

The Nature of the B-text of *Doctor Faustus*: Consideration Through the Comparative Study on the Revisions and the Additions to the A-text

UMEMIYA Yu

FAUSTUS Was this the face that launched a thousand ships,
 And burnt the topless towers of Ilium? (5.1.91-2)¹

In 1998, *Shakespeare in Love*, which features the process of *Romeo and Juliet* being created through the romantic occurrences in William Shakespeare's life, charmed the world. This attractive fiction film was so successful that it was nominated in thirteen divisions of the 71st Academy Awards, and received seven Oscars. In the movie, there is one crucial moment, where Shakespeare sees Viola disguised as a talented male actor named Thomas Kent. It is the scene of the audition, and many local amateur actors come along with the speech prepared, but Viola is the only one who cites from Shakespeare's previous work, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Other actors try out with the lines quoted above and they are from *Doctor Faustus*, written by one of Shakespeare's contemporaries: Christopher Marlowe. Although *Shakespeare in Love*, is a mixture of facts and fictions, it is believed that Marlowe became popular in the field of theatre much earlier than Shakespeare. Therefore, frequent recital most likely happened in the real world as well. In this paper, I am going to consider the nature of this influential *Doctor Faustus* by comparing the two substantive texts published in the early 17th century.

Christopher Marlowe was born in a relatively poor family in Canterbury, two months before Shakespeare in 1564. With a scholarship, he finished his education at Corpus Cristi College, Cambridge². During his school year of 1584-5, Marlowe is thought to have left the college and visited France and Netherland³. The possibility of his voyage to Europe is discovered from the account book preserved at Corpus Cristi College, which shows no entry for Marlowe's expense for thirty-two weeks. Together with the references to the European countries in his

plays, the dramatist is believed to have spent some time outside of England. From a special letter sent from the Privy Council to ask for the grant of Marlowe's MA degree, scholars presume that he was also involved in a mission for the Elizabethan government⁴. At the same time, he was not always freed from various troubles. A sheet of paper with the heretic nature was found in the house of Thomas Kyd, a contemporary playwright who once shared a lodging with Marlowe. As a result of search, the Council concluded that the owner of the paper in question was Marlowe, and a warrant was issued for Marlowe's arrest on May 18th 1593, and the charge was pressed to his allegations of blasphemy. He was brought to the court to attend the questioning of the Privy Council on the 20th of the same month, but ten days later, after being released, he was conspicuously stabbed to death at Deptford by the hand of Ingram Frizer⁵. The sudden and mysterious death of Marlowe prevented any further personal information to leak out, especially the ones related to his religious beliefs. However, the stress should be placed on the plays that remained rather than the ambiguous life of the author.

The oldest remaining records of the performance of *Doctor Faustus* are in the diary of Philip Henslowe, the owner of the Rose Theatre in London. There are twenty-four entries of the performances starting from September 30th 1594 to January 5th 1597. This frequency of the production is supposed to be the evidence for the popularity of the play from its appearance⁶. Judging from the high box office takings for the first year, up to the sum of three pounds twelve shillings, Roma Gill concludes that the play did not reach the public stage while Marlowe was still alive⁷. Without the discovery of new facts, it is impossible to determine whether the author saw his creation on stage, but the heretic content of the play might be the reflection of Marlowe's own character introduced earlier.

The play 'perform[s] / The form of Faustus' fortunes, good or bad' (Prologue. 7-8). He was born 'In Germany, within the town called Rhode. / Of riper years to Wittenberg he went, [...] So soon he profits in divinity, [...] shortly he was graced with doctor's name' (Prologue. 11-17), but in the end, he falls 'to a devilish exercise' and 'surfeits upon cursed necromancy' (Prologue. 23-25). His endless curiosity urges him to make a pact even with the devils, and in exchange of all the knowledge and magical power he acquires, he gives away his vital object: his soul.

FAUSTUS I, John Faustus of Wittenberg, Doctor, by these presents, do give both body and soul to Lucifer, Prince of the East, and

his minister Mephistopheles; and furthermore grant unto them that four-and-twenty years being expired, the articles above written inviolate, full power to fetch or carry the said John Faustus, body and soul, flesh, blood, or goods, into their habitation wheresoever. (2.1.106-112)

The protagonist repents his pact with Lucifer towards the end, but not being able to flee from the hands of the devils, dies with his ‘body and soul, flesh, blood, or goods’ fetched by the enemies of the Christianity. The ending of the play may indicate the tragic death of Faustus. However, the story also entails the relationship between a man and a devil, especially the one with Faustus and Mephistopheles. At some points, their interaction may resemble that of a pair of human beings. In short, the play clearly shows the damnation of Faustus who practiced apostasy, and it is a fair context considering England to be a Christian country. At the same time, since it is showing a playful relationship between a human and a devil, one question may emerge. Could the play reach the public stage with such a heretic content and not being severely censored?

