Review Essay

Brett D. Hirsch

Moving Targets: Constructing Canons, 2013–2014

This review essay considers early modern dramatic authorship and canons in the context of two recent publications: an anthology of plays — William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays *(2013), edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen as a companion volume to the RSC* Complete Works — *and a monograph study* — *Jeremy Lopez's* Constructing the Canon of Early Modern Drama *(2014).*

Yet it is impossible to evaluate literature in the abstract; a book is neither produced nor read in a vacuum and the very word 'value' involves right away criteria which are not just 'literary'. Literature is a part of life and can be judged only in its relevance to life. Life is not static but moving and changing. Thus we have to see both literature and ourselves in history, not as abstract entities.

— Arnold Kettle (1951)[1]

To conceive of a 'coherent, unitary canon', as if 'it were less an assortment of classics than a single monumental entity',[2] is perhaps commonplace, but any canon is subject to the same historical forces that shape the production and reception of the literature it seeks to define, value, collect, and exclude. If John Milton is right to suspect that books are not 'absolutely dead things',[3] then neither are our canons.

Brett D. Hirsch (brett.hirsch@uwa.edu.au) is ARC Discovery Early Career research fellow and assistant professor of English and Cultural Studies at the University of Western Australia.

This review essay considers two books, one published in 2013 and the other in 2014, concerned with early modern dramatic authorship and canons. Both of these concepts were 'under threat' by 'the end of the twentieth century', with authorship 'challenged as a non-entity, and seen as doubly problematic in relation to the frequently collaborative practices of Elizabethan and Jacobean script-writing', and canons 'abhorred as restrictive practices by critics and theorists who wanted to impose other kinds of restriction, of their own choosing, on the study of literature'.[4] Almost a decade and a half since Richard Proudfoot made these observations, both terms remain contentious. If recognizing the production of early modern plays in both the theatre and the print shop as collaborative enterprises is now a critical commonplace, for some it has become evidence of the impossibility of 'authorship' as individual labour. The 'specific qualities of drama' that 'inevitably dissolve authorial intentions into the collaborative demands of performance'[5] have led critics such as Jeffrey Masten to dismiss attempts to determine the discrete shares of collaborators from the surviving playbooks as futile,[6] and others to challenge the notion of individual style and to posit company style in its place. For Gordon McMullan, 'the nature of the early modern company repertory militates in several ways against the idea of individual style', giving rise to 'a *company* style', because the 'formation of an acting company' amounts to 'an institutionalisation of the collaborative process'.[7]

The chief opponents of this critical trend to 'emphasize the collaborative, socialized labours of the players, the scribes and compositors' to the extent that their 'effects upon the surviving script are treated as though they are nearly as important as the author's labour' are the stylometrists, whose 'extraordinary successes … have illustrated the importance of authorship in the teeth of postmodernism's denial of it'.[8] As Hugh Craig has persuasively shown, whereas 'statistical studies might have revealed — were free to reveal — that authorship is insignificant in comparison to other factors', in fact 'authorship emerges as a much stronger force in the affinities between texts than genre or period'.[9] Recent studies also challenge the extent to which individual authorial style was constrained by the repertory company under whose auspices authors wrote.[10]

The so-called 'culture wars' of the 1980s and 1990s scrutinized literary canons in stark political terms, pitting traditionalists in favour of a curriculum of 'classic' texts against revisionists seeking to expand or replace them with works by authors belonging to marginalized groups, genders, cultures, races, religions, sexualities, socio-economic backgrounds, and political

affiliations. Though the revisionists are typically cast as the victors, the extent of their success remains debatable; we will return to this aspect of the debate later. For now, worth noting is that critics on both sides of the 'culture wars' frequently conflated 'distinct but related' senses of the term 'canon,' which could refer to a set of works 'esteemed within a culture' and those 'written by a particular person', as well as 'the totality of these works conceived of as an idea'.[11] This ambiguity allowed the notion of individual authorship to dominate the terms of the canon debate; to adapt Roland Barthes's aphorism, the question of '*what* gets taught'[12] effectively became '*who* gets taught'. Just as Portia has to establish 'which is the merchant here, and which the Jew' before proceeding with her case in *The Merchant of Venice* (4.1.171),[13] arguments for the canonical inclusion or exclusion of particular texts were predicated on the identity of their respective authors. As a result, texts of unknown, uncertain, or unconventional authorial status were essentially excluded from the debate.

