

**LEWIS THEOBALD'S *DOUBLE FALSEHOOD*: THE  
AUTHORSHIP QUESTION RECONSIDERED**

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the  
University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in  
Philosophy by Naseem Alotaibi.

JULY 2016

# Abstract

---

This thesis offers a response to the recent publication of Lewis Theobald's *Double Falshood*<sup>1</sup> (1728) in the Arden Shakespeare series (2010). It questions Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood's* source play, and presents a number of factors suggesting that Fletcher is possibly its prime (if not its sole) author. This study also addresses other problems relating to Shakespeare's supposed authorship of the play, including Theobald's unreliability, which casts doubt on his claims for Shakespeare having any hand in the play: i.e., his plagiarism of other people's work, and his obsessive imitation of Shakespeare. Because there has been to date no scholarly work dedicated to highlighting Theobald's contributions to the play, this thesis aims to address this significant gap in scholarship. It does so by examining recent approaches to determining the authorship of *Double Falsehood*, highlighting the limitations of both stylometric analysis and the use of electronic databases—such as *LION*—in authorship studies. By identifying such limitations, and by building on recent theories in attribution scholarship, this thesis proposes a new methodology for determining the authorship of the play: one that focuses on locating much longer verbal parallels within Theobald's other works, rather than counting the frequency of individual words to establish probable attribution. While this thesis criticises the Arden edition for its preoccupation with establishing Shakespeare-Fletcher connections to the play, it shows that the most distinctive parallels can be found in the works of Theobald, as evident in instances of three, four, five, and six consecutive-word parallels, all of which have been overlooked by the Arden editor Brean Hammond. Finally, the thesis addresses the editorial approach Hammond employs in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, focusing on the question of the textual presentation of adaptations. An investigation of the methodology applied by John Jowett in editing *Measure for Measure* for the *Oxford Middleton* (2007) facilitates here a solution to the problem of editing adaptations, one that is not emphasised by Hammond. This approach highlights the significance of presenting the process of adaptation within the edited text

---

<sup>1</sup> From this point onwards, Theobald's original printed title will be modernised.

itself by utilizing the text's typography in a way that highlights the different layers of the adapted text: showing, that is, what is presumed to be the original text versus the adapted text. Such an apparatus not only highlights the elements of adaptation in the text, but it also dislocates *Double Falsehood* from the Shakespeare canon (which is clearly a key purpose behind the publication of the Arden edition), positioning it instead within the more accurate authorial arena of the Shakespeare Apocrypha.

# Acknowledgments

---

First, I would like to extend my gratitude to Umm Al-Qura University for funding this doctoral dissertation. Their generous financial support has given me the opportunity to conduct this research, to which I am extremely grateful. I would also like to extend my thanks to my teachers and advisors at the English department in UQU for their support, and for encouraging me to pursue a degree in Renaissance and Eighteenth-Century literature: although this has not been my original choice, now, I cannot imagine having done it any other way. My prayers go out to Dr. Rajih Almughamsi who has recently passed away; he has been a great source of inspiration, and it is my honour to have been one of his students.

I am greatly indebted to my supervisors Dr. Michael Davies and Prof. Marcus Walsh whose inspiration to work on this topic began at the MA level. Dr. Davies has introduced me to many stimulating critical debates on reading and interpreting all things Shakespeare; Prof. Walsh has taught me so many things about the history of editorial theory and literary editing in the eighteenth century. Their knowledge and expertise (both individually, and collaboratively) has had a profound impact on my research to which I will be forever grateful. I am extremely thankful for the constructive criticism and valuable feedback they provided throughout the entire process of writing this thesis; and above all I am grateful for their kindness.

To my dear friends Fadia Mereani, Suha Alansari and Latifa AlAbdulkareem: thank you for your continuous support and encouragement; but most importantly, thank you for having a great sense of humour which helped me stay sane through those difficult years. To my adorable nieces and nephews Saud, Khawla, Abdullah, Ahmad, and Khuzama: thank you for bringing so much joy and happiness to my life. To my siblings Amal, Sami, Manal and Nada, and my sister in law Fatimah: my love and gratitude is immeasurable. Thank you for your kind and endless support, and for always being there for me; but mostly, thank you for constantly giving me the right push at the right moment. Special thanks to Amal

and Nada, who were my roommates at the time and also PhD students themselves: thank you for all those brainstorming sessions, and especially for listening to my ramblings about Fletcher, Shakespeare and Theobald. To my fiancée Badr Saber: thank you for being tremendously patient and for always being by my side during this time-intensive process of writing my thesis. I am extremely grateful for your regular follow-ups on all the tiny details in my research; but I am most grateful for your love and continuous support. Finally, to my loving parents, my first teachers, Abdullah and Jawaher: you have given me so much and provided me with the strength and determination to see this project through. I cannot thank you enough for being a vital source of support. I am most grateful to you for looking after me throughout what seemed to be a never-ending journey. Thank you for your unconditional love and encouragement and for always reminding me that this too shall pass.

# Table Of Contents

---

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: FROM <i>CARDENIO</i> TO <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i>? BACKGROUND AND SOURCES</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1. THEOBALD’S MANUSCRIPTS: FACTS AND PROBLEMS .....	8
2. THE CASE FOR FLETCHER AS THE (SOLE?) AUTHOR OF <i>CARDENIO</i> .....	12
3. SHELTON’S TRANSLATION OF <i>DON QUIXOTE</i> (1612).....	21
4. CONCLUSION.....	26
<b>CHAPTER 2: LEWIS THEOBALD AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i></b> . 27	
1. THEOBALD AND CHARGES OF PLAGIARISM .....	31
2. LEWIS THEOBALD, ‘IMITATOR OF THE IMMORTAL SHAKESPEARE’ .....	40
3. THEOBALD AND ADAPTATION .....	49
4. ‘WAS IT RAPE THEN? [OR] THE COYNESS OF A MODEST BRIDE’?.....	57
5. EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RECEPTION OF <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i> .....	62
6. A REVIEW OF RECENT APPROACHES TO THEOBALD AND AUTHORSHIP .....	68
7. CONCLUSION.....	97
<b>CHAPTER 3: THE USE OF VERBAL PARALLELS IN ATTRIBUTION STUDIES: PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL RISKS</b> .....	<b>102</b>
1. ‘WOODS, ROCKS, & MOUNTAINS’: LOST SONG FOUND?.....	102
2. ‘SHAKESPEARE’S UNTIL PROVED OTHERWISE’? .....	117
3. CONCLUSION.....	135
<b>CHAPTER 4: ‘NONE BUT HIMSELF CAN BE HIS PARALLEL’: VERBAL CONNECTIONS BETWEEN <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i> AND THE WORKS OF THEOBALD</b> .....	<b>137</b>
1. A FEW WORDS ON THE APPROACH .....	140
2. THE ARDEN EDITION AND THE LIMITATIONS OF <i>LION</i> .....	143
3. ARDEN’S PARTIALITY FOR SHAKESPEARE .....	148
4. EVIDENCE FOR AUTHORSHIP THROUGH ADAPTATION.....	166

5. PARALLEL STAGE DIRECTIONS .....	175
6. CONCLUSION.....	185
<b>CHAPTER 5: TEXTUAL REPRESENTATIONS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS OF</b>	
<b>ADAPTATION.....</b>	<b>187</b>
1. AN APPROACH TO EDITING ADAPTATIONS .....	189
2. ARDEN’S MISREPRESENTATION OF ADAPTATION.....	195
3. CONCLUSION.....	207
<b>CONCLUSION: <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i> AND THE SHAKESPEARE CANON .....</b>	<b>209</b>
1. THE SHAKESPEARE APOCRYPHA: INSIDE OR OUTSIDE THE CANON?.....	216
2. DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	221
<b>APPENDIX 1: RAPE AND PRE-CONTRACTS OF MARRIAGE IN <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i></b>	
<b>AND <i>CARDENIO</i>.....</b>	<b>227</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: VERBAL PARALLELS BETWEEN <i>DOUBLE FALSEHOOD</i> (1728) AND THE</b>	
<b>WORKS OF THEOBALD (1707-1741) AS IDENTIFIED BY <i>LION</i> AND <i>ECCO</i> .....</b>	<b>229</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>238</b>

# Abbreviations and References

---

Throughout the text, references to Shakespeare's works will be cited from *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., ed. by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), using the common abbreviations for Shakespeare's plays. Citations from the Beaumont and Fletcher canon will be cited from *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, edited by Fredson Bowers (1992), unless specified otherwise. References to Theobald's plays will be cited using *Literature Online (LION)*, and *Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO)* will be used for citing works that are unavailable on LION.<sup>2</sup> Examples from *Double Falsehood* will be cited from Theobald's original edition, Lewis Theobald, *Double Falshood: Or, The Distrest Lovers* (London: 1728) available on ECCO; when discussing Hammond's work, examples will be cited from Brean Hammond, ed., [Theobald, Lewis], *Double Falsehood* (London: Methuen, 2010).

John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* will be abbreviated as *Duchess*; Thomas Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612) will be abbreviated as *DQ*. References to Theobald's works will be abbreviated as follows:

<i>A Pindarick Ode on the Union</i> (1707)	<i>Ode</i>
<i>The Life and Character of Marcus Cato of Utica</i> (1713)	<i>Marcus</i>
<i>Electra</i> (1714)	<i>Elec</i>
<i>The Cave of Poverty</i> (1715)	<i>CoP</i>
<i>The Clouds</i> (1715)	<i>Cl</i>
<i>The Perfidious Brother</i> (1715)	<i>PB</i>
<i>The Persian Princess</i> (1715)	<i>PP</i>
<i>Plutus</i> (1715)	<i>Plu</i>
<i>The Censor</i> i-iii (1717)	<i>Cen</i>
<i>The History of the Loves of Antiochus and Stratonice</i> (1717)	<i>A&amp;S</i>
<i>Decius and Paulina</i> (1719)	<i>D&amp;P</i>

---

<sup>2</sup> As will be discussed in Chapter 4, ECCO will be used to cite references from Theobald's works that are published on LION without their supplementary materials.

<i>Memoirs of Sir Walter Raleigh</i> (1719)	<i>Ral</i>
<i>Richard II</i> (1720)	<i>R2</i>
<i>Harlequin a Sorcerer</i> (1725)	<i>Harl</i>
<i>Shakespeare Restored</i> (1726)	<i>ShR</i>
<i>The Rape of Proserpine</i> (1727)	<i>Rape</i>
<i>Double Falsehood</i> (1728)	<i>DF</i>
<i>Perseus and Andromeda</i> (1730)	<i>P&amp;A</i>
<i>Orestes</i> (1731)	<i>Ores</i>
<i>Theobald's Letters</i> (1731-1735)	<i>Letters</i>
<i>The Works of Shakespeare</i> (1733)	<i>Works</i>
<i>Merlin</i> (1734)	<i>Mer</i>
<i>The Fatal Secret</i> (1735)	<i>FS</i>
<i>Orpheus and Eurydice</i> (1739)	<i>O&amp;E</i>
<i>The Happy Captive</i> (1741)	<i>HC</i>

Citing Theobald's works is not as straightforward as citing Shakespeare's. For example, some of Theobald's plays were published with no scene divisions. Equally, Theobald has produced masques and pantomimes in which the format is entirely different from that of his plays. Hence, for ease of reference, Theobald's works will be cited from the *LION* database according to the following: (a) works that were published with act and scene divisions will be cited in the form in which Shakespeare's works are commonly cited, and those published with act/scene divisions; but those published as prose will be cited with act/scene number (where applicable), followed by page number; (b) works in which there were act but no scene divisions will be cited with act followed by line number only; (c) in one act productions, such as masques, pantomimes and dramatic operas, the scene number will be marked with an abbreviated 's.' followed by the line numbers, i.e. 's. 1.10-12';<sup>3</sup> (d) page numbers will be used when citing parallels found in published books, or when citing a work's dedication or preface; volume number will be used when applicable; (e) Theobald's poem *The Cave of Poverty* will be cited by stanza and page number. It must be noted that any

---

<sup>3</sup> The only exception is citing parallels from *Merlin*, which was published with no scene divisions. In this case, parallels will be cited by indicating the line and page number.

parallels cited from *The Perfidious Brother*, *Richard II* and *The Fatal Secret* have already been checked against their original versions to ensure that they have not originated in either Henry Mestayer, Shakespeare or John Webster.

# Introduction

---

'[...] You said you had a copy of *Cardenio*?'

'Of course!' She enthused, then added with a wink:

'Will's lost play popping up like a jack-in-the-box must come as quite a surprise to you, I imagine?'

I didn't tell her that a *Cardenio* scam was almost a weekly event.

In Jasper Fforde's *Lost in a Good Book* (2002), the literary detective Thursday Next goes on a hunt for Shakespeare's lost *Cardenio*, a manuscript copy of which she eventually finds in Bartholomew Volescamper's private library. The opening soliloquy to the play reads: 'Know'st thou, O love, the pangs which I sustain'. To her and her partner Bowden Cable, 'the sentences, the meter, the style [were] all pure Shakespeare'.<sup>4</sup> Similar quests for the play feature in two other mystery novels: *Looking for Cardenio* (2008) by Jean Rae Baxter and *Interred with their Bones* (2008) by Jennifer Lee Carrell.<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, reality is not far from fiction. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the search for the lost *Cardenio* has preoccupied many Shakespeare scholars. The problem with their investigations, however, is that the search was not for an authentic manuscript, but rather a search for Shakespeare within Lewis Theobald's *Double Falsehood* (1728), an eighteenth-century adaptation allegedly based on a lost Shakespeare play. In 2001, for instance, Michael Wood proposed that 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes', a song set by the King's lutenist Robert Johnson, is all that survives from Shakespeare's lost *Cardenio*. His theory considers the scene featuring music in *Double Falsehood* (4.2) and locates verbal parallels between the corresponding scene in Thomas Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612), now regarded as *Double Falsehood*'s main source, and Robert Johnson's song.<sup>6</sup> The search for Shakespeare's lost play was maximised upon more prominently, however, with

---

<sup>4</sup> Jasper Fforde, *Lost in a Good Book* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2002), pp. 30, 42.

<sup>5</sup> See Jean Rae Baxter, *Looking for Cardenio* (Hamilton, Ontario: Seraphim, 2008); and Jennifer Lee Carrell, *Interred with their Bones* (New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007).

<sup>6</sup> Michael Wood, *In Search of Shakespeare* (London: BBC, 2001).

the 2010 Arden Shakespeare publication of *Double Falsehood* 'as containing what may be the sole surviving textual evidence for a lost Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration'.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, in 2012, Gregory Doran, the Chief Associate Director of the Royal Shakespeare Company, published *Shakespeare's Lost Play: In Search of Cardenio*, a book that details his quest for the lost text, written in preparation for a production of the play in 2011.<sup>8</sup> Also in the same year, Oxford University Press published *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, & the Lost Play*, a collection of essays by leading Shakespeare scholars in search of the great lost play.<sup>9</sup>

Theobald's claims to have re-worked a Shakespearean text in his *Double Falsehood* have been taken more seriously in the twentieth century with the emergence of 'the Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition',<sup>10</sup> which was made convincing by the 1653 Stationers' Register entry for 'The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare'.<sup>11</sup> Scholars welcomed this tradition given that Shakespeare and Fletcher collaborated in *Henry VIII* and *Two Noble Kinsmen*. Researchers, however, have not found sufficient evidence for Shakespeare's hand in *Double Falsehood* in comparison to evidence found for Fletcher's, but since there was no contradictory evidence that Shakespeare was involved in writing *Cardenio*, Theobald's claims have been *gradually* accepted as fact.<sup>12</sup>

Because much research has been dedicated to establish a connection between Shakespeare and *Double Falsehood*, this present study mainly aims to question such a connection, building on scholarship in support of another

---

<sup>7</sup> [Lewis Theobald], *Double Falsehood*, ed. by Brean Hammond (London: Methuen, 2010), p. xvi.

<sup>8</sup> Gregory Doran, *Shakespeare's Lost Play: In Search of Cardenio* (London: Nick Hern Books Ltd., 2012).

<sup>9</sup> David Carnegie and Gary Taylor, eds., *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Any reference to this volume will be abbreviated as *Quest* from this point onwards.

<sup>10</sup> Gamaliel Bradford, Jr., 'The History of Cardenio by Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare', *Modern Language Notes*, 25.2 (1910), 51-56, p. 55.

<sup>11</sup> W. W. Greg, *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols (London, 1939-59), I, p. 61.

<sup>12</sup> See for instance Walter Graham, 'The *Cardenio-Double Falsehood* Problem', *Modern Philology*, 14 (1916), 269-280; E. H. C. Oliphant, "'Double Falsehood': Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald", *Notes and Queries* 89 (1919), 30-32; 90 (1919), 60-62; 91 (1919): 86-88; John Freehafer, 'Cardenio, by Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 84 (1969): 501-513; Stephan Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*', *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1990), 81-89; Kenneth Muir, 'Cervantes, Cardenio and Theobald', in *Spain & Its Literature: Essays in Memory of E. Allison Peers*, edited with an introduction by Ann L. Mackenzie (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), 141-150.

tradition, the one that explores Theobald's (rather than Shakespeare's and Fletcher's) role in the writing of *Double Falsehood*. It is influenced by the work of previous scholars, such as Harriet C. Frazier (1968) and Jeffrey Kahan (2004), who not only question Shakespeare's involvement in the play, but also suggest the possibility that Theobald actually forged it.<sup>13</sup> The thesis is more influenced, however, by the recent observations presented by Tiffany Stern (2011-2), which mainly highlight why Shakespeare's name must not be associated with *Cardenio*, and why Theobald's claims are not necessarily reliable.<sup>14</sup>

It must be noted that this study will not explore the possibility that the play is an outright forgery, as there is some evidence suggesting that Theobald appears to have been in possession of some sort of manuscript that originated in the Jacobean era. Chapter 1, 'From *Cardenio* to *Double Falsehood*? Background and Sources', investigates Theobald's claims for adapting an original Shakespeare play. It examines Theobald's preface to the play in order to establish the number, date, and quality of the manuscripts he claimed to have. It will then explore the external evidence in connection to *Cardenio* along with the internal evidence offered by *Double Falsehood* to determine whether or not an earlier text lies beneath Theobald's play. This part of the discussion mainly aims to answer questions as to which of the two collaborators—i.e. Shakespeare or Fletcher—stands out as the primary candidate to have been involved in both *Cardenio* and *Double Falsehood*; it also aims to determine to what extent the latter is closely paralleled to Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612).

Chapter 2, 'Lewis Theobald and the Authorship of *Double Falsehood*', explores Theobald's role in play. Considering none of Theobald's Shakespeare manuscripts have survived, the chapter investigates Theobald's reliability by (1) determining if he is innocent of previous accusations of plagiarism, and (2) exploring Theobald's reputation as a Shakespearean imitator in order to establish if his borrowings were actually substantial. Another significant aspect of Theobald's career worth investigating is his method of adaptation. An examination of his other adaptations—Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1720) and

---

<sup>13</sup> See Harriet C. Frazier, 'The Rifling of Beauty's Stores', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 69 (1968): 232-256; and Jeffrey Kahan, *Shakespeare Imitations, Parodies and Forgeries*, 3 vols (London: Routledge, 2004).

<sup>14</sup> See Tiffany Stern, "'The Forgery of Some Modern Author?': Theobald's Shakespeare and *Cardenio*'s *Double Falsehood*", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62.4 (2011), 555-593.

Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* (1733)—tells us something about the authorship of *Double Falsehood* as it highlights the extent to which Theobald might have possibly altered his alleged Shakespeare manuscripts in the process of adaptation. The second part of the chapter will review the most recent approaches to verbal parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald, and how these were used in determining the authorship of the play. This section of the thesis will examine the work of Richard Proudfoot, Macdonald P. Jackson, and Gary Taylor (2012), in order to highlight the main difficulties and problems with their methodologies. The aim is to propose an alternative methodology that best serves the *Double Falsehood* authorship question. As will be shown in this chapter, my methodology mainly builds on recent work by Brian Vickers (2012), whose use of collocation studies has enabled him to locate a group of distinctive verbal parallels between the 1602 additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the works of Shakespeare.<sup>15</sup>

Chapter 3, 'The Use of Verbal Parallels in Attribution Studies: Problems and Potential Risks', explores the scholarly use of *Literature Online* (discussed in the previous chapter) to determine the authorship of *Double Falsehood*. It begins by presenting Michael Wood's previously mentioned theory that the song 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes', set by the King's lutenist Robert Johnson, is all that survives from Shakespeare's lost *Cardenio*. It will then discuss the employment of *LION* by Gary Taylor and Brean Hammond in determining the authorship of both the song and Theobald's play respectively, with the aim of discussing the potential risks involved. More specifically, these two studies will be evaluated in light of the principles—presented by M. St Clare Byrne in 1932—to which attribution scholars should adhere when searching for verbal parallels,<sup>16</sup> and to which my research aims to conform.

Chapter 4, "'None but Himself can be his Parallel':<sup>17</sup> Verbal Connections between *Double Falsehood* and the Works of Theobald', explores Hammond's use of verbal parallels in establishing the authorship of the play, providing a critical evaluation of his commentary. This discussion investigates the editor's approach

---

<sup>15</sup> Brian Vickers, 'Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602): A New(er) Approach', *Shakespeare* 8.1 (2012), 13-43.

<sup>16</sup> M. St Clare Byrne, 'Bibliographic Clues in Collaborative Plays', *Library*, 4<sup>th</sup> ser. 13 (1932): 21-48.

<sup>17</sup> Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift, 'Peri Bathous: Or, Martinus Scriblerus His Treatsie of the Art of Sinking in Poetry', *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*, 2 vols. (London: 1728), II, p. 102.

to verbal parallels, with an aim to determine whether or not parallels to Theobald's works receive equal attention to those found in the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher. Chapter 5, 'Textual Representations and Misrepresentations of Adaptation', examines editorial approaches to presenting adapted texts. It compares Hammond's approach to the innovative approach employed by John Jowett in his edition of *Measure for Measure* for the *Oxford Middleton* (2007) based on the theory that its 1623 text was prepared from an adaptation by Middleton in 1621. By showing how Jowett's presentation of the text is helpful in the way it highlights features that define the play as an adaptation, this chapter explores Hammond's presentation of the text, looking at how the features of adaptation in *Double Falsehood* are presented in the Arden edition. Does the edition differentiate between the features that define the text as belonging to the eighteenth century, and those that define it as belonging to a much earlier date?

Therefore, when it comes to the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, the issue of paramount importance to us is its editorial representation (or misrepresentation) of authorship, not only because it is part of a new scholarly trend that aims to expand the Shakespeare canon, but also because it could potentially have an active role in rewriting literary history and redefining Shakespeare as a cultural icon. This thesis, then, examines *Double Falsehood* (1728) as a play 'Adapted to the Stage By Mr. Theobald', rather than as one 'Written Originally by W. SHAKESPEARE'. It is a response to the recent publication of the play in the Arden Shakespeare drama series—a move that seeks to position the play more firmly within the canon of Shakespeare's plays—as well as to the scholarly contributions following this publication. The aim here is to assess Arden's publication of *Double Falsehood* in terms of its approach to determining its authorship and whether or not the edition presents a satisfactory solution to the controversy by (1) questioning Shakespeare's involvement in the lost *Cardenio*; (2) investigating Theobald's reliability in the light of different aspects of his career; (3) identifying the limitations of previous approaches to determining the authorship of the play, thus leading to a proposal for a more appropriate methodology; (4) searching for verbal parallels to the works of Theobald (rather than the more common emphasis on searching for echoes of

the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher), while ensuring that the approach, unlike others, follows the essential principles for using verbal parallels in authorship studies; and more importantly (5) proposing how the *Double Falsehood* text could be presented to readers, and thereby providing some answers to the question of its position within the Shakespeare canon. By doing so, this thesis attempts to offer new answers to the *Double Falsehood* authorship question.

# CHAPTER 1

## From *Cardenio* To *Double Falsehood*?

### Background and Sources

---

In 1727, *Double Falsehood; Or The Distrest Lovers* was staged as a play ‘Written Originally by *W. SHAKESPEARE*; And now Revised and Adapted to the Stage by Mr. Theobald’; it was later published in 1728 as such. If we fast-forward to 2010, this very play is published by the Arden Shakespeare series as ‘The History of Cardenio By William Shakespeare and John Fletcher Adapted for the eighteenth-century stage as *Double Falsehood or The Distressed Lovers* by Lewis Theobald’.<sup>18</sup> Regardless of the absence of a seventeenth-century manuscript to support this claim, the play has been granted a place in the prestigious Arden series. The series editors’ conclusions regarding this decision have been based on the 1653 Stationers’ Register entry for ‘The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare’,<sup>19</sup> which has been commonly used as evidence to support that the latter (irrespective of the former) is the author of this lost play. This chapter aims to address the authorship controversy *the other way around* by raising the following questions: (a) which of the two dramatists stands out as the author of *Cardenio*; and, (b) whether or not Shakespeare was *ever* involved in writing such a play? The discussion will start by reviewing the case for Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare, as the primary (if not, the sole) author of *Cardenio*. It will do so by highlighting any Fletcherian connections to the external evidence surrounding the lost play, along with any connections to the internal evidence offered by the *Double Falsehood* text itself, i.e. the assigned printed version. It will, moreover, address recent (and also less recent) approaches to Fletcher’s co-authorship of *Cardenio*. The chapter will then review the literature that identifies Shelton’s translation of *Don Quixote* (1612) as the source text for both *The History of Cardenio* (1613) and *Double Falsehood* (1727-8). However, our discussion will first begin by exploring Theobald’s account of the manuscripts he claimed to

---

<sup>18</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 161.

<sup>19</sup> Greg, *Bibliography*, I, p. 61.

have, and what this account could possibly tell us about the authorship of the play.

### 1. Theobald's Manuscripts: Facts and Problems

The most immediate difficulty with the *Double Falsehood* controversy involves the obscurity and ambiguity surrounding the business of how Theobald dealt with it. To begin, Theobald's role in producing and publishing this play is clearly an ambiguous matter. Though the play has been described as an adaptation, Theobald described himself in his preface 'as an *Editor*, not an *Author*'.<sup>20</sup> Ivan Lupić explains:

On its title page, *Double Falsehood* is described as [an adaptation by Theobald], whose Preface to the play is, however, specifically called a 'Preface of the *Editor*' [...] while the editor's credentials are guaranteed by the invocation of *Shakespeare Restored*, a treatise devoted exclusively to the recovery of Shakespeare's genuine text. The term 'revised', though somewhat ambivalently, also suggests the careful examination and correction associated with editorial labor.<sup>21</sup>

Indeed, if Theobald was the editor, and if he did have an original manuscript, he would have later published the play in his Shakespeare's *Works* (1733). Moreover, Theobald was equally vague about the number of manuscripts to which he had access, and which has caused some scholars to view that he had three manuscripts,<sup>22</sup> while others believed he had four<sup>23</sup> (though four seems closer to what Theobald was describing). In the preface to the play, Theobald explains that he had the following manuscripts: one 'of above Sixty Years Standing, in the Handwriting of Mr. *Downes*, the famous Old Prompter', which as Theobald was 'credibly inform'd, was early in the Possession of the celebrated Mr. *Betterton*'; the second—as Theobald was told by 'the Noble Person' who

---

<sup>20</sup> Lewis Theobald, *Double Falshood: Or, The Distrest Lovers*, second issue (London, 1728), sig. A5v.

<sup>21</sup> Ivan Lupić, 'Malone's *Double Falsehood*', in *Quest*, 95-114, p. 95.

<sup>22</sup> See for instance, Howard Marchitello, 'Finding *Cardenio*', *ELH*, 74.4 (2007), 957-987, p. 965; and Richard Meek and Jane Rickard, "'This orphan play": *Cardenio* and the Construction of the Author', *Shakespeare*, 7.3 (2011), 269-283, p. 270.

<sup>23</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 563. In fact, Stern's article offers the most comprehensive reading of Theobald's manuscripts' account; see pp. 563-566.

supplied him with it—was given by Shakespeare, ‘as a Present of Value, to a Natural Daughter of his, for whose Sake he wrote it’; the third, which Theobald ‘was glad to purchase at a very good Rate [...] may not, perhaps, be quite so Old’ as the second copy; and the fourth ‘is much more perfect, and has fewer Flaws and Interruptions in the Sense’. Complicating the matter further is Theobald’s secrecy when it comes to how he obtained those manuscripts. While he explained that he was ‘credibly inform’d’ that his first manuscript ‘was early in the Possession of the celebrated Mr. *Betterton*’, he however did not mention *who* informed him. We moreover do not learn about the name of ‘the Noble Person’ who supplied Theobald with his second copy, and from where he ‘Purchase[d]’ his third copy, or who provided him with the fourth. Theobald also indicated that the play was well received by some ‘Great Judges, to whom [he has] had the Honour of communicating it in Manuscript’, yet again, we are not provided with any names.<sup>24</sup> A sense of secrecy, whether discretion or mystery, surrounds Theobald’s “sources” from the outset.

Brean Hammond, the editor of the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, points to a letter Theobald sent to the Countess of Oxford, and how it ‘suggests that she was one of the “Great Judges”’.<sup>25</sup> In this letter, which was presented by John Cadwalader in 1940, Theobald wrote to the Countess: ‘If your Honour has any mind to read the play in manuscript, upon the earliest intimation of your pleasure you shall command it’. Although Cadwalader believes this provides ‘additional evidence’ that Theobald ‘actually had a manuscript of Shakespeare’s day’,<sup>26</sup> it is clear that what Theobald appeared to have offered the Countess is the manuscript of *Double Falsehood* itself.<sup>27</sup> Of course, the use of this source as evidence in support of Theobald’s manuscript would in itself present a further difficulty considering the absence of evidence supporting that the Countess—or anyone else for that matter—had seen Theobald’s manuscripts. Hammond refers to an advertisement of the 1770 edition of *Double Falsehood* which broadcasted that ‘the original Manuscript of this play is now treasured up in the Museum of

---

<sup>24</sup> Theobald, *Double Falsehood*, sigs. A5r-v.

<sup>25</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 21.

<sup>26</sup> John Cadwalader, ‘Theobald’s Alleged Shakespeare Manuscript’, *Modern Language Notes*, 55.2 (1940), 108-109, pp. 108-109.

<sup>27</sup> Harriet C. Frazier, *A Babble of Ancestral Voices: Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Theobald* (Mouton: The Hague, 1974), p. 27.

Covent-Garden Playhouse'; he obviously is 'very tempt[ed] to conclude that this reference' is to one of Theobald's manuscripts. If it is, he argues, the manuscript would have been destroyed in a theatre fire that erupted on 19 September 1808.<sup>28</sup>

However, our investigation must not stop at a theatre fire; there still remains a significant time period between 1770 and 1808 to have allowed interested Shakespeare scholars to view the manuscript. Tiffany Stern rightly assert that

had a Shakespeare manuscript resided in Covent Garden from before the 1770s to 1808 it is barely conceivable that the great editors preparing major Shakespeare editions during that period, who include Malone, Steevens, Johnson, and Capell, would not have gone to see it, or that the great actor, bardolator, and book-collector David Garrick would not have devoted his life to acquiring it.<sup>29</sup>

Stern makes an equally (if not more) significant point regarding Theobald's manuscripts by comparing Theobald's *Double Falsehood* controversy to one of his much earlier controversies. In 1715, Theobald was accused of plagiarising *The Perfidious Brother* from the watchmaker Henry Mestayer (to be discussed in the following chapter). Stern cites an advertisement in the *Daily Courant* (14 April 1716), broadcasting that the original manuscript handed to Theobald by Mestayer was left at a tavern so people could make comparisons between the two versions, and thus, judge if Theobald did in fact plagiarise the play. Clearly, Theobald dealt with such accusations by 'reveal[ing] his sources', however, he 'never placed his Shakespeare manuscript(s) on public display'.<sup>30</sup>

The closest we could ever get to a comprehensive account of the play's authorship is in the second issue of *Double Falsehood* (1728). Theobald writes:

I had once design'd a *Dissertation* to prove this Play to be of *Shakespeare's* Writing, from some of its remarkable Peculiarities in the *Language*, and Nature of the *Thoughts*: but as I could not be sure

---

<sup>28</sup> Hammond, *DF*, pp. 113, 122-123.

<sup>29</sup> Tiffany Stern, "'Whether one did Contrive, the Other Write, / Or one Fram'd the Plot, the Other did Indite": Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers', in *Quest*, 115-130, p. 127.

<sup>30</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 577.

but that the Play might be attack'd, I found it advisable, upon second, Consideration, to reserve *that* Part to my *Defence*. That Danger, I think, is now over; so I must look out for a better Occasion. I am honour'd with so many powerful Sollicitations, pressing Me to the Prosecution of an Attempt, which I have begun with some little Success, of *restoring* Shakespeare from the numerous Corruptions of his Text: that I can neither in Gratitude, nor good Manners, longer resist them. I therefore think it not amiss here to promise, that, tho' *private Property* should so far stand in my Way, as to prevent me from putting out an *Edition of Shakespeare*, yet, some Way or other, if I live, the Publick shall receive from my Hand his *whole* Works corrected, with my best Care and Ability. This may furnish an Occasion for speaking more at large concerning the present *Play*: For which Reason I shall now drop it for another Subject.<sup>31</sup>

However, this was far from the case. First, Theobald's edition of Shakespeare's *Works* (1733) only mentions *Double Falsehood* in a textual note to a line in *1 Henry VI*, where he described it as 'a *posthumous* Play of our Author's which I brought upon the Stage'.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, Edmund G. C. King maintains that aside from a letter in *Mist's Weekly Journal* written in defence of an attack by Alexander Pope in *Peri Bathos*, "Theobald never published anything like this "dissertation".<sup>33</sup> John Freehafer (1969) who praised Theobald for his success 'in defending the play against direct attack', and in how he 'reserved the right to publish a Bentleyan "*Dissertation*" against anyone who might attack [it]',<sup>34</sup> does not mention to his readers that Theobald, in fact, never published the dissertation. Moreover, while Hammond finds it 'enigmatic that Theobald did not produce the "Dissertation"',<sup>35</sup> he however does not venture to propose the

---

<sup>31</sup> Theobald, *Double Falshood*, sig. A5v.

<sup>32</sup> William Shakespeare, *The Works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; with Notes, Explanatory, and Critical*, ed. by Lewis Theobald (London, 1733), vol. 4, pp. 187-188.

<sup>33</sup> Edmund G. C. King, 'Cardenio and the Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Canon', in *Quest*, 81-94, p. 82.

<sup>34</sup> Freehafer, p. 511.

<sup>35</sup> Brean Hammond, 'After Arden', in *Quest*, 62-78, p. 74.

possible reasons behind this, neither in his edition,<sup>36</sup> nor in any of his post Arden publications. With all of that in mind, the way Theobald dealt with presenting the play to the public, and his vague account regarding his alleged Shakespeare manuscripts, both represent his weakest point in the controversy, and indeed gives us every reason to disbelieve his claims.

## 2. The Case for Fletcher as the (Sole?) Author of *Cardenio*

So far, we have discussed Theobald's unconvincing claims for adapting an original Shakespeare play. However, there is some external evidence, which although it does not confirm Theobald's claims, nevertheless suggests that there might be *some* truth behind them. The first involves records from the court's treasurer's accounts of payments made to John Heminges for two King's Men performances in 1613 under the title 'Cardenno' and 'Cardenna'.<sup>37</sup> The second involves the 1653 entry made by the publisher Humphrey Moseley in the Stationers' Register for 'The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare'.<sup>38</sup> It was not until 1780 that George Steevens linked the 'Cardenna' and 'Cardenno' records to *The History of Cardenio* entry. Isaac Reed followed in 1782 by 'suggest[ing] that Theobald's *Double Falsehood* may in fact be *The History of Cardenio*'.<sup>39</sup> These two conclusions mark the emergence of the Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition, and unfortunately they have influenced considerably the views of modern scholars in accepting the possibility of Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*.<sup>40</sup> In other words, these conclusions have been taken for granted, as they have been used to confirm (rather than question) Shakespeare's involvement in the source play. Having said that, we must explore the many ways in which Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare, appears to be the dramatist connected to the records of *Cardenna/Cardenno*

---

<sup>36</sup> Hammond, *DF*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>37</sup> *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber*, Bodleian MS Rawl A 239, sigs. 47r-47v, as cited in Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 555-557.

<sup>38</sup> Greg, *Bibliography*, I, p. 61

<sup>39</sup> Ivan Lupić emphasizes Steevens's role in introducing the Moseley entry, pointing out that it was not introduced by Malone as suggested by Freehafer (1969), who was later followed by Hammond (2010); both, according to Lupić, provide no authoritative sources for their assertions. See Lupić, 'Malone's *Double Falsehood*', pp. 98-99.

<sup>40</sup> To name but a few, see for instance Freehafer, p. 501; Graham, 'The *Cardenio-Double Falsehood* Problem', p. 269; and Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *DF*', p. 81.

(1613) and *The History of Cardenio* entry (1653), and also, to *Double Falsehood* (1727-8).

Since the publication of *Double Falsehood* in 1728, not everyone shared Theobald's enthusiasm for the play as the work of Shakespeare. In fact, audiences proposed that the play possibly belongs to Fletcher instead, even before Steevens introduced the 1653 Stationers' Register entry. In his preface to the first edition of *Double Falsehood*, which shows no indication that he was aware of the 1653 entry, Theobald explained that some commentators believed that the play belonged more to Fletcher, as its 'colouring, diction and characters [came] nearer to the style and manner of Fletcher'.<sup>41</sup> While the preface strictly shows that Theobald regarded the play as purely Shakespeare's, he later acknowledged Fletcher as a collaborator.<sup>42</sup> Modern scholarship has now moved away from the either/or approach to this debate (which either embraces *Double Falsehood* as Shakespeare's lost play,<sup>43</sup> or dismisses Theobald as a forger<sup>44</sup>), to one that identifies Fletcher as its dominant author. For instance, there are a number of factors regarding the Moseley entry that point to Fletcher, rather to Shakespeare, as the prime—if not the sole—author of *Cardenio*. The first involves the way the entry was punctuated, with a full stop after 'Mr. Fletcher', followed by '& Shakespeare', which according to John Freehafer, possibly indicates that Shakespeare's name 'was added as an afterthought'. Freehafer—who is sympathetic to claims for the Shakespearean authorship of the play—adds that Moseley, being the publisher of Fletcher, and not Shakespeare, has entered the play 'in alphabetical order of authorship', which indicates 'that he might have preferred to have a play by Fletcher alone'.<sup>45</sup>

However, Robert F. Fleissner contends that this argument is not necessarily 'very plausible'. He explains that scholars such as Freehafer, as well

---

<sup>41</sup> Theobald, *Double Falshood*, sig. A5v.

<sup>42</sup> Theobald, *Double Falshood*, 2nd issue, sig. A5v.

<sup>43</sup> See for instance, Brean Hammond, 'Theobald's *Double Falsehood*: "An Agreeable Cheat?"' *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 2-3.

<sup>44</sup> See for instance, Rudolph Schevill, 'Theobald's *Double Falsehood*?' *Modern Philology*, 9.2 (1911), 269-285; and Frazier, *A Babble of Ancestral Voices* (1974).

<sup>45</sup> Freehafer, p. 508. Also, see Harold G. Metz, *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare: The Reign of Edward III, Sir Thomas More, The History of Cardenio, The Two Noble Kinsmen* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989), p. 227.

as Harold G. Metz, underestimate specifics regarding Moseley's entry as being caused by its 'overall hurried effect'. Consequently they judged its

anomalous, cramped spacing, omission, abbreviation, and the wild end-stop, as amounting to no more than a sporadic little, incidental fact, one hardly diminishing Shakespeare's claims to partial authorship.

Fleissner thus concludes that Moseley's entry was initially an attribution to Fletcher, and that Shakespeare's name was nothing more than an afterthought; it merely 'constitute[s] a belated interpolation'.<sup>46</sup> Tiffany Stern reiterates Freehafer's sentiments, though without much sympathy for the Shakespeare authorship hypothesis. She also notes that Moseley lists his plays in alphabetical order with *The History of Cardenio* listed under "'F" for Fletcher', and arguing that 'it is Fletcher's authorship that is recorded as primary'. She further suggests that Moseley, being a publisher of Fletcher, was perhaps hoping to add *Cardenio* to his Beaumont and Fletcher collection if there ever was an opportunity to reprint it.<sup>47</sup>

There seems to be one further reason to question whether Shakespeare was, in any way, ever involved in penning *Cardenio*. To elaborate, Stern addresses 'the untrustworthy nature' of the other plays ascribed to Shakespeare in Moseley's 1653 Stationers' register entries, which, she asserts, is 'less frequently addressed in the context of the *Cardenio* question'. She points out that in his entry to *The Merry Devill of Edmonton* (1608), for example, Moseley ascribed the play to Shakespeare though it was clearly not, nor was it described as such in his lifetime. Moseley's ascription of 'Henry ye. First, & Hen: ye 2d', to 'Shakespeare, & Davenport', similarly portrays his attributions as doubtful. Moreover, his 1660 entry further exposes his attributions to Shakespeare as questionable, as he also ascribes the following non-Shakespearean plays to Shakespeare: *The History of King Stephen, Duke Humphrey. a Tragedy*, and *Iphis & Iantha, Or a marriage without a man. A Comedy*. Stern suggests that 'Moseley seems to take liberties with some names, particularly those of authors who could be published lucratively in quartos or *en masse* in large folios'. She adds that

---

<sup>46</sup> Robert F. Fleissner, 'The Likely Misascription of *Cardenio* (and Thereby *Double Falsehood*) in Part to Shakespeare', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97 (1996), 217-230, p. 219.

<sup>47</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 557.

Moseley was also unreliable when it came to other playwrights as well, citing Aston Cokain who questions Moseley's mislabelling of plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 Folio:

In the large book of Playes you late did print  
(In *Beaumonts* and in *Fletchers* name) why in't  
Did you not justice? give to each his due?  
For *Beaumont* (of those many) writ in few:  
And *Massinger* in other few; the Main  
Being sole Issues of sweet *Fletchers* brain.<sup>48</sup>

Thus, it remains a matter of serious concern that scholars in favour of Shakespeare's authorship of *Double Falsehood* would overlook such significant problems with Moseley's Shakespeare attributions, which on their own are capable of casting doubt on the only available early modern evidence that attaches Shakespeare to *Cardenio*. In the introduction to the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, for example, Hammond describes Moseley as 'often considered to be the chief publisher of the fine literature of his era'.<sup>49</sup> Gary Taylor, on the other hand, admits that 'Moseley and/or his source might well have been wrong about what Shakespeare wrote' (citing the exact instances noted by Stern); he, however, minimizes the significance of Moseley's misattributions and their potential implications by suggesting that 'premeditated fraud seem[ed] unlikely'.<sup>50</sup>

Besides Moseley's unreliability, one might wonder why he never published this *Cardenio*, especially considering that he managed to print Fletcher's lost play *The Wild-Goose Chase* in 1652. In the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher collection (published by Humphrey Moseley and Humphrey Robinson), Moseley stated that while the volume has no omissions, in this edition the readers will not only have 'all [they] could get, but all that [they] must ever expect'. Of course, that is with the exception of one play, he adds, stating that this matter he means to deal with openly:

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., pp. 557-558. See Aston Cokain, 'To Mr. Humphrey Mosley, and Mr. Humphrey Robinson', *Small Poems of Divers Sorts* (London, 1658), p. 117 (cited in Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 557-558).

<sup>49</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 9.

<sup>50</sup> Gary Taylor, 'A History of *The History of Cardenio*', in *Quest*, 11-61, p. 20.

*The Wild-Goose Chase* [...] hath beene long lost, and I feare irrecoverable; for a person of quality borrowed it from the actors many yeares since, and (by the negligence of a servant) it was never return'd; therefore now I put up this Si quis, that whosoever hereafter happily meets with it, shall be thankfully satisfied if he please to send it home.<sup>51</sup>

In 1652, however, the play, which was only 'temporarily unavailable',<sup>52</sup> was 'retriv'd [...] by a person of honour', and published 'as it hath been acted with singular applause at the Black-Friars'.<sup>53</sup> In this case, one must consider the possible reasons why Moseley never published *Cardenio*. Even if Shakespeare's authorship in the Moseley entry was doubtful, and Fletcher's was—as mentioned previously—recorded as primary, why didn't Moseley seize the opportunity and publish this never published before Fletcher play? Perhaps he realized that whatever text he had was heavily adapted, and clearly not based on an authorial document; this is possibly why he never mentions the play again.

Yet, even when considering the unreliability of Moseley's attributions and the fact that he never followed through with the publication of the play, Fletcher's hand can still be discerned in Theobald's *Double Falsehood*. By the beginning of the twentieth century, attitudes towards division of authorship in the play started to recognize much more of Fletcher than there proved to be of Shakespeare. Scholars certainly started to reconsider the authorship controversy; some concluded that Fletcher's hand appears more vividly in the play, with Shakespeare appearing less prominently. Theobald thus emerges, perhaps, as Fletcher's posthumous collaborator. Gamaliel Bradford (1910), for instance, noted Theobald's predominance in the first two acts, as well as act III, scene i and ii. Beneath all his alterations, Bradford identified 'another touch, firm, vivid, masculine, high-wrought, imaginative' which either stands out as an Elizabethan's hand, 'or a most skilful imitation'. He, moreover, recognizes

---

<sup>51</sup> Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London: Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1647), sig. A4r.

<sup>52</sup> Eugene M. Waith ed., William Shakespeare, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, London), p. 4.

<sup>53</sup> Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Wild Goose Chase, a Comedy* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1652).

another Elizabethan hand from III.iii onwards, which he argues, must not be mistaken for anyone's other than Fletcher's, whose shares must also have undergone much revision by Theobald.<sup>54</sup> E. H. C. Oliphant (1927) agrees with Bradford's division of the play between Shakespeare and Fletcher, and offers an even more specific division of authorship between the two collaborators and their adapter. Though he acknowledges Theobald's clear presence throughout the entire play, he asserts that Shakespeare's shares seem to have suffered major revision when compared to Fletcher's, which still appear to have retained some of their original language.<sup>55</sup> More recently, Kenneth Muir (1997) echoed this observation, arguing that while 'Shakespeare's scenes were vandalized', those belonging to Fletcher, 'were left relatively undamaged'; furthermore, the division of authorship Muir presents is in agreement with previous scholarship.<sup>56</sup> More specifically, elements such as 'the metre, the collocation of certain words, and the stylistic mannerisms of large parts of the play', according to Stephan Kukowski (1990), were 'distinctively Fletcherian'.<sup>57</sup>

Research published subsequent to the Arden edition is increasingly revealing an even stronger Fletcherian presence in the play. In a recent study, Gary Taylor (2012) has argued in favour of Fletcher's strong presence in *Double Falsehood*, by laying out some verbal/structural parallels between 4.2 (identified by scholars as belonging to Fletcher) and a scene in Fletcher's *The Chances*. In this scene, Julio and two other men overhear Violante singing a song accompanied by lute music, as signified by the stage direction '*Lute sounds within*'. Interestingly, Taylor points out that this phrase 'appears nowhere else in English drama, or English literature, except Fletcher's *The Chances* (2.2.13)'. He notes that this scene is very similar to 4.2 in *Double Falsehood* in that they both have: a deserted setting; offstage lute music interrupting the scene; and questions about the source of the music. Taylor also maintains that both scenes have 'conjectures about supernatural agency' concluding that the location was

---

<sup>54</sup> Bradford, 'The History of Cardenio', pp. 53-55.

<sup>55</sup> E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to Determine Their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), pp. 291-299.

<sup>56</sup> Muir, 'Cervantes, Cardenio and Theobald', p. 150.

<sup>57</sup> Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *DF*', p. 89.

'haunted' by 'an angel's voice' in *The Chances*, and a 'spirit' in *Double Falsehood*.<sup>58</sup> In a recent study that aims to identify the 1602 Shakespeare additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, Brian Vickers presents examples where 'a series of matching interlinked collocations' cluster in two scenes of two different works, arguing that such parallelism 'far exceeds the bounds of coincidence'.<sup>59</sup> This statement certainly applies to the examples presented by Taylor, and might thus suggest an even stronger form of parallelism when compared to single parallel instances. The following table presents parallels as introduced by Taylor (cited from the original sources to allow for more extended parallels).

**Table 1.**

<i>Double Falsehood (4.2)</i>	<i>The Chances (2.2)</i>
'Lute sounds within' (4.2, p. 47)	'Lute sounds within' (2.2.13)
'Sings within' (4.2, p. 47)	'Sings within a little' (2.2.24)
'Sings within' (4.2, p. 48)	'Sing again' (2.2.32)
'Ha! Hark, a sound from heav'n! Do you hear nothing?' (4.2, p. 47)	'Harke' (2.2.14) 'Doest not hear a Lute? Agen?' (2.2.16)
'Here's no inhabitant' (4.2, p. 47)	'There's no creature' (2.2.19)

One cannot deny that such parallels are very much worth considering, as they fit extremely well within the Fletcher authorship hypothesis. In fact, it seems possible that these verbal parallels are not only an indication that an earlier document lies beneath Theobald's play, but that Fletcher can legitimately be considered as one of its authors.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 45. To establish the authenticity of this scene and to dismiss the possibility that Theobald imitated Fletcher, Taylor attempts to locate parallels in a Fletcher play that was not available to Theobald. Fletcher's and Massinger's *Sir John van Olden Barnavelte* (1619) 'satisfies these criteria', as it 'remained unpublished until 1883'. Interestingly, Taylor was able to locate some very distinctive parallels; see pp. 46-47.

<sup>59</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 21.

<sup>60</sup> These observations clearly go in hand with the general theory—to be discussed shortly—that Thomas Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612) is *Double Falsehood's* most immediate source. For example, at the corresponding point of the translation, and similar to how the scene was laid out in the play, two characters—Sancho and his companion—overheard 'the sound of a voice' (*DQ*, p. 262). Similar to the listeners in *Double Falsehood* who were in 'wild and solitary Places' (*DF*, p. 47), in the translation, 'the solitarines of the place' and '[the] voice' struck both wonder and delight in the minds of the listeners (*DQ*, p. 263). Moreover, whereas in the play, Julio and another gentlemen describe it as 'a strange Place to hear Musick in', and that it has 'no Inhabitant' (*DF*, p. 47), in Shelton's translation, Sancho and his friend 'esteemed that not to be a place

In an equally recent study, Macdonald P. Jackson (2012)—whose work builds on *Double Falsehood's* allocations of authorship as presented by E. H. C. Oliphant—demonstrates that there are more links to *Double Falsehood* in Fletcher's non-Shakespearean collaborations and his sole-authored plays, than there are links to Shakespeare. The strongest parallels Jackson presents interestingly stand in agreement with previous arguments suggesting the possibility of Fletcher being the sole author of Theobald's source play. For instance, Jackson notes that the phrase 'o' my conscience', which occurs 'in the putatively Fletcher based 3.3', was never used by Shakespeare or Theobald, but occurs twice in *Henry VIII*, at 2.1.50 and 3.1.30 (both considered to be Fletcher scenes); the phrase also occurs in *Two Noble Kinsmen* at 2.4.12, also regarded as a Fletcher scene. Jackson moreover points out that the phrase 'Stand off' (*DF* 4.2, p. 48) 'appears thirty times in plays of the extended Fletcher canon (including once in a Fletcher scene of *Two Noble Kinsmen*) but never in a Shakespeare play'.<sup>61</sup> In fact, we can locate a further connection in the repetition of the phrase: while *Double Falsehood* uses it consecutively three times in the same line (4.2, p. 48), *The Beggar's Bush* uses it consecutively twice in (3.4.120), a scene that scholars assign to Fletcher.<sup>62</sup> A further parallel is the phrase 'all the miseries' (*DF* 4.2, p. 50), which Jackson argues, occurs seven times in Fletcher's works and only once in Shakespeare's. He also shows that the phrase 'as I have a soul' (*DF* 5.1, p. 52) which occurs in what is presumed to be a 'Fletcher revised by Theobald' scene, was used ten times in Fletcher's unaided plays and his non-Shakespearean collaborations; the phrase occurs once in *Henry VIII* at 4.1.44 and twice in *Two Noble Kinsmen* at 2.2.217 and 4.2.143, all of which are considered to be Fletcher scenes. However, Jackson shows that Shakespeare only uses the phrase once in *Hamlet*.<sup>63</sup>

---

wherein any so good a Musitian might make his abode' (*DQ*, p. 262). Of course, all of this supports the hypothesis that this translation either served as the source for Theobald when he produced *Double Falsehood*, or as a source for the play upon which it was based.

<sup>61</sup> MacDonald P. Jackson, 'Looking for Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood: Stylistic Evidence*', in *Quest*, 133-161, pp. 142, 145.

<sup>62</sup> See Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 260; Cyrus Hoy, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon', *Studies in Bibliography* (III) 11 (1958), 85-106, p. 87.

<sup>63</sup> Jackson, 'Stylistic Evidence', pp. 145, 142.

There is one final piece of evidence in support of Fletcher's involvement in the *Cardenio/Double Falsehood* controversy. Fletcher, argues Tiffany Stern, 'was a keen Spanish reader who regularly looked to Spain for his sources', which, of the two supposed collaborators, makes him 'a likely prospect':

The plots of at least ten of his plays have Spanish origins, and some descend from novellas by Cervantes, including *Love's Pilgrimage* (1614), *The Chances* (1615), and *The Coxcomb* (1609-13). The "Cardenio" story from Cervantes' *Don Quixote* is likely to have appealed to him, not least because his friend and frequent coauthor Francis Beaumont had written a parody of *Don Quixote*, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (performed 1607, published 1613).<sup>64</sup>

Fletcher, indeed, was more likely to have turned to Cervantes, for not only were the plots of the above works based on Spanish sources (especially on Cervantes), but most of them were performed within the same years (1609-1615). Stern adds that *Cardenio*, 'if it descends from Cervantes's *Don Quixote* (as its title suggests), mimics the particular plotting habits [Fletcher] displays elsewhere'. She extends her argument, moreover, to suggest that Fletcher was 'the more obviously plot-reliant of the two', and that he most likely provided the plot for *Cardenio* (as with his other collaborations with Shakespeare), whereas the dialogue was written either by Shakespeare alone, or by Shakespeare and Fletcher.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, in view of our previous discussion, there seems to be very little reason to avoid the obvious conclusion that, of the two dramatists, Fletcher certainly proved to have a much more evident presence in *Double Falsehood* than his senior alleged collaborator. On the contrary, external evidence testifying to Shakespeare's involvement in *Cardenio* proves to be very questionable, which ultimately strengthens (yet not necessarily validates) the case for Fletcher's more obvious involvement in the play.

---

<sup>64</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 558.

<sup>65</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', p. 121.

### 3. Shelton's Translation of *Don Quixote* (1612)

*Double Falsehood* is a dramatization of the Cardenio episode in Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. In 1612, Thomas Shelton published his translation of *Don Quixote*; this appears to be the play's most immediate source as there is a demonstrable connection between the two. In 1916, Walter Graham presented a list of distinctive parallels between Shelton's translation and *Double Falsehood*, and this according to him, is evidence that the author(s) of the play 'went directly to this early translation of Cervantes'. The following are a few examples:

**Table 2.**

Shelton	Theobald
'this bodie, since it is not Lucinda, can be no humane creature, but a diuine'. ( <i>DQ</i> , p. 283)	'Since she is not <i>Leonora</i> , she is heav'nly'. ( <i>DF</i> , 4.2, p. 49)
'Ladie, whatsoeuer you be, stay and feare nothing'. ( <i>DQ</i> , p. 284)	'Stay, Lady, stay: Can it be possible, That you are <i>Violante</i> ?' ( <i>DF</i> , 4.2, p. 50)
'is it possible that you are named Dorotea?' ( <i>DQ</i> , p. 291)	
'For Sir I know you verie well'. ( <i>DQ</i> , 270)	' <i>Leon</i> . Know you <i>Julio</i> , Sir? <i>Mess</i> . Yes, very well; and love him too, as well'. ( <i>DF</i> , 2.4, pp. 23-24)

Graham explains that these passages from *Double Falsehood* not only follow Shelton's translation, but also that some of them 'are little more than paraphrases of the original'. Such parallelism is most evident in Graham's following example, which is an excerpt from the scene where Dorotea (in Shelton's translation) and Violante (in *Double Falsehood*) flee to the Sierra Morena:

How much more gratefull companions will these cragges and thickets proue to my designes, by affording me leisure to communicate my mishaps to heauen with plaints; then that if any mortall man liuing,

since there is none vpon earth from whom may be expected counsell  
in doubts, ease in complaints, or in harmes remedie? (*DQ*, p. 282)

The following is an excerpt from Theobald containing many verbal parallels:

How much more grateful are these craggy Mountains,  
And these wild Trees, than things of nobler Natures;  
For These receive my Plaints, and mourn again  
In many Echoes to Me. All good People  
Are faln asleep for ever. None are left,  
That have the Sense, and Touch of Tenderness  
For Virtue's sake: No, scarce their Memory:  
From whom I may expect Counsel in Fears,  
Ease to Complainings or Redress of Wrongs. (*DF*, 4.2, p. 48)<sup>66</sup>

Evidently, both excerpts 'are highly coincidental'<sup>67</sup> as they contain 'similar phrasing'.<sup>68</sup>

The following table will highlight the verbal parallels between the passages in Shelton and Theobald cited above:

**Table 3.**

	<b>Shelton</b>	<b>Theobald</b>
<b>Identical</b>	How much more gratefull	How much more grateful
<b>Almost identical</b>	Cragges from whom may be expected counsell in doubts ease in complaints	craggy From whom I may expect Counsel in Fears Ease to Complainings
<b>Closely related</b>	none vpon earth Communicate [...] with Plaints	None are left receive my Plaints

<sup>66</sup> Graham, 'The *Cardenio-Double Falsehood* Problem', pp. 271-273; because Graham uses a modern reprint of Shelton's translation, the passages from Shelton cited above are taken directly from Thomas Shelton, trans., Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The History of the Valorous and Wittie Knight-Errant, Don-Quixote of the Mancha* (London, 1612).

<sup>67</sup> Angel-Luis Pujante, 'Double Falsehood and the Verbal Parallels with Shelton's Don Quixote', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 95-105, p. 97.

<sup>68</sup> Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 170-171.

---

<b>Remotely related</b>	if any mortall man liuing,	All good people Are faln asleep for ever
-------------------------	----------------------------	---

---

Taking a closer look at parallels from the first two categories, one cannot help but notice identical words and phrases, demonstrating a number of instances where *Double Falsehood* evidently duplicates the language of Shelton's translation. This example is similar to the parallels discussed earlier between Fletcher's *The Chances* (2.2) and *Double Falsehood* (4.2); here, the parallel instances also cluster in two scenes of two different works, which according to Vickers, 'far exceeds the bounds of coincidence'.<sup>69</sup> Searching on the online digitized databases *Literature Online* (LION) or *Early English Books Online* (EEBO) for the phrases mentioned above demonstrates whether or not such duplications are of any value to us, as their frequency, as opposed to their infrequency, can possibly tell us something about the sources of *Double Falsehood*. Indeed, this is especially true for the phrase 'How much more grateful', which is identical in both works. A simple search for the phrase on LION from works that were published between 1612 and 1728 would, remarkably, only generate one additional instance in which the phrase was used by a writer other than Theobald. This instance occurs in a letter by John Howe published in 1680: 'how much more grateful an Inhabitant that Charity is'.<sup>70</sup> However, the parallel found in Shelton is much more telling given that it is a rare collocation that occurs in a

---

<sup>69</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 21. The Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, as will be shown in Chapter 4, mainly aims to highlight parallels to Shakespeare, neglecting to emphasize any parallels to Theobald's works. The same is true for parallels to Shelton's translation, particularly the ones found in the last example presented by Graham. Indeed, in 4.2.38-39, Hammond relates these lines to *As You Like It* and *Cymbeline*:

The lines call to mind the sentiments of Duke Senior in *AYL* 2.1.3-4: 'Are not those woods / More free from peril than the envious court?' Taking fuller account of the dramatic situation, the moralizing speech of Belarius in *Cym* 3.3.21-6 may be closer. Leading the princes on their 'mountain sport', he comments, 'O, this life / Is nobler than attending for a check: / Richer than doing nothing for a robe, / Prouder than rustling in unpaid-for silk: / Such gain the cap of him that makes him fine, / yet keeps his book uncross'd: no life to ours'. (Hammond, *DF*, p. 273)

Clearly, the parallels to Shelton's translation are much stronger, thus, Hammond fails to set this passage against its more obvious source.

<sup>70</sup> John Howe, *A letter written out of the country [...] before the Lord Mayor* (London, 1680), p. 48.

work from which *Double Falsehood* is clearly derived, as opposed to its other occurrence in a work that is unrelated to the play.

In 1969, John Freehafer provided a few more parallels to Shelton's translation. His main argument, however, is that '*Cardenio* probably was even more heavily indebted than *Double Falsehood* to the 1612 translation'. The most obvious parallel is the phrase 'The History of Cardenio' (*DQ*, p. 264), which he explains, is the exact title that appears on the 1653 Moseley entry. Freehafer suggests, moreover, that Julio in *Double Falsehood* must have been named Cardenio in the 1613 play, arguing that 'the chief characters in *Cardenio* must have retained their Cervantic names' given that some of the minor characters in *Double Falsehood* seem to derive their names from Shelton: for instance, he illustrates that the Master of the Flocks in *Double Falsehood* seems to derive from Shelton's 'Master' (*DQ*, p. 299), while Roderick 'may derive from a marginal note to Shelton' (*DQ*, p. 267). Freehafer also presents a parallel between Shelton's translation and *Double Falsehood*: Shelton's 'thousand oaths and promises' (*DQ*, p. 222) and Theobald's 'the Interchange / Of thousand precious Vows' (*DF*, 1.2, p. 7).<sup>71</sup> In 1998, Angel-Luis Pujante presented a more comprehensive discussion, adding thirteen additional close parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Shelton's translation, whose number, he argues, 'establishes conclusively [the latter] as a proximate source: so proximate that it appears to have been at the writer's elbow in the course of the writing'. It shall suffice for the current discussion to list only four of these parallels:

**Table 4.**

Shelton	Theobald
'All the house was in a tumult for this sudden amazement of Lucinda'. ( <i>DQ</i> , p. 248)	' <i>Don Bernard</i> , this wild Tumult soon will cease'. ( <i>DF</i> , 3.2, p. 32)
'And, touching his dwelling or place of abode, he said that he had none other than that where the night overtook	' <i>Mast</i> . Where lies He? 1 <i>Shep</i> . Ev'n where the Night o'ertakes him'. ( <i>DF</i> , 4.1, p. 39)

<sup>71</sup> Freehafer, pp. 502, 507.

---

him'. (*DQ*, p. 193)

---

'for when he is taken with this fit of madness'. (*DQ*, p. 194)

'He seems much disturb'd: I believe the mad Fit is upon him.

I fear, his Fit is returning. Take heed of all hands'. (*DF*, 4.1, pp. 40, 42)

---

'almost two days in the most solitary places of this mountain'. (*DQ*, pp. 192-3)

'These wild and solitary Places, Sir, But feed your Pain'. (*DF*, 4.2, p. 47)<sup>72</sup>

---

The problem with Pujante's conclusion, and also Graham's and Freehafer's, is that they all seem to agree that Shelton's translation mainly provided a source for *Cardenio* more than it did for *Double Falsehood*.<sup>73</sup> However, there are a few reasons to suggest that Theobald used the same translation when he was working on his play. For instance, Theobald's *The Happy Captive* (1741) is similar to *Double Falsehood* in that it is based on 'a Novel in Cervantes's *Don Quixote*',<sup>74</sup> and thus, might have possibly been based on Shelton's translation. In the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, Hammond argues that Theobald is less likely to have been responsible for the verbal parallels between the play and Shelton's translation as the sale catalogue of his library includes Spanish versions of *Don Quixote*, yet not Shelton's translation.<sup>75</sup> However, Stern emphasizes that 'a catalogue of a sale' is not 'a catalogue of a library', and thus 'lacks other books Theobald will have owned, including *Double Falsehood* and his other plays'.<sup>76</sup> She moreover adds that Shelton's translation 'was readily available to Theobald, having been lavishly reprinted in four volumes in 1725'.<sup>77</sup> Therefore, that Shelton's translation could have been the immediate source for *Double Falsehood* (rather than for *Cardenio*) is a possibility we must not dismiss.

