

Introduction

On Collaboration¹

Seth Whidden

“It may be said that curiosity is the only useful vice, since without it there would be neither discovery nor invention; and curiosity it is which lends interest to many a book written in collaboration.” (Matthews 295)

“Aucun chef-d’œuvre n’est le résultat d’une collaboration” (Gide 357) [No *chef-d’œuvre* was ever produced by several people together (343)]. So says Olivier in *Les faux-monnayeurs*; in his distaste for multiple authorship he is picking up on La Bruyère from two centuries earlier: “L’on n’a guère vu jusques à présent un chef-d’œuvre d’esprit qui soit l’ouvrage de plusieurs” (9) [A literary masterpiece that is the work of several hands has yet to be seen (qtd. in Hemmings 49)]. The “myth of solitary genius,”² as Jack Stillinger and others have discussed, has long held sway in literary studies, going back to “the concept of the poet as prophet and possessor of transcendent knowledge [... giving] the writer and the artistic intention an especially exalted status” (Inge 624). More recently, considerations of the instability of this traditional “solitary genius” have shown how “double writing is a symptom of the monolithic author’s decline” (Koestenbaum 8). In this respect, literary collaboration is an example of Bakhtinian heteroglossia, with multiple languages existing in every word.³ “Collaborative texts, like quilted novels, make the reader vulnerable to heterogeneity and indeterminacy, and, by obscuring who wrote what, they prevent the reader from limiting the text’s sense” (Koestenbaum 8). In particular, gender studies have questioned the notion of the monolithic author, with good reason, and have focused on the multiplicity offered by collaborative texts.⁴ For many such studies, literary collaboration extends

¹ My discussion of collaboration benefited greatly from the wisdom and comments of Frank Paul Bowman, to whose memory this introduction is dedicated.

² This phrase is borrowed from Stillinger’s book, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (see Works Cited).

³ Referring to “the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions” (263), Bakhtin defines “heteroglossia” as that “internal stratification present in every language at any given moment of its historical existence [... permitting] a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships” (263). See in particular his chapter “Discourse in the Novel” (259-422).

⁴ Just some examples of studies that focus on specific instances of literary influence and collaboration include: Peter F. Alexander, *Leonard and Virginia Woolf: A Literary*

beyond the page and enters into the more social aspects of textual creation; in this model, multiple authorship reflects “the partners’ search for fulfillment and self-expression.”⁵ In a description that bears similar tones, the Goncourt brothers called their own collaboration: “[...] la confession de deux vies *inséparées* dans le plaisir, le labeur, la peine; de deux pensées jumelles, de deux esprits recevant du contact des hommes et des choses, des impressions si semblables, si identiques, si homogènes, que cette confession peut être considérée comme l’expansion d’un seul *moi* et d’un seul *je*” (37) [the confession of two lives *never separated* in pleasure, in work or in pain, the confession of two twin spirits, two minds receiving from the contact of men and things impressions so alike, so identical, so homogeneous, that his confession may be considered the effusion of a single *ego*, of a single *I* (xix)].

Early studies of multiple authorship focused less on who contributed what and more on the silent partners: those whose contributions went unnoticed. As Bette London discussed in her book *Writing Double*:

[...] in the case of women, literary collaborators suffered from a double invisibility – the invisibility of collaboration and the invisibility of women’s writing. Even where such collaborations were openly recognized, they tended to be represented in ways guaranteed to ensure their marginalization. To study collaboration, then, was to study the conditions of its erasure. (9)

While Wayne Koestenbaum’s *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration* is certainly among the most important recent studies of collaborative literature,⁶ it is incomplete in its consideration of multiple-author works. Here we

Partnership (New York: St. Martin’s, 1992); Whitney Chadwick and Isabelle de Courtivron, eds, *Significant Others: Creativity & Intimate Partnerships* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1993); Jeffrey N. Cox, *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School: Keats, Shelley, Hunt and their Circle* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Scott W. Klein, *The Fictions of James Joyce and Wyndham Lewis: Monsters of Nature and Design* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and Miranda Seymour, *A Ring of Conspirators: Henry James and His Literary Circle, 1895-1915* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989). See also James S. Leonard, Laura Brady, and Robert Murray Davis, “Collaborative Writing: A Selective Bibliography,” *Author-ity and Textuality: Current Views of Collaborative Writing*, ed. James S. Leonard et al. (West Cornwall, CT: Locust Hill Press, 1994): 229-50.

⁵ Benstock 240. For more on collaboration and gender, see “Why Call Successful Co-authoring Feminine?”, 48-60 in *(First Person)?: A Study of Co-authoring in the Academy*, by Kami Day and Michele Eodice (Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2001); and *Common Ground: Feminist Collaboration in the Academy*, ed. Elizabeth G. Peck and JoAnna Stephens Mink (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1998).