Year	Occurrence
1593. 5. 18	A warranty for Marlowe’s arrest.
1593. 5. 30	Stabbed to death at Deptford.
1594. 9. 30	First record for the performance of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> in Henslowe’s <i>Diary</i> .
1597. 1. 5	Last record for the performance of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> in Henslowe’s <i>Diary</i> .
1601. 1. 7	Entrance of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> in the Stationers’ Register.
1602. 11. 22	Henslowe’s payment to William Birde and Smauel Rowley for the addition.
1604	Publication of the oldest existing copy of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> (A1).
1609-1611	Two more reprints of the A-text (1609, 1611).
1616	Publication of a different version of <i>Doctor Faustus</i> (B1).
1619-1631	Five more reprints of the B-text (1619, 1620, 1624, 1628, 1631).

[Table 1: A Chronology Surrounding *Doctor Faustus*]

As shown in Table 1, ‘The booke called the palie of Doctor Faustus’ was entered in the Stationers’ Register by Thomas Bushell on the 7th of January 1601⁸, eight years after the author’s death, seven years after its first appearance in Henslowe’s diary, and four years after the last record of the performance. A year later, on 22nd of November 1602, Philip Henslowe paid a sum of four pounds to

The Nature of the B-text of *Doctor Faustus*: Consideration Through the Comparative Study on the Revisions and the Additions to the A-text

William Birde and Samuel Rowley for the addition of the play⁹. Finally, in 1604, *Doctor Faustus* was published by Valentine Simmes for Thomas Bushell who entered the play to the Stationers' Register in 1601¹⁰. This, so called, the A-text had been reprinted twice in 1609 and 1611. Since the oldest published copy appeared three years after its entry to the Stationers' Register, and two years from Henslowe's payment, whether this 1604 copy reflects the text from the actual practice on stage is uncertain. Several scholars, such as Leo Kirshbaum¹¹, W. W. Greg¹² and Fredson Bowers¹³, claim that the A-text was composed through the process of the memorial reconstruction of the performance. More recent scholar, Eric Rasmussen, argues that the A-text is the closest one to the original writing by Marlowe rather than the one from the stage¹⁴.

The debate on the subject has not yet been concluded, but to make the situation more difficult to comprehend, another copy holding the title of *Doctor Faustus* was published in 1616. This version was reprinted at least five times, and after the copy of 1619 onwards, the declaration on the title page, 'with new additions', was inserted¹⁵. The content of these publications is called the B-text, and the scholars venture to pin down the relationship of the two variations. Greg suggests that the B-text should be the closest style to Marlowe's original¹⁶, whereas Bowers claims the B-text may be the one affected by the additional writing dating from around 1602¹⁷.

The aim of this paper is not to reveal which copy is closer to the original play, but to find out the nature of the B-text, appeared a decade after the publication of

Modern-A ¹⁸	Prologue	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2		2.3		Chorus 3			
1604-A ¹⁹	Prologue	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1			2.3		Chorus 3	3.1	Chorus 4	2.2
Modern-B	Prologue	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2		2.3		Chorus 3			
1616-B ²⁰	Prologue	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1		Chorus 3-1	2.3	2.2	Chorus 3-2			

3.1	3.2		Chorus 4	4.1	4.2					5.1	5.2		Epilogue
	3.2			4.1	4.2					5.1	5.2		Epilogue
3.1	3.2	3.3		4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	5.1	5.2	5.3	Epilogue
3.1	3.2	3.3		4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	5.1	5.2	5.3	Epilogue

[Table 2: A list of scene comparison between the A-text, the B-text and the modern editions]

the oldest A-text. As an inevitable feature of the early texts, there are fair portion of miss spellings or dislocation of the scene. As it is shown in Table 2, the ordering of the scenes in the A-text is distinctively different from the modern versions.

The problem of the A-text scene sequence has been pointed out by many modern editors, and as a consequence, they make an editorial decision of rearranging the scenes. In the A-text, the comical interaction between Robin and Rafe dose not occur after Act 2, Scene 1. Instead, Faustus remains on stage²¹, and the play reaches the Chorus for Act 3²². Since the Chorus functions to introduce the scene that follows, the succession from Act 2, Scene 2, to the Chorus 3, and then Act 3, Scene 1 is acceptable. However, the next scene is the one with the two comical characters which can be distinguished as the conflation of the modern Act 2, Scene 2 and Act 3, Scene 2²³. In addition, Chorus 4 should be connected to the beginning of Act 4, and accordingly the recent editions alters the placement from the original²⁴.