---

<sup>72</sup> Pujante, 'Verbal Parallels', pp. 104, 102.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>74</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The Happy Captive* (London, 1741), sig. A4r.

<sup>75</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 81.

<sup>76</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 582.

<sup>77</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', p. 124.

#### 4. Conclusion

This chapter began by addressing the problems associated with Theobald's preface to *Double Falsehood*, particularly focusing on Theobald's account regarding his alleged Shakespeare manuscripts. There are a number of factors that substantially weaken Theobald's argument: (1) describing his role as an *editor* rather than *adapter*; (2) the ambiguity over the number of manuscripts he claimed to have had in his possession; (3) his secrecy regarding important names (i.e. the 'Great Judges', the 'Noble Person', and those who sold/supplied him with the manuscripts); (4) the absence of evidence that anyone has ever seen any of his manuscripts; and (5) his failure to meet his promise of publishing more about the play in his Shakespeare's *Works* (1733), including the "dissertation" in which he promised to prove that the play belongs to Shakespeare. Yet, regardless of these factors, our discussion has aimed to present evidence suggesting that there might be *some* truth behind Theobald's claims. The first part of this discussion has attempted to confirm a possible relationship between Fletcher and both *Cardenio* and *Double Falsehood*. It has done so by offering a close investigation of the external evidence that might probably be related to this play, as well as internal evidence in *Double Falsehood* itself. It has shown a very plausible (though not certain) connection to Fletcher, and an extremely less likely one to Shakespeare. The second part has likewise highlighted some very distinctive verbal parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612), concluding that it is the play's most immediate source. Having established that there are evidences for Fletcher's involvement in *Cardenio* and for Shelton's hand in *Double Falsehood*, the following chapter explores in more detail Theobald's role in the authorship of the play.

## CHAPTER 2

# Lewis Theobald and the Authorship of *Double Falsehood*

---

There are many reasons why we must question Theobald's claims for adapting an allegedly original Shakespeare play when he presented *Double Falsehood* to the public in the eighteenth century. Having examined the controversy itself in the previous chapter, this chapter will explore some of the less-discussed sides of Theobald's career. This chapter aims to question Theobald's reliability, for example, by highlighting a few incidents in his career when he was accused of plagiarism. It will also explore his reputation as a Shakespeare imitator, which thus presents the possibility that *Double Falsehood* was the product not only of adaptation but also of imitation. Moreover, it will examine Theobald's method of adaptation in relation to Shakespeare's *Richard II*, which he adapted for the stage in 1720, and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* adapted for performance by Theobald in 1733. The purpose is to highlight the extent to which Theobald might hypothetically have altered his alleged Shakespeare manuscripts in the process of adaptation in order to produce *Double Falsehood*, and what that could say about the play's authorship—that is of course, if we suppose that Theobald did possess the Shakespeare manuscripts he claimed to have. By way of example, the discussion will explore 'rape' in *Double Falsehood* as an element of the adaptation by comparing it to its portrayal in the likely source—Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612)—as a verbal contract of marriage. The second part of this chapter will then highlight the significance of attempting to establish a relationship between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald, rather than between the play and Shakespeare and Fletcher. It will start by investigating the eighteenth-century reception of the play, focusing particularly on whether it was taken for Shakespeare's, or if it was regarded as a forgery. Moreover, this part of our discussion will review the most recent approaches to determining the authorship of *Double Falsehood* following its publication in the Arden Shakespeare series

(2010). It will investigate contributions to the debate made by Richard Proudfoot, Macdonald P. Jackson, and Gary Taylor (2012), whose approaches tend to favour claims for Shakespeare's involvement in the play. More importantly, this chapter aims to address a gap in scholarship by proposing a methodology that could identify aspects of *Double Falsehood* that are unique to Theobald, and that are definitely not present in the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher; this will be accomplished in the light of Tiffany Stern's recent criticism of approaches to the authorship of *Double Falsehood* (2011-2012), as well as that of some equally recent work by Brian Vickers who examines the problems of using stylometry in Shakespeare attribution studies (2011-2012).

The scholarly reception of *Double Falsehood* in the twentieth century supports Shakespeare's possible involvement in its root text,<sup>78</sup> and it appears to have paved the way for the publication of the play in the Arden Shakespeare series (2010). This rather bold decision played a strong role in reinitiating the debate; while it has clearly inspired a scholarly and theatrical campaign aimed at promoting the play as an adaptation of a lost work by Shakespeare, it has, to a lesser degree, inspired studies that challenge this perspective which is now a generally accepted assumption. For instance, within a year of its publication, the play was performed three times in the UK alone: the KDC production (2010) and the MokitaGrit production (2011), both at the Union Theatre, in addition to the Royal Shakespeare Company production (2011); that is not to mention the staged reading of Gary Taylor's reconstruction of the lost *Cardenio* at Shakespeare's Globe (2011). Within the same year, Tiffany Stern published her ground-breaking essay, which, as shown previously, raises some very serious issues that question the legitimacy for Shakespeare's involvement, not only in *Double Falsehood*, but also in *Cardenio* itself. In September 2012, Oxford University Press published a collection of essays in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, & the Lost Play*. Contributors to this collection mostly accept the external evidence that links Shakespeare to *Cardenio*, thus supporting—in varying degrees—the legitimacy of such a play; of course, that is

---

<sup>78</sup> Graham, 'The *Cardenio-Double Falsehood* Problem' (1916), 269-280; E. H. C. Oliphant, "'Double Falsehood': Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald", *Notes and Queries* 89 (1919), 30-32; 90 (1919), 60-62; 91 (1919): 86-88; Freehafer, 'Cardenio, by Shakespeare and Fletcher' (1969), 501-513; Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher' (1990): 81-89; Muir, 'Cervantes, Cardenio and Theobald' (1997), 141-150; A. Luis Pujante, 'Verbal Parallels' (1998), 95-105.

excluding some scholars i.e. Ivan Lupić and Tiffany Stern. In 2013, Roger Chartier published *Cardenio Between Cervantes and Shakespeare: The Story of a Lost Play*, where he discusses Shakespeare's involvement in the lost *Cardenio*. In October of the same year, Terri Bourus and Gary Taylor published *The Creation & Re-Creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, which in addition to including over a dozen essays by different scholars, also includes Taylor's creative reconstruction of the play. And just a month later, Palgrave Macmillan published *Double Falsehood* within an RSC collection that has unhelpfully merged some collaborative Shakespeare plays alongside plays of the Shakespeare Apocrypha, all under the title *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* (which is a companion to *The RSC Shakespeare: The Complete Works*).<sup>79</sup>

There is no doubt that the Arden publication has initiated a modern revival of interest in *Double Falsehood* and the lost *Cardenio*. But the most urgent problem is the widespread interest in tracing echoes for Shakespeare and Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*, an interest that is not equally extended to Theobald. Obviously taking the lead is the Arden edition of the play, which according to its editor, aims to address

the various questions raised by the state of the text, by documentary evidence bearing on the issue of authorship and by recent scholarship in the field. The commentary [Hammond argues] represents a full attempt to assess the range and scale of Shakespearean and Fletcherian allusion, as well as to gloss lexical and other difficulties.<sup>80</sup>

But publishing within a Shakespeare series a play whose authorship is contested, has placed the Arden editor in the awkward position of having repeatedly to acknowledge it as an adaptation, while simultaneously ascribing different parts of it to Shakespeare and Fletcher. In fact, Hammond acknowledges that between

---

<sup>79</sup> See Roger Chartier, *Cardenio Between Cervantes and Shakespeare: The Story of a Lost Play*, trans. by Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013); Charles Nicholl, 'Cardenio's Ghost: the Remnants of a Lost Shakespeare Play', in *Traces Remain: Essays and Explorations* (London: Penguin Books, 2011), 84-101; Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus, eds, *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, eds., *William Shakespeare & Others: Collaborative Plays* (Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2013).

<sup>80</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 148.

the original play and Theobald's adaptation, there was probably 'an intermediate version prepared in the Restoration'; thus, he refers to the play as a 'palimpsest' or 'pentimento', and 'nothing that is *straightforwardly* Shakespeare-Fletcher'.<sup>81</sup> This would mean that the editor has traced parallels to Shakespeare and Fletcher in a text that has clearly undergone more than one stage of adaptation. Therefore, the main problem with the general editorial position regarding the play's authorship lies in its partiality for Shakespeare (and often for Fletcher) when addressing the controversy. Such a partiality is evident on the cover of the edition for instance, in which the play was not attributed to any of the three candidates, be that Theobald, Fletcher, or even Shakespeare. However, the title of the publication series 'The Arden Shakespeare' certainly implies Shakespearean authorship, and this can give us a clear idea of how the Arden series intends to represent the play.<sup>82</sup> Arden's partiality for Shakespeare is also evident in a statement made by Richard Proudfoot, one of the general editors of the Arden Shakespeare, when he states that '[Hammond] is quite open to the obvious fact that there is an element of speculation', but that both of them 'believe that the balance of doubt lies in favour of its claim being authentic rather than a total fabrication'.<sup>83</sup>

Through their own interpretation of the external evidence, the editor and the general editors of the Arden Shakespeare have redefined this eighteenth-century text, neglecting to address some serious problems that have surrounded Theobald's career: namely, issues surrounding accusations of plagiarism, and his obsessive imitation of Shakespeare. But what is more problematic about the Arden approach is how the editor fails to present verbal parallels to Theobald, equal to those presented for Shakespeare and Fletcher. Unfortunately, this eighteenth-century play basically gets its claim to a Shakespeare Arden edition, not on account of the discovery of a new ancient document linked to Shakespeare for instance, but rather on the basis of very little external evidence that scholars

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>82</sup> Arden's partiality for Shakespeare is also noted in the edition's references which designates *Double Falsehood* to the 'Works by and Partly by Shakespeare' section, yet not citing it as also belonging to the works cited by Fletcher or Theobald (Hammond, *DF*, pp. 420-421).

<sup>83</sup> Mark Brown, "Shakespeare's lost play" no hoax, says expert: New evidence that *Double Falsehood* was, as 18th-century playwright Lewis Theobald claimed, based on Bard's *Cardenio*', *The Guardian*, 15 March 2010 < <http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2010/mar/15/Shakespeare-lost-play-double-falsehood> > [accessed 9 May 2012]

found to be ‘ambiguous’<sup>84</sup> and ‘questionable’.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, while the general editors assert in their preface that ‘this edition makes its own cautious case for Shakespeare’s participation in the genesis of the play’,<sup>86</sup> their overall approach however is far from the case. I have shown in Chapter 1 that there is little reason to believe that Shakespeare was ever involved in the lost *Cardenio*, and that although Fletcher appears to be the more likely candidate, his involvement is nevertheless doubted. The discussion will now turn to examining a few incidents in Theobald’s career that negatively reflect on the credibility of his claims.

### 1. Theobald and Charges of Plagiarism

In 1726, Theobald published a response to Pope’s 1725 edition of Shakespeare’s *Works. Shakespeare Restored: Or, a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of This Poet*. This volume—‘the first book-length study of Shakespeare’s texts’<sup>87</sup>—

is an extraordinary piece of detailed and strenuous critical analysis which already reflects Theobald’s qualifications for the task of Shakespearean editing: his practical knowledge of the theatre, his wide reading, his knowledge of secretary hand gained in the course of his training and employment as a lawyer, his extensive familiarity with and recall of Shakespeare’s plays themselves, and a striking critical intelligence.

In comparison to Pope’s ‘aesthetic’ editing, Theobald’s editorial decisions were essentially aimed at ‘the restoration and interpretation of the text’,<sup>88</sup> which has represented him as the more capable editor. In fact, Pope himself acknowledged some of Theobald’s emendations in the second edition of his Shakespeare’s *Works* (1728).<sup>89</sup> These emendations were eventually published in Theobald’s own edition of Shakespeare’s *Works* (1733), which according to David Erskine

---

<sup>84</sup> Macdonald P. Jackson, ‘Stylistic Evidence’, p. 133.

<sup>85</sup> Stern, ‘Forgery’, p. 558.

<sup>86</sup> Richard Proudfoot, et al, “General Editors’ Preface,” *DF*, xii-xvi, p. xvi.

<sup>87</sup> Lukas Erne, ‘Emendation and the Editorial Reconfiguration of Shakespeare’, *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, ed. by Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 300-313, p. 301.

<sup>88</sup> Marcus Walsh, *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretative Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 130, 133.

<sup>89</sup> William Shakespeare, *The Works of Shakespear. In eight volumes. Collated and corrected by the former editions, by Mr. Pope*, 2nd edn, 8 vols. (London, 1728), 8: sig. H2r.

Baker's *The Companion to the Playhouse* (1764), was 'preferred to those editions published by Pope, Warburton, and Hanmer'.<sup>90</sup> Thus, it is no surprise that most modern editions 'acknowledge the brilliance of [Theobald's] emendations'.<sup>91</sup> But regardless, we must explore other aspects of Theobald's career, namely, the various authorship controversies in which he was involved.

*Double Falsehood* was not the first authorship controversy in which Theobald was involved. In 1715, he produced and published as his own a play entitled *The Perfidious Brother*, which he was accused of plagiarizing from a watch-maker named Henry Mestayer. In a bid to clear his name from these charges, Theobald explains in his preface how he 'became indebted to [Mestayer's] Assistance', a man whom he believes 'is an utter Stranger to the Dead Languages', and one he does not even consider to be a master of English. In the following excerpt, Theobald recounts the incident with Mestayer:

he brought me the Story, (of which the Plot of this Play, with some Alterations, is form'd;) wrought up into Something design'd to be call'd Tragedy: There was what pleas'd me in general in the Tale, and Design of the Diction, and from which, I thought, no ill Distress, or Passion might be drawn. Proposals were made betwixt us, and I agreed to endeavour to make it fit for a Stage. I labour'd at it Four Months almost without Intermission; and believe I may pretend to have created it anew: For even where the Original Matter is continued, I have brought it to Light, and drawn it as from a Chaos.<sup>92</sup>

David Nokes has observed that 'Theobald's Preface indicates a sensitivity to the charge of plagiarism'.<sup>93</sup> However, current scholarship on *Double Falsehood* has not thoroughly investigated this incident, particularly in relation to what Theobald discloses in his preface. For example, where Theobald agreed to make the play fit for performance, he later seems to have abandoned this agreement.

---

<sup>90</sup> Baker, *Biographica Dramatica*, II, p. 706.

<sup>91</sup> Peter Seary, *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 2.

<sup>92</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The Perfidious Brother* (London, 1715), sigs. A2v-A3r.

<sup>93</sup> David Nokes, 'Shakespeare Crucified', in *Literary Milieux: Essays in Text and Context Presented to Howard Erskine-Hill*, ed. by David Womersley and Richard McCabe (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 91-103, p. 99.

John Churton Collins explains that according to Theobald, the changes he made to the original 'involved the complete recasting and rewriting of the piece', entitling him to produce the play 'as his own work' and thus 'take the credit of it'.<sup>94</sup> Later in his preface, Theobald insists that the version Mestayer plans to publish is identical to the one he has published, which is why he threatens to expose Mestayer's original version, and let the world judge Mestayer's 'Grammar', 'Concord' and 'English'. To avoid any future debate with Mestayer in print, Theobald adds:

As for any Complaints, or Grimace in his future Preface, I have determin'd not to think them worth an Answer. I will go no farther on this Subject, since, I hope, it will be sufficient to clear Me from the Imputation of assuming to my self what I had no Right or Title to do.<sup>95</sup>

On April 10 1716, *The Daily Courant* advertised the publication of Mestayer's version as 'the Original Copy [...] By the real Author'.<sup>96</sup> His version was published with a satirical dedication to Theobald:

The major Part of the Authors of this Age are a Company of sly, cautious Plagiaries, pilfering here and there a Thought, or a Line, and so compounding an *Olio*, which they palm on the Town for their own. But a certain *Attorney*, with whom you are intimately acquainted, has so violent a Propensity to *Stealing*, that he seizes on every Thing that comes in his Way, without giving himself the Trouble of concealing his Theft, and wonders at the Impudence of People, that dare put in their Claim to what is their own.<sup>97</sup>

Theobald kept his word and he never replied to Mestayer, nor did he ever discuss this incident anywhere in his writings. A record of the play in David Erskine

---

<sup>94</sup> John Churton Collins, 'Lewis Theobald', *The Dictionary of National Biography: 1885-1900*, vol. 56, p. 599. On the contrary, Peter Seary, who is sympathetic to Theobald's position, argues that 'although Theobald evidently proceeded in good faith, the controversy is regrettable'. Peter Seary, 'Theobald, Lewis (bap. 1688, d. 1744)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27169>> [accessed 2 Sep 2015]

<sup>95</sup> Theobald, *The Perfidious Brother*, sigs. A3r-A3v.

<sup>96</sup> *Daily Courant*, London, 10 April 1716.

<sup>97</sup> Henry Mestayer, *The Perfidious Brother*, second edition (London, 1720), sigs. A2r-A2v.

Baker's *Companion to the Playhouse* relates the incident and confirms Theobald's plagiarism of the play:

Theobald made only a few alterations in the language of the piece, and, on the strength of these few assumed to himself the merit of the whole structure. We shall certainly be credited on the present occasion, as perhaps no reader will undergo, as we have done, the fatigue of examining evidence on both sides. Impartiality, however, compels us to aver, that Mestayer might bring as fair an action against his opponent [...] Poor Tib, though unmercifully ridiculed by Pope, never appeared to us so despicable as throughout this transaction. We have seen him before only in the light of a puny critic.

“But here the fell *attorney* prowls for Prey.”<sup>98</sup>

Accordingly, comparisons of the two texts have been carefully made, resulting in an impartial verdict in Mestayer's favour.

Unfortunately, and aside from contemporary (or post Arden) scholarship, scholars in the previous century have not provided a judicious account of this controversy. For example, in *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama: 1700-1750* (1929), Allardyce Nicoll records the duplicate versions of the play, but he neither mentions the incident, nor the charges of plagiarism against Theobald.<sup>99</sup> In *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (one of the most comprehensive studies to date on Theobald), Peter Seary briefly mentions the incident. He asserts that Mestayer only presented Theobald with ‘an outline of the tragedy’, rather than the tragedy itself, thus, concluding that Theobald's ‘account seems accurate’.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, while some scholars believed in Theobald's right to regard the play as his own,<sup>101</sup> others have confused it as a collaboration with

---

<sup>98</sup> David Erskine Baker, *Biographica Dramatica, Or, a Companion to the Playhouse: Containing Historical and Critical Memoirs, and Original Anecdotes, of British and Irish Dramatic Writers*, 2 vols (London, 1764; new ed. 1782), I, p. 312.

<sup>99</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama: 1700-1750* (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 344, 359.

<sup>100</sup> Seary, *The Editing of Shakespeare*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>101</sup> Alfred Harbage, ‘Elizabethan: Restoration Palimpsest’, *The Modern Language Review*, 35:3 (1940), 287-319, p. 297.

Mestayer.<sup>102</sup> Worse still, many scholars do not even acknowledge/record Mestayer's involvement in the play whatsoever.<sup>103</sup>

Although modern scholarship has not paid close attention to this incident, there are a number of scholars who have expressed doubts regarding the play's authorship. For instance, in his attempt to determine the author of *Double Falsehood*, Walter Graham compared the play against Theobald's acknowledged works, yet he excluded *The Perfidious Brother* 'because of the uncertainty as to its authorship'.<sup>104</sup> In *A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700-1737*, William J. Burling lists eighteenth-century scholarship that presents the possibility that Theobald plagiarized it.<sup>105</sup> Moreover, while John Churton Collins argues that both versions 'are identical in plot and very often in expression', he still acknowledges the impossibility of resolving the relative honesty or dishonesty of the two authors, because Mestayer's published version succeeded Theobald's. However, that Theobald failed to follow through with his threat of publishing Mestayer's original text, according to Collins, 'is not a presumption in his favour'.<sup>106</sup> Thomas R. Lounsbury equally recognizes the limitations of investigating this incident, and also believes that the probabilities were not in favour of Theobald. He argues that the names of both the 'creator' and 'reviser' should have been acknowledged in both the staging and publication of *The Perfidious Brother*.<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, David Nokes rightly asserts that Theobald's acknowledgment of receiving Mestayer's 'Tale' and 'Design' might possibly indicate that Mestayer's published edition was similar to the manuscript

---

<sup>102</sup> Malcolm Goldstein, *Pope and the Augustan Stage* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 85.

<sup>103</sup> Edward A. Langhans, 'Three Early Eighteenth-Century Manuscript Promptbooks', *Modern Philology*, 65.2 (1967), 114-129; David Wallace, 'Bourgeois Tragedy or Sentimental Melodrama? The Significance of George Lillo's *The London Merchant*', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 25:2 (1991-1992), 123-143, p. 130; J. Michael Walton, 'Theobald and Lintott: A Footnote on Early Translations of Greek Tragedy', *Arion*, Third Series, 16:3 (2009), 103-110, p. 108.

<sup>104</sup> Graham, p. 275.

<sup>105</sup> William J. Burling, *A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700-1737* (New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1993), p. 61.

<sup>106</sup> Collins, 'Lewis Theobald', p. 599.

<sup>107</sup> Lounsbury mentions that the only reference to *The Perfidious Brother* in Pope's writings can be found in a note to the following line in the first book of *The Dunciad*:

"Now flames old Memnon, now Rodrigo burns."

Rodrigo is here the Roderick of 'The Perfidious Brother', "a play written," remarked Pope, "between T. and a watchmaker." Thomas R. Lounsbury, *The First Editors of Shakespeare (Pope and Theobald): The Story of the First Shakespearean Controversy and of the Earliest Attempt at Establishing a Critical Text of Shakespeare* (London: David Nutt, 1906), pp. 144-145.

he gave to Theobald; in this case, any ‘verbal alterations distinguishing the two versions can hardly be said to justify Theobald’s claim to have “created the play a-new”’.<sup>108</sup> But one point in Theobald’s favour regarding *The Perfidious Brother* was that there seems to have been no contemporary hostility from critics, including Pope,<sup>109</sup> which might have, from that point onwards, influenced the scholarly neglect of investigating this incident.

But after the Arden publication of *Double Falsehood*, scholars have started to express doubt regarding Theobald’s authorship of *The Perfidious Brother*. Lori Leigh, for instance, has acknowledged that the play ‘may not [...] be entirely [Theobald’s]’.<sup>110</sup> On the other hand, Tiffany Stern has fully accepted Mestayer’s report. In fact, she has argued that

unable to deny he had “borrowed” heavily from Mestayer’s text, Theobald repeatedly claimed to have disregarded all its words so that his “updating” counted as a fresh play’.<sup>111</sup>

A similar perspective was shared by Edmund G. C. King regarding Theobald’s attitude towards authorial ownership of unrevised manuscripts. King has noted a similarity between Theobald’s response to Pope’s criticism in his *Art in Sinking in Poetry* (1728) for the line ‘None but itself can be its parallel’ (*DF*, p. 25)—which Pope believed was unShakespearean, describing it as ‘*Profundity it self*<sup>112</sup>—and his reply to Mestayer’s accusations of stealing his play. Theobald responded to the former in a letter published in *Mist’s Weekly Journal* (1728), stating that ‘the line is in Shakespeare’s old copy; for I might have suppressed it’; while his response to the latter was threatening to publish his version and expose its weaknesses. King highlights the ‘commonalities between the two episodes’:

Theobald hints that he, as adapting playwright, has both the power and the obligation to ‘supress’ material that might harm Shakespeare’s reputation. In his earlier dispute with the playwright-

---

<sup>108</sup> Nokes, p. 99.

<sup>109</sup> Lounsbury, p. 145.

<sup>110</sup> Lori Leigh, “‘Tis no such killing matter”: Rape in Fletcher and Shakespeare’s *Cardenio* and in Lewis Theobald’s *Double Falsehood*, *Shakespeare*, 7:3 (2011), 284-296, p. 288.

<sup>111</sup> Stern, ‘Forgery’, p. 576.

<sup>112</sup> Pope, ‘Peri Bathous’, *Miscellanies*, p. 102.

watchmaker Mestayer over who should take credit for *The Perfidious Brother*, Theobald displayed a similar belief that unrevised dramatic manuscripts did no credit to their authors. In response to Mestayer's claims that Theobald had stolen his play, Theobald threatened to publish the original manuscript, minus Theobald's corrections, thus allowing 'the world to judge of [its] Grammar, Concord, or English'. [...] In both [episodes], Theobald reserves the right to 'create anew' or 'supress' parts of the original text, and, in the case of *The Perfidious Brother*, at least, he insinuates that publication of the 'uncorrected' document might not be in the best interests of its author's reputation.<sup>113</sup>

Furthermore, Gary Taylor—who similar to Hammond, is equally leading the new scholarly movement that aims to attribute fragments of *Double Falsehood* to Shakespeare—has neglected to acknowledge Mestayer's involvement in *The Perfidious Brother*, or even mention the controversial nature of the play's authorship.<sup>114</sup>

Because the Arden Shakespeare series aims to argue for Shakespeare's involvement in the play behind *Double Falsehood*, this edition has avoided any detailed discussion of *The Perfidious Brother* so as not to associate Theobald's name with plagiarism, or any other form of dishonesty for that matter. Due to the fact that some scholars have suspected Theobald's forgery of *Double Falsehood*, Hammond states in the introduction that it is 'necessary to record that the stigma of plagiarism, if not of forgery, does attach to his name'.<sup>115</sup> But although the introduction discusses *The Perfidious Brother* incident, it nevertheless fails to carry out a comprehensive investigation of it. It is also unfortunate that the editor—who is clearly sympathetic to Theobald—fails to engage with the critical literature on the subject. Thus, Hammond briefly states the facts and does not venture to provide any further commentary. In fact, his discussion of the play tackles matters that are unrelated to the controversy. For example, he points out

---

<sup>113</sup> King, 'Cardenio & the 18th Cent. Shakespeare Canon', p. 94.

<sup>114</sup> Taylor, 'A History', pp. 40-41; and also in Gary Taylor and Steven Wagschal, 'Reading Cervantes, or Shelton, or Phillips? The Source(s) of *Cardenio* and *Double Falsehood*', in *Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, 15-29, p. 24.

<sup>115</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 73.

that the play ‘incidentally’ has a character named Roderick, which was also used in *Double Falsehood*. Moreover, he states that ‘equally incidentally, but tellingly’, the play’s title implies a connection to Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, quoting Prospero’s lines:

My brother and thy uncle called Antonio —  
I pray thee mark me, that a brother should  
Be so perfidious. (*Tem* 1.2.66-8)

Hammond further adds that the play ‘is already heavily steeped in Shakespeare’, and that it relies on *Othello* ‘for some of its jealousy-plot elements’.<sup>116</sup>

It is not clear why the Arden editor mentions the previous points, because they only seem to stress Shakespearean connections, and this does not necessarily reflect positively on Theobald, but rather reinforces his status as a Shakespeare imitator. It should also be noted that in the textual notes, Hammond refers to *The Perfidious Brother* as ‘Theobald’s own earlier play’,<sup>117</sup> regardless of the fact that its authorship proved to be controversial. Accordingly, Hammond appears to support Theobald’s claims without clarifying the reasons behind such a conclusion. Moreover, unlike Graham (whose analysis excludes *The Perfidious Brother*), Hammond, presuming the play belongs to Theobald, has searched for parallels between *The Perfidious Brother* and *Double Falsehood*, thus locating Theobald’s evident hand in the latter; e.g. his use of the name ‘Roderick’ (p. 179), as well as parallels discussed in 1.2.115-116n, 3.2.160n, 4.1.58n, 4.2.70n, and 5.2.251n.<sup>118</sup>

In addition, Hammond mentions a similar incident with William Warburton, in which Theobald was accused again of taking credit for the work of others. Though Hammond does not inform his readers about the details behind this disagreement, he only refers to Peter Seary’s views on the matter, arguing that his ‘account of their relationship makes it abundantly clear how untruthful

---

<sup>116</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 74.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 244. It is worth mentioning, that the Eighteenth-Century Collections online database lists both editions of *The Perfidious Brother* as authored by Henry Mestayer.

<sup>118</sup> For instance, in 4.2.70n, Hammond argues that the word ‘wiles [is] commonly used by Theobald. The word occurs no fewer than five times in *Perfidious Brother* (Act 1, p. 2; ac3, pp. 24, 27, 29, 34). It occurs twice in *Orestes* (Act 5, pp. 63, 71); and in three other works by him’. It is true that Theobald uses the word five times in *The Perfidious Brother*, but at least four of them were borrowed from Mestayer as they all appear in his original version (pp. 1, 21, 26, 30).

Warburton could be'.<sup>119</sup> Readers, however, would have been interested to learn that the reason behind their disagreement was because Theobald published his preface to *The Works of Shakespeare* without 'acknowledg[ing] the magnitude of Warburton's help', which as shown by Tiffany Stern, was acknowledged by Theobald in a letter written to Warburton on January 1732.<sup>120</sup> It is even more alarming to learn that before their disagreement, Theobald wrote the following in a letter to Warburton on November 1731:

But, dear Sir, will you, at your leisure hours, think over for me upon the contents, topics, orders, &c. of this branch of my labour? You have a comprehensive memory, and a happiness of digesting the matter joined to it, which my head is often too much embarrassed to perform; let that be the excuse for my inability. But how unreasonable is it to expect this labour, when it is the only part in which I shall not be able to be just to my friends: for, to confess assistance in a *Preface* will, I am afraid, make me appear too naked.<sup>121</sup>

This letter not only reveals the extent to which Warburton seems to have helped Theobald, but it also shows that Theobald was not prepared to acknowledge Warburton's help in his preface. It remains unfortunate that Hammond should neglect to mention such details about the man responsible for introducing *Double Falsehood* to the world, details that would have obviously had a direct bearing on current perceptions of the play's authorship. Thus, the Arden editor concludes his brief discussion by insisting that '[d]espite the whiff of unscrupulousness mentioned [...] close study of his career does not suggest that Theobald was a likely forger';<sup>122</sup> yet the Arden edition does not offer readers any such study.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 74.

<sup>120</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', p. 123.

<sup>121</sup> John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (London, 1817-1858), vol. 2, pp. 621-622.

<sup>122</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 75.

<sup>123</sup> One incident that was not mentioned at all in the Arden edition was the one involving Theobald's *Posthumous Works of William Wycherley* (1728), which was published in the same year as *Double Falsehood*. Pope—who was also editing Wycherley—prepared his own edition of the writer,

matching Theobald's edition much as Theobald's *Shakespeare restored* had shadowed Pope's Shakespeare, and similarly overlaying it with a grid through which inauthenticity might be detected. The list of Contents reproduced Theobald's, but with caustic annotation indicating those items Pope considered to be forgeries.

Therefore, if Theobald proved to be dishonest about what he claimed was his own work, there is no doubt that he could also be dishonest in his claims about Shakespeare.

## 2. Lewis Theobald, 'Imitator of the immortal Shakespeare'<sup>124</sup>

Theobald's reputation as a Shakespeare imitator makes it necessary to explore whether or not *Double Falsehood* shows any traces of imitation. In fact, the eighteenth century—being 'an age [...] in which literary imitation flourished'—witnessed 'a number of sustained and professed imitations of Shakespeare'.<sup>125</sup> Shakespearean echoes in *Double Falsehood* have led some scholars to regard them as forged attempts at imitation by Theobald. For instance, in the eighteenth century Alexander Pope argued that Shakespearean echoes in the play serve as a sign of forgery, rather than being evidence of authenticity.<sup>126</sup> Edmond Malone—the name more commonly cited in the literature arguing against Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*—shared similar views. He considered such interpolations 'to be symptoms of a poorly concealed fraud'.<sup>127</sup> The same views are also held by scholars of the twentieth century. Leonard Schwartzstein (1954), for instance, presents 'verbal and situational echoes' of Shakespeare in the *Double Falsehood* text, which he believes indicate 'deliberate imitation of Shakespeare on the part of someone'.<sup>128</sup> Later, Kenneth Muir (1960) followed suit, but in his opinion, 'some scenes in *Double Falsehood* look as though they were manufactured by Theobald, with a copy of Shakespeare's works open in front of him'.<sup>129</sup> In agreement with Muir, Harriet C. Frazier (1968) further added that in order to 'convince his audience of [its] authenticity', Theobald filled

---

Had the Arden edition addressed this incident, readers would have been made aware of the manner in which Theobald dealt freely with the literary property of others. See Paul Baines, *The House of Forgery in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), p. 45.

<sup>124</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The cave of poverty, a poem. Written in imitation of Shakespeare. By Mr. Theobald* (London, 1715), sig. A4v.

<sup>125</sup> James R. Sutherland, 'Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century', *The Modern Language Review*, 28 (1933), 21-36, p. 21. For more on eighteenth-century imitations of Shakespeare see Jeffrey Kahan, *Shakespeare Imitations, Parodies and Forgeries*, 3 vols (London: Routledge, 2004).

<sup>126</sup> Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad, Variorum* (London, 1729), p. 143.

<sup>127</sup> Lupić, 'Malone's DF', p. 109.

<sup>128</sup> Leonard Schwartzstein, 'The Text of "*The Double Falsehood*"', *Notes and Queries*, 199 (1954), 471-472, p. 472.

<sup>129</sup> Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1960), p. 154.

*Double Falsehood* with many echoes from *Hamlet*, ‘which the Eighteenth Century preferred to all others’.<sup>130</sup>

But being a Shakespeare imitator was not something Theobald intended to hide from the public. In 1715, he published *The Cave of Poverty*, ‘a Poem, Written in Imitation of Shakespeare’, stating in his dedication to the Earl of Halifax that he ‘should venture to start up an Imitator of the Immortal Shakespeare’.<sup>131</sup> But that was not Theobald’s only attempt at imitation. For example, he revealed in two letters to William Warburton, that his *Orestes* was an imitation of Shakespeare. In the first letter (dated 1 January 1730), following a citation from *King Lear*, Theobald writes the following:

As you encouraged me in one plagiary [...] I will not dismiss this passage without troubling you with another sentiment in my *Orestes* (the ground of which I borrowed from the two lines marked by *italic*); which I have been arrogant enough to fancy a little Shakespearesque.<sup>132</sup>

Theobald later adds in another letter to Warburton (written on 10 February 1730), that ‘he imitated Shakespeare [in *Orestes*], especially *Macbeth* and *Lear*’.<sup>133</sup> Though these statements were disclosed in private letters, Theobald did not mention anything to the same effect in the dedication to *Orestes*, as was the case with *The Cave of Poverty*. Also, in 1739, the *London Daily Post* published reports of another imitation by Theobald—which was neither acted nor published<sup>134</sup>—entitled *The Death of Hannibal*, a tragedy ‘attempted in Imitation of Shakespear’s Manner’, which was ‘designed to appear on the Stage [that] Season’.<sup>135</sup>

But how close to Shakespeare’s works were Theobald’s imitations? Thomas R. Lounsbury (1906) argues that Theobald’s familiarity with Shakespeare’s diction has had an influence on his writings, especially his later works such as *Orestes*, ‘throughout [which] there is an imitation of the manner of

---

<sup>130</sup> Frazier, ‘The Rifling of Beauty’s Stores’, p. 239.

<sup>131</sup> Theobald, *Cave*, sig. A4v.

<sup>132</sup> Nichols, *Illustrations*, vol. 2, p. 377.

<sup>133</sup> R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with Some Unpublished Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966), p. 151.

<sup>134</sup> John Egerton, *Egerton’s Theatrical Remembrancer* (London, 1788), p. 143.

<sup>135</sup> *London Daily Post*, 26 September 1739.

the dramatist so far as that manner can be imitated'. The play, he adds, contains many echoes of *King Lear*, *Macbeth*—as was admitted by Theobald in his letter to Warburton—and *The Tempest*. Moreover, given that Theobald had been occupied with his edition of Shakespeare for a long time, Lounsbury suggests that it is therefore expected 'to find him then so thoroughly familiar with the writings of his author as to be affected consciously or unconsciously by their influence'.<sup>136</sup> Similarly, in 'Shakespeare Imitators in the Eighteenth Century' (1933), James R. Sutherland identifies some Shakespearean borrowings in *Orestes*:

the most interesting signs of Shakespearean influence are to be found in the two comic scenes of the shipwrecked sailors. Those two scenes necessitated prose; and the Grecian crew provided that almost forgotten touch of comic relief which the tragic drama of Theobald's own day absolutely forbade.<sup>137</sup>

As for *The Cave of Poverty*, though some scholars have suggested that the poem was an imitation of Edmund Spenser,<sup>138</sup> most demonstrate that it closely imitates Shakespeare.<sup>139</sup> In a letter to Theobald, Zurich professor Johann Jacob Bodmer has praised the poem for 'possessing not only the style of Shakespeare but his spirit itself'.<sup>140</sup> However, in the dedication, Theobald asserts that his 'imitation [was] very Superficial; extending only to the borrowing some of [Shakespeare's] Words, without being able to follow him in the Position of them, his Style, or his Elegance'.<sup>141</sup>

But a close examination of the poem reveals that this is far from the case. According to Lounsbury, Theobald's assertion 'is very much of an understatement'. The poem, he argues, adopts Shakespeare's phraseology, style and versification, 'characteristics [that] could have been manifested only by one who had become thoroughly steeped in [Shakespeare's] diction', particularly that of

---

<sup>136</sup> Lounsbury, pp. 182-183.

<sup>137</sup> Sutherland, pp. 29-30.

<sup>138</sup> Edward B. Koster, Review of *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with some Unpublished Letters*, by Richard Foster Jones, *English Studies* 4.1-6 (1922), 20-60, p. 22; Sutherland, p. 29; and Michael Caines, *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 31.

<sup>139</sup> For instance, Freehafer, p. 507, and Marchitello, p. 967.

<sup>140</sup> Jones, *Lewis Theobald*, p. 14.

<sup>141</sup> Theobald, *Cave*, sig. A4v.

his two narrative poems, which were hardly known at the time. Lounsbury, in fact, demonstrates that the poem was written in the six-line stanza of *Venus and Adonis*, 'a measure then hardly ever used and none too familiar since'. But more importantly, he illustrates that Theobald's main imitation was of Shakespeare's phraseology, borrowing Shakespearean words and phrases that were also not very well known at the time. For example, Theobald borrowed from *The Rape of Lucrece* 'copesmate', and 'bateless', as well as the following phrase:

That from their own misdeeds **askance their eyes!** (*Luc* 637)

Behold, how Friendship does **askaunce his Eye!** (*CoP* 470)

Theobald additionally used other Shakespearean words and phrases, in which their usage was clearly 'derived from Shakespeare'; e.g. 'gallow' from *King Lear*, 'agnize' from *Othello*, 'tristful' from *Hamlet*, 'callet' from several plays, and 'rebate the edge' from *Measure for Measure*. Lounsbury moreover adds that Theobald has imitated Shakespeare's use of compound adjectives, which appear more in his two narrative poems, that is, after having 'coined on his own account a pretty large number of these compounds'. For instance, he notes Theobald borrowing fifteen compound adjectives from *The Rape of Lucrece*, 'sometimes coupling them with the same substantives', citing as examples the following two instances:

Look, as **the fair and fiery-pointed sun,** (*Luc* 372)

Nor when **the hot and fiery-pointed Sun** (*CoP* 493)

And round about *her* **tear-distained eye** (*Luc* 1586)

Possessing thee, *the* **tear-distained Eye** (*CoP* 551)

Lounsbury additionally notes a compound adjective Theobald borrows from *Venus and Adonis*:

These **blue-vein'd violets** whereon we lean (*V&A* 125)

Who shone, like **blue-vein'd Violets** peering thro (*CoP* 317)

Furthermore, Lounsbury notes Theobald borrowing 'tender-hefted' from *King Lear*, and 'wonder-wounded' from *Hamlet*.<sup>142</sup> Sutherland similarly shows

---

<sup>142</sup> Lounsbury, pp. 184-185.

instances of Shakespearean imitation in *The Cave of Poverty*, as exemplified in Theobald's borrowing of compound adjectives; in addition to two instances previously noted by Lounsbury, Sutherland adds the following:

Then shalt thou see **the dew-bedabbled** wretch, (*V&A* 703)  
 Ev'n as **the Dew-Bedabled** lev'ret flies, (*CoP* 481).<sup>143</sup>

In 1968, Harriet Frazier presented a thorough examination of *The Cave of Poverty*, in which she emphasizes that Theobald's imitation of Shakespeare in this poem was not merely 'superficial'. As was previously pointed out by Lounsbury, Frazier similarly shows that Theobald's borrowings from Shakespeare in *The Cave of Poverty* were not restricted to his two narrative poems. For instance, she cites Theobald's borrowing of 'bear the Whips and Scorns of Time' (LXXXVIII, p. 35) from *Hamlet* (3.1.72), which according to her 'is not surprising', considering that 'something of *Hamlet* seems to appear in virtually every work which Theobald authored'. Frazier additionally points out close connections between *The Cave of Poverty* and Shakespeare's two narrative poems. In addition to borrowing from *The Rape of Lucrece*, Theobald, she argues, modelled his poem on the stanza and metre of *Venus and Adonis* (which consists of 121 stanzas of six lines mostly written in iambic pentameter). Moreover, Frazier illustrates, that Theobald's borrowings from this poem, involve more than rhyme and metre, as he would have us believe. She further demonstrates Theobald's substantial borrowings from Shakespeare by listing a total of fifteen examples, showing very strong instances of imitation. The following list only includes the ten examples that were not noted by previous commentators:

<b>O</b> unseen <b>shame!</b> Invisible disgrace!	<i>Luc</i> 827-828
O unfelt sore! <b>Crest-wounding</b> , private scar!	
<b>O</b> faulty Riot, and <b>Crest-wounding Shame!</b>	<i>CoP</i> 205
<b>Feast-finding minstrels</b> , tuning my defame,	<i>Luc</i> 817
<b>Feast-finding Minstrell's</b> patrons! Harlot's Tools!	<i>CoP</i> 294
<b>Love-lacking</b> vestals, <b>and</b> self-loving <b>nuns</b> ,	<i>V&amp;A</i> 752

<sup>143</sup> Sutherland, p. 29.

<b>And</b> pale <b>Love-lacking Nuns</b> of rigid Clare	<i>CoP</i> 316
Once more the <b>ruby-colour'd portal open'd</b> ,	<i>V&amp;A</i> 451
'Till Morn her <b>Ruby-colour'd Portal op'd</b>	<i>CoP</i> 431
Being wasted in such <b>time-beguiling</b> sport.	<i>V&amp;A</i> 24
To rob her of the <b>time-beguiling</b> tale	<i>CoP</i> 438
<b>O comfort-killing</b> Night, image of hell!	<i>V&amp;A</i> 764
<b>O Comfort-killing State!</b> Heart-wounding Greif!	<i>CoP</i> 455
And <b>not Death's ebon dart</b> , to strike him dead.	<i>V&amp;A</i> 948
Why may <b>not</b> Friendly <b>Death</b> come end my smart,	<i>CoP</i> 461-462
When tir'd of Life, I court <i>his</i> <b>Ebon dart</b>	
But when a <b>black-fac'd cloud</b> the world doth threat,	<i>Luc</i> 547
Whilst <b>black-fac'd Clouds</b> ride o'er the troubled Sky,	<i>CoP</i> 509
<i>Her</i> <b>pity-pleading</b> eyes are sadly fixed	<i>Luc</i> 561
Inviting <i>Echo's</i> <b>pity-pleading</b> Strains	<i>CoP</i> 515
Yet, foul <b>night-waking</b> cat, he doth but dally,	<i>Luc</i> 554
Nurse of Repose! <b>Night-waking</b> Sorrow's Foe	<i>CoP</i> 549 <sup>144</sup>

These examples, and many other instances, all show that Theobald's imitation is beyond superficial, and that he was, at times, directly copying Shakespeare. In fact, reading his writing alongside Shakespeare's, one cannot help but conclude that Theobald was merely attempting to reproduce Shakespeare. Frazier elaborates on Theobald's imitation:

The cadence of the stanzas is nearly identical, and the frequency in both of noun-preposition-noun, the piling up of substantives whose use is adjectival, the placing of two descriptive phrases per line, and the use of verbs only in the last lines suggest that Theobald could copy some of the more minute features of Shakespeare's style as early as 1715.<sup>145</sup>

More recently, Robert Folkenflik has similarly confirmed Theobald's imitation of Shakespeare in *The Cave of Poverty*, being 'full of Shakespearean

<sup>144</sup> Frazier, 'The Rifling of Beauty's Stores', pp. 235-238.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238.

compound words'; i.e. 'mid-day', 'Sick-thoughted', and 'Glow-worms', borrowed from *Venus and Adonis*, in addition to 'cloud-kissing' and 'night-wandering', borrowed from *The Rape of Lucrece*.<sup>146</sup> Moreover, Tiffany Stern—the leading contemporary scholar to have expressed scepticism as to Shakespeare's involvement in the play behind *Double Falsehood*—has demonstrated that Theobald was a Shakespeare imitator, who has attempted to write in Shakespeare's style in *The Cave of Poverty* (1715), his adaptation of *Richard II* (1720), *Orestes* (1731), and *The Death of Hannibal* (1739). She rightly asserts that 'whether or not Theobald had a manuscript when he was working on *Double Falsehood*, [the] text can be expected to sound "Shakespearean"'.<sup>147</sup> In fact, she explains that what Theobald might have meant by 'Shakespearesque', is that 'he is not simply writing Shakespearean pastiche', but that he is rather 'suggesting that his style is Shakespearean by nature [...] almost becom[ing] the playwright he so much admires'.<sup>148</sup>

Stern's observations on Theobald being a Shakespeare imitator have been described by Gary Taylor as 'exaggerations' and 'omissions', thus prompting him to 'investigat[e], objectively, the possibility of imitation'.<sup>149</sup> However, it remains odd that Taylor should have boldly critiqued views which he previously adopted elsewhere. Theobald, he has stated,

had venal, social, and psychological motives for imitating Shakespeare; he had a history of explicitly imitating Shakespeare (in his 1715 poem *The Cave of Poverty*); his detailed editorial knowledge of Shakespeare would make imitation possible.<sup>150</sup>

More odd still, then, that Taylor should vigorously challenge Stern's views on Theobald's imitation, especially considering that Theobald himself published the poem as an imitation of Shakespeare. However, it is expected that Taylor would

---

<sup>146</sup> Robert Folkenflik, "'Shakespearesque": The Arden *Double Falsehood*', Review of *Double Falsehood*, edited by Brean Hammond, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75 (2012), 131-143, p. 132.

<sup>147</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 577-578.

<sup>148</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', pp. 123-124.

<sup>149</sup> Gary Taylor, 'Slight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearean Desire', in *Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, 125-169, p. 134.

<sup>150</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 48. The same views were reiterated in the same collection; See Gary Taylor and John V. Nance, 'Four Characters in Search of a Subplot: Quixote, Sancho, and *Cardenio*', in *Quest*, 192-213, p. 206.

be inclined to disprove Theobald's capability of imitating Shakespeare, being a leading advocate (alongside Hammond) for *Double Falsehood* as containing traces of Shakespeare, rather than Shakespearean imitations. More difficulties arise from Taylor's analysis of *The Cave of Poverty*, as his approach is limited to examining the first seven lines of the poem, which is based on his hypothesis that a forger would put his best efforts in the very first lines of the forged work. Taylor states:

perhaps we should be especially suspicious that the first seven lines of *DF* have been identified as Shakespearean by many critics. Could the strong start just be evidence that the forger recognized the importance of first impressions?

Thus, Taylor concludes that the poem 'reeks of Theobald', identifying two parallels to Shakespeare in comparison to eight parallels to the works of Theobald. Such a generalization Taylor simplifies (rather conveniently) within his table 10.1,<sup>151</sup> a technique of which other attribution scholars seem to be similarly fond.<sup>152</sup> Equally (if not more) problematic, is how Taylor reaches such conclusions, yet disregarding data published in previous studies (e.g. Lounsbury, Sutherland, Frazier, and Folkenflik), which all clearly attest to the contrary.

Along with *The Perfidious Brother*, *The Cave of Poverty* is equally neglected in the Arden edition. In fact, Hammond appears to be undecided as to whether or not this poem was a Shakespearean imitation. He goes from stating that it was written in imitation of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, to stating that it is 'supposedly' written in imitation of this poem, and then again to stating that it was written in imitation of it. He then argues that 'although some scholars have found significant stylistic overlaps', *The Cave of Poverty* 'bears only a formal relationship to that poem'; Hammond here does not engage with previous scholarship. He merely cites a lengthy passage from Lounsbury (1906) in a footnote, and then directs readers to 'King Tibbald' by Neil Pattison 'for a recent and meticulous assessment of the poem and its relationship to *Venus and*

---

<sup>151</sup> Taylor, 'Cognitive Illusions', pp. 134-136.

<sup>152</sup> See tables 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4 and 5 in Richard Proudfoot, 'Can *Double Falsehood* Be Merely a Forgery by Lewis Theobald?' in *Quest*, 162-176, pp. 167-169, 173-174.

*Adonis*'.<sup>153</sup> But when it comes to an authoritative edition of a text of contested authorship, it would seem that matters involving suspected plagiarism or imitation which would reflect seriously on readers' perceptions of authorship, certainly should not have been the subject of a footnote.<sup>154</sup> What is more, and as with his discussion of *The Perfidious Brother*, Hammond's discussion of *The Cave of Poverty* tackles matters that are unrelated to or less significant than Theobald's imitation of Shakespeare. For instance, according to Hammond, 'what perhaps is noteworthy about [Theobald's poem]' is the fact that an instance in Pope's *The Dunciad* is paralleled to it, thus suggesting that Pope might have 'stole[n] a hint from Theobald'.<sup>155</sup> In other words, here, Hammond emphasises that Pope may have borrowed from Theobald, instead of highlighting Theobald's Shakespearean borrowings.

But the problem with the possibility of *Double Falsehood* being a forged imitation, or even an unconscious imitation, is not restricted to the imitation of Shakespeare alone. It is very possible that Theobald, in his imitative tendencies, had imitated Fletcher as well, because he was not only familiar with the works of Shakespeare, but also with the works of Beaumont and Fletcher having edited their works. It is likely, argues Tiffany Stern, 'that Theobald, working phrase by phrase through Fletcher to emend him, had absorbed much of that poet's style, too'. She in fact points out two instances where Theobald has asserted his familiarity with the works of Fletcher; the first in 1728, when he declared that he had made around two thousand emendations to the works of Beaumont and Fletcher, and the second in 1733, when he stated in his Shakespeare edition that he intimately knew all the plays of Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher and that he 'drew numerous parallels with those authors in his notes'. Theobald's emendations developed into an edition of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher, though he fell ill while working on this project, and was unable to complete it. His co-editors, Thomas Seward and Thomas Simpson, worked on the edited volumes and proposed emendations Theobald left behind. The edition was completed and

---

<sup>153</sup> Hammond, *DF*, pp. 8, 72, 165, 72-73.

<sup>154</sup> Hammond similarly uses appendices, for instance, when discussing the authorship of the song 'Fond Echo', as will be shown in Chapter 5.

<sup>155</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 73.

published in 1750, after Theobald's death.<sup>156</sup> Therefore, Theobald's acquaintance with Fletcher's works must certainly not be overlooked, as Theobald might have possibly been influenced by the playwright's language and style while he was working on the alleged Shakespeare manuscripts.

### 3. Theobald and Adaptation

No less significant, and equally neglected by the Arden editor, is a discussion of Theobald's other adaptations, a neglect that would most likely influence readers' perceptions regarding the authorship of *Double Falsehood*. This discussion departs from approaches employed by previous scholars who investigated Theobald's method of adaptation *because* they presupposed Shakespeare's involvement in Theobald's source play. John Freehafer (1969), for instance, illustrates that 'the taste of [Theobald's] age [...] called for more drastic alteration of Shakespeare's work than of Fletcher's'. Such an argument, I believe, was made to explain (or rather, to explain away) Fletcher's more obvious presence in the play in comparison to Shakespeare's.<sup>157</sup> David Carnegie (2012), on the other hand, presents characteristics of Theobald's adaptive strategies, though one problem with his analysis is that it does not attempt to reveal how such characteristics might reflect on the controversy. Carnegie thus concludes that 'none of these characteristics provides us with evidence of what lies behind a text like *Double Falsehood*'. A further problem with this study is that it pays more attention to *The Fatal Secret*, an adaptation of John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, on the basis that 'Webster's original was written at much the same time as *Cardenio*, for the same company, for the same players, and for the same theatres'. However, it seems that equal attention should have been given to Theobald's earlier adaptation of *Richard II*, given it is based on a Shakespeare play, and particularly considering that Carnegie 'presume[s] that *Double Falsehood* derives from a lost 1613 *Cardenio*';<sup>158</sup> that is, the analysis of this previous Shakespeare adaptation could have highlighted the alterations Theobald has presumably made to the *Cardenio* manuscripts. Having established in the previous chapter

---

<sup>156</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 584, 578-579.

<sup>157</sup> Freehafer, p. 505.

<sup>158</sup> David Carnegie, 'Theobald's Pattern of Adaptation: *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Richard II*', in *Quest*, 180-191, pp. 191, 180.

Shakespeare's non-involvement in both *Cardenio* and Theobald's *Double Falsehood*, it therefore must be noted that my examination of Theobald's adaptation techniques here is not intended to suggest that *Double Falsehood* includes remnants of a Shakespeare play. Instead, it attempts to highlight the extent to which Theobald might have altered whatever manuscripts were in his possession.

Let us now examine Theobald's adaptation of *Richard II* (performed in 1719). Similar to the title-page of *Double Falsehood* which describes the play as 'Revised and Adapted to the Stage', the title-page of *Richard II* describes it as 'Alter'd from Shakespear'. In his preface to this adaptation (published in 1720), Theobald discusses his alterations:

The many scatter'd Beauties, which I have long admir'd in His Life and Death of K. Richard the II., induced me to think they would have stronger Charms, if they were interwoven in a regular Fable. For this Purpose, I have made some Innovations upon History and Shakespear [...] In these, and such Instances, I think there may be reserv'd a discretionary Power of Variation, either for maintaining the Unity of Action, or supporting the Dignity of the Characters.

Similar sentiments are repeated in the prologue:

Immortal Shakespear on this Tale began,  
And wrote it in a rude, Historick Plan,  
On his rich Fund our Author builds his Play,  
Keeps all his Gold, and throws his Dross away.<sup>159</sup>

Of course, such was the case with many other Shakespeare adaptations within that period. For example, when adapting *King Lear* in 1681, Nahum Tate found Shakespeare's play to be 'a heap of jewels, unstrung and unpolished, yet so dazzling in their disorder', which is why he came 'to rectify what was wanting in the regularity and probability of the tale'.<sup>160</sup> This sense of disorder, which 'lay in

---

<sup>159</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The Tragedy of King Richard II* (London, 1720), sigs. A2r, 2B3r.

<sup>160</sup> Nahum Tate, *The History of King Lear*, ed. by James Black (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), p. 1.

the social and stylistic indecorum of the original',<sup>161</sup> is perhaps what motivated these adapters in making their alterations, which according to them, would consequently make their versions more *orderly* and *regular*.

Observing the Neoclassical rules of decorum, as well as the unities of time and place, is characteristic of eighteenth-century adaptations of Shakespeare. In the preface to *The Fatal Secret* (1735), Theobald mainly criticises Webster for not adhering to the Neoclassical rules:

As for Rules, he either knew them not, or thought them too servile a Restraint. Hence it is, that he skips over Years and Kingdoms with an equal Liberty. (It must be confess'd, the Unities were very sparingly observ'd at the Time in which he wrote; however, when any Poet travels too fast, that the Imagination of his Spectators cannot keep pace with him, Probability is put quite out of Breath.<sup>162</sup>

This subject has been discussed at length by George C. Branam (1956), who explains that while modern scholars have merely regarded these Shakespeare adaptations 'as mutilations', such alterations still tell us something about these adapters. Branam mainly illustrates how adapters of the eighteenth century must have believed that through adaptation, they were in fact 'improving the original play[s]', and that in comparison to Shakespeare's versions, theirs were 'more polished and better constructed'. Of course, this they accomplish by preserving 'the parts they especially value [...] while removing the marks of a "barbaric" age';<sup>163</sup> or in Theobald's words, keeping the gold and throwing the dross away.

In the case of his adaptation of *Richard II*, Theobald makes a lot of alterations in his version, as was usually the case with many Shakespearean adaptations of the period. For instance, he cuts the first two acts of the play, thus 'eliminating Richard's misgovernment'; and while he preserves the play's most prominent speeches, he however assigns them to different characters. Moreover, Theobald has Richard meet Bolingbroke for the first time in the Tower, where

---

<sup>161</sup> John D. Cox, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 180.

<sup>162</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The Fatal Secret* (London, 1735), sig. A4v.

<sup>163</sup> George C. Branam, *Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1956), p. v.

Richard is murdered. In addition, the Queen, Northumberland and Aumerle were given more important roles. Theobald also adds the character Lady Percy<sup>164</sup> (the daughter of Northumberland), who was forbidden by her father to marry Aumerle for being one of Richard's supporters. The adaptation ends with Aumerle being executed, prompting Lady Percy to kill herself; and the King is killed right before the Queen, while York grieves the death of his son. 'This farrago', argues Kenneth Muir, proved to be 'dramatically disastrous', and the alterations made in the dialogue 'displayed a false taste'.<sup>165</sup> Moreover, Theobald's addition of a love-plot by introducing the character of Lady Percy was merely 'to add pathos to his main action by showing young love being sacrificed to duty'.<sup>166</sup> In fact, Theobald believed that this, among other alterations, would appeal to eighteenth-century sensibilities being 'pathos-oriented' and, similar to other Shakespeare adaptations of the same period, was controlled by 'female pathos' and an added interest in the domestic.<sup>167</sup> Therefore, in comparison to Tate's radical adaptation of *Richard II* (1680), Theobald's is described as 'an even more radical adaptation', in which he 'sentimentalizes the drama unblushingly'.<sup>168</sup>

Furthermore, the adaptation consisted of around five hundred lines of Shakespeare's original dialogue and an additional three hundred partially Shakespearean lines. So, within Theobald's major alterations, he managed to retain about a quarter of the text originally found in Shakespeare's *Richard II*.<sup>169</sup> Thus, in the process of adapting the play, Theobald reduced the original text from 2500 lines to 1575.<sup>170</sup> Moreover, Branam illustrates that rhymed lines in Shakespearean tragedies posed a problem for eighteenth-century adapters, particularly with a tragedy as *Richard II*, which in comparison to other tragedies (e.g. *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet*), had as many as 514 rhymed lines. Theobald's extensive alterations to the structure of the play caused many of those lines to disappear in his adaptation (it barely has fifty rhymed lines 'against

---

<sup>164</sup> The name Percy is consistently spelled as Piercy in Theobald's edition.

<sup>165</sup> Kenneth Muir, 'Three Shakespeare Adaptations', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, 8 (1959), 233-240, pp. 239-240.

<sup>166</sup> Branam, pp. 161-162.

<sup>167</sup> Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 95, 97.

<sup>168</sup> William Shakespeare, *King Richard II*, ed. by Charles R. Forker (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002), pp. 52-53.

<sup>169</sup> Freehafer, 506.

<sup>170</sup> Frazier, *Ancestral Voices*, p. 52.

ten times that number in the original'). Branam in fact shows that while Theobald retained some of Shakespeare's rhymed lines, he 'in almost every instance [...] destroyed the rhyme', which, according to him, reflects 'Theobald's treatment of rhyme in general'.<sup>171</sup> Though such alterations are to be expected of adaptations, they must not be taken lightly when it involves an adaptation such as *Double Falsehood*, which quite problematically cannot be traced back to its alleged source. While no one appears to have seen any of Theobald's manuscripts, what the Arden edition did was reproduce an eighteenth-century adaptation of a play that was neither printed in any quarto or folio edition, nor attributed to Shakespeare in his lifetime.

But there are certain elements in how Theobald presented his adaptations that could tell us precisely how we should regard *Double Falsehood*. For instance, in the preface to his adaptation of *Richard II*, Theobald states:

I must, like an honest Man, begin first with my largest Debts, and make a Sort of Compensation for the Helps which I have borrowed from Shakespear.<sup>172</sup>

Such a statement seems somewhat odd given the play's status as an adaptation. It appears that following *The Perfidious Brother* incident, Theobald developed an obsessive concern with charges of plagiarism. Interestingly, unlike his adaptation of *Richard II*, Theobald's adaptation of Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* had not been judiciously credited to its original author. The following advertisement was published in a 1733 issue of the *London Daily Journal*, which neither mentions Webster's name, nor Theobald's:

Never Acted Before. At the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden, this present Wednesday, being the 4<sup>th</sup> of April, will be presented a new Tragedy, call'd, The Fatal Secret.<sup>173</sup>

Moreover, the title page of the play, published in 1735, describes it as '*The Fatal Secret. A Tragedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal, In Covent-Garden. By Mr.*

---

<sup>171</sup> Branam, pp. 77-83.

<sup>172</sup> Theobald, *Richard II*, sig. A2.

<sup>173</sup> *London Daily Journal*, 2 April 1733.

*Theobald*', yet it does not acknowledge Webster as the author of its source. And although Theobald never described the play as an adaptation, he ambiguously gave credit to Webster in a preface that reads more like a defensive confession:

Tho' I call'd it *The Fatal Secret*, I had no intentions of disguising from the Publick, that, (as my Friend has confess'd for me in the Prologue) John Webster had preceded me, above a hundred Years ago, in the same Story. I have retain'd the Names of the Characters in his *Duchess of Malfy*; adopted as much of his Tale as I conceiv'd for my Purpose, and as much of his Writing as I could turn to Account without giving into too obsolete a Diction. If I have borrow'd his Matter freely, I have taken it up on fair and open Credit; and, hope, I have repaid the Principal with Interest. I have no where spared my self, out of Indolence; but have often engrafted his Thoughts and Language, because I was conscious I could not so well supply them from my own Fund.<sup>174</sup>

Here, Theobald admits, quite defensively, that he has relied heavily on Webster in different aspects of his play, (i.e. plot, characters, thoughts and language).

But we must point to an interesting fact about this adaptation that has not been previously mentioned in the literature on *Double Falsehood*: this fact involves what the public knew about the play in the time period between its first performance in 1733, and its publication in 1735. To clarify, when Theobald first staged the play, rather than presenting it as an adaptation, he presented it as his own original work. Martin White (1998) cites Theobald's 1731 letter to Warburton where he describes the plot of a play he had been working on, a plot that clearly corresponds to that of *The Duchess of Malfi*:

I have applied my uneasy summer months upon the attempt at a tragedy [...] I lay my scene in Italy. My heroine is a young widow duchess who has two haughty Spanish brothers that enjoin her not to marry again. She, however, clandestinely marries the Master of her Household on the morning I open my scene.

---

<sup>174</sup> Theobald, *Fatal Secret*, sig. A3v.

Theobald here was obviously talking about *The Fatal Secret*. '[His] deception', argues White, 'was apparently discovered', thus forcing him to declare his sources in the preface.<sup>175</sup> This observation, I believe, explains Theobald's rather confessional preface to *The Fatal Secret* and his awkward acknowledgment of Webster's role.

According to White, the problem lies in how adapters at that time could publish their plays without mentioning they were versions of much earlier works. In 1707 for instance, Nahum Tate published *Injured Love: or the Cruel Husband*<sup>176</sup> 'without thinking it necessary to mention that it was a version of Webster's *The White Devil*'. He explains:

these adapters seem to have had no concern that their sources would be identified, even when as in Theobald's case, Warburton, to whom he wrote, was himself a scholar and future editor of Shakespeare — a tangible sign of just how little-known certain plays had become less than a hundred years after their last recorded performances in the seventeenth century.