⁶ Particularly useful is his introduction, “Interpreting Double Talk: An Introduction” (1-14).

propose a new model for considering literary collaboration, in nineteenth-century French literature and beyond, and the essays in this volume help to shed some light on the contour lines that define – to the extent to which such definition is possible – the rich field of literary collaboration.⁷

To avoid confusion, a few words of clarification are in order: to avoid excessive repetition of the word “writer,” the terms “author” and “writer” are sometimes used interchangeably, even though they obviously do not designate the same person. Collaboration focuses on the process of literary creation; as such, the writer should be taken to be the privileged member of any tension between writer and author. In addition, while there is much to be said about the numerous kinds of collaboration, two important examples fall beyond the scope of this study. First is that kind of collaboration that inevitably develops between writers and editors, somewhere during the creative process, in which the latter shapes, redefines, and certainly collaborates on an early version, leading up to a final published work; as Stillinger has shown, this kind of collaboration is common to nearly all works that we commonly consider to be the fruits of a single, solitary author.⁸ Second is what T.S. Eliot referred to as “that collaboration of the audience with the artist which is necessary in all art” (407); the rich field of narratology takes on this exchange much more fully than could be attempted in this volume. Finally, the studies in this volume do not follow the approach, espoused by Whitney Chadwick and Isabelle de Courtivron in their *Significant Others*, that limits their discussion of collaborative couples to those “who have shared a sexual as well as creative partnership” (9); this volume’s criterion is that the activity of authorship be textual, not (necessarily) sexual.

Let us return to Koestenbaum’s central assumptions regarding collaborative texts:

A text is most precisely and satisfyingly collaborative if it is composed by two writers who admit the act by placing both of their names on the title page. A double signature confers enormous interpretive freedom: it permits the reader to see the act of collaboration shadowing every word in the text. Collaborative works are intrinsically *different* than books written by one author alone; even

⁷ The theoretical discussion that follows retains the central argument of my “On Poetry and Collaboration in the Nineteenth Century.”

⁸ See Jack Stillinger, especially his “What Is an Author?” (3-24), in which he states, “multiple authorship – the collaborative authorship of writings that we routinely consider the work of a single author – is quite common, and that instances [...] can be found virtually anywhere we care to look in English and American literature of the last two centuries” (22); there is no reason why this statement cannot be extended to include French literature of the same time period. M. Thomas Inge concurs, stating that “It is now commonplace to understand that all texts produced by authors are not the products of individual creators” and “There has seldom been a time when someone did not stand between author and audience in the role of a mediator, reviser, or collaborator” (623 and 624, respectively).

if both names do not appear, or one writer eventually produces more material, the decision to collaborate determines the work's contours, and the way it can be read. (2)

As discussed in this volume's chapters, examples from nineteenth-century French letters expose the limits of these claims, beginning with Koestenbaum's first sentence: that authors "admit the act" by signing their names to a title page. Similarly, Koestenbaum's insistence on *two* writers producing *one* text stops short of the enhanced richness of texts such as poems in the *Album zutique*, for example, in which the "collaboration shadowing every word in the text" is shared by three, four, and even five different authorial presences; safety in numbers can be an important aspect of multiple-author texts. Finally, while it is true that "Collaborative works are intrinsically *different* [since] the decision to collaborate determines the work's contours, and the way it can be read," the focus on "*books* written by one author alone" highlights the privileged position given to the novel; in this respect Koestenbaum is in good company, as almost all studies of collaborative writing focus on theater and prose, as we see in Sir Walter Besant's early work "On Literary Collaboration":

[...] the main advantage of partnership lies in the discussion of the plot and its situations, and the hammering out of all the effects of which they are capable. To state this is to state the apology of literary partnership. Not the saving of labour, but the improvement of the work should be the reason for partnership. Two minds working upon the same idea, having the same object in view, and agreed upon the group of characters to carry out the plan of the piece, ought to arrive, more certainly and more clearly than one mind alone, not only at the possibilities but also at the certainties of the subject. They should discover the Fate – the Necessity – which compels the actors to the end. [...] the chief advantage of collaboration is that it is tolerably certain to produce clearness of purpose, a well-defined plot, and distinct characters. (207-8)

In a similar vein, Théophile Gautier railed against the preponderance of collaboration in literature written for the stage in 1838. Just three years after the introduction to his *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, this description of an assembly-line approach to literary collaboration shows his preoccupation with how the pressures of the growing industrial age and the importance of progress would come to bear on the literary work:

Une pièce se fabrique absolument comme un habit; l'un des collaborateurs prend la mesure de l'acteur, l'autre coupe l'étoffe, et le troisième assemble les morceaux; l'étude du cœur humain, le style, la langue, tout cela est regardé comme rien. La collaboration, pour une œuvre de l'intelligence, est quelque chose d'incompréhensible, et dont il ne peut résulter que des produits hybrides et monstrueux, en admettant même que les collaborateurs accouplés soient des

gens d'esprit, ce qui est rare. Avec un pareil mode de travail, toute inspiration est impossible; le génie est essentiellement solitaire. (82-3)

[A play is created just like a costume; one of the collaborators takes the actor's measurements, the other cuts the fabric, and the third assembles the pieces; the study of the human heart, of style, of language, is all looked at as nothing. Collaboration, for a work of intelligence, is incomprehensible, and all that can come from it are hybrid and monstrous products, even if we admit that the collaborators are smart people, which is rare. With such a means of working, all inspiration is impossible; genius is essentially solitary.]⁹

Over the last few centuries, numerous critics have, in their silence with respect to poetry, preserved the primacy of the monolithic poet and thus unwittingly aided and abetted “the concept of the poet as prophet and possessor of transcendent knowledge.”