The B-text, on the other hand, has less of a disorder compared to the A-text, but it cannot be freed from adjustment. As Table 2 shows, the comical Act 2, Scene 2 is placed before the second Chorus rather than the first²⁵. The Chorus 3 in both A and B-text are delivered by Wagner, and he describes the quest of Faustus after his acquisition of the devilish power, then, refers to the visitation to the Pope in Rome²⁶. Faustus clearly mentions 'Hast thou, as erst I did command / Conducted me within the walls of Rome?' (3.1.22-23), which suggests the proceeding scene is in Rome and the Chorus functions as a proper introduction. However, the B-text does not place the Chorus right before the Act 3, and therefore the linear shift of scenes is not achieved. Additionally, as it is written as Chorus 3-2 in Table 2, the text of the next Chorus has a peculiar feature. The previous Chorus 3 passages consist of eleven lines and they are preserved in the Chorus 3-2 with a little alteration. The first line changes 'to know the secrets'²⁷ to 'to find the secret'²⁸, and the fourth, from 'Being seated'²⁹ to 'Where sitting'³⁰. The beginning of the last line in the B-text is changed to 'The which this day'³¹ from 'That to this day'³². These changes may not affect the context as a whole, but the B-text has thirteen more lines that explain the adventure of Faustus in further detail. Since the scene that follows is the one in Rome, the modern edition deletes the first Chorus, and cites this longer version in connection to Act 3.

As I have briefly demonstrated, the matter of agreement and disagreement between the A-text and the B-text is so complicated that it requires a careful

The Nature of the B-text of *Doctor Faustus*: Consideration Through the Comparative Study on the Revisions and the Additions to the A-text

consideration when comparing the two. The misplacement of the Chorus and the scenes may imply that either or both the A-text and the B-text were printed from the collection of parts rather than an entire play script. The parts are the papers given to the actors with the lines for their roles and corresponding cues, and therefore, to rearrange to the right order should be problematic. Also, there is a possibility that it is printed from the note takings of the actual performance, because, as Tiffany Stern claims, actors who are cue-reliant were prone to skipping or swapping scenes³³. This recognition may be related to the idea to think that the texts were created from the memorial reconstruction.

Greg prepared a parallel edition, showing the A-text on the left, and the B-text on the right. He also transposed the scenes and lines that cohere with one another. The following is the result of a close reading of Greg's parallel edition, and the difference between the two should become more apparent for the later examination.

The A-text contains 1,518 lines and the B-text, 2,122 lines. Variants in punctuations and vocabularies including capitalizations, italicization and spellings

A	Prologue	1-29	A	5	437-627	A	7	821-929
B	Prologue	1-28	B	II - i	389-556	B	III - i	802-1126
A	1	20-200	A	[Chorus 1]	[809-820]	A	Chorus 2	930-947
B	I - i	29-188	B	Chorus 1	557-568	B	×	×
A	2	201-242	A	(6)	628-808	A	8	948-984
B	I - ii	189-224	B	II - ii	569-742	B	(II - iii)	[745-774]
A	3	243-359	A	(8)	[949-962]	A	9	985-1037
B	I - iii	225-339	B	II - iii	743-776	B	III - iii	1127-1180
A	4	360-436	A	[Chorus 1]	[809-820]	A	×	×
B	I - iv	340-388	B	Chorus 2	777-801	B	IV - i	1181-1232

A	10	1038-1133	A	(12)	1227-1265
B	IV - ii	1233-1370	B	IV - vii	1636-1173
A	×	×	A	13	1266-1386
B	IV - iii	1371-1492	B	V - i	1174-1893
A	×	×	A	14	1387-1508
B	IV - iv	1493-1522	B	V - ii	1894-2092
A	(11)	1134-1226	A	×	×
B	IV - v	1523-1576	B	V - iii	2093-2112
A	×	×	A	Epilogue	1509-1518
B	IV - vi	1577-1635	B	Epilogue	2113-2122

[Table 3; A list of scene comparison from Greg ed.³⁵]

can be seen in over 1,000 occasions. As Rasmussen suggests after his research on the copies, these alterations occurred very likely during the printing process or the result of the compositors' tastes³⁴. Similar to the matter of misplacements, these sorts of disagreements might not dramatically affect the play as a whole when emended to the correct form. Thus, accepting his claim, this paper focuses on the lines added or deleted from the A-text, as well as the words and phrases that cannot be explained simply as minor differences.