At the same time, the repudiations of the singular 'author' noted above had a disruptive effect on the conception of the term 'canon'. 'The author', Lucy Munro observed, 'is a useful organising principle, but it is not the only one available'[14] and 'repertory studies' — as it has come to be known — shifted the focus away from individual, named dramatists and their plays toward the playing companies for whom they wrote and were written respectively, considered alongside 'other contributors to a company's dramatic output, such as actors, sharers, playhouse owners (and the buildings themselves), audiences, and patrons'.[15] Proposals of canons without recourse to the singular, named 'author' as the traditional touchstone for inclusion or exclusion were now feasible:

> Such collections might include the plays associated with particular acting companies, or with particular playhouses, or with particular moments in theatrical history; they would also allow for proper attention to plays of doubtful or unknown authorship.[16]

Editions and editorial series adopting some of these alternative canonical models have since materialized: under the general editorship of Helen Ostovich, the *Queen's Men Editions* offers the first repertory-based edition of early modern drama,[17] collecting and publishing plays associated with Queen Elizabeth's Men; *Stages of Transition: Plays and Texts, 1603–1604,* an anthology under the general editorship of Matteo Pangallo, brings together

plays, sermons, ballads, travel accounts, and other texts from the 1603–04 season.[18] These pioneering projects aside, single-author canons remain the dominant editorial form. The past two decades alone have witnessed the completion, inauguration, or commission of collected works editions of John Webster (1995–),[19] Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher (1966–96),[20] Thomas Middleton (2007; 2012),[21] Fulke Greville (2008),[22] Richard Brome (2010; 2020),[23] John Ford (2011–),[24] Ben Jonson (2012; 2014),[25] Thomas Heywood (Oxford, 2015–22),[26] James Shirley (Oxford, 2018–22),[27] and John Marston (Oxford, 2019–20);[28] an edition of the complete works of Cyril Tourneur is also currently in preparation.

Over the same period, the handful of dedicated series publishing anthologies and single-text editions of early modern plays — the Arden Early Modern Drama, Globe Quartos, New Mermaids, Norton Critical Editions, Penguin Renaissance Dramatists, Revels Plays, and Revels Plays Companion Library — has focused almost exclusively on plays of singular, known authorship. The notably few anonymous plays published in these series include: *Thomas of Woodstock,* the only unattributed play out of twenty-four published in the Revels Plays series since 1995;[29] *Captain Thomas Stukeley* and *The Tragedy of Cicero,* out of the twenty plays anthologized in the Revels Plays Companions Library series;[30] *Arden of Faversham,* alone amongst the twenty-seven plays published in the New Mermaids;[31] *King Leir* and *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* out of the Globe Quartos' sixteen plays;[32] and, the late medieval moralities, *Everyman* and *Mankind,* out of the ten plays published in the Arden Early Modern Drama series to date.[33] None of the eighteen or twelve plays in the Norton Critical Editions and Penguin Renaissance Dramatists series respectively is anonymous. Collaborative drama has fared little better: Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* and *A King and No King* represent the only collaborative plays published in the Arden Early Modern Drama (one of ten) and the Revels Plays (one of twenty-four) respectively;[34] three out of the twenty-seven plays in the New Mermaids are attributed to multiple authors,[35] with the same number out of the sixteen plays in the Globe Quartos;[36] and, although the Norton Critical Editions series includes editions of *Doctor Faustus, Macbeth,* and *Measure for Measure,* the only play in the series to be credited as a collaborative work on its cover and title-page is *The Roaring Girl* (one of eighteen).[37] None of the twenty plays anthologized in Revels Plays Companion Library volumes is collaborative, nor is any of the twelve Penguin Renaissance Dramatists' plays.

Stand-alone dedicated anthologies of early modern drama published since 1995 also reflect this pattern: a masque and coronation entertainment aside, *Arden of Faversham* and *Everyman* are the only anonymous plays represented across sixteen collections (the former appearing in five anthologies and the latter only in one),[38] with six collaborative plays appearing across nine anthologies.[39] A broader survey of early modern plays as they appear in the full range of literary anthologies — such as the Longman, Norton, and Broadview anthologies of English/British literature and/or drama, collections of women's writing, medieval drama, and so on — may reveal different patterns of inclusion and exclusion, but is outside the scope of this essay.

A History and Prolegomenon

To be at all useful, any historical study of the canon of early modern drama at any given moment in time — that is, an aggregate of the play-editions available — has to be comprehensive. The effort required to compile an enumerative bibliography of editions steadily increases as the scope of the investigation widens. Scholarship accompanying critical editions notwithstanding, this requirement is perhaps one of the reasons why studies of this kind have typically focused on a particular dramatist,[40] editor,[41] editorial theory/practice,[42] or publication event.[43] A comprehensive historical survey of the editing and publishing of early modern plays remains to be written.