A more useful approach to multiple-authored works is a model that is not limited to novels and considers the possibilities of numerous authors residing in a single work, and for many – though admittedly not all – of the ways in which multiple authorial presences can impact our reading of a given text. Since, as Matthews said, “In a genuine collaboration, when the joint work is a true chemical union and not a mere mechanical mixture, it matters little who holds the pen” (301), it is preferable to avoid a dissection of a work into its constitutive collaborative parts in the quest for some authorial whodunit: a near impossibility that nevertheless leads Koestenbaum and others to speculate and identify with one contributor over another; as he explains:

I find, however, that one writer in a team captures my sympathies more entirely: I enter the mind of the writer who keenly feels lack or disenfranchisement, and seeks out a partner to attain power and completion. Approaching the text, I ask how this writer's wish for a partner infused the work eventually composed; I let his sought-after collaborator remain a shadowy, aloof figure, and I inquire less assiduously into this second man's motives. (2)

Rather than “enter the mind of the writer,” essays in the present volume on collaboration seek to focus on the very nature of the collaborative texts themselves.

Two major categories can help frame these studies: collaboration *in praesentia* and collaboration *in absentia*. In the former, the co-authors are physically present at the time of creation; this is the traditional collaborative model of two or more people co-writing a text. Within this broad category, there is a distinction between

⁹ Quoted in Hemmings 48. See Hemmings's important analysis of the over 30,000 plays produced in the nineteenth century in France, and the trends of collaboratively written plays within each theatrical subgenre, from 1816 to 1900.

authorial presences that are explicitly stated and those that are merely implied, or perhaps left unspoken. Most often, of course, both or all authors are explicitly named; in this case, we have the traditional co-authored work.¹⁰ An obvious example from nineteenth-century French letters is the collaboration of Alphonse Daudet and Paul Arène, who wrote the first five stories that would eventually become *Lettres de mon moulin* under the joint signature Marie-Gaston.¹¹ The counter example, in which one or more authors are active in the work's creation but not mentioned, falls under the category of ghost-written materials. Perhaps the best-known case of ghost writing in nineteenth-century French letters involved Alexandre Dumas. Of his many collaborators – detailed in the 1845 pamphlet *Fabrique de romans. Maison Alexandre Dumas et compagnie* – few generated as much interest and controversy as Auguste Maquet, who wrote much of *The Three Musketeers* and other works that appeared with Dumas's name alone on the title page.¹² Dumas's works later would be famously defended by Thackeray in his *Roundabout Papers*:

They say that all the works bearing Dumas's name are not written by him. Well? Does not the chief cook have aides under him? Did not Rubens's pupils paint on his canvases? Had not Lawrence assistants for his backgrounds? [...] Sir Christopher is the architect of St. Paul's. He has not laid the stones or carried up the mortar. There is a great deal of carpenter's and joiner's work in novels which surely a smart professional hand might supply. A smart professional hand? I give you my word, there seem to me parts of novels – let us say the love-making, the "business," the villain in the cupboard, and so forth, which I should like to order

¹⁰ Such is the case of sociologists Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox, whose foundational work on collaboration *The Imperial Animal* considers the very kind of collaborative text it exemplifies. As they explain: "We both had one sacred rule. Every single sentence had to be written with both perpetrators present [...] No taking home of manuscripts, no dividing up of chapters. Either could rewrite anything and rewrite everything, so much so that eventually we forgot totally who started and finished what, whose idea was this and whose caveat that" (xxvii).

¹¹ About this collaboration, Murray Sachs states, "While the statements of both Paul Arène and Alphonse Daudet make it plain that there was some form of collaboration in the writing of those stories, we are still a long way from certainty as to the exact contribution of each" (116).

¹² Written by Eugène de Mirecourt, pseudonym of Charles Jean Baptiste Jacquot, *Fabrique de romans* popularized the use of the word *nègre* to mean ghost-writer, and led to virulent attacks in the press and, ultimately, to de Mirecourt's condemnation. As for Maquet, he famously sued Dumas for damages in 1857-1858. For more on Dumas, Maquet, and de Mirecourt, see Gustave Simon, *Histoire d'une Collaboration: Alexandre Dumas et Auguste Maquet* (Paris: Editions Georges Crès & Cie, 1919). Most recently, this collaboration was the subject of *Signé Dumas*, a play written by Cyril Gely and Eric Rouquette, performed for the first time at the Festival d'Anjou (16 June 2003), and published that same year (Paris: Les impressions nouvelles, 2003).

John Footman to take in hand, as I desire him to bring the coals and polish the boots.