Though White asserts that Tate's adaptation does not appear to have been performed, the situation is different for Theobald, who actually staged *The Fatal Secret* in 1733.<sup>177</sup>

But precisely how far does Theobald's version resemble Webster's? In his letter to Warburton, Theobald submits to him a couple of soliloquies from his new play 'as a Taste of [his] poor Workmanship'; however, a quick search would reveal that these soliloquies are mostly based on Webster. The following section compares how a passage appears in both Webster and one of the soliloquies cited in Theobald's letter; parallels will be printed in bold to show the extent to which the latter borrows from the former:

**Oh sacred Innocence, that sweetly sleepes**  
**On Turtles feathers: whil'st a guilty conscience**

---

<sup>175</sup> Martin White, *Renaissance Drama in Action: An Introduction to Aspects of Theatre Practice and Performance* (London: Routledge, 1998; repr. 2013), p. 195.

<sup>176</sup> On a similar note, the title-page of this play describes Tate as Author of the Tragedy call'd *King Lear*.

<sup>177</sup> White, pp. 195-196.

**Is a blacke Register, wherein is writ**

**All our good deedes, and bad: a Perspectiue**

**That shoves vs hell;** that we cannot be suffer'd

To doe good when we haue a mind to it? (*Duchess* 4.2.403-8)

The following excerpt from Theobald's letter—which would later appear in 4.314-321 of *The Fatal Secret*—shows that it is clearly evident (though not acknowledged) that he borrowed heavily from Webster:

**O sacred Innocence** I that sweetly sleeps

**On Turtles Feathers, whilst guilty Conscience**

Makes all our Slumbers worse than feavrish Dreams,

When only Monstrous Forms disturb the Brain.

**Tis a black Register, wherein is writ**

**All our good Deeds & bad : a Perspective**

**That shews us Hell,** more horrid than Divines,

Or Poets, know to paint it.<sup>178</sup>

Though Theobald's cited soliloquies could be recognised by some scholars as based on Webster, they were apparently not recognised by the scholar Warburton, which obviously reflects the state of Webster scholarship at that time.<sup>179</sup> Accordingly, Theobald's letter reveals how he is prepared to claim ownership of the work of other writers, and eventually, take the credit for it. Had he not been discovered, the public might have carried on crediting the adapted version of Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* entirely to Theobald, which he from the outset, and quite alarmingly, proved to show no concern for. The conclusions of this particular incident certainly stand in support of the previously discussed accusations of plagiarism. Moreover, they also support Tiffany Stern's observation regarding Theobald's 'plot-neediness', which she believes forced him to rely on the help of Mestayer in his *Perfidious Brother*, Warburton in his preface to *The Works of Shakespeare*, Thomas Corneille in *Antiochus and Stratonice*, and John Hill in *Orpheus and Eurydice*,<sup>180</sup> another play which Theobald was (not to

---

<sup>178</sup> Jones, p. 292.

<sup>179</sup> Don D. Moore, ed., *John Webster: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1981), p. 6.

<sup>180</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', pp. 123-124.

our surprise) accused of plagiarizing.

#### 4. 'Was it Rape then? [or] the Coyness of a modest Bride'?<sup>181</sup>

Let us now turn to a feature of the play that can be characterised as Theobaldian. Although there appears to be no way to compare *Double Falsehood* to the manuscripts on which it was allegedly based, there are still some ways to determine the changes Theobald might have made to those original manuscripts. For example, one element Carnegie could have explored is how a seduction into marriage in *Don Quixote*<sup>182</sup> has been adapted into a rape in *Double Falsehood*; this could be shown by examining the incident in both works. Marriages of pre-contracts were often consummated (sexually) 'before being formally legitimated by a church rite', and in Shakespeare's time, many 'continued to believe in the legal validity of a verbal contract'.<sup>183</sup> In Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* (1612), Dorotea seems to have been the victim of this type of contract, as Fernando later abandoned her.<sup>184</sup> In part 4 chapter 1, she narrates her misfortunes; she describes how Fernando suddenly appeared in her chamber, proceeding to take her between his arms and professing his love to her. But Dorotea resisted what she describes as his 'forcible desires'. She states that '[no] one may obtaine of me ought who is not my lawfull spouse', prompting Fernando right then and there to proclaim himself her lawful husband:

behold I giue thee here my hand to be thine alone: and let the heauens from which nothing is concealed; and this Image of our Lady which thou hast heere present, be witness of this [...] contract.

Dorotea then called for her waiting maid to witness Fernando 'reiterat[ing] and confirm[ing] his oathes'; the couple then consummated their marriage. Dorotea adds:

and for a more confirmation of his word hee tooke a rich ring off his finger, and put it on mine [...] I said to Don Fernando at his departure

---

<sup>181</sup> Theobald, *DF*, p. 14.

<sup>182</sup> For ease of reference, the original names in Cervantes are as follows: Theobald's Julio is Cardenio in *Don Quixote*, Luscinda is Leonora, Henriquez is Fernando, and Violante is Dorotea.

<sup>183</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 43.

<sup>184</sup> For the authorship of this incident in both *Double Falsehood* and *Cardenio*, see Appendix 1.

that he might see mee other nights when he pleased by the same meanes hee had come that night seeing I was his owne, and would rest so, vntil it pleased him to let the world know that I was his wife. But he neuer returned againe.<sup>185</sup>

Of course, this was not the case in *Double Falsehood* (1728). When revisiting the incident, Henriquez did not seem to recollect whether or not there was a promise of marriage:

Now then to Recollection — Was't not so? A Promise first of Marriage — Not a Promise only, for 'twas bound with Surety of a thousand Oaths; — and those not light ones neither. — Yet I remember too, those Oaths could not prevail; th'unpractis'd Maid trembled to meet my Love.

So instead of being a pre-contract of marriage, as was the case in Shelton, it was only 'a promise of marriage', a promise Henriquez was obviously not prepared to meet. He then admits that he 'sntatch'd th'imperfect joy' not by 'Love', but 'by Force alone' and 'brutal Violence'.<sup>186</sup> Tormented by guilt, Henriquez struggles between confessing that it was rape, or convincing himself it was consensual:

Hold, let me be severe to my Self, but not unjust. — Was it Rape then? No. Her Shrieks, her Exclamations then had drove me from her. True, she did not consent; as true, she did resist; but still in Silence all. — 'Twas but the Coyness of a modest Bride, not the Resentment of a ravisht Maid. And is the Man yet born, who would not risque the Guilt, to meet the Joy? — The Guilt!

Accordingly, his words show that there was clearly no contract of marriage, but more importantly, that Violante did not consent to his advances. To him, it was an 'imperfect joy'; there was 'force', 'violence', and 'guilt'. Yes, it was rape. Henriquez then decided he 'ha[d] no Choice', but to abandon Violante, declaring

---

<sup>185</sup> Shelton, *Don Quixote* (London: 1612), part 4, chapter 1, pp. 289-294.

<sup>186</sup> Theobald, *DF*, p. 13-14.

Leonora 'the Tyrant Queen of [his] revolted Heart'.<sup>187</sup>

Perhaps to convince audiences in 1727 that *Double Falsehood* was authentic, the play's anonymous epilogue—possibly written by Theobald himself—declares rape as an element of the source play. The epilogue repeatedly suggests that the play was not written for the eighteenth-century stage, stating that rape is 'no such killing Matter', and that it was only the dramatists of 'ancient Plays' who would 'draw a Rape as dreadful as a murder'. Moreover, the epilogue reduces the seriousness of such a violation, arguing that 'Violante grieves, or we're mistaken, / Not because ravisht, but because — forsaken', thus criticising her reaction as exaggerated. In fact, there is a clear emphasis on how the subject matter is not the product of the eighteenth century:

Had this been written to the modern Stage,  
Her Manners had been copy'd from the Age.  
Then, tho' she had been once a little wrong,  
She still had had the Grace to've held her Tongue;<sup>188</sup>

Again, the occurrence of rape in eighteenth-century drama is described as a thing of the past:

Well, Heav'n be prais'd, the Virtue of our Times  
Secures us from our Gothic Grandsires Crimes.  
Rapes, Magick, new Opinions, which before  
Have fill'd our Chronicles, are now no more [...]  
Then, as for Rapes, those dangerous days are past;  
Our Dapper Sparks are seldom in such haste.<sup>189</sup>

However, some scholars have argued that the rape was perhaps introduced by Theobald. For example, Kenneth Muir points to the likelihood of the rape being Theobald's idea, considering that 'a broken promise was regarded as less reprehensible in the aftermath of the *Comedy of Manners* than it had been a century before'.<sup>190</sup> Similarly, Bernard Richards (2011) has suggested that the

---

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., sig. A7v.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., sig. A8r.

<sup>190</sup> Muir, 'Cervantes, Cardenio and Theobald', p. 148.

rape perhaps 'never existed' in the original play.<sup>191</sup>

But what the epilogue attempted to classify as an ancient (or rather Shakespearean) theatrical device, is one that interestingly occurs in many of Theobald's plays. In addition to occurring in *The Rape of Proserpine*, the subject of rape is at the heart of Theobald's plagiarised play *The Perfidious Brother*, featuring in two separate plots. Moreover, Jeffery Kahan (2004) has pointed out an obvious connection between *Double Falsehood* and many of Theobald's works. He explains that works such as *The Persian Princess* (1711), *Electra* (1714), *The Rape of Proserpine* (1725), *Harlequin Sorcerer, with the Loves of Pluto and Proserpine* (1725), *Apollo and Daphne* (1726), and *Orpheus and Eurydice* (1740) all shared the key feature of the act or threat of rape. Although he argues that rape could also be found in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *Cymbeline* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, Kahan finds it peculiar that 'Theobald's "lost" Shakespeare featured his favourite dramaturgical device'.<sup>192</sup> Yet it is disappointing that the Arden edition does not point out this connection to Theobald. And although Hammond cites Kahan's study, his references are merely to criticize his work (e.g. pointing out his spelling mistakes,) rather than engaging in the discussion:

When, on p. 169, Theobald is credited with a play entitled *Harliquin [sic] a Sorcerer, with the Loves of Pluto and Persephine [sic]*, the reader begins to wonder how well Kahan knows his author.<sup>193</sup>

In a recent review of the edition, Ivan Lupačić points to Hammond's insistence on the emergence of 'a definite consensus' over the last hundred years that *Double Falsehood* includes remnants 'of an otherwise lost Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration'. According to Lupačić, this statement not only overlooks conflicting scholarly views (i.e. those expressed by Frazier, Kahan, Stern, etc.),

but [it] also unjustly implies that all of their scholarship is somehow unsound. [Hammond] chooses the work of Kahan as his main target and spends a couple of pages enumerating Kahan's errors, which are meant to show the inadequacy of his more general view of the play as

---

<sup>191</sup> Bernard Richards, 'Now Am I in Arden': Arden Shakespeare 'Double Falsehood' Book Review, *Essays in Criticism*, 61:1 (2011), 79-88, p. 87.

<sup>192</sup> Kahan, *Shakespeare Imitations*, p. 169.

<sup>193</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 89.

a forgery. Kahan's work is far from perfect and his theory may not be ultimately persuasive, but most of Hammond's objections to Kahan's scholarship are either irrelevant or incorrect.<sup>194</sup>

In "'Tis no such killing matter": Rape in Fletcher and Shakespeare's *Cardenio* and in Lewis Theobald's *Double Falsehood*' (2011), Lori Leigh presented the most comprehensive discussion on the subject to date. But serving as assistant director to Gary Taylor's *The History of Cardenio* has perhaps influenced her arguments in favour of Shakespeare's authorship of Theobald's source play. Although she presents arguments in support of Theobald's involvement in the rape plot, she repeatedly (and rather unconvincingly) attempts to explain away such arguments. For instance, she points to scholarship that discusses 'the popularity of "rape-roles" for actresses in the Restoration and early eighteenth century', as well as 'the addition of rapes or attempted rapes in adaptations of Shakespeare such as Nahum Tate's version of *King Lear*'.<sup>195</sup> However, the value of such observations is reduced when Leigh takes the epilogue's word for it that rape does not occur in eighteenth-century drama. What complicates the matter and is rather contradictory to her previous statement, is how she later comes to acknowledge that rape, was in fact, featured in a number of Theobald's plays, e.g. *The Rape of Proserpine*, *The Happy Captive*, and *The Perfidious Brother*. Moreover, Leigh explains:

Hester (Santlow) Booth, the actress playing Violante in the original 1727 production of *Double Falsehood*, had been known as an "actress-whore", but by the time she was cast as Violante she had been married to Barton Booth for nearly a decade, and was nearly 40 years old [...] Mr Booth played Julio (*Cardenio*) and [...] it seems unlikely that Theobald would have gratuitously added a rape for the wife of his other male protagonist.<sup>196</sup>

But one possible (and perhaps obvious) explanation is that while Theobald

---

<sup>194</sup> Ivan Lupić, 'And relish beauties he alone could write': *Double Falsehood* in the Arden Shakespeare', *Shakespeare*, 7.3 (2011), 369-376, pp. 372-373.

<sup>195</sup> Leigh, 'Rape', p. 287.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 287-291.

appears to be the one responsible for adding the rape, it is likely that he in fact did not *stage* it precisely because the role belonged to Booth's wife. That is not to mention, being the wife of one of the managers of Drury Lane, Hester Booth 'had much more authority than Theobald did, over whether and how his script would be performed';<sup>197</sup> of course, this in itself offers another explanation as to why the rape was not fully staged.

## 5. Eighteenth-Century Reception of *Double Falsehood*

*Double Falsehood* was advertised, staged and published as an adaptation of an *alleged* Shakespeare play, thus, there appears to be no question that the play is an *adaptation*; of course, the fact that it was not published in Theobald's *Works of Shakespeare* (1733) reinforces its status as such. Although Theobald staged it as originally written by Shakespeare, its text has linguistic, stylistic and dramatic features that are characteristic of the eighteenth century. But, regardless of this fact, the play was initially well received, and some accepted it as Shakespeare's. For instance, only a day following its premiere (December 14, 1727) the *Evening Journal* published a positive review of the production in support of Theobald's claims:

Last Night was acted an original play of William Shakespear's in Drury-Lane, where the Audience was very numerous and [gave] the most remarkable attention through the whole.<sup>198</sup>

But while Shakespeare's authorship of the play was accepted by some, many eighteenth-century writers/scholars questioned his involvement in the play. Alexander Pope—Theobald's greatest literary adversary—took the lead in his *Art in Sinking in Poetry* (1728) when he criticized the line 'None but itself can be its Parallel' (*DF*, p. 25). He described the line as '*Profundity* it self', and misquoted it as '*None but Himself can be his Parallel*'<sup>199</sup> (the line, as will be shown shortly, was thus misquoted by Malone in 1780). In the same volume Pope ridicules

---

<sup>197</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 43.

<sup>198</sup> Cited in Hammond, *DF*, p. 12. Previously on May 20 of the same year, the *London Journal* validated Theobald's claims, announcing that he was working on a new Shakespeare play: '[readers] may expect to receive an undoubted original Play written by *Shakespeare*, some Time between his Retirement and Death', *London Journal*, 20 May 1727.

<sup>199</sup> Pope, 'Peri Bathous', *Miscellanies*, II, p. 102.

Theobald's obsession with associating himself with Shakespeare:

Yet ne'er one Sprig of Laurel grac'd those Ribalds,  
From sanguine Sew\_\_\_ down to pidling T\_\_\_s,  
Who thinks he reads when he but *scans* and *spells*,  
A Word-catcher, that lives on Syllables.  
Yet ev'n this Creature may some Notice claim,  
Wrapt round and sanctified with *Shakespear's* Name;  
Pretty, in Amber to observe the forms  
Of Hairs, or Straws, or Dirt, or Grubs, or Worms:  
The *Thing*, we know, is neither rich nor rare,  
But wonder how the Devil it got there.<sup>200</sup>

Theobald's line was ridiculed again in *The Dunciad Variorum* (1729), this time appearing as 'None but Thy self can be thy parallel' (3.72). In his commentary on these lines, Pope accuses Theobald of forgery, stating that this is

A marevellous line of *Theobald*; unless the Play call'd the *Double Falshood* be, (as he would have it believed) *Shakespear's*: But whether this line be his or not, he proves *Shakespear* to have written as bad.

In addition, Pope quotes lines from Theobald's article in *Mist's Weekly Journal*, suggesting that in these lines, Theobald '[was] able to imitate *Shakespear*'.<sup>201</sup> Therefore, according to Pope, parallels to Shakespeare do not offer proof of authorship, but only a sign of imitation.

Others followed in accusing Theobald of forgery. For instance, *The Grub Street Journal* featured an anonymous piece in which Theobald was mocked for being a lawyer who does not fear the punishment of such a legal offence, which in extreme cases in the eighteenth century, would have had one's ears cut off.<sup>202</sup>

---

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>201</sup> Pope, *Dunciad*, p. 143. However, Pope adopted a less critical tone in a letter addressed to Aaron Hill in 1738 when he stated that '[Theobald] gave it as *Shakespear's*, and I take it to be of that Age'. Alexander Pope, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. by George Sherburn, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), vol. 4, p. 102.

<sup>202</sup> During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, forgery was made punishable by 'various mutilations of the body including the loss of ears and the slitting of the nose'; this sentence was passed on Japhet Crook who was charged with forgery in 1731, (Baines, pp. 7, 66).

See T\_\_\_\_\_ leaves the lawyer's train,  
 To wrack with poetry his tortur'd brain:  
 Fir'd or not fir'd, to write resolves with rage,  
 And constant pores o'er Shakespear's sacred page;  
 Then starting cries, I something will be thought:  
 I'll write — then — boldly swear 'twas Shakespear wrote.  
 Strange! He in poetry no forgery fears,  
 That knows so well in law he'd lose his ears.<sup>203</sup>

Criticisms continued and their main focus was to discredit claims for Shakespeare's authorship of the play. David Mallet, for instance, writes the following in a reference to Theobald in *Of Verbal Criticism*: 'See him on *Shakespear* pore, intent to steal | Poor farce, by fragments, for a third-day meal' (65-66).<sup>204</sup> Later in 1747, Thomas Whincop makes two references to the play, one stating that it was 'said to be a Piece of *Shakespear's*, but certainly very unjustly', and in the other arguing that 'it was pretended to be a Piece of the celebrated *Shakespear*, but few People, who have seen or read it, give Credit to that Report'.<sup>205</sup> In 1756, Colley Cibber described the play as Theobald's own.<sup>206</sup> Also, upon the 1767 revival of the play, the *British Chronicle* stated that 'whoever will give himself the trouble to examine this Play, will be puzzled to find the least marks of Shakespeare's judgment, style, or manner'.<sup>207</sup>

Richard Farmer also discredited Shakespeare's authorship of the play in his *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*, as he was under the impression that Theobald desired to palm this play 'upon the world for a posthumous one of *Shakespeare*'. According to Farmer, 'sometimes a very little matter detects a forgery'; the play, he believes, was not written by Shakespeare, as 'a mistaken accent determines it to have been written since the middle of the last century'. Farmer lists two examples of the word 'aspect' where the accent appears on the

---

<sup>203</sup> 'The Modern Poets: A Satire in allusion to the Satire of the first Book of Horace', by a Young Gentleman of Cambridge, *The Grub-Street Journal*, No. 98, November 18, 1731.

<sup>204</sup> David Mallet, *Of Verbal Criticism: An Epistle to Mr. Pope. Occasioned by Theobald's Shakespeare, and Bentley's Milton* (London: 1733), p. 6.

<sup>205</sup> Thomas Whincop, *Scanderbeg: Or, Love and Liberty, a Tragedy. To Which are Added a List of all the Dramatic Authors* (London, 1747), pp. 180, 294.

<sup>206</sup> Colley Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber*, fourth edition, 2 vols (London, 1756), II, p. 270.

<sup>207</sup> *British Chronicle*, April 27-29 (London, 1767).

first syllable, which he asserts ‘was never the case in the time of *Shakespeare*’:

This late Example  
Of base Henriquez, bleeding in me now,  
From each good Aspect takes away my Trust: (*DF* 2.4.6-8)

And:

You have an Aspect, Sir, of wond’rous Wisdom, (*DF* 4.1.47)

From all aspects of the play’s style and manner, Farmer ascribes it to Shirley—who according to Langbaine—has left some plays in manuscript which were written around the Restoration period ‘when the *Accent* in question was more generally altered’.<sup>208</sup> To Farmer’s argument, Alexander Dyce added the ‘purely gratuitous hypothesis’—to use the words of Gamaliel Bradford—which was occasionally accepted as a fact, suggesting that Theobald misread the letters ‘Sh.,’ printed on the title-page, as belonging to Shakespeare instead of Shirley.<sup>209</sup>

In addition, Farmer believed that *Double Falsehood* was ‘superior to *Theobald*’.<sup>210</sup> He cites one passage from the entire play, which Theobald claimed to have written:

Strike up, my Masters;  
But touch the Strings with a religious Softness;  
Teach Sound to languish thro’ the Night’s dull Ear,  
‘Till Melancholy start from her lazy Couch,  
And Carelessness grow Convert to Attention. (*DF* 1.3.10-14)

Farmer explains because this passage was ‘particularly admired [Theobald’s] vanity could not resist the opportunity of claiming them’.<sup>211</sup> However, it seems

---

<sup>208</sup> Richard Farmer, *An essay on the learning of Shakespeare Addressed to Joseph Cradock, Esq; The Second Edition with Large additions* (London, 1767), pp. 26, 28-29

<sup>209</sup> Bradford, ‘The History of Cardenio’, pp. 52-53. Similarly, Farmer believed that when Theobald found a play by “W.Sh.” he revised it, assuming that it belonged to Shakespeare, when in fact, it was by William Shirley, (Stern, ‘Forgery’, p. 590). Bradford also mentions that he had carefully studied Shirley’s plays and detects none of the suggested stylistic resemblances to *Double Falsehood*.

<sup>210</sup> In 1813, William Gifford has similarly traced parts of the text he believed were superior to Theobald. William Gifford, ed., Philip Massinger, *The Plays of Philip Massinger*, second edn., 4 vols (London: W. Butler and Co. Cleveland-Row, St. James, 1813), III, p.159.

<sup>211</sup> Farmer, p. 28.

possible that Theobald wrote these lines, as this particular claim was supported by previous commentators. For example, in *The Beauties of Shakespear* (1752), William Dodd states:

A gentleman of great judgment happening to commend these lines to Mr. *Theobald*, he assured him, he wrote them himself, and only them, in the whole play; if this be true, they are the best lines Mr. *Theobald* ever wrote in his life.<sup>212</sup>

This account was cited a year later in *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland* (1753). Dodd was described as ‘ingenious’ and commended for his ‘judicious collection of the beauties of Shakespear’, and the authorship of the quoted lines (1.3.10-14) were confirmed as ‘a beautiful stroke of Mr Theobald’s’.<sup>213</sup> However, Edmond Malone supported Farmer’s views on these lines. The following is an excerpt from Malone’s annotated copy of *Double Falsehood*: ‘Theobald asserted that he was the author of these five lines & they were the only lines in the play that he wrote. I believe both assertions to have been false’.<sup>214</sup>

In fact in 1780, both Malone and George Steevens made some valuable contributions to the controversy. For instance, in a reference to Moseley’s 1653 entry on *The History of Cardenio*, Steevens rejected Shakespeare’s involvement in the play, asserting that ‘had it [...] been written by our author, it would surely have been published in the folio of 1623, or at least would have been ascribed to him in some ancient catalogue’. On the other hand, Malone ascribes the play to Massinger. He for instance, lists from the Stationers’ Books eleven plays that were written by Massinger but never published and are perhaps all lost; thus, Malone implies a possible relationship between one of these plays and Theobald’s *Double Falsehood*. Moreover, Malone cites a parallel between the line which was ridiculed by Pope—and similarly misquoted as ‘None but Himself can be his Parallel’ (*DF*, p. 25)—and Massinger’s *Duke of Milan*:

Her goodness does disdain comparison,

---

<sup>212</sup> William Dodd, *The Beauties of Shakespear*, 2 vols (London, 1752), I, p. 70.

<sup>213</sup> Theophilus Cibber and others, ‘Mr. Lewis Theobald’, *The Lives of the Poet of Great Britain and Ireland*, 5 vols. (London, 1753), V, p. 286.

<sup>214</sup> Lupić, ‘Malone’s *DF*’, p. 107.

*And but itself admits no parallel.*

He also points to two other lines from the same play,

yet be wise;

Soar not too high to fall, but stoop to rise,

which find their parallel in:

I must stoop to gain her;

Throw all my gay Comparisons aside, (1.3.72-73)

Malone, however, takes note of a much stronger parallel between the second line cited above, and 'lay his gay comparisons apart' in *Antony and Cleopatra* (3.13.26), arguing that if the line was not interpolated by Theobald, it 'would serve to confirm Massinger's title to this play, he having very frequently imitated Shakespeare'.<sup>215</sup>

Ivan Lupić presents the most authoritative account of Malone's contribution to the controversy. Interestingly, with regard to the above line (1.3.72-73) that Malone suggested was borrowed from *Antony and Cleopatra*, Lupić points out that in his annotated copy, Malone was 'more direct in his charge against Theobald', citing the following:

This line is taken from Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra*. It was, I believe, inserted by Theobald, to give colour to the imposition that he meant to pass upon the public.

Lupić argues that Malone's observations which were 'only half-articulated' in the 1780 *Supplement*, were 'violently and unambiguously expressed on the title page of his annotated copy' of the second issue of the play (c. 1778);<sup>216</sup> 'there, the words "Written Originally by W. SHAKESPEARE" are crossed out not with one, but with two horizontal lines'. Lupić then adds that Malone further annotated the *Dramatis Personae* and commented on 'Duke *Angelo*', stating: '*Angelo* [...] was an

---

<sup>215</sup> Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, *Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays Publish in 1778*, ed. by Edmond Malone, 2 vols. (London, 1780), II, p. 718.

<sup>216</sup> Lupić explains that the edition, being a 'generous gift' from Steevens, dates Malone's notes approximately around the year 1778, either before or after the copy was bound, (p. 106).

interpolation of Theobald's, to countenance his fraud. I suppose in the MS. this person was only called *Duke*'. Lupić additionally cites Malone's doubts concerning the song 'Fond Echo' (4.2.16-23): 'I strongly suspect this Song. It has, I think, too modern an air; & was, I believe, an interpolation of Theobald's'. He then points to the 'much harsher' language Malone uses in the rest of his notes. For instance, in a note written next to four lines approaching the end of the fourth act, Malone states 'Stollen [*sic*]—I forgot from whence', and that he also believed that these lines were Theobald's; exactly which four lines was not clear to Lupić. Accordingly, Malone believed that any Shakespearean echoes are 'symptoms of a poorly concealed fraud', rather than being evidence for Shakespeare.<sup>217</sup> Thus, there certainly has been ample scholarship in the eighteenth century that rejects the notion of any Shakespearean presence in Theobald's play, dismissing it either as a forged imitation or the work of another dramatist for the King's Men. I have shown in the first part of this chapter that there are elements surrounding Theobald's career—i.e. plagiarism and imitation—that might weaken his case for *Double Falsehood* being based on an original Shakespeare play. In the following section I will review approaches to *Double Falsehood* that are similar to Arden's, and highlight the main problems with these approaches, occasionally referring to the Arden edition.

## 6. A Review of Recent Approaches to Theobald and Authorship

One of the most significant contributions to the controversy following the Arden publication can be found in the collection (co-edited by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor) entitled *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, & the Lost Play* (2012), where the scholarly disregard for Theobald's role is clearly indicated in the title. In the introduction, Carnegie points to the significance of the collection's stylometric studies found in the works of Macdonald P. Jackson, Richard Proudfoot, Gary Taylor and John Nance. He states that

these essays—collectively the most extensive stylometric study ever carried out on *Double Falsehood*—provide substantial new evidence to justify a cautious but reasonable hypothesis that Theobald's *Double*

---

<sup>217</sup> Lupić, 'Malone's *DF*', pp. 106-109.

*Falsehood* is indeed based on an early modern *Cardenio*; and that it shows clear evidence of Fletcher's authorship, as well as less strong but still probable evidence of Shakespeare.<sup>218</sup>

Carnegie's statement demonstrates the collection's general partiality for presenting evidences for Shakespeare and Fletcher (rather than Theobald) in the *Double Falsehood* text. This section will review the approaches employed by Proudfoot, Jackson and Taylor, which represent the collection's most significant contributions. The discussion will exclude Taylor's other essay written in collaboration with John V. Nance, given that he and Nance employ the same techniques used in Taylor's first essay.<sup>219</sup>



Due to our special interest in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, we will begin by examining contributions made by Richard Proudfoot, one of the general editors of the Arden Shakespeare, in order to highlight the methodology behind his endorsement of the play. In his essay, 'Can *Double Falsehood* Be Merely a Forgery by Lewis Theobald?' Proudfoot states that his 'primary aim is to dispel the notion that *DF* in its entirety could possibly be a forgery by Theobald (or any other writer of the early eighteenth century)'. Through his analysis, he hopes 'to offer one small item of evidence' that supports *Double Falsehood's* right to a Shakespeare edition. Moreover, he explains that his investigation aims to 'put an end to the speculation, perhaps maliciously initiated by Alexander Pope [...] that the whole thing was fabricated by Theobald himself'.<sup>220</sup> Much of the difficulty, however, may well stem from Proudfoot's main research question, which is most evident in the title of his essay. While such a question gives Proudfoot the opportunity to refute the less likely possibility that the play is an outright

---

<sup>218</sup> David Carnegie, 'Introduction', in *Quest*, 3-10, p. 5.

<sup>219</sup> Though it is worth mentioning that their analysis incorrectly considers *Poems on Several Occasions* (1719), *Albion* (1720), and *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations* (1724), as belonging to Lewis Theobald, when in fact they were all written by John Theobald; Taylor and Nance have clearly searched for parallels using only the last name alone. See Taylor and Nance, 'Four Characters', p. 202.

<sup>220</sup> This statement is reminiscent of Theobald's dedication, where he expresses his desire to 'silence the censures of the unbelievers', and also his comment in the preface where he states that it is aimed 'to wipe out a flying objection or two', (*DF*, sigs. A3v, A5r).

forgery, it allows him to neglect addressing the more urgent question of how much Theobald actually contributed to the play. In reference to Hammond and Jackson, Proudfoot states that '[they] have conducted a thorough survey of attempts to discern the hands of Fletcher and Shakespeare in *DF*', which is a statement that clearly disregards the significance of investigating evidence for Theobald. And while his analysis sets out to 'investigate *DF* for traces of participation in its authorship by Shakespeare, Theobald, and Fletcher', Proudfoot makes many concessions in what is clearly an attempt to establish a Shakespeare connection to the play. For instance, he argues that Fletcher's presence emerges 'with increasing clarity' while Shakespeare's 'remains more elusive', pointing to the difficulty with 'the idiosyncratic late style of Shakespeare', which he believes 'would have been especially vulnerable to cutting or alteration' at the time of the adaptation. But even in the case where Shakespeare's hand could be identified, Proudfoot points to the problem with 'stylistic parallels [being] two-edged weapons', in the sense that most parallels to Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood* are open to the possibility of being imitations by Theobald or Fletcher who have both imitated Shakespeare. Thus, while arguing in favour of the existence of Shakespearean fragments in Theobald's play, Proudfoot still presents the possibility of imitation.<sup>221</sup>

In his analysis, Proudfoot supports Theobald's claims for adapting a 1613 Shakespeare play, and dismisses the possibility of forgery. His approach mainly investigates the level of matching found between words

of three or more syllables found in line-end position in *DF* [and] the same words in the same metrical position in the designated plays of Shakespeare and Fletcher written from about 1602 to 1614 and in the published decasyllabic verse of Lewis Theobald in *The Cave of Poverty* (1715), his original plays, and his translations of Sophocles [in addition to] Theobald's two adaptations.

Proudfoot concludes that it is highly likely that Theobald was telling the truth. His analysis produces one hundred words of which there is a far higher level of

---

<sup>221</sup> Proudfoot, 'Forgery', pp. 162-164.

matching to the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher than to Theobald's. He explains the reason behind his choice of methodology:

it was the universal practice of verse playwrights between about 1590 (when we suppose Shakespeare to have started writing plays) and 1625 (when Fletcher died) to end the vast majority—as much as 85 per cent to 95 per cent—of decasyllabic verse lines, whether blank or rhymed, with monosyllables, varying this with disyllables and, much less frequently, polysyllables (that is words of three or more syllables). Both Shakespeare and Fletcher used line-end polysyllables regularly enough to yield significant listings from their plays, but rarely enough to provide investigation of them with manageably small quantities of material.

His choice of methodology is thus based on the assumption that a playwright's choice in ending a line with a polysyllable was made 'on a level somewhere between reflex based on habit and conscious metrical and stylistic decision-making', one that is 'most unlikely to occupy the attention of a forger'.<sup>222</sup>

Proudfoot believes that the word-lists he presents 'adopt clear criteria for inclusion', that is except for a group of words in *Double Falsehood* which had no parallels occurring at the end of the verse line in the plays selected. He explains:

[these lists] take no account of cognate forms based on the same root and found at line-end in either Fletcher or Shakespeare, or both, nor of listed words used at the end of speeches which end in midline [...] As will be apparent from the notes on individual words, relaxation of the strict criteria would perceptibly increase a sense that this seemingly arbitrary small selection from the vocabulary of *DF* is in fact deeply rooted in the metrical and stylistic habits of both Fletcher and Shakespeare in the years 1602-14.

Thus, allowances have been made to loosen the strict criteria of his search, in an attempt to locate parallels to these unmatched words. For instance, Proudfoot links words in *Double Falsehood* to the works of Shakespeare, Fletcher, and

---

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., pp. 164-165.

Theobald, presenting more links to the former two, rather than the latter. However, these parallels do not fit his criteria: (1) they either occur in different word forms, or (2) occur mid-line, rather than at the end of the verse line, and sometimes both. The following are but to name a few examples:<sup>223</sup>

- **'agonies'** (3.2.76) is identified as occurring in its singular form 'agony' three times in Fletcher and not at the end of a verse line.
- **'confederacy'** (5.2.170) matched as 'Confed'racy', and occurring mid-line in Theobald's *The Fatal Secret*, an instance that does not originate in Webster.
- **'contrivance'** (3.2.20) is matched to an occurrence mid-line in Fletcher's *The Mad Lover*.<sup>224</sup>
- **'dishonourably'** (3.3.21) is identified as 'dishonor' occurring at the end of the verse line in Fletcher's *The Humorous Lieutenant*, and as 'honourably' occurring mid-line in *Monsieur Thomas*.
- **'misbecomingly'** (1.2.107) occurs mid-line in a Shakespearean part in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, while 'mis-becomes' was employed by Fletcher mid-line in *The Maid's Tragedy*.
- **'numberless'** (1.3.38) is another match recorded as occurring in *Timon of Athens*, *Henry VIII* (Fletcher's), *Philaster*, *The Tragedy of Valentinian*, but again, never at the end of the verse line.

Although Proudfoot argues that a few of these instances 'point—inconclusively—to one of the three writers in question', it is the relaxation of his strict criteria that has mainly allowed him to produce results which he described as inconclusive.<sup>225</sup>

However, there is an intrinsic flaw in Proudfoot's approach: his analysis attempts to make authorship claims based on a faulty consideration of a heavily

---

<sup>223</sup> Citations of *Double Falsehood* presented by Richard Proudfoot are based on the Arden edition.

<sup>224</sup> Proudfoot's instance however is incorrect, as the word does not occur in the text of Fletcher's *Mad Lover*. Instead, the word occurs in a poem written by William Cartwright, which is one of the commendatory poems published in the beginning of the Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 Folio. These poems were inserted by *LION* as part of the text of the play, being the first play to be printed in the folio, and their text has been incorrectly taken for Fletcher's. This problem with employing *LION* in attribution studies, is also evident in the work of Hammond, and will be discussed in Chapter 3.

<sup>225</sup> Proudfoot, 'Forgery', pp. 168-171.

adapted text, for not only did Theobald cut and alter it in the eighteenth century, but the text also appears to have undergone a previous phase of adaptation in the 1660s. He explains:

It should, however, be acknowledged that this analysis takes no account of any possible revision or adaptation of the play earlier than that of Theobald. It is of course conceivable that, in common with some other 'Beaumont and Fletcher', it had previously undergone superficial revision by Massinger in the later 1620s or the 1630s [...] Equally, no note has been taken of the possible adaptation in the 1660s, under the auspices of Thomas Betterton, which may be implied by Theobald's description of one of his manuscript copies as being in 'the handwriting of Mr Downes, the famous old prompter'.<sup>226</sup>

And although Proudfoot acknowledges this as a limitation, the data he presents still does not account for this limitation. Accordingly, his analysis does not attempt to make any differentiation between the *original* text and the *adapted* text. John Jowett has addressed this problem in editing adaptations when he was working on editing *Measure for Measure* for the Oxford Middleton, considering its folio text was printed from a version adapted by Middleton in 1621. And if we were to apply Jowett's theory on *Double Falsehood*, we would conclude that Proudfoot treated it as a 'continuous' and 'linear' text, as opposed to a 'stratified' and 'layered' text, which unfortunately, is identical to Hammond's treatment of the text in his edition. The problem with 'continuous-text or clear-text presentation [is that it] accepts the impression of textual stability and monolinearity, and by doing so it generates that impression in the reader'.<sup>227</sup> The difficulty with Proudfoot's analysis is how it mainly disregards that *Double Falsehood* is an adapted text, and thus still investigates a feature of its versification to offer evidence for Shakespeare and Fletcher involving elements of the text that might have been altered by Theobald.

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., p. 170.

<sup>227</sup> John Jowett, 'Addressing Adaptation: *Measure for Measure* and *Sir Thomas More*', *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. by Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63-76, pp. 65-68. Jowett's theory and approach will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

Another problem with Proudfoot's analysis involves the significant differences between Theobald's works selected in his study, compared to Shakespeare's and Fletcher's, differences that would make an attempt at stylometric analysis seem biased. One difficulty that must not be overlooked concerns the disproportionate number of works selected for each author in the analysis: while the study considers fifteen plays by Fletcher and thirteen by Shakespeare, it only takes account of nine works for Theobald. A further problem involves the length of samples analysed. In his analysis of the 1602 Shakespeare additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, Brian Vickers illustrates that the length of the text analysed is regarded as one of the limitations of stylometric analysis. Citing Hugh Craig, Vickers asserts that while

this method can undoubtedly make broad distinctions between two authors for whom an adequate corpus of firmly ascribed plays exists [...] it may not be reliable on such a short text as the 1602 Additions, "only five scenes, 2656 words in all."

Such was the case with Proudfoot's consideration of Theobald's *Decius and Paulina*, which only consists of 2302 words. This total is far lower than 3000 words (or the more preferable 5000 words), which Vickers cites as the minimum length recommended by traditional stylometry for works considered for analysis.<sup>228</sup> In fact, previous scholarship has found results obtained from samples that are less than 3000 words to be 'simply disastrous'.<sup>229</sup>

A further problem with Proudfoot's analysis is that he does not emphasize the origins for some of Theobald's works considered; these include a translation (*Oedipus, King of Thebes*), a plagiarised play (*The Perfidious Brother*), two Shakespeare imitations (*The Cave of Poverty* and *Orestes*), and two adaptations (*Richard II* and *The Fatal Secret*), all of which must not be considered as

---

<sup>228</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', pp. 23, 27. See Hugh D. Craig, 'Authorial Styles and the Frequencies of Very Common Words: Jonson, Shakespeare, and the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*', *Style* 26 (1992), 199-220; Jan Rybicki and Maciej Eder, 'Deeper Delta Across Genres and Languages: Do We Really Need the Most Frequent Words?' *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 26.3 (2011), 315-321.

<sup>229</sup> Maciej Eder, 'Does Size Matter? Authorship Attribution, Small Samples, Big Problem', paper presented at the Digital Humanities 2010 meeting <<http://dh2010.cch.kcl.ac.uk/academic-programme/abstracts/papers/pdf/ab-744.pdf>> [accessed 21 May 2015], cited in Brian Vickers, 'Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.1 (2011): 106-142, p. 199.

representative of Theobald's style. And although Proudfoot demonstrates some caution in his treatment of Theobald's adaptations by comparing them to their originals (Shakespeare's *Richard II* and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*), such caution was not applied to Theobald's *The Perfidious Brother*, which as discussed previously, was written originally by Henry Mestayer. For example, Proudfoot records a link between 'presumptions' in 3.2.11 of *Double Falsehood*, and a singular instance of the word in Theobald's version of the play (*PB* 2.294), yet not showing that it in fact originates in Mestayer's version (*PB*, p. 17).

To summarise, the fact that the works Proudfoot selects for Theobald in his analysis (in comparison to works selected for Shakespeare and Fletcher) are fewer in number, much shorter in length, and do not represent Theobald's original style, all create an imbalanced approach that would obviously produce more results for Shakespeare and Fletcher, and much fewer results (if any) for Theobald. Thus, and as expected, Proudfoot concludes that Theobald's 'was clearly the minor role', with a 32 per cent rate of matching to *Double Falsehood*, in comparison to a 65 per cent matching rate to Fletcher, and 63 per cent for Shakespeare (and a rate of 79 per cent for both dramatists combined). Proudfoot admits, rather apologetically, that his investigation presents rates for Shakespeare and Fletcher that 'may well be somewhat inflated in comparison to Theobald['s], as it covers a range of thirty plays against [Theobald's] very much smaller oeuvre'. Proudfoot then uses these figures in questioning the possibility of forgery:

That a forger should have chanced upon a total rate of nearly 80 per cent matching of these words with those in the plays of [Fletcher and Shakespeare] in the years around and leading up to 1613 seems, to say the least, unlikely.<sup>230</sup>

Although Proudfoot asserts that his aim is to 'investigate *DF* for traces of participation in its authorship by Shakespeare, Theobald, and Fletcher', his approach is biased in the sense that it is very much in favour of presenting traces for Shakespeare and Fletcher, in comparison to Theobald. In fact, limitations of his approach are what allowed him to reach 'the (always likely) conclusion that

---

<sup>230</sup> Proudfoot, 'Forgery', pp. 171-172.

*DF* shows traces of authorship by Fletcher and Shakespeare, but also, to a lesser degree, of their adaptor, Theobald'. And while Proudfoot apologetically reveals the many limitations of his approach, he still employs his results in refuting Theobald's forgery of *Double Falsehood*, but more especially to establish Shakespeare's involvement in the lost *Cardenio*. Moreover, these methodological problems have led Proudfoot to qualify his conclusions. At one point for instance, he argues that his approach 'may still offer some level of evidence about the likely authorship of the play Theobald claimed to have adapted as *DF*'; while at another, he states that '[his] hope is to demonstrate a level of probability approaching certainty that Theobald's claim to have adapted a manuscript play of circa 1612 (when Shelton was published) was made in good faith'.<sup>231</sup> Statements such as these highlight the limitations of the approach employed. But with texts of disputed authorship, a more refined methodology is needed in order to draw conclusions that are more definite.



Similar to Proudfoot, Jackson's main research questions seem to focus on dismissing accusations of forgery. His essay 'Looking for Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood*: Stylistic Evidence', focuses on finding evidence for Shakespeare's hand in the play, which, in one way or another, places less emphasis on the play's status as an adaptation. Jackson investigates the existence of 'a textual line of descent' from the King's Men's *Cardenio* (1613) to Theobald's *Double Falsehood* (1727); he then explores the possibility that *Cardenio* was a collaboration between Shakespeare and Fletcher, and whether or not traces of this collaboration survive in Theobald's play. Though 'the external evidence seems to [him] ambiguous', his study focuses on the internal evidence: the 'stylistic and sub-stylistic features' of the play. Interestingly however, the limitations acknowledged in his study are similar to the ones discussed by Proudfoot. Jackson begins by evaluating the internal evidence, pointing out two 'complicating factors':

---

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., pp. 163, 175, 164-165.

(1) that Theobald avowedly ‘Revised and Adapted’ [...] the materials he claimed to possess—and did so for the eighteenth-century theatre, where late Shakespeare’s rugged, complex, and packed dramatic verse was more apt to be discarded or recast than Fletcher’s; and (2) that any *Cardenio* playscript associated with Downes, Betterton, and Davenant might already in the 1660s have been cut and altered for post-Restoration performance.

In addition, when assessing his figures, Jackson discusses an additional limitation regarding ‘the disparate sizes of the canons’, and how his analysis considers fifty plays by Fletcher (of which fifteen were solely his), thirty-nine by Shakespeare, yet only fifteen works by Theobald, ‘most of [which] are *very short entertainments*’. Therefore,

a rough calculation suggests that Fletcher’s output, including collaborations, is more than seven times the size of Theobald’s, that Shakespeare’s is more than five times the size, and that Fletcher’s unaided output is about two and a quarter times the size.

For this reason, Jackson’s analysis of 4.2.1-82 (commonly attributed to Fletcher) unsurprisingly locates more links to Fletcher than those to Shakespeare and Theobald.<sup>232</sup>

But the main difficulty with Jackson’s methodology is how his results—similar to Proudfoot’s—were produced by a false consideration of a text that appears to have been subjected to more than one stage of adaptation. Jackson for instance examines the *Double Falsehood* text for (a) the regulated and unregulated use of the auxiliary ‘do’, (b) the use of double endings, and (c) the occurrence of certain linguistic forms, i.e. ‘hath’ and ‘doth’ versus ‘has’ and ‘does’. However, given that the play is an adaptation, what Jackson has attempted, was to make authorship attributions based on figures produced by analysing a multi-authored text. This would mean that he has examined the text’s linguistic forms, thus attributing them to Shakespeare, Fletcher, or Theobald, when in fact they might have been added by another author/adaptor in the 1660s. More

---

<sup>232</sup> Jackson, ‘Stylistic Evidence’, pp. 133-134, 144.

problematic is the fact that he examines the text for each author's hand, yet *according* to allocations of authorship as introduced by E. H. C. Oliphant (1970), which according to Jackson, were 'specific enough to be tested'.<sup>233</sup> The difficulty with Oliphant's study lies in the fact that it accepts that *Double Falsehood* was based on a Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration.<sup>234</sup>

But searching for links to the works of each candidate within Oliphant's proposed authorial allocations might have obliged Jackson to present results accordingly, and overlook other possibilities; in other words, the analysis was confined to searching for evidences within a theoretical division of authorship. For instance, in his analysis of 4.2.1-82 'which Oliphant regards as Fletcher's with a minimum of revision by Theobald', Jackson 'ignore[s]' the song (4.2.16-23), yet without stating the reason why. Excluding the song 'Fond Echo' is problematic because not only has it been argued that it is 'an interpolation of Theobald's',<sup>235</sup> but also because both external and internal evidence (as will be shown in chapter 5) suggest that it indeed belongs to him. By neglecting to consider the song, Jackson's analysis has missed a unique connection to Theobald, which is neither found in Shakespeare nor in Fletcher:

Or **death** will **make pity too** slow. (*DF*, p. 47)

E'er **Death make Pity** come **too** late. (*P&A* 49, p. 3)

Disregarding the song (a choice that might have been motivated by Oliphant's authorship allocations) would naturally produce fewer connections to Theobald and more to Fletcher. Another difficulty with Jackson's analysis (one he shares with Proudfoot), is that he keeps making qualified conclusions; and because it entirely depends on whether or not we accept Oliphant's allocations, readers would find him constantly making conditional assertions that end with statements such as 'if Oliphant's classifications are correct', 'if he is right', or 'if [his] allocations are even approximately correct'. This is even more evident in Jackson's final statements, where he asserts that 'there can be no certainty' regarding Oliphant's conclusions, which were based on 'a balance of probabilities'; he, however, believes that Oliphant 'seems' to be right. Thus,

---

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>234</sup> Oliphant, 'Double Falsehood', *N&Q* 89-91 (1919).

<sup>235</sup> Lupić, 'Malone's *DF*', p. 109.

Jackson concludes that Theobald ‘probably’ worked from a Shakespeare-Fletcher *Cardenio* ‘manuscript (or manuscripts)’, but that ‘scarcely a line of Shakespeare’s verse survives intact into *Double Falsehood*’.<sup>236</sup>

But it must be noted that half way through his essay, Jackson employs a different approach where he searches for parallel ‘words, phrases, or collocations’ between *Double Falsehood* and the works of all three candidates via the *Literature Online (LION)* database.<sup>237</sup> Here, he emphasises that all parallels have been ‘checked for uniqueness’ by applying the negative check, which is a test that searches for a phrase or collocation in the works of all candidates to confirm that it only occurs in the works of one of these candidates.<sup>238</sup> In comparison to his first approach, Jackson here is able to identify longer parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of our three candidates, thus providing stronger evidence for authorship. Interestingly, he has found that ‘proportionally to the size of Theobald’s dramatic canon [...] the number of links to Theobald’s plays surpass those to Fletcher, and the number of unique links is much greater’. Jackson for instance locates three unique parallels in 5.1, assigned by Oliphant as a Fletcher scene revised by Theobald. He identifies a parallel that is ‘unmatched in the whole of *LION* Drama’, one where “sway”, “rebellious” and “reason/reas’ning” [were similarly] brought together’:

The Tyrant God that bows us to his **Sway**,  
**Rebellious** to the Laws of **reas'ning** Men, (*DF*, p. 52)  
I feel th'imprison'd Passions all unchain'd,  
**Rebellious** to the gentle **Sway** of **Reason**. (*PB* 2.324-5)<sup>239</sup>

It is important to note, however, that this parallel could also be found in Mestayer’s original version,<sup>240</sup> and though it is not necessarily representative of Theobald’s style, it can be regarded as a collocation borrowed from Mestayer, and employed similarly in *Double Falsehood*. Therefore, it must not be regarded

---

<sup>236</sup> Jackson, ‘Stylistic Evidence’, pp. 144, 136, 154, 157, 161.

<sup>237</sup> Like many attribution scholars, Jackson employs the *LION* database as it contains a large body of English drama (ranging from Early Modern to Eighteenth-Century).

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144. The negative check, one of the most essential principles attribution scholars must conform to when searching for verbal parallels, will be further discussed in Chapter 3. See Byrne, p. 24.

<sup>239</sup> Jackson, ‘Stylistic Evidence’, p. 146.

<sup>240</sup> Mestayer, p. 18.

as a valid parallel.

Jackson then identifies two other parallels to the works of Theobald that are also unmatched in *LION*. The first is ‘fair appeal’, which in addition to occurring in *Double Falsehood*, also occurs in *The Persian Princess* (1715) and Theobald’s *Richard II* (1720):

**Make thy fair Appeal**

**To** the good *Duke*, **and** doubt not but thy Tears

Shall be repaid with Interest from his **Justice**. (*DF*, p. 54)

Go **make a fair Appeal**

**To** *Æacus*, to *Minos*, *Rhadamanthus*;

**And** let those Potentates of nether **Justice** (*PP* 5.137-9)

There lies a **fair Appeal**, on this Head (*R2* Preface, sig. 2B1r)<sup>241</sup>

Here, Jackson illustrates that ‘*The Persian Princess* provides the more extended parallel: “Make thy fair Appeal/To” being varied only by “a” instead of “thy.” We must note that the parallel in fact extends further to include ‘and’ and ‘Justice’, thus, making it a much stronger signifier of Theobald’s hand in *Double Falsehood*, than was shown by Jackson. But the most significant parallel he has identified is the phrase ‘I throw me at your feet’, one of the play’s longest to be found in the works of any of the three authors. And although the parallel occurs in *The Perfidious Brother*, it could not be found in Mestayer’s version, and is therefore considered a valid one:

**I throw me at your Feet**, and sue for Mercy. (*DF*, p. 52)

My Lord [...] | **I throw Me at your Feet**, and do conjure You (*PB* 3.213)<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>241</sup> In the Arden edition, Hammond takes no note of these two parallels; however, the following is his comment on the above-cited lines:

79-81 **appeal** . . . **justice** reminiscent of the opening of the final act of *MM*, where Isabella is exhorted by the Duke to appeal for justice to Angela.

Here, Hammond attempts to associate 5.1.79-81 to Shakespeare, yet he neglects (or perhaps even avoids) mentioning the distinctive parallels found in Theobald, which—we might be tempted to argue—possibly explains why his commentary only begins mid-sentence starting from ‘appeal’, rather than including the full phrase ‘Make thy fair appeal’ (Hammond, *DF*, p. 284).

<sup>242</sup> Jackson, ‘Stylistic Evidence’, p. 146. In Chapter 4, I will demonstrate how a search for the parallel on *ECCO* would reveal 15 additional instances of the parallel that were not identified by Jackson.

*LION* has only traced three instances of the phrase in English dramatic works: Theobald's two instances, and one by William Phillips in *Belisarius* (1724). Therefore, considering these results, and especially if we consider the parallel's length, it is clear that this is an exceptionally rare phrase which more definitely points to Theobald as its author.



Turning now to Gary Taylor, the co-editor of *The Quest for Cardenio*, and the most ardent scholar—beside Hammond—currently arguing in support of Shakespeare's involvement in Theobald's source play. Taylor employs electronic databases when searching for parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of our three candidates. And because he does not employ the stylometric approach, he was not required to count parallels found in the work of each author and calculate the percentages of their shares, as is done by both Proudfoot and Jackson. Although Taylor does not mention Oliphant's *Double Falsehood* scene allocations, his analysis clearly seems to adhere to it. As was shown in the previous chapter for instance, he identified a number of strong parallels to Fletcher that clustered in one scene (4.2), which interestingly was classified by Oliphant as a Fletcher scene revised by Theobald.<sup>243</sup> And while Taylor was unable to locate any distinctive parallels to Shakespeare, he has traced many unique links to Theobald. The approach Taylor has employed involves 'identifying' and 'discounting' elements of the *Double Falsehood* text 'that clearly originated after the recorded 1613 performances' of *The History of Cardenio*. He for instance identifies changes in the play's title to *Double Falsehood*, and changes to the characters' names (e.g. the change from 'Cardenio' to 'Julio', etc.) as the result of adaptation which must postdate the 1653 Moseley entry. Moreover, Taylor identifies a number of stage directions as the product of adaptation. However, he argues that such elements still do not establish Theobald's authorship of the play. Taylor explains:

evidence of anachronistic lexical usage must be established

---

<sup>243</sup> Oliphant, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 299.

systematically and objectively, but even when proven beyond a reasonable doubt it establishes only that a single word, or phrase, of *Double Falsehood* has been altered by someone at some point between 1613 and 1727. One word, or phrase, does not in itself establish an eighteenth-century origin even for the entire line in which it occurs.

It must be noted that Taylor's approach is in no way aimed at highlighting the eighteenth-century elements of the play, nor at revealing Theobald's authorship of a significant part of *Double Falsehood*. His main aim is to retrieve and revive the allegedly lost Shakespeare play. At one point in the analysis, Taylor compares Theobald's adaptation of *Double Falsehood* to Ralph Crane's 'edit[ing of] the manuscript behind the earliest surviving printed text of *The Tempest*'. He argues that in both cases—and from an editor's perspective—the aim must be to identify 'the habits of the intermediary, in order to detect elements of the extant text that are untrustworthy'; and after isolating these details, an editor makes 'conjectures [on] how we might restore the lost original'.<sup>244</sup> In fact, Taylor has taken his quest for *Cardenio* a step further when he attempted to reconstruct and restore the *Double Falsehood* text to *The History of Cardenio*. Performed in New Zealand (2009), his version was published in 2013 as '*The History of Cardenio, 1612-2012: [by] John Fletcher, William Shakespeare, and Gary Taylor*', which makes him a collaborator rather than an editor. In 'A Posthumous Collaborator's Preface', Taylor describes his project as 'a thought experiment', one that explores whether or not it is possible to 'unadapt Theobald's adaptation'.<sup>245</sup>

One difficulty with Taylor's methodology is that his analysis considers parallels from Theobald's *The Perfidious Brother* which were originally written by Mestayer, and hence, must not be considered as representative of Theobald's style. For instance, Taylor points to a parallel in the following lines:

That she refus'd my **Vows**, and shut the Door  
Upon my **ardent** Longings. (*DF*, p. 13).  
Deaf to your Orders, and my **ardent Vows**, (*PB* 3.122).

---

<sup>244</sup> Taylor, 'A History', pp. 38, 40.

<sup>245</sup> Gary Taylor, 'A Posthumous Collaborator's Preface', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, 237-240, p. 237.

Here, he does not indicate that the phrase ‘ardent Vows’ was originally written by Mestayer (act 1, p. 2). Similarly, he points out that no database was able to trace any instance of the phrase ‘brutal violence’ as occurring in English works before 1700, but that it also occurs in Theobald’s *The Perfidious Brother*, in which a rape was also described in terms of ‘force’ and ‘dishonour’:

By **Force** alone I snatch’d th’imperfect Joy [...] Not Love, but **brutal Violence** prevail’d; to which the Time, and Place, and Opportunity, were Accessories most **dishonourable**. (*DF*, p. 13-14)

Then he with **brutal Violence** attempted | to **force** me to **Dishonour**:  
(*PB* 2.98-99)

Again, Taylor neglects to notify readers that the phrase also occurs in Mestayer’s version (act II, p. 10). While a comparison between the two versions could ensure whether or not a parallel actually has originated in one version or the other, scholars differ in their approaches to identifying parallels between *Double Falsehood* and this particular play. For instance, and as shown previously, Walter Graham excludes *The Perfidious Brother* from his analysis due to the uncertainty of its authorship; on the other hand, Hammond and Jackson have both included the play in their analyses, thus citing instances, many in Hammond’s case, which were originally written by Mestayer. Therefore, the two instances cited from Taylor cannot be considered as valid parallels.

But regardless of this, Taylor’s analysis still provides many strong parallel collocations between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald’s other works, parallels that surpass the number of those presented by Jackson. For example, Taylor locates a parallel in the same line cited above: ‘brutal Violence’ (*DF*, p. 14). He demonstrates that while the adjective ‘brutal’ was neither used by Shakespeare, Fletcher, Beaumont, or any of the other King’s Men playwrights, it occurs in Theobald’s *The Happy Captive* as well as *The Persian Princess*, in which both instances were also ‘referring to rape’:

Did he not once with **brutal Force** | Attempt, (*HC* 2.6.21-22)

Shall She be made the Spoil of **brutal Lust**, (*PP* 5.77)

So unlike the previous example, this instance occurs in Theobald’s original

works, and is thus regarded as a valid parallel. In addition, Taylor points out a list of other valid parallels between Theobald's works and *Double Falsehood*. He for example demonstrates that the phrase 'at present' does not occur in the works of Shakespeare, Fletcher, Beaumont or Massinger, nor 'in any extant English play before 1638'. However, he shows that the phrase was employed 'thirty-six times' in Theobald's writings 'as an idiomatic expression meaning "at the present time"'.<sup>246</sup> But before reviewing the examples, I must first point out some slight inaccuracies in Taylor's data. For instance, while he demonstrates that the phrase occurs in *Censor* (1717) in vol. I on page 47, 81, 82, 165, 169, 185 and 196, it must be noted that the instances he refers to as occurring on page 165 and 185, were not written by Theobald himself. The first actually belongs to a letter Theobald cites as signed on May 3<sup>rd</sup> 1715 by the initials P. M., and the second to a quotation he cites from the essay 'Of Contentment' by Sir Richard Bulstrode's published in *Miscellaneous Essays* (1715). In addition, Taylor does not show that the phrase also occurs on sig. A4v, page 141 and 143 of the same volume. Moreover, the instance that he suggests occurs in vol. III page 86, actually occurs on page 80.

While Taylor's data also shows that the phrase occurs eight times in Theobald's *Works of Shakespeare* (unavailable on *LION*), a search on *ECCO* identifies only five instances in which the phrase occurs (I p. 129, II p. 344, p. 344, III p. 353, IV p. 379). What complicates the matter is Taylor's unhelpful reference to this particular work, as he does not list the volume nor the page numbers at which the phrase actually occurs each time, but only notes that it occurs '8 times'.<sup>247</sup> Here, we are required to reproduce the analysis and evaluate the data, in order to consider the proposed parallels. However, *ECCO* shows there is some discrepancy between Taylor's numbers and the results it retrieves. This inconsistency could be resolved by a series of trial-and-error search attempts, which might, in turn, trace additional results to what the database has automatically identified (only five). One such attempt was to search for 'preſent', using the long 'ſ' rather than the short 's', which allowed us to trace one additional instance (vol. IV, p. 447). Though it would have supported the main

---

<sup>246</sup> Taylor, 'A History', pp. 40-41.

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

argument of this study to record more parallels in the works of Theobald, I will only count six of the eight parallels Taylor has identified in the *Works*, as this is the number of instances I was able to locate. But regardless, Taylor's data still misses some occurrences of the phrase in Theobald's works due to limitations of both *LION* and *ECCO*. For example, he does not mention that the phrase occurs in *The Rape of Proserpine* (1731), perhaps because it occurs in the dedication (p. v), which was not published on *LION*. He moreover records two instances occurring in *Shakespeare Restored* (on page 13 and 46). However, two other instances (on page 133 and 164) were not mentioned, possibly because they appear in the appendix. Therefore, by adding the instances Taylor has missed and subtracting those that were falsely identified, as well as those I was unable to locate, the total changes slightly from thirty-six to thirty-eight.

The purpose behind listing the inaccuracies in Taylor's data is to highlight the potential problems of approaches that rely heavily on digital databases in authorship and attribution studies (to be further discussed in chapters 3 and 4). Taylor, it must be noted, has a high regard for digital databases, for not only does he rely on them when making authorship attributions, he also discredits previous studies for not having access to such databases. For example, he discredits (rather unconvincingly) the previously discussed theory presented by Richard Farmer (1767), which is worth revisiting here. Farmer's identification of a mistaken accent appearing on the first syllable of the word 'aspect' which he argues was never the case in Shakespeare's time, has led him to conclude that Shakespeare did not write this play.<sup>248</sup> But Taylor asserts that Farmer has 'leapt from the accent of a single word to a conclusion about the authorship and dating of an entire play', which according to Taylor, 'is manifestly absurd'. While some might agree with Taylor's argument, others would surely find it difficult to accept his following statement:

Almost all previous claims about *Double Falsehood* have been, like Farmer's, based on a narrow, subjective and (by modern scholarly standards) unreliable survey of the linguistic evidence, for the simple

---

<sup>248</sup> Farmer, p. 26.

reason that until very recently no one had access to digital databases.<sup>249</sup>

But previous attribution scholarship must not be dismissed simply for not having the same research tools available today. In fact, it is the reliance on these databases that has allowed Taylor to present incomplete and faulty results (as shown earlier), or more dangerously, to falsely attribute a seventeenth-century song to John Fletcher in his attempt to confirm that Shakespeare and Fletcher collaborated on the lost *Cardenio* (which will be shown in chapter 3).

A further problem with Taylor's analysis is that he cites only four of the thirty-six instances of the phrase 'at present' which he has identified. However, these four instances represent the stronger parallels as they contain 'additional matching word[s] outside the basic sequence'<sup>250</sup> (in the sense described by Brian Vickers in 'Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*'), which in this case, is the two-word sequence 'at present'. Taylor explains:

on several occasions [Theobald] combined [the phrase] with other elements of the lines in *Double Falsehood*. In a note on *Richard III* 3.1.83 he wrote 'all that I can at present'; 'all that' followed by 'at present' (in any sense) is not recorded in LION or EEBO before 1650. Theobald's note on *Titus* 1.1.136 has 'that I can at present', which also appears in *Shakespeare Restored* (p. 13) along with 'that I at present' (46); the preface to his adaptation of *Richard II* has 'I at present'. This collocation—the pronoun 'I' immediately adjacent to 'at present'—does not appear in English drama before 1642. A letter of 1734 has 'I am at present', a phrase not recorded before 1623 in prose or before 1663 in drama.