Jeremy Lopez's *Constructing the Canon of Early Modern Drama* (2014) is an ambitious but flawed attempt to produce such a history, as well as a prolegomenon to a new anthology of plays, with Lopez reluctantly offering his 'services as its steward, compiler, and editor'.[44] Despite the broad scope implied by its title, a near-exhaustive litany of exclusions pares the canon of early modern drama under investigation to just thirty-one stand-alone dedicated anthologies, from Robert Dodsley's *Select Collection of Old Plays* in 1744 through to the *Routledge Anthology of Renaissance Drama* in 2003, as well as the twenty-one volumes published in the original Mermaids series between 1887 and 1895. Collected works editions, 'acting editions', 'dramatic-history anthologies', 'numerous [but unnamed] other small series', 'bibliographical editions' (is any edition *not* bibliographical?), the 'great many small or genre-specific anthologies', 'collections of medieval drama', Shakespeare, and 'the Shakespeare "apocrypha"', are all excluded (14–16). The result is a canon of early modern drama bereft of Shakespeare, closet drama, university drama, early Tudor drama, and plays by women. Nonetheless, Lopez proceeds to

generalize about the canon writ large on the basis of this narrowly defined, unrepresentative editorial sample. These generalizations are questionable at best and valid only in heavily constrained circumstances.

Lopez suggests, for example, 'the history of these anthologies can be divided into two waves', one from 1744 to 1885 concerned with the antiquarian recovery of forgotten and hitherto unpublished plays, and another, 'initiated by the Mermaid Series', concerned with anthologizing only the 'best' plays for its readership (12–13). Such a sharp division between scholarship/antiquarianism and aestheticism is only plausible by excluding the numerous editions characterized by Lopez as 'bibliographical', such as the twelve-volume Early English Dramatists series, the 143-volume Tudor Facsimile Texts, and the various Malone Society editions and *Collections.* Lopez posits another artificial distinction, geographical this time, between British 'antiquarians' and American 'academics': 'anthologies published up through 1885', he writes, 'were all produced in Britain by British antiquarians', whereas 'anthologies published since 1911, with the exception of the Routledge, have been published by American presses and edited by academics working in American universities' (13). This observation is puzzling and simply untrue, even within the restrictive terms of Lopez's editorial sample. In addition to the *Routledge Anthology of Renaissance Drama* (2003), edited by British scholars and published simultaneously in America and Britain by Routledge, a British multinational publisher, two anthologies included in Lopez's own list — the first and second editions of Arthur F. Kinney's *Renaissance Drama* (1999; 2005) — were also simultaneously published on both sides of the Atlantic by Blackwell, a British publisher that only later merged with John Wiley & Sons, an American publisher, to form Wiley–Blackwell in 2007.[45] The suggestion, moreover, that academics working in American universities have enjoyed a monopoly on anthologies of early modern plays is fanciful and the result of extrapolating from a severely limited sample that excludes the many contrary examples. Only one of the eleven multi-author anthologies of early modern plays in the Oxford World's Classics, for instance, a series excluded by Lopez, is by an academic working at an American university, namely, Katharine Eisaman Maus.[46] If single-author volumes in the same series are included in the tally, only two more American-based academics join Maus — David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen — that is, three academics out of the nineteen in total.[47] Likewise, Lopez's suggestion that Thomas Dekker has been 'represented solely' by *The Shoemaker's Holiday* in anthologies published after 1976 is baffling (24), not least because *The Roaring Girl* is present in two of

the stand-alone dedicated anthologies included in his sample (ie, the Norton and Routledge), and *The Magnificent Entertainment* is also included in the 1999 edition of the Blackwell anthology, which also made the list.

Stand-alone dedicated anthologies are only a part of the editorial landscape and even these are thoroughly under-represented in Lopez's sample. As a result, Lopez's generalizations about anthologies are just as dubious as his observations on the canon of early modern drama more broadly defined. 'In modern anthologies of early modern drama', he writes, 'the genre of the English history play has been almost exclusively represented by Marlowe's *Edward II*' (78), a play conspicuously absent from the only stand-alone anthology devoted to the genre — William A. Armstrong's *Elizabethan History Plays* — and excluded from Lopez's sample.[48] Elsewhere, he makes this inaccurate and misleading claim in more comprehensive terms: '*Edward II* is the only play to appear in every anthology of early modern drama published since 1911' (59). Other absences are works of criticism, whose omissions are more puzzling than convenient. The only monograph devoted entirely to the subject of Marlowe's nineteenth-century critical reception and canonization is Thomas Dabbs's *Reforming Marlowe: The Nineteenth-Century Canonization of a Renaissance Dramatist* (1991). Lopez's failure to mention this text, even when he remarks that 'the canonization of this play [*Edward II*] is perhaps more than anything else a product of nineteenth-century character criticism', is thus surprising (60).