The practice of using ghost-writers, or *nègres*, was hardly limited to Dumas; on 4 April 1889, Jules Simon, in his speech in honor of Henry Meilhac's election to the Académie française, famously stated "Je sais que, de nos jours, on a des collaborateurs. On en a toujours eu sous une forme ou sous une autre. [...] Les collaborateurs sont devenus au XIX^e siècle une institution" (qtd. in Fillaire 79) [I know that, at the present day, there are collaborators. There have always been, in one form or another. [...] Collaborators have become an institution in the nineteenth century]. Despite its preponderance, this type of collaboration is perhaps the hardest to study, since the very nature of the implied or silent presence makes it elusive to readers. Without proof of its existence – proof that would render it explicit – the category certainly does exist, but it does not offer a particularly promising area of inquiry into modes of collaboration.

The second category, collaboration *in absentia*, obviously refers to situations in which one of the co-authors of the resulting text is not there when the work is being created (conceived, worked through, and/or composed). Before delving deeper, however, it is useful to see how this kind of collaboration differs from intertextuality. In most general terms, the distinction is one of process and results. Collaboration refers specifically to the relationship between two or more agents at some point during the creation of a literary text, whereas intertextuality refers to the relationship between two or more texts; the former emphasizes the process, the latter the results. The distinction in French is even more remarkable, since only the noun *la collaboration* exists, whereas there are no adjective equivalents for the English word "collaborative." On the other hand, a brief review of Julia Kristeva's definition of *intertextualité* will remind us that it focuses not on the potential relationships between people, but between texts: "Le terme d'*inter-textualité* désigne cette transposition d'un (ou de plusieurs) système(s) de signes en un autre" (59) [The term *inter-textuality* denotes this transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another (59-60)]. It is perhaps useful to mention the common misunderstanding of *intertextualité*, which contributes, at least indirectly, to its confusion with collaboration: "[Intertextuality] has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon another, or with the sources of a literary work; it does, on the other hand, involve the components of a *textual system* such as the novel, for instance" (Roudiez 15). Confusion stems in part from the fact that collaboration often coincides with the common occurrences of this mistaken understanding of intertextuality; the result of efforts taken in collaboration very often bear the traces of such influence. Nevertheless, several examples of collaboration yield works devoid of intertextuality, in the two definitions established above. Insofar as collaboration requires two or more agents, and intertextuality two or more texts, it is useful to consider those situations that satisfy one of the two, but not both: two or more agents producing only one text; and the relationship between two or more texts from one sole individual.

The former is perhaps easiest seen in collaboration across the arts. In Assia Djebar's *Femmes d'Alger dans leur appartement*, for example, Eugène Delacroix's influence is felt throughout. Baudelaire would have not been able to write his *Peintre de la vie moderne* without the work of Constantin Guys. Similar contributions to a collective work are Loie Fuller's influence on Stéphane Mallarmé's writings on dance; and Richard Wagner's contributions, even in his absence, to the aesthetic upon which the *Revue wagnérienne* was based. Shared labors such as these are not a function of interplay between two texts, but stem rather from a vision common to two or more people. The converse situation is equally useful in pointing out the possible differences between collaboration and intertextuality: instead of multiple authors yielding one text, multiple texts coming from one lone author. Perhaps one of the most stunning examples of this kind of single-author intertextuality can be found between the novels of Marguerite Duras. Whereas numerous studies have shed light on the numerous threads linking the Duras character in *L'amant* (1984), *Les Yeux bleus cheveux noirs* (1986), *Emily L.* (1987), and *L'amant de la Chine du nord* (1991),¹³ none suggest that they come from divisions internal to Marguerite Duras the author. The undeniable intertextuality between her works is just as undeniably the fruits of one lone authorial presence, and as such it is clear evidence of intertextuality ... and, just as clearly, evidence of no collaboration whatsoever between multiple authors. Of course, these examples point to the extreme cases of collaboration on the one hand and *intertextualité* on the other, and most examples of this kind of influence occupy that space in which the two worlds intersect: multiple authors creating texts in which an earlier text imposes its system on the resulting text. Nevertheless, this brief aside insists that the two do not depend on one another, and as these most recent examples show, they can exist entirely independent from the other kind of literary cross-pollination (be it authorial, in the case of collaboration, or textual, in the case of *intertextualité*).

This distinction between collaboration and intertextuality having been established, we should more easily see the different kinds of collaboration *in absentia*. One common example of collaboration *in absentia* is that of parody and pastiche, the palimpsestes that Gérard Genette so famously studied.¹⁴ As Genette explained: "J'entends par [hypertextualité] toute relation unissant un texte B (que j'appellerai *hypertexte*) à un texte antérieur A (que j'appellerai, bien sûr, *hypotexte*) sur lequel il se greffe d'une manière qui n'est pas celle du commentaire" (11-12) [By hypertextuality I mean any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the *hypotext*), upon which

¹³ See Aliette Armel, *Marguerite Duras et l'autobiographie* (Castor Astral, 1990); and Sharon Willis, *Marguerite Duras: Writing on the Body* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1987).