Although there is overwhelming evidence in favour of Theobald's authorship of this phrase, Taylor concludes that among the possible candidates (Fletcher, Shakespeare, Beaumont, or any of the other King's Men dramatists in 1613), Theobald is the 'far likelier [...] to have written "all that at present I could"' (*DF*, p.

---

<sup>249</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 39.

<sup>250</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 30.

13) or 'I am at present' (*DF*, p. 23) of *Double Falsehood*:<sup>251</sup> in other words, Taylor introduces it as a likely possibility rather than an almost obvious fact. A rather more serious problem with this particular point in Taylor's analysis concerns the absence of the remaining parallel examples, as he only includes references to these instances and not the actual examples. Thus, apart from the four examples Taylor cites, readers are not presented with the remaining thirty-two out of the thirty-six parallels he suggests occur in Theobald's works. Had he cited these additional examples, readers would have been even more convinced that Theobald was the one responsible for the two instances of the phrase 'at present' in *Double Falsehood*, which as was shown, neither occurs in Shakespeare nor Fletcher.

According to my count, 24 of the 38 instances of the phrase that appear in Theobald's works occur as the basic sequence 'at present' (see Appendix 2), while 14 extend to include more than the basic sequence. The following section will list these 14 parallels, starting by the four extended parallels cited by Taylor, and then followed by 10 extended parallels that he does not cite. Let us first list the two instances that occur in *Double Falsehood* followed by the four instances that were cited by Taylor, as they include the more extended parallels. The first two instances cited are 'discontinuous' in comparison to the second two, which are 'consecutive sequences', as defined by Vickers; both types however represent very valid parallels:<sup>252</sup>

**All that at present I** *could* boast my own, (*DF*, p. 13)

It happens, **that I am at present** of Opinion [...] (*DF*, p. 23)

**All that I can at present** (*Works IV*, p. 447)

**that I can at present** remember in him, (*ShR* p. 13)

**that I at present** remember, (*ShR* p. 46)

**I am at present** a sort of Shopkeeper, (*Letters* p. 323)

Because these examples extend to include more than the basic sequence, they therefore introduce much stronger parallels. The following 10 matches present equally (or slightly less) extended parallels, however, they are all discontinuous

---

<sup>251</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 41.

<sup>252</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', pp. 29-30.

sequences:

But **I shall** forbear doing **that at present** (*Cen* I, p. 82)

But **I cannot** but lament **that** it seems **at present** to shoot up [...] (*Cen* I, p. 143)

**that** wicked man, whom you **at present** live with (*Elec* 2.1, p. 19)

though **I** do not remember **at present** [...] (*ShR* p. 133)

**I shall** add but one more Error **at present** [...] (*ShR* p. 164)

is more than **I at present** remember. (*R2* preface, sig. 2A4r)

To give a few Instances, **that** occur **at present**. (*Works* I, p. 129)

Whom [...] **I at present** acknowledge for my Master. (*Works* II, p. 344)

a few Instances [...] **that** occur to me **at present**. (*Works* IV, p. 379)

**I** [...] *shall* only **at present** confess myself, (*Letters* p. 334)

Accordingly, listing additional instances has clearly revealed a higher degree of parallelism than was shown by Taylor, which therefore points to Theobald as the author of the phrase on pages 13 and 23 of *Double Falsehood*.

However, Taylor then adds a group of some highly distinctive parallels, most in the form of consecutive sequences which *LION* identifies as unique to Theobald, and as not occurring ‘in any play before 1643’:

---

<i>Enter</i> [...] <i>HENRIQUEZ</i> on <b>the Opposite Side</b> .	<i>DF</i> , p. 13
<i>Exit Iphigenia</i> at <b>the opposite Side</b> .	<i>Ores</i> 4.1.60
and then goes off at <b>the opposite Side</b> .	<i>FS</i> 2.288

---

<b>Oh the devil, the devil, the devil!</b>	<i>DF</i> , p. 13
<b>O the devil! the devil!</b>	<i>Cl</i> act 1, p. 6
<b>O the devil!</b>	<i>Cl</i> act 1, p. 27 <sup>253</sup>

---

<b>I grieve as much   That I</b> have rifled all the Stores of Beauty,	<i>DF</i> , p. 13
<b>I grieve as much that I</b> cannot recover the whole,	<i>Cen</i> I, p. 30

---

<b>had drove</b> me from her.	<i>DF</i> , p. 14
-------------------------------	-------------------

---

<sup>253</sup> Taylor did not present the second instance occurring in *The Clouds*, perhaps because the phrase was not repeated; however, it is still worth citing the occurrence of this unique three-word sequence.

<b>had drove</b> into the Sentiments of <i>Melancholy</i> and <i>Despair</i> .	<i>Cen</i> III, p. 148
<b>still in Silence all.</b>	<i>DF</i> , p. 14
<b>still</b> smother'd <b>in Silence</b> , has caus'd <b>all</b> the Grief [...]	<i>A&amp;S</i> , p. 105
<b>of the ruin'd Maid,</b>	<i>DF</i> , p. 14
<b>the ruin'd maid</b>	<i>Ovid</i> II, p. 147
<b>of the ruin'd</b> Abbey.	<i>FS</i> 5.225
<b>sooth</b> with Words <b>the Tumult</b> in his Heart!	<i>DF</i> , p. 14
<b>sooth the Tumults</b> of thy Breast to Peace.	<i>FS</i> 3.328

Similar to the problems with his investigation of the first seven lines of *The Cave of Poverty*, Taylor's analysis of *Double Falsehood*, like Jackson's, is equally restricted in that it only considers parallels that occur in a particular part of the play, rather than the entire play. But to be exact, Taylor's analysis is perhaps more limited in that it only considers parallels that occur in one particular scene (2.1). It appears that such a restriction (similar to the one evident in Jackson's analysis) was based on the fact that 2.1 was classified by Oliphant as a Shakespeare scene revised by Theobald,<sup>254</sup> not to mention that 'a variety of stylistic tests', as shown in Jackson's and Proudfoot's essays, 'has demonstrated that Act Two is the least Jacobean fifth of *Double Falsehood*'.<sup>255</sup> Therefore, although the parallels Taylor presents are of immense value and will be cited in my research, restricting his analysis to only one scene serves as a further limitation to his study.



In an essay published in the same collection, Tiffany Stern highlights a number of problems with the recent and less recent stylometric analyses of *Double Falsehood*. Stern emphasises that all stylometric analysts so far have 'limited' their work to searching for Shakespeare and Fletcher, yet without exploring other possibilities, for instance, that the play was entirely written by Theobald, or

<sup>254</sup> Oliphant, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, p.299.

<sup>255</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 42.

the possibility that the root text was written by ‘other early modern writers’. She argues:

No one has yet examined *Double Falsehood* for the hand of Philip Massinger (whom Edmond Malone believed had written Theobald’s play) or James Shirley (whom Richard Farmer believed had written Theobald’s play); indeed no one has ever used a ‘control’ against their Shakespeare/Fletcher designations.<sup>256</sup>

Although Proudfoot claims to have searched for traces of Massinger’s hand in the text, this was merely mentioned in passing. To elaborate, while his analysis reveals that Massinger’s early plays produced ‘high levels (over 20 per cent) of matching’ with *Double Falsehood*, he immediately reduces the significance of this statement by adding that ‘perhaps [Massinger’s] close connections and indebtedness to Fletcher have something to do with this’. Moreover, Proudfoot mentions in a brief footnote that other playwrights—including Beaumont, Chapman, Day, Dekker, Field, and Middleton—have not produced matches at the rate of 20 per cent or higher; unfortunately he does not provide the data behind these conclusions.<sup>257</sup>

Beaumont, on the other hand, who collaborated with Fletcher from 1606 to 1613, and whose *Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607-1613) was ‘a parody of *Don Quixote*’,<sup>258</sup> was also not seriously considered as a possible candidate. Jackson, for instance, refers to Humphrey Moseley’s 1653 advertisement of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ‘undoubtedly by Shakespeare and Fletcher, as a comedy by Beaumont and Fletcher’, wondering whether or not Moseley might ‘have made a mistake in the other direction over *Cardenio*’. Such questions prompted him to examine *Double Falsehood* for any links to Beaumont; the results were 19 links to Beaumont and 328 to Shakespeare. However, Jackson has only searched for parallels to Shakespeare and Beaumont within samples identified by Oliphant as ‘Shakespeare revised by Theobald’, which as was previously shown, represents a confined approach. More problematic is how ‘nine of the ten Beaumont plays [examined] are co-authored’, while the thirty-nine Shakespeare plays considered

---

<sup>256</sup> Stern, ‘Collaborative Writers’, p. 129.

<sup>257</sup> Proudfoot, ‘Forgery’, p. 175.

<sup>258</sup> Stern, ‘Forgery’, p. 558.

are 'mainly single-authored plays'. Thus, considering the number of plays analysed and their classification as collaborative or solo-authored, the analysis would almost certainly produce much more results for Shakespeare than it would for Beaumont.

Jackson has further examined the text for Beaumont's hand, this time checking for three-word sequences between *Double Falsehood* and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* on the one hand, and between *Double Falsehood* and *Coriolanus* on the other:

In such a single play versus single play comparison the difference in size of the two author's canons becomes immaterial. The Shakespeare tragedy was chosen because its date (1608) closely matches that of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607) and in order to give Beaumont's plays the benefit of any generic bias that might be operating. All the sections of *Double Falsehood* that Oliphant attributed to Shakespeare revised by Theobald were checked for three-word sequences that *The Knight* shared with *Double Falsehood* but that *Coriolanus* did not, and vice versa.

The results were thirty-four verbal links to Beaumont and forty-eight to Shakespeare. Although Jackson argues that 'the sequences are trivial in the extreme', he still asserts that 'at least they were objectively identified', thus, ruling out the possibility that Beaumont collaborated with Fletcher in *Cardenio*.<sup>259</sup> Yet it must be emphasised here that we cannot rule out a possible author by merely analysing only one of his plays alongside one of Shakespeare's and according to a theoretical division of authorship (Oliphant's). In this case, certainly much more research is required.

Stern further highlights other problems with previous stylometric analysis of *Double Falsehood*. She, for instance, demonstrates that until recently (2012), only one study on the play (1994) considered to check if verbal connections to Shakespeare and Fletcher could also be found in Theobald. She explains:

---

<sup>259</sup> Jackson, 'Stylistic Evidence', pp. 159-161.

Shockingly, until [*The Quest for Cardenio*], only Jonathan Hope had checked to see whether any of the habits being identified as Shakespearean or Fletcherian were also Theobaldian—and he limited his comparison to one ‘pure’ Theobald play, *The Persian Princess* [...] Yet most of the ‘unique’ hallmarks of Shakespeare/Fletcher identified by other stylometricians can be found throughout Theobald’s oeuvre and thus negate themselves as ‘proof’ of anything.<sup>260</sup>

These observations point out a scholarly bias in favour of representing parallels to Shakespeare rather than to Theobald, which I have found to be one of the main difficulties with the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*. Stern then discusses a further problem. She points to the analysis of both Proudfoot and Jackson, demonstrating that both scholars do not account for Theobald’s works that are unavailable on *LION*, or for his works that are not even available electronically:

their important analyses are of necessity mainly limited to the Theobaldian texts easily available in hard copy or digitized on *Literature Online (LION)*, however, and thus do not take account of his lesser dramatic verse or poetry (though Proudfoot does include analysis of Theobald’s Shakespeare imitation *The Cave of Poverty*). Yet about twenty poems by Theobald survive, some lengthy, like the first five-and-a-half books of Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* [...] which extends to over 150 pages.<sup>261</sup>

But this also applies to Taylor, because although his analysis considers many of Theobald’s works that are unavailable on *LION* (e.g. *Antiochus and Stratonice*, *Censor*, *Shakespeare Restored*, and *The Works of Shakespeare*), as well as texts that are not available on *ECCO* (e.g. Theobald’s *Letters 1731-1735*), it still does not consider *all* of Theobald’s works. This limitation is also present in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* (which will be discussed in chapter four).

---

<sup>260</sup> Stern, ‘Collaborative Writers’, p. 129. See Jonathan Hope, *The Authorship of Shakespeare’s Plays: A Socio-linguistic Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Stern’s observation goes in line with the negative check, a test that M. St Clare Byrne (1932) emphasised as one of the ‘golden rules’ scholars must follow when using verbal parallels in authorship studies, which will be discussed in the following chapter (Byrne, p. 24).

<sup>261</sup> Stern, ‘Collaborative Writers’, p. 129.



So far I have reviewed three of the most recent investigations of the *Double Falsehood* text (as shown in the work of Proudfoot, Jackson and Taylor), in light of the many difficulties associated with employing both stylometric analysis as well as the *LION* database in authorship studies. More importantly, I have shown that when scholars (Proudfoot and Jackson) have employed the stylometric approach, they could not identify any distinctive parallels; yet, on the other hand, when scholars (Jackson and Taylor) employed the *LION* database, they have produced some unique parallels. The second approach, I believe, is precisely the type that could tell us something about the authorship of this play. Brian Vickers, one of the most outspoken critics of computer-assisted attribution studies, presents the most comprehensive study to date on why this approach represents the more appropriate approach for authorship studies. In 2011, he highlighted the many problems of stylometric studies, mainly that they employ methods that are ‘out of date’, and that the results they have produced so far have been ‘uncertain’. Vickers reviews contributions of leading practitioners who have shown ‘that the discipline is in a permanent state of confusion’, as there is no consensus on the accepted methodology and techniques, nor was there any consensus on results. He explains that the main problem with the stylometric approach lies in how analysts attempt to fragment language into function words and lexical words, and by counting the frequency of each word group, they attempt to make authorship attributions. But Vickers illustrates that words—according to modern linguistics—are interdependent rather than dependent, therefore, he believes that ‘fragmenting language into a few separate items’ is a basic flaw in computational stylistics.<sup>262</sup>

In his recent work on identifying the 1602 Shakespeare additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (2012), Vickers reiterates his criticism of how the stylometric approach ‘depends entirely on counting word frequencies’, but here he

---

<sup>262</sup> Vickers, ‘Authorship Studies’, pp. 114-117. Vickers cites two independent reviews by leading practitioners in the field: see Joseph Rudman, ‘The State of Authorship Attribution Studies: Some Problems and Solutions’, *Computers and the Humanities*, 31 (1998), 351-65; and Patrick Juola, ‘Authorship Attribution’, *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 1 (2008), 233-334.

emphasises the importance of identifying 'longer word sequences' rather than 'individual words':

Attributionists need to develop methods that go beyond the lexicon, beyond the atomistic form of analysis that single words offer, into a "holistic" method that can respect the phenomenon of language as words that a speaker or writer has joined together in unique sequences. To isolate either function words or lexical words ignores the fact that every linguistic utterance beyond the most simple uses both categories. The basic problem is that [...] the data is words separated out from a literary text which was composed to be performed or read as a unit, and which relies on the interaction of all its constituent words to create meaningful utterances.<sup>263</sup>

Vickers builds his methodology on the qualitative method employed by Warren Stevenson (1954) in identifying the 1602 Shakespeare additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. He cites Stevenson's methodological principle that locates the strongest evidences of authorship in 'clusters or interrelated groups of images and phrases which combine to form a distinct pattern', rather than in 'single or isolated parallels'. Stevenson's analysis, argues Vickers, has produced 'some truly idiosyncratic collocations that point unmistakably to Shakespeare's authorship'. In fact, Stevenson has pointed out some instances that were closely paralleled to Shakespeare, and occurring in a similar context as well, which according to Vickers, indicates that they all 'come from Shakespeare's verbal memory'. Moreover, Vickers praises Stevenson's method for being 'text-specific' and 'author-specific', as opposed to the 'number-specific' stylometric approach:

it deals with the text directly at the verbal level, identifying sequences of words common to two or more plays in such a way as to preserve something of their verbal fabric. These phrases are like patches cut from a swathe of cloth, preserving what Stevenson called "the stylistic wrap of woof" of an author's writing, together with its distinctive

---

<sup>263</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', pp. 24-25.

patterning, the element of meaning that can be conveyed by even a small fragment of text.<sup>264</sup>

So rather than the quantitative approach to language found in stylometry, Vickers proposes a qualitative approach drawn from corpus linguistics. He explains that the advent of electronic word processing in the 1960s has made it possible to create large concordances, allowing linguists to experiment with these resources and investigate how people actually create language. Vickers explains:

[these linguists] realised that in natural languages, many words serve as a centre around which other words cluster, and that human beings communicate not just by placing single words in the appropriate slot in a grammatical structure, according to “Chomsky’s open-choice-principle”. Rather, we speak and write by grouping several words together, creating collocations, chunks of words or “*N*-grams”, as linguists now call them (two words regularly collocated form a bigram, three make a trigram, and so on).<sup>265</sup>

Vickers then refers to the work of John Sinclair (1991)—developed from J. R. Firth (1951)—to demonstrate ways in which attribution scholars could determine unique linguistic utterances. He cites Sinclair’s definition of collocation as ‘the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text’, and classifies them into two types: (a) ‘dramatic and interesting because unexpected’, or (b) ‘important in the lexical structure of the language because of being frequently repeated’. Using the linguistic terms introduced by Saussure, Vickers demonstrates that Sinclair’s first type of collocation described above belongs to the category of *parole* (including collocations unique to one person’s lexicon), as opposed to the second, *langue* (which includes collocations

---

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., pp. 18-22; see Warren Stevenson, ‘Shakespeare’s Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy* 1602’, Diss. (McGill U, 1954).

<sup>265</sup> Vickers, ‘Shakespeare’s Additions’, p. 25.

shared by one speech community); and it is the first type, argues Vickers, that is useful in authorship attribution.<sup>266</sup>

Thus, according to him, if we compare collocation matching to the outdated method of stylometric analysis, we would find that it produces more reliable results as it preserves the writer's 'original verbal fabric', considering we are dealing with language at 'the verbal plane' rather than 'the numerical-statistical plane'. An added advantage of the approach explains Vickers, is that it 'does not depend on the existence of large quantities of text'.<sup>267</sup> So we could apply this approach to Theobald's short works to produce more reliable results than those presented in previous studies (i.e. Proudfoot's analysis of *Decius and Paulina*). To illustrate, by applying this approach to Theobald's *Decius and Paulina*, which consists of 2302 words (far lower than the 3000 words recommended by traditional stylometry), I have identified three unique parallels to *Double Falsehood*:

Something to **start at**, (*DF*, p. 34)

My spirits **start at** Decius' Name. (*D&P* s. 7.4)

And it **has hurt** my **brain**. (*DF*, p. 41)

If no bad Star **has hurt** thy **Brain** (*D&P* s. 10.15)

**You gracious pow'rs**, | The guardians of sworn Faith [...] (*DF*, p. 28)

**Ye gracious Pow'rs!** am I awake? (*D&P* s. 12.5)

Thus, unlike Proudfoot's approach, this method—as shown by Vickers—is considered to be more reliable when applied to this particular work, as it does not require the work in question to meet a specific length. Therefore, I believe that digital databases such as *LION* could be successfully employed to identify the author(s) of *Double Falsehood*; this could be accomplished by locating much longer verbal parallels in comparison to the single word parallels of the stylometric approach. But more importantly, the *LION* approach allows us to

---

<sup>266</sup> Ibid., p. 26. See John Sinclair, *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 170. Also see J. R. Firth, 'Modes of Meaning', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, 4 (1951), pp. 118-149; reprinted in J. R. Firth, *Papers in Linguistics 1935-51* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 190-215.

<sup>267</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 27.

reach more definite conclusions, rather than the tentative ones achieved via the stylometric approach.

## 7. Conclusion

The publication of *Double Falsehood* in the Arden Shakespeare has resurrected scholarly interest in the controversy of its authorship, prompting many scholars to conduct research mostly in support of Shakespeare's involvement in this eighteenth-century play. However, there are many difficulties with these studies. For example, recent contributions have presented parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of Shakespeare, yet these parallels are open to the possibility of being an imitation by either Fletcher or Theobald. Moreover, the *Double Falsehood* text has evidently undergone more than one stage of adaptation; therefore, evidences presented for Shakespeare and Fletcher might in fact belong to part of the text that was altered by Theobald in the eighteenth century, or altered by another adapter at a much earlier date (e.g. in the Restoration period). More problematic is how these scholars were primarily focused on establishing a Shakespeare-Fletcher connection to *Double Falsehood* and have consequently neglected to establish one to Theobald or other early modern writers. And while it is a practical approach to search for proof of Shakespeare's and Fletcher's hands in a work where both their authorship is suspected, such a methodology is still restricted in its partiality against Theobald, which makes for an incomplete and biased approach. Moreover, while all three studies reviewed have still attempted to search for Theobald's hand in the play, their approaches are in favour of producing more parallels for Shakespeare and Fletcher than they are for Theobald. For instance, scholars employing the stylometric approach have chosen a method that is bound to be biased against Theobald. So, in comparison to the works they have analysed for Shakespeare and Fletcher, those they have analysed for Theobald are fewer in number, much shorter in length, and do not represent Theobald's original style (as they include translations, adaptations and plagiarised works). In fact, Proudfoot, Jackson and Taylor have all searched for parallels within *The Perfidious Brother*, which Theobald was accused of plagiarising; and although Proudfoot makes comparisons between Theobald's and Mestayer's versions to ensure that the

links belong to Theobald, Jackson and Taylor unfortunately do not, thus they cite collocations that were originally written by Mestayer. Consequently, this approach has located more parallels for Shakespeare and Fletcher than it has done for Theobald.

Yet still, there are further difficulties. For instance, of the three studies reviewed, two have restricted their analysis to certain scenes of *Double Falsehood* rather than attempting to analyse the whole play; while Jackson has searched for parallels within samples according to authorship allocations proposed by E. H. C. Oliphant (1970), Taylor's analysis has been even more restricted, given he has limited his search for Theobald in only one scene (2.1). More problematic is how Proudfoot and Jackson at one point were compelled to relax their search criteria. Proudfoot for instance loosens his strict criteria to locate matches for unmatched words, thus accepting matches of different word forms or for those occurring in the middle rather than the end of the verse line. Jackson on the other hand has excluded a song written by Theobald in a scene ascribed by Oliphant as a Fletcher scene revised by Theobald. Accordingly, both decisions resulted in producing more links to Shakespeare and Fletcher, and fewer to Theobald. And while Taylor's analysis traced long unique parallels to Theobald, his reliance on electronic databases in searching for parallels has resulted in errors. For example, when he identified parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald's *Censor*, two parallels did not belong to a passage that was actually written by Theobald, but instead, they belong to quotations he had supplied. Moreover, Taylor's reliance on these databases has obliged him to regard their results as complete and accurate, which this study has shown they were not (e.g. he was unable to trace some parallels, perhaps because they occur in the supplementary materials of these works).

On a similar note, Tiffany Stern points to a problem with the stylometric analyses of Proudfoot and Jackson who both did not search for parallels within Theobald's works that are unavailable on *LION* or works that are not even available digitally. This problem also applies to Taylor's analysis, because while it considers many works that are unavailable on *LION* or even unavailable digitally, it still does not consider Theobald's works in their entirety. And although this is generally acceptable for non-stylometric studies which are text-specific, Taylor's

analysis could have been improved by practising more caution given some of his results involved listing the number of parallels found in Theobald's works, yet not considering those that have possibly occurred in his works that are digitally unavailable.

This chapter has, then, examined Theobald's claims in light of two aspects of his career: (1) previous accusations of plagiarism, and (2) his reputation as a Shakespeare imitator. While the first issue represents Theobald as our least reliable source when it comes to claims for adapting a Shakespeare play, the second presents the possibility that he might have imitated Shakespeare while working on his alleged manuscripts. On both these issues, then, there are legitimate grounds for questioning (or even rejecting) Theobald's claims for adapting a Shakespeare play. We have also examined Theobald's adaptations in order to highlight the extent of his alterations to the original plays, but more importantly, to serve as a warning to those who assume Shakespeare's involvement in a play where Theobald emerges as its most prominent contributor. Furthermore, an investigation of the 'rape' incident in the play has shown plausible evidence of Theobald's hand; and although this is to be expected of an adaptation, it rightly opens up a new line of investigation to examine the extent of Theobald's (rather than Shakespeare's) contributions to *Double Falsehood*. In fact, a review of eighteenth-century scholarship on *Double Falsehood* has revealed that scholars/editors not only rejected Shakespeare's involvement in the play, but that they have also suggested that the play was a forgery by Theobald, written in imitation of Shakespeare. However, this chapter builds upon the idea presented in the previous chapter: that the play is not an outright forgery, but an adaptation of a number of manuscripts—some of which descend from the seventeenth century—that are *possibly* linked to Fletcher, yet *falsely* attributed to Shakespeare.

As shown above, an overview of research to date can demonstrate that it tends to focus on highlighting evidence for Shakespeare's and Fletcher's hands in *Double Falsehood*. It has also revealed that previous approaches employed to trace verbal parallels to the play were bound to treat Theobald's works unfairly; thus, scholars are unable to identify parallels to Theobald as much as they are to Shakespeare and Fletcher. Considering the dearth of scholarship emphasising

Theobald's contributions to the *Double Falsehood* text, the demand for this type of research becomes more pressing. It is the hope that this thesis can address this dearth by approaching *Double Falsehood* as an eighteenth-century adaptation of a number of dramatic manuscripts, some which possibly originated in the Jacobean era. More importantly, this study aims to approach *Double Falsehood* as an adaptation *by* Theobald, rather than an adaptation *of* Shakespeare. And rather than searching for parallels in the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher, my analysis instead turns to the works of Theobald. It will abandon the stylometric approach—now rejected as methodologically flawed—and employ electronic databases (such as *LION* and *ECCO*) in searching for verbal parallels. The type of parallels I aim to present are the longer consecutive sequences as opposed to individual words, which according to Vickers, are the most useful in authorship attribution. According to the theories he presents, the analysis must aim to confirm that the parallels found in the works of Theobald are unique to him alone, and not common phrases that he shares with others. Therefore, the negative check will be applied to ensure that parallels to the works of Theobald cannot be found in the works of the other two dramatists; this can be accomplished by searching for parallels in the works of all possible candidates rather than just the preferred candidate(s).<sup>268</sup>

Because mine is a text-specific/author-specific approach rather than the number-specific stylometric approach, it will *not* be necessary to search for parallels within *all* of Theobald's works as this type of approach does not demand such a comprehensive search, and therefore, does not entirely depend on calculating the occurrence of *all* parallel instances. In other words, the accumulation of rare verbal parallels becomes much more important than the calculation of single word parallels, and for this reason, the approach I employ does not necessitate considering Theobald's works that are unavailable electronically. Moreover, unlike previous scholars, my analysis considers Theobald's *The Perfidious Brother* to be a plagiarised play, hence, any parallels to Theobald from this play will only be cited if they are not found in Mestayer's version; and the same applies to Theobald's *The Fatal Secret* which is an adaptation of Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*. But before attempting to discuss

---

<sup>268</sup> Byrne, p. 24.

parallels to Theobald, we must first present a more elaborate discussion on the potential risks of employing electronic databases such as *LION* in attribution studies. The discussion will mainly focus on recent contributions to *The Double Falsehood* controversy made by Gary Taylor and Brean Hammond. My intention is in no way aimed at dismissing digital databases as a valid tool in authorship studies, but rather to highlight and warn against their potential pitfalls.

## CHAPTER 3

# The Use of Verbal Parallels in Attribution Studies: Problems and Potential Risks

---

This chapter aims to explore the subject of lost plays and anonymous songs by investigating one historian's view of the possible relationship between an early modern song and *Double Falsehood*. This particular approach was proposed by Michael Wood (2001)—who accepts the Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition—and holds that 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes', a song set by the King's lutenist Robert Johnson, is all that survives from Shakespeare's lost *Cardenio*. The chapter aims to explore the plausibility of Wood's theory on the one hand, and more importantly, to examine its further development by Gary Taylor (2012) on the other. It will then reintroduce the *Literature Online* approach (discussed in the previous chapter) by which this anonymous song was linked to *Double Falsehood*. The chapter moreover aims to present the essential principles that must be adhered to when employing verbal parallels in authorship studies, which will first lead to an evaluation of Taylor's findings in light of those principles, and would later move to examining the employment of the approach in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*.

### 1. 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountains': Lost Song Found?

Anyone familiar with the literature on the *Double Falsehood* authorship controversy, might find that some scholars would often revert to the case for Fletcher's authorship of *Cardenio*, or to the Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition, only to prove that Shakespeare could, indeed, be found in Theobald's play. This is almost certainly the case with Taylor's recent publication on the subject; it is also the case with the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* (which will be discussed shortly). Taylor clearly argues in support of Fletcher's authorship of the play, yet without discrediting claims for Shakespearean authorship. This section will discuss in great detail Taylor's attempt to authenticate the

Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition by emphasizing Fletcher's participation in the original play. While one might expect Taylor's authentication to be accomplished by analyzing Fletcher's works alongside the *Double Falsehood* text itself, instead, it was accomplished by comparing them against an early modern song with possible connections to Shakespeare.

Michael Wood offers a historian's account of the original music of *Double Falsehood*. In 2001, he argued that 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes', a song set by Robert Johnson—who composed music for the King's men—and based on Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, 'is all we have from Shakespeare's lost Blackfriar's play *Cardenio*'.<sup>269</sup> This theory has steered scholarship in an entirely new direction, by revolutionizing how scholars approached questions that have plagued claims for Shakespearean authorship of this eighteenth-century text. In fact, some modern productions or recreations of *Double Falsehood* have substituted Theobald's song 'Fond Echo' with Johnson's 'Woods, Rocks, and Mountaynes'—based on Johnson's connection to the King's Men—in their attempt for a more authentic representation of the lost play, including Bernard Richards's *Cardenio* version staged at Queen's College, Cambridge (2009)<sup>270</sup> and Gary Taylor's *The History of Cardenio* performed at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand (2009).<sup>271</sup> These productions exclude, however, the RSC's *Cardenio, Shakespeare's 'Lost Play' Re-Imagined*, reconstructed by Gregory Doran in collaboration with Antonio Álamo. Doran's aim was to create a production using Theobald's play as 'a guide' to how Shakespeare and Fletcher might have reconstructed Cervantes' *Cardenio* episode. Although Doran restores two missing scenes from *Double Falsehood* using Shelton's translation,<sup>272</sup> he and composer Paul Englishby likewise chose to incorporate Theobald's 'Fond Echo',

---

<sup>269</sup> Michael Wood, *In Search of Shakespeare* (London: BBC, 2001). Wood only briefly mentions his theory in both the documentary and the book version *In Search of Shakespeare* (London: BBC Worldwide Ltd, 2003); he however discusses it in great detail in his unpublished essay "A sound from heaven": new light on Shakespeare's *Cardenio*' (2001).

<sup>270</sup> Bernard Richards, 'Reimagining *Cardenio*', in *Quest*, 344-351, p. 347.

<sup>271</sup> See the employment of 'Woods, Rocks and Mountains' in Taylor's published version, Gary Taylor, John Fletcher and William Shakespeare, 'The History of *Cardenio*, 1612-2012', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, 240-316, pp. 298-299. For a discussion on how such changes worked on stage, see Lori Leigh, 'The "Unscene" and Unstaged in *Double Falsehood*, *Cardenio*, and Shakespeare's Romances', 171-184, in the same collection (p. 179).

<sup>272</sup> Gregory Doran, 'Restoring *Double Falsehood* to the Perpendicular for the RSC', in *Quest*, 360-367, pp. 361, 364.

arguing that 'Johnson's Jacobean Musical setting — although very beautiful — did not chime with [their] heightened Spanish setting'.<sup>273</sup>

Before exploring the relationship between Johnson's song and the lost *Cardenio*, however, it is necessary to investigate further Johnson's association with the theatre. Robert Johnson (c. 1583—1633), appointed as the King's lutenist in 1604, 'probably' started a career with the theatre in 1607 through a connection with his patron the Lord Chamberlain (also the patron of the King's Men), composing music for their productions from that year on. Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, *A Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* all feature songs set by Johnson. He also composed music for Middleton's *The Witch*, Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, and Ben Jonson's *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*. Moreover, Johnson composed music for five of Fletcher's plays, *The Captain*, *Valentinian*, *The Mad Lover*, *The Chances*, and *The Lovers' Progress*, two of which were collaborations.<sup>274</sup> Interestingly, this rates Fletcher's plays/collaborations as the highest to feature songs composed by Johnson, which on its own, is worth exploring. Christopher Goodwin for instance, argues that 'more than two-thirds of Johnson's songs can be identified as originating from plays, principally by Beaumont and Fletcher'. In response to Wood's theory—and obviously under the impression that *Cardenio* was authored by Shakespeare alone—Goodwin states that

on closer examination the imagery and diction of this song is suspiciously close to that of *Away delights* (words by Beaumont and Fletcher) and *Care-charming sleep* (by Fletcher) [both set by Johnson], so perhaps one should avoid over-excitement on this score.<sup>275</sup>

All the more reason, then, to associate this anonymous song with the works of John Fletcher.

---

<sup>273</sup> Doran, *Shakespeare's Lost Play*, p. 207. Moreover, the published script of the RSC *Cardenio* production includes brief supplementary material at the end regarding their decisions on music, and it publishes the first stanza of Johnson's 'Woods, rocks and mountains'; See Gregory Doran and Antonio Álamo, *Cardenio, Shakespeare's 'Lost Play' Re-imagined* (London: Nick Hern Books Ltd., and RSC, 2011), p. 115. Doran has contributed to Wood's BBC documentary *In Search For Shakespeare* by directing a number of extracts from Shakespeare, one of which was a reimagined scene from *Cardenio* featuring Johnson's song.

<sup>274</sup> Matthew Spring, 'Johnson, Robert (c. 1583-1633)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>275</sup> Christopher Goodwin, 'Lutes and Voices', *Early Music*, 36.1 (2008), 140-142, p. 141.

Research dating as early as the 1950s makes a similar connection to that made by Michael Wood, in associating 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes' (and other songs set by Johnson) to Fletcher. John Cutts explored the provenance of four songs composed by Robert Johnson, occurring in BL Add. MS. 11608, and whose author remains anonymous. Two of those songs are linked to Fletcher. 'Care charming sleepe' (f. 15b), for instance, appears in Fletcher's *Valentinian*, and 'Myn Ost's song' (f. 20) appears in Fletcher's and Massinger's *The Lovers' Progress*. The remaining two songs are 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes' (f. 15b), and 'With endles teares' (f. 15). Cutts explains:

All four are written out in the same hand, and this is quite distinct from the handwriting in which the rest of the manuscript is written. This leads to the conclusion that these four songs have either been copied into blank pages of the manuscript from another manuscript or—and I think this is much more certainly the case—the relevant leaves have been inserted into the manuscript. The pages give every appearance of having been inserted into the body of the manuscript. Only a study of the binding and physical composition of the manuscript can decide this, however.

The fact that two of the songs set by Johnson, for Fletcher plays, were grouped in a distinct form in the manuscript with two of his anonymous songs is certainly worth considering. It might possibly suggest that those two anonymous songs might have been authored by Fletcher, or Beaumont and Fletcher, though this cannot necessarily be proved. Another song Cutts finds worth mentioning is 'As I walked forth', which although it first appears in Playford's *Musical Ayres* (1652), he believes was composed very early in the seventeenth century. This anonymous song, he argues, is 'haunting in its sadness', making him almost certain that it is 'a companion to' both 'Woods, Rocks & Mountains' and 'With Endless Tears':

All three have more than a suggestion in their figures of distressed and forsaken lovers and heroines of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, and I think it possible that they may be some of those songs which are

frequently mentioned throughout their plays as being sung off stage and on, but are not specified.<sup>276</sup>

It is not clear whether or not Cutts is aware of the Shakespeare-Fletcher-*Cardenio* tradition, but another explanation that may well have supported his argument would have been that those songs might be connected to this lost play. Accordingly, Cutts is not only suggesting the possibility that the songs belonged to the Beaumont and Fletcher canon, but he is also pointing out the recurring theme of forsaken maids in their plays.

What we are concerned with here, of course, is what those songs can possibly say about the lost *Cardenio*. First, the physical appearance of the songs in the manuscript groups them with songs of Fletcherian plays; second, their theme is similar to that of 'Woods, rocks & mountains', which as previously discussed, shows an evident relationship to *Double Falsehood*—specifically with its song, 'Fond Echo', being sung by a forsaken maid. In fact, Michael Wood has also suggested that 'With endless tears' might be the first song to have been sung in the original Shakespeare-Fletcher play, which was not included in the *Double Falsehood* text, but only hinted at in Shelton:<sup>277</sup>

With endless tears that never cease  
I saw a heart lie bleeding  
Whose griefs did more and more increase,  
Her pains were so exceeding.  
When dying sighs could not prevail  
She then would weep amain;  
When flowing tears began to fail  
She then would sigh again.  
Her sighs like raging winds did blow,  
Some grievous storm foretelling,  
And tides of tears did overflow  
Her cheeks, the rose excelling.  
Confounding thoughts so filled her breast

---

<sup>276</sup> John P. Cutts, 'Robert Johnson: King's Musician in His Majesty's Public Entertainment', *Music and Letters*, 36.2 (1955), 110-25, p. 119.

<sup>277</sup> Wood, 'A sound from heaven', cited from Hammond, *DF*, pp. 329-333.

She could no more contain  
But cries aloud, Hath love no rest,  
No joys, but endless pain?<sup>278</sup>

While Hammond describes Wood's other theory as 'speculative', he still believes 'it is a speculation that deserves to be heard'.<sup>279</sup> In his discussion of Johnson's 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes', Gary Taylor does not discuss 'With endless tears', arguing that 'it does not demonstrably derive from *Don Quixote*, and that the plausibility of its connection to the lost play depends on its relationship to *Double Falsehood*'.<sup>280</sup> However, Taylor's reconstructed version is in accordance with Wood's theory as he inserts the song 'With endless tears' in 4.1, thus, appearing before 'Woods, Rocks and Mountaynes'.<sup>281</sup>

Accordingly, Gary Taylor's subsequent view that Fletcher is the most probable author of Johnson's song is not out of line with scholarship supporting Fletcher's authorial predominance in *Cardenio* (discussed in Chapter 1). Taylor has recently approached the authorship question of *Cardenio* in his discussion of 'Woods, Rocks and Mountains' by attempting to establish verbal connections between the song and Fletcher's other works. Taylor, building on Wood's theory, points to Johnson's songs that survived in seventeenth-century manuscripts, ten of which were not connected to any theatrical productions; 'Woods, rocks and mountains', he suggests, 'fits exceptionally well an episode in the *Cardenio* story'. External evidence, he argues, dates the song from 1607, after Johnson's return from abroad, and before his death in 1633 (most likely between 1609 and 1623, during which time he was actively involved with the King's Men). That said, Taylor's approach uses internal evidence to relate Johnson's song to *Cardenio*. Taylor argues that woods, rocks, mountains, cold and hunger all '[locate] the singer in a specific setting', a deserted and solitary place, one that 'exactly fits the Sierra Morena [...] in *Don Quixote*'. There is a significant relationship found in the song's setting, involving 'silver fountains' and 'hollow waters', which Taylor believes is mirrored in 'the cleere stream' in which Dorothea is described

---

<sup>278</sup> Elise Bickford Jorgens, *English Song 1600-1675: Facsimiles of Twenty-six Manuscripts and an Edition of the Texts*, vol. 12 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), p. 294.

<sup>279</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 333.

<sup>280</sup> Taylor, 'History', p. 28.

<sup>281</sup> Taylor, 'The History of *Cardenio*', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, p. 288.

washing her feet. Interestingly, he argues, that the song offers a dramatic solution, for

a problem created by any Jacobean attempt to transform the Spanish novel into an English play. Cervantes can describe a stream; but the King's Men could not place a body of water on stage. Cervantes could describe a young woman partially undressing to bathe in a stream; for the King's Men, Dorothea would be played by a boy actor. On stage, the novel's scenic and erotic effect would have to be created by other means: not narratively or corporeally, but vocally and musically.<sup>282</sup>

Establishing a connection between Johnson's song and the corresponding scene from Shelton with *Double Falsehood* is thus fairly straightforward. This song is obviously sung by a forsaken maid, one who has been deceived and betrayed by her beloved, similar to the unfortunate position Dorothea was subjected to by Fernando in *Don Quixote*:

Woods rocks & Mountaines & you desert places  
where nought but bitter cold & hunger dwells  
heare a poore maids last words killd with disgraces  
slyde softly while I sing you silver fountains  
& lett your hollow waters like sad bells,  
Ring ring to my woes while miserable I  
Cursing my fortunes dropp dropp dropp a teare & dye.  
Griefs, woes, and groanings, hopes and all such lyes  
I give to broaken harts yt dayly weepe  
To all poor Maids in love, my lost desiringe.  
Sleeps sweetly while I sing my bitter Moaninge  
And last my hollow lovers that nere keepe  
Truth [truth] in their harts, while Miserable I  
Cursing my fortunes, drop a teare and dye.<sup>283</sup>

---

<sup>282</sup> Taylor, 'History', pp. 29-30.

<sup>283</sup> Cutts, p. 120. I cite Cutts because he offers a comprehensive collation of the song in terms of textual variants.

Yet, due to the song being a small sample of text, Taylor acknowledges the limitations of using stylometric analysis in attempting to identify its author: with no more than seventy-two words, it would not be possible to conduct statistical tests to search for words of ‘high-frequency’. According to Taylor, then, we can only make a secure identification of its author by searching for any linguistic occurrences that are clearly rare, language that is rare enough to ‘serve as an authorial fingerprint’.<sup>284</sup>

At this point, Taylor makes use of the *Literature Online (LION)* electronic database to check the song for any ‘unusual’ idioms and collocations in works published before Johnson’s death in 1633. Parallels, he argues, not only need to be ‘counted’, but they also must be ‘analysed’. For instance, he established that none of the parallels he cites are based on Shelton’s translation; he also checked the works of Heywood, Jonson and Middleton—which he described as ‘very large canons’—with no results. Moreover, he records one unique parallel in the works of three other dramatists: ‘mountains, and you’ in Samuel Daniel’s *Philotas* 4.2; ‘truth in their hearts’ in John Lyly’s *Love’s Metamorphosis*, and ‘hunger dwells’ in Massinger’s *The Picture* 3.1. He explains however, that such parallels have no statistical value as a single parallel cannot prove anything. In order to establish authorship ‘stylometrically’, Taylor suggests that there must be ‘an *accumulation* of verbal parallels, *each* of which is mathematically rare’.<sup>285</sup>

The following table shows verbal parallels between Johnson and Fletcher, and Johnson and Shakespeare as cited by Taylor.

**Table. 1**

<b>Johnson</b>	<b>Fletcher</b>
*‘Where nought but bitter cold and hunger dwells’	Where nought inhabits but night and cold, <i>A Wife for a Month</i> (Act 4)
*‘hear a poor maids’	hear a poor maid, <i>Rollo</i> 3.1
‘a tear and’	a tear and, <i>The Loyal Subject</i> 1.5
‘maids in love’	maid in love, <i>Philaster</i> 1.1
*‘lost desiringe’	lost desires, <i>Mad Lover</i> 5.1
‘and last my’	and last my, <i>Barnavelte</i> 4.2

<sup>284</sup> Taylor, ‘History’, p. 30.

<sup>285</sup> Taylor, ‘History’, pp. 30-32.

**Table. 2**

<b>Johnson</b>	<b>Shakespeare</b>
'bells ring to'	bells ring to, <i>2 Henry IV</i> 4.2
'maids in love'	maids in love, <i>Troilus and Cressida</i> 3.2
*'hollow lovers'	hollow lover, <i>As You Like It</i> 4.1

The asterisked instances above signify what Taylor describes as a 'super-rare parallel'. Based on these results, his conclusion is as follows:

On the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the song's vocabulary, Fletcher is three times likelier than Shakespeare to have written the lyrics, and Shakespeare is likelier than any dramatist but Fletcher.<sup>286</sup>

This, of course, fits very well the Fletcher-Shakespeare *Cardenio* theory. A close inspection however, reveals that in searching for verbal parallels, Taylor did not conform to the most basic rules devised by authorship and attribution scholars over the course of the last century.

One of the main problems with Taylor's method concerns not just how a unique parallel is defined (or misdefined for that matter), but more importantly, how the analysis of such inaccurate data would almost certainly result in erroneous conclusions. This in fact is a very serious issue that requires urgent scholarly attention, and specifically in relation to a play like the lost *Cardenio*, as claims of authorship have been and are still being established without a clearly defined approach. To elaborate, Taylor has made authorial claims on the authorship of Johnson's song, and hence that of *Cardenio*, based on internal evidence:

This song, composed by a lutenist associated with the King's Men between 1609 and 1623, and seemingly based on a character and scene in the *Cardenio* chapters of *Don Quixote*, almost certainly belonged to the lost *Cardenio*. It is more likely to have been written by John Fletcher than by any other playwright working between 1576

---

<sup>286</sup> Ibid., pp. 27-32.

and 1642. Indeed, the parallels to Fletcher's work suggest that he wrote it in the second decade of the seventeenth century. The song thus tends to confirm, independently, the accuracy of at least the first name in Moseley's attribution of *The History of Cardenio*.<sup>287</sup>

There should however be specific criteria for evaluating verbal parallels. In *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, Brian Vickers discussed in great detail the 'deceptive nature' of verbal parallels. He cites scholars such as E. H. C. Oliphant, R. H. Barker, Cyrus Hoy and David Lake, who all warn against the misuse of verbal parallels in attribution studies, yet still use them. Vickers also cites Muriel St Care Byrne (1932), in what he describes as a 'classic essay'.<sup>288</sup> Byrne suggests that when searching for verbal parallels, scholars must 'formulate and obey certain golden rules' before making any conclusions on the authorship of the text in question. She presents the following guidelines:

- (1) Parallels may be susceptible of at least three explanations: (a) unsuspected identity of authorship, (b) plagiarism, either deliberate or unconscious, (c) coincidence;
- (2) *Quality* is all-important, and parallels demand very careful grading—e.g. mere verbal parallelism is of almost no value in comparison with parallelism of thought coupled with some verbal parallelism;
- (3) mere accumulation of ungraded parallels does not prove anything;
- (4) in accumulating parallels for the sake of cumulative effect we may logically proceed from the known to the collaborate, or from the known to the anonymous play, but not from the collaborate to the anonymous;
- (5) in order to express ourselves as certain of attributions we must prove exhaustively that we cannot parallel words, images, and phrase

---

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>288</sup> Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 58; see also pp. 58-62.

as a body from other acknowledged plays of the period; in other words, the negative check must always be applied.<sup>289</sup>

By applying such principles, attribution scholars would ensure that their research employs a more regulated use of verbal parallels. The following section, then, will evaluate Taylor's results and conclusions with these principles in mind; the discussion will only discuss the criteria that apply.

The second criterion (regarding the quality of the parallel) is of special interest to us, specifically concerning the verbal parallels that were presented by Taylor as 'unique', and how they are not clearly defined in terms of quality. There is a clear difference between what Byrne describes as 'mere verbal parallelism' and 'parallelism of thought coupled with some verbal parallelism'. To elaborate, the first instance Taylor cites for a single unique parallel with Johnson's song occurs in Samuel Daniel's *Philotas* 'mountains, and you'. Regardless of the fact that he does not consider it of any statistical value, being a singular instance, not to mention the fact that Daniel 'did not write plays for the King's Men (or any known commercial plays after 1607)',<sup>290</sup> the verbal parallel he presents is still invalid in terms of linguistic and semantic uniqueness. This can be further clarified if we cite the two parallels in full (parallel phrases will be printed in bold type). In Daniel's example, Craterus addresses Philotas saying:

You promise **mountaines, and you** draw men on  
With hopes of greater good that hath been seene.<sup>291</sup>

The singer in Johnson's song makes a different kind of address:

Woods rocks & **Mountaines & you** desert places  
where nought but bitter cold & hunger dwells

However, there is a difference between these two examples: while in the former, the noun 'you' is an active subject of a verb, in the latter, the noun is the object addressed. This difference clearly dismisses any claims for parallelism.

---

<sup>289</sup> Byrne, p. 24.

<sup>290</sup> Taylor, 'History', p. 31.

<sup>291</sup> Samuel Daniel, *Philotas* (London, 1623), 4.2.20-21.

Moreover, two of the examples Taylor presents as proof of Fletcher's authorship of the song can also be classed as mere parallelism, as they are not paralleled semantically with Johnson's text, and thus, carry no authorial implications. For instance, similar to the previous example, 'a tear and' and 'and last my' both evidently have nothing unique about them, and therefore, cannot be considered as instances of strong collocations. Let us look at the first example from Fletcher's *The Loyal Subject* alongside its parallel:

He shook his head, let fall **a teare, and** pointed  
Thus with his finger to the ground; a grave  
I think he meant. (1.5.22-24)<sup>292</sup>

The previous parallel is matched by Taylor with the following example:

& lett your hollow waters like sad bells,  
Ring ring to my woes while miserable I  
Cursing my fortunes dropp dropp dropp **a teare &** dye.

Though the parallels are matched in form, the collocations themselves carry no distinctive meaning, and cannot be necessarily considered as a unique occurrence in an author's idiolect. Interestingly, a closer parallel Taylor could have highlighted is 'let fall a teare' from the same line; although it is not identical to Johnson's 'dropp a teare', it obviously represents a stronger parallel. Oddly enough, and equally alarming, the phrase 'dropp a tear', which appears in Johnson's song, also appears in Fletcher's *The Loyal Subject*, and is certainly a more appropriate parallel than 'a tear and'.

Bring him to bed with ease Gentlemen,  
For everie stripe I'le **drop a teare** to wash 'em  
And in my sad repentance (4.6.13-138).<sup>293</sup>

Taylor, for some reason, avoids citing this parallel, though it contains a much stronger similarity; this might perhaps be because the collocation also occurs in

---

<sup>292</sup> Fredson Bowers, ed., Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, 10 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992; repr. 2008), V, p. 177.

<sup>293</sup> Bowers, V, p. 245.

James Shirley's *The Wedding* (4.1). The difficulty with this method, quite clearly, is that it places a lot of value on results that could be deemed insignificant (according to attribution scholarship),<sup>294</sup> which would thus result in false attributions. Taylor's approach does not attempt, then, to define an idiom, a unique parallel or collocation. Though he aims to use verbal parallels to distinguish between a writer's 'authorial idiolect' and the 'sociolect' of the language of his/her time and place, the parallels he presents are far from being (as he describes) 'sufficiently rare to serve as an authorial fingerprint'.<sup>295</sup> Yet, if scholars are to take up Taylor's definition of rare, they too will certainly be able to locate all sorts of parallels in the works of their preferred authors. Thus, one must attempt to clearly define a rare parallel, and conduct the search on the entire corpus of early modern drama, rather than searching in the works of particular authors. MacDonald P. Jackson argues that

the comprehensive collecting of rare verbal parallels between an anonymous scene and the full range of theoretically possible authors—when a definition of 'rare' is established in advance—is a completely different process from the uncontrolled accumulation of parallels between a disputed work and an authorial candidate whom the scholar favours.<sup>296</sup>

There are, furthermore, other serious problems with Taylor's results. To begin with, of the six Fletcherian verbal parallels cited in his study, three occur in collaborative plays. As far as citing parallels from collaborative works are concerned, let us consider Byrne's fourth criterion, mentioned previously, regarding parallels and collaborative works:

in accumulating parallels for the sake of cumulative effect we may logically proceed from the known to the collaborate, or from the

---

<sup>294</sup> For a full discussion, see Vickers, 'Parallel Passages', *Co-Author*, pp. 57-75.

<sup>295</sup> Taylor, *History*, p. 30.

<sup>296</sup> MacDonald P. Jackson, *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham & A Lover's Complaint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 19.

known to the anonymous play, but not from the collaborate to the anonymous.<sup>297</sup>

It would be useful to refer to Byrne's classification of the works of Henry Chettle, which we can apply to the works of Fletcher: class A: acknowledged solo-authored works; class B: acknowledged collaborative works; and class C: anonymous works in which the author in question might possibly have had a hand. Byrne states that

unless the parallels *within* class A are numerically overwhelming, and aesthetically striking, additional parallels from class B will prove nothing. If they are, however, then comparison between classes A and C will be just as instructive as that between A and B.<sup>298</sup>

That said, we can only establish a connection between the style of Johnson's song and Fletcher's co-authored works, if the parallels in his solo-authored works are 'numerically overwhelming' and 'aesthetically striking'. That is, while it is possible to establish a connection between Fletcher's solo-authored plays and those in which he collaborated, what concerns us here is how it is not possible to establish a connection between his collaborative plays and works that are anonymous, in this case, Johnson's song. For example, Taylor's citation of an instance from *Philaster* (a collaboration with Beaumont) and one from *Barnavelte* (a collaboration with Massinger) cannot make any claims for Fletcher's authorship of the song. But worse still is his citation of what he describes as a 'super-rare' parallel in *Rollo*, which was written by Fletcher in collaboration with Chapman, Jonson and Massinger. All the more reason, then, for those parallels to lose their statistical value—especially the last one—despite the fact that they have all been cited from portions that scholars have assigned to Fletcher.<sup>299</sup> Accordingly, of the six unique Fletcherian parallels (and of the three super-rare

---

<sup>297</sup> Byrne, p. 24.

<sup>298</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25 (cited in Vickers, *Co-author*, p. 59).

<sup>299</sup> 4.2 of *Sir John Van Olden Barnavelte* and 1.1 of *Philaster* have both been ascribed by Cyrus Hoy as belonging to Fletcher. Though Taylor's parallel in *Rollo, A Tragedy* occurs in the first part of 3.1 which has also been ascribed to Fletcher (where the remaining part was identified as written by Chapman), it still remains difficult to count this as a valid parallel, not only because of the play's multiple authorship, but specifically because it occurs in a scene where two authorial hands have been identified. See Hoy, *Fletcher and His Collaborators*, (II) 9 (1957): 143-62, p. 145; (III) 11 (1958): 85-106, p. 95; (VI) 14 (1961): 45-67, p. 56.

parallels) we are now only left with two. Taylor also accounts for a parallel that occurs in Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*, which is believed to be a collaboration 'with at least two other authors'; this, equally, must not be accounted for, even if the parallel occurs in parts scholars ascribed to Shakespeare.<sup>300</sup>

Another problematic aspect of Taylor's research, is that of adhering to Byrne's fifth criteria of applying the 'negative check'. Taylor makes it an option to account for a parallel statistically, in the case where it fails the negative check. For instance, while 'bells ring to' occurs once in Shakespeare's *2 Henry IV*, Taylor also demonstrates that it occurs in the singular form 'bell rings to' in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* 2.2 and three times in Heywood's *The Captives* (twice in 2.1, and once in 4.3). Moreover, an exact parallel to 'maids in love' can be found in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* 3.2, but in the singular form in *Philaster* 1.1. According to Taylor, there are two options at hand: either to account for parallels regardless of singular/plural distinctions, or to account for those that depend on such distinctions.<sup>301</sup> The verbal parallels he presents clearly escape the negative check, because, if Taylor were to apply it, he must either (a) dismiss two of Shakespeare's parallels, 'bells ring to' and 'maids in love', or (b) Fletcher's 'maid in love'. In other words, he would be forced to discount those results in support of what his study clearly reveals as his two *preferred* candidates. Such flexibility only makes Taylor's method unstable and inconsistent, and it does not necessarily serve an authorship problem of this sort, especially when we are dealing with a very small sample as Johnson's song. However, the negative check should always be applied, and parallels that do not pass this test (resulting in occurrences appearing in the works of more than one author), must be dismissed, rather than undergo another test (the singular/plural test).

More complicated than accounting for instances that did not pass the negative check, or for those that occur in collaborative works, is the business of accounting for instances that occur in works performed outside the specified search parameters for the song's proposed date (1607-1633). For instance, parallels that occurred in *2 Henry IV* (1592), Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*

---

<sup>300</sup> Stanley Wells, ed., William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, second edition (Oxford: University Press, 2005), p. 125.

<sup>301</sup> Taylor, 'History', p. 31.

(1598), *As You Like It* (1599), and *Troilus and Cressida* (1602-3), were considered by Taylor though they were all performed long before Johnson began composing music for the King's Men. Accordingly, those parallels too must surely be disregarded. Thus, a reconsideration of Taylor's claims for Fletcher's authorship of Johnson's 'Woods, rocks, and mountains' in light of the most essential principles for using verbal parallels in authorship studies, would provide entirely different results: Shakespeare's parallels would drop from two to none, and Fletcher's from six to two (the first and fifth examples in table 1.), which are hardly sufficient, we might think, as significant signs of definite authorship.

## 2. 'Shakespeare's Until Proved Otherwise'?<sup>302</sup>

Of course, raising such issues serves, in no way, to discredit Taylor's overall conclusions, which support the *Cardenio* hypothesis (that Fletcher possibly wrote *The History of Cardenio*). Rather it serves to highlight that in Taylor's case, such conclusions were reached by a faulty application of what is otherwise a dependable approach; this, in itself, cannot but cast doubt, we might think, on the strength of his methodology. Taylor himself was in fact guilty of misusing verbal parallels in 1985 when he claimed that the poem *Shall I Dye* was the original work of Shakespeare. We must pause to consider his previous Shakespearean ascription, and specifically how he came to adopt, as was just shown, the same faulty approach with *Cardenio* around three decades later. On December 15, 1985, Taylor published an article discussing a newly found Shakespeare poem. It all began on 14 November, a month before publishing the article, when he came across a poem he did not recognise. The poem was ascribed to William Shakespeare by an unknown scribe, and can be found in the Rawlinson Poetic Manuscript 160 at the Bodleian Library. Taylor describes the poem as

the literary equivalent of Sleeping Beauty, a nameless poem awakening from the ancient sheets in which it had lain undisturbed for centuries, a poem without a critical history.

---

<sup>302</sup> Gary Taylor, 'Shakespeare's New Poem: A Scholar's Clues and Conclusions', *New York Times Book Review*, 15 December 1985, 11-14, p. 14.

By November 22, Taylor, with the help of Stanley Wells—both were undertaking the roles of general editors of the Oxford Shakespeare at the time—‘had subjected the poem to every accepted test of authenticity’; the results, he claims, ‘were all positive’, and they ‘could think of nothing else to check’. The manuscript, explains Taylor, contains fifty other poems that are attributed to certain authors, arguing that

none of those other attributions are demonstrably wrong, most are demonstrably right, and only two ambiguous initials are even dubious — “J. D.” (Jon Donne?) and “G. H.” (George Herbert?).

Therefore, according to Taylor, the manuscript’s attributions ‘deserve our respect’. In terms of quality, he, rather apologetically, states that we can excuse the weaknesses of the poem, being the work of a younger Shakespeare, but regardless, he believes that the poem ‘must be regarded as Shakespeare’s until proved otherwise’.<sup>303</sup> In addition to the Shakespeare attribution (regardless of the anonymous scribe), and the verbal parallels (irrespective of the poem’s quality), Taylor argues that it was ‘a feeling’ in his ‘gut’ that convinced him that the poem was written by Shakespeare; he concludes: ‘now the onus is on the people to prove that it isn’t Shakespeare’.<sup>304</sup> It has since become a commonplace among scholars and editors to approach any text that has been attributed to Shakespeare (regardless of the long scholarly tradition that rejects many Shakespearean ascriptions) with a view towards canonical expansion, albeit one that is led—as is the case in this instance—by a false employment of verbal parallels in authorship studies.

Brian Vickers is among the least convinced by Taylor’s ‘discovery’. This, along with another misascription, he discusses in book length in *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford’s Funerall Elegye*. Vickers dedicates his entire prologue (of over 50 pages) to refuting Taylor’s attribution, an attribution he believes was based on ‘entirely undistinctive verbal collocations that occur over and over again in the literature of this period’, which

---

<sup>303</sup> Ibid., pp. 11, 13-14.

<sup>304</sup> Simon Freeman, ‘A Scholar’s Find May be Lost Shakespeare Love Poem’, *Sunday Times*, 24 November 1985, p. 1.

according to him, is among the many ‘weaknesses of [Taylor’s] methodology’.<sup>305</sup> Central to Vickers’s approach to attribution studies, as was mentioned earlier, is his repeated reference to the ‘fundamental principles’ of this field; this time he cites four of the general principles that must be observed in authorship studies, as presented by M. W. A Smith:

1. The onus of proof lies entirely with the person making the ascription.
2. The argument for adding something to an author’s canon has to be vastly more stringent than for keeping it there.
3. If doubt persists an anonymous work must remain anonymous.
4. Avoidance of a false attribution is far more important than failing to recognise a correct one.<sup>306</sup>

It is unfortunate that many attributionists (including some editors and general editors of major Shakespeare publications) are still failing to adhere to even at least half of these basic principles. In the case of *Double Falsehood*, for example, Richard Proudfoot, one of the current general editors of the Arden Shakespeare series, argues that ‘[Hammond] is quite open to the obvious fact that there is an element of speculation’ with regard to *Double Falsehood*, but he states that both of them ‘believe that the balance of doubt lies in favour of its claim being authentic rather than a total fabrication’.<sup>307</sup> Though the play is not anonymous, if we are to apply Smith’s third principle, the contested element of the authorship of *Double Falsehood* ought to be treated in the same manner; that is, even considering Theobald’s claims that the adaptation was based on a Shakespeare play, editors/general editors of this particular text are duty-bound not to represent it as such. Theobald himself when confronted with the dilemma that *Double Falsehood* was possibly the work of Fletcher more than of Shakespeare, offered a rather biased response: ‘my Partiality for *Shakespeare* makes me wish,

---

<sup>305</sup> Brian Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford’s Funerall Elegye* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 19, 21.

<sup>306</sup> M. W. A Smith, ‘Attribution by Statistics: A Critique of Four Recent Studies’, *Review informatique et statistique dans les sciences humaines*, 26 (1990), 233-51, as cited in Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare*, p. 3.

<sup>307</sup> Richard Proudfoot, cited in Mark Brown, ‘“Shakespeare’s lost play” no hoax, says expert: New evidence that *Double Falsehood* was, as 18th-century playwright Lewis Theobald claimed, based on Bard’s *Cardenio*’, *The Guardian*, 15 March 2014 < <http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2010/mar/15/shakespeare-lost-play-double-falsehood> > [accessed 9 May 2012]

that Every Thing which is good, or pleasing, in that other great Poet, had been owing to *his Pen*'.<sup>308</sup> Even more unfortunate is how the scholar's editorial power is being exploited in authorship studies to the extent that doubtful works have started to emerge in prominent Shakespeare editions, editions that instead of being authorial, proved to be partial. It took Taylor a week to make a decision on the authorship of *Shall I Dye*, thus publishing his statement in press, and eventually having the poem itself published in the Oxford Shakespeare edition:

Shall I die? Shall I fly  
Lovers' baits and deceits,  
    sorrow breeding?  
Shall I tend? Shall I send?  
Shall I sue, and not rue  
    my proceeding?  
In all duty her beauty  
Binds me her servant for ever.  
If she scorn, I mourn,  
I retire to despair, joining never.<sup>309</sup>

As with the Moseley *Cardenio* entry, the manuscript's Shakespearean ascription was evidently taken for granted; Taylor asserts:

Whoever demands more proof is demanding that a poem pass the threshold of his own critical esteem before it can be admitted into Shakespeare's house. But documents, like defendants must be presumed innocent until proved guilty; unless this document's attribution can be disproved, this poem must be included in any edition of Shakespeare's works that claims to be "complete".<sup>310</sup>

Proudfoot reiterated such assertions in the general editors' preface to *Double Falshood*, when he stated that, the case for Shakespeare's participation in the play 'could be substantiated beyond all doubt *only* by the discovery of an

---

<sup>308</sup> Theobald, *Double Falshood*, second issue, sig. A5v.

<sup>309</sup> 'Various Poems', *Oxford Shakespeare*, p. 807.