A particularly frustrating feature of *Constructing the Canon of Early Modern Drama* is its unorthodox form: sixty short chapters meticulously organized to facilitate what Lopez calls 'diagonal' reading. His explanation bears quoting in (near) entirety:

> The chapters ending in 1 and 0 are concerned, in various ways, with how editorial groupings of texts define and circumscribe the interpretive vocabulary to which those texts might be subjected. The chapters ending in 5 are concerned with the relation between genre and canon. The chapters ending in 7 explicitly take up questions of the relation between form and history … The chapters ending in 9 demonstrate the degree to which the current early modern dramatic canon and its critical tradition are mutually constitutive … [The] chapters ending in 2 … all deal with critical or theatrical revisionism, or those ending in 4, which are mostly concerned with plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher canon … [or] chapters ending in 3, which deal with different problems of 'form'; or those ending in 6, which both explain the book's form and goals and analyze the idealism of

various critical, editorial, and theatrical attitudes towards antecedent texts …
[or] chapters ending in 8, which present tripartite readings of two plays. (20–1)

Readers will be relieved to know that Lopez refrains from indulging in more
complex forms of numerology, such as ciphers in every *n*th line or page. The
decision to reject a traditional linear structure on aesthetic grounds disorien-
tates the reader — I frequently experienced déjà vu whilst jumping from
chapter to chapter — and resists any sense of cohesion and development
of argument. In choosing to make each of the sixty short chapters as self-
contained as possible, Lopez forgoes any linear narrative. As a result of this
imposition of unorthodox, non-linear format and overdetermined numero-
logical chapter organization, *Constructing the Canon of Early Modern Drama*
awkwardly straddles the line between scholarship and book-as-art-object.

An unrepresentative history of the canon of early modern drama, Lopez's
book is also a prolegomenon to a 'new anthology', one containing thirty-
seven plays 'to arrive at the magical, Shakespearean number' (201) — despite
modern scholarly consensus that Shakespeare's canon contains thirty-eight
plays.[49] *Macbeth,* which Lopez attributes solely to Shakespeare, is included
on account of 'its surprising, and perhaps entirely coincidental, resonances'
with *Northward Ho,* another play on his list. As for the rest, 'four [?] prin-
ciples of selection governed the construction' of his proposed canon: plays
'that have served a very particular, even symbolic, function in defining the
historical or aesthetic character of the early modern dramatic canon'; plays
'that have served to represent what is most, or least, characteristic about a
given authorial canon'; plays that allow the application of 'biographical or
theater-historical information in order to construct critical allegories about
the dynamics of canon-formation'; plays 'clearly bifurcated in form' or 'whose
forms are difficult to understand as unified or coherent'; and 'plays which
I like, which have meager critical traditions, which I think deserve serious
and attentive readings', and those 'which can be productively read against
(or in some cases with) the grain of the critical vocabularies that define and
arise out of the current non-Shakespearean canon' (201–2). Lopez's honesty
is admirable, but the category of 'plays which I like' undercuts the other cri-
teria, since to retrospectively justify *any* play from the period on historical,
aesthetic, generic, biographical, theatre-historical, formal, or critical grounds
is not difficult. Given so much freedom of choice, Lopez's new anthology is
as disappointingly unrepresentative as the canon he attempts to historicize,

lacking plays before 1587 or after 1630, university drama, closet drama, and plays by women.

Apocrypha Redivivus

In 1908, C.F. Tucker Brooke published an old-spelling anthology of plays that the scholarship of the day could, 'without entire absurdity', class as 'doubtfully Shakespearian'.[50] Many of the fourteen plays assembled in Tucker Brooke's seminal collection and dubbed 'Apocrypha'[51] have since found their way into the acknowledged canons of Shakespeare and his contemporaries: *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *The Puritan* are now attributed to Middleton, scholarly consensus assigns 'Hand D' in the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* to Shakespeare, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is accepted as a collaboration between Fletcher and Shakespeare. The authorial status of the other ten plays in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* remains uncertain: *Arden of Faversham, Locrine, Edward III, Mucedorus* (with the 1610 additions), *Sir John Oldcastle, Thomas Lord Cromwell, The Merry Devil of Edmonton, Fair Em,* and *The Birth of Merlin.*