¹⁴ Some interesting examples of parody and pastiche in nineteenth-century French literature can be found in Catherine Dousteyssier-Khoze and Floriane Place-Verghnes, eds, *Poétiques de la parodie et du pastiche de 1850 à nos jours*. *Modern French Identities* 55 (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006).

it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary (5)]. Of course, Genette's model is not limited to cases in which the other (the object of parody or pastiche) is explicitly named, and there are numerous examples in which the identity of the object of parody is obvious to all without ever being named publicly. As a result, the categories of implicit and explicit are no longer useful for collaboration *in absentia*. In their place lies the distinction between an outside presence felt consciously by the author or authors, and an influence that works on the text unconsciously.

These sub-categories are of course problematic, since it is impossible to enter to the mindset of one or several authors, including at any time during the production of a literary work. Nevertheless, it seems that they can help us separate different kinds of collaboration *in absentia*. On the one hand, conscious collaboration *in absentia* yields works that actively keep the authorial or collaborative other in mind: most often objects of the Genettian palimpsest.¹⁵ The remaining category, in which the collaborative other is absent both physically and from the consciousness of the author or authors during that creation, leads to the most common examples of intertextuality that are discussed so cogently in Harold Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence*. (It is possible, of course, for authors to be conscious of such influence, which is why Bloomian anxiety can be considered to be working consciously and/or unconsciously.) Since much of literary study takes place in an academic setting, it is worth adding that plagiarism would fall under both kinds of collaboration *in absentia*, depending on the motives – difficult if not impossible to ascertain – of the text's author or authors. Let us not forget, too, that plagiarism is not limited to students, but that “[Alphonse] Daudet was frequently accused of plagiarizing – not only Dickens, but also Chateaubriand, Balzac, Flaubert, and even Zola and Goncourt” (Sachs 116). Finally, collaboration *in absentia* allows us to renew our critique of Koestenbaum's model, which ignores the possibility of collaboration *in absentia* via influence from a previous text. His reliance on collaborators' physical and temporal presence during creation leaves him unable to discuss several of the collective ventures discussed in this volume.

Of course, Koestenbaum's is not the only study of issues related to literature produced in collaboration. Other discussions have yielded questions on matters

¹⁵ Another example is the named influence of external inspiration, such as the sentiment in the conclusion to Blaise Cronin's article “Bowling Alone Together: Academic Writing as Distributed Cognition”:

The three individuals named in Acknowledgments were my cognitive partners on this paper, even though they may not have known it – or, indeed, wished it. I may be center stage, in the sense that it is my name that is up in lights and it is I who will be *the* author of record, but this publication emerged from a series of (essentially unplanned) interactions distributed over space and time. I may have bowled alone on this occasion as far as the scorekeepers (in the academic reward system) are concerned, but I was materially aided and abetted by a largely unwitting and unseen team. (560)

such as what makes up a social, political, or cultural network; what defines authorial identity; and how collaboration plays out in non-literary fields. Recently, the editors of *Les Réseaux littéraires*¹⁶ focus their attention primarily on networks for they lend stability within the tradition of Belgian literature, often disdained and characterized as “une ‘institution littéraire faible’” (de Marneffe and Denis 15) [a “weak literary institution”].¹⁷ Their discussion of networks, while giving a nod to collective efforts, still upholds the general notion of a single, unified author. Another recent study, *Nous est un autre*, proposes a series of collaborations from a biographical point of view; the editors explain that they chose the individual partnerships “pour ce qu’ils révèlent chacun de spécifique sur l’écriture en collaboration” (11) [for what each of them reveals specifically about writing in collaboration]. This work is perhaps the most recent example of the biographical approach to collaborative writing, which often provides an interesting read but is not always useful in studying anything particular about literature that resulted from such partnerships.

In *Collaborative Circles: Friendship Dynamics & Creative Work*, Michael P. Farrell offers insight into the formation and development of collaborative groups. His attempt at establishing a theory for studying collaborative circles is cast in largely spatial terms, including the “magnet place that draws together talented and ambitious novices” and the “place where two or more visions are vying with one another for centrality.”¹⁸ In the chapters to follow, many of Farrell’s conditions are present at the collaborative group’s formation. Whether the group dynamics ultimately encourage or hinder creativity will depend on each venture, but all the attempts at collaborative literature discussed here spring from “magnet places” that are deeply rooted in the French literary, and artistic, tradition. In addition the changing social space of nineteenth-century France has already shown to have had enormous impact on the literature it produced.¹⁹

Certainly, the proper (spatial and temporal) setting is crucial to the formation of a collaborative environment, as is having “a set of highly ambitious novices who are marginalized because of their gender, ethnicity, theoretical orientation, or some other characteristics” (Farrell 294). Furthermore, as Nathalie Heinich has shown, the group formation that comes from sharing a time and space that is conducive to literary collaboration results in the identification with being part of a generation of artists. Heinich’s important work convincingly shows how a specific historical context shapes the shared experience that defines a (literary, artistic) generation, and her study is draws heavily on examples from the nineteenth century. Beginning

¹⁶ Daphné de Marneffe and Benoît Denis, eds. *Les Réseaux littéraires* (see Works Cited).