As it is clear from Table 3, Greg compares the two in detail and rearranges the corresponding scenes even the original texts place them elsewhere. For that reason, there are some repetitions in the edition. To summarize the comparison, Greg divides the A-text into fourteen scenes with two Choruses, a Prologue and an Epilogue. On the other hand, he counts the B-text up to Act 5, Scene 3, that contains nineteen scenes with two Choruses, a Prologue and an Epilogue. As this paper have discussed earlier, the B-text shows its unsatisfactory state in terms of the Choruses. Although Greg writes 'Chor 2'³⁶, the lines would inevitably be similar to Chorus 1, and the B-text is still lacking a proper second Chorus in the A-text. Nevertheless, the seventeen lines of Chorus 2 in the A-text is not placed before the Act 4³⁷, when achieving the true effect as the introduction for the Act 4, it needs to be transposed.

Focusing on the addition in the B-text, Greg's edition shows that five scenes were added to the B-text, and they are Act 4, Scene 1; Act 4, Scene 3; Act 4, Scene 4; Act 4, Scene 6; and Act 5, Scene 3. Rasmussen points out that there are seven passages added to the A-text, but even for the five complete scenes clearly indicated by Greg are effectively summarized. Act 4, Scene 1 is the scene with Marino, Frederick and Benvolio, and it functions as to introduce three new characters to the audience. Act 4, Scene 3 and Scene 4 are again the one with Benvolio, Martino and Frederick and they depict 'Benvolio's revenge and Faustus's retaliation'³⁸. Act 4, Scene 6 is presented by a Clown (Robin), Dick (another Clown), a Horse-courser and a Carter. As Rasmussen writes as 'The Clowns in the tavern and their interruption at Vanholt'³⁹, it is obvious that the scenes are accompanied with laughter. Act 5, Scene 3 is enacted by three scholars where they discover the remains of Faustus's damnation, in other words, mingled body⁴⁰. The brief summary of the each scene may explain that apart from the last addition in Act 5, Scene 3, four other scenes somehow function to furthermore stress the comical phase of the play.

The story of Faustus progresses with the involvement of Mephistopheles. However, similar to the plays from the same period, *Doctor Faustus* also contains subplots, and Robin is mainly responsible for providing the comic relief in the section. Therefore, it is obvious how Act 4, Scene 6, where most of the comical characters exchange their unfortunate incidents, affects the tension of the B-text version of the play. Before moving on, we should not overlook the effect of the character of Benvolio in the B-text, nameless Knight in the A-text. His first appearance in the B-text is in Act 4, Scene 1, which is original in the B-text, and here he shows his unwillingness to become one of the spectators of Faustus's conjuring in front of the Emperor. By firmly placing the character as a person who opposes Faustus's magic, the scene where Benvolio appears with a pair of horns on his head, given by Faustus as a sign of punishment, should become more laughable. The reaction to his transformation from the Emperor seems to have been written in more detail to induce a laughter: 'I had thought thou hadst been a bachelor, but now I see thou hast a wife, that not only gives you horns but makes thee wear them' (4.1.77-79). A husband with horns implies that he has been cuckolded by someone else. Since the Knight is a bachelor, the lines sound ironical. On the contrary, the B-text does not contain the same line but gives the Emperor more opportunities to talk with the Knight and says 'I blame thee not to sleep much, having such a head on thine own' (4.1.129-130). Here, Benvolio is not addressed as a bachelor, but indifferent to the outer world for his desire of sleeping may result in becoming a cuckold husband. In order to make this vague analogy work, the play should distinctively show the confrontation of the two for a longer period of time. Interestingly, the expansion of Benvolio's role allows the insertion of Act 4, Scene 3, which may relate to the next characteristic of the B-text, that is to stress Faustus's nonhuman quality.

Act 4, Scene 3 is a scene where Benvolio waits for Faustus with Martino, Frederick and Soldiers to take revenge against his public humiliation that has been discussed in the previous section. This original scene in the B-text can be seen as a continuation of the comical jesting presented on stage. Alongside this effect of laughter, two lines, first given by Martino, 'his head is off' (4.3.1420)⁴¹, and later by Benvolio, 'the Devil is alive again' (4.3.1443) hint the additional feature of the B-text. According to these lines, it is confirmed that Faustus's head has been cut off, and then he has been resurrected. Although it is only a stage illusion, as Faustus claims himself, Faustus is no longer portrayed as a human who inevitably dies after

a fatal strike of a sword.

FAUSTUS ... had you cut my body with your swords,
Or hewed this flesh and bones as small as sand,
Yet in a minute had my spirit returned
And I had breathed a man made free from harm.
(4.3.1449-1452)

Act 4, Scene 4 proceeds with the confusion of the comical characters which is clearly stated in the stage direction for their entrance.