As influential as Tucker Brooke's anthology is, no successful attempts to update it to reflect modern scholarship and editorial practice precede the publication of Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen's *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* (2013).[52] Intended as a supplement and companion volume to the RSC Shakespeare *Complete Works* (2007) and adopting the features and format of that series, *William Shakespeare and Others* offers modern-spelling annotated texts of eight of the plays originally included in Tucker Brooke's anthology, with *Sir John Oldcastle, Fair Em, The Merry Devil of Edmonton, The Two Noble Kinsmen,* and *The Birth of Merlin* discarded and two plays now thought to be at least partly by Shakespeare added in their place: Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (with the 1602 additions) and Lewis Theobald's *Double Falsehood.*

Limited availability of modern-spelling annotated editions of many of the plays included in *William Shakespeare and Others* makes the collection a welcome addition, but the volume as a whole suffers from an identity crisis. While Bate justifies the decision to call the collection *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* 'in order to keep the many unresolved questions open' and also 'to avoid the quasi-biblical (and thus unhelpfully bardolatrous) associations of the word "apocrypha"' (15), the uncertain authorial status and textual provenance of many plays included renders the title

problematic. In many cases, we simply do not know whether the plays are in fact collaborations. For example, the introduction to *Thomas Lord Cromwell* reports 'some critics have suggested the play may contain multiple hands, but this is perhaps an impression borne of textual confusion' (300). Equally uncertain is Shakespeare's involvement in many, if not all, of the plays. 'No reputable scholar', for example, 'thinks there is a remote possibility of [*Thomas Lord Cromwell*] actually being by Shakespeare' (298). The inclusion of *A Yorkshire Tragedy,* 'almost universally attributed to Thomas Middleton' in its entirety, relies upon a strained argument that Shakespeare's privileged position within the King's Men meant his 'involvement could be operating at a different level', such that he 'may have been responsible for the overall design of the sequence' of plays to which *A Yorkshire Tragedy* belongs (479). *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* is therefore a doubly mis-leading title, suggesting that the plays contained within are all collaborative, and all collaborations between Shakespeare and 'others'. The collection is also incomplete in its own terms, since, with the exception of *Sir Thomas More,* none of the collaborative plays already securely in the canon (ie, *Macbeth, Measure for Measure, Timon of Athens, Titus Andronicus, The Two Noble Kinsmen, Henry VIII, Pericles,* and the three parts of *Henry VI*) is included, on account of these plays' presence in the RSC *Complete Works.*[53]

Despite Bate's disavowal of the term 'Apocrypha', his General Introduction is not short on bardolatry. A particularly egregious example is his assertion that the value of the plays included in the volume resides for the most part, if not entirely, with the fact that they were at some time or another ascribed to, or associated with, Shakespeare. 'These facts alone make the plays worth reading', Bate writes, since 'even if they are not by Shakespeare, they are plays that were plausibly passed off as his' (10–11). The volume itself is arguably an exercise in bardolatry, bringing together plays solely on the basis of their putative relation to Shakespeare, however remote or insubstantial. In addition to the issue of authorship, each short introduction inevitably frames its play in Shakespearean terms: 'The mature Shakespeare would never have suffered the tautology of a rock being stony' in *Locrine* (74), '*Edward III* feels like a Shakespearean history play' (133), *The London Prodigal* 'represents the closest that Shakespeare's name came to an explicitly London-located city comedy' (424), to cite a few examples. In this and other respects, *William Shakespeare and Others* is an opportunity lost. Will Sharpe's essay, 'Authorship and Attribution' (641–745), comprehensively addresses the authorship status of each play, so the introductions may instead have usefully focused on

the plays' merits as theatre, their major themes, and their historical-critical importance beyond Shakespeare.[54] The decision to retain the format of the RSC *Complete Works* also means that the collations and textual notes for each play are woefully limited to no more than a page or two, in which *all* editorial interventions, after the early textual witnesses, are conflated together under the abbreviation 'Ed'. The readings introduced by Rasmussen, if any, are therefore impossible to distinguish from those adopted from previous editors. At one point, even the editors themselves seem unsure: 'Ed = a correction introduced by a later editor???' (549).

Aesthetically, the volume adopts the layout and design of the RSC *Complete Works*. Whereas the *Complete Works* used the play headings from the first folio, *William Shakespeare and Others* draws these — in full — from the title-pages of the copy-text (typically an early quarto), with an idiosyncratic and inconsistent use of all caps and title case. The edition of *Arden of Faversham,* for example, is headed by 'THE LAMENTABLE AND / TRUE TRAGEDY OF MASTER / ARDEN FAVERSHAM IN KENT. / Who was Most Wickedly Murdered, by / the Means of His Disloyal and Wanton / Wife, Who for the Love She Bare to One / Mosby, Hired Two Desperate Ruffians, / Black Will and Shakebag, to Kill Him. Wherein is Showed the Great Malice and / Dissimulation of a Wicked Woman, the / Insatiable Desire of Filthy Lust and the / Shameful End of All Murderers' (7). The headings for many other plays in the collection also take up half a page. Some use sentence case, others title case, but none reflects the capitalization of the copy-text.