¹⁷ See Frédéric Claisse, “De quelques avatars de la notion de réseau en sociologie,” 21-43 in *Les Réseaux littéraires*.

¹⁸ 294. See in particular “Toward a Theory of Collaborative Circles” (266-96).

¹⁹ See for example Kristin Ross’s *The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the Paris Commune* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).

with the Romantic period, the very vocation of writer was characterized by its being a non-vocation, including a lack of clear training or apprenticeship and a refusal of more traditional means of employment; this confusion leads to similar blurring of the lines between amateurs and professionals, and goes to the very heart of the definitions of (individual) writer and work of art.²⁰ The Romantic movement also gave rise to the commingling of the arts; specifically, the Jeune-France group marked the first time that literature and painting were inextricably linked in the modern notion of an artistic “fraternité”: that is to say, collaboration across the arts that is independent of any formal or official institution. As Heinich explains, this nineteenth-century “fraternité” took the place of more formal memberships before the French Revolution: “Aussi devenait-il nécessaire d’inventer de nouveaux collectifs susceptibles de remplacer cette ‘fraternité’ qu’assurait dans le passé [...] la triple appartenance à un atelier, à une corporation et à une confrérie” (150) [As a result, it became necessary to invent new collectivities that might replace the ‘fraternity’ provided in the past by [...] the triple membership in a workshop, a corporation and a brotherhood].

Heinich’s excellent work begs the question: why did so many writers seek out substitutes for these formal collectivities that had disappeared? They could just as easily have returned to the previous model of solitary artistic production. But they didn’t, at least not exclusively, as the examples in the coming chapters will show, and so we wonder: why was collaboration so important that Romantic writers created new informal social groupings in order to facilitate it? A more general question about the drive to collaborate, about this preference for shared literary experience, goes to the heart of the question underpinning this volume: what, precisely, was at stake in collaboration, that it was so prevalent, with such a variety of approaches, throughout the nineteenth century?

Of course, literary collaboration was not a result of Romanticism, nor was it a product of the French Revolution. While the role of the individual – and, more specifically, of the solitary author – was of capital importance at the dawn of the nineteenth century, it is important to consider the evolution of that individual, and that author, within its appropriate historical context. As a result, before discussing literary collaboration within the nineteenth century, we first turn our attention to the precursors who defined just what was meant by authorship and collaboration in artistic and literary ventures for nineteenth-century writers and artists and for twentieth- and twenty-first-century readers and critics alike. As Brander Matthews reminds us, collaboration prior to the nineteenth century was rampant across Europe:

[...] collaboration has been attractive to not a few of the foremost figures in the history of literature. The list includes not only Beaumont and Fletcher among the mighty Elizabethans, but Shakespeare and almost every one of his fellow

²⁰ Heinich 145; see Heinich’s *Être écrivain: Création et identité* (Paris: La Découverte / L’Armillaire, 2000) for more on these definitions (or lack of definitions).

dramatists – not only Corneille, Molière, and Racine, but almost every other notable name in the history of the French theater. Cervantes and Calderon and Lope de Vega took partners in Spain; and in Germany Schiller and Goethe worked together. In Great Britain Addison and Steele united in the *Spectator*, and in the United States Irving and Paulding combined in *Salmagundi*, as did Drake and Halleck in the *Croakers*. The list might be extended almost indefinitely [...] ²¹

In collaboration before the nineteenth century, *les règles du jeu* were different: for everything from literary salons to laws governing the freedom of speech and the right to assemble; from the common conceptions of intelligence and authority to access to the very tools that made literature possible (education, even paper and writing instruments). Nevertheless, early attempts at shared literary production were monumental in the ground they broke, and they set lasting models to which nineteenth-century literary collaboration would have to respond, in one way or another.

It is clear, then, that a thorough discussion of literary collaboration in the nineteenth century in France, “the country where collaboration is the most frequent” (Matthews 311), cannot ignore the rich tradition that preceded it. For this reason, the first two studies in *Models of Collaboration* investigate earlier examples of collaboration and provide twenty-first-century readers with the baseline of what nineteenth-century writers took to be the most compelling examples of collective authorship. The crucial task of laying the foundation for the questions that this book raises is handled with aplomb by Joan DeJean and John Iverson, who discuss literary collaboration in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, respectively. In the early modern period, DeJean reminds us, many works – including collective volumes, the most obvious candidates for multiple-authorship – were published anonymously; signed volumes did not always accurately account for the (often) multiple authors present; and so it would seem that Stillinger’s “solitary genius” was the exception rather than the rule.²² Iverson sets the table for our discussion of the nineteenth century with his probing look at the eighteenth-century “dîner des philosophes,” through the *Encyclopédie*, Voltaire’s *Dictionnaire philosophique* and other collective ventures, real and fictitious. The slippery notion of authorship

²¹ Matthews 304. Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher were English dramatists whose collaboration (roughly 1605-1625) produced over a dozen plays, including *The Woman Hater*; *A King and No King*; *Love’s Pilgrimage*; and *The Noble Gentleman*. Joseph Addison and Sir Richard Steele founded and wrote *The Spectator*, a daily paper (1711-1712). James Paulding and William Irving penned the satirical *Salmagundi* together in 1807, and Joseph Rodman Drake and Fitz-Greene Halleck together wrote the “Croaker Papers” (1819), satires of New York high society that first appeared in the *New York Evening Post*.