*Enter at several doors, Benvolio, Frederick, and Martino
Their heads and faces bloody, and besmear'd with
Mud and dirt; all having horns on
Their heads.* (4.4.1489-1492)

The involvement of the horns has become customary for the audiences who have witnessed Benvolio in Act 4, Scene 1. Due to this relevance to the previous comical representation, it also suggests the comedic interpretation. At the same time, the ragged external appearance of the three could imply the inhuman power of Faustus alongside its comical imagery.

A similar sight of Faustus being mutilated is also inserted later in Act 4, Scene 5, where Horse-courser pulls off Faustus's leg believing that he has been deceived. Here, once again, it is stressed that Faustus has no physical damage with the injury, but instead, he exclaims 'Ha, ha, ha! Faustus hath his leg again, and the Horse-courser a bundle of hay for his forty dollars' (4.5.1567-1569). These two scenes, where Faustus mocks the characters by his unbelievable conjuring, have the function of enhancing the laughter of the audience, and at the same time, they will present his devilish power, not just verbally, but make it perceivable on stage. Therefore, the protagonist will gradually, but surely detaching himself from being human. Since the B-text contains two more scenes of this nature in Act 4, Scene 3 and 4, the effect should be strengthened compared to the A-text.

How this feature of the B-text should affect the character as a whole? From the A-text, we receive the impression of Faustus venturing his way to the quest for knowledge with his companion Mephistopheles, whereas in the B-text, Faustus

seems to be leading his life through the agent of Lucifer. One example of this is in the scene where Faustus makes a pact with the devil for his magical power in Act 2, Scene 1 in the B-text and, Scene 5 in the A-text. Here, Faustus confirms his willingness to seal the contract by claiming, 'I'll give it him' (2.1.436). The word 'him' obviously suggests Lucifer and the demonstrative pronoun 'it' is Faustus's soul. In the A-text, Faustus says 'I give it thee' (5.488). This personal pronoun 'thee' can be Mephistopheles so as to imply that Faustus is offering the sacrifice to Mephistopheles rather than his master Lucifer.

Rasmussen also notices this difference in terms of the relationship between Faustus and Mephistopheles. He concludes, 'the close bond that exists between Mephistopheles and Faustus in the A-text is systematically broken in the B-text'⁴². He introduces two parts from the B-text both of which cannot be found in the A-text. One is in Act 2, Scene 1, when Faustus repents for his decision, Mephistopheles claims, "'Twas thine own seeking' (2.1.573). Mephistopheles shows his indifference in taking responsibility of his possible plotting thus, but the line is not in the A-text. As for the other example, Rasmussen suggests the lines delivered later on in Act 5, Scene 2. Here, in response to Faustus's dispute 'O thou bewitching fiend, 'twas thy temptation, / Hath robbed me of eternal happiness' (5.2.1986-1987), Mephistopheles mockingly replies as follows.

Mephistopheles I do confess it Faustus, and rejoice;
 'Twas I, that when thou were in the way to heaven,
 Damned up thy passage, when thou tookst the book,
 To view the scriptures, then I turned the leaves
 And lead thy eyes.
 What weepst thou? 'Tis too late, despair, farewell,
 Fools that will laugh on earth, most weep on hell.
 (5.2.1988-1994)

By observing the combination of "'Twas thine own seeking' and "'Twas I', Rasmussen concludes that 'the B-text Mephistopheles lies to Faustus' and it should further distances the two, and as a result, the B-text Mephistopheles appears clearly 'less of a friend and more of a devil'⁴³. It is true that Mephistopheles in the B-text seems more detached from Faustus. At the very beginning of Act 5, Scene 2, Mephistopheles invites Lucifer and Belzebug into Faustus's study, so

that they can snatch away the soul from the body of Faustus. This part, original in the B-text, surely indicates that Mephistopheles is a servant to Lucifer and only obeying Faustus to fulfill the contract. Although it might seem small, this sort of implication has already appeared earlier on in the play. In Scene 5 in the A-text, and in Act 2, Scene 1 in the B-text, when Faustus has made a pact with the devil, Mephistopheles claims in the A-text, 'That I shall wait on Faustus whilst I live' (5.471). On the other hand, Mephistopheles in the B-text tells Faustus 'That I shall wait on Faustus whilst he lives' (2.1.419). These lines are the response to the question from Faustus asking how Lucifer reacted to the proposal of making his servant a servant to a human being. Changing the personal pronoun from 'I' to 'he' shows Mephistopheles's dedication to Faustus, because when it is announced 'I', Mephistopheles implies that he will serve Faustus until he (Mephistopheles) dies, whereas 'he' suggests Mephistopheles will live without any remorse after the death of his once master Faustus. As well as establishing the devilish character of Mephistopheles, the B-text seems to have succeeded in reducing his human nature by deleting one of his interactions with the other characters. Such interaction is omitted from Act 4, Scene 5 in the B-text, which used to be included in Scene 11 of the A-text: the exchange of words with the Horse-courser. While Faustus has fallen into sleep, Horse-courser returns wet, claiming that his horse, purchased from Faustus, has disintegrated in the water. In the A-text, Mephistopheles deals with the Horse-courser as if he is a real human servant to a master. First of all, Mephistopheles rejects the Horse-courser by saying 'you cannot speak / with him' (11.1190-1191), and then he tells him to 'come some other time' (11.1193). Mephistopheles even shows his concern to Faustus: 'I tell thee he has not slept this eight nights' (11.1196). Focusing on these three parts of interaction of Mephistopheles and the Horse-courser, it can be said that Mephistopheles has acted here as a normal servant rather than a devil with insincere attachment.

