare in notes to the 'Fletcher' scenes of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. And how could she not? The Jailor's Daughter's madness is clearly descended from Ophelia's, no surprise as Fletcher, like Wilkins, was deeply indebted to works of Shakespeare written well before the collaboration took place. But Potter also points out resemblances 'between the Daughter and Viola in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Coxcomb*', allowing another glimpse of the complexities of theatrical influence by noting that 'this part of the plot is thought to be the work of Beaumont'.[35] The roaring boy school of *A Fair Quarrel* (1615–16) is indebted to Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), but the scenes of both authors reflect real rowdies causing trouble on the London streets. A careful note reader will form a different picture of Middleton and Rowley's 'originality' depending upon which piece of the play's background is cited or emphasized.

CONCLUSION

In the end, there is one way in which editing collaborated plays is the same as editing plays unquestionably originated, if never completed by, a single author. Every play is different.[36] The editorial problems of *Pericles* and the problems of *Eastward Ho!* represent, in useful ways, the extremes. In one case we have a play that appears with only one name on the title-page, yet where much of the play or the writing does not seem 'like Shakespeare', whether that means the text has been distorted during the production process or that another author is responsible for some of the writing. Consequently, much scholarly energy has been expended trying to determine whether transmission or collaboration is the cause of the play's peculiarities, and, if the latter, the identity of the other author. In the case of *Eastward Ho!*, the play has three names on the title-page, and at least some of the history of the writing, theatrical production and publication is known. We have letters from Chapman and Jonson, Jonson's somewhat obfuscatory acknowledgement of his participation in his conversations with Drummond, and even the fortuitous survival of two exemplars of the cancel page. The rest of the text is very 'clean', so clean in fact that

[34] We thus contest some of the conclusions of D. J. Lake, '*Eastward Ho!*: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship', *Notes and Queries*, 28 (1981), 158–166.

[35] Potter, p. 49.

[36] 'All playwriting is collaborative in nature: all collaborative playwriting is like any playwriting', Charles Cathcart, 'Plural Authorship, Attribution, and the Children of the King's Revels', *Renaissance Forum* 4 (2000), p. 5.

there are large white spaces on some of the pages. According to Herford and Simpson, these blanks were caused by a first round of censorship, probably by the printer.[37] A fuller list of the possible agents responsible can be deduced and, David Kay and I believe, may include Jonson and Chapman themselves, trying rather desperately to censor what they realized had been left in the text, once they were released from prison and saw the printer's working manuscript. Even the role of the company is clearer than in *Pericles*. That play was inaugurated at the Globe but shortly afterwards was being taken around the provinces by the recusant Cholmley players, in a text that may or may not have been altered and for reasons that either do or do not have to do with the company's religious orientation. *Eastward Ho!*, on the other hand, was produced by the Children of the Queen's Revels, not surprising for players who seem regularly to have been so willing to risk offence that three years after *Eastward Ho!* they put on another Marston play and succeeded in having their company suppressed.

The real question for the editor, then, is what to do with all this information. For example, in the case of *Eastward Ho!*, should a modern edition print the original material, on the grounds that it was heard on the stage sometime between 16 July and 30 August 1605, or the revision, on the grounds that it represents the socialized, that is, censored, text? One cannot lean on the authors' intentions: aside from the more general objection that such intentions are unknowable, an editor is faced with the contingency of the collaboration and 'its' intentions. Marston, fled westward, may have had different intentions for the play than his associates, just as we do not know if the second author of *Sejanus*, often assumed to be Chapman, intended that his contribution to the play disappear in the printing. In the case of *Eastward Ho!* intentions may well have been fluid: having at first 'intended' the scurrilous attack on James, the letters that Jonson and Chapman sent to various powerful courtiers reveal that soon their overriding intention was to get out of jail and save their ears and noses. Furthermore, we do not know who wrote the substitute passages in *Eastward Ho!* – he might have been anyone in the printing shop, but he might just have been one of the authors. The additions in question are only, respectively, two words and thirty-one words long, not meeting a minimum requirement for statistically meaningful analysis of language. Meanwhile, the example of *Pericles* shows how widely editors may vary in their reactions to collaboration, from the Cambridge edition, which does what it can to ignore what the editors would clearly prefer to deny, to the Oxford reconstruction, whose editors practically become collaborators themselves.[38] About all one can ask is for an editor to take a coherent position and share it clearly with the readers.

Perhaps the last word should go to another Bentley, one Thomas, a little noted collaborator in the editing of *Pericles*. A notorious crux in 2.2, a 'Wilkins scene', is Simonides's sententious comment on the Knights' objections to the unknown Pericles' dusty appearance as he presents his device to Thaisa. Q 1609 prints, 'Opinion's but a foole, that makes vs scan / The outward habit, by the inward man'. In the diachronic collaboration of successive editors, my emendation comes from Ernst Schanzer, who changes only 'by' to 'for'.[39] Such a reading seems confirmed by Wilkins's *The Painful Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*, another possible participant as we try to develop a text of *Pericles*, claiming as it does to be the 'true History of the Play of *Pericles*, as it was lately presented'. If this is true, and many have doubted it, *Painful Adventures* is an account of King's Men's production, although it also includes a good deal of material plagiarized from Lawrence Twine's *The Pattern of Painful Adventures*, which thus must also be considered as a predecessor/collaborator. Wilkins has the King

[37] *Ben Jonson*, vol. 4, pp. 495–7.

[38] 'We as editors don't really care who wrote *Pericles* (though we do believe it to be the product of a single creative imagination)', Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond, eds., *Pericles* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 15; compare *A Reconstructed Text of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, in Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1986).

[39] Ernst Schanzer, ed., *Pericles* (New York, 1965), p. 76.

report that 'the outward habite was the least table of the inward minde'.[40] But Bentley, our annotator, writes at the end of his copy of Chapman's 1599 *A Humorous Day's Mirth*, now owned by the Folger Shakespeare Library, 'Thomas Bentley owes this booke / he is a foole that scann / The Inward habitts by the outward man / Shackesphere'.[41] In Bentley's mind and Shackesphere's text, Wilkins has vanished, the final line is reversed, and *habit* changes from a mode of apparel (*OED* I) to a mental construction (*OED* III). Yet the change creates the same emendation. Duncan-Jones proposes that 'Bentley's garbled version suggests recollection of a performance'.[42] If so, we end where we started, with the collaboration of theatrical agents and readers, and an author whose name, while delightfully reminiscent of the Globe in which he acted, will have to be regularized in a modern edition.

[40] Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 6 (London, 1966), p. 509.

[41] Duncan-Jones, 205.

[42] Duncan-Jones, p. 303, n. 28.