²² Matthews supports this notion, reminding us that “Rotrou and Corneille worked together with three others on five-act tragedies barely outlined by Cardinal Richelieu. Corneille and Quinault aided Molière in the writing of *Psyché*. Boileau and La Fontaine and other friends helped Racine to complete the *Plaideurs*” (308).

developed during this “siècle philosophe” would prove to be a point of departure for the nineteenth-century examples of collaboration.²³

Anthony Glinoe’s study opens our reflections on the nineteenth century with a discussion of the cenacle, one of the characteristic modes of literary production in the first third of the century. When writers joined not only with fellow writers but also with artists, the potential for collaboration was even greater; as Paul Bénichou has noted, “Le mouvement de 1825-1830 se caractérise, on le sait, par la présence des artistes (Louis Boulanger, les Devéria, les Johannot, David d’Angers, Delacroix) aux côtés des poètes” (345 n. 244) [The 1825-1830 movement is characterized, as is well known, by the presence of artists (Louis Boulanger, the Devérias, the Johannots, David d’Angers, Delacroix) alongside the poets (237 n. 244)]. Julia Przybos shows how a compelling example of nineteenth-century literary collaboration raises social questions that transcend the literary and implicate the political, social, and religious spheres. Specifically, she considers the 1864 work *L’Ami Fritz*, by Erckmann-Chatrion (Émile Erckmann and Alexandre Chatrion), about whom Sir Walter Besant declared: “[...] there is not, I believe, any separate work of either which can be compared with the combined work of both” (202). The next chapter studies the impact of collaboration within the specific genre of *tombeaux*: specifically, the mid-century’s ubiquitous Théophile Gautier is the subject of Pascal Durand’s treatment of the *Tombeau* following Gautier’s death in 1872. The post-Commune 1870s offer numerous examples of collaboration across boundaries, as the next chapter’s treatment of the *Album zutique* explores: blurring the lines defining parody; between literature and illustration; and across linguistic limits via translation. Joseph Acquisto explains how the notion of author is further troubled by the example of André Gill and Louis de Gramont’s *La Muse à Bibi* (1879, 1881, and 1882). For Jennifer K. Wolter, *Les Soirées de Médan* (1880) speak to the fate of Naturalism as much as they do the Franco-Prussian War, and they have much to tell us about the Médan authors’ group dynamic and their adherence to or rejection of Naturalism – and, by extension, what it meant for them to be Naturalist authors. Frédéric Canovas shows how artist Maurice Denis responded differently to more and less stable authorial presences in his work on Paul Verlaine’s *Sagesse* and André Gide’s *Voyage d’Urien*. Further interdisciplinarity comes to the fore in Pamela Genova’s discussion of the 1886-1888 *La Revue Wagnérienne* and, as Lawrence Schehr explains, in the monstrous writing of the Goncourt brothers. In fact, some of the Goncourts’ own contemporaries treated their collaboration as a sort of oddity, as Brander Matthews wrote in 1901:

²³ It is worth noting that, in 1867, Jules Goizet said of the *L’Encyclopédie* that “Cette œuvre, l’une des plus grandes et des plus utiles conceptions de l’esprit humain, doit son succès à la multiplicité de ses collaborateurs” (48) [This work, one of the greatest and most useful conceptions of the human mind, owes its success to the multiplicity of its collaborators].

Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, for example, although not twins, thought alike on most subjects; and so close was their identity of cerebration that when they were sitting at the same table at work on the same book, they sometimes wrote almost the same sentence at the same moment. This is collaboration carried to an abnormal and unwholesome extreme; and there is much that is morbid and much that is forced in the books the Goncourts composed together. (316)

Schehr shows that, in *Manette Salomon*, the brothers are not mere chroniclers, journalists, or novelists, but monstrous writers writing the monstrous: rhyparographers. Daphné de Marneffe closes our investigation of the nineteenth century with a look to the future, to the consequences of nineteenth-century collaboration on twentieth-century letters. Specifically, she picks up on the earlier chapters of sociability with a twentieth-century version, aided by a growing world of media contacts, in her discussion of the network of Belgian literary journals of the 1920s.

It would be tempting to include in this study the Surrealists' stated attempt in 1923 at "the collectivization of ideas," which led André Breton to conclude: "Je crois pouvoir dire qu'est mise en pratique entre nous, sans aucune espèce de réserve individuelle, la collectivisation des idées [...] Nul ne cherche à rien garder pour soi, chacun attend la fructification du *don* à tous, du *partage* entre tous. Et rien n'est alors, en effet, plus fructueux" (71; original emphases) [I think that I can state that the collectivization of ideas developed between us, without the slightest bit of individual reservation. [...] No one seeks to keep anything for himself; each one waits for the fructification of the *gift* to all, of *sharing* between all. And so nothing is, in fact, more fruitful]. However, the fundamental shift in their conception of the author places their work beyond the scope of this study of nineteenth-century literary collaboration.