<sup>310</sup> Taylor, *New Poem*, p. 14.

authenticable manuscript or altogether disproved by other equally convincing forms of external evidence'<sup>311</sup> (*italics mine*). Both statements seem to be what Smith refers to as the 'short-cuts of attribution studies'.<sup>312</sup> Equally, Proudfoot added more recently that '*Double Falsehood*, as all we have left of *Cardenio*, has a right to its place in the story, and to a presence in any collection of Shakespeare's plays that aspires to completeness'.<sup>313</sup> Such an approach does not define Shakespeare as a fixed canon of works, but rather, as an openly impermanent canon, one characterized by a readiness to include doubtful works ranging in quality simply because Shakespeare's name or initials were tagged to them, and to exclude them only when external evidence resurfaces to prove the contrary. Taking such attributions for granted would place the Shakespeare canon in a perpetual state of instability, thus confusing students and scholars alike.

The question for us to address here, then, is how exactly are we to define the *complete* works of Shakespeare? A compilation of Shakespeare's *Complete Works*—or at least of his dramatic works: the Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies—was initially attempted in the 1623 folio, which includes a total of thirty-six plays. Though John Heminge and Henry Condell argued that the plays were offered 'absolute in their numbers, as [Shakespeare] conceived them',<sup>314</sup> the folio does not mention that some of these plays are collaborations such as *Titus Andronicus* and *All is True*, and it still excludes *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Pericles*, two other collaborative works that are now generally accepted as part of the Shakespeare canon. Moreover, a scene from *Sir Thomas More* has been admitted to the canon, and can now be found in most authoritative Shakespeare editions.<sup>315</sup> In respect to *Double Falsehood* (as was the case with *Shall I Dye* back in 1985), scholars are now, more than ever, challenging this notion of completeness to an extreme, most often adopting an all-inclusive approach to works of doubtful authorship, and placing much value on different kinds of

---

<sup>311</sup> Richard Proudfoot, et al, "General Editors' Preface," *Double Falsehood*, xii-xvi, p. xvi

<sup>312</sup> Smith, p. 250.

<sup>313</sup> Proudfoot, 'Forgery', p. 176.

<sup>314</sup> [John Heminge and Henry Condell], *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*, ed. by Charlton Hinman, 2nd edn., with a new introduction by Peter W. M. Blayney (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996), p. 7.

<sup>315</sup> Shakespeare, *Oxford Shakespeare*, pp. 813-815. Quite remarkable was Arden's publication of an independent edition of the entire play in order to highlight Shakespeare's role as a reviser. See John Jowett, ed., Anthony Munday and Henry Chettle, *Sir Thomas More* (London: Methuen Drama, 2011).

external evidence: evidence that most sceptical scholars would dismiss as either problematic or irrelevant.

There is a growing scholarly consensus, then, that views the Shakespeare canon as an expansive and as an expanding canon. It is complicating, and quite unsettling for some, that though a work can be welcomed in the canon, it soon afterwards could just as easily be dismissed by scholars. This was precisely the case with *Shall I Dye*; while Taylor asserted that the poem does not 'survive in any other copy in the major manuscript collections at the British Library, the Bodleian, Folger, Huntington, Rosenbach, Yale or Harvard libraries', he suggested that it is possible that 'the poem may surface in some other collection';<sup>316</sup> and surfaced it has. On 19 January 1986, over a month after Taylor's statement, Donald Foster published a response to Taylor's claims. He pointed to the presence of an additional copy of 'an apparently less corrupt text' of the poem in a manuscript at the Beinecke Rare Book Library at Yale, which is 'more authoritative in every respect than the Rawlinson volume'. The following is Foster's assessment of the manuscript:

Though the handwriting is elegant, the texts in the Rawlinson manuscript are in most cases corrupt even by 17th-century standards. Whole lines are omitted, copied twice or thoroughly mangled. It is apparent from manifest errors that the texts are corrupt even for those 30 or so poems that have not survived elsewhere [...] As for those items that appear in a reliable text, one can scarcely find 10 lines in a row in Rawlinson without a variant reading; many of these variants are virtual gibberish. The scribe responsible for the Rawlinson manuscript was either unusually careless or worked from terribly corrupt texts or both. The poor quality of the texts does not lend credibility to the manuscript's many dubious attributions.<sup>317</sup>

Though this was brought to the public's attention, Taylor, acknowledging that the poem was subject to major controversy, asserted, with support from his

---

<sup>316</sup> Taylor, *New Poem*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>317</sup> Donald W. Foster, 'Letter to the Editor', *New York Times Book Review*, 19 January 1986, p. 4

colleagues, that there is still no reason ‘to abandon [their] original conclusion’, and that the poem will be published in a special section in the Oxford edition.<sup>318</sup>

Thus, amid growing controversy surrounding its authorship, and despite increasing scholarly disagreement (with some scholars dating the poem as belonging to the 1630s),<sup>319</sup> the poem was published in the Oxford *Complete Works of Shakespeare* (1986), and later reprinted in its second edition. Moreover, the Oxford edition’s statement regarding the Rawlinson manuscript being ‘generally reliable’ along with an emphasis on Shakespearean parallels,<sup>320</sup> would certainly imply Shakespeare’s authorship of the poem, hence, misleading—to this very day—the presumably unknowing reader. Therefore, it would be reasonable to say that the Oxford *Complete Works* embodies a rather flexible approach to the Shakespeare canon, thus inspiring contemporary and later scholarship to make a transition from the less recent tradition that questions the textual and authorial indeterminacy of Shakespeare’s plays (by authorial, we mean in terms of co-authorship)<sup>321</sup> to a new movement that not only welcomes, but also, embraces Shakespeare’s canonical instability, particularly when it comes to questions of attribution. In his attempt to attribute Johnson’s song to Fletcher, not only did Taylor reemploy the same faulty approach he used with *Shall I Dye*, albeit with the aid of *LION*, but he also used it on a much shorter sample: that is, by attempting to determine Fletcher’s partial authorship of *Cardenio* by searching for verbal parallels in a song of seventy-two words, as opposed to a lyric of ninety lines. Though the lyric is obviously much longer than Johnson’s song, some argued that it still ‘allow[ed] little scope for valid stylistic and linguistic tests’ due to its fairly abbreviated length.<sup>322</sup>

---

<sup>318</sup> Gary Taylor, ‘Revisiting “Shall I Die”’, *New York Times Book Review*, 9 February 1986.

<sup>319</sup> See for instance Donald W. Foster, ‘“Shall I Die” Post Mortem: Defining *Shakespeare*’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 58-77; and Thomas A. Pendleton, ‘The Non-Shakespearean Language of “Shall I Die”’, *Review of English Studies*, 40 (1989), 323-351.

<sup>320</sup> Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, p. 805.

<sup>321</sup> As it was highlighted by Tiffany Stern in *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 5; see also E. A. J. Honigmann, *The Stability of Shakespeare’s Text* (London: Edward Arnold, 1965); and Vickers, *Co-Author* (Oxford: 2002). Might we add the instability of Shakespeare’s identity, and the conspiracy theories that surrounds it? For more on this theory, see James Shapiro, *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2010); and Donovan Sherman, ‘Stages of Revision: Textuality, Performance and History in *Anonymous*’, *Literature Film Quarterly*, 41. 2 (2013), 129-142.

<sup>322</sup> Macdonald P. Jackson, ‘Editions and Textual Studies’, *Shakespeare Survey* vol. 40 (1988), 224-236, p. 227.

But before moving to the discussion of how Wood's approach to such issues does not necessarily carry validity either, we must first acknowledge the ways in which Wood's theory can be deemed to be valid. Supposing Wood was correct, and Johnson's 'Woods, Rocks, and Mountains' was sung in *Cardenio*; and supposing too that *Double Falsehood* was based on *Cardenio*, there are two possible reasons why the song does not survive in Theobald's adaptation. Either the song was cut or altered to 'Fond Echo' in the adaptation process, or Johnson's song, though possibly composed for *Cardenio*, does not survive in the original play-text, now presumably lost. In fact, the absence of songs in early modern playbooks was not unusual. For instance, the plays of Marston, Chapman and Shirley all suffer from lost songs. Moreover, the Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 folio has thirty missing songs that were 'reduced to twenty' in the 1679 new folio; this is not to mention either that some songs do not survive in the play-text itself, but in a separate document instead.<sup>323</sup> Though 'Woods, rocks & mountains' shows a possible relationship to *Double Falsehood*, one cannot necessarily make definitive authorial attributions by attempting to determine the author of the song. Research into music in Jacobean drama reveals that songs featured in plays are not necessarily authored by the playwright.<sup>324</sup> Therefore, the aim must not be limited to identifying the author of the song (which was more than emphasized by Taylor), but there should rather be a more general aim to prove that the song was possibly sung in *Cardenio*. In other words, if a relationship to *Double Falsehood* can be established, we can still argue with some confidence that the song was originally heard by audiences of *The History of Cardenio*, rather than attempting to prove that either Shakespeare or Fletcher was the author of that song.

Now let us turn to how music and sources are unreliable tools when it comes to authorial attributions. While the song's attribution to Robert Johnson is secure, its author is still anonymous and the song bears no connections to a specific play or playhouse. But sometimes a song can be shared between more than one source, and its authorship still remains uncertain. This very well may be the case with Johnson's song, as a very similar song exists in a different

---

<sup>323</sup> Stern, *Documents of Performance*, p. 137.

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid*, p. 148.

manuscript: the title is 'Woods, rockes and mountaynes', the author, William Cranford (*d. c.* 1645), the lyrics almost identical to Johnson's (save for some repetitions and other minor differences). Cranford was a composer (most probably based in London), and was active 'at least from the second decade of the seventeenth century'. Most popular was his elegy of six voices that he wrote on the death of Prince Henry in 1612. He was associated with St. Paul's Cathedral from 1624 to the 1640s, and not much of his church music survives.<sup>325</sup> Unlike Johnson's 'Woods, rockes and mountaynes', Cranford's was a 'sacred madrigal'<sup>326</sup> performed by several singers, which explains the repetitions not present in Johnson's version of the song:

Woods rockes and mountaynes , and mountaynes,  
wheare noughte but bitter could and hunger dwelles, and hunger  
dwelles,  
heare, heare a poore wretches loste will,  
kilte with disgraces kilte with disgraces  
oh kilte with disgraces with disgraces.  
Slyde softly whilst I singe yee silver fountynes  
And let your hollowe waters like sadde belles, like sadde belles  
ring a doleful peace, a dolefull peace, a doleful peace  
ringe a dolefull peace a dolefull peace to my woes whilst miserable  
miserable I,  
Cursing my fates cursing my fate cursing my fates  
Droppe for the teares and dye, droppe droppe teares and dye  
Droppe droppe for the teares and dye.<sup>327</sup>

Cranford's song was not mentioned by Taylor and other scholars, perhaps because it cannot be found in the *LION* database, which is a limitation one must always consider. On the other hand, even works available on this database can escape being subjected to keyword searches, because, though they might be found on *EEBO* via *LION*, they might only be accessed manually by entering their

---

<sup>325</sup> Peter Lyman, 'Cranford, William (*d. c.* 1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>326</sup> Andrew Ashbee, 'Cranford [Cranforth], William', *Lyra Viol Composer Biographies*, 1-75, p. 2 <<http://www.newtunings.com/research/violbios.pdf/>> [accessed 20 October 2014].

<sup>327</sup> Christ Church Library *Manuscript 56-60* (c.1620), pp. 14-15.

details (title/author's name), and only as digital facsimile images. However, I was able to come across Cranford's song by searching for the title of the song using the Google Books database. One result the database has located (and which is not connected to Johnson's song) is in *Catalogue of Music in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford* (1915), of which Google Books provides no preview.<sup>328</sup> I was, nevertheless, able to find a record for a song called 'Woods, Rocks and Mountains' under the name of one William Cranford by searching on the Christ Church Library website.<sup>329</sup> The song can be found in the Christ Church Library manuscript 56-60 in Oxford (c. 1620), which certainly predates the British Library Add. MS 11608 f. 15b (c. 1640-1660) containing Johnson's song.<sup>330</sup> It is possible that it was a popular church song that Johnson borrowed and adapted for *Cardenio*, or for a King's Men play. The only clue that Johnson adapted the song is the line 'heare a poore *wretches* loste will, kilte with disgraces' being altered to 'heare a poore *maids* last words killd with disgraces'. The alteration from 'poore wretche' to 'poore maid' would possibly show how a theatre composer can adapt a well-known church song to use it for his play. As both songs do not have a clear date, it is possible that Johnson borrowed from Cranford, but less possible (though still likely) that it was the other way around. Previous scholarship has not noted/discussed Cranford's version, and more research is required.

Though verbal parallels helped develop authorship studies, scholars must always be realistic about the authorial implications they make, which can be accomplished by making a cautious assessment of one's evidences. Such caution is evident in John Jowett's approach to identifying collaboration between Shakespeare and Hand C in *Sir Thomas More*. His represents a conservative approach in dealing with verbal parallels, one that differs from the approach adopted by Taylor and Hammond in a number of respects: it acknowledges that its conclusion is 'provisional' rather than certain/almost certain; it evaluates the evidence as soft/hard, instead of generally considering (or even representing) all

---

<sup>328</sup> G. E. P. Arkwright, *Catalogue of Music in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford*, vol. 1 (London, 1915).

<sup>329</sup> Christ Church Library, 'Mus. 56-60' < <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+56--60> > [accessed 26 September 2015]

<sup>330</sup> William Lawes, *Collected Vocal Music: Part 1: Solo Songs*, ed. by Gordon J. Callon (Middleton: A-R Editions, Inc., 2002), p. 71.

evidence as hard evidence; and finally, it admits to the limitations of the approach, rather than take it for granted. In making his conclusions, Jowett explains that:

The searchable databases available at the present, though huge, are not complete. The conflicting indications [...] point to a vulnerability in the method — though one that leaves the evidence locally ambiguous rather than invalidating the method itself. Findings presented here are based on soft evidence; the parameters for inclusions and exclusion are malleable, and the value attributable to the findings varies. Although every effort has been made to pursue the investigation in a rigorous and even-handed way, the possibility remains that there may be undetected counter-evidence — or, for that matter, undetected evidence in support.<sup>331</sup>

Authorship controversies are, thus, better served by such an approach that which would allow editors to present conclusions that are far from being certain. This caution will not only help improve the editor's presentation of the text, but it will eventually, permit him/her to locate the play within the appropriate canon— which does not necessarily have to be that of Shakespeare.

As is often the case in attribution studies, Brean Hammond employs the *Literature Online (LION)* database to establish a connection between Theobald's *Double Falsehood* and a large body of English drama (ranging from Early Modern to Eighteenth-Century) by searching for parallel words, phrases and collocations in the works of Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald. Hammond's approach, similar to Taylor's, reveals serious methodological problems, as it does not live up to the bold authorial claims that are made in the introduction to his Arden edition. One of the main difficulties with Hammond's approach to the *LION* database is the absence of a discussion or commentary that defines how he employs this technique. In fact, while the *LION* database was obviously utilized in his study, it is not explained as part of his overall methodology. In fact, there are a number of factors suggesting that the editor used *LION*, not least of which is the

---

<sup>331</sup> John Jowett, 'A Collaboration: Shakespeare and Hand C in Sir Thomas More', *Shakespeare Survey* vol. 65 (2013), 255-268, p. 264.

popularity of the method amongst attribution scholars. Moreover, Hammond (as many scholars) might have been motivated to use this database as manual searches for verbal parallels between the works of Fletcher, Shakespeare and Theobald in the *Double Falsehood* text would be too complex to be undertaken. Also, one might conclude that it would be extremely difficult, and perhaps, almost impossible, to manually search for parallels in one of Theobald's lengthy works without the aid of electronic databases, like for instance, Translations from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, by Mr. Theobald (c. 1716), not available on either *LION* or *ECCO*; Hammond, unsurprisingly, cites no parallels from this work. Interestingly, his commentary notes strictly cite parallels from Theobald's works that are available on *LION* and neglect those that are not,<sup>332</sup> not to mention, that the 'Works by Theobald cited' section of the edition (pp. 424-425) does not list many of Theobald's works unavailable on *LION*. Therefore, neglecting to define the approach would ultimately mean neglecting to address its problems/limitations, and, as we have seen in relation to Taylor, the *LION* database, indeed, presents us with a wide array of potential problems, regardless of the fact that it seems to have revolutionized authorship and attribution studies.<sup>333</sup>

Let us take the commentary note to the word 'herse' as our first example of Hammond's problematic approach in this regard. The word appears four times in *Double Falsehood*: at 4.1.238, 4.1.241, 5.1.13 and 5.2.35. In 4.1.238n, Hammond explains that it was a common variant of 'hearse', arguing that this variant was deployed many times by Shakespeare, for example in *Richard II* and *The Tempest*. There are two problems with this explanation. First, this commentary note has a technical error as it suggests that the word occurs in the text of *Richard II*; however, a search on the *LION* database shows that it instead occurs in the text of *Richard III*. Second, in the first folio of *Richard III*, the word appears at 1.2.2, though it was spelled 'hearse' in all eight quartos.<sup>334</sup> As for *The Tempest*, the word does not appear in the dramatic text of the play as was suggested by Arden, but only in one of a series of dedicatory poems that were printed before the dramatic

---

<sup>332</sup> One exception is found in 3.2.9n where Hammond points out that the adjectival use of 'mere' occurs in *Shakespeare Restored*.

<sup>333</sup> MacDonald P. Jackson, *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 190.

<sup>334</sup> Q1 (1697), Q2 (1598), Q3 (1602), Q4 (1605), sig. A4r; Q5 (1612), sig. B1r; Q6 (1622), Q7 (1629), Q8 (1634) sig. A4r.

text in the first folio of 1623 (written by Leonard Digges, Hugh Holland, Ben Johnson and James Mabbe). The word appears in Digges' poem entitled *TO THE MEMORIE of the deceased Authour Maister W. Shakespeare*, in the following lines: 'ev'ry Line, each verse / Here shall revive, redeeme thee from thy Herse' (sig. A5r). Though the *EEBO* database tags this instance to the entire First Folio, the *LION* database prints the commendatory poems in *The Tempest* text alone, perhaps because it is the first play that appears in the folio. In the same note, Hammond adds that the word was employed by Fletcher in *Bonduca*, *Four Plays in One*, *The Little French Lawyer*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *The Mad Lover* and 'elsewhere'. By elsewhere, he is most likely referring to *The Double Marriage*, being the only other Fletcher play *LION* records in which the word occurs. However, Hammond's explanatory note at 4.1.238 is not very helpful even in this regard, because excluding *Bonduca* and *The Mad Lover*, the four remaining plays are all collaborations; thus, parallels from those plays must not be counted. Regardless of these issues, however, Hammond's evidence still has other problems. Unlike Taylor, two of the collaborative works he cites as Fletcherian parallels to 'herse' in *Double Falsehood*, occur in the shares of the collaborator, rather than those believed to be authored by Fletcher. For instance, in *The Double Marriage*, the word appears in (5.4.39), which scholars agree, was authored by Massinger.<sup>335</sup> In *The Little French Lawyer* on the other hand, the example reads 'your herse, sir' (4.5.235); this instance not only appears in a portion scholars believed belongs to Massinger,<sup>336</sup> but the word, though spelled 'herse', has in fact, resulted from a compositorial error in the 1647 text that has the press variant 'hrose', but was later amended to 'horse'.<sup>337</sup> Even more problematic is the third instance of a Fletcherian parallel from *The Mad Lover*. In this play, the word does not appear in the text of the play; but instead (and similar to the previous example cited from *Richard III*), it occurs in one of the commendatory poems published at the beginning of the Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 Folio; those too were inserted by *LION* as part of the text of the play, being the first play to be printed in the folio. The poem was written by J. Earle, and is entitled *On Mr. Beaumont. (Written thirty years since, presently after his Death)*: 'Who now

---

<sup>335</sup> Hoy, *Fletcher & His Collaborators*, II (9), p. 147.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid*, p. 150.

<sup>337</sup> Bowers, IX, p. 398.

shall pay thy Tomb with such a Verse / As thou that Ladies didst, fair Rutlands Herse?' (sig. C3v). This takes us to the instance Hammond cites from the collaborative play *The Maid's Tragedy*, which appears in neither of the parts believed to be written by Beaumont, or by Fletcher. Instead, the word appears in the same way as in the previous example, also in Earle's poem (similarly inserted by *LION* as part of the text of this play): *The Maid's Tragedy* being the first printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher 1679 Folio (sig. A2r), it therefore immediately follows the commendatory poems.<sup>338</sup>

There are other instances too where Hammond does not appear to use the *LION* database cautiously. In 1.2 for example, when Cammilo informs Julio that he has been called to court, Julio's response (in an aside) was:

Hem!— to Court? Which is the better, to serve a Mistress, or a Duke? I am sued to be his Slave, and I sue to be *Leonora's*.<sup>339</sup>

*OED* defines 'Hem' as 'An interjectional utterance like a slight half cough, used to attract attention, give warning, or express doubt or hesitation' (*OED n. a*). The following is Arden's commentary note to the word 'Hem!':

**Hem!** Indicates a nervous cough or throat-clearing, as in *Oth* 4.2.29, 'Cough, or cry hem, if anybody come'. Fletcher uses this ejaculation often: several times, for example, in *BB*.<sup>340</sup>

However, the usage employed in *Othello*—also used in the same sense in *Troilus and Cressida* (1.2.225)—is different from that used in *Double Falsehood*, where the former was employed to 'attract attention' and 'give warning', whereas the latter on the other hand, occurring in an aside, was clearly used to 'express doubt or hesitation'. Thus, the Shakespeare parallel Hammond provides is of little value to us, we might think, since it carries no strong claims of authorship. Shakespeare uses 'Hem' elsewhere, as a verb, meaning to 'cough away' in *As You Like it*

---

<sup>338</sup> Though the word 'Hearse' appears twice in this play (5.4.209, 291), Hammond most certainly was referring to the word's occurrence in Earle's example, as his note was concerning the word 'Herse' as a common variant deployed both by Shakespeare and Fletcher in the plays he cites.

<sup>339</sup> Theobald, *Double Falsehood*, sig. B2v.

<sup>340</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 191.

(1.3.18-19), and in *Much Ado About Nothing* (5.1.16). That said, it is clear that no definitive Shakespeare parallels could be established.<sup>341</sup>

This takes us to the second part of Hammond's note, which as will be shown, is even more seriously problematic. While it has been suggested that Fletcher frequently uses the word 'Hem', an examination of the *LION* database results for this search would suggest otherwise. The reason I say an *examination* of the results, is to emphasize the significance of the scholar's role in analyzing those results. But before dealing with Hammond's specific statement regarding Fletcher's frequent use of 'Hem' in *The Beggar's Bush*, let us examine the more general statement of Fletcher's recurrent use of this ejaculation:

**Table 3.** *LION* search results for 'Hem' in the works of John Fletcher

<i>The Pilgrim</i>	4 times
<i>The Humorous Lieutenant</i>	4 times
<i>Women Pleased</i>	2 times
<i>The Honest Man's Fortune</i>	1 time
<i>The Beggar's Bush</i>	96 times

The instances that occur in *The Pilgrim*—twice in 1.2 (p. 49), and twice in 2.1 (p. 50-51)—though spelled 'hem', in fact, all refer to the indefinite pronoun *them*, later emended to 'em in modern editions.<sup>342</sup> Three of the four instances that appear in *The Humorous Lieutenant* are similar to the one in *Double Falsehood* as they were followed by exclamation marks, yet here, they were used to attract attention/give warning (3.6, p. 135). Similarly, the two instances in *Women Pleased* were also used in the same sense as the previous example (2.6, p. 32). The fourth instance must not be counted, as it appears in a collaborative play, but more importantly, because it occurs in the shares that are believed to be the work of Field and Massinger.<sup>343</sup> These instances, however, are probably among those Hammond refers to generally as Fletcher's use of this exclamation. More

<sup>341</sup> Moreover, we cannot prove Theobald's authorship of those lines as his previous use of 'Hem!' in *The Clouds* was mainly to attract attention: 'Hem!---Hem!--- *Socrates* ! Why, little *Socrates*!' (act I, p. 15).

<sup>342</sup> The word occurs in 1.2.102, 118 and in 2.1.13, 191. See Bowers, VI.

<sup>343</sup> Hoy, *Fletcher & His Collaborators* (IV) 12 (1959): 91-116, p. 100.

specifically, he mentions that the term features in *The Beggar's Bush* 'several times'. But if we examine the figures for 'Hem' that occur in that play, we would find that the total actually does not refer to the word itself, but it refers to the number of times the abbreviated speech prefix for Hemskirke (*Hem.*) was used, which amounts to a total of 96 times.

It must be noted, however, that Hammond's authorship claims do not involve a stylometric analysis that investigates the frequency of certain words and phrases. Therefore, the absence of statistical data makes such errors in authorial ascriptions (though still serious) somewhat less misleading. But dangers to the unregulated use of electronic databases in attribution studies are even more enhanced when they involve stylometric and statistical data. For instance, in 1998, Macdonald P. Jackson published new evidence in support of Peele's co-authorship of *Titus Andronicus*. His study mainly employed *LION* to detect any patterns in the works of Peele and Shakespeare regarding their use of the indefinite article 'an'. What he found was that the overall figure for Shakespeare's use of 'an' is almost double that of Peele's. Moreover, when he 'consider[ed] the rates of "an" for each scene' in *Titus Andronicus*, he found that 'the pattern of indefinite article use [...] [was] thus in accord with a rough division of authorship between Shakespeare and Peele'. This new evidence was particularly interesting to Jackson as it supported (what was at the time, considered as) recent research that confirms Peele's contribution to most of I.i, II.i, II.ii, and IV.i.<sup>344</sup> However, a year later, Jackson published a paper in the same journal to correct those figures; in fact, he issued a warning against placing trust in results generated by electronic databases when searching for keywords, arguing that scholars must 'visit the individual contexts so as to ensure that the counts include only those items with which [they] are specifically concerned'. He identifies one of the pitfalls of using such databases in attribution scholarship: one which he admits he 'tumbled into'.

Jackson explains that in his previous study (on the indefinite article 'an' in *Titus*), the *LION* figures for 'an' in *Richard III* and *The Comedy of Errors* were 'seriously misleading'. It has been brought to his attention that the figures for 'an'

---

<sup>344</sup> Macdonald P. Jackson, 'Indefinite Articles in *Titus Andronicus*, Peele and Shakespeare', *Notes and Queries* 45.3 (1998), 308-310, pp. 308-309.

in the former was 'inflated'; after checking the total count for 'an' in the latter, he found out that the same is also true. Both figures accounted for many abbreviated speech prefixes, instead of the indefinite article in question. Furthermore, after checking the original contexts, he found that the *LION* count for 'an' includes the abbreviated speech prefixes for Lady Anne and Antipholus (in both *Richard III* and *The Comedy of Errors* respectively).<sup>345</sup> Though Hammond's study does not record the number of occurrences of the abbreviated speech prefix 'Hem' in *The Beggar's Bush* (which is 96 times), his results regarding Fletcher's possible authorship of the word nevertheless still remains misleading.

Before turning now to examine Hammond's violation of Byrne's previously mentioned 'golden rules', we must first revisit her fourth criteria. As mentioned earlier, Byrne has argued that our search for parallels must follow a certain logic; that is, either to 'proceed from the known to the collaborate', or 'anonymous play', but that we must not proceed 'from the collaborate to the anonymous'.<sup>346</sup> We briefly mentioned previously, that in searching for parallels, Hammond (similarly to Taylor) does not conform to this particular principle, as he frequently cites from the collaborative works of Fletcher as proof of Fletcher's contribution to *Double Falsehood*. For example, in 1.1 n.29, he cites an instance from *The Maid in the Mill* (3.2); and in 1.2 n.146, he cites a parallel with *Love's Pilgrimage* (2.4), both scenes identified as Fletcher's.<sup>347</sup> The edition is also full of commentary notes supporting Fletcher's authorship of the play by citing instances from scenes in collaborative works where two dramatists were identified as their author; for example, in 1.1 n. 43, Hammond cites an instance from 3.1 of *Rollo*, identified as shared between Fletcher and Chapman;<sup>348</sup> in 1.2 n. 35, he cites one from 2.4 of *Philaster*, identified as shared between Beaumont and Fletcher.<sup>349</sup> Hammond goes on to cite further instances in collaborative works, yet from shares that scholars ascribe to the collaborator, instead of Fletcher; i.e. in 1.2.66, citing two instances from 1.1 of *The Scornful Lady*, identified as

---

<sup>345</sup> Macdonald P. Jackson, 'Titus Andronicus and Electronic Databases: A Correction and a Warning', *Notes and Queries* 46.2 (1999), 209-210, pp. 209-210.

<sup>346</sup> Byrne, p. 24.

<sup>347</sup> Hoy, (V) 13 (1960): 77-108, p. 96; and III (11), p. 92.

<sup>348</sup> Hoy, II (9), p. 147.

<sup>349</sup> Hoy, III (11), p. 95.

authored by Beaumont;<sup>350</sup> and in 1.2 n.90, citing a parallel in 2.1 of *The Maid's Tragedy*, which was also identified as being authored by Beaumont.<sup>351</sup> Hammond's explanatory notes abound with such examples, yet space does not permit us to digress into a thorough review of the notes in their entirety.

In order to prove the case for Shakespeare's authorship of the play, however, Hammond would sometimes venture even beyond the limits proposed by Byrne, thus attempting to establish a connection between two contested works. For instance, in 1.1.22n, he associates the phrase 'court opinion' to Shakespeare, by citing an argument presented by Donald Foster, regarding the occurrence of this phrase twice in *A Funeral Elegy* (1612), and how this 'support[s] the view that there must be something genuine behind *DF*'. Though Hammond admits that such is a 'circular argument, as the elegy in question is now attributed to John Ford', he nonetheless asserts that 'the occurrence of the phrase in any text dated 1612 may be relevant to the question of what lies behind *DF*'.<sup>352</sup> However, it seems clear (even from Hammond's statement itself) that arguments of this sort, cannot, and must not, be considered as reliable internal evidence.<sup>353</sup>

There still remains room for one further example of Arden's editorial misrepresentation of the authorship of *Double Falsehood*. This example involves Hammond's citation of parallels that are recorded in the Oxford English Dictionary definitions, thus citing references to Shakespearean usages from *OED* as a strong implication of Shakespeare's authorship of *Double Falsehood*. For instance, the note to 'additions' in 1.3.74 reads:

**Additions** 'Something annexed to a man's name, to show his rank, occupation, or place of residence, or otherwise to distinguish him; "style" of address' (*OED* n. 4). Examples are cited from *KL* and *Oth*.<sup>354</sup>

---

<sup>350</sup> Ibid, p. 96.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid, p. 94.

<sup>352</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 187.

<sup>353</sup> See Donald Foster, 'A *Funeral Elegy*: W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "best-speaking witnesses"', *PMLA*, 111. 5 (1996), 1080-1105; G. D. Monsarrat, 'A *Funeral Elegy*: Ford, W. S., and Shakespeare', *Review of English Studies*, 53. 210 (2002), 186-203; and Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare*, pp. 57-493.

<sup>354</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 211.

One cannot deny that citing *OED*'s testimony—being an authoritative source—can be considered *editorially biased*, we might say, as readers are not made aware thereby that Fletcher employs the word similarly in *The Island Princess* (4.5, p. 114). While *OED* entries remain an essential source for authorship studies, referring to *OED* Shakespearean citations that neither confirm the word as a coinage, nor as an extremely rare usage, is simply misleading. In fact, it is now widely accepted that *OED* is biased to Shakespeare:

its compilers, who listed over 29,000 citations from Shakespeare, were unduly influenced by the availability of his works, and neglected equally inventive writers, such as Nashe.<sup>355</sup>

Another example can be found in a note to the word 'knoll' in 3.2.65. Hammond mentions *OED*'s citations of Shakespearean instances of the word: *Macbeth* (5.9.16), *As You Like It* (2.7.115), and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1.1.134)—of course, overlooking *TNK* being a collaboration—while Fletcher's use of this word in *The Humorous Lieutenant* (2.4, p. 129) is left unmentioned. Hammond would furthermore emphasize Shakespearean authorship in 1.1.38 regarding the word 'horse' being used 'for the collective plural', only citing *OED*'s reference to *Titus* (2.2.18) as an instance where the word was employed as such.<sup>356</sup> But the reader is not informed that the plural use of *horse*, as suggested by *OED*, 'was in general use down to the 17<sup>th</sup> c.', and that it was in fact used by Fletcher several times as in *Women Pleased*: 'Let me have Horse, and good Armes, ile serve willingly' (4.1.118); or *The Pilgrim*: 'A thousand horse' (3.4.26); and *Monsieur Thomas*: 'Money and horse unjustly ye took from him' (4.5.22).<sup>357</sup>

### 3. Conclusion

This chapter has examined the potential dangers that might arise from the misapplication of the *LION* approach in authorship studies. Scholars might usefully practise caution when employing this technique, as it can often provide inaccurate results, potentially leading to faulty conclusions. Perhaps even more

---

<sup>355</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 18, based on Jürgen Schäfer, *Documentation in the OED: Shakespeare and Nashe as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

<sup>356</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 188.

<sup>357</sup> Bowers, V, p. 498; VI, p. 400; and vol. IV, p. 495.

unsettling is how this approach has been misused (or rather abused) in generating results that feed the widespread obsession with discovering lost Shakespeare works, as was shown in Taylor's ascription of Johnson's song to Fletcher, and his earlier Shakespearean misattribution of *Shall I Dye*. Those dangers are particularly evident when a trusted Shakespeare publisher endorses such projects, as it runs the risk of promoting false claims of authorship, which unfortunately, appears to be the case with the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*.

## CHAPTER 4

***‘None but Himself can be his Parallel’*:<sup>358</sup>**

### **Verbal Connections between *Double Falsehood* and the Works of Theobald**

---

Any scholar attempting to prove Shakespeare’s involvement in the authorship of *Double Falsehood*’s source text cannot avoid the uncomfortable fact that Theobald had made a considerable contribution to this play. Of course, one cannot emphasize this point strongly enough. The play was staged in 1727 (and later published in 1728) as an adaptation of Shakespeare; thus, the text as we now have it, is mostly a product of the eighteenth century. This conclusion is further supported by a number of observations that were discussed in previous chapters. First, there is no evidence that the play is in any way related to the King’s Men’s ‘Cardenno’ or ‘Cardenna’, nor is there any proof that it is related to *The History of Cardenio* that was registered in the 1653 Moseley entry. Although this title is obviously linked to Cervantes’ Cardenio plot featured in *Double Falsehood*, its attribution to Fletcher, though possible, is still doubted; but more importantly, its attribution to Shakespeare proved to be questionable. As also previously discussed, there are some aspects of Theobald’s career that might indicate he was an unreliable source. For example, his plagiarism of Mestayer’s *The Perfidious Brother* may well be indicative, perhaps, of his treatment of other writers’ intellectual property. Therefore, an author who produces as his own a play that proved to be someone else’s, is certainly not our most reliable source when it comes to making claims for uncovering a lost Shakespeare play. Of course, we must not overlook a similar incident regarding a disagreement with Warburton, who has accused Theobald of not acknowledging his contributions to his preface to *The Works of Shakespeare* (1733). The fundamental question regarding Theobald’s reliability arises once again when considering *The Cave of*

---

<sup>358</sup> Pope, ‘Peri Bathous’, *Miscellanies*, II, p. 102.

*Poverty* (1715) 'A Poem Written in Imitation of Shakespeare', his dramatic opera *Orestes* (1731), or his play 'The Death of Hannibal, [also] attempted in Imitation of Shakespear's Manner'<sup>359</sup> (1739). All of these works make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that Theobald possibly attempted to imitate Shakespeare in the process of adapting *Double Falsehood*.

Moreover, Theobald's adaptations of Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1720), and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* as *The Fatal Secret* (1735), both reveal major alterations made to the original plays. Such changes clearly conform to common eighteenth-century adaptation techniques that pay special attention to the Neoclassical rules of decorum, as well as the unities of time and place. Thus, both adaptations resulted in many cuts and alterations, not to mention the changes in language, style and stagecraft,<sup>360</sup> which all provide us with an idea of how Theobald possibly altered whatever manuscript was in his possession when he adapted *Double Falsehood*. These critical observations are joined by what was perhaps most harmful to Theobald's cause: his unconvincing claims regarding the manuscripts he said he possessed, and his failure to present any of these manuscripts to the public. Therefore, one is most certainly justified in questioning Theobald's claims that Shakespeare was the original author of the text that lies behind *Double Falsehood*, and in considering Theobald, instead, as its most prominent contributor.

It has already been demonstrated that in his edition, Hammond has not adequately addressed all of these significant factors. Moreover, there are additional problems in his methodology; i.e. how Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote* was seriously underrepresented; the editor's unregulated use of the *LION* database in presenting evidence for Shakespeare and Fletcher as authors of the source play; not to mention, his non-adherence to the most essential principles for employing verbal parallels in authorship and attribution studies. However, these are not the only limitations of Hammond's approach. Equally problematic is the Arden edition's editorial position regarding authorship issues, particularly the editor's and the publisher's decision to edit the play within a Shakespearean context, an approach that does not pay equal attention to its eighteenth-century

---

<sup>359</sup> *London Daily Post*, 26 September 1739.

<sup>360</sup> See Carnegie, 'Pattern of Adaptation', pp. 180-191.

context. At a certain point in the edition, one cannot help but notice the absence of a discussion of the play within the context of eighteenth-century adaptation, in contrast to the strong Shakespearean presence which is emphasized throughout both the introduction and commentary notes. Thus, those interested in the play's status as an adaptation may well be disappointed by the Arden edition, because, even though its editor attempts to acknowledge Theobald's contributions, his edition, unfortunately, falls short due to an editorial preoccupation with representing Shakespeare's possible authorship of the source play, (a possibility this study dismisses). Accordingly, Hammond's commentary has provided a wealth of parallels drawn from Shakespeare, but not nearly as much attention is given to those that could be drawn from Theobald.

This chapter provides a critical evaluation of Hammond's commentary, specifically his use of verbal parallels in establishing connections to Shakespeare and Fletcher rather than to Theobald, who I believe is the play's most prominent contributor. The discussion will focus on how the editor's approach to verbal parallels is selective in its emphasis on tracing parallels to works by the former two dramatists, in comparison to a clear neglect of those involving the latter. While some might consider Hammond's a practical and useful approach, the current study will investigate the extent to which the approach could also be harmful, particularly in how its results entitles the play to be included in a Shakespeare series: a rather bold move that appears to have redefined the Shakespeare canon. As a result, the *Cardenio* authorship controversy has intensified once again amidst Arden's recent publication, which promotes claims that are gaining increasing scholarly support (evidently not always justified) of Shakespeare's possible involvement in *Double Falsehood's* source play. This chapter aims, then, to present instances in which Hammond has identified evidence for Shakespeare or Fletcher when there is equal, if not stronger, evidence for Theobald. More importantly, the chapter will reveal instances where Hammond has overlooked very strong evidence that points to clear connections with Theobald's works.<sup>361</sup> This chapter also aims to take a new direction by

---

<sup>361</sup> Verbal parallels to the play's music will be discussed in the following chapter.

employing an ‘adaptation-oriented’<sup>362</sup> approach to the *Double Falsehood* text and to the question of its authorship.

### **1. A Few Words on the Approach**

Before introducing any verbal parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald’s works, it is essential to re-cap on the approach proposed in the concluding sections of Chapter 2. Because this study mainly aims to approach the *Double Falsehood* text as an adaptation, the analysis will focus on searching for parallels in the works of Theobald, rather than in the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher. It will abandon the stylometric approach—now rejected as methodologically flawed—and employ electronic databases (such as *LION* and *ECCO*) in searching for verbal parallels. The type of parallels I aim to present are the longer consecutive sequences as opposed to individual words, which are precisely the type that could tell us something about the authorship of this play. Furthermore, the analysis must aim to confirm that the parallels found in the works of Theobald are unique to him alone, and not common phrases that he shares with others. Therefore, the negative check must be applied. This term—which will be repeatedly used in this chapter—involves a test attributionists are required to conduct in order to make valid attributions when using verbal parallels; it emphasizes the importance of searching for parallels in the works of all possible candidates rather than just the preferred candidate(s). Applying this test will ensure that parallels to the works of Theobald cannot be found in the works of the other two dramatists. Moreover, I will apply the negative check to instances where Hammond does not. I will therefore list parallels to Theobald where the Arden editor provides parallels to Fletcher and Shakespeare (or to both), yet not to Theobald. Interestingly, these turned out to be considerably more than initially expected.

In my use of the *LION* database, phrases under investigation have been inserted between quotation marks in the keyword search box and ‘Lewis Theobald’ has been entered in the author’s search box. I have selected the ‘variant spellings’ check box to trace instances where the parallel is spelled differently. The system also ‘automatically search[es] for typographical variants

---

<sup>362</sup> John Jowett’s term (‘Addressing Adaptation’, p. 69).

of [the] search terms'; thus, *LION* 'find[s] variant forms of [the] search term in which the following characters have been substituted':

- v for u
- u for v
- j for i or y
- i for j or y
- y for i or j
- w for vv or uu
- s for f.<sup>363</sup>

I have also selected the 'variant forms' check box to search for a word in all of its different forms. So when confronted with a strong parallel, my analysis will overlook any differentiation in form (i.e. contractions, grammatical variation and singular/plural variations) and will account for such instances as valid parallels. Thus, general parallelism of an entire phrase would always be favoured over literal word-to-word parallels. Most importantly, and as mentioned earlier, the negative check will be applied by searching for the same phrase in the works of the two other candidates; that is, 'Shakespeare OR Fletcher' will be inserted in the authors' search box, and the analysis will thus disregard all parallels that occur in the works of more than one author.

This study does not aim to conduct a comprehensive search for parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald's works; in fact, such a task cannot be achieved by using only *LION* (the selected method for this study). To illustrate, *LION* would be unable to trace all unique parallels to Theobald, as a number of his works are published without their supplementary materials, and not in their complete and original form. Moreover, the database would be unable to detect parallels found in the prefaces and dedications to some of Theobald's works. For instance, *The Perfidious Brother* is published on *LION* missing its preface; *The Fatal Secret* is published with a preface but no dedication; *The Happy Captive* is published with an Advertisement but not the dedication; *Orestes* and *The Rape of Proserpine* are both published without their dedications; whereas the *Double*

---

<sup>363</sup> *Literature Online*: 'Help: Searching for variant spellings', <<http://lion.chawyck.co.uk>> [accessed 20 December 2014]

*Falsehood* text itself is published with no dedication nor a preface. Of course, such materials (as will be later shown) are significant when it comes to establishing verbal connections as some of them contain strong parallels to *Double Falsehood*, and would thus point to Theobald as their author.

*LION* also fails to trace some unique parallels to Theobald as the database does not include his complete works, which is not the situation with the works of Fletcher and Shakespeare, whose complete works are available electronically. Thus, it must be noted that *LION* excludes Theobald's following works:

- *A pindarick ode on the union* (1707)
- *The life and character of Marcus Portius Cato Uticensis* (1713)
- *Plato's Dialogue of the Immortality of the Soul* (1713)
- *The mausoleum. A poem. Sacred to the memory of Her Late Majesty Queen Anne* (1714)
- *Oedipus King of Thebes* (1715)
- *The Cave of Poverty* (1715)
- *The Censor* (1717)
- *The history of the loves of Antiochus and Stratonice* (1717)
- *Memoirs of Sir Walter Raleigh* (1719)
- *Shakespeare Restored* (1726)
- *A curious and remarkable letter from Mr. Theobald to Mr. Pope* (1728)
- *An Epistle humbly addressed to the Right Honourable John, Earl of Orrery* (1732)
- *The Works of Shakespeare in Seven Volumes* (1733)

All of these works, while not available on *LION*, can be found on *Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO)*. However, works available on *ECCO* cannot be searched for parallel phrases in the effortless/straightforward manner available through *LION*. To elaborate, using *LION*, one could search a huge selection of English literary works by inserting the phrase within double quotation marks, and running multiple searches by selecting different titles, authors and dates. Thus, with only one click, the user would be able to retrieve tens, and sometimes hundreds of parallel hits. But while a similar search can be conducted using

*ECCO*, the results are not nearly as accurate. So if one searches for a certain phrase, the database will sometimes yield results that would include single-word hits rather than the literal phrase in question, even when inserted between double quotation marks. Therefore, the total hits would naturally be inflated, in which case the researcher must manually filter results produced via *ECCO*; this could be achieved by clicking on each of Theobald's works separately, and searching within their texts, in order to retrieve results as accurate as those produced by *LION*.

Though this is still generally helpful, my research mainly focuses on parallels to Theobald's works that are available on *LION*. Thus, it only employs *ECCO* to identify any parallels in works that are unavailable on *LION*, or parallels the latter might have missed (e.g. those in supplementary materials absent from *LION*); this not only highlights the limitations of *LION*, but also attempts to avoid them as much as possible. It however must be noted that this study is by no means intended to be exhaustive in presenting all parallels to Theobald, therefore, it does not consider parallels to many of Theobald's other works that are not available electronically (either on *LION* or *ECCO*). This in itself must not be regarded as a limitation to this research, because it is unlike studies that employ a stylometric approach, which demand a complete search throughout the entire body of Theobald's works, and mostly depend on calculating the occurrence of *all* parallel instances. Moreover, this must not be regarded as a limitation *especially* because my aim (unlike the aims of other scholars) is to establish Theobald's authorship; so any parallels to his works that my analysis would have missed as a result of this factor, would offer less (rather than more) evidence for the claims I aim to make; therefore, rather than being partial to Theobald's works, the method treats them objectively.

## **2. The Arden Edition and the Limitations of *LION***

One of the central problems in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* (as mentioned in the previous chapter) is that the editor does not discuss his approach to the text at any point in his introduction/commentary; that is, he does not explain his method in making authorship attributions, nor does he confirm his use of *LION* as part of his methodology, though it most likely appears

to be the database he employed.<sup>364</sup> We have also shown in the previous chapter that a neglect of defining the approach would ultimately result in a neglect of addressing its limitations. One of the most alarming limitations is the fact that the Arden editor appears to be making authorial attributions in his commentary notes by consulting online databases of all the published works of Shakespeare and Fletcher, but without considering Theobald's works that are unavailable on *LION*. Thus, if we are correct in proposing that Hammond employed *LION* in his search for verbal parallels, then his incautious use of this method is certainly the reason behind some of the problematic claims he makes in his commentary notes. For instance, in the commentary to 'reclaim' in

His taints of wildness hurt our nicer honour  
And call for swift reclaim,

Hammond asserts that 'Theobald does not use the word [reclaim] elsewhere in his works' (1.1.18-19n). The word, however, was previously used in a similar sense in Theobald's *Censor* (unavailable on *LION*). The word occurs as a verb in lines written in response to a letter from a lady who was seeking advice on the jealousy of her suitor:

All I can do to serve the Fair One, is to give my Sentiments of this  
Passion; and if his Reason and good Sense, seconding my Opinion, can  
help to **reclaim** him, I shall be pleas'd at having been instrumental in  
both their Happiness.<sup>365</sup>

Also in 1.2.31n, Hammond similarly comments on the word 'peremptorily', stating that Theobald does not use it elsewhere in his works. Such assertions are precisely the kind one must avoid, because, they treat the works available on online databases as the complete body of English literature, rather than as an incomplete and accumulating collection. Readers should have been informed that Theobald, in fact, used the word previously in *Shakespeare Restored*. In a discussion of Shakespeare's 'self-contradiction' Theobald states: 'I would not be

---

<sup>364</sup> This could be compared to the way Brian Vickers thoroughly describes his approach in 'Shakespeare's Additions', pp. 25-32.

<sup>365</sup> Lewis Theobald, *The Censor* vol. 1, 2nd edn (London, 1717), pp. 114-115.

so hardy to assert peremptorily, that Shakespeare was aware of this seeming absurdity'.<sup>366</sup> Thus, it becomes clear, based on these observations, that there are dangers in using *LION* in authorship and attribution studies, especially when scholars treat it as an all-inclusive database, and more especially—as seems to be the case with Hammond—when they make such outright assertions. One example of an editor practising caution when it comes to employing electronic databases can be found in the Arden edition of *Sir Thomas More*. In this edition, the editor John Jowett consistently cites *LION* in his notes, thus recognizing it as a source, rather than the entire body of English Literature.<sup>367</sup> In fact, Jowett has previously asserted that such databases are incomplete, which 'point[s] to a vulnerability in the method [...] rather than invalidat[es] the method itself'.<sup>368</sup>

It must also be noted that the editor would sometimes falsely assert the absence of existing parallels in the *Double Falsehood* text, even those that could be traced by *LION*. For instance, in his commentary on the line 'This Bus'ness so discordant' (3.2.43), the editor argues that the word 'discordant', meaning 'inharmonious' and 'jarring', does not occur 'in the Shakespeare or Fletcher canons, nor does Theobald use it elsewhere'.<sup>369</sup> But Theobald reuses the word again in *The Happy Captive*: '(Discordant Twins) should be the Guests | Of one fair Bosom!' (2.1.3-4). Of course, this is not to mention that the word was also previously used by Shakespeare in *Henry IV, Part 2*: 'The still-discordant wav'ring multitude can play upon it' (Induction 19-20).

A reliance on *LION* in generating verbal parallels also seems to reflect on the comprehensiveness of some of the editor's commentary notes. Let us for instance take Hammond's comment on Theobald's use of 'heart-wounded' (*DF*, p. 16) as an example:

This phrase does not occur in Shakespeare or Fletcher, though it is commonplace from their period onward and is particularly prevalent as a compound in Restoration drama. Theobald introduces the compound adjective to describe Richard II in his 1720 version of he play: 'See, your disconsolate, heart-wounded Lord, / with folded

---

<sup>366</sup> Lewis Theobald, *Shakespeare Restored* (London, 1726), p. 83.

<sup>367</sup> See for instance 8.206n, 8.209n, and 9.91.5n in Jowett, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 232, 233, 248.

<sup>368</sup> Jowett, *Collaboration*, p. 264.

<sup>369</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 236.

Arms, and down cast Eyes, approaches' (Act 4, p. 44). It also appears in another play of 1720, John Leigh's *Kensington Gardens, or The Pretenders* (1720), Act 3, p. 44.<sup>370</sup>

This comment does not note Theobald's earlier usage of a slightly different form of the adjective. The instance occurs in *The Cave of Poverty* (1715), unavailable on the *LION* database: 'O Comfort-killing State! Heart-wounding Greif!' (Lxxvi, p. 31). *The Cave of Poverty* includes other unique parallels to *Double Falsehood*, which unlike the previous example, were not noticed or pointed out by Hammond. One example is the very distinctive and rather rare phrase 'dissembling knave/s':

Is't in the Man, or some **dissembling Knave**,

He put in Trust? (*DF*, p. 41)

Wealth-**dissembling Knaves!** (*CoP* XLVII, p. 18)

What are we to make of these oversights? On one hand, the absence of this parallel in the commentary might have been influenced by an editorial *choice* that overlooks Theobald's contributions. The other possibility involves how the editor might have strictly employed the *LION* database in searching for verbal parallels, rather than using *ECCO* or manually searching through the original texts. Therefore, the absence of some of Theobald's parallels in Hammond's edition might also be due to his reliance on *LION*.

However, an analysis that does not consider Theobald's works that are unavailable on *LION* would indeed neglect to account for parallels that are unique to Theobald. Thus, by employing *ECCO*, one can trace parallels to Theobald's works that were not detected by *LION*. Let us for instance search for parallels to phrases that proved to be most unique to Theobald; i.e. the consecutive six-word parallel 'I throw me at your feet' 5.1.26, identified by Macdonald P. Jackson. Interestingly, *ECCO* has identified 15 additional unique matches, which were not pointed out by Jackson; most of these matches are 'discontinuous', as opposed to 'consecutive sequences'.<sup>371</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 217.

<sup>371</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 29.

**Table. 1**

<b>I throw me at your Feet</b> , and sue for Mercy.	<i>DF</i> , p. 52
I need not blush to own, that my desire of <b>throwing this Poem at your Lordship's Feet</b> [...]	<i>CoP</i> Dedication, sig. Ar2
<i>The little Piece</i> , which I now <b>throw at your Feet</b> ,	<i>FS</i> Dedication, sig. Ar3
The Captive , who presumes to <b>throw himself at your Ladyship's Feet</b> ,	<i>HC</i> Dedication, sig. Ar2 <sup>372</sup>
I am preparing to <b>throw myself at his Feet</b> ,	
<b>I throw it at your Feet.</b>	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 18
And <b>throwing himself again at her Feet</b> ,	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 48
[...] <b>threw himself at the Monarch's Feet</b> , and begging	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 77
a Thousand Pardons for his Impositions,	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 93
when <i>Antiochus</i> <b>throwing himself at her Feet</b> , and	
bursting into Tears	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 187
<i>The Prince</i> , as Stratonice was about to retire, <b>threw himself at her Feet</b>	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 94
When <b>throwing myself at her Feet</b> , and imploring her	
to pardon the Insolence of a confession which she	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 235
would extort from me,	
do you expect <i>the Suppliant Father</i> should <b>throw himself at your Feet</b> [...]?	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 247
if I should still <b>throw a Scepter at her Feet</b> ,	
if <i>my Son</i> <b>throwing a Diadem at your Feet</b> ,	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 261
for <i>he</i> had <b>thrown himself at his Feet</b> ,	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 280
[...] has afforded me so particular an advantage of	<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 289
<b>throwing myself at your Feet</b> in an humble	<i>Ode</i> sig. A3r
acknowledgment,	

Although the consecutive six-word parallel pointed out by Jackson in *The*

<sup>372</sup> These instances cited from *The Fatal Secret* and *The Happy Captive* cannot possibly be traced via *LION*, although both works are available on the database; this is because, as mentioned previously, the database publishes these works without their dedications, in which the parallels occur.

*Perfidious Brother* can serve as a secure identifier of Theobald's hand in *Double Falsehood* (being a considerably rare parallel), the additional 15 parallels identified by *ECCO* show the significance of employing this electronic database in making authorship attributions, a database that appears to have been neglected by the Arden editor, and to the detriment of acknowledging Theobald's role as a very prominent (if not the most prominent) contributor to the play.

### 3. Arden's Partiality for Shakespeare

The publication of *Double Falsehood* in the Arden Shakespeare series implies a strong Shakespeare connection to an adaptation of an *allegedly* lost Shakespeare play. The problem begins with the scholarly tradition—obviously embraced by the Arden editor—that accepts Moseley's attribution of *The History of Cardenio* to Fletcher and Shakespeare. Like many scholars arguing in favour of Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*, Brean Hammond and the general editors of the Arden Shakespeare have overlooked some serious issues regarding the Moseley entry, Theobald's reliability, and most importantly, the lack of proof that Theobald ever owned *any* of the four manuscripts he claimed to possess. The Arden Shakespeare series has essentially taken Theobald's word for it, thus welcoming *Double Falsehood* into the Shakespeare canon. The fact that this eighteenth-century play received endorsement from this Shakespeare series, specifically via an authorization of its possible connection to Shakespeare, would undoubtedly carry more scholarly weight than, say for instance, receiving endorsement from independent scholarly contributions published in books or academic journals. This partiality for Shakespeare's authorship of the play's source text dates back to Theobald's preface, where he responds to claims that the play resembles the 'style' and 'manner' of Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare: 'my partiality for Shakespeare', he states, 'makes me wish that everything which is good and pleasing in our tongue had been owing to his pen'.<sup>373</sup> Such partiality, as it has been discussed in Chapter two, is the case with many Shakespeare scholars today.

Because of this partiality, the *Double Falsehood* Arden edition neglects to explore many elements of adaptation in the text. In fact, as this chapter will show,

---

<sup>373</sup> Theobald, *Double Falsehood* sig. A5v.

the play abounds with verbal parallels to Theobald's works that were neither highlighted in the introduction nor in the commentary notes of the Arden edition. Unfortunately, Theobald has not received editorial attention equal to that given to Fletcher and Shakespeare. The following section will discuss the verbal parallels to *Double Falsehood* found in the works of Theobald that are not highlighted in the Arden edition; it will also discuss parallels that are either slightly highlighted or entirely underrepresented by the Arden editor. The aim here is to present an evaluative commentary on the editorial methodology applied to each entry, mainly signifying the degree to which those instances were editorially neglected. Thus, the evidence Hammond introduces in support of Theobald's authorship of particular words and phrases, as will be reviewed in the following section, is not as thorough as that presented for Fletcher and Shakespeare. It must be noted that my study, for instance, differs from the one presented by Vickers in which he presented 116 parallel instances between the 1602 additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the works of Shakespeare,<sup>374</sup> while I only present 39 instances<sup>375</sup> between Theobald's works and the much more extensive text of *Double Falsehood*. The main difference between the two studies lies in the former being an attempt to establish Shakespeare as the author of an anonymous work, while the latter is an attempt to highlight verbal connections between Theobald's writings and *Double Falsehood*, in which Theobald is *already* established as the adapter.

One of the main weaknesses in Hammond's approach is his neglect when it comes to citing evidence in favour of Theobald's authorship. For example in 1.2.76-7n he merely points to the convention of using 'an indented couplet' at the end of acts 1, 2, 3 and 4, arguing that 'this practice must postdate Shakespeare and Fletcher'. He then states that 'Thomas Betterton could have been responsible, or Theobald', yet he offers no further elaboration. Elsewhere,

---

<sup>374</sup> See Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', Appendix 2 (pp. 35-43) where he presents 116 parallels between Shakespeare's additions to Q4 *The Spanish Tragedy* and Shakespeare's other works, 'checked against over 400 plays and masques, 1587-1642'. The parallels were made by Vickers and Marcus Dahl, and they build on parallels presented by Warren Stevenson. Parallels are cited from Warren Stevenson, *Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy: A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions* (Lewiston, NY; Queenstown, Ontario; Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008); and Marcus Dahl and Brian Vickers, 'The 1602 Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*: Shakespeare versus Jonson', *Early Modern Literary Studies* (forthcoming).

<sup>375</sup> Ten of these instances have been presented by previous scholars.

however, when carefully examining the editor's commentary notes, it becomes clear that only a very small number of notes in the edition point to Theobald as the sole author of a particular word or phrase. For instance, in a commentary on the phrase 'stubborn sex' in 3.2.160, Hammond argues that 'the only other recorded literary usage of the phrase is in Theobald's own earlier play *The Perfidious Brother* (1715), Act 1, p. 3', though he does not provide the parallel itself:

Oh, **the stubborn Sex**,

Rash e'en to Madness! (*DF*, p. 32)

Of **the** fantastick, giddy, **Stubborn Sex**,

E'er good Gonsalvo loose a Moment's Quite! (*PB* 1.262)<sup>376</sup>

Also in 5.2.32n, Hammond comments on the phrase 'makes approach', stating that it does not occur in Shakespeare nor Fletcher, even though it appears in the period, citing Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (1599) as an example. He later adds that 'its popularity with Theobald himself suggests that it might be his', pointing out that it occurs in *The Fatal Secret*, *The Happy Captive*, *Perseus and Andromeda*, and *Orestes*. The following is the list of parallels:

Lord Rod'rick **makes Approach**. (*DF*, p. 55)

To learn how near our Nephew **makes Approach**; (*FS* 5.137)

*Pizarro* **makes Approach**;

With him a comely Stranger Youth, (*HC* 2.7.1-2)

No Mortal to these dreary Cells

Dares **make Approach**, and hope to live. (*P&A* 149-150 p. 9)

Tall Ships of War, my Liege,

With hostile Preparation **make Approach**, (*Ores* 1.2.41-42)

Although, Hammond confirms Theobald's possible authorship of these lines, he does not cite the actual parallels in this commentary note, which could have helped in terms of emphasising what appears to be a very likely contribution by Theobald.

---

<sup>376</sup> The phrase clearly belongs to Theobald, as it does not occur in Mestayer's version: 'The giddy, treacherous Sex, than you shall lose / A Moment's Rest or Quite', (Act 1, p. 2).

Another instance where Theobald's authorship is asserted, yet without citation, occurs in 1.2.17n, which is worth citing in full:

**in a spleen** in a gloomy, irritable ill humour or passion with. This particular use of the word 'spleen' suggests that the passage is Theobald's own, since in Shakespeare and Fletcher the spleen is associated much more with laughter or caprice than with ill nature and depression, i.e. 'melancholy': cf. *TS* Ind. 1.136, *1H4* 5.2.19, *LLL* 5.2.117, *WPI* 1.3.30. The sense employed by Camillo was far more prevalent in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century: cf. the Cave of Spleen in Pope's *Rape of the Lock* (1714).<sup>377</sup>

Difficulties arise, however, when the editor attempts to attribute this line to Theobald without supplying any evidence. Hammond's habit of citing references for Shakespeare and Fletcher, but not for Theobald, thus undermines *Double Falsehood's* status as an adaptation, particularly in instances in which Theobald's authorship is confirmed. Here, the editor's statement seems to be based on the fact that Theobald, unlike Shakespeare and Fletcher, consistently uses 'spleen' to mean melancholy or ill-nature. In fact, *LION* identifies ten instances where Theobald employs this meaning of 'spleen'. Furthermore, *ECCO* traces a total of twelve times where 'spleen' was similarly employed by Theobald (see table below). Regardless of the overwhelming evidence in favour of Theobald's usage, and although this word appears to be more firmly associated with Theobald than with Shakespeare and Fletcher, this parallel does not pass the negative check, thus it will not be counted as a valid parallel. Furthermore, Shakespeare uses *Double Falsehood's* exact phrase 'in a spleen' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1.1.146), while Theobald uses the less similar 'in his spleen' in *Shakespeare Restored* (p. 164). Although Theobald might have imitated Shakespeare's phrase, its occurrence in Shakespeare is another reason why we must disregard this parallel. It is however worth citing the complete list of parallels found in Theobald's works to highlight how Hammond often does not provide comprehensive evidence for Theobald in his commentary, even when he is asserting his authorship.

---

<sup>377</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p, 191.

**Note:** parallels occurring in works marked by an asterisk indicate that they were retrieved via *ECCO*.

**Table. 2**

I was this other day in a <b>Spleen</b> against your new Suits.	<i>DF</i> , p. 3
A Sight of Horror!   Pernicious Pallas, Such thy <b>Spleen</b> ,   To blast a favour'd Rival!	<i>P&amp;A</i> 130-2, p. 8
Who, was this Object of her fatal <b>Spleen</b> ?	<i>Ores</i> 1.1.17
I'll save thee from the Dangers of thy <b>Spleen</b> ;	3.2.96
The Work of Sickly <b>Spleen</b> , and Indigestion?	<i>PB</i> 2.16
The swelling <b>Spleen</b> contends to choak my Utt'rance:	3.232
Which Policy made just, t'avert the Storm   Of their ungovern'd <b>Spleen</b> .	<i>FS</i> 2.259-60
Spight of my <b>Spleen</b> ,   It must prevail.	3.268-9
The rising <b>Spleen</b> swells in my lab'ring Breast,	<i>R2</i> 2.62
Ill can we brook, the Comments of your <b>Spleen</b>	2.198
... go Nurse the <b>Spleen</b> , and Sing to the Tune of your Sorrows and Disappointments.	<i>Plu</i> 2, p. 30
I shall not allow my <b>Spleen</b> to get the better of my Humanity	<i>*Cen</i> I, p. 7
[...]	*p. 8
[...] my Natural <b>Spleen</b> disposes me to grow uneasy at the World [...]	<i>*Cen</i> II, p. 15
[...] you are sure to give him the <b>Spleen</b> by not pulling off your Hat in Respect to his Person,	*p. 61
<b>Spleen</b> [...] which centres in Envy, has over-rul'd their Opinions,	*p. 97
[...] would give him the <b>Spleen</b> :	*p. 109
Mirth turns into <b>Spleen</b> ,	<i>*Cen</i> III, p. 11
in his Hours of <b>Spleen</b> and Contempt of the World;	*p. 225
we take a particular <b>Spleen</b> to a Person,	<i>*CoP</i> XXXI, p. 12
So Poverty, with fierce envenom'd <b>Spleen</b> ,	*XCIV, p. 37
And when soft Sleep would the rack'd Brain surprise   Thy <b>Spleen</b> unlocks the slumber-closing Eyes.	<i>*Ral</i> p. 6

<p>Raleigh found an Advocate in the Great Earl of Leicester, who either out of <b>Spleen</b> to the Lord-Deputy [...]</p> <p>Don John [...] a Hater of Claudio, is in his <b>Spleen</b> zealous to disappoint the Match.</p>	<p>*<i>ShR</i> p. 164</p>
--	---------------------------

But there are other difficulties with the editor's commentary notes when making assertions involving Theobald as the likely author of a particular passage. For instance, in his commentary on a passage in 4.2.68-71, Hammond states that 'the list of abstract nouns [...] combined with the occurrence of words used elsewhere in Theobald's *oeuvre*, suggests his hand'.<sup>378</sup> However, some readers would expect a more detailed comment that provides the list of the abstract nouns and their parallels, which thus justifies the editor's attribution of these particular lines to Theobald. Such an expectation becomes more demanding considering that the average Shakespeare student/scholar will be largely unfamiliar with Theobald's works. Another similarly problematic note is 5.2.12n; here Hammond shows that Theobald uses 'showers' in its elided form 'in all of his major translations, adaptations and original plays', simultaneously arguing that it was 'vastly popular in Restoration theatre' and that 'it also occurs in plays of 1590s' (p. 285). Thus, not only are one-word parallels insignificant in comparison to much longer parallels, but their occurrence in all three dramatic periods makes them even less significant.