Will Sharpe's essay, 'Authorship and Attribution' (641–745), offers a much-needed update of Samuel Schoenbaum's important survey of attribution studies in the field, *Internal Evidence and the Attribution of Elizabethan Plays* (1966).[55] Sharpe's chapter admirably summarizes the authorship debates surrounding the apocryphal plays, whether included or excluded from the present volume. With high stakes, attribution studies of Shakespeare are notoriously vicious and frequently play out in fierce debates (such as those published in the *Times Literary Supplement*), but Sharpe's essay is admirably balanced and unbiased. This balance is perhaps because *William Shakespeare and Others* relies entirely upon existing scholarship rather than conducting authorship attribution studies of its own — another opportunity lost.[56] Even so, Sharpe's essay remains one of the most valuable elements of the volume. Peter Kirwan's 'From Script to Stage' (746–82), a series of interviews with actors and directors in historical productions of the plays for the Globe and

RSC, is another important resource. Kirwan is an insightful theatre critic and reviewer, and as valuable an archive as these interviews are, the volume could have benefited greatly by also employing him to write extensive performance histories.

Both books reviewed here are compromised in their conception of canonicity, and point to an abiding concern — one might even say obsession — with authorship as a category for inclusion and exclusion, as uncertain, tenuous, or critically unfashionable as it may be. But the questions they raise, explicitly or inadvertently, are crucial to our understanding of the complex processes of canon formation, changing conceptions of early modern dramatic authorship, and the roles of the editor and publisher in framing these discourses.

Notes

An Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DE130100621) supported research for this essay.

1   Arnold Kettle, *An Introduction to the English Novel,* 2 vols (New York, 1951), 1.10.

2   Trevor Ross, 'The Canon', David Scott Kastan (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature* (Oxford, 2006), 1.367.

3   John Milton, *Areopagitica* (London, 1644), A3v.

4   Richard Proudfoot, *Shakespeare: Text, Stage and Canon* (London, 2001), 64.

5   David Scott Kastan, 'The Body of the Text', *English Literary History* 81.2 (2014), 446, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/elh.2014.0018.

6   Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1997), 17.

7   Gordon McMullan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing: Authorship in the Proximity of Death* (Cambridge, 2007), 239, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511483790.

8   Gabriel Egan, 'What is Not Collaborative about Early Modern Drama in Performance and Print?' *Shakespeare Survey* 67 (2014), 27, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/sso9781107775572.002.

9   Hugh Craig, 'Style, Statistics, and New Models of Authorship', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 15.1 (2009–10), 2.3.

10 Hugh Craig and Brett D. Hirsch, *Beyond Authorship: Computational Studies of Early Modern Drama* (forthcoming).

11 Ross, 'The Canon', 367.

12   Qtd in Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford, 1983), 197.

13   All quotations from Shakespeare are to Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (gen. eds), *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 2005).

14   Lucy Munro, *Children of the Queen's Revels: A Jacobean Theatre Repertory* (Cambridge, 2005), 4, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486067.

15   Tom Rutter, 'Repertory Studies: An Overview', *Shakespeare* 4.3 (2008), 336, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17450910802295484. The timeline presented here is an oversimplification — repertory studies traces its roots as far back as the 1930s. As Rutter suggests, however, its growth into a recognizable 'discipline' begins in the 1980s with the publication of Reavley Gair's *The Children of Paul's: The Story of a Theatre Company, 1553–1603* (Cambridge, 1982).

16   Proudfoot, *Shakespeare*, 70. On the notion of repertory-based editions, see also Tanya Hagen, 'Thinking Outside the Bard: REED, Repertory Canons, and Editing Early English Drama', Audrey Douglas and Sally-Beth MacLean (eds), *REED in Review: Essays in Celebration of the First Twenty-Five Years* (Toronto, 2006), 216–35.

17   Helen Ostovich (gen. ed.), *Queen's Men Editions*, 2006–, http://qme.internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/.

18   Matteo Pangallo (gen. ed.), *Stages of Transition: Plays and Texts of 1603–1604* (forthcoming).

19   David Gunby, David Carnegie, and MacDonald P. Jackson (gen. eds), *The Works of John Webster*, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1995–).

20   Fredson Bowers (gen. ed.), *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1966–96).

21   Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (gen. eds), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford, 2007), doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780199580538.book.1; although an ambitious electronic edition was planned, the Oxford Middleton was added to Oxford Scholarly Editions Online in 2012.