The studies in *Models of Collaboration* show how the numerous collective literary ventures of the nineteenth century, strongly grounded in the traditions that preceded them, raise fundamental questions regarding authorship and authority that continue to haunt readers and critics today. Just like contemporary French poetry's renewed interest in the lyric can be traced to its nineteenth-century disturbances exemplified by Arthur Rimbaud's "Je est un autre" [I is an other] and Stéphane Mallarmé's "disparition élocutoire du poète" [disappearance of the poet as speaker], contemporary criticism's interest in the consequences of collective literary ventures begins here, in the collaborative literature of the nineteenth century.

In some respects we are still searching for an answer to Charles Séchan's question from 1883: "Connaissez-vous au monde littéraire une question plus controversée que celle de la collaboration, de sa nécessité, de ses avantages et de ses inconvénients?" (234) [Do you know, anywhere in the literary world, a more controversial question than that of collaboration, of its necessity, its advantages and its disadvantages?]

Works Cited

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist, Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Bénichou, Paul. *Le sacre de l'écrivain, 1750-1830. Essai sur l'avènement d'un pouvoir spirituel laïque dans la France moderne*. 1973. Paris: Gallimard / Bibliothèque des idées, 1996. Trans. by Mark K. Jensen as *The Consecration of the Writer, 1750-1830*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).
- Benstock, Shari. "Afterword." 239-56 in *Intimate Warriors: Portraits of a Modern Marriage, 1899-1944*, by Neith Boyce and Hutchins Hapgood, ed. Ellen Kay Trimberger. New York: Feminist Press, 1991.
- Besant, Sir Walter. "On Literary Collaboration." *New Review* 6.33 (February 1892): 200-209.
- Breton, André. *Entretiens 1913-1952*. 3rd ed. Paris: Gallimard / Le point du jour, 1955.
- Chadwick, Whitney, and Isabelle de Courtivron, eds. *Significant Others: Creativity & Intimate Partnerships*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1993.
- Cronin, Blaise. "Bowling Alone Together: Academic Writing as Distributed Cognition." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 55.6 (April 2004): 557-60.
- Eliot, T.S., *Selected Essays*. New York: Harcourt, 1950.
- Farrell, Michael P. *Collaborative Circles: Friendship Dynamics & Creative Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Fillaire, Bernard. *Alexandre Dumas et associés*. Paris: Bartillat, 2002.
- Gautier, Théophile. *Histoire de l'art dramatique en France depuis vingt-cinq ans*. Vol. 1. Paris: Hetzel, 1857-1858.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982. Trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky as *Palimpsests – Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Gide, André. *Les faux-monnayeurs*. Paris: Gallimard/Folio, 1925. Trans. by Dorothy Bussy and Justin O'Brien as *The Counterfeiters*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.
- Goizet, J[ules]. *Histoire anecdotique de la collaboration au théâtre*. Paris: Au bureau du Dictionnaire du Théâtre, 1867.
- Goncourt, Edmond de, and Jules de Goncourt. *Journal des Goncourt*. Vol. 1: 1851-1857. Ed. Jean-Louis Cabanès. Paris: Champion, 2005. Trans. by Robert Baldick as *Pages from the Goncourt Journal*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Heinich, Nathalie. *L'élite artiste: Excellence et singularité en régime démocratique*. Paris: Gallimard, 2005.
- Hemmings, F.W.J. "Co-authorship in French Plays of the Nineteenth Century." *French Studies* 40.1 (January 1987): 37-51.

- Inge, M. Thomas. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA* 116.3 (2001): 623-30.
- Koestenbaum, Wayne. *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Kristeva, Julia. *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Seuil, 1974. Trans. by Margaret Waller as *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Lafon, Michel, and Benoît Peeters. *Nous est un autre: Enquête sur les duos d'écrivains*. Paris: Flammarion, 2006.
- London, Bette. *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Marneffe, Daphné de, and Benoît Denis, eds. *Les Réseaux littéraires*. Brussels: Le Cri / CIEL, 2006.
- Matthews, Brander. "*The Historical Novel*" and Other Essays. 1890. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1901.
- Roudiez, Leon S. "Introduction." 1-20 in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. By Julia Kristeva. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Roudiez. Ed. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Sachs, Murray. "The Role of Collaborators in the Career of Alphonse Daudet," *PMLA* 73.1 (March 1958): 116-22.
- Séchan, Charles. *Souvenirs d'un homme de théâtre, 1831-1855*, ed. Adolphe Badin. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1883.
- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. "Chapter 24: On A Peal of Bells." *Roundabout Papers*.
- Tiger, Lionel, and Robin Fox. *The Imperial Animal*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998.
- Whidden, Seth. "On Poetry and Collaboration in the Nineteenth Century." *French Forum* 32.1-2 (Winter-Spring 2007): 73-88.