Thus, the alteration from the A-text to the B-text gives the different impression in terms of comical element and the nature of the protagonist and his relationship with the devil. All of these alterations can be simply explained as the shift of audiences' expectation to the stage drama. Since there is a high chance of the B-text being the revised version of the original written by William Birde and Smauel Rowley in 1602, it should contain some changes demanded by the consumer of the time, rather than those of 1594 when the author was still alive. However, Faustus's inhuman characterization and detachment from

Mephistopheles require more attention.

With the feature in the B-text, Faustus is depicted as a character who gradually shifts from a inquisitive doctor to a pseudo devil. In contrast, with the deletion of the close relationship with Mephistopheles, the story of Faustus in the B-text has the impression of the inability of the protagonist's true transformation. This paradoxical situation might save Faustus from being persecuted as a heretic character. Then the question may be, why the people who were involved in the later additions and alterations decided to make such changes?

The possible answer can be discovered from the statute of 1606. The statute is called *An Act to Restrain Abuses of Players* that prohibited the profanity spoken on the stage⁴⁴. The practice of this act may suggest that there were numerous swearing on stage, in other words, 'taking the Lord's name in vain'⁴⁵, and it should be exactly the thing which the government wanted to control in order to maintain the divinity of Christianity. In *Doctor Faustus*, several differences between the A-text and the B-text can be ascribed to this statute. Gill claims that *Doctor Faustus* is one of the plays heavily affected by it⁴⁶. Manabu Tsuruta suggests that there are fourteen incidents of this nature⁴⁷, and to be precise, as it is shown in Table 4, on some occasions, the word 'God' is changed to 'heavens' or 'power', 'church' to 'law', 'heavens' to 'spheres'. In several speeches, the impression of God is deleted as follows: 'gods / mercies are infinite' (14.1400-1004) to 'mercy is infinite' (5.2.1935), 'see where God stretcheth out his arm' (14.1468) to 'see a threatening arm' (5.5.2053), and 'Oh God, if thou wilt not have mercy on my soul, / Yet for Christ sake, whose bold hath ransomed me' (1483-1484) to 'O, if my sole must suffer for my sin' (5.2.2066-2067).

A-text	B-text
God	heavens / power
church	law
heavens	spheres
gods / mercies are infinite	mercy is infinite
see where God stretcheth out his arm	see a threatening arm
Oh God, if thou wilt not have mercy on my soul, Yet for Christ sake, whose bold hath ransomed me	O, if my sole must suffer for my sin

[Table 4; A list of alterations of the words related to profanity]

David Lake points out that the B-text should be written after entering the 17th century by discovering several vocabularies original in the B-text, such as 'i the', which were not in use before that time⁴⁸. Adding to his perspective, the changes probably affected by the statute of 1606, will also become an evidence to confirm that the B-text was written after 1606 or derived from the stage performances taken place after this said year. Therefore, it is sensitive to presume, that even though the last remaining record of the performance is dated 1597, *Doctor Faustus* could have made it to the public stage elsewhere in England for several more years. Moreover, since Henslowe had paid a fair amount of money for the addition, he might have produced a new version of the play at his theatre, and only allowed the older version to be out in print. This old version can be assumed as the A-text, possibly Marlowe's work affected by the stage practice, and the early version of the B-text remained in the hand of Henslowe for the future performances. Through the process to the revival production of the play, which may have involved the demand from the audience, and through a censorship that included the new statute of 1606 and other Christian issues, the B-text could have reached the state as we see today. Rasmussen supports this view by saying '[i]t is certainly possible that the text have been further revised'⁴⁹.