Other commentary notes would equally reveal weak attribution claims. For example, in 3.3.101n the editor highlights a connection between 'my foot shall be foremost' and 'I know, you will be foremost in that Quarrel' in Theobald's adaptation of *Richard II* (4.91). Similar to the previous commentary note, this note highlights some of the main limitations of this edition. The first is that the editor points to parallels with Theobald that are not unique, or to rephrase, parallels that are not as unique as those neglected by Hammond: that is, one-word parallels pointed out by Hammond would indeed be deemed insignificant when considering the long consecutive word sequences ranging from two to as long as six-word parallels that were not highlighted in the edition (to be discussed later in the chapter). The second limitation involves the editor failing

---

<sup>378</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 275.

to apply the negative check, which would reveal that Shakespeare also uses 'foremost' similarly in *Henry IV Part 2*, an example Hammond neglects to point out: 'In which you, father, shall have foremost hand' (5.2.139), and in *Coriolanus*: 'being one o'th' lowest, basest, poorest, / Of this most wise rebellion, thou goest foremost' (1.1.155-6). While it is Theobald's authorship which I aim to highlight, Hammond's example offers evidence for Theobald where there is similar evidence in Shakespeare's works; therefore, the instance is invalid as it is not unique to Theobald alone.

In fact, there are numerous instances in the editor's commentary where he does not apply the negative check. Hammond has provided many Shakespearean echoes and verbal parallels at a particular point in the text that actually offers much stronger parallels to the works of Theobald. For instance, in 1.2.75-76, Julio praises the sound of Leonora's 'charming tongue', and how it is 'Sweet as the lark that wakens up the morn'. In his edition, Hammond points to the resemblance between the imagery of 'Sweet as the lark' and the line 'Hark, hark, the lark at heaven's gate sings' in a song in *Cymbeline* 2.3.20-25 (p. 195). However, a more precise resemblance can be found in *Orestes*, in a scene when Thoas, outraged by his beloved Circe, starts hearing her voice differently from how he recalls. What is worth mentioning is that Theobald uses a sentence structure here similar to 'Sweet as the lark', which similarly focuses on the lark's morning-awakening quality:

O, add the Musick of *thy charming Tongue*  
**Sweet as the lark** that wakens up the **morn**, (*DF*, p. 5)  
*that alluring Voice*, which late I thought  
**Sweet as the Tune of Morn-saluting Lark**,  
Sounds harsh, and fatal as the *Mandrake's Groan*' (*Ores* 5.2.72-74).

In this example, Hammond clearly neglects to emphasize Theobald's role by failing to perform the negative check, which would have provided instead Theobald's much stronger parallel.

Other scholars—those who are not necessarily arguing for Shakespeare's authorship of the play—have also missed Theobald's parallel, cited above. Macdonald P. Jackson, who believes that 'scarcely a line of Shakespeare's verse

survives intact into *Double Falsehood*, cites the 'Sweet as the lark' example from the play, also adding the preceding line, 'See how her beauty doth enrich the place', yet he nevertheless seems to

detect muffled echoes of *Romeo and Juliet*, where Juliet at the Capulet ball 'doth enrich the hand/Of yonder knight' (1.5.41-2) and 'the lark, the herald of the morn' awakens Romeo and Juliet from their wedding night (3.5.6) and so can be accused of not making 'sweet division' (3.5.29).

But although Jackson presents this instance as an echo of Shakespeare, he does not rule out the possibility that such echoes might possibly be 'Theobald's own'.<sup>379</sup> Thus, the contributions made by Hammond and Jackson are different in the sense that the former presents an indistinctive Shakespeare parallel (in comparison to Theobald's), while the latter expresses caution by presenting the possibility that the echoes might belong to Theobald in the first place. Hammond's comment is especially misleading given that it is part of an authoritative edition's commentary notes. The point worthy of our attention here lies in the importance of evaluating the parallels presented by the Arden editor; this could be accomplished by examining whether or not these parallels are valid, or are the result of a biased approach, which as discussed previously, does not adhere to the main principles of the field.

This approach does, appear then, to be the result of a conscious editorial choice in responding to the *Double Falsehood* text (in part or full) as the work of Shakespeare rather than Theobald, which we might find quite disconcerting. As a matter of caution, scholars must be alert when attempting to determine the authorship of this play, given that Shakespearean echoes in the text are often identified more easily—as was possibly the case with Jackson—due to their more ready familiarity with Shakespeare's works. On the other hand, unfamiliarity with Theobald's writings poses the greater risk that both textual and thematic parallels to his works might escape the attention of even the most scrutinizing scholars. The same is also true regarding parallels found in the works of Fletcher, as many of his works still remain relatively (or entirely) unknown to the average

---

<sup>379</sup> Jackson, 'Stylistic Evidence', pp. 161, 152.

scholar, regardless of the fact that he produced some of the most successful English comedies and tragedies of his era. In other words, determining the authorship of *Double Falsehood* could not be simplified to the mere search for verbal parallels because of the multifaceted nature of this text's authorship. Realistically speaking, then, one cannot concurrently offer comprehensive parallels for Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Theobald (or even Shelton) in the standard format provided by the Arden edition. And because scholars are more likely to recognize parallels to and echoes of Shakespeare more easily than they would those of Fletcher and Theobald (due to their unfamiliar contexts), one must always apply the negative check so as not to make any false or biased attributions.

One might wonder, for instance, why the Arden editor suggests in 4.1.90n that the phrase 'cross'd your love [...] calls to mind the opening of [*Romeo and Juliet*], "a pair of star-cross'd lovers"' (1.1.5), or why he cites a parallel found in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 'If then true lovers have been ever cross'd' (1.1.150),<sup>380</sup> when a similar parallel (with a clearly a similar context) can be found in Theobald's *The Fatal Secret*:

You've met **some** *disappointment*, **some** *foul play*  
 Has **cross'd** *your love*. (*DF*, p. 41)  
 Talk o'er **some** *Tragedy of dismal Woe*:  
 Of *Lovers* **crost** by Fate. (*FS* 4.98-99)

Accordingly, the negative check not only reveals a similar parallel which occurs in one of Theobald's works, but one that also extends to include the word 'some', along with 'tragedy of dismal woe' which corresponds to 'disappointment' and 'foul play'. Similarly, in 3.3.45n Hammond refers to the phrase 'start at' which employs the meaning 'to occasion surprise or need for further investigation'. He states that the phrase occurs in Shakespeare's *All's Well That Ends Well* (1.3.139), as well as 'several of Fletcher's single-authored and collaborative plays', referring to two instances from *The Captain*, (1.1.11, 1.3.219). This line of reasoning could be deemed biased, though, when considering Theobald's usage of the same

---

<sup>380</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 260; he cites the second parallel from Henry Salerno, *Double Falsehood and Shakespeare's Cardenio: A Study of a Lost Play* (Philadelphia, Pa., 2000), p. 41.

phrase in a number of his works, which are not mentioned by the editor:

Something to **start at**, hither have I travell'd  
To know the Truth of you. (*DF*, p. 34)  
My spirits **start at** Decius' Name. (*D&P* s. 7.4)  
[...] And silent night **start at** my waking groans. (*PP* 2.63)  
And shall I **start at** danger  
To save a lingering life [...] (*FS* 4.13-4)  
the sick'ning soul  
**Starts at** the objects of its own creation. (*R2* 3.71-2)  
My shuddering soul **starts at** the dire alarm [...] (*R2* 5.23)

Equally in 4.1.34n, Hammond comments on the use of 'Parthian', citing examples from Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* 1.7.20, and Shakespeare's and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* 2.2.48-50, also pointing out that it occurs three times in Fletcher's *Valentinian*, at 1.3.40, 189, and 4.1.137. Yet, *LION* identifies an instance in which Theobald has previously used 'Parthian':

The **Parthian**, that rides swift without the rein, (*DF*, p. 40)  
We'll hire us forty thousand **Parthian** Archers. (*PP* 3.279)

Moreover, *ECCO* identifies two other instances in Theobald's works:

some Legions of **Parthian** Horse, who were plac'd in the Centre of the  
Enemies Battle [...] (*A&S* p. 203)  
[...] in **the Parthian** wars. (*Marcus* p. 12)

Similarly, Hammond's commentary to 4.1.61 overlooks a strong verbal connection to 'And it **has hurt** my **brain**', which finds its parallel in Theobald's *Decius and Paulina*'s 'If no bad Star **has hurt** thy **Brain**' (s. 10.15). What he suggests is that the phrase is 'reminiscent of Lear's "I am cut to the brains"' (4.6.189),<sup>381</sup> which is clearly not as closely paralleled to *Double Falsehood* as it is in relation to Theobald's *Decius and Paulina*. In another commentary note, Hammond likewise mentions that Shakespeare associates the word 'cordial' with

---

<sup>381</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 258

'poison' in both *Cymbeline* at 1.6.64, 4.2.327 and 5.5.247, and in *A Winter's Tale* at 1.2.318 and 5.3.77. He adds

the word is equally important to Fletcher and his collaborators, occurring in at least 12 of his plays. It remains common throughout the Restoration and 18th century.<sup>382</sup>

But, Hammond does not mention that Theobald associates the two words with one another in *The Fatal Secret* (1735):

Or should I drink that Wine, and think it **Cordial**,  
When I see **Poyson** in't? (*DF*, p. 52)  
There's some Comfort:  
A **Cordial** Med'cine from a Brother's Hand,  
To save me from the slow and lingring **Poison**. (*FS* 2.381-382)

*ECCO* similarly identifies a parallel to Theobald in *Censor* N° 47:

These Creatures [...] convey their **Poison** immediately after a **Cordial**.  
(*Cen* I, p. 113)

The problem with the Arden commentary here is, then, twofold: first, the editor highlights Shakespearean parallels, and adds further commentary on Fletcher's use of 'cordial', though not associating it with 'poison'; he then overlooks parallels to Theobald that actually employ both words similarly, and at the same time, provides a general statement only that the word was common in the Restoration and the eighteenth century.

The same pattern is repeated in 2.3.51n, where Hammond comments on the phrase 'the censuring world'. Here he argues that it occurs in *The Maid's Tragedy*, also stating that 'the expression had something of a vogue in the 1680s, [and that] it is found in several works written by Behn, Lee, Elkanah Settle and others'.<sup>383</sup> Hammond, however, does not record Theobald's usage of the exact phrase in *The Happy Captive* (1741):

---

<sup>382</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>383</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

**The censoring world** occasion to reproach (*DF*, p. 18)

How may **the censoring world** impeach my name, (*HC* s. 4.15)

Another occasion where the editor fails to perform the negative check occurs in 2.4.39n, where the reader is informed that ‘outfly’ was used by Shakespeare in *Troilus and Cressida* (2.3.113),<sup>384</sup> but not that ‘outflies’ occurs in Theobald’s *The Fatal Secret* 2.320, an instance that interestingly does not originate in Webster. Furthermore, at 3.2.83n we are informed that ‘task’, in its transitive usage occurs in *Othello* (2.3.38-9), *Coriolanus* (1.3.35-8), and Fletcher’s *Bonduca* (2.1.43); though performing the negative check reveals that Theobald uses it twice in *Orestes* in ‘task the Demons’ (4.2.89) and ‘task’d each aiding Pow’r’ (5.2.99).

Yet again, the negative check is not being applied in 3.2.128n, in which Hammond demonstrates that the word ‘vassal [was] commonly used in Shakespeare’, also pointing out a Fletcher connection as the word occurs in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* 5.1.84-85. However, the commentary note leaves out instances of the word that occur in Theobald’s *Harlequin A Sorcerer* (58, p. 13), as well as two instances that occur in his adaptation of *Richard II*. While ‘lift their Vassal Hands’ (2.241) originates in Shakespeare’s version of the latter play (*R2* 3.3.89), the other usage however was added by Theobald in his adaptation: ‘I will not meanly linger, like a Slave | To be, by Vassal Hands, dragg’d from your presence’ (5.62-3). This instance not only presents the possibility that ‘vassal’ in *Double Falsehood* was written by Theobald (just as it is equally possible to have been written by Fletcher, or any other author), but it also demonstrates how Theobald clearly borrows from Shakespeare, by using ‘vassal hands’ a second time in his version of *Richard II*. Searching for the word on *ECCO* traces an occurrence in *The Cave of Poverty*: ‘Thou on thy Vassals bateless Woe entailest’ (*Xciv*, p. 37).

In other instances, the editor points to Shakespearean parallels to a phrase, when there are just as strong, or perhaps even stronger, parallels to Theobald. In 3.2.85n, for example, Hammond shows the resemblance between ‘So I shall **make** it **foul**’ and two instances in *Macbeth*: ‘Fair is foul, and foul is fair’ (1.1.11), and ‘So foul and fair a day I have not seen’ (1.3.38). One would however

---

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 230.

question why he does not mention Shakespeare's much closer parallel 'We'll **make foul** weather with despised tears' (3.3.160) that occurs in *Richard II*, especially given that it appears unaltered in Theobald's adaptation of the play (3.130). What is more, the same phrase can also be found in *The Perfidious Brother*: '**Make foul** suspicion speak a gentler Language' (3.234), which interestingly, appears nowhere in Mestayer's version; i.e. it is Theobald's phrase. However, this instance cannot be considered as a valid parallel as it was previously used by Shakespeare. In addition to not mentioning Theobald's parallel, however, this commentary note contains a technical mistake by the Arden editor: rather than writing '**make. . . foul**' in the heading of the commentary note, Hammond writes '**fair. . . foul**', a mistake—a Freudian slip even—which reflects again, consciously or unconsciously, partiality towards Shakespeare.

Of special interest to our discussion on the editorial underrepresentation of Theobald is a connection pointed out by Hammond between the phrases 'wrathful elements' occurring in *Double Falsehood* 4.1.118 and 'wrathful skies' that occurs in *King Lear* 3.2.43. The commentary note provided here clearly suggests a Shakespearean parallel, but at the same time overlooks some very interesting ones found in the works of Theobald.<sup>385</sup> But before discussing Theobald's parallels, we must first see how 'wrathful' was employed in both plays, and then explore its frequency and the manner in which it was used in both Shakespeare's and Theobald's works. The adjective occurs in 3.2 *King Lear* (both versions), during one of the storm scenes when Kent says to Lear:

Alas, sir, are you here? Things that love night  
 Love not such nights as these. The wrathful Skies  
 Gallow the very wanderers of the dark  
 And make them keep their caves. Since I was man  
 Such sheets of fire, such bursts of horrid thunder,  
 Such groans of roaring wind and rain I never  
 Remember to have heard. Mans nature cannot carry  
 Th'affliction, nor the fear. (3.2.42-49)

---

<sup>385</sup> Fletcher is ruled out as a possible author as the *LION* database records no occurrence of 'wrathful' in his works.

It must be noted, however, that although Shakespeare uses the adjective a number of times in his plays, he almost never uses it the same way it is used in *King Lear*. To begin, the adjective occurs in *1 Henry VI*, in the part where ‘Henry V is conceived [...] in terms of a mythical force’,<sup>386</sup> referring to ‘his sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire’ (1.1.12). It appears again in ‘Mad ire and wrathful fury’ (4.3.28), in which it was used more to refer to one’s wrathful anger, rather than divine vengeance. In *2 Henry VI* the adjective is used to describe ‘wrathful weapons’ (3.2.238), ‘[a] father’s wrathful curse’ (3.2.155), and a ‘Barren winter, with his wrathful nipping cold’ (2.4.3). In the same play, it is also employed to refer to the quality of being ‘angry, wrathful, and inclined to blood’ (4.2.125), or that of a ‘heart be[ing] wrathful’ (5.2.5); in *Macbeth* it is similarly employed to describe the quality of being ‘wayward [...] Spiteful, and wrathful’ (3.5.11-12).<sup>387</sup> The word also features as ‘wrathful iron arms’ in *Richard II* (1.3.130), ‘wrathful terms’ in *Troilus and Cressida* (5.2.37), and ‘the wrathful dove’ in *2 Henry IV* (3.2.157). The closest Shakespeare ever gets to the concept of divine wrath as portrayed in *King Lear*, occurs in *King John* when he identifies himself as ‘God’s wrathful agent’ (2.1.87).

Accordingly, the word usage in these instances by Shakespeare is clearly different from the one noted by Hammond in *King Lear*, in which the connection he makes to *Double Falsehood* seems valid. It is useful to mention how the adjective is employed in *Double Falsehood*, which occurs upon Julio finding out that the disguised Violante is the young maid wronged by Henriquez, thus prompting him to call for divine vengeance against Henriquez as a punishment for betraying them both:

I will sollicit ev'ry Saint in Heav'n  
To lend me Vengeance. I'll about it strait.  
The wrathful Elements shall wage this War;

---

<sup>386</sup> Michael Taylor, ed., William Shakespeare, *1 Henry VI*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 1.1.10-14n, p. 96.

<sup>387</sup> This example is cited with reservation since Shakespeare’s authorship of this scene (as well as parts of 4.1) has been generally doubted. See Anthony B. Dawson, ‘Notes and Queries Concerning the Text of *Macbeth*’, *Macbeth: The State of Play*, ed. by Ann Thompson, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 11-30; and William Shakespeare, adapted by Thomas Middleton, ‘The Tragedy of *Macbeth*: A Genetic Text’ ed. by Gary Taylor, intro. Inga-Stina Ewbank, in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1165-1201.

Furies shall haunt him; Vultures gnaw his Heart;  
And Nature pour forth all her Stores of Plagues,  
To join in Punishment of Trust betray'd. (4.1.116-121)

Let us now turn to how Theobald employs the word 'wrathful' in his works. A search via *LION* for the use of 'wrathful' in Theobald's works reveals that seven out of the eight times Theobald employs the word, all refer to divine wrath. In *Orestes* for instance, Araxes describes '[a] guardian Goddess [...] who, for the crime of one o'er-daring man, | pursues a nation, unappeas'd and wrathful' (1.1.14-16); in another instance, *Orestes* describes 'heav'n [as] wrathful, imploring the 'Unrighteous Pow'rs [...] [to] withhold [their] dire commands' (1.1.53-54). Additionally, the same play has references to a 'wrathful Goddess' (3.2.79) and to 'wrathful Gods' (5.4.34), a phrase that also occurs in Theobald's *Antiochus and Stratonice* (p. 129). Moreover, 'wrathful pow'rs' occurs twice in *The Persian Princess* at (1.20) and (4.87).<sup>388</sup> A brief look at Theobald's preface to his adaptation of *Richard II* would reveal something equally (if not more) significant than a parallel to *Double Falsehood*. Readers would have been interested to know that Theobald expressed praise of this Shakespearean dramatic device employed in *King Lear*; he states:

The Strength, and Vigour, of his Fancy have been confess'd, and admir'd, in the extravagant and supernatural Characters of his own Creation, such as his Caliban , Witches , &c. And give me Leave to take Notice of the Delicacy of his Spirit in One Instance; because the Observation has not, that I know of, ever yet been started by Any body. No Dramatic Poet, before Shakespear , in any Language that I know, or remember, has heighten'd his Distress from the Concurrence of the Heavens, as He has done in his Lear ; by doubling the Compassion of the Audience for his Heroe, when they behold a Storm,

---

<sup>388</sup> In *The Fatal Secret*, the adjective was used in a similar manner to that of *King Lear*:

You, as Heav'n's Friend, this Province shall assume,  
To dictate, and denounce the righteous Doom:  
While I, his wrathful Minister, will stand,  
Prepar'd to deal the Thunders, you command. (2.90-93)

Although this instance does not originate from Webster, it will not be regarded as a valid parallel because it resembles 'God's wrathful agent' that was used in Shakespeare's *King John* (2.1.87).

in which he is turn'd out, aggravate the Rigour of his Daughters Inhumanity. How beautifully is that rude, and boisterous, Night describ'd! And what Reflections on their Savage Treatment of a Father!<sup>389</sup>

In addition to citing the previously cited excerpt from *Lear*, Theobald provides another passage:

I tax not you, you elements, with unkindness.  
I never gave you kingdom, called you children.  
You owe me no subscription. Then let fall  
Your horrible pleasure. Here I stand your slave,  
A poor, infirm, weak and despised old man,  
But yet I call you servile ministers,  
That will with two pernicious Daughters join  
Your high-engendered battles, 'gainst a head  
So old and white as this. O, ho 'tis foul! (*KL* 3.2.16-24).

Interestingly, Theobald has praised and taken notice of this specific Shakespearean device; moreover, he has borrowed the phrase from *Lear*, employing it in different forms. Most interesting is a connection between the two passages cited from *Lear* in Theobald's preface, which has Kent addressing the heavens as '**the wrathful skies**', and *Lear* as 'you **elements**'; thus, we would not be too far off the mark in suggesting that Theobald, in his usual tendency to imitate Shakespeare, might have possibly merged the two phrases resulting in *Double Falsehood*'s '**the wrathful elements**'.

There are other problems with Hammond's misapplication of the negative check. In fact, a major difficulty with some of his commentary notes involves instances where, instead of applying the negative check (which confirms that a parallel is only found in the works of one author), Hammond cites parallels occurring in the works of all three candidates. For instance, in 1.2.115-6n, he points to 'the paradoxical juxtaposition of freedom and bondage' in *Double Falsehood*, which also occurs in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (3.1.88-9),

---

<sup>389</sup> Theobald, *Richard II*, sig. A2v.

Shakespeare's and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (2.1.34-5), Fletcher's and Rowley's *The Maid in the Mill* (1.3.71-2), and Theobald's *The Perfidious Brother* (3.1, p. 20). Also, in 1.2.128n, Hammond provides a lengthy comment on the word 'business' and how it was very frequently used by Fletcher and Shakespeare, arguing that Fletcher in particular used it 'epidemically'. However, he then adds that 'awkwardly, for any conclusions on authorship, Theobald [was] also very fond of it'. The same is repeated in 3.2.9n, in which Hammond indicates that

the adjectival use of 'mere', to mean downright or nothing short of, [was] deployed by Shakespeare and Fletcher in their collaborative plays, on four occasions in *H8* (3.1.112; 3.2.324, 329; 4.1.59); and five in *TNK* (1.2.42; 2.2.58; 4.2.26, 44, 52). Fletcher uses it twice in *CR*, at 3.4.13, 145. It remains common in the plays of Theobald's time. Theobald uses it elsewhere, e.g. in *Shakespeare Restored*.<sup>390</sup>

Hammond makes similar observations, for instance, in 3.2.9n, 4.1.58n, and 4.1.83—this is excluding several comments where he cites evidence for Shakespeare and Theobald, or for Fletcher and Theobald. The key problem here is that in most cases, these observations in which Hammond cites multiple parallels for all three candidates (or for the adapter and one of the supposed collaborators) reveal a limitation in the methodology he employs, in that such comments might be confusing for some as they rarely provide any clue regarding the authorship of the lines in question.<sup>391</sup> In order to base conclusions on his data, scholars are required to reproduce the analysis and evaluate each instance cited by Hammond (particularly those where he provides references without citing the actual parallels); this would allow them to evaluate each parallel and make the most appropriate attribution.

---

<sup>390</sup> Hammond, *DF*, pp. 198, 199, 234. Incidentally, the last commentary note reveals another difficulty in Hammond's methodology, particularly his comprehensive references when it comes to parallels in Shakespeare and Fletcher, as opposed to his more general comments regarding those found in Theobald.

<sup>391</sup> One exception can be found in 4.1.81n, where Hammond comments on the use of the adverb 'extremely' qualifying an adjective occurs in the works of both Fletcher and Theobald, yet he argues that 'the balance of evidence associates the line with Fletcher'. He then refers readers to further evidence in 4.2.74n, in which additional proof for Fletcher is provided (Hammond, *DF*, p. 260).

To further elaborate on this point, it is worth examining one such commentary note provided in the edition. In 4.1.140n, Hammond comments on the word ‘seeming’, providing the brief gloss ‘outward appearance’, and referring readers to 4.2.70n, in which he offers two detailed notes on ‘seeming saints’. In the first note, he points out a parallel to Shakespeare, splitting the phrase into two words, citing each word occurring at a different occasion:

The collocation calls Angelo in *MM* to mind. The term ‘seeming’ is applied to him both by Isabella and by the Duke (2.4.149, 3.1.222); in 2.2.180-1, he refers to himself and Isabella as ‘saints’: ‘O cunning enemy, that, to catch a saint, / With saints dost bait thy hook!’

Hammond then demonstrates that Theobald employs the adjective ‘seeming’ five times in *The Fatal Secret*,<sup>392</sup> twice in each of *The Happy Captive*, *Orestes*, and *The Persian Princess*, ‘as well as singly in other dramatic works’<sup>393</sup> that he does not name. Although he cites parallels to Theobald here, he does not provide the actual parallels found in each work. In other words, readers are informed of the frequency of Theobald’s use of the word, but they are not made aware of the level of parallelism involved in each instance. It is worth noting that only two of the instances indicated represent a distinctive parallel, and interestingly they are not matched to the one occurring in 4.2.70 as indicated by Hammond. Instead, the two instances (unfortunately overlooked by Hammond) are matched to the one occurring in 4.1.140, in which ‘outward appearance’ is the meaning employed. The following represents a more precise parallel to *Double Falsehood*, matched to two of Theobald’s works where he employed ‘seeming’ in conjunction with ‘garb’:

He but puts on this **Seeming**, and his **Garb** (*DF*, p. 43)

In **Garb** a **seeming** Moor, (*HC* 2.7.3)

I must wear the **Garb** of **seeming** Mystery; (*FS* 2.18-9)

The main problem with the editor’s commentary is rooted not only in the fact

---

<sup>392</sup> Hammond does not mention that one of these instances originates in Webster’s version:  
All publick too, **conduct to seeming Honours**; (*FS* 1.237)

There are a-many ways **that conduct to seeming honour**, (*Duchess* 5.2.290)

<sup>393</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 275.

that the Shakespearean parallels might be unconvincing to some, or in how the parallels cited for Theobald (though not provided) are typically single-word examples that remain quite general. Rather, the main difficulty arises from Hammond's attempt to provide evidence for both Shakespeare and Theobald, which instead of establishing a clear sense of authorship, merely introduces possibilities.

#### 4. Evidence for Authorship through Adaptation

A thorough examination of certain words and phrases in the *Double Falsehood* text would reveal that there are many parallels between the adaptation and Theobald's works. Our analysis will begin by citing parallel two-word collocations, moving to three-word collocations, and so on. Let us for instance examine a parallel that occurs in Theobald's *Orestes* (1731):

He but commanded, what your Eyes inspir'd;  
Whose **sacred Beams**, darted into my Soul. (*DF*, p. 52)  
As saw the Sun, and worshipp'd not his Ray?  
Such Lustre yours, so fierce your **sacred Beams** (*Ores* 3.4.28-9)

Beside these two instances, 'sacred beams' only occurs twice before *Double Falsehood*, as indicated by *LION*: in *Astraea* (1651) by Leonard Willan, and *Lady Jane Gray* (1715) by Nicholas Rowe, which certainly makes it a rare collocation. An even rarer two-word collocation is the phrase 'awake suspicion' which occurs in its plural form in Theobald's *The Fatal Secret*:

why he hath of late [...] Wrested our Leave of Absence from the Court,  
**Awake Suspicion.** (*DF*, p. 2)  
These Circumstances join'd **awake Suspicions**,  
That fright my lab'ring Thoughts. (*FS* 5.1.9-10)

*LION* shows that the phrase occurs once in dramatic works before 1728, in James Shirley's *The Royall Master* (1638), making it a very rare phrase that most likely belongs to Theobald.

Moving to consecutive three-word parallels, *LION* shows that the phrase 'repaid with Interest' does not occur in either Fletcher nor Shakespeare.

However, Theobald has reused the phrase with minor variation in his preface to *The Fatal Secret*, where he explains the changes he has made to Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*:

thy Tears

Shall be **repaid with Interest** from his Justice. (*DF*, p. 54)

If I have borrow'd his Matter freely, I have taken it up on fair and open Credit; and, hope, I have **repaid** the Principal **with Interest** (*FS* Preface, p. 6)

Another distinctive collocation not highlighted in the Arden edition occurs in both *The Fatal Secret* and *The Happy Captive*, though it is more closely paralleled to the former than the latter, which similar to *Double Falsehood*, employs 'soothing' the tumults of one's heart/breast:

**sooth** with Words **the Tumult** in his Heart! (*DF*, p. 14)

**sooth the Tumults** of thy Breast to Peace. (*FS* 3.328)

Sweet thy **Tumults**, soft thy Anguish,

Inly **soothing** past expressing. (*HC* 1.2.56-7)

The parallel to *The Fatal Secret* was introduced by Gary Taylor,<sup>394</sup> though he does not highlight the entire parallel which has 'the Tumult in his Heart' in *Double Falsehood*, and 'the Tumult of thy Breast' in *The Fatal Secret*.

What also remains unhighlighted by Hammond is a consecutive three-word collocation that occurs in 1.2. When upon their parting, Julio was reassuring Leonora of his faithfulness, hers was the exact response by Salima to Pizzaro's reassurance of his loyalty in Theobald's *The Happy Captive*:

**Enough; I'm satisfied:** and will remain

Yours, (*DF*, p. 8)

**Enough; I'm satisfied:**

What most we value, most we fear to lose. (*HC* 1.6.29-30)

In both instances, the phrase was similarly punctuated, and occurs in a parallel

---

<sup>394</sup> Taylor, 'History', p. 42.

context. The Arden edition also does not discuss the phrase 'gracious pow'rs' which was neither used by Shakespeare nor Fletcher, but was used many times by Theobald. This phrase occurs not only in *Decius and Paulina* (1719), but three times also in *The Perfidious Brother* alone (1715). The parallel is extended in *D&P* as 'Ye gracious Pow'rs', and occurs as 'gracious pow'rs' in the remaining examples:

**You gracious pow'rs,**

The guardians of sworn Faith [...] (*DF*, p. 28)

**Ye gracious Pow'rs!** am I awake? (*D&P* s. 12.5-6)

Thanks to the **gracious Pow'rs**, most well, and cheerful! (*PB* 2.147)

Then by the **gracious Pow'rs** of Heaven I swear,

I'm innocent [...] (*PB* 4.198-9)

the **gracious Pow'rs**

Controul'd the Rage of fierce Destructive Malice. (*PB* 5.366-7)

Again, this phrase can be found nowhere in Mestayer's version, and was clearly added by Theobald in his version of the play.

So far this section has focused on verbal parallels to the works of Theobald that are not discussed in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*. The following part of this discussion will highlight a number of instances in the editor's commentary where Theobald's role as a prominent contributor to the play is likewise minimized. Let us take 'righteous pow'rs' as our first example. This phrase clearly occurs in a very un-Shakespearean passage, one that more closely belongs to the eighteenth century:

The righteous pow'rs at length have crown'd our loves.

Think, Julio, from the storm that's now o'erblown,

Though sour affliction combat hope awhile,

When lovers swear true faith the list'ning angels

Stand on the golden battlements of heav'n

And waft their vows to the eternal throne.

Such were our vows, and so are they repaid. (*DF*, p. 63)<sup>395</sup>

Hammond briefly discusses this phrase in the editorial notes and he cites an example where Theobald uses the phrase in *Orestes*. He then explains: “‘Righteous’ is a favourite adjective of Theobald’s, qualifying “Powers” again in his adaptation of *Richard II* and in *Perseus*, and occurring some 15 times in his plays’.<sup>396</sup> Of the fifteen instances where Hammond identifies Theobald using his favourite adjective, the editor only cites three examples where the phrase righteous pow’rs’ was used (*Ores* 3.109, *R2* 5.193, and *P&A* 44 p. 3.), neglecting to mention that an additional two of these 15 instances also involve the phrase itself, rather than the adjective alone. The first instance occurs in *The Perfidious Brother* (not in Mestayer’s version), and the second occurs in *Antiochus and Stratonice* (traced via *ECCO*). The phrase was also used twice in the form of ‘unrighteous pow’rs’ in *Orestes*:

**The righteous pow’rs** at length have crown’d our loves. (*DF*, p. 63)

You **righteous Pow’rs!** do with Me what you please (*R2* 5.193)

Ye **righteous Powers**, at whose dread Hand [...] (*P&A* 44 p. 3.)

thou tempt’st **the righteous Pow’rs** (*PB* 3.15)

Be gone! and tell th’**unrighteous pow’rs** you serve [...] (*Ores* 2.24)

**Unrighteous pow’rs!** Withhold your dire commands; (*Ores* 2.54)

You **righteous Pow’rs**, that for your awful Thrones

Look down with Pity. (*Ores* 3.109)

Ye **righteous powers**, forgive my impious Frenzy! (\**A&S* p. 117)

Although the editor clearly suggests that Theobald is the author of these lines, he does not list all the instances in which Theobald used the phrase, thus failing to be comprehensive in presenting internal evidence in support of Theobald’s contribution to the play. However, it must be noted that the 15 times Theobald

---

<sup>395</sup> In the recent Royal Shakespeare Company production entitled *Cardenio Re-imagined*, Gregory Doran removed these lines altogether; they were neither staged, nor were they published in the script. Perhaps the director removed these lines in an effort to portray the play as belonging more to Shakespeare’s period, rather than the eighteenth century. See Doran and Álamo, *Cardenio, Shakespeare’s ‘Lost Play’ Re-imagined*, p. 102. See also Doran, *Shakespeare’s Lost Play: In Search of Cardenio* (2012). Taylor equally removes the passage from his version. For an explanation why Theobald possibly added this speech to the adaptation, see Gary Taylor, *Creation* (2013), p. 142.

<sup>396</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 300.

uses the adjective as indicated by Hammond only account for instances detected by *LION*, thus not considering those that could be traced via *ECCO* or those that cannot even be detected electronically.

In 1.1.8n, Hammond implies (or rather forces?) a Shakespeare connection in a commentary note that might strike some readers as far-fetched. Here, he points to the use of the verb 'heir' in its transitive form to mean 'inherit', arguing that it is not found in Shakespeare's works, though previous commentators believed it was 'Shakespearean'.<sup>397</sup> He explains:

*OED* heirs v. a provides an example from George Chapman's translation (c. 1611) of Homer's *Iliad*, v. 161: 'Not one son more / To heir his goods'. [*Troilus and Cressida*] demonstrates that Shakespeare knew Chapman's text. As Palmer, the editor of the second Arden edition of the play writes: 'it is . . . likely that [Shakespeare] knew Chapman's *Seven Books of the Iliades* (1953), which afforded him Books I, II, VII-XI . . . Those who argue for the use of Chapman point out that matter from Chapman's Books corresponds to what we find in the play in Acts I-IV . . . and that what Chapman omits . . . is also omitted by Shakespeare. The argument is persuasive' (Palmer, 33-4).

Hammond then adds that 'Theobald again uses "heir" as a verb' in *The Fatal Secret* (1735),<sup>398</sup> yet overlooking two significant points: that the parallel is a parallel phrase rather than a parallel verb, and that the verb was used again in the same play:

worthy the Man,  
**Who**, with my **Dukedoms**, **heirs** my better Glories. (*DF*, p. 2)  
[...] our young Nephew's Right, **who heirs** her **Dukedom**. (*FS* 4.70)  
And may he **heir** her Virtues (*FS* 4.71)

Although Hammond cites the first example, the degree of parallelism was not highlighted, and its significance was certainly reduced by his lengthy reference to

---

<sup>397</sup> See for instance, Oliphant, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, p. 297; and Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, p. 156.

<sup>398</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 185; See William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. by Kenneth Palmer (London: Methuen, 1982).

Chapman's *OED* example;<sup>399</sup> this, again, shows us just how much of Theobald's contributions to the text were underrepresented by the Arden editor.

But even when establishing a connection between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald's other works, some of Hammond's commentary notes are alarming in their evasiveness regarding the degree of parallelism they reveal. For example, in 2.2.14n, Hammond comments on the word 'presaging', arguing that 'recorded uses are found in [*Edward III*] and in 1619 and 1622'; he also notes its occurrence in Dryden's *Sigismonda and Guiscardo* (1700), Nathaniel Lee's *The Massacre of Paris* (1690) and Pope's translation of *The Iliad* (1715). Hammond finally mentions that 'Theobald reuses it in his own *Perseus and Andromeda* (1730)',<sup>400</sup> yet without citing the parallel itself:

**O my presaging Heart!** When goes he then? (*DF*, p. 15)

What do I hear? **O my presaging Heart!** (*P&A* 23, p. 2)

That Hammond failed to include this four-word sequence, which is uniquely matched to another work by Theobald, reflects seriously on the reliability of this edition, particularly in its approach to authorship attribution. It is not clear why the instance was not cited. Perhaps the editor—similar to Taylor in his emphasis on parallels occurring in Theobald's works published before *Double Falsehood*—has underestimated the value of the above parallel being from a later work published in 1730, which, thus, presents the possibility that Theobald's later works might have been influenced by *Double Falsehood* (presumed to be based on a play written by Shakespeare). Taylor explains:

dates raise an important logical distinction, often ignored by critics determined to discredit *Double Falsehood*. Theobald began publishing in 1707, two decades before *Double Falsehood* appeared, and texts from those two decades are the most reliable evidence of Theobald's own verbal habits. If Theobald in 1727 did possess, and work closely

---

<sup>399</sup> MacDonald P. Jackson has argued that the use of this verb 'to mean "inherit" is recorded by *OED* as early as 1330', and that 'it occurs in Pope's *Thebais* (1703)'; he has also pointed out the two instances in Theobald's *The Fatal Secret*, arguing that they occur 'in dialogue not derived from *The Duchess of Malfi*'. However, Jackson does not discuss nor cite the actual parallels. Jackson, 'Stylistic Evidence', p. 149.

<sup>400</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 215.

with, one or more manuscripts of a Jacobean play, then his writing after 1727 might have been influenced by that Jacobean play.<sup>401</sup>

While it remains possible that Hammond did not notice the parallel, it is also possible that he did, but neglected to point it out, presuming it was the result of imitation/borrowing from the *Cardenio* manuscripts. If so, the parallel should nevertheless have at least been mentioned. Therefore, what remains clear is an editorial pattern that neglects (or perhaps refuses) to point out strong parallel collocations between this authorially-contested play and Theobald's other writings.

Hammond's commentary to 4.2.71, regarding Theobald's use of 'sirens' poses further difficulties. Here, he argues that

**sirens** [are] dangerous bird-women who lure sailors to their death in Greek mythology, best known from Homer's *Odyssey*, Book 12. In Theobald's *Orestes*, Thoas refers to Circe's 'Siren's Face' (5.1, p. 66). Unusually here, Violante figures the sirens as male.<sup>402</sup>

The problem with such an observation is that it implies only a distant connection to Theobald, and thus, fails to point out another parallel that occurs in the same work, and which is almost identical to the instance occurring in *Double Falsehood*:

To make them seeming saints are but the Wiles  
By which these **Syrens lure us to Destruction.** (*DF*, p. 49)  
[...] the **Siren's** Song,  
Who strove in vain to **lure him to Destruction.** (*Ores* 2-260-1)

Of our three candidates, this remarkably distinctive parallel only occurs in Theobald's writings. One might wonder why Hammond mentions the 'Siren's Face' instance from *Orestes*, but not the other more pertinent example from the same text, especially considering that there is clearly nothing distinctive about Theobald's use of 'Siren's face'.

---

<sup>401</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 40.

<sup>402</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 276.

More alarming is the editor's commentary to 1.2.157, in which he points to the adverbial usage of 'wondrous', arguing that it

is found in several of Shakespeare's plays, e.g. *Tem* 2.1.198, *Per* 2.5.35, *AW* 3.6.107, 5.3.304; and in Fletcherian parts of *TNK*: 2.2.148, 151, 2.5.20.<sup>403</sup>

However, applying the negative check would reveal more than is disclosed in the editor's commentary. For instance, the adverbial usage of 'wondrous' was frequently used in Fletcher's solo-authored plays, and it was also employed many times by Theobald, though far less frequently when compared to the number of times it occurs in Fletcher's works. By examining these parallels in the works of both Fletcher and Theobald, we no longer become concerned with the parallel word on its own, as a clearly distinctive parallel phrase including 'wond'rous' was previously used by Theobald. The parallel phrase occurs in Theobald's adaptation of *Richard II*, which is a work that predates *Double Falsehood*:

Tell thy pleas'd Soul, **I will be wond'rous faithful**; (*DF*, p. 8)  
**I will be wondrous faithful** to Despair, (*R2* 3.107)

*LION* records no occurrences of this consecutive five-word sequence except for these two instances, which makes it an extremely rare phrase. It must be noted that there is no trace of the phrase or even the word 'wondrous' itself in Shakespeare's *Richard II*.

However, as mentioned in Chapter two, one of the longest parallels to Theobald's works was identified by Macdonald Jackson; this parallel is a consecutive six-word sequence occurring in *The Perfidious Brother* (1715), which similar to the instance from the previous example, also predates *Double Falsehood*:

**I throw me at your Feet**, and sue for Mercy. (*DF*, p. 52)  
My Lord [...]  
**I throw Me at your Feet**, and do conjure You,  
As you hope Pardon at that dreadful Day

---

<sup>403</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 201.

When all your Deeds shall come to strictest Audit,  
To tell me what has rais'd your Wrath against me. (*PB* 3.213)

In both instances, the parallel extends to the phrase that follows in which each speaker asks for forgiveness: thus, the parallel phrase is followed by 'and sue for Mercy' in *Double Falsehood*, and 'and do conjure you / As you hope Pardon' in *The Perfidious Brother*. The phrase could not be found in Mestayer's version of the play. Moreover, a search for the phrase in the *LION* database reveals that aside from the two instances found in Theobald, the phrase only occurs in *Paris to Helen* (1680) by Matthew Stevenson, and *Belisarius. A Tragedy* (1724), which makes it a very rare phrase; of course, that is not to mention the 15 instances the phrase occurs in Theobald's works (previously cited as identified by *ECCO*, and occurring in discontinuous consecutive word sequences).

What makes the previous two parallels stand out more prominently from the three that precede them is that they both occur in Theobald's much earlier works. Thus, with *The Perfidious Brother* being published in 1715, and *Richard II* in 1720, these two parallels cannot be refuted on the grounds that Theobald might have possibly imitated *Double Falsehood*—presumed to be based on an authentic Shakespeare play—given it was published in 1728. That is, one parallel occurs in a play that predates *Double Falsehood* by thirteen years, and another in a play that predates it by eight years: there is certainly more reason to believe, then, that such long consecutive sequences belong to Theobald. To highlight such facts does not underestimate the value of parallels that postdate the 1728 text; rather, it permits us to rule out any claims for Theobald's imitation of *Double Falsehood* (supposing it is a Shakespeare play) in his later works when it comes to parallels that predate the text.

The chapter so far has presented some very distinctive parallels to Theobald's works that remain unhighlighted by the Arden editor. All of the parallels presented are valuable in a study that aims to highlight Theobald's contributions to the text. Yet, what is even more valuable, are parallels of longer consecutive sequences. In fact, the longer the sequence, the rarer the phrase becomes; Brian Vickers explains:

In collocation analysis, the trigram is taken as the basic unit defining recurring phrases. As research has shown, three consecutive words give a reliable indicator of the existence of a repeated phrase, whether shared or unique to one writer. The occurrence of longer consecutive sequences is an even stronger indicator, since a run of four words is statistically rarer, one of five is even rarer, and one of six is rarer still.<sup>404</sup>

Thus, the analysis has yielded three instances of a sequence of three consecutive words: 'You gracious pow'rs' (3.2.48), 'Enough; I'm satisfied;' (1.2.162), and 'The righteous pow'rs' (5.2.251). It has also identified one instance of four, five, and six consecutive word parallels, here cited respectively: 'O my presaging Heart' (2.2.14), 'I will be wond'rous faithful' (1.2.157), and 'I throw me at your Feet' (5.1.26). Of course, that is in addition to the parallels presented by Gary Taylor (introduced in Chapter 2): sequences of three consecutive words as shown in '*the Opposite Side*' (2.1.0) and 'the ruin'd Maid' (2.1.45); the four consecutive word sequence 'I am at present' (2.1.9); the consecutive five-word sequence 'Oh the devil, the devil' (2.1.3); and the consecutive six-word sequence 'I grieve as much | That I'; see Appendix 2: examples No. 31-34, 37. All of these rare parallels, in addition to the discontinuous consecutive parallels discussed throughout this chapter, represent reliable evidence for Theobald being a more than prominent contributor to *Double Falsehood*. Though proof for Theobald's hand in the play is to be expected considering his role as the adapter, it is essential to emphasise the shortcomings of the Arden edition regarding editorial representations of authorship, or misrepresentations for that matter.

## 5. Parallel Stage Directions

It must be emphasized that the absence of a comprehensive editorial differentiation between what is presumed to be Shakespeare's text and what is clearly part of Theobald's adaptation as evidenced in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*, is an editorial choice rather than failure. To elaborate, throughout the edition's commentary, the editor shows no hesitation in portraying eighteenth-

---

<sup>404</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 29.

century dramatic conventions evident in the play, sometimes in great detail; he, however, does not adequately highlight parallels that strongly support Theobald's authorship. A careful look at the commentary notes provided for stage directions reveals that there was no attempt from the editor to highlight Theobald's contribution to their composition. For example, let us examine the commentary Hammond provides for the first stage direction of the original 1728 text, in which he offers an explanation of their origin:

**SD A royal palace** This and other indicators of setting, such as those in 1.2 and 2.1, either go back to the Restoration or are, presumably, Theobald's own additions. They call for back shutters that would be in stock in scenery stores of the period. Since the first Drury Lane theatre had been built in 1663, the stage had been equipped with perspective scenery, something Fletcher and Shakespeare could have only seen in court masques. Such indications at the start of scenes as to where they are taking place — common to most Restoration and 18th-century playtexts, and to 18th-century editions of Shakespeare from Nicholas Rowe's (1709) onwards — imply the use of painted back shutters, of which that depicting the interior of a palace was absolutely standard, particularly in tragedy.<sup>405</sup>

At first glance, the commentary note cited above reflects positively on the edition in terms of establishing stage directions as the product of adaptation (that is, as belonging either to the Restoration or the Eighteenth Century), an editorial observation that is to be commended. Yet, upon closer examination, one would find that while doing so, the editor does not discuss distinctive collocations that indisputably point to Theobald's likely authorship of particular stage directions.

For instance let us examine 'the other indicators of setting [i.e.] in 1.2 and 2.1' that are pointed out by Hammond, yet not discussed. These two stage directions have '*Prospect of a village*', which occurs in three other instances in the play (2.3, 3.1 and 3.3). A search on the *LION* database would reveal that, of our three candidates—Fletcher, Shakespeare or Theobald—Theobald is the likely author of this collocation, as he previously employed an identical phrase in the

---

<sup>405</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 184.

stage direction to 1.1 of *The Clouds* (1715), though in its plural form: ‘*a Prospect of Villages, Forests, Mountains*’ (p. 5). Moreover, the word ‘prospect’ as will be shown, appears in many of Theobald’s stage directions. In addition to the five times it was used in *Double Falsehood*, the word appeared a few times more: in 2.4 where the scene ‘*Changes to another Prospect of Don Bernard’s House*’; in 4.1: ‘*A wide plain, with a prospect of mountains at a distance*’, and 5.1: ‘*The prospect of the mountains continued*’. The following table shows how Theobald used the word (sometimes more than once) in the following works:<sup>406</sup>

**Table. 3**

<i>The Persian Princess</i> (1715)	‘ <i>SCENE changes to a Plain, with a distant Prospect of the City</i> ’ (act 4, p. 47).
<i>Perseus and Andromeda</i> (1730)	‘ <i>Scene opens to a Prospect of the Sea</i> ’ (p. 14).
<i>Orestes</i> (1731)	‘ <i>A Port: With a distant Prospect of the Sea, and a Watch-Tower on Rocks</i> ’ (1.3). ‘ <i>A pleasant Prospect of the Country</i> ’ (3.1).
<i>Merlin</i> (1734)	‘ <i>A Prospect of Stone-henge</i> ’ (Preface, p. 5). ‘ <i>A Desert Heath: A Prospect of Stone-henge</i> ’ (p. 13). ‘ <i>Merlin changes the Scene to a pleasant Prospect of the Infernal Regions</i> ’ (p. 16). ‘ <i>SCENE Changes to a prospect of Hell</i> ’ (p. 22).
<i>The Fatal Secret</i> (1735)	‘ <i>SCENE changes to a Prospect of ruinous Monuments</i> ’ (act 5, p. 50).
<i>The Happy Captive</i> (1741)	‘ <i>Prospect of a Grotto in Abdalla ’s Garden</i> ’ (1.8). ‘ <i>Prospect of the Grotto</i> ’ (3.6).

<sup>406</sup> The word appears in the stage directions to 3.1, 5.5, and 5.6 of *The Lady’s Triumph* (1718), and although *LION* shows that it was authored by both Elkanah Settle and Lewis Theobald, the comi-dramatic opera itself was written by Settle, whereas Theobald only ‘furnished [its] songs and a little of [its] poetry’. The same is also true for ‘the masque of *Decius and Paulina*, which occurs in the last act of Settle’s production’. In fact, in addition to being published in the text of *The Lady’s Triumph’s*, Theobald’s contributions were published separately in the same year under the title *The Entertainments, Set to Musick, For The Comic-Dramatick Opera, Called, The Lady’s Triumph. Written by Mr. Theobald, and Set to Musick by Mr. Galliard*. Thus, results from *LION* for the word *prospect* in the stage directions for this play will be disregarded. Jones, *Lewis Theobald*, p. 26.

Interestingly, Theobald even uses the word in supplementing stage directions for some of his Shakespeare editions. For example, the stage direction to 2.3 of *Richard II* reads 'In Gloucestershire' in Pope's edition, and 'Wilds in Gloucestershire' in Capell's, yet in Theobald's edition, it reads, 'a wild prospect, in Gloucestershire'. Moreover, in *A Winter's Tale*, the stage direction Theobald adds to 4.4 reads 'The prospect of a Shepherd's cotte', in comparison to the one later added by Capell 'A room in the shepherd's house'.<sup>407</sup>

Although the phrase 'prospect of a village' clearly appears to have been written by Theobald (as exemplified in his previous use of the collocation in *The Clouds*), the Arden editor does not highlight this to the reader. That Hammond does not comment on those parallels seems to have little to do with editorial space restrictions, as he provided a commentary note on almost each one of those stage directions; the following are the commentary notes provided for four of the stage directions that include 'prospect of a village':

**[2.1] SD** Unlike 1.2, the scene is not here specified as a village '*at a distance*'. It is likely that this is a differently painted back shutter with a closer view of the village. Its function is to identify an open-air location where Henriquez can plausibly be overheard.

**[2.3] SD** A back shutter representing the exterior of Don Bernard's house is presumably used to create the scene here.

**[3.1] SD** The scene here is the same as for 2.1.

**[3.3] SD** After the more spectacular interior staging of the latter part of 3.2, this scene returns to the back shutter used for 1.2.<sup>408</sup>

It must be noted that Hammond does not comment on the stage direction to 1.2, which includes the first instance of the parallel '*Prospect of a village*'. These notes seem preoccupied with clarifying the theatrical aspects of the play as an eighteenth-century production,<sup>409</sup> which identifies the play's staging techniques

---

<sup>407</sup> William George Clark, William Aldis Wright, and John Glover, eds., *The Works of William Shakespeare*, 9 vols (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1863-6): *Richard II* vol. 4, p. 154, and *The Winter's Tale* vol. 3, p. 378.

<sup>408</sup> Hammond, *DF*, pp. 211, 218, 230, 244.

<sup>409</sup> This is discussed further in *DF*, Appendix 4: Scene Plan for *Double Falsehood*, (p. 325-327).

as belonging either to the eighteenth century or to the Restoration period. While Hammond suggested that the stage directions in *Double Falsehood* were 'presumably Theobald's own additions' (italics mine),<sup>410</sup> he presents it as a possibility, rather than a highly likely fact.

Some scholars and editors (as it will be shown shortly) have attempted to attribute an authorially-contested text to Shakespeare based on its stage directions. However, it must be noted that this is not helpful in making an authorship attribution as Shakespeare did not necessarily insert the stage directions in his plays himself. In fact, 'some stage-directions in the good Quartos, and many more in the Folio, were added or misplaced by scribes, prompters, Folio editors or compositors'.<sup>411</sup> The situation however is not the same with plays produced in the eighteenth century where the print conventions are entirely different from those that were in operation during Shakespeare's lifetime. For instance, during the eighteenth century, plays were usually published two to four weeks after their premiere:

everything about the printed text of a play leads one to believe it was indeed intended as a means of recapturing the stage experience. The title pages apprise us that the play is published as performed at a given theatre; the first cast is usually listed; the acts and scenes are marked; sometimes stage directions, perhaps even props appear; the prologue and epilogue, which tend to focus on the theatre or social follies, are printed although they often have different authorship and ordinarily have nothing to do with the contents of the play; prefaces deal with stage matters; frontispieces, when they appear, clearly reflect actors emoting on a specifically recognizable stage. The one thing that is decidedly not related in most cases to performances is the dedication by which the playwright hoped to reap suitable remuneration.<sup>412</sup>

---

<sup>410</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 184.

<sup>411</sup> E. A. J. Honigmann, *Myriad-Minded Shakespeare: Essays on the Tragedies, Problem Comedies and Shakespeare the Man*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 187.

<sup>412</sup> Shirley Strum Kenny, 'The Playhouse and the Printing Shop: Editing Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Plays', *Modern Philology*, 85.4 (1988), 408-419, p. 412.

Because *Double Falsehood* was published ‘As it [was] acted at the Theatre-Royal in *Drury-Lane*’, it seems that we are on safe grounds in suggesting that the stage directions containing ‘prospect of a village’ were composed by Theobald. This possibility is perhaps even more likely given that Theobald used the same collocation in its plural form in a stage direction of a previous play in 1715. Thus, editorially speaking, determining the origin of the stage directions in *Double Falsehood*—rather than attempting to confirm a Shakespearean connection to the text—becomes significant, not only in the sense of highlighting Theobald’s role as the adapter of *Double Falsehood*, but more importantly, in the sense of emphasizing exactly how much of the play can be represented as belonging to the eighteenth century.

Of course, this sometimes can be an uncomfortable fact to accept, especially for scholars purporting that a Shakespeare play lies behind Theobald’s *Double Falsehood*; such a position, for instance, is evident in the work of Gary Taylor. As is shown in the previous chapter, Taylor clearly makes extensive use of the *LION* database in determining the authorship of the play. He has also searched for verbal parallels to certain stage directions in order to make authorship attributions. For instance, Taylor has pointed to the stage direction ‘*Lute sounds within*’ and to the fact that it ‘appears nowhere else in English drama, or English literature, except Fletcher’s *The Chances*’; and based on this observation, he concludes that Fletcher was its author.<sup>413</sup> Yet, on the other hand, equal attention was not given to ‘*Prospect of a village*’, a distinctive collocation that appears in five stage directions in *Double Falsehood*, one with strong connections to Theobald. Taylor, in support of Hammond, identifies that the stage directions of the play ‘presuppose Restoration and eighteenth-century theatre technologies’. He cites the stage directions to 3.2 ‘Opens to a large hall’ and 4.1 ‘A wide plain, with a prospect of mountains at a distance’,<sup>414</sup> which both show no distinctive relationship to the stage directions of Theobald’s other plays, except for the word ‘prospect’ that appears in the second example. Although Taylor identifies the stage direction to 3.1 ‘*The Prospect of a village*’ as an ‘interpolat[ion]’ by Theobald, he does not point out that it is used repeatedly in

---

<sup>413</sup> Taylor, ‘History’, p. 45.

<sup>414</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38

the play, and he does not indicate (or, realise, perhaps) that it occurs (in its plural form) in Theobald's much earlier play *The Clouds* (1715).

Taylor has extended the argument elsewhere, in collaboration with Steven Wagschal, to suggest that the stage direction 'Prospect of a village' is among four features of the play they believe are linked to Cervantes's original Spanish version, and to a 1687 translation by John Phillips (rather than the 1612 Shelton translation), copies of both being owned by Theobald at the time of his death.<sup>415</sup> Taylor and Wagschal point to the stage direction 'Prospect of a village', arguing that in Shelton, Luscinda's and Cardenio's home has been accurately translated from the Spanish 'ciudad' to the word 'city'; whereas Phillips has translated it as a 'village'. Though they suggest that this stage direction—which, as I have shown earlier, occurs repeatedly in *Double Falsehood* (in 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.3)—was added by Theobald, they argue that it was not purely his, but was rather influenced by Phillips's translation:

These scene directions represent anachronistic theatrical conventions, which would not have been present in a play manuscript of 1613 or 1653; they must have been added to the text at some time after 1660. Stage directions for a "prospect of" occur thirteen times in six other plays by Theobald. But that theatrical convention would have been satisfied by a "Prospect of the City," as in Theobald's *Persian Princess* (1715), or by the very common scene location "A Street," as in Theobald's *Merlin*. By contrast, "prospect of a village" first appears here in *Double Falsehood*. The choice of "Village," as the locale for those scenes, cannot derive from theatrical convention, or from Cervantes, or Shelton, or a pre-1642 play manuscript. But it could derive from Phillips.<sup>416</sup>

Taylor and Wagschal do not present the very likely possibility that the choice of 'village' could have derived from Theobald himself. Though they assert that 'prospect of a village' first appears in *Double Falsehood*, we now know that the

---

<sup>415</sup> Theobald in fact owned two Cervantes copies, one published in 1611 and the other undated. Taylor and Wagschal, 'Reading Cervantes, or Shelton, or Phillips?' p. 17.

<sup>416</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

exact phrase was used much earlier in its plural form 'Prospect of Villages' in Theobald's *The Clouds*.

It is possible that both scholars are unaware of this particular example, but it is also possible that they were being *too literal* in identifying parallels, as the plural form of 'villages' is a possible reason why this instance was not discussed and considered. To elaborate, Taylor himself, in his previous study on *The History of Cardenio*, has pointed out two options in accounting for verbal parallels: (1) to consider parallels regardless of singular/plural distinctions, or (2) to account for parallels that depend on these distinctions. Having already discussed Taylor's attempt at establishing a Fletcher connection to Robert Johnson's 'Woods, Rocks, & Mountains' in the previous chapter, it is not my purpose here to reiterate his findings. It is however useful to cite that particular part of his discussion (regardless of the specifics), to discern how that might reflect on our current discussion:

If we eliminate cases where the uniqueness of the parallel depends entirely on the distinction between a plural and a singular noun ('bells ring to', 'maids in love'), then Shakespeare's canon also provides only a single parallel. On the other hand, if we insist on the significance of the difference between plural and singular, we can keep those two phrases, but must remove from the list Shakespeare's 'hollow lover'. Depending on our treatment of the plural/singular distinction, Shakespeare provides either one or two unique parallels.<sup>417</sup>

Here, Taylor clearly acknowledges that a scholar's treatment of the plural/singular distinction has a direct influence on the verbal parallels he or she accounts for. Thus, regardless of whether or not Taylor and Wagschal believe that the plural form of 'prospect of a village' in Theobald's *The Clouds* was worthy of consideration, the parallel should have at least been mentioned, especially by Taylor, who has previously considered/disregarded verbal parallels based on whether they were plural or singular nouns. This again would point to potential inconsistencies in Taylor's approach, already proved to be unreliable. For this reason, we might simply conclude that Theobald's repeated use of the word

---

<sup>417</sup> Taylor, 'History', p. 31.

'prospect' in his works, and his previous use of 'prospect of a village', with village in its plural form, makes Theobald, the most likely author of the five parallel stage directions in *Double Falsehood*.

Returning to Arden's editorial position regarding the authorship of stage directions in *Double Falsehood*, there are other issues to be addressed. For example, let us examine 3.2.151n, in which Hammond emphasizes a Shakespearean connection to the stage direction '*Leonora Swoons*', one he believes is evident in four different plays:

Hermione swoons at the climactic moment in *WT* 3.2 when the death of her son is announced and Leontes accepts his error; Hero swoons similarly at the moment of deepest intensity when she is wrongfully accused in *MA* 4.1; as does the disguised Julia in *TGV* 5.4. Another famous Shakespearean swooner (though a comic one) is Rosalind, who loses consciousness when she sees Orlando's bloody napkin brandished by Oliver in *AYL* 4.3.<sup>418</sup>

However, if we visit the original texts of these plays (in the 1623 folio) we would find that there were no stage directions cueing any of these characters to swoon, but that in each instant, a swoon (or a similar action) is merely implied in the text.<sup>419</sup> It should be noted that 'the only stage direction for a swoon in [Shakespeare's first folio] is '*King sounds*' in *2 Henry VI* [3.2.32]',<sup>420</sup> which interestingly, and unlike the one in *Double Falsehood*, involves a male rather than a female character.

The point we intend to investigate here is why the Arden editor emphasized the stage direction '*Swoons*' in *Double Falsehood* as Shakespearean though it does not occur at the points indicated of the cited plays. The following section lists the added stage directions in the Arden and Oxford editions of these plays, as shown in the first and second columns, respectively:

---

<sup>418</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 243.

<sup>419</sup> See *Mr Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories & Tragedies* (London: 1623) *Literature Online*, *The Winter's Tale* p. 287; *Much Ado About Nothing* p. 114; *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* p. 37; *As You Like It* p. 203.

<sup>420</sup> John D. Cox, 'Open Stage, Open Page? Editing Stage Directions in Early Dramatic Texts', *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 178-209, p. 209.

<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	[ <i>Hermione faints</i> ]	[ <i>Hermione falls to the ground</i> ]
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i>	[ <i>Hero falls</i> ]	[ <i>Hero falls to the ground</i> ]
<i>Two Gentlemen of Verona</i>	[ <i>Faints</i> ]	[ <i>She faints</i> ]
<i>As You Like It</i>	[ <i>Rosalind faints</i> ] <sup>421</sup>	[ <i>Rosalind faints</i> ] <sup>422</sup>

It would seem that modern editors are more comfortable with *faints/falls*, and not *swoons*, which was perhaps more fashionable in the eighteenth century. This in itself encourages us to question Hammond's emphasis on the Shakespearean element in this stage direction.