22   G.A. Wilkes (ed.), *The Complete Poems and Plays of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke (1554–1628)*, 2 vols (Lewiston, 2008).

23   Richard Allen Cave (gen. ed.), *Richard Brome Online* (Sheffield: HRI Online, 2010), http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/brome/; Richard Allen Cave and Eleanor Lowe (gen. eds), *The Plays of Richard Brome*, 4 vols (Oxford, 2020).

24   Brian Vickers (gen. ed.), *The Collected Works of John Ford*, 3 vols (Oxford, 2011–); as with the Oxford Middleton, the Ford volumes are being added to the Oxford Scholarly Editions Online platform as they become available. Volume 1 was added to OSEO in 2013 (doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780199592906.book.1).

25   David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson (gen. eds), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, 7 vols (Cambridge, 2012); *The Cambridge Edition*

of the Works of Ben Jonson Online, 2014, http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/.

26 Grace Ioppolo (gen. ed.), *The Collected Works of Thomas Heywood*, 10 vols (Oxford, 2015–2022); an electronic edition is also planned.

27 Eugene Giddens, Teresa Grant, and Barbara Ravelhofer (gen. eds), *The Complete Works of James Shirley*, 10 vols (Oxford, 2018–2022); an electronic edition is also planned.

28 Martin Butler and Matthew Steggle (gen. eds), *The Complete Works of John Marston* (Oxford, 2020); an electronic edition is also planned.

29 Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge (eds), *Thomas of Woodstock* (Manchester, 2002).

30 Published in Charles Edelman (ed.), *The Stukeley Plays* (Manchester, 2005) and Janet Clare (ed.), *Drama of the English Republic, 1649–60* (Manchester, 2002) respectively.

31 Martin White (ed.), *Arden of Faversham*, intro. Tom Lockwood, 2nd edn (London, 2007).

32 Tiffany Stern (ed.), *King Leir* (London, 2002); Nicola Bennett (ed.), *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (London, 2000).

33 Douglas Bruster and Eric Rasmussen (eds), *Everyman and Mankind* (London, 2009).

34 Suzanne Gossett (ed.), *Philaster* (London, 2009); Lee Bliss (ed.), *A King and No King* (Manchester, 2004).

35 Elizabeth Cook (ed.), *The Roaring Girl*, 2nd edn (London, 1997); Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *The Witch of Edmonton* (London, 1998); Michael Neill (ed.), *The Changeling*, 3rd edn (London, 2006).

36 Nick de Somogyi (ed.), *The Honest Whore, Parts One and Two* (London, 1998); Nick de Somogyi (ed.), *The Custom of the Country* (London, 1999); Gabriel Egan (ed.), *The Late Lancashire Witches* (London, 2002).

37 Jennifer Panek (ed.), *The Roaring Girl* (New York, 2011). The Norton Critical Editions of *Doctor Faustus* (2005), *Macbeth* (2003), and *Measure for Measure* (2009) are attributed solely to Marlowe and Shakespeare on their respective covers and title-pages.

38 *Arden of Faversham* appears in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments* (Oxford, 1999; 2nd edn 2005); David Bevington et al. (eds), *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology* (New York, 2002); Simon Barker and Hilary Hinds (eds), *The Routledge Anthology of Renaissance Drama* (London, 2003), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203446584; and Martin Wiggins (ed.), *'A Woman Killed With Kindness' and Other Domestic Plays* (Oxford, 2008). *Everyman* appears in Greg Walker (ed.), *The Oxford Anthology of Tudor Drama* (Oxford, 2014).

39 Collaborative plays include *The Changeling* (six times)*, The Concealed Fancies, The Insatiate Countess, The Maid's Tragedy* (three times)*, The Roaring Girl* (twice), and *The Witch of Edmonton,* appearing in S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (eds), *Renaissance Drama by Women* (New York, 1996); Colin Gibson (ed.), *Six Renaissance Tragedies* (New York, 1997); Martin Wiggins (ed.), *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies* (Oxford, 1998); Kinney (ed.), *Renaissance Drama* (1999 and 2005); Barker and Hinds (eds), *Routledge Anthology of Renaissance Drama* (1999); Frank Kermode (ed.), *'The Duchess of Malfi': Seven Masterpieces of Jacobean Drama* (New York, 2005); and Wiggins (ed.), *'A Woman Killed With Kindness' and Other Plays* (2008).

40 Examples include: Andrew Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing* (Cambridge, 2003), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511483820; and Thomas Dabbs, *Reforming Marlowe: The Nineteenth-Century Canonization of a Renaissance Dramatist* (Cranbury, 1991).