When we consider that *Doctor Faustus* was censored during the period from 1594 to 1616, the person who was in charge of scrutiny of the play's fairness was first Edmund Tylney and later George Buc. Since Tylney remained as the Master of the Revels, the one responsible for the censorship of the plays, until 1610, *Doctor Faustus* could have not been censored by Buc, because his successor Henry Herbert was the first Master of the Revels who decided to censor the plays that appeared before his term of service⁵⁰. By noticing Tylney's new office was granted the right of the censorship in 1581, William Empson claims that through treatment of *Doctor Faustus* should be the exhibition of Tylney's ego and power⁵¹, however, his rather subjective argument failed to convince most of the scholars.

In this paper, the issues surrounding the relationship between the A-text and the B-text of *Doctor Faustus* have been discussed through both external and internal examination. However, there is no concrete evidence that would confirm the process for the B-text's creation other than possible involvement of the two paid writers: William Birde and Smauel Rowley. The argument we could make is that when concentrating on the fact of its appearance of the A-text, and by extracting the characteristic differences between the two, we can assume several likely

interpretations. It is the urge from the consumer of the play, which was consolidated in the expansion of the comical scenes. This feature can also be connected to the control of the government, possibly related to the statute of 1606 and forwarded by the Revels' Office. Judging from this circumstance, the modern editors might prefer to use the A-text for their editions, considering it as the closer version to the original writing by Marlowe⁵². However, the B-text, with its obvious revisions performed around 1602, has its own value of being one important material. Since the features discussed in this paper are mainly enclosed in the text, the B-text could become a valuable source to have a glance on the sensitive relationship between the play, the audience and its revisions.

* This essay is the rewritten, revised and extended version of the presentation 'What's in the B-text?: Comparative Study on *Doctor Faustus*', delivered at The Japan Society of English Usage and Style in 2013.

¹ The quotations of the play for this essay are, if not stated, from Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*. Eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993.

² Marlow, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus: Based on the A Text*. ed. Roma Gill. London: Methuen Drama, 1968. New Mermaid Edition. p.xxiv.

³ *Ibid*, p.xxv.

⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵ Nicholl, Charles. 'By my onely meanes sett downe: The Texts of Marlow's Atheism'. *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Eds. Takashi Kozuka and J. R. Mulryne. Aldershot: Ashgate. 2006. p.153.

⁶ Chambers, E. K. *Elizabethan Stage*. Vol.3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. p.423.

⁷ Marlowe, Christophe. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. Roma Gill. Vol.2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987. p.XV.

⁸ Gill ed. *Doctor Faustus*. p.xvi.

⁹ Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe's Diary*. Ed. R. A. Foakes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p.206.

¹⁰ At the 2018 annual conference of the Shakespeare Society of Japan, professor Chiaki Hanabusa delivered a detailed paper on the subject of the printer of the early texts.

¹¹ Kirschbaum, Leo. 'The Good and Bad Quarto of *Doctor Faustus*'. *The Library*, 26 (1946), 272-294. p.284.

¹² Marlowe, Christopher. *Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus' 1604-1616: Parallel Texts*. Ed. W. W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. p.54.

¹³ Bowers, Fredson. 'The Text of Marlowe's *Faustus*'. *Modern Philology*, 49 (1952), 195-204.

- p.197.
- ¹⁴ Rasmussen, Eric. *A Textual Companion to Doctor Faustus*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993. p.32.
- ¹⁵ Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. London, 1619. Early English Book Online. p.A₁^r.
- ¹⁶ Greg. ed. p.80-1.
- ¹⁷ Bowers, Fredson. 'Marlowe's Doctor Faustus: The 1602 Additions'. *Studies in Bibliography*. 26 (1973) p.18.
- ¹⁸ The scene divisions in this table are collected from Marlowe, Christopher. *Christopher Marlowe: Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*. Eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- ¹⁹ The scene divisions in this table are collected from Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. London, 1604. Early English Books Online.
- ²⁰ The scene divisions in this table are collected from Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. London, 1616. Early English Books Online.
- ²¹ *Doctor Faustus*, 1604. pp. C₂^v-D₁^r.
- ²² *Ibid.* p. D₁^r.
- ²³ *Ibids.* pp. D₃^r-D₄^r.
- ²⁴ *Ibids.* pp. D₂^v-D₃^r.
- ²⁵ *Doctor Faustus*, 1616. pp. C₄^r-C₄^v.
- ²⁶ *Ibid*, 1616. p. C₁^v.
- ²⁷ *Doctor Faustus*, 1604. p. D₁^r.
- ²⁸ *Doctor Faustus*, 1616. p. C₄^v.
- ²⁹ *Doctor Faustus*, 1604. p. D₁^r.
- ³⁰ *Doctor Faustus*, 1616. p. C₄^v.
- ³¹ *Doctor Faustus*, 1616. p. D₁^r.
- ³² *Doctor Faustus*, 1604. p. D₁^r.
- ³³ Stern, Tiffany. 'Actor's Parts'. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*. Ed. Richard Dutton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. p.55.
- ³⁴ Rasmussen. *Companion*. p.45.
- ³⁵ The brackets suggest that the scene is either transposed, repeated or can be regarded as one continuous scene.
- ³⁶ Ed. Greg. *Parallel Texts*. p.213.
- ³⁷ *Doctor Faustus*, 1604. pp. D₂^v-D₃^r
- ³⁸ Rasmussen. *Companion*. p.41.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ Since Bevington and Rasmussen's edition counts the scenes differently from Greg's parallel texts, in order to achieve coherence with Table 3, the quotations following this are from Greg. *Parallel Texts*. Modernizations of the spellings are mine.