Building on our discussion in the previous chapter regarding the potential problems of relying on the *LION* database in authorship studies, it is important to draw attention to how this point might be applied in this particular instance. It is possible that Hammond's use of *LION* has traced instances of 'swoons', though not from the Shakespeare folio, but instead, from the Cambridge edition (1863-6) edited by William George Clark, William Aldis Wright and John Glover (as Hammond's citations are from the *Oxford Shakespeare*). This nine-volume edition contains a collation of selected emendations from previous editors, which are all available electronically on the *LION* database. To elaborate, the stage direction 'Swoons' was added by Pope in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and 'Hero Swoons' was added by Hanmer in *Much Ado About Nothing*; both added stage directions are present in this edition, and thus, can be detected through a *LION* search that selects Shakespeare in the author's search box. Moreover, an instance for 'Swoons' in Shakespeare's works can equally be detected in this Cambridge edition of *As You Like It*. Here, *LION* traces the stage direction 'Rosalind swoons', which the editors themselves have added as their own emendation (this indicates that the word is equally popular with the Victorian editors).<sup>423</sup> If that were the case with Hammond's use of *LION* in his Arden edition, then we are

---

<sup>421</sup> John Pitcher, ed., William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale* (London: Methuen Drama, 2010), p. 230; Claire McEachern, ed., William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing* (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), p. 264; William C. Carroll, ed., William Shakespeare, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, (London: Thomson Learning, 2004), p. 277; Juliet Dusinberre, ed., William Shakespeare, *As You Like It* (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), p. 312.

<sup>422</sup> *The Winter's Tale* (p. 1136), *Much Ado About Nothing* (p. 585), *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (p. 23), *As You Like It* (p. 676), ed. by Stanley Wells (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986, rep. 2005).

<sup>423</sup> Clark, Wright, and Glover, *The Works of William Shakespeare*, vol. I, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, p. 153; vol. II, *Much Ado About Nothing*, p. 59; *As You Like It*, p. 446.

seriously looking into more problems than those discussed in the previous chapter.

But what is most important about this commentary note is that Hammond does not consider the two other candidates. For instance, Theobald seems to be the more likely candidate for writing '*Leonora Swoons*', because he uses the stage direction '*Swoons*' for a female character in *The Persian Princess* (3.185),<sup>424</sup> as well as in *The Perfidious Brother*, which has the cue '*She Swoons*' for Luciana in Theobald's version (3.185),<sup>425</sup> but '*Faints*' in Mestayer's.<sup>426</sup> This not only points to Theobald's previous use of this stage direction, but it also shows his preference of *swoons* over *faints* when he was revising Mestayer's version of the play. Equally significant is the stage direction '*She swoones*' which occurs in Fletcher's *The Mad Lover* (3.4.108).<sup>427</sup> But what is even more significant, is that the parallel extends to the second line after the stage direction in both plays: '**But give her air**' in *Double Falsehood* (p. 32), and '**Give her fresh air**' in *The Mad Lover* 3.4.110.<sup>428</sup> This suggests a very strong parallel to Fletcher, in comparison to the more general parallel to Shakespeare. Both points, of course, are not addressed by the Arden editor, and thus, reveals (once more) his bias towards establishing Shakespearean connections to *Double Falsehood*.

## 6. Conclusion

This chapter has aimed to address questions regarding Theobald's authorial contributions to *Double Falsehood* by attempting to bring these questions to the centre of the debate. The chapter has identified many verbal connections between the *Double Falsehood* text and Theobald's works, which are not addressed by the Arden editor. This identification of connections to Theobald is in no way aimed at implying forgery, but rather at emphasizing his active—perhaps, even authorial—role as the adapter of a seventeenth-century or Restoration manuscript that is very possibly linked to Fletcher (rather than Shakespeare). Moreover, this study has provided a thorough investigation of the editor's approach to authorship attribution as well as a detailed examination of

---

<sup>424</sup> Theobald, *Persian Princess*, p. 20.

<sup>425</sup> Theobald, *The Perfidious Brother*, p. 29.

<sup>426</sup> Mestayer, *The Perfidious Brother*, p. 26.

<sup>427</sup> Bowers, V, p. 60.

<sup>428</sup> Ibid.

the commentary notes provided, particularly those carrying claims for Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood's* source text, thus, identifying a number of problems with the Arden edition. The Arden editor does not discuss, for example, the authorship attribution method employed in his edition. Furthermore, the commentary notes demonstrate an evident partiality for Shakespeare, and often Fletcher, as the authors of the play behind this adaptation. This partiality has resulted in an editorial neglect of the play's status as an adaptation, especially when we are dealing with a text in which Theobald is already recognized as its adapter. Hammond's efforts have been clearly dedicated to establishing Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood's* source play, which has resulted in an editorial disregard for Theobald's role. But readers interested in the *Double Falsehood* enigma would anticipate a much more exhaustive discussion than the one provided when it comes to verbal connections to Theobald, instead of a comprehensive commentary on different ranges of Shakespeare/Fletcher parallels. The fact that readers are presumably less familiar with Theobald's works would necessitate a greater need for this discussion. Thus, and in terms of its authorially-contested status, *Double Falsehood* could *only* benefit from an impartial approach that is prepared equally to highlight the verbal and thematic connections that are unique to Theobald, just as it is prepared to highlight those unique to Fletcher and Shakespeare.

# CHAPTER 5

## Textual Representations and Misrepresentations of Adaptation

---

As we have seen, there are many editorial problems surrounding the textual complexity of *Double Falsehood*. To re-cap, the source of this complexity mainly lies in its authorially-contested background, which has been the cause of a major authorship controversy that continues to this day. The main problem as we know, is that the play originated in the eighteenth century as an adaptation of a Shakespeare play that was neither printed as a quarto edition, nor in the 1623 Folio. However, being a dramatization of the Cardenio episode in Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, *Double Falsehood* has been linked to Shakespeare's name based on the 1653 Stationers' Register entry for *The History of Cardenio* by Fletcher and Shakespeare, an attribution current research considers to be inaccurate.<sup>429</sup> The controversy has intensified after the 2010 publication of this eighteenth-century text in the Arden Shakespeare series, marking the first time that the play has become available in a scholarly Shakespeare series as a fully annotated edition.<sup>430</sup> What complicates the matter further, is that the play was granted the full status of an Arden Shakespeare edition despite the following factors: (1) the growing scholarly consensus that accepts Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare, as the primary (if not, the sole) author of *Cardenio*; (2) the many accusations of plagiarism against Lewis Theobald (which clearly represent him as an untrustworthy source); (3) Theobald's tendency to write in imitation of Shakespeare (which introduces the possibility of forgery); and most importantly, (4) his unconvincing claims regarding the manuscripts he said he possessed, and

---

<sup>429</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 557-558.

<sup>430</sup> Previous editions of *Double Falsehood* are not nearly as comprehensive as the Arden edition. See *Double Falsehood: A New Edition*, ed. by Walter Graham (Cleveland, Ohio: Western Reserve University, 1920); *The Double Falsehood*, *Shakespeare Imitations, Parodies and Forgeries: 1710-1820*, vol. 1 ed. by Jeffery Kahan (New York: Routledge, 2004), 159-242; *Double Falshood; or, The Distrest Lovers*, ed. by John W. Kennedy, (2002-2004), <<http://www.skensoftware.com/Double%20Falshood/>>[accessed 26 September 2015]. Though each edition is useful in its own way, none has approached the play with the same depth as evident in the Arden edition.

his failure to present them to the public. Such serious issues as these have not been adequately addressed by the Arden editor, Brean Hammond. Hammond focuses on establishing Shakespeare as the author of the source-play, instead of highlighting Theobald's role as the adapter (or even the author of a considerable part) of *Double Falsehood*. But while the publication of the play within a Shakespearean context has reopened the authorship question once again, more importantly it has also shifted scholarly enquiry to questions that are more editorially specific.

This chapter will examine Hammond's approach to editing the *Double Falsehood* text with a particular focus on whether or not that approach presents the text as an adaptation, and whether it actually solves the play's controversy. It will do so by comparing it to the approach proposed by John Jowett in 2004, and later adopted in his edition of *Measure for Measure* for the *Oxford Middleton* (2007), and that of *Sir Thomas More* for the Arden Shakespeare (2011). The discussion will begin by reviewing the theory—discussed by Gary Taylor and John Jowett in 1993—for the 1623 *Measure for Measure* text being prepared from an adaptation by Middleton in 1621. It will then explain the textual situation of the play as it is presented in the *Oxford Middleton*, mainly highlighting the features that define it as an adaptation. The discussion will then move to exploring Jowett's approach to editing adaptations, a method that is innovative both in how it focuses on the importance of highlighting the process of adaptation within the edited text itself, and also in how it departs from the traditional reproduction of copy-text by presenting the adapted text as a 'stratified' rather than a 'linear' text. Because it is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the textual issues of both of these plays, prime emphasis will be given to *Measure for Measure*, while *Sir Thomas More* will be discussed generally, and only alluded to when necessary. The second part of this chapter aims to show the ways in which the Arden Shakespeare's presentation of *Double Falsehood* as a linear text could be potentially misleading. It will demonstrate how any evidence for Theobald's hand in *Double Falsehood* (e.g. the song 'Fond Echo') must be represented as a differentiated layer, rather than being manually reproduced as part of a single continuous text. The discussion will then address the difficulties that result from presenting an adaptation as a continuous text,

and it will moreover emphasize the significance of presenting the different layers of an adaptation within the edited text. By referring to Jowett's approach to editing *Measure for Measure*, the purpose of this discussion is in no way aimed at validating the theory that this play is an adaptation (though it embraces it), but rather to use its text as an example of how editorial problems presented by adaptations could be approached.

### **1. An Approach to Editing Adaptations**

Jowett's work on *Measure for Measure* as an adaptation by Thomas Middleton began in *Shakespeare Reshaped* (1993), a collaborative work with Gary Taylor which dedicates a chapter to the subject of theatrical interpolation in the play.<sup>431</sup> In this chapter, Taylor and Jowett refer to the work of previous scholars (i.e. George Steevens and Grant White) who have dismissed certain lines and phrases in *Measure for Measure* as 'interpolation[s]'. The problem, explain Taylor and Jowett, lies in how such decisions were purely made on the basis of personal taste. Therefore, they state that 'anyone who alleges that something has been interpolated has an obligation to explain who interpolated it, when, and how that interpolation made its unsavoury way into a printed text'. In fact, they believe that the difficulty with the work of early critics, even those in the twentieth century (e.g. Dover Wilson), is that while they claimed that certain texts contained interpolations, their work does not present evidence on how these interpolations affected the early manuscripts. Taylor and Jowett add that 'some recent editors have continued to operate on the assumption that "actors' interpolations" have corrupted our texts of Shakespeare', yet none has 'provided a convincing explanation of how this corruption made its way into the early printed texts'. At that point, Taylor and Jowett present their own explanation which is that the play 'suffered from posthumous theatrical interpolation[s]' that were possibly added during a revival. Despite what they describe as a

---

<sup>431</sup> The possibility for Middleton being the adapter of *Measure for Measure* was first introduced in the *Oxford Shakespeare* (1986). There, the text—also edited by Jowett—was presented in what is 'believe[d] to be its adapted form', followed by an 'Additional Passages' section which includes a conjectured reconstruction of the original version of the adapted passages; see Stanley Wells, gen. ed., *The Oxford Shakespeare*, p. 843. For an edition that does not represent the play as an adaptation, see William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. by N. W. Bawcutt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

‘psychological resistance’ to acknowledging the presence of interpolations in the ‘well-known’ and ‘much-praised’ work of the most popular poet of the English language, their research results in the following conclusions: that *Measure for Measure*, in the form in which it survives, is an adaptation; that there are passages in its text that must be ‘stigmatized as unShakespearean interpolations’ that were added during a revival of the play in 1621; and that some of these interpolations were written by Thomas Middleton.<sup>432</sup>

Thus, Taylor’s and Jowett’s theory of adaptation comes to explain the textual problems of *Measure for Measure*, eventually allowing the reader to make sense of any unShakespearean features in the text. They state:

it seems to us that the interpolations weaken Shakespeare’s play, confuse its structure, and contribute in some small measure to the dissatisfaction many critics have felt with its mixture of genres.<sup>433</sup>

In other words, the theory of adaptation thus becomes the textual solution, rather than the problem.<sup>434</sup> Interestingly, it must be noted that Taylor’s and Jowett’s research on *Measure for Measure* does not transform the text, but instead, it transforms the reader’s experience of the text. In *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (2009), Margaret Jane Kidnie highlights the impact of their contribution:

Jowett’s and Taylor’s explanation of these perceived cruces proposes that users have long misrecognized Shakespeare’s work, wrongly taking an instance of partial adaptation that survives in the Folio as the thing itself [...] [Their] research has no physical impact on the Folio text of *Measure for Measure*. Rather, it potentially alters the

---

<sup>432</sup> Gary Taylor and John Jowett, ‘With New Additions’: Theatrical Interpolation in *Measure for Measure*, in *Shakespeare Reshaped: 1606-1623* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 107-236, pp. 107-108, 236.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid., p. 236.

<sup>434</sup> It is worth mentioning that the 2004 Oxford Shakespeare edition of *Timon of Athens* presents the play as a collaboration with Middleton, similarly treating the theory of collaboration as a solution to the textual problem. Jowett explains that ‘the obstacle [is turned] into a source of re-engagement with the play [...]’. And in the light of collaboration [it] looks not only different, but better. Questions of coherence are reframed. The play can be granted a particular license to ebb and flow, and the cause of some of its disjunctions becomes self-evident’. John Jowett, ed., William Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton, *Timon of Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 145-146.

grounds on which modern producers and consumers evaluate that particular instance of production as genuine or adaptive by changing one's ideas and expectations about *the work*. What is therefore instructive about their research [...] is the way it prises apart work and text, implicitly demonstrating how the former is a pragmatic concept that *comes after*, rather than antedates, production instances.<sup>435</sup>

Building on his research with Taylor, Jowett edits *Measure for Measure* for the *Oxford Middleton* (2007). In the introduction to his edition, Jowett emphasizes that while the play's 'credentials as a Shakespeare play are sound', it still 'seems clear that the 1623 text had undergone adaptation by Middleton'. Jowett then begins by pointing to certain features that date the text to a year later than 1603-04. For example, the fact that the text is free of Shakespearean oaths suggests that the play has most likely undergone censorship imposed by the 1606 Act to Restrain Abuses of Players, which 'had made blasphemy on stage illegal'. Moreover, Jaggard's act divisions suggest that the play was produced after 1609, when the King's Men started playing at the Blackfriars (a theatre that observes this practice). One indication that the text belongs to an even later date involves its inclusion of 'Take, O take those lips away', a song that occurs in Fletcher's *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* (1617-1620). Jowett explains that the song is

positioned immediately after one of the act-breaks. This lyric also occurs, with a second stanza, in [Fletcher's] tragedy [...] Every indication is that the song originated in *Rollo*. The song fits the context of *Rollo* considerably better than that of *Measure*, and, as the two stanzas were influenced by a common source, the Latin lyric '*Ad Lydiam*', it can reasonably be inferred that they were written as a single piece. Accordingly, the song must have been introduced into *Measure* for the occasion of a revival staged several years after Shakespeare's death.

---

<sup>435</sup> Margaret Jane Kidnie, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 153.

The final indication that the text belongs to yet an even later date involves an allusion to the Thirty Years War which occurs in 1.2.1-5. The scene points to the date 1621 as it opens with a reference to the King of Hungary, who at that time was 'an enemy of Vienna', where the play was set.<sup>436</sup>

Having discussed the elements that date the 1623 text of *Measure for Measure* to a time later than 1603-04, it is essential to highlight the main additions and alterations which the Oxford editor attributes to Middleton. For example, Jowett demonstrates that one passage at the beginning of 1.2 (lines 1-79) independently confirms that 'the play was adapted posthumously', but more importantly, that 'the case for Middleton's authorship of the passage is particularly strong'. To illustrate, Jaggard printed two duplicate passages in 1.2 'as a continuous sequence': these passages are (1) lines 1-79, marked by the editor as 'an interpolation', and (2) the following eight lines (79<sup>a</sup>-79<sup>h</sup>), marked by the editor 'as a cancel' as they were supposed to be removed in the adaptation. Jowett highlights Middleton's evident presence in the interpolated lines:

The sequence might be attributed to Shakespeare's oversight (though a rather puzzling one), or to a result of his revision, were it not that the opening episode includes a striking cluster of grammatical and lexical features that would not be expected in a Shakespeare text. It is Middleton who favours the linguistic forms that mark this passage out from the rest of the play and from Shakespeare's usage more generally: 'has' (as against 'hath'), 'whilst' (as against 'while'), 'ay' (as against 'yes'), and 'between' (as against 'betwixt') [...] Furthermore, whereas only four relatively unremarkable words in the passage are found in Shakespeare's works but not Middleton's, an impressive array of individual words, distinctive phrases, and idiosyncratic turns of thought can be paralleled in Middleton but not Shakespeare.<sup>437</sup>

Another feature of the adaptation that has connections to Middleton involves the addition of Fletcher's song 'Take, O take those lips away' to 4.1.

---

<sup>436</sup> John Jowett, ed., 'Measure for Measure: A Genetic Text', in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1542-1585, pp. 1542, 1544-1545.

<sup>437</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1542-1543.

Jowett argues that Middleton followed the practice of introducing new songs in revivals, which is evident in *Macbeth* for instance.<sup>438</sup> Similar to *Measure for Measure*, it is now believed that the 1623 Folio text of *Macbeth* also includes non-Shakespearean interpolations by Middleton. Among these are the songs ‘Come away, come away’ and ‘Blacke Spirits’ which occur in full in Middleton’s *The Witch*.<sup>439</sup> Jowett adds that Middleton also added ‘the Bawd’s song’ in a revival of *A Fair Quarrel*, and ‘adapted and shortened’ a song by Thomas Ravenscroft in 4.5.1-4 of *A Trick to Catch the Old One*. Moreover, in 1.4 of *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, Middleton adapted his own song ‘Venus is Cupid’s only joy’ from *Masque of Cupids*, possibly cutting the first stanza. The final feature of the adaptations with a connection to Middleton is the Bawd’s name, ‘Mistress Overdone’, which Jowett believes is ‘distinctively Middletonian’. For instance, he illustrates that Middleton’s *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman’s* features ‘a sexually decrepit’ character named ‘Master Overdone’. In fact, not only do names coined by Middleton ‘involve a compound’, but quite interestingly, they repeatedly ‘suggest a sexual identity’. The following names are just some examples: ‘Mistress Newcut, Mistress Cleveland, Mistress Openwork, Castiza, Kix, Whorehound, Touchwood, De Flores, [and] Mistress Underman’; corresponding examples are considerably fewer in Shakespeare.<sup>440</sup>

So far we have shown the essential features of *Measure for Measure* that for Jowett establish it as an adaptation by Middleton. We turn next to the editorial approach to adaptations as it was proposed by Jowett in ‘Addressing Adaptation: *Measure for Measure* and *Sir Thomas More*’ (2004). In this article, Jowett points to the similarity between publishing the former in the Oxford Middleton’s *Collected Works*, and the latter in the Arden Shakespeare. He explains that ‘despite their manifest differences as texts’, both plays ‘demand attention to the same editorial issue’. He demonstrates that *Measure for Measure*—as was shown earlier—appears in the Middleton collection based on the fact that its Folio text is published from a version of the play adapted by Middleton in 1621. *Sir Thomas More*, he explains, is also an adapted text, given that its manuscript

---

<sup>438</sup> Ibid., p. 1546.

<sup>439</sup> Inga-Stina Ewbank, ‘The Tragedy of *Macbeth*: A Genetic Text’, *Middleton’s Collected Works*, ed. by Gary Taylor, 1165-1201, p. 1165.

<sup>440</sup> Jowett, ‘Genetic Text’, pp. 1546, 1543.

contains the original text in the hand of Anthony Munday, and 'a complex set of revisions on separate leaves in a number of other hands'. It is, therefore, 'the process of adaptation that gives the play its claim to a place in the Arden3 series', considering that 'Hand D' has been recognized as Shakespeare's. Accordingly, Jowett points to 'a striking parallel' between the inclusion of a Shakespeare play in a Middleton collection and the inclusion of a non-Shakespeare play in a Shakespeare series 'in that both plays are transposed into new authorial environments that are defined by the process of adaptation'.<sup>441</sup>

Jowett's approach to editing these two plays mainly emphasizes that adaptation is an issue that needs to be presented to the reader 'within the edited text itself', in a way that 'present[s] the text in both its pre-adaptation and post-adaptation states'. Because evidences of adaptation are 'localized', the editing will therefore alternate between single-text and two-text presentation. Jowett illustrates how the approach is applied to highlight the alterations made to the *Measure for Measure* text, which is published in the 1623 Folio as 'an undifferentiated and continuous single text'. For example, the passage at 1.2.1-79 (identified as an interpolation) and the passage that follows (identified as a cancel) were both printed in the Folio as a continuous text without any sign of differentiation. Jowett's approach solves this problem by departing from the conservative reproduction of copy-text to mediate to the reader both stages of textual production. This way the edition presents 'two textual strata': instead of reproducing the 1623 Folio text by printing it as a 'linear text', the *Oxford Middleton* edition prints it as a 'stratified text' to highlight its two states (before and after the adaptation). Therefore, according to Jowett's approach, the inclusion of *Measure for Measure* in the *Oxford Middleton* allows the text to be presented in a way that 'highlights the process of adaptation', thus aiding the reader in identifying the differences between the 1603-4 text and the 1621 adaptation.<sup>442</sup> 'To indicate the changes attributed to the adaptation, text posited to have been deleted for the adaptation is printed in grey type, and added text is

---

<sup>441</sup> John Jowett, 'Addressing Adaptation: *Measure for Measure* and *Sir Thomas More*', in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. by Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63-76, p. 63.

<sup>442</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64, 67, 69.

printed in bold type'.<sup>443</sup> We shall now turn to examining the approach employed in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* in the light of Jowett's approach to editing adaptations.

## 2. Arden's Misrepresentation of Adaptation

Although Theobald's *Double Falsehood* was performed and published as an adaptation of Shakespeare, the immediate difficulty is that there is no evidence to support such a claim, as the *alleged* Shakespeare play itself does not physically exist, nor is there any evidence that such a play was attributed to him in his lifetime. However, elements dating the text to a period earlier than the eighteenth century (i.e. evidences for Fletcher's hand) make the case for the play being an outright forgery less likely, even when considering that Theobald proved to be an unreliable source. Thus, there is strong reason to believe that the play is an eighteenth-century adaptation of a manuscript that originated in the seventeenth century, one that is very possibly linked to Fletcher. Though the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* clearly acknowledges that the play is an adaptation that has possibly undergone two stages of revision,<sup>444</sup> one of the main problems with the edition is the publisher's *choice* to edit the play within a Shakespearean context. To elaborate, the editor frequently highlights verbal and thematic connections to Shakespeare and Fletcher, rather than to Theobald. The negative impact of this choice could have been reduced had Hammond given equal attention to highlighting Theobald's contributions to the text. Unfortunately, his approach to editing the play was particularly misleading in this regard. As is shown in Chapter 2, an examination of Theobald's two other adaptations—*Richard II* (1720) and *The Duchess of Malfi* (1735)—reveals that he had made some major changes to the original plays. Of course, this indicates the extent to which Theobald might have adapted whatever manuscript was in his possession when he was working on *Double Falsehood*. But while major changes to the original text are to be expected of any adaptation, it remains the responsibility of the editor to highlight any evidence of textual alterations that were the result of adaptation.

---

<sup>443</sup> Jowett, 'Genetic Text', p. 1546.

<sup>444</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 159.

One might ask, however, how—if *Double Falsehood* is the product of the eighteenth century, and its source is a seventeenth-century and/or a Restoration document that appears to be lost—is an editor expected ‘to present the text in both its pre-adaptation and post-adaptation states’ as is proposed by Jowett? The answer to this question is to be found in Jowett’s explanation of the difference between the textual situation of *Measure for Measure*, and that of *Sir Thomas More*. He illustrates that while the former exists as ‘a printed text’, the latter on the other hand, ‘survives as a manuscript in which all the variation that is discovered through inference in *Measure* is [there] laid out before us in incontrovertible form and detail’.<sup>445</sup> Likewise, the textual situation of *Double Falsehood* is similar to that of *Measure for Measure* in that it also survives as a printed text where evidences of adaptation could equally be discovered through inference. So, similar to how Middleton’s hand was revealed in *Measure for Measure*, the same could also be applied to *Double Falsehood*. The following section will present from each play two instances where there is evidence of adaptation in order to compare the different editorial approaches employed.

In 1.2.100.1 of the *Oxford Middleton’s* edition of *Measure for Measure*, Juliet’s entry is printed in bold as a textual signal that adaptation took place at this point. Jowett explains in the introduction that Juliet’s role was obviously ‘accentuated’ as she was brought on stage in 1.2 and 5.1, allowing her to appear as ‘a silent moral comment’. The following is the commentary note provided to signify her entry in 1.2.100.1:

She has no part in the scene other than to appear visually as the observed, in a manner that contrasts in appearance and gender with the similarly silent but observing Gentlemen. Her theatrical function must be to be inscribed as visibly pregnant, ‘With character too gross’, and she may well have worn the gown of penance imposed on detected fornicators. It seems characteristic of the adaptation to add to and emblemize the presence of women [...] Pregnant unmarried women appear on stage to supply a visual and sometimes silent serio-comic comment on their misdeeds in *No Wit* (Grace), *Witch*

---

<sup>445</sup> Jowett, ‘Addressing Adaptation’, pp. 63, 72.

(Francisca), *Quarrel* (Jane), *Nice Valour* (the 'Cupid') and *Dissemblers* (the 'Page').<sup>446</sup>

Readers interested in exploring the commentary notes will be made aware of the changes made to the adaptation, as well as reasons behind such changes. Moreover, those who are only interested in reading the text are also notified when the text switches to the adaptation as Juliet's name is printed in bold to signify that her entry was added for the adaptation. Hammond's editorial response to a similar situation is slightly different. In 1.2.73.1n of the *Double Falsehood* edition, Hammond notifies readers of the possible addition of a female character as part of Theobald's adaptation. The textual note to '*Enter LEONORA and Maid*' reads:

This non-speaking maid, of whom no other character in the scene takes any notice and who is given nothing to do, was probably added in the adaptation in the interests of decorum: some 18th-century theatre-goers would have looked askance at a heroine willing to converse with her suitor while alone in the fields.<sup>447</sup>

By representing the maid as a feature of the adaptation, Hammond is identifying the character as an interpolation in the sense of the approach adopted by Jowett, which portrays a form of textual consciousness. However, Hammond's approach is far less effective than Jowett's as the addition of this character is not highlighted within the edited text itself. So, with regard to textually highlighting eighteenth-century elements of the play, the Arden edition is not entirely helpful.

As another example, let us examine much longer interpolations, namely, song additions. As we have mentioned earlier, Fletcher's song 'Take, O take those lips away' (4.1.1-6) is proposed to have been added to the 1621 revival of *Measure for Measure*. Similar to the previous example, Jowett prints the full song in bold type, and writes the following in the commentary:

---

<sup>446</sup> Jowett, 'Genetic Text', pp. 1543, 1550.

<sup>447</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 195.

The song seems to have been added as part of the adaptation. The second stanza in the composer John Wilson's manuscript, and similarly most other texts including *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*, reads:

Hide, O hide those hills of snow  
That thy frozen bosom bears,  
On whose tops the pinks that grow  
Are yet of those that April wears;  
But first set my poor heart free,  
Bound in those icy chains by thee.

This makes it certain that the addressee is a woman, whereas in *Measure* the song expresses Mariana's feelings towards Angelo. For the dramatic technique, see Introduction; for a musical setting, see *Companion*, p. 167.<sup>448</sup>

The same was not applied to the song 'Fond Echo' (4.2.16-23), which as will be detailed shortly, clearly belongs to Theobald. Edmond Malone, for instance, expressed his doubts regarding the authorship of 'Fond Echo' in his annotated copy of the second issue of *Double Falsehood* (c. 1778). He stated: 'I strongly suspect this Song. It has, I think, too modern an air; & was, I believe, an interpolation of Theobald's'.<sup>449</sup> Arden's commentary note on this song, however, does not engage the reader with the provenance of its lines, nor does it attempt to attribute them to any of the main three candidates (Fletcher, Shakespeare, or Theobald). And while Hammond does not highlight the song as an interpolation within the text, neither does he highlight it as such in the commentary. The note to the song—which is very brief if we are to compare it with Jowett's—reads: 'See pp. 29 and 57, and Appendix 5 on the play's music'.<sup>450</sup>

However, if we go to the discussion on page 29, it becomes clear that the editor is certainly implying Shakespeare's authorship of the song:

In 4.2, a passage of supreme aesthetic appeal is achieved in the *Tempest*-like 'sweet airs' of the song that Violante renders offstage: 'Fond Echo, forego they light strain' (16-23). In Gouge's lovely setting

---

<sup>448</sup> Jowett, 'Genetic Text', p. 1570.

<sup>449</sup> Lupić, 'Malone's *DF*', p. 109.

<sup>450</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 272.

(see Fig. 3), the music is permitted to begin the pacification of Julio and effect his return to sanity. Indeed the song changes the play's mood as much as the transitional scene in *The Winter's Tale*, when the Shepherd announces to the Clown that 'thou met'st with things dying, I with things new-born' (3.3.111-12).

On page 57, on the other hand, Hammond informs readers that 'Fond Echo', is in fact, one of Theobald's contributions to the play, though still implying a Shakespearean connection by comparing it, again, to *The Tempest*:

Another of Theobald's innovations was certainly the song in 4.2, Violante's 'Fond Echo, forego thy light strain'. Julio experiences the song in the mysterious way that Caliban experiences music on the island and Ferdinand hears Ariel's song in *The Tempest*. In context there is a Shakespearean texture to this passage of action. The lyrics, however, are probably Theobald's [...] The song is further discussed in Appendix 5.<sup>451</sup>

Here, Hammond appears hesitant in his assertions as he goes from stating that the song was *certainly* one of Theobald's innovations, to suggesting that the lyrics are *probably* his. Thus, his position towards the song's authorship wavers between establishing Shakespearean connections to the song and acknowledging Theobald as the author of those lines. In a recent review of the Arden edition, Ivan Lupić highlights the difficulties with this particular discussion:

As for internal evidence, it is unfortunate that Hammond sometimes presents the relevant material in a way that may misrepresent the problem instead of illuminating it. While discussing the play and its Shakespearean resonances [...] he points out the aesthetic appeal of

---

<sup>451</sup> Ibid., pp. 29, 57. Establishing a Shakespearean connection to *The Tempest* is repeated again in appendix 5:

In Act 4, it becomes crucial rather than merely important, and it is here that the closest resemblance to the use of music in Shakespeare's later romantic comedies is found [...] In 4.2, Julio and the Gentleman hear the sound of a lute, provoking from Julio a sentiment very similar to the unexpected lyricism of Caliban in *The Tempest*:

I'm often visited with these sweet airs.  
The spirits of some hapless man that died  
And left his love hid in a faithless woman  
Sure haunts these mountains. (p. 328)

the song “Fond Echo” (4.2.16-23) and its “Tempest-like” quality (29), but we have to wait for 20 pages to learn — in a completely different context — that the song, too, was actually one of “Theobald’s innovations” (57).<sup>452</sup>

Theobald’s authorship of the song is later discussed by Hammond in appendix 5. However, the greater part of this section is dedicated to attempting to establish a connection between *Double Falsehood* and Shakespeare, by highlighting parallels to Robert Johnson’s ‘Woods, Rocks, & Mountains’ (discussed here in Chapter 3), rather than focusing on Theobald’s song ‘Fond Echo’. But in the section on ‘Fond Echo’, Hammond reviews the song’s appearance in print in the eighteenth century, thus revealing more about its connection to Theobald than he does in either the introduction and the commentary. For example, he shows that the song was published anonymously in 1728 as ‘The Forsaken Maid. A new song in the tragedy called “Double Falsehood” by Shakespeare’; that it was reprinted in the second volume of *The Musical Miscellany* in 1729 as ‘sung in the Distrest Lovers, The Words by Mr. Theobald’; and that it was published in the first volume of *Calliope or English Harmony* in 1746, emphasizing that here, ‘the words are again ascribed to Shakespeare’.<sup>453</sup> Hammond’s review however does not elucidate the origin of the song. In fact, he has previously argued that ‘the printing history of the song preserves the ambiguity of the play’s authorship’.<sup>454</sup> The problem, argues Tiffany Stern, is that ‘the words were changing (or not established) in an “authorial” fashion, without its being clear whether or not that particular piece of text was to be viewed as Theobald’s or Shakespeare’s’.<sup>455</sup> In another discussion of ‘Fond Echo’, Stern has argued that Theobald ‘allowed passages in the play that were clearly his to be taken for Shakespeare’s’, stating that ‘[he] had long wished to muddy the distinction between himself and Shakespeare’, which according to

---

<sup>452</sup> Lupić, ‘*DF* in the Arden Shakespeare’, p. 371.

<sup>453</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 334.

<sup>454</sup> Brean Hammond, ‘The Performance History of a Pseudo-Shakespearean Play: Theobald’s *Double Falshood*’, *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7.1 (1984), 49-60, p. 59.

<sup>455</sup> Stern, ‘Collaborative Writers’, p. 126.

her, he accomplished in *Double Falsehood*.<sup>456</sup> Having said that, it remains unfortunate that when it comes to his adaptation, Theobald did not attempt to distinguish between the alleged Shakespeare text and his own contributions as the adapter.

Yet, when it comes to determining the authorship of the song, two sources are of even greater interest to us. The first is the 1728 publication describing it as 'a new song in the tragedy called "Double Falsehood" by Shakespeare'. This title is vague in regards to the song's authorship. However, describing it as a 'new' song clearly suggests that it belongs to the adaptation, so it would seem that it is the play itself that was given the Shakespeare ascription. The second source is the 1729 *Musical Miscellany* entry, which clearly establishes Theobald as the author of the song, for not only was it attributed to his name, but equally importantly, it was 'an attribution he never denied'.<sup>457</sup> Hence, the external evidence concerning 'Fond Echo' establishes the song as Theobald's. The internal evidence of the song also supports the view that Theobald is its author. For example, Theobald has employed the word 'echo' in a number of songs that feature in his other dramatic works; but echo/echoes do not occur in the songs of Shakespeare's or Fletcher's plays. The following is a song from Theobald's opera *Pan and Syrinx* (1718):

Great Diana whilst we sing,  
Let the Plains with Ecchoes ring,  
Whilst we pay the Honours due,  
And the sprightly Chace renew. (s. 10.17-20)

The following song appears in in *Apollo and Daphne* (1726):

**Hark**, hark, the Huntsman sounds his Horn,  
A Call so musical chides the Drone,  
*Ton, ton, &c.*  
The Clangor wakes the drousy Morn,

---

<sup>456</sup> For instance, she demonstrates that when certain lines were commended in *Double Falsehood* (1.3.10-14), Theobald asserted that 'he wrote them himself'; but when it came to the line 'None but Itself can be its Parallel' (3.1.17) which received the most criticism, 'Theobald declared [that it] was definitely Shakespeare's', (Stern, 'Forgery', pp. 588-589).

<sup>457</sup> Gary Taylor, 'History', p. 44.

The Woods re-eccho the sprightly Tone.

*Ton, ton, &c.* (s. 3.1-6)

And this one occurs in *The Rape of Proserpine* (1727):

Let Harmony sweetly resounding,  
Gay Pleasure and Transport invite;  
Till the Voice in loud Ecchoes rebounding,  
Thro' the Vallies diffuse our Delight. (s. 1.16-19)

But the song that resembles 'Fond Echo' the most occurs in Theobald's *The Happy Captive* (1741), which, similar to *Double Falsehood*, is quite interestingly based on 'a Novel in Cervantes's *Don Quixote*'.<sup>458</sup> It is worth citing 'Fond Echo' in full, followed by the song that occurs in *The Happy Captive*; parallels words are printed in bold to highlight the similarities:

Fond **Echo!** forego thy light **Strain**,  
And heedfully hear a lost Maid;  
Go, tell the false Ear of the Swain  
How deeply his Vows have betray'd.  
Go, tell him, what Sorrows I bear;  
See, yet if his Heart feel my Woe:  
'Tis now he must heal my Despair,  
Or **death** will make Pity too slow. (4.2.16-23)

The song in *The Happy Captive* reads:

**Echo**, that tuneful **Strain** prolong,  
'Tis Musick fit to swell thy Song:  
Teach ev'ry vocal Vale and Grove  
To catch, and spread, the Voice of Love.  
My Soul with Bliss so full is crown'd,  
**Death** only now my Peace can wound. (1.9.22-27)

---

<sup>458</sup> Theobald, *The Happy Captive*, sig. A4r. Harriet C. Frazier discusses the general resemblance between the two songs in *A Babble of Ancestral Voices* (pp. 102-103).

Clearly, there are a number of similarities between the two songs. Both are sung by female characters, and both are invocations of Echo. In the former, Violante invokes Echo's aid to tell Henriquez of the sorrows she suffered because of his betrayal, while in the latter, Zorayda's invocation is in celebration of Carlos's declaration of his love to her. Moreover, the songs are clearly paralleled in their first and last lines, particularly the words 'echo', 'strain' and 'death'. In addition, both songs end with a suggestion that death is what will end the speaker's grief/happiness. In his appendix 5, Hammond points out that the song in *The Happy Captive* is similar to 'Fond Echo' as it is 'sung [...] under similar dramatic conditions'.<sup>459</sup> However, Hammond does not cite the song, and so the above parallels are not revealed to the reader. Interestingly, one final parallel between 'Fond Echo' and Theobald's works is found in his *Perseus and Andromeda* (1730), and it also occurs in a song:

Or **death** will **make Pity too** slow. (*DF* 4.2.23)

E'er **Death make Pity** come **too** late. (*P&A* 49, p. 3.)

It must be noted that the *LION* database could not trace a similar parallel in the works of Shakespeare and Fletcher. With all this in mind, then, both the external and internal evidence, as well as an assessment from a contemporary scholar (Malone), all suggest that Theobald was the most likely author of the song 'Fond Echo'.

This song is only one example of how contributions by Theobald are not highlighted in the Arden edition. The previous chapter, for instance, has already presented a lengthy list of verbal parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald's other works, which are also not mentioned in the edition. The problem with an approach like Hammond's, is that by presenting the play as a continuous text, it 'accepts the impression of textual stability and monolinearity', and thus 'generates that impression in the reader';<sup>460</sup> in other words, given that the play was published as a Shakespeare edition, readers would falsely read the song as Shakespeare's regardless of its authorship. It is clear that such a method

---

<sup>459</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 334.

<sup>460</sup> Jowett, 'Addressing Adaptation', p. 68.

does not ensure ‘that the problem of adaptation has [...] been averted’.<sup>461</sup> The following is an editorial sample that applies Jowett’s approach to 4.2.15-26 of *Double Falsehood*, in order to highlight how the song—identified as a feature of the adaptation—could be usefully distinguished from the rest of the text:

JULIO

I’m often visited with these sweet Airs. [15]

The Spirit of some hapless Man that dy’d,

And left his Love hid in a faithless Woman

Sure haunts these Mountains.

[VIOLANTE *Sings within.*

**Fond Echo ! forego thy light Strain,**

**And heedfully hear a lost Maid;** [20]

**Go, tell the false Ear of the Swain**

**How deeply his Vows have betray'd.**

**Go, tell him, what Sorrows I bear;**

**See, yet if his Heart feel my Woe:**

**'Tis now he must heal my Despair,** [25]

**Or Death will make Pity too slow.**

19-26 **Fond Echo** In (c. 1778), Edmond Malone expressed his doubts regarding the authorship of this song in his annotated copy of the second issue of *Double Falsehood*: ‘I strongly suspect this Song. It has, I think, too modern an air; & was, I believe, an interpolation of Theobald’s’ (Lupić, p. 109). Both the external and internal evidence suggest that the song is Theobald’s. In 1729, the song was reprinted in the second volume of *The Musical Miscellany*, its title reads: ‘sung in the Distrest Lovers. The Words by Mr. Theobald’. In fact, Theobald has employed the word ‘echo’ in a number of songs that feature in his other dramatic works, i.e. *Pan and Syrinx* (1718), *Apollo and Daphne* (1726), and *The Rape of Proserpine* (1727). In *The Happy Captive* (1741), Theobald writes a similar song, reflecting an almost identical dramatic effect:

Echo, that tuneful Strain prolong,

'Tis Musick fit to swell thy Song:

Teach ev'ry vocal Vale and Grove

To catch, and spread, the Voice of Love.

My Soul with Bliss so full is crown'd,

---

<sup>461</sup> Kidnie, *Problem of Adaptation*, p. 153.

Death only now my Peace can wound. (1.9.22-8)

Both songs are sung by female characters, and both are invocations of Echo. In *DF*, Violante invokes Echo's aid to tell Henriquez of the sorrows she suffered because of his betrayal, while in *HC*, Zorayda's invocation is in celebration of Carlos's declaration of his love to her. The songs are clearly paralleled in their first and last lines. Interestingly, one final parallel between 'Fond Echo' and Theobald's works is found in his *Perseus and Andromeda* (1730), and it also occurs in a song:

Or **death** will **make pity too** slow. (*DF* 4.2.23)

E'er **Death make Pity** come **too** late. (*P&A* 49, p. 3.)

While I have demonstrated that an approach similar to Jowett's is helpful when dealing with a play as textually complex as *Double Falsehood*, one observation remains to be made. As it was mentioned previously, when editing *Measure for Measure* and *Double Falsehood* as adaptations, both plays could not be compared alongside their supposedly original texts because they both survive only in their final printed forms; therefore, any evidence of adaptation in these plays could be discovered through inference, instead of comparing the adaptation to the original. The difficulty, however, is that editing *Double Falsehood* as a Shakespearean adaptation would still demand a tremendous amount of speculation on the editor's part, a difficulty that is not shared with *Measure for Measure*. The problem specifically involves the status of both plays as Shakespearean adaptations, and the factors that qualify them as such. To elaborate, one must ask how are these plays defined as adaptations? In 'Textual Identity and Adaptive Revision: Editing Adaptation as a Fluid Text' (2013), John Bryant argues that a work cannot exist as an adaptation without being linked to its original source. His point is explained through the following allegory, which is worth quoting at length:

One day a ship set sail, and in its long journey, it would stop in one port after another to refit its riggings. After many years at sea, the crew had replaced each rope, plank and rib of the ship. It had replaced the rotted deck, and put up new sails, masts and spars. The crew as

well had changed; the sailors had died or run off and been replaced by new seamen; the first and second mates had died. The skipper was replaced as well. Even the name of the ship and its figurehead were changed. In fact, the owners had sold it to another shipping firm. So after its many years at sea, and when the ship finally returned to port, not a sliver of the original ship had survived. So I put it to you: What is this ship?

Bryant concludes that an adaptation 'cannot exist without its tether to its originating source'. He explains that when readers lose hold of the original story, the adaptation 'becomes at best a retelling only'; but if readers are to forget the original story, the adaptation becomes 'an originating textual identity of its own, a text without a link to a defining past'.<sup>462</sup>

In light of Bryant's observations, we cannot really describe *Measure for Measure* and *Double Falsehood* as adaptations in the strict sense of the word, because they cannot be linked to their original sources. This statement is in no way intended to reflect negatively on Jowett's approach; rather, it is aimed at highlighting one of the major challenges in editing *Double Falsehood*. To elaborate, there is one essential difference between the two plays that must be acknowledged. While Middleton is presumed to have adapted some parts of *Measure for Measure*, the play still has a secure place in the Shakespeare canon, and can thus be definitely edited as an adaptation. However, in the case of *Double Falsehood*, the authorship of the play has been contested since it was first staged and published in the eighteenth century, and until the Arden edition, the play has been consistently excluded from the Shakespeare canon. Moreover, there were no reports by any of Theobald's contemporaries on the manuscripts he claimed to have possessed, thus making the *alleged* Shakespeare play physically non-existent. As for its connection to *The History of Cardenio*, we have already discussed the serious issues surrounding the unreliability of Moseley's 1653 Stationers' Register entries, and how some of his Shakespearean attributions were incorrect.

---

<sup>462</sup> John Bryant, 'Textual Identity and Adaptive Revision: Editing Adaptation as a Fluid Text', *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 47-67, p. 65.

All of these observations bring us to *Double Falsehood's* status as a *lost* play: we cannot claim that there is a lost Shakespeare play without confirming that such a play ever existed. Therefore, considering all of the problems and issues surrounding its authorship, *Double Falsehood*, in the form it is presented to us, is a play that originated in the eighteenth century with unproven claims attaching it to Shakespeare's name. And while Jowett's 'adaptation-oriented editing'<sup>463</sup> can be of considerable use in presenting the different authorial voices in *Double Falsehood* (i.e. Fletcher and Theobald), applying this method to the play must first and foremost respect its textual identity and the authorial environment to which it belongs. Whereas the features of adaptation have 'transposed' *Measure for Measure* to the Middleton canon, and *Sir Thomas More* to the Shakespeare canon,<sup>464</sup> the features of adaptation must, by extension, transpose *Double Falsehood* from the Shakespeare canon in which it has been inaccurately placed, to a new authorial setting. So, based on its background as an eighteenth-century text and its authorship as a play with a disputed attribution to Shakespeare, *Double Falsehood* belongs without the bounds of the Shakespeare canon, and is most appropriately fit to be published within a collection of Shakespeare 'Apocrypha'.

### 3. Conclusion

In conclusion, it would be fair to say that the main problem with the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* is that despite the many issues that weaken Theobald's claims for adapting an original Shakespeare play, the Arden Shakespeare series has still decided to publish the play within a Shakespearean context. While the general editors assert in their preface that the edition 'makes its own cautious case for Shakespeare's participation in the genesis of the play',<sup>465</sup> the editor has regrettably neglected to treat its unique textual situation with the much needed caution. This thesis has aimed to question the legitimacy of the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*. The purpose has been to reject the need for a critical edition of the play in a Shakespeare collection. And although I do not support the need for editorial projects that establish any kind of relationship

---

<sup>463</sup> Jowett, 'Addressing Adaptation', p. 69.

<sup>464</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>465</sup> Richard Proudfoot et al., 'General Editors' Preface', *DF*, p. xvi.

between Shakespeare and Theobald's play, I believe that an approach such as Jowett's is the only method to date that could appropriately represent Theobald's play for what it really is: an eighteenth century text. Applying this approach will not only highlight eighteenth-century features of the text, but more importantly, it will transport the play to a new authorial setting, and by identifying it as an apocryphal play (rather than ambiguously grouping it among canonical works), it will thus provide a more appropriate answer to the *Double Falsehood* authorship question.

## Conclusion: *Double Falsehood* and the Shakespeare Canon

---

The main difficulty with the Arden Shakespeare edition of *Double Falsehood* lies in the decision to publish a text originating from the eighteenth century alongside the other established works of the Shakespeare canon. The Arden edition appears as ‘The History of Cardenio By William Shakespeare and John Fletcher Adapted for the eighteenth-century stage as *Double Falsehood* or *The Distressed Lovers* by Lewis Theobald’.<sup>466</sup> This decision was based on Humphrey Moseley’s 1653 entry in the Stationers’ Register for ‘The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare <sup>467</sup>’, in addition to the presence of various Shakespearean echoes in the text, which have been regarded by a number of scholars as a sign of imitation.<sup>468</sup> Arden’s controversial decision to publish this play in its Shakespeare series was made regardless of many serious problems that were unfortunately left unaddressed by the editor. These problems include, as discussed in Chapter 1, the unreliability of Moseley’s entries and how he attributed a number of non-Shakespearean plays to Shakespeare, and mislabelled plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 Folio.<sup>469</sup> In the same chapter, Theobald’s account of the manuscripts he claimed to have possessed is also addressed, highlighting significant factors that have substantially weakened his argument, including the ambiguity over the number of these manuscripts; his secrecy regarding the names of those involved; the absence of evidence that anyone had ever seen any of these manuscripts; and finally, his failure to fulfil his promise of publishing more about the play in his Shakespeare’s *Works* (1733).

A review of eighteenth-century scholarship on *Double Falsehood* has revealed that many scholars have rejected Shakespeare’s involvement in the play, with some suggesting that it is a forgery written in imitation of Shakespeare. This thesis, however, has shown that Theobald’s play may not be an

---

<sup>466</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 161.

<sup>467</sup> Greg, *Bibliography*, I, p. 61.

<sup>468</sup> See Pope, *Dunciad*, p. 143; Malone, cited in Lupić, ‘Malone’s *DF*’, p. 109; Schwartzstein, p. 472; Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, p. 154; and Frazier, ‘Beauty’s Stores’, p. 239.

<sup>469</sup> Stern, ‘Forgery’, pp. 557-558.

outright forgery given that there is evidence that an earlier text does lie beneath it. Therefore, Chapter 1 presents a number of factors suggesting that Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare, is possibly the prime (if not the sole) author of *Double Falsehood's* source play. For instance, and regardless of Moseley's unreliability, it has been noted that his *Cardenio* entry suggests that while Fletcher was recorded as the prime author, Shakespeare was merely added as an afterthought.<sup>470</sup> It has also been noted that Moseley listed his plays alphabetically with *The History of Cardenio* listed under 'F' for Fletcher, rather than 'S' for Shakespeare, thus recording Fletcher as the prime author.<sup>471</sup> Moreover, scholarly contributions regarding the proposed scene allocations between the two dramatists, as well as the verbal and structural parallels, all suggest the presence of much stronger evidence for Fletcher's—rather than Shakespeare's—hand in the play.<sup>472</sup> It was also Fletcher (not Shakespeare) who relied on Spanish sources, as ten of his plays were based on such sources, and quite interestingly, some were even based on Cervantes.<sup>473</sup> All of these issues, in addition to the verbal connections between *Double Falsehood* and Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*—now regarded as the play's most immediate source—have not been adequately discussed by the Arden editor.

Chapter 2 has addressed other serious problems involving Theobald's unreliability, which suggest that his claims for Shakespeare's authorship of the play behind *Double Falsehood* are not to be trusted: i.e. previous accusations of plagiarism against him, and his reputation as a Shakespeare imitator. Furthermore, an examination of Theobald's other adaptations (Shakespeare's *Richard II* and Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*) has highlighted the extent to which Theobald altered the original plays; this in itself, reveals the extent to which he might have re-worked whatever manuscripts were in his possession when he was working on *Double Falsehood*. Though such alterations are expected of any eighteenth-century adaptation, highlighting evidence of the adapter's hand is extremely important when it comes to this play, not only because its

---

<sup>470</sup> Freehafer, p. 508.

<sup>471</sup> Stern, 'Forgery', p. 557.

<sup>472</sup> See Bradford, 'The History of Cardenio', pp. 53-55; Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp. 291-299; Muir, 'Cervantes, Cardenio and Theobald', p. 150; and Kukowski, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *DF*', p. 89.

<sup>473</sup> Stern, 'Collaborative Writers', p. 121.

authorship is so contested, but also because it is a play with which most Shakespeare students are unfamiliar. The chapter has also investigated current approaches to determining the authorship of the play. It has revealed that following the Arden publication, contemporary scholars—such as Richard Proudfoot, Macdonald P. Jackson and Gary Taylor—are similar, in many ways, to scholars at the beginning of the century—such as Walter Graham, E. H. C. Oliphant, and John Freehafer, to name but a few—in their support of Shakespeare’s possible involvement in the play. While these studies presented parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Shakespeare’s works, scholars have overlooked that the parallels could possibly be (a) the result of imitation by either Fletcher or Theobald considering they both imitated Shakespeare, or (b) the result of adaptation given that the text has undergone more than one stage of adaptation.

A further difficulty in these studies is their preoccupation with establishing a Shakespeare-Fletcher connection to the play, rather than establishing one to Theobald, or any other author for that matter. In fact, Proudfoot and Jackson have employed the stylometric approach, which proved to be a method bound to be biased against Theobald’s works. To illustrate, in comparison to Shakespeare’s and Fletcher’s works, Theobald’s are fewer in number, considerably shorter in length, and include translations, adaptations, and plagiarised works, and thus, are less representative of his original style. Therefore, Proudfoot’s and Jackson’s employment of the stylometric approach has obviously helped produce more parallels for Shakespeare and Fletcher than it has for Theobald. Yet, other difficulties are also evident in how these studies restricted the analysis only to certain scenes in *Double Falsehood* (as shown in the work of Jackson and Taylor), and how they relaxed their strict search criteria (as shown in the work of Proudfoot and Jackson). In addition, the stylometric analyses of both Proudfoot and Jackson do not consider Theobald’s works that are unavailable on *LION* or those that are unavailable digitally.<sup>474</sup> Again, such limitations have mainly established a Shakespeare-Fletcher connection to the play, and thus, seems to serve a particular authorship agenda.

---

<sup>474</sup> Ibid., p. 129.

Because there has been no scholarly work dedicated to highlighting Theobald's contributions to the play, this thesis has aimed to address this significant gap in scholarship, which, I believe, has become particularly urgent following the Arden publication. Therefore, Chapter 2 also proposes an alternative way of determining the authorship of *Double Falsehood*. This approach employs electronic databases such as *LION* and *ECCO* to search for verbal parallels in Theobald's works. It is based on the method presented by Brian Vickers, which, rather than searching for individual words, aims to trace longer consecutive sequences (either continuous or discontinuous), as they prove to be the most useful in authorship attribution. Building on the work of Vickers, in addition to observation made by Tiffany Stern, this approach emphasizes the importance of applying the negative check, which ensures that the search would produce parallels that are unique to one author alone, rather than being common phrases shared with other writers. The negative check, described by M. St Clare Byrne (1932) as one of the main principles that scholars must follow when employing verbal parallels in authorship studies, has been discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, where I have shown that both Taylor and Hammond do not conform to this and other of Byrne's principles. Taylor, for instance, ascribes Johnson's song (Woods, Rocks, & Mountaynes) to Fletcher, based on verbal parallels that are neither semantically unique, nor as 'sufficiently rare' as he describes.<sup>475</sup> On the other hand, Hammond cites parallels from collaborative works that occur in the collaborator's shares rather than in the shares of the author in question. Moreover, Hammond at one point attempts to establish a connection between two works of contested authorship when he presents a parallel between *Double Falsehood* and *A Funeral Elegy*, a poem that was falsely attributed to Shakespeare and is now ascribed to John Ford.

Equally problematic is Hammond's failure to justify the approach he employs when it comes to authorship attribution, though he most likely appears to have used *LION*, which is the most popular database used by attribution scholars. His results highlight the dangers of the unregulated use of electronic databases in authorship studies. For instance, on more than one occasion, Hammond's incautious use of the database has allowed him to cite parallels that

---

<sup>475</sup> Taylor, *History*, p. 30.

do not actually occur in the dramatic text itself, but instead occur in the commendatory poems printed before the plays themselves. In other instances, he cites the frequent occurrence of the interjection 'Hem!' in Fletcher's *The Beggar's Bush*, which, however, turns out to be the abbreviated speech prefix for Hemskirke (*Hem.*), rather than the interjection itself. All of these limitations have been taken into consideration in this thesis in order to avoid making similar mistakes in my own analysis.

In Chapter 4 I have employed the approach discussed in the previous two chapters, to trace verbal parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of Theobald, while simultaneously assessing Hammond's approach and the parallels he presents. Similar to Proudfoot, Jackson and Taylor, in his edition, Hammond focused on presenting evidence for Shakespeare's and Fletcher's authorship of Theobald's source play. Although his approach evidently has similar limitations, the implications they have for his work with regard to determining the authorship of the play are far more serious given that it is part of an editorial project aimed at representing authoritative editions of Shakespeare's plays. Likewise, Hammond's commentary notes can be unhelpful at times in frequently citing parallels for Shakespeare and Fletcher where there are equal (if not stronger) parallels in the works of Theobald. Even more problematic is the fact that Hammond has overlooked a number of extremely distinctive collocations that emphasize the extent of Theobald's contributions to the play. I have shown that the most distinctive parallels to the works of Theobald as evident in instances of three, four, five, and six consecutive word parallels have been overlooked by the Arden editor. I have also shown that Hammond has neglected to highlight equally rare parallels in the form of discontinuous consecutive words. All of these parallels (listed in Appendix 2) represent reliable evidence for Theobald being the most prominent contributor to *Double Falsehood*. I have therefore concluded that Arden's failure to address these parallels, and the publisher's emphasis on establishing a connection to the lost *Cardenio*, has thus, misleadingly represented the play as belonging more to Shakespeare than to Theobald.

Chapter 5 has examined the editorial approach Hammond employs in *Double Falsehood*, with a focus on the question of the textual presentation of

adaptations. It investigates the approach applied by John Jowett in his edition of *Measure for Measure* for the *Oxford Middleton*. This chapter has introduced, then, a methodology that presents a solution to the problem of editing adaptations. Jowett has, for instance, carefully identified the elements that date the 1623 text of *Measure for Measure* to a date later than 1603-04: i.e. instances of textual censorship (1606), the addition of act-divisions (1609), the addition of a song that originally featured in Fletcher's *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* (1617-1620), and allusions to the Thirty Years War (1621). Jowett then highlights the main additions and alterations made to the play that are attributed to Middleton: i.e. the grammatical and textual features of the adaptation in 1.2.1-79; the addition of Fletcher's song, considering that introducing new songs in revivals was a practice Middleton has repeatedly followed; and finally, the Bawd's name, 'Mistress Overdone', given that the names of some of Middleton's characters which include a compound and suggest a sexual identity far exceed those that occur in Shakespeare. Jowett's approach to editing adaptations mainly attempts to present the process of adaptation within the edited text itself by utilizing the text's typography in a way that highlights two layers of the text: what is presumed to be the original text versus the adapted text.

Although the Arden editor generally argues that *Double Falsehood* has possibly undergone two stages of adaptation (first in the Restoration and then in the eighteenth century), his approach to the text does not highlight the process of adaptation. Hammond manually reproduces the text as a continuous (rather than a stratified) text, thus, neglecting to highlight Theobald's role as the adapter. For instance, in comparison to Jowett's presentation of the song 'Take, O take those lips away' in *Measure for Measure*, as originally written by Fletcher and thus belonging to Middleton's adaptation, Hammond has not emphasized the origin of *Double Falsehood's* song 'Fond Echo'. Whereas Jowett prints the text in bold to mark it as a feature of the adaptation, and at the same time gives a full description of the song's authorship in a commentary note, Hammond manually reproduces the text as one layer, thus, neglecting to present 'Fond Echo'—which proved to be Theobald's song—as part of the eighteenth-century adaptation. Worse still, Hammond's commentary note on the song does not mention that it was in fact written by Theobald at all. Instead, the textual note provides

references only to parts of the introduction and the appendixes, which, unfortunately, have been prepared to highlight connections to Shakespeare rather than to Theobald. Based on this example, Jowett's method—in comparison to Hammond's—has been successfully applied in highlighting the features of adaptation in *Measure for Measure*, and has as a result, represented it as an *adaptation*.

In conclusion, my thesis has shown that there is insufficient evidence for Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*. It has also shown that Theobald's account of the manuscripts he possessed, along with different incidents in his career, all negatively reflect on the credibility of his claims. Therefore, this thesis discredits Theobald's claims for adapting an original Shakespeare play, and thus rejects the need for editorial projects that establish a relationship between *Double Falsehood* and Shakespeare's name. The thesis has also emphasized that only an approach such as Jowett's is capable of highlighting eighteenth-century elements of the text, and, consequently, identifying it as belonging to that period. It has moreover shown that such an approach is the type that could accurately locate the play in its most appropriate authorial environment. It is possible to conclude, therefore, that *Double Falsehood* belongs alongside plays of the Shakespeare Apocrypha, rather than those of the Shakespeare canon. As for the controversy itself, it is safe to assert that the play is not an outright forgery as there is some evidence suggesting that there might be some truth behind Theobald's claims: i.e. the play having plausible links to John Fletcher as well as verbal parallels to Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*. Having said that, I believe that Theobald had an adaptation (possibly prepared in the Restoration period) of a Fletcher play that was based on Cervantes, and probably based on the Shelton translation. I also believe that this adapted version is one of Theobald's alleged Shakespeare manuscripts. It is possible that this adaptation was attributed to Shakespeare, but it is more likely—considering Theobald's obsession with Shakespeare—that such an attribution was made by Theobald himself. Either way, Theobald adapted and published this version as a Shakespeare play, using his knowledge as a Shakespeare editor in imitating him, to make the play appear more Shakespearean. As for the parallels to the Shelton translation, another possibility is that this source was one of Theobald's alleged

manuscripts and was therefore used in the process of adapting *Double Falsehood*.

### 1. The Shakespeare Apocrypha: Inside or Outside the Canon?

In the preface to the 1623 First Folio, John Heminge and Henry Condell address ‘the great Variety of Readers’:

It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to haue bene wished, that the Author himselfe had liu'd to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them; and so to haue publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors, that expos'd them: euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued the[m]. [...] His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he vttered with that easinesse, that we haue scarce receiued from him a blot in his papers.<sup>476</sup>

Nevertheless, scholars have been constantly critical of the first Folio preliminaries.<sup>477</sup> For instance, it has been argued that ‘perhaps no line of Shakespeare’s has been more carefully scrutinized’ than Heminge and Condell’s claim that the Folio came to replace ‘stolne’ and ‘surreptitious’ quartos with the original copies that were received from Shakespeare’s own hand.<sup>478</sup> Scholars have, moreover, been specifically critical of the widely propagated notions of Shakespeare’s ‘free composition’ and of his ‘unblotted papers’, which were dismissed by some as mere exaggeration.<sup>479</sup> It has been shown, for example, that

---

<sup>476</sup> [Heminge and Condell], *First Folio*, p. 7.

<sup>477</sup> Such criticisms date back to eighteenth-century Shakespeare editors. For a brief commentary on the topic as discussed in the works of Alexander Pope, Lewis Theobald and Samuel Johnson, see Leah S. Marcus, ‘Who’s Afraid of the Big Bad Quarto?’ in *Renaissance Historicisms: Essays in Honor of Arthur F. Kinney*, ed. by James M. Dutcher and Anne Lake Prescott (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), pp. 147-158.

<sup>478</sup> Margreta de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 43.

<sup>479</sup> Honigmann, *The Stability of Shakespeare’s Text*, pp. 31-32.

the authorial revisions in *Sir Thomas More* 'are made by the very procedure Heminge and Condell had so specifically denied: by crossing out erroneous words and phrases and rewriting them'.<sup>480</sup> Centuries of scholarship have also shown that Shakespeare, unlike his representation in the first Folio, was not 'a writer isolated from other writers'. The Folio, for instance, does not describe *1 Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Timon of Athens*, and *All is True* as collaborations. It also excludes other plays now acknowledged as Shakespeare's (which also happen to be collaborations), such as *Edward III*, *Sir Thomas More*, *Pericles*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.<sup>481</sup> Yet, while modern scholarship has corrected the misconceptions introduced by Shakespeare's fellow actors when presenting the first Folio, this move has gradually paved the way for welcoming plays of contested authorship in the Shakespeare canon. The most recent example is evident in the 2010 publication of Theobald's *Double Falsehood* by the Arden Shakespeare.

The 'Shakespeare Apocrypha' is a term first introduced in 1908 by C. F. Tucker Brooke to refer to a group of plays and poems that have been attributed to Shakespeare, though their attribution is disputed.<sup>482</sup> Canonizing plays of the Shakespeare Apocrypha has been the source of many controversies. Chiefly problematic is the scholarly willingness to regard works that have been falsely attributed to Shakespeare as authentic, thus making for a more *flexible* rather than a *fixed* canon. This problem has undoubtedly intensified with more dubious works being authenticated via editorial promotion. It seems unfortunate how a scholar's editorial power can be exploited in attribution studies to the extent that works of disputed authorship have now started to emerge in prominent Shakespeare editions. As is shown in Chapter 3, for instance, Gary Taylor's hasty endorsement of the Rawlinson Shakespeare attribution of 'Shall I Dye' has eventually resulted in the poem being published in the *Oxford Shakespeare* (1986). This decision was certainly not without its risks. Over a decade later, *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Shakespeare Edition* (1997) has perpetuated Taylor's misleading tradition, by similarly publishing 'Shall I Dye' as a poem by Shakespeare. However, Norton has 'take[n]' over Taylor's attribution

---

<sup>480</sup> Stern, *Making Shakespeare*, p. 37.

<sup>481</sup> John Jowett, *Shakespeare and Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 90-91.