41 Shakespearean examples include: Peter Seary, *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1990); Margreta de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim* (Oxford, 1991), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198117780.001.0001; Edward Tomarken, *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare* (Athens, 1991); Peter Martin, *Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar* (Cambridge, 1995); and Simon Jarvis, *Scholars and Gentlemen* (Oxford, 1995), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198182955.001.0001. Sonia Massai offers an important corrective to a number of these narratives in *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge, 2007).

42 Examples include: Gabriel Egan, *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* (Cambridge, 2010), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511781742; and Marcus Walsh, *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-Century Editing* (Cambridge, 1997).

43 For example, Zachary Lesser's, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* (Cambridge, 2004) analyzes a number of plays in the context of the print shops responsible for their first editions. Lesser's recent *Hamlet After Q1* (Philadelphia, 2015) traces the perception of the play after the nineteenth-century rediscovery of the first quarto. While its focus is on dedications and prefaces, David Bergeron's *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570–1640* (Aldershot, 2005) is similarly concerned with first editions.

44 Jeremy Lopez, *Constructing the Canon of Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge, 2014), 154; doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139344128. Further references are cited parenthetically.

45 Lopez also erroneously cites Barker and Hinds's anthology as *The Routledge Anthology of English Renaissance Drama* (11, 230).

46 Katharine Eisaman Maus (ed.), *Four Revenge Tragedies* (Oxford, 1995). The other editors include William A. Armstrong, F.S. Boas, Eugene Giddens, James Knowles, David Lindley, A.K. McIlwraith, C.B. Wheeler, and Martin Wiggins, all at British universities.

47 The UK-based editors include Gordon Campbell, Richard Dutton (then at Lancaster), M.J. Kidnie (then at South Bank), Marion Lomax (aka Robyn Bolam), Keith Sturgess, and René Weis; in Canada, Michael Taylor.

48 William A. Armstrong (ed.), *Elizabethan History Plays* (Oxford, 1965). The plays included are *Edward III, King Johan, King John and Matilda, Perkin Warbeck*, and *Thomas of Woodstock.*

49 The plays, as listed and attributed by Lopez, are: Fletcher and Massinger, *The Custom of the Country*; Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*; Dekker and Webster, *Westward Ho*; Tailor, *The Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*; Marlowe, *Edward II*; Anon., *The Tragedy of Nero*; Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*; Anon., *Look About You*; Ford, '*Tis Pity She's a Whore*; Middleton and Rowley, *The Changeling*; Anon., *The Fair Maid of Bristow*; Dekker et al., *Sir Thomas More*; Fletcher, *The Mad Lover*; Jonson, *Volpone*; Fletcher et al., *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*; Anon., *Dick of Devonshire*; Dekker and Webster, *Northward Ho*; Shakespeare, *Macbeth*; Dekker, *The Shoemaker's Holiday*; Chapman, *Sir Giles Goosecap*; 'Fletcher' (Ford?), *The Laws of Candy*; Webster, Heywood, and Rowley, *A Cure for a Cuckold*; Fletcher, Massinger, and Field, *The Queen of Corinth*; Fletcher, *Wit without Money*; Heywood, *The Rape of Lucrece*; Chapman, *Monsieur D'Olive*; Heywood, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*; Anon., *Guy of Warwick*; Heywood, *The Escapes of Jupiter*; Ford, *The Fancies Chaste and Noble*; Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*; Yarington, *Two Lamentable Tragedies*; Fletcher and Field, *Four Plays in One*; Massinger, *The Picture*; May, *The Heir*; Marston (?), *Histriomastix*; and Anon., *Arden of Faversham.*

50 C.F. Tucker Brooke (ed.), *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908), iii.

51 Detailed discussion of the history of the Shakespeare apocrypha and the impact of this designation on scholarship and editorial practice is beyond the scope of this essay. Interested readers are directed to Peter Kirwan's lively and illuminating *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* (Cambridge, 2015).

52 Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (eds), *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* (Basingstoke, 2013). Further references are cited parenthetically. Oxford University Press previously commissioned Richard Proudfoot to update *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, but the project was abandoned.

53 With the exception of *Sir Thomas More*, of which only the scene associated with Hand D is printed, all of these plays appear in their entirety in the RSC *Complete Works*.

54 The use of a different typeface to set Shakespeare's contributions apart from the main text of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Mucedorus*, but not in the case of *Sir Thomas More, Edward III*, and *Arden of Faversham*, is also rendered unnecessary.

55 Samuel Schoenbaum, *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (Evanston, 1966).

56 Unlike the New Oxford Shakespeare, which has conducted extensive authorship attribution studies to support its editorial inclusions and exclusions; see Gabriel Egan and Gary Taylor (eds), *Shakespearian Authorship: A Companion to The New Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford, 2016).