The Nature of the B-text of *Doctor Faustus*: Consideration Through the Comparative Study on the Revisions and the Additions to the A-text

- ⁴² Rasmussen. *Companion*. p.78.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.* p.80.
- ⁴⁴ Chambers vol.4. pp.338-9.
- ⁴⁵ Gizzard, Hugh. 'An Act to Restrain Abuses of Players (1606)'. *Review of English Studies* 61 (2010): 495-528. p.499.
- ⁴⁶ Gill. ed. *Doctor Faustus*. p.xv.
- ⁴⁷ Tsuruta, Manabu, 'Censorship and *Doctor Faustus* as an Offensive Book', 'Ihon to shite no Fōsutasuhakase to Kenetsu', Kazuaki Oota ed, *Elizabethan Drama and Censorship, Elizabethu chō Engeki to Kenetsu*, Tokyo: Eiho sya, 1996. p.54
- ⁴⁸ Lake, David. 'Three Seventeenth-Century Revision: *Thomas od Woodstock, The Jew of Malta, and Faustus B*'. *Notes and Queries*. 228 (1983): 133-43. p.143.
- ⁴⁹ Rasmussen. *Companion*. p.45.
- ⁵⁰ Umemiya, Yu, 'Elizabethan and Jacobean Censorship of Dramas: Surrounding *The Chess Game* by Thomas Middleton', 'Elizabethu chō · Jēmuzu chō ni okeru Engeki Kenetsu no Jittai – Tomas Midoruton no Chesu Gēmu wo Megutte' *Theatre and Film Studies 2012. Eizo Engeki Gaku 2012*. Theatre Museum, Waseda University. 2013. pp.4-5.
- ⁵¹ See Empson, William, *Faustus and the Censor: The English Faust-book and Marlowe's Doctor Faustus*. Oxford and New York: B. Blackwell, 1987.
- ⁵² Similar to the current situation of *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare which has multiple texts from the early modern period, editions nowadays may include both texts in a single volume. Apart from Greg's parallel texts, Oxford World Classics and The Revels Plays, though both edited by the same pair of editors, David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen, separately printed the two rather than conflating the play into one. New Mermaids edition was the only copy that stated it is 'based on the A text'.

『フォースタス博士』Bテキストの性質： 改変と加筆の比較からの考察

梅宮 悠

英国ルネサンス演劇にあつて、ウィリアム・シェイクスピアに先駆けて活躍したクリストファー・マーロウは数奇な運命を辿った人物でもあった。大学在学中にヨーロッパへ旅していた背景や、それが国命を受けてのものであった可能性、さらには背教的な活動が見え隠れし、最期は逮捕から釈放されたかと思つた矢先に事故死となっている。このような劇作家によって仕上げられた『フォースタス博士』は絶大な人気を誇り、後にシェイクスピアが活躍する演劇界の土壌を完成させる要因になつたと思われる。

上演記録を一瞥すると、初演が1594年9月30日になっており、最後の再演は1597年1月5日と記録されている。マーロウの死は1593年5月30日ではあるものの、公開年の収入が高いことから、1594年以前の上演はなかつたと考えられ、作者は自らの作品の舞台化を見ずして夭逝したと推察される。1601年1月7日には書籍出版業組合記録に『フォースタス博士』は登記され、翌年11月に上演を行つていた劇団の経営者により加筆の依頼が行われ、1604年に活字版の『フォースタス博士』が出版されている。このAテキストと呼称されるものは1609年と1611年に重版されるも、1616年に登場した版はBテキストと呼ばれ、様々に異なる部分が含まれている。

Bテキストは1616年の初版から1631年にかけて5回重版され、これまでも多くの比較研究が行われてきた。どちらがマーロウのオリジナルに近いか検討したものや、上演中の台詞を書き取った版とする論など、両テキストの位置付けは多岐にわたっている。本研究ではW. W. グレグによって作成された並列テキストを元に、戯曲全編を比較し、それぞれの差異から後に出版されたBテキストの性質を考察する。