<sup>482</sup> See C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908).

without any apparent attempt at an independent critical evaluation', which, according to Vickers, represents 'a disturbing abdication of editorial responsibilities'.<sup>483</sup>

But in other cases, the publication of an apocryphal play by one Shakespeare series will almost certainly inspire canonical experimentation by another; this is exactly the case with Palgrave Macmillan's publication of *Double Falsehood* within the RSC *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* collection (2013), edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. Although both the Arden and the RSC editions acknowledge the play as an adaptation, their decision to publish a play whose authorship is disputed certainly has implications on this particular authorship question. Thus, to some students and scholars, such a decision might represent the publisher's authorization of the play as belonging to the Shakespeare canon. Of course, the worst-case scenario would be that such publications would mislead inexperienced readers who might easily take the play for an original Shakespeare play.

Within these controversies there is a central concern over current approaches to reformulating the Shakespeare canon evident in the blurring of the boundaries that define it; this is particularly true for *Double Falsehood*, the Arden edition of which has in one way or another inspired a breakdown of such boundaries, considering that this eighteenth-century text has been granted the full status of an Arden Shakespeare edition. The *blurring* and *breakdown* of canonical boundaries is equally present in the RSC *Collaborative Plays* collection. One would expect to find *Henry VIII*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Pericles*, and *Titus Andronicus* in this collection, which have already been included in the RSC Shakespeare's *Complete Works*; instead, readers will find plays that are typically grouped as belonging to the Shakespeare Apocrypha, such as *Arden of Faversham*, *The London Prodigal* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*. In the general introduction to the collection, Jonathan Bate describes the purpose behind the *Collaborative Plays* edition:

Indeed, until now there has *never* been a modern spelling (and thus theatrically usable), or an annotated, or a critically and theatrically

---

<sup>483</sup> Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare*, p. 52.

introduced, edition of the so-called apocrypha. This gap—perhaps the single most significant lacuna in twenty-first-century Shakespearean scholarship—is what we seek to fill here, in a volume intended as a supplement and companion to our RSC *William Shakespeare: Complete Works* (2007). In order to keep the many unresolved questions open and to avoid the quasi-biblical (and thus unhelpfully bardolatrous) associations of the word ‘apocrypha’, we call our edition *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*.<sup>484</sup>

Though the demand for annotated and critical editions of these plays might be valid, the difficulty with this collection lies in how it confuses Shakespeare’s collaborative plays with those of the Shakespeare Apocrypha, for not only are *apocryphal* plays being mislabelled as *collaborative*, but equally problematic is the grouping of plays of two different categories all under one title.

To elaborate further, the editors of this collection include plays that have already been accepted by many scholars as partly co-written by Shakespeare, such as *Sir Thomas More* and *Edward III*, but they also publish plays that are strictly regarded as belonging to the Shakespeare Apocrypha, like *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, not on the basis of strong internal evidence, but mainly based on their *apocryphal* status. Shakespeare scholars might find a difficulty in the inclusion of *Arden of Feversham* in this collection, and specifically the statements made by Will Sharpe in a section entitled ‘Authorship and Attribution’, where he argues that the play was included in the edition on the basis of ‘sound evidence to suggest strongly Shakespeare’s involvement in scene 8 at least’. Although the editors of the edition still cannot identify the author of the rest of the play, nor the conditions of its textual transmission, they explain that they ‘still offer [the play] to readers of this volume as one of the finest plays that a young Shakespeare, possibly, never wrote’.<sup>485</sup> The main difficulty here revolves around the criteria for the inclusion and/or exclusion of such plays, which might misinform some readers, while confusing others. Gary Taylor discusses this problem in a recent review of the volume. He quotes Sharpe stating that it is ‘highly unlikely and almost impossible’ that Shakespeare

---

<sup>484</sup> Jonathan Bate, ‘General Introduction’, in *RSC Collaborative Plays*, 9-30, p. 15.

<sup>485</sup> Will Sharpe, ‘Authorship and Attribution’, in *RSC Collaborative Plays*, 641-745, p. 657.

contributed anything to *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, *The London Prodigal*, *Lochrine* and *Thomas Lord Cromwell*. In disagreement with Bate's justification for those inclusions (that they were among the plays ascribed to Shakespeare in his lifetime), Taylor questions the exclusion of *The Puritan* and *Sir John Oldcastle* which both 'qualify by those same criteria'.<sup>486</sup>

In a recent paper, Peter Kirwan (one of the associate editors of the RSC *Collaborative Plays* collection) discusses the importance of canonizing the 'Shakespeare Apocrypha', arguing in favour of co-existent canons. He explains that the persisting label of the Shakespeare Apocrypha as 'the "other" of the Shakespeare canon' and as 'a collectively excluded canon leads to their relative obscurity in print and on stage'. Because these plays 'remain ostracized in critical attention and are still dominated by the question of attribution', Kirwan calls for 'breaking down the dichotomy between canon and apocrypha'. He adds that a model for 'co-existing canons' can be found in the Oxford Middleton *Collected Works*, pointing to its publication of both *Measure for Measure* and *Macbeth* as adaptations by Middleton, which according to Kirwan, supports the 'fluidity of all authorial canons'. He states that 'if even a safe play such as *Macbeth* can be shared between two canons, then any play can'.<sup>487</sup>

It must be emphasized, however, that while the textual and historical conditions of *Measure for Measure* allow the play to be shared between the Shakespeare canon and the Middleton canon, there is certainly no sufficient evidence to allow certain apocryphal plays to be published within the Shakespeare canon. To further illustrate (and as has been shown in Chapter 5), the Oxford Middleton's transposition of *Measure for Measure*—which has a secure place in the Shakespeare canon—to Middleton's canon was based on features of the text that have been recognized as belonging to a 1621 adaptation by Middleton. However, the situation with the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*

---

<sup>486</sup> Gary Taylor, "'William Shakespeare & Others'", edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen', *The Washington Post*, 30 December 30, 2013 <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/books/william-shakespeare-and-others-edited-by-jonathan-bate-and-eric-rasmussen/2013/12/30/4a1e86ce-6cd7-11e3-b405-7e360f7e9fd2\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/books/william-shakespeare-and-others-edited-by-jonathan-bate-and-eric-rasmussen/2013/12/30/4a1e86ce-6cd7-11e3-b405-7e360f7e9fd2_story.html)> [accessed 23 September 2015]

<sup>487</sup> Peter Kirwan, 'Canonising the Shakespeare Apocrypha: Shakespeare, Middleton and Co-Existent Canons,' *Literature Compass*, 9.8 (2012): 538-548, pp. 538-544. Also see Peter Kirwan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

is entirely different, given that an eighteenth-century play with unproven claims attaching it to Shakespeare's name has been transposed alongside plays of the Shakespeare canon. Based on its contested nature, the Arden Shakespeare has created a problem in how it appears to have merged Canon with Apocrypha, leaving readers unsure as to whether the play belongs to one or the other. Therefore, in the case of *Double Falsehood*, I believe that the expansion of the Arden Shakespeare editorial project is unwarranted, as it dissolves the boundaries of the Shakespeare canon—either directly or indirectly—by emphasizing Shakespeare's possible (though highly unlikely) authorship of the source play. This thesis has shown that a proper study of the apocryphal plays, *Double Falsehood* included, does not necessitate dissolving canonical boundaries, nor the need for any intersection between canon with apocrypha.

## **2. Directions for Further Research**

This thesis has reviewed the literature on the authorship of *Double Falsehood*, with an emphasis on what scholars have added to the debate following the Arden Shakespeare publication of the play. It has expanded previous research on the reliability of Theobald's claims in light of eighteenth-century accusations of plagiarism against him, and his reputation as a Shakespeare imitator. Yet there is more work still to be done in terms of research in this field. For example, regardless of the many limitations of employing *LION* in authorship studies, this tool is still very useful in identifying the author(s) of disputed works, and my research so far has yielded a list of extremely distinctive parallels between *Double Falsehood* and the works of Theobald. However, a much more recent method proposed by Brian Vickers promises to introduce even more distinctive parallels. In his attempt to identify Shakespeare's additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, Vickers employs a computer software designed to help tutors detect student plagiarism, which according to him, offers results that are very precise. He explains:

The program that we use, called "*Pl@giarism*" ([www.plagiarism.tk](http://www.plagiarism.tk), available free of charge), was developed by Dr Georges Span for the law faculty of the University of Maastricht. It works by collating two

texts in parallel and listing every instance where the same three consecutive words (trigrams) appear in both. This method overcomes the notorious deficiency of which earlier exponents of “parallel passages” were often accused, namely that their choice of parallels was subjective and partial: that is, favouring those passages which supported a particular attribution, and ignoring those which did not.<sup>488</sup>

If we compare this new approach to the previous *LION* approach (which perhaps proved to be unprincipled at times), we will find that while the former *automatically* searches for parallel collocations between two texts, the latter relies on the scholar to *manually* insert specific collocations of his/her choice. And although the *LION* approach still proves to be extremely successful (especially when remaining cautious to avoid its limitations), Vickers’s method promises to offer much more comprehensive results. More importantly, it promises to produce results that are anything but biased as the entire list of parallels is automatically generated by the software.

The use of such a software can be a significant improvement to authorship studies, as it dismisses any partial attributions that might possibly be informed by a certain authorship agenda. While using *LION* has enabled me to locate some extremely distinctive parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald’s works, I believe that using a tool such as the ‘*Pl@giarism*’ software could enable scholars to produce even more parallels to Theobald’s works. Moreover, using this software would be less time consuming as it automatically generates the results between *Double Falsehood* and each of Theobald’s works, in comparison to the *LION* approach which depends on the scholar’s manual search for certain phrases and collocations in the works of Theobald. The software could be employed by searching for parallels of three consecutive words or more between the *Double Falsehood* text—already available on *LION*—and the texts of Theobald’s entire works (these works must include Theobald’s publications that are unavailable on *LION* and *ECCO*). Therefore, the method allows the researcher to create his/her own database by transcribing and digitizing works that are unavailable

---

<sup>488</sup> Vickers, ‘Shakespeare’s Additions’, pp. 13, 28.

electronically, thus offering electronically searchable documents. An example of such private databases is the one created by Tiffany Stern which includes *A Translation of the First Book of the Odyssey, with Notes by Mr. Theobald* (1716), *The Entertainments, set to music, for the comic-dramatic opera, called The Lady's Triumph* (1718), *The Grove, Or a Collection of Original Poems, Translations, &c.* (1721), prologues to *The Artful Husband* (1721), *Edwin* (1724), *The Fall of Saguntum* (1727), *A Woman's Revenge* (1735), and a revival of *Hamlet* (1739). Another database is the one prepared by John Nance, which he employs in collaboration with Gary Taylor in 'Four Characters in Search of a Subplot: Quixote, Sancho, and *Cardenio*' (2012); this database includes: 'Theobald's letters, and his translations of *Plato's Dialogue of the Immortality of the Soul* (1713), and Books IX-XIV of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1716)'.<sup>489</sup> Had Vickers's study been published in the beginning of my PhD programme, the 'Pl@giarism' software would undoubtedly have been an approach I would have wanted to explore; moreover, it is certainly a method I plan to consider in my future work on *Double Falsehood*.

However, Vickers's methodology has been severely criticised by Gabriel Egan in a recent review published in *The Year's Work in English Studies* (2014). One valid point that must be taken into consideration in future research is the fact that scholars cannot replicate Vickers's work because the Internet url he provided for the Pl@giarism software 'point[s] to an advertising website that randomly redirects visitors to various commercial sites with no scholarly content'. He then adds that 'a Google search for the software under various permutations of its name leads to nothing'. But the difficulty with this review is that it points out the weaknesses of Vickers's method to discredit it rather than acknowledge any of its contributions to the field of attribution studies. For example, Egan argues that

Vickers criticizes Craig for using as a corpus of plays to search within the Chadwyck-Healey Verse Drama Database on CD-ROM [...] but in

---

<sup>489</sup> Taylor and Nance, 'Four Characters', in *Quest*, 192-213, p. 202.

Craig's favour is the fact that other researchers have access to that database and can thereby verify or refute his claims.<sup>490</sup>

But to be fair to Vickers, we must emphasize that his method—as mentioned earlier—aims to overcome the weaknesses of *LION*, namely its subjectivity, and how it allows scholars to highlight passages that support their preferred attribution and disregard those that do not. Such a deficiency is a serious one as highlighted in Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis where I argue that both Brean Hammond and Gary Taylor more than often favour parallels to Shakespeare over identical ones found in the works of Theobald. But with Vickers's method, 'the electronic searching process is automatic, [which makes the analysis] immune to personal bias or manipulation in advance'.<sup>491</sup>

Furthermore, Egan presents two additional points that I believe could help in refining Vickers's approach rather than diminishing our confidence in it. The first point involves the database Vickers used in his analysis (created by Marcus Dahl), 'which contains over 400 plays and masques dating from the 1580s to the 1640s, and including the complete canons of Marlowe, Lyly, Peele, Kyd, Shakespeare, Dekker, Jonson, Chapman, Middleton, Beaumont, Fletcher, Massinger, and Shirley, together with all the anonymously published plays'.<sup>492</sup> Egan, however, highlights that Dahl's database does not contain the complete Middleton canon, a deficiency that I believe could be overcome simply by ensuring that one's database is complete. The other point highlighted by Egan involves the fact that some of the matches described by Vickers as 'uniquely Shakespearean' occur in plays of dramatists not included in Dahl's database (with some even occurring in the absent Middleton plays); this was confirmed by searching within *LION* for the matches Vickers has found between the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the Shakespeare canon.<sup>493</sup> Thus, future scholars could avoid this by running the negative check on their proposed parallels using the *LION* database.

The discussion in Chapter 2 of Theobald's imitation of Shakespeare also offers further opportunities in terms of exploring afresh Theobald's *Shakespeare*

---

<sup>490</sup> Gabriel Egan, 'Shakespeare: Editions and Textual Matters', *The Year's Work in English Studies*, 93.1 (2014), 295-362, p. 335.

<sup>491</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', p. 28.

<sup>492</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>493</sup> Egan, pp. 335-338.

*Restored* as it particularly reveals how well Theobald knew Shakespeare's works, his style and his language. An additional direction for future research would also be to examine Theobald's letters published by R. F. Jones in *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with Some Unpublished Letters* (1966). Having only encountered this source recently, it has already proved to be helpful in the discussions on Theobald's dispute with Warburton over not acknowledging the help he extended to Theobald in his preface to *The Works of Shakespeare*, and could, I believe, be of tremendous use in further uncovering some uncomfortable facts about other controversies in Theobald's career. Likewise, scholars are yet to give an adequate response to the serious issues raised by Tiffany Stern regarding Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*. For instance, although Proudfoot mentions Stern's claims for Theobald's possible forgery of the play, he does not engage with her work but asserts instead that Brean Hammond does so in an essay published in the same volume.<sup>494</sup> Yet Hammond's essay includes nothing of the sort. In fact, Hammond changed his initial views expressed in his Arden edition regarding 'Stern [as having] built up a case convincing enough to render any editor of the play cautious'.<sup>495</sup> However, in his 2012 essay (in a section ironically titled 'Unanswered Questions'), he briefly discusses Stern's arguments, describing hers as 'the most sceptical response' to his authorship hypothesis, one that he has come to regard 'as holding less weight than the comments in [his] introduction might suggest'.<sup>496</sup>

The same problem is evident in Hammond's most recent publication on the play, entitled '*Double Falsehood: The Forgery Hypothesis, the 'Charles Dickson' Enigma and a 'Stern' Rejoinder*' (2014), where he attempts to refute 'individual strands of arguments pursued in [Stern's] articles', rather than attempting to respond to her most convincing observations.<sup>497</sup> But the most lengthy response to Stern's arguments comes from Gary Taylor in his essay 'Slight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearean Desire' (2013), where he argues that

---

<sup>494</sup> Proudfoot, *Forgery*, p. 163.

<sup>495</sup> Hammond, *DF*, p. 160.

<sup>496</sup> Hammond, 'After Arden', p. 71-72.

<sup>497</sup> Brean Hammond, '*Double Falsehood: The Forgery Hypothesis, the 'Charles Dickson' Enigma and a 'Stern' Rejoinder*', *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 67 (2014), 165-179.

the studies that identify Shakespeare and Fletcher in passages of *DF* may be inadequate, but Stern's accusations of systematic confirmation bias are not credible. Her account is riddled with misrepresentations and factual errors. I want to emphasize that I am not playing the popular academic game of ruin-a-rival. Stern's essay does not criticize me, and she has often declared that my early work inspired her own academic career. I have often praised her scholarship. The mystery is: why does such a good scholar make such bad mistakes?<sup>498</sup>

In fact, Taylor, more than once, finds it surprising that Stern's claim for Shakespeare's non-involvement in *Cardenio* 'was published by *Shakespeare Quarterly*, which [according to him] means [that] it persuaded the distinguished editorial board of one of the world's top Shakespeare journals'.<sup>499</sup> The downside to statements like these (along with an overall neglect of responding to the most urgent questions and concerns regarding Shakespeare's involvement in *Double Falsehood*) is what hinders the possibility for any scholarly dialogue that could potentially enrich the current debate and provide a platform for further research.

---

<sup>498</sup> Gary Taylor, 'Slight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearean Desire', in *Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio*, 125-169, p. 120.

<sup>499</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125.

## APPENDIX 1

### Rape and Pre-contracts of Marriage in *Double Falsehood* and *Cardenio*

---

In Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, Fernando's seduction of Dorotea into a pre-contract of marriage (part 4 chapter 1) has been adapted as a rape in 2.1 of *Double Falsehood*. There appears to be a Fletcher connection to this incident occurring in *The Spanish Curate*, written in collaboration with Massinger. First, similar to *Cardenio*, the play was based on a Spanish novel, which points to Fletcher, who as mentioned previously, often turned to Spanish sources. Second, the play features characters called Henrique and Violante (also a couple), which on its own implies a Fletcher connection to *Double Falsehood*.<sup>500</sup> Finally, this Fletcher collaboration similarly has a pre-contract of marriage as evidenced in the *Dramatis Personae* that describes Violante as 'supposed Wife to Don Henrique', and Jacintha as 'formerly contracted to Don Henrique'.<sup>501</sup> A further Fletcher connection involves the rape incident, especially in how *Double Falsehood* ends with Violante marrying her rapist. Suzanne Gossett (1984) has pointed out that this was the case with *The Spanish Gypsy*, *Women Beware Women* and Fletcher's collaborative play *The Queen of Corinth*. In these three Jacobean plays, she explains, 'the heroine survives the rape and marries the rapist'.<sup>502</sup> A point worth noting is that it was Cervantes' novella *La Fuerza de la Sangre* that 'inspired the rape plot' in *The Spanish Gypsy*.<sup>503</sup>

Fletcher aside, Theobald must not be relived from the responsibility of the play's happy ending, as his *Rape of Proserpine* (1727) similarly ends with the victim marrying her rapist. As for Shakespeare, previous scholarship has

---

<sup>500</sup> The play, argues Jeffery Kahan, 'may have been written as a sequel' to *Cardenio*. Jeffrey Kahan, 'The Double Falsehood and The Spanish Curate: A Further Fletcher Connection', *ANQ* 20:1 (2007), 34-36, p. 34.

<sup>501</sup> Beaumont and Fletcher, *Dramatic Works*, vol. 10, p. 302.

<sup>502</sup> Suzanne Gossett, "'Best Men are Molded out of Faults:" Marrying the Rapist in Jacobean Drama', *English Literary Renaissance*, 14.3 (1984): 305-327, p. 309.

<sup>503</sup> Suzanne Gossett, 'The Spanish Gypsy: Introduction', *The Oxford Middleton, 1723-1727*, p. 1723.

suggested a few connections to *Measure for Measure*. On the one hand, Gary Taylor has pointed out that it includes a pre-contract of marriage,<sup>504</sup> and on the other, Karen Bamford has shown that it ends in the raped victim marrying her rapist.<sup>505</sup> The significance of such connections is much reduced considering research classifying *Measure for Measure* as one of Shakespeare's dramatic works that survive as an adaptation by Thomas Middleton.<sup>506</sup> As is shown in Chapter 5, John Jowett has pointed to two major alterations Middleton has made to Shakespeare's folio text. He also states that 'other changes made at the same time may be harder to detect, yet if adaptation affected two passages it could potentially affect others as well. And indeed it probably did so'. Thus, it is possible that this particular incident in *Double Falsehood* and its consequences are in one way or another associated with Middleton; this is especially true if we consider that 'no other dramatist of the period [was] so persistently concerned with the politics of the libido and the economics of sexual exchange'.<sup>507</sup>

---

<sup>504</sup> Taylor, 'A History', p. 43.

<sup>505</sup> Karen Bamford, *Sexual Violence on the Jacobean Stage* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000), pp. 124-125.

<sup>506</sup> See Taylor and Jowett, 'With New Additions', pp. 107-236.

<sup>507</sup> Jowett, 'Measure for Measure', *The Oxford Middleton*, pp. 1543-1544.

## APPENDIX 2

### Verbal Parallels Between *Double Falsehood* (1728) and the Works of Theobald (1707-1741) as Identified by *LION* and *ECCO*

---

Throughout this study, parallels cited from Theobald's works have been identified using the Literature Online Chadwyck-Healey Database (*LION*) and Eighteenth Century Collections Online (*ECCO*), on the other hand, was employed to trace parallels in Theobald's works that are unavailable on *LION*. Parallels occurring in works marked with an asterisk signify those identified by *ECCO*.

In presenting parallels between *Double Falsehood* and Theobald's works, I have followed the technical format in which Brian Vickers has recently presented parallels between the 1602 additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* and the works of Shakespeare, as it is practical for this type of analysis. 'Exact verbal matches [will be] printed in **bold face**'; while 'words fulfilling the same semantic or syntactic function' will be *italicized*. I have also copied the physical layout of the table in which Vickers presents his data, and included it in the appendix.<sup>508</sup> Each parallel will be listed alongside its corresponding instance in *Double Falsehood*. As shown in Chapter 2 and 4, all parallels cited in the following table were either underrepresented or not discussed at all in the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood*. Furthermore, the entire list of parallels is the result of my own independent findings, except for the following: the first instance in example 27, and all instances in examples 28 were identified by Macdonald P. Jackson in 'Looking for Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood*: Stylistic Evidence'; in addition to the first instance in example 29, and all instances from examples 30 to 37, were identified by Gary Taylor in 'A History of *The History of Cardenio*', published in *The Quest for Cardenio* (2012), also published in the same collection.

---

<sup>508</sup> Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Additions', pp. 35-43.

1	<p>O, Wretched and betray'd! Lost <i>Violante</i> !   <b>Heart-wounded with</b> a thousand perjur'd Vows,  See, your disconsolate, heart-wounded Lord, / <b>with</b>  folded Arms, and down cast Eyes, approaches  <b>O</b> Comfort-killing State! <b>Heart-wounding</b> Greif!</p>	<p>DF, p. 16   R2 4.173-4   *CoP LXXVI, p. 31</p>
2	<p>Is't in the Man, or some <b>dissembling Knave</b>,   He put in  Trust?  Wealth-<b>dissembling Knaves!</b></p>	<p>DF, p. 41   *CoP XLVII, p. 18</p>
3	<p>Oh, <b>the stubborn Sex</b>,   Rash e'en to Madness!  Of <b>the</b> fantastick, giddy, <b>Stubborn Sex</b>,   E'er good  Gonsalvo loose a Moment's Quite!</p>	<p>DF, p. 32   PB 1.262</p>
4	<p>Lord Rod'rick <b>makes Approach</b>.  No Mortal to these dreary Cells   Dares <b>make Approach</b>,  and hope to live.  Tall Ships of War, my Liege,   With hostile Preparation  <b>make Approach</b>,  To learn how near our Nephew <b>makes Approach</b>;  <i>Pizarro</i> <b>makes Approach</b>;   With him a comely Stranger  Youth,</p>	<p>DF, p. 55  P&amp;A 149-150 p. 9   Ores 1.2.41-42   FS 5.137  HC 2.7.1-2</p>
5	<p>O, add the Musick of thy <i>charming Tongue</i>   <b>Sweet as the lark</b>  that wakens up the <b>morn</b>  that <i>alluring Voice</i>, which late I thought   <b>Sweet as the</b>  Tune of <b>Morn-saluting Lark</b></p>	<p>DF, p. 5   Ores 5.2.72-3</p>
6	<p>You've met <b>some</b> <i>disappointment</i>, <b>some</b> <i>foul play</i>   Has  <b>cross'd your love</b>.  Talk o'er <b>some</b> <i>Tragedy of dismal Woe</i>:   Of Lovers <b>crost</b>  by Fate.</p>	<p>DF, p. 41   FS 4.98-99</p>
7	<p>Something to <b>start at</b>, hither have I travell'd   To know  the Truth of you.  My spirits <b>start at</b> Decius' Name.  ... And silent night <b>start at</b> my waking groans.</p>	<p>DF, p. 34   D&amp;P s. 7.4  PP 2.63</p>

	And shall I <b>start at</b> danger   To save a lingering life... the sick'ning soul   <b>Starts at</b> the objects of its own creation. My shuddering soul <b>starts at</b> the dire alarm...	<i>FS</i> 4.13-4 <i>R2</i> 3.71-2 5.23
8	The <b>Parthian</b> , that rides swift without the rein, We'll hire us forty thousand <b>Parthian</b> Archers. some Legions of <b>Parthian</b> Horse, who were plac'd in the Centre of the Enemies Battle... ... in <b>the Parthian</b> wars.	<i>DF</i> , p. 40 <i>PP</i> 3.279 * <i>A&amp;S</i> p. 203 * <i>Marcus</i> p. 12
9	And it <b>has hurt</b> my <b>brain</b> . If no bad Star <b>has hurt</b> thy <b>Brain</b>	<i>DF</i> , p. 41 <i>D&amp;P</i> s. 10.15
10	Or should I drink that Wine, and think it <b>Cordial</b> ,   When I see <b>Poyson</b> in't? There's some Comfort: / A <b>Cordial</b> Med'cine from a Brother's Hand,   To save me from the slow and lingering <b>Poison</b> . These Creatures... convey their <b>Poison</b> immediately after a <b>Cordial</b> .	<i>DF</i> , p. 52 <i>FS</i> 2.381-382 * <i>Cen</i> I, p. 113
11	<b>The censuring world</b> occasion to reproach How may <b>the censuring world</b> impeach my name,	<i>DF</i> , p. 18 <i>HC</i> s. 4.15
12	O Julio, feel but half my grief,   And thou wilt <b>outfly</b> time to bring relief. Suspicion, that too oft <b>outflies</b> the mark   once found to err, gives up its credulous truster   To common laughter.	<i>DF</i> , p. 24 <i>FS</i> 2.320-322
13	... each hour of growing time   Shall <b>task</b> me to thy service, <b>task</b> the Demons both of middle air, Rack'd ev'ry spell, and <b>task'd</b> each aiding Pow'r?	<i>DF</i> , p. 29 <i>Ores</i> 4.2.89 5.2.99
14	... knowing you are our <b>vassal</b> , Where <b>vassal</b> peers thy nod obey,   And scepter'd slaves their homage pay. To be, by <b>Vassal</b> Hands, dragg'd from your presence.	<i>DF</i> , p. 31 <i>Harl</i> s. 3.58-9 <i>R2</i> 5.63

	Thou on thy <b>Vassals</b> bateless Woe entailest...	*CoP XCIV, p. 37
15	The <b>wrathful</b> Elements shall wage this War The guardian Goddess... who, for the crime of one o'er-daring man,   pursues a nation, unappeas'd and <b>wrathful</b> . heav'n is <b>wrathful</b> , when it dictates to us. And with fresh Zeal appease the <b>wrathful</b> Goddess. and if the <b>wrathful</b> Gods have doom'd it so, He would obey the Summons of the <b>wrathful</b> Gods, For instant Sacrifice, and so appease The <b>wrathful</b> pow'rs. Asist, ye <b>wrathful</b> pow'rs;	DF, p. 42 Ores 1.1.14-16 1.1.53 3.2.79 5.4.34 A&S p. 129 PP 1.20 4.87
16	He but puts on this <b>Seeming</b> , and his <b>Garb</b> In <b>Garb</b> a <b>seeming</b> Moor, I must wear the <b>Garb</b> of <b>seeming</b> Mystery;	DF, p. 43 HC 2.7.3 FS 2.18-9
17	He but commanded, what your Eyes inspir'd;   Whose <b>sacred Beams</b> , darted into my Soul As saw the Sun, and worshipp'd not his Ray?   Such Lustre yours, so fierce your <b>sacred Beams</b>	DF, p. 52 Ores 3.4.28-9
18	why he hath of late... Wrested our Leave of Absence from the Court,   <b>Awake Suspicion</b> . These Circumstances join'd <b>awake Suspicions</b> , / That fright my lab'ring Thoughts.	DF, p. 2 FS 5.1.9-10
19	thy Tears   Shall be <b>repaid with Interest</b> from his Justice. I have <b>repaid</b> the Principal <b>with Interest</b> .	DF, p. 54 FS Preface p. 6
20	<b>Enough; I'm satisfied:</b> and will remain   Yours, <b>Enough; I'm satisfied:</b>   What most we value, most we fear to lose. <b>Enough</b> , my fair cozen, replies the King; <b>I am satisfied</b> of your kindness.	DF, p. 8 HC 1.6.29-30 A&S p. 173
21	<b>You gracious pow'rs</b> ,   The guardians of sworn Faith...	DF, p. 28

	<p><b>Ye gracious Pow'rs!</b> am I awake?  Thanks to the <b>gracious Pow'rs</b>, most well, and cheerful!  Then by the <b>gracious Pow'rs</b> of Heaven I swear,   I'm  innocent...  the <b>gracious Pow'rs</b>   Controul'd the Rage of fierce  Destructive Malice.</p>	<p><i>D&amp;P</i> s. 12.5  <i>PB</i> 2.147  4.198-9  5.366-7</p>
22	<p><b>The righteous pow'rs</b> at length have crown'd our loves.  You <b>righteous Pow'rs!</b> do with Me what you please  Ye <b>righteous Powers</b>, at whose dread Hand...  thou tempt'st <b>the righteous Pow'rs</b>  Be gone! and tell th'un<b>righteous pow'rs</b> you serve...  <b>Unrighteous pow'rs!</b> Withhold your dire commands;  You <b>righteous Pow'rs</b>, that for your awful Thrones  Look down with Pity.  Ye <b>righteous powers</b>, forgive my impious Frenzy!</p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 63  <i>R2</i> 5.193  <i>P&amp;A</i> 44 p. 3.  <i>PB</i> 3.15  <i>Ores</i> 2.24  2.54  3.109  *A&amp;S p. 117</p>
23	<p>worthy the Man,   <b>Who</b>, with my <b>Dukedoms, heirs my  better Glories.</b>  ... our young Nephew's Right, <b>who heirs her Dukedom.</b>  And may he <b>heir her Virtues</b></p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 2  <i>FS</i> 4.70  4.71</p>
24	<p><b>O my presaging Heart!</b> When goes he then?  What do I hear? <b>O my presaging Heart!</b></p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 15  <i>P&amp;A</i> 23, p. 2</p>
25	<p>the Wiles   By which these <b>Syrens lure us to  Destruction.</b>  ...the <b>Siren's Song</b>,   Who strove in vain to <b>lure him to  Destruction.</b></p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 49  <i>Ores</i> 2.1.260-1</p>
26	<p>Tell thy pleas'd Soul, <b>I will be wond'rous faithful;</b>  <b>I will be wondrous faithful</b> to Despair,</p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 8  <i>R2</i> 3.107</p>
27	<p><b>I throw me at your Feet</b>, and sue for Mercy.  My Lord...   <b>I throw Me at your Feet</b>, and do conjure You  <b>I</b> need not blush to own, that my desire of <b>throwing this  Poem at your Lordship's Feet...</b>  <i>The little Piece</i>, which <b>I</b> now <b>throw at your Feet</b>,</p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 52  <i>PB</i> 3.213  *<i>CoP</i> Dedication, sig.  Ar2.  *<i>FS</i> Dedication, sig.</p>

	<p>The Captive , who presumes to <b>throw himself at your Ladyship's Feet,</b>  <b>I am preparing to throw myself at his Feet,</b>  <b>I throw it at your Feet.</b>  And <b>throwing himself again at her Feet,</b>  ... <b>threw himself at the Monarch's Feet,</b> and begging a  Thousand Pardons for his Impositions,  when <i>Antiochus</i> <b>throwing himself at her Feet,</b> and  bursting into Tears  <i>The Prince,</i> as <i>Stratonice</i> was about to retire, <b>threw himself at her Feet</b>  When <b>throwing myself at her Feet,</b> and imploring her to  pardon the Insolence of a confession which she would  extort from me,  do you expect <i>the Suppliant Father</i> should <b>throw himself at your Feet...?</b>  if <b>I should still throw a Scepter at her Feet,</b>  if <i>my Son</i> <b>throwing a Diadem at your Feet,</b>  for <i>he</i> had <b>thrown himself at his Feet,</b>  ... has afforded me so particular an advantage of  <b>throwing myself at your Feet</b> in an humble  acknowledgment,</p>	<p>Ar3.  *<i>HC</i> Dedication, sig.  Ar2.  *<i>A&amp;S</i> p. 18  * p. 48  * p. 77  * p. 93  * p. 187  * p. 94  * p. 235  * p. 247  * p. 261  * p. 280  * p. 289  *<i>Ode</i> sig. A3r</p>
28	<p><b>Make thy fair Appeal   To the good Duke, and</b> doubt not  but thy Tears   Shall be repaid with Interest from his  <b>Justice.</b>  Go <b>make a fair Appeal   To Æacus , to Minos,</b>  <i>Rhadamanthus ;   And</i> let those Potentates of nether  <b>Justice</b>  There lies a <b>fair Appeal,</b> on this Head</p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 54  <i>PP</i> 5.137-9  <i>R2</i> Preface, sig. 2B1r</p>
29	<p><b>sooth</b> with Words <b>the Tumult in his Heart!</b>  <b>sooth the Tumults of thy Breast</b> to Peace.  Sweet thy <b>Tumults,</b> soft thy Anguish,   Inly <b>soothing</b> past</p>	<p><i>DF</i>, p. 14  <i>FS</i> 3.328  <i>HC</i> 1.2.56-7</p>

	expressing.	
30	By <b>Force</b> alone I snatch'd th'imperfect Joy... Not Love, but <b>brutal Violence</b> prevail'd; Did he not once with <b>brutal Force</b>   Attempt, Shall She be made the Spoil of <b>brutal Lust</b> ,	<i>DF</i> , p. 13-14  <i>HC</i> 2.6.21-22 <i>PP</i> 5.77
31	<b>All that at present</b> I <i>could</i> boast my own, It happens, <b>that I am at present</b> of Opinion You're in your Pomp <b>at present</b> , carrying on the same Design <b>at present</b> , My purpose <b>at present</b> is... The Tricks of judicial Astrology are practis'd <b>at present</b> But I <i>shall</i> forbear doing <b>that at present</b> , Under whose Direction the play-house is <b>at present</b> , But I <i>cannot</i> but lament <b>that</b> it seems <b>at present</b> to shoot up... his Sign, which is <b>at present</b> the bumper, Behold it <b>at present</b> ... There are Academies which <b>at present</b> are little regarded... without any further reflections <b>at present</b> . we <b>at present</b> have the least Reason... would be by this Means much less frequent than <b>at present</b> ; <b>that</b> wicked man, whom you <b>at present</b> live with: You need not tell me <b>at present</b> of your mother's wicked Deeds, 'Tis indeed, <b>at present</b> : too much <b>at present</b> ... or to make a long Apology for the Revival of them <b>at present</b> . <b>that I can at present</b> remember in him, <b>that I at present</b> remember, though I do not remember <b>at present</b> ...	<i>DF</i> , p. 13 <i>DF</i> , p. 23 <i>Cl</i> act 3, p. 40 * <i>Cen</i> I, Preface, Sig A4v p. 47 p. 81 p. 82 p. 141 p. 143  p. 169 p. 196 * <i>Cen</i> II, p. 221  p. 222 * <i>Cen</i> III, p. 80 p. 113  <i>Elec</i> 2.1, p. 19 4.1, p. 49  <i>FS</i> 4. 107 <i>A&amp;S</i> p. 67 <i>Rape</i> , Dedication, p. v.  <i>ShR</i> p. 13 p. 46 p. 133

	<p><b>I shall</b> add but one more Error <b>at present...</b>  is more than <b>I at present</b> remember.  if there be not the strongest View, <b>at present</b>,  To give a few Instances, <b>that</b> occur <b>at present</b>.  who <b>at present</b> personates you,  whom... <b>I at present</b> acknowledge for my Master.  as They <b>at present</b> seem.  a few Instances... <b>that</b> occur to me <b>at present</b>.  <b>All that I can at present</b>  yet <b>at present</b>,  This Reply <b>at present...</b>  <b>At present</b> our Friend Concanen has them,  <b>I am at present</b> a sort of Shopkeeper,  And so much for y* Author <b>at Present</b>.  Litterary News are <b>at present</b> quite dead.  <b>I... shall</b> only <b>at present</b> confess myself,  The State of litterary Matters is very dull <b>at present</b>,</p>	<p>p. 164  R2 preface, sig. 2A4r  sig. 2B2v  Works I, p. 129  II, p. 344  p. 344  III, p. 353  IV, p. 379  p. 447  Letters, p. 280  p. 281  p. 299  p. 323  p. 327  p. 330  p. 334  p. 337</p>
32	<p><i>Enter... HENRIQUEZ on <b>the Opposite Side</b>.</i>  <i>Exit Iphigenia at <b>the opposite Side</b>.</i>  <i>and then goes off at <b>the opposite Side</b>.</i></p>	<p>DF, p. 13  Ores 4.1.60  FS 2.288</p>
33	<p><b>Oh the devil, the devil</b>, the devil!  <b>O the devil! the devil!</b>  <b>O the devil!</b></p>	<p>DF, p. 13  Cl act 1, p. 6  Cl act 1, p. 27</p>
34	<p><b>I grieve as much   That I</b> have rifled all the Stores of  Beauty,  <b>I grieve as much that I</b> cannot recover the whole,</p>	<p>DF, p. 13  Cen I, p. 30</p>
35	<p><b>had drove</b> me from her.  <b>had drove</b> into the Sentiments of <i>Melancholy</i> and  <i>Despair</i>.</p>	<p>DF, p. 14  Cen III, p. 148</p>
36	<p><b>still in Silence all</b>.  <b>still</b> smother'd <b>in Silence</b>, has caus'd <b>all</b> the Grief...</p>	<p>DF, p. 14  A&amp;S, p. 105</p>
37	<p><b>of the ruin'd Maid</b>,</p>	<p>DF, p. 14</p>

	<b>the ruin'd maid of the ruin'd Abbey.</b>	<i>Ovid II, p. 147</i> <i>FS 5.225</i>
38	<i>Prospect of a Village at a Distance.</i> <i>the Prospect of a Village.</i> <i>Prospect of a Village, before Don Bernard's House.</i> <i>The Prospect of a village.</i> <i>Prospect of a Village at a Distance.</i> <i>a Prospect of Villages, Forests, Mountains,</i>	<i>DF, p. 3</i> <i>DF, p. 13</i> <i>DF, p. 16</i> <i>DF, p. 25</i> <i>DF, p. 32</i> <i>Cl act 1, p. 5</i>
39	Or <b>death</b> will <b>make pity too</b> slow. E'er <b>Death</b> <b>make Pity</b> come <b>too</b> late.	<i>DF, p. 47</i> <i>P&amp;A 49, p. 3</i>

# Bibliography

---

## Primary Works

- [Anonymous], 'The Modern Poets: A Satire in allusion to the Satire of the first Book of Horace', by a Young Gentelman of Cambridge, *The Grub-Street Journal*, No. 98, November 18, 1731
- Arkwright, G. E. P., *Catalogue of Music in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford*, 2 vols (London, 1915)
- Baker, David Erskine, *Biographica Dramatica, Or, a Companion to the Playhouse: Containing Historical and Critical Memoirs, and Original Anecdotes, of British and Irish Dramatic Writers*, 2 vols (London, 1764; new ed. 1782)
- Bate, Jonathan, and Eric Rasmussen, eds., *William Shakespeare & Others: Collaborative Plays* (Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2013)
- Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London: Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1647)
- , *The Wild Goose Chase, a Comedy* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1652)
- Bowers, Fredson, ed., Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher, *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, 10 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992; repr. 2008)
- British Chronicle*, April 27-29 (London, 1767)
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908)
- Cibber, Colley, *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber*, fourth edition, 2 vols (London, 1756)
- Cibber, Theophilus, and others, *The Lives of the Poet of Great Britain and Ireland*, 5 vols. (London, 1753)
- Church Christ Library *Manuscript 56-60* (c.1620)
- Christ Church Library, 'Mus. 56-60' < <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+56--60>> [accessed 26 September 2015]
- Clark, William George, William Aldis Wright, and John Glover, eds., *The Works of William Shakespeare*, 9 vols (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1863-6)
- Cokain, Aston, 'To Mr. Humphrey Mosley, and Mr. Humphrey Robinson', in *Small Poems of Divers Sorts* (London, 1658)

- Collins, John Churton, 'Lewis Theobald', *The Dictionary of National Biography: 1885-1900*, vol. 56
- Daily Courant*, London, 10 April 1716
- Dodd, William, *The Beauties of Shakespear*, 2 vols (London, 1752)
- Egerton, John, *Egerton's Theatrical Remembrancer* (London, 1788)
- Gifford, William, ed., Philip Massinger, *The Plays of Philip Massinger*, second edn., 4 vols (London: W. Butler and Co. Cleveland-Row, St. James, 1813)
- Graham, Walter, ed., Lewis Theobald, *Double Falsehood: A New Edition* (Cleveland, Ohio: Western Reserve University, 1920)
- Greg, W. W., *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols (London, 1939-59)
- Hammond, Brean, ed., [Theobald, Lewis], *Double Falsehood* (London: Methuen, 2010)
- [Heminge, John, and Henry Condell], *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*, ed. by Charlton Hinman, 2nd edn., with a new introduction by Peter W. M. Blayney (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1996)
- Howe, John, *A letter written out of the country [...] before the Lord Mayor* (London, 1680)
- Johnson, Samuel, and George Steevens, *Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays Publish in 1778*, ed. by Edmond Malone, 2 vols. (London, 1780)
- Jorgens, Elise Bickford, *English Song 1600-1675: Facsimiles of Twenty-six Manuscripts and an Edition of the Texts* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989)
- Kahan, Jeffery, ed., Lewis Theobald, 'The Double Falsehood', *Shakespeare Imitations, Parodies and Forgeries: 1710-1820*, vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2004), 159-242
- Kennedy, John W., ed., Lewis Theobald, *Double Falshood; or, The Distrest Lovers*, ed. JohnW.Kennedy,(2002-2004),<<http://www.skensoftware.com/Double%20Falshood/>>[accessed26September 2015]
- Lawes, William, *Collected Vocal Music: Part 1: Solo Songs*, ed. by Gordon J. Callon (Middleton: A-R Editions, Inc., 2002)
- London Daily Journal*, 2 April 1733
- London Daily Post*, 26 September 1739
- London Journal*, 20 May 1727
- Lynan, Peter, 'Cranford, William (d. c. 1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press: 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/view/article/67959>> [accessed 26 Sep 2015]

- Mestayer, Henry, *The Perfidious Brother*, second edition (London, 1720)
- Nichols, John, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (London, 1817-1858)
- Middleton, Thomas, *The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Munday, Anthony, and Henry Chettle, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. by John Jowett (London: Methuen Drama, 2011)
- Pope, Alexander, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. by George Sherburn, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956)
- , *The Dunciad, Variorum* (London, 1729)
- Pope, Alexander, and Jonathan Swift, *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*, 2 vols. (London: 1728)
- Shakespeare, William, *1 Henry VI*, ed. by Michael Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003)
- , *As You Like It*, ed. by Juliet Dusinberre (London: Thomson Learning, 2006)
- , *King Richard II*, ed. by Charles R. Forker (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002)
- , *Measure for Measure*, ed. by N. W. Bawcutt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- , *Much Ado About Nothing*, ed. by Claire McEachern (London: Thomson Learning, 2006)
- , *The Complete Works*, gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, second edition (Oxford: University Press, 1986; repr. 2005)
- , adapted by Thomas Middleton, 'The Tragedy of Macbeth: A Genetic Text' ed. by Gary Taylor, intro. Inga-Stina Ewbank, *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1165-1201
- , *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ed. by Eugene M. Waith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, London)
- , *The Winter's Tale*, ed. by John Pitcher (London: Methuen Drama, 2010)
- , *The Works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; with Notes, Explanatory, and Critical*, ed. by Lewis Theobald (London, 1733)
- , *The Works of Shakespear. In six Volumes. Collated and corrected by the former editions*, ed. by Alexander Pope (London, 1725)

- , *The Works of Shakespear. In eight volumes. Collated and corrected by the former editions, by Mr. Pope*, 2nd edn, 8 vols. (London, 1728), 8: sig. H2r.
- , *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. by Kenneth Palmer (London: Methuen, 1982)
- , *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, ed. by William C. Carroll (London: Thomson Learning, 2004)
- Shakespeare, William and Thomas Middleton, ed. by John Jowett, *Timon of Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Shelton, Thomas, trans., Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The History of the Valorous and Wittie Knight-Errant, Don-Quixote of the Mancha* (London, 1612)
- Spring, Matthew, 'Johnson, Robert (c. 1583-1633)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press: 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/view/article/14914?docPos=7>> [accessed 26 Sep 2015]
- Tate, Nahum, *The History of King Lear*, ed. by James Black (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975)
- Theobald, Lewis, *The cave of poverty, a poem. Written in imitation of Shakespeare. By Mr. Theobald* (London, 1715)
- , *The Perfidious Brother* (London, 1715)
- , *The Censor* vol. 1, 2nd edn (London, 1717)
- , *The Tragedy of King Richard II* (London, 1720)
- , *Shakespeare Restored* (London, 1726)
- , *Double Falshood: Or, The Distrest Lovers* (London, 1728)
- , *Double Falshood: Or, The Distrest Lovers*, second issue (London, 1728)
- , *The Fatal Secret* (London, 1735)
- , *The Happy Captive* (London, 1741)
- Whincop, Thomas, *Scanderbeg: Or, Love and Liberty, a Tragedy. To Which are Added a List of all the Dramatic Authors* (London, 1747)

## Secondary Works

- Ashbee, Andrew, 'Cranford [Cranforth], William', *Lyra Viol Composer Biographies*, 1-75, <<http://www.newtunings.com/research/violbios.pdf/>> [accessed 20 October 2014]
- Baines, Paul, *The House of Forgery in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999)

- Bamford, Karen, *Sexual Violence on the Jacobean Stage* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000)
- Bate, Jonathan, 'General Introduction', in *William Shakespeare & Others: Collaborative Plays*, ed. by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2013), 9-30
- Baxter, Jean Rae, *Looking for Cardenio* (Hamilton, Ontario: Seraphim, 2008)
- Bradford, Gamaliel, Jr., 'The History of Cardenio by Mr. Fletcher and Shakespeare', *Modern Language Notes*, 25.2 (1910), 51-56
- Branam, George C., *Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1956)
- Brown, Mark, "'Shakespeare's lost play" no hoax, says expert: New evidence that Double Falsehood was, as 18th-century playwright Lewis Theobald claimed, based on Bard's Cardenio', *The Guardian*, 15 March 2010 < <http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2010/mar/15/shakespeare-lost-play-double-falsehood>> [accessed 9 May 2012]
- Bryant, John, 'Textual Identity and Adaptive Revision: Editing Adaptation as a Fluid Text', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 47-67
- Burling, William J., *A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700-1737* (New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1993)
- Byrne, M. St Clare, 'Bibliographic Clues in Collaborative Plays', *Library*, 4<sup>th</sup> ser. 13 (1932), 21-48
- Cadwalader, John, 'Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare Manuscript', *Modern Language Notes*, 55.2 (1940), 108-109
- Caines, Michael, *Shakespeare and the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
- Carnegie, David, 'Introduction', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 3-10
- , 'Theobald's Pattern of Adaptation: *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Richard II*', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by

- David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 180-191
- Carrell, Jennifer Lee, *Interred with their Bones* (New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007).
- Chartier, Roger, *Cardenio Between Cervantes and Shakespeare: The Story of a Lost Play*, trans. by Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013)
- Cox, John D., *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989)
- , 'Open Stage, Open Page? Editing Stage Directions in Early Dramatic Texts', in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 178-209
- Craig, Hugh D., 'Authorial Styles and the Frequencies of Very Common Words: Jonson, Shakespeare, and the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*', *Style* 26 (1992), 199-220
- Cutts, John P., 'Robert Johnson: King's Musician in His Majesty's Public Entertainment', *Music and Letters*, 36.2 (1955), 110-25
- Dahl, Marcus, and Brian Vickers, 'The 1602 Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*: Shakespeare versus Jonson', *Early Modern Literary Studies* (forthcoming)
- Daniel, Samuel, *Philotas* (London, 1623)
- Dawson, Anthony B., 'Notes and Queries Concerning the Text of *Macbeth*', in *Macbeth: The State of Play*, ed. by Ann Thompson, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 11-30
- Dobson, Michael, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1992)
- Doran, Gregory, 'Restoring *Double Falsehood* to the Perpendicular for the RSC', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 360-367
- , *Shakespeare's Lost Play: In Search of Cardenio* (London: Nick Hern Books Ltd., 2012)
- Doran, Gregory, and Antonio Álamo, *Cardenio, Shakespeare's 'Lost Play' Re-imagined* (London: Nick Hern Books Ltd., and RSC, 2011)
- Eder, Maciej, 'Does Size Matter? Authorship Attribution, Small Samples, Big Problem', paper presented at the Digital Humanities 2010 meeting <<http://dh2010.cch.kcl>

- ac.uk/academic-programme/abstracts/papers/pdf/ab-744.pdf> [accessed 21 May 2015]
- Egan, Gabriel, 'Shakespeare: Editions and Textual Matters', *The Year's Work in English Studies*, 93.1 (2014), 295-362
- Erne, Lukas, 'Emendation and the Editorial Reconfiguration of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, ed. by Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 300-313
- Ewbank, Inga-Stina, intro., Gary Taylor ed., 'The Tragedy of Macbeth: A Genetic Text', in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1165-1201
- Farmer, Richard, *An essay on the learning of Shakespeare Addressed to Joseph Cradock, Esq; The Second Edition with Large additions* (London, 1767)
- Fforde, Jasper, *Lost in a Good Book* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2002)
- Firth, J. R., 'Modes of Meaning', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, 4 (1951), 118-149
- , *Papers in Linguistics 1935-51* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Fleissner, Robert F., 'The Likely Misascription of *Cardenio* (and Thereby *Double Falsehood*) in Part to Shakespeare', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97 (1996), 217-230
- Folkenflik, Robert, "'Shakespearesque": The Arden *Double Falsehood*', Review of *Double Falsehood*, edited by Brean Hammond, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75 (2012), 131-143
- Foster, Donald, 'Letter to the Editor', *New York Times Book Review*, 19 January 1986
- , "'Shall I Die" Post Mortem: Defining *Shakespeare*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38 (1987), 58-77
- , 'A Funeral Elegy: W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s "best-speaking witnesses"', *PMLA*, 111. 5 (1996), 1080-1105
- Frazier, Harriet C., 'The Rifling of Beauty's Stores', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 69 (1968), 232-256
- , *A Babble of Ancestral Voices: Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Theobald* (Mouton: The Hague, 1974)
- Freehafer, John, 'Cardenio, by Shakespeare and Fletcher', *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 84 (1969), 501-513

- Freeman, Simon, 'A Scholar's Find May be Lost Shakespeare Love Poem', *Sunday Times*, 24 November 1985
- Goldstein, Malcolm, *Pope and the Augustan Stage* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958)
- Goodwin, Christopher, 'Lutes and Voices', *Early Music*, 36.1 (2008), 140-142
- Gossett, Suzanne, "'Best Men are Molded out of Faults:" Marrying the Rapist in Jacobean Drama', *English Literary Renaissance*, 14.3 (1984), 305-327
- , 'The Spanish Gypsy: Introduction', *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1723-1727
- Graham, Walter, 'The Cardenio-Double Falsehood Problem', *Modern Philology*, 14 (1916), 269-280
- Grazia, Margreta de, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)
- Hammond, Brean, 'The Performance History of a Pseudo-Shakespearean Play: Theobald's *Double Falshood*', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7.1 (1984), 49-60
- , 'Theobald's *Double Falsehood*: "An Agreeable Cheat?"' *Notes and Queries*, 229 (1984), 2-3
- , 'After Arden', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 62-78
- , 'Double Falsehood: The Forgery Hypothesis, the 'Charles Dickson' Enigma and a 'Stern' Rejoinder', *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 67 (2014), 165-179
- Harbage, Alfred, 'Elizabethan: Restoration Palimpsest', *The Modern Language Review*, 35.3 (1940), 287-319
- Honigmann, E. A. J., *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text* (London: Edward Arnold, 1965)
- , *Myriad-Minded Shakespeare: Essays on the Tragedies, Problem Comedies and Shakespeare the Man*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)
- Hope, Jonathan, *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays: A Socio-linguistic Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

- Hoy, Cyrus, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon', *Studies in Bibliography* (II) 9 (1957): 143-62; (III) 11 (1958): 85-106; (IV) 12 (1959): 91-116; (V) 13 (1960): 77-108; (VI) 14 (1961): 45-67.
- Jackson, MacDonald P., 'Editions and Textual Studies', *Shakespeare Survey* vol. 40 (1988), 224-236
- , 'Indefinite Articles in *Titus Andronicus*, Peele and Shakespeare', *Notes and Queries* 45.3 (1998), 308-310
- , '*Titus Andronicus* and Electronic Databases: A Correction and a Warning', *Notes and Queries* 46.2 (1999), 209-210
- , *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- , 'Looking for Shakespeare in *Double Falsehood*: Stylistic Evidence', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 133-161
- , *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham & A Lover's Complaint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
- Jones, R. F., *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with Some Unpublished Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966)
- Juola, Patrick, 'Authorship Attribution', *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 1 (2008), 233-334
- Jowett, John, 'Addressing Adaptation: *Measure for Measure* and *Sir Thomas More*', in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. by Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63-76
- , ed., William Shakespeare, adapted by Thomas Middleton, 'Measure for Measure: A Genetic Text', in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, gen. eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1542-1585
- , *Shakespeare and Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- , 'A Collaboration: Shakespeare and Hand C in *Sir Thomas More*', *Shakespeare Survey* vol. 65 (2013), 255-268
- Kahan, Jeffrey, *Shakespeare Imitations, Parodies and Forgeries*, 3 vols (London: Routledge, 2004)

- , 'The Double Falsehood and The Spanish Curate: A Further Fletcher Connection', *ANQ* 20:1 (2007), 34-36
- Kenny, Shirley Strum, 'The Playhouse and the Printing Shop: Editing Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Plays', *Modern Philology*, 85.4 (1988), 408-419
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009)
- King, Edmund G. C., 'Cardenio and the Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Canon', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 81-94
- Kirwan, Peter, 'Canonising the Shakespeare Apocrypha: Shakespeare, Middleton and Co-Existent Canons,' *Literature Compass*, 9.8 (2012), 538-548
- , *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Koster, Edward B., Review of *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with some Unpublished Letters*, by Richard Foster Jones, *English Studies* 4.1-6 (1922), 20-60
- Kukowski, Stephan, 'The Hand of John Fletcher in *Double Falsehood*', *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1990), 81-89
- Langhans, Edward A., 'Three Early Eighteenth-Century Manuscript Promptbooks', *Modern Philology*, 65.2 (1967), 114-129
- Leigh, Lori, "'Tis no such killing matter": Rape in Fletcher and Shakespeare's *Cardenio* and in Lewis Theobald's *Double Falsehood*', *Shakespeare*, 7.3 (2011), 284-296
- , 'The "Unscene" and Unstaged in *Double Falsehood*, *Cardenio*, and Shakespeare's Romances', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, ed. by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 171-184
- Literature Online*: 'Help: Searching for variant spellings', <<http://lion.chawyck.co.uk>> [accessed 20 December 2014]
- Lounsbury, Thomas R., *The First Editors of Shakespeare (Pope and Theobald): The Story of the First Shakespearean Controversy and of the Earliest Attempt at Establishing a Critical Text of Shakespeare* (London: David Nutt, 1906)
- LupiĆ, Ivan, 'And relish beauties he alone could write': *Double Falsehood* in the Arden Shakespeare', *Shakespeare*, 7.3 (2011), 369-376

- , 'Malone's *Double Falsehood*', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 95-114
- Mallet, David, *Of Verbal Criticism: An Epistle to Mr. Pope. Occasioned by Theobald's Shakespear, and Bentley's Milton* (London: 1733)
- Marchitello, Howard, 'Finding *Cardenio*', *ELH*, 74.4 (2007), 957-987
- Marcus, Leah S., 'Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Quarto?' in *Renaissance Historicisms: Essays in Honor of Arthur F. Kinney*, ed. by James M. Dutcher and Anne Lake Prescott (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008)
- Meek, Richard, and Jane Rickard, "'This orphan play": *Cardenio* and the Construction of the Author', *Shakespeare*, 7.3 (2011), 269-283
- Metz, Harold G., *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare: The Reign of Edward III, Sir Thomas More, The History of Cardenio, The Two Noble Kinsmen* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989)
- Monsarrat, G. D., 'A Funeral Elegy: Ford, W. S., and Shakespeare', *Review of English Studies*, 53. 210 (2002), 186-203
- Moore Don D., ed., *John Webster: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1981)
- Muir, Kenneth, 'Three Shakespeare Adaptations', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, 8 (1959), 233-240
- , *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1960)
- , 'Cervantes, *Cardenio* and Theobald', in *Spain & Its Literature: Essays in Memory of E. Allison Peers*, edited with an introduction by Ann L. Mackenzie (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), 141-150
- Nicholl, Charles, 'Cardenio's Ghost: the Remnants of a Lost Shakespeare Play', in *Traces Remain: Essays and Explorations* (London: Penguin Books, 2011), 84-101
- Nicoll, Allardyce, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama: 1700-1750* (Cambridge, 1927)
- Nokes, David, 'Shakespeare Crucified', in *Literary Milieux: Essays in Text and Context Presented to Howard Erskine-Hill*, ed. by David Womersley and Richard McCabe (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 91-103
- Oliphant, E. H. C., "'Double Falsehood": Shakespeare, Fletcher and Theobald', *Notes and Queries* 89 (1919), 30-32; 90 (1919), 60-62; 91 (1919), 86-88

- , *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to Determine Their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927)
- Pendleton, Thomas A., 'The Non-Shakespearian Language of "Shall I Die"', *Review of English Studies*, 40 (1989), 323-351
- Proudfoot, Richard, 'Can *Double Falsehood* Be Merely a Forgery by Lewis Theobald?' in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 162-176
- Proudfoot, Richard, et al, "General Editors' Preface," *DF*, xii-xvi
- Pujante, Angel-Luis, 'Double Falsehood and the Verbal Parallels with Shelton's Don Quixote', *Shakespeare Survey*, 51 (1998), 95-105
- Richards, Bernard, 'Now Am I in Arden': Arden Shakespeare 'Double Falsehood' Book Review, *Essays in Criticism*, 61:1 (2011), 79-88
- , 'Reimagining *Cardenio*', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 344-351
- Rudman, Joseph, 'The State of Authorship Attribution Studies: Some Problems and Solutions', *Computers and the Humanities*, 31 (1998), 351-65
- Rybicki, Jan, and Maciej Eder, 'Deeper Delta Across Genres and Languages: Do We Really Need the Most Frequent Words?' *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 26.3 (2011), 315-321
- Salerno, Henry, *Double Falsehood and Shakespeare's Cardenio: A Study of a Lost Play* (Philadelphia, Pa., 2000)
- Schäfer, Jürgen, *Documentation in the OED: Shakespeare and Nashe as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980)
- Schevill, Rudolph, 'Theobald's *Double Falsehood*?' *Modern Philology*, 9.2 (1911), 269-285
- Schwartzstein, Leonard, 'The Text of "*The Double Falsehood*"', *Notes and Queries*, 199 (1954), 471-472
- Seary, Peter, *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)
- , 'Theobald, Lewis (bap. 1688, d. 1744)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press: 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27169>> [accessed 2 Sep 2015]

- Shapiro, James, *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2010)
- Sharpe, Will, 'Authorship and Attribution', in *William Shakespeare & Others: Collaborative Plays*, ed. by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2013), 641-745
- Sherman, Donovan, 'Stages of Revision: Textuality, Performance and History in *Anonymous*', *Literature Film Quarterly*, 41. 2 (2013), 129-142
- Sinclair, John, *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Stern, Tiffany, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page* (London: Routledge, 2004)
- , *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- , "'The Forgery of Some Modern Author'?: Theobald's Shakespeare and Cardenio's Double Falsehood', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62.4 (2011), 555-593
- , "'Whether one did Contrive, the Other Write, / Or one Fram'd the Plot, the Other did Indite": Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 115-130
- Stevenson, Warren, 'Shakespeare's Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy* 1602', Diss. (McGill U, 1954)
- , *Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy: A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions* (Lewiston, NY; Queenstown, Ontario; Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008)
- Sutherland, James R., 'Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century', *The Modern Language Review*, 28 (1933), 21-36
- Taylor, Gary, 'Shakespeare's New Poem: A Scholar's Clues and Conclusions', *New York Times Book Review*, 15 December 1985, 11-14
- , 'Revisiting "Shall I Die"', *New York Times Book Review*, 9 February 1986
- , 'A History of *The History of Cardenio*', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 11-61
- , 'A Posthumous Collaborator's Preface', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, ed. by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 237-240

- , 'Slight of Mind: Cognitive Illusions and Shakespearean Desire', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, ed. by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 125-169
- , "'William Shakespeare & Others'", edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen', *The Washington Post*, 30 December 30, 2013 <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/books/williamshakespeare-and-others-edited-by-jonathan-bate-and-ericrasmussen/2013/12/30/4a1e86ce-6cd7-11e3-b405\\_7e360f7e9fd2\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/books/williamshakespeare-and-others-edited-by-jonathan-bate-and-ericrasmussen/2013/12/30/4a1e86ce-6cd7-11e3-b405_7e360f7e9fd2_story.html)> [accessed 23 September 2015]
- Taylor, Gary, and John Jowett, 'With New Additions': Theatrical Interpolation in *Measure for Measure*', in *Shakespeare Reshaped: 1606-1623* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 107-236
- Taylor, Gary, and John V. Nance, 'Four Characters in Search of a Subplot: Quixote, Sancho, and *Cardenio*', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 192-213
- Taylor, Gary, and Steven Wagschal, 'Reading Cervantes, or Shelton, or Phillips? The Source(s) of *Cardenio* and *Double Falsehood*', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, ed. by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 15-29
- Taylor, Gary, John Fletcher and William Shakespeare, 'The History of *Cardenio*, 1612-2012', in *The Creation and Re-creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*, ed. by Gary Taylor and Terri Bourus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 240-316
- Vickers, Brian, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford's Funeral Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- , *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- , 'Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602): A New(er) Approach', *Shakespeare* 8.1 (2012), 13-43
- Wallace, David, 'Bourgeois Tragedy or Sentimental Melodrama? The Significance of George Lillo's *The London Merchant*', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 25.2 (1991-1992), 123-143

- Walsh, Marcus, *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretative Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Walton, J. Michael, 'Theobald and Lintott: A Footnote on Early Translations of Greek Tragedy', *Arion*, Third Series, 16.3 (2009), 103-110
- White, Martin, *Renaissance Drama in Action: An Introduction to Aspects of Theatre Practice and Performance* (London: Routledge, 1998; repr. 2013)
- Wood, Michael, "A sound from heaven": new light on Shakespeare's *Cardenio*, unpublished essay (2001)
- , *In Search of Shakespeare* (London: BBC, 2001)