

“HERE LAY MY HOPE”: ATTRIBUTION, COLLABORATION,
AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE THIRD ADDITION TO
THE SPANISH TRAGEDY

Keegan Cooper

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Arts
in the Department of English,
Indiana University

October 2016

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Master's Thesis Committee

Dr. Terri Bourus, Chair

Dr. Jonathan Eller

Dr. April Witt

Dedication

For Mom,

who first introduced me to Shakespeare
and inspired me to imagine and create.

For Char, Beeg, and Pops.

Without your company and counsel,
this thesis might not have been completed.

Acknowledgements

A huge thank you to my thesis committee: Dr. Jonathan Eller and Dr. April Witt. Your feedback in and out of class has been vital these past few years. And I cannot thank my mentors enough: my thesis chair, Dr. Terri Bourus, and Dr. Gary Taylor. Without your support and guidance over the past three years, I would not have been able to finish my educational career as successfully as I have. (And thanks for employing me too!)

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part 1: Backstory	3
Part 2: Control Tests	19
First Segment	25
Second Segment	42
Part 3: Conclusion	50
Bibliography	52
Curriculum Vitae	

Introduction

The authorship of the five additions to Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* remains a conundrum. Ben Jonson was first thought responsible, but a majority of scholars argue against his involvement. Other candidates have been proposed, namely Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, William Shakespeare, and John Webster. Past attribution studies have mainly focused on Shakespeare due to the fourth addition, the Painter's Scene, which has been perceived to exhibit Shakespearean quality. John Nance's lexical study of the fourth addition makes a most compelling case: Shakespeare's hand is almost certainly present.¹ Warren Stevenson, Hugh Craig, Brian Vickers, and Douglas Bruster have also supported an attribution to Shakespeare; however, their research errs in assuming a single author wrote all five of the additions.² This assumption is disproven by Gary Taylor's work on the first addition, which is the first to identify Heywood, not Shakespeare, as its likely author.³ Taylor's conclusion emphasizes that the additions could embody revisions by more than one playwright, such as in the case of *Sir Thomas More*. Therefore, the authorship of the other additions must remain conjectural until further study. My thesis is the first to independently explore the

¹ John V. Nance, "Shakespeare and The Painter's Part," forthcoming in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.

² Warren Stevenson, "Shakespeare's Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy* 1602," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 8, no. 2 (1968); Hugh Craig, "The 1602 Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*," in *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, ed. Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Brian Vickers, "Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602): A New(er) Approach," *Shakespeare* 8, no. 1 (2012); Douglas Bruster, "Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting in the Additional Passages Printed in the 1602 *Spanish Tragedy*," *Notes and Queries* 60, no. 3 (2013).

³ Gary Taylor, "Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?" forthcoming in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.

third addition's authorship, and based on lexical evidence, the following analysis disproves claims of Shakespeare's presence within the third addition.

Part 1: Backstory

The 1602 quarto (Q4) of *The Spanish Tragedy* advertises on its title page that the text is “Newly corrected, amended, and enlarged with | new additions of the Painters part, and | others, as it hath of late been | diuers times acted.”⁴ Not only do the additions add to the play, but some are meant to replace segments of the original 1592 text (Q1).⁵ The five additions vary in length and purpose, though most of them intensify the madness of the main character, Hieronimo, as he grieves and enacts revenge for his murdered son.

Dating the composition of the additions, as well as the text of the 1592 quarto, has proven difficult. Scholars generally agree Q1 was written between 1584 and 1589 and Q4’s additions between 1597 and 1601, though little evidence survives to support this. Ben Jonson alluded to *The Spanish Tragedy* in his Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), in which he wrote “Hee that will sweare, *Jeronimo*, or *Andronicus* are the best playes, yet, shall passe unexcepted at, heere, as a man whose Judgement shewes it is constant, and hath stood still, these five and twentie, or thirtie yeeres” (Ind. 106-11).⁶ This loosely dates the first edition somewhere between 1584 and 1589. As for the additions, most scholars agree their likely origin to be a revision of the play believed to have occurred in 1600-1601 when Edward Alleyn, the lead actor of the Admiral’s Men, returned to the stage from a three-year retirement.⁷ However, there is no conclusive evidence that affirms this. There may also have been a revival in 1597, but if so, Richard Hillman warns

⁴ *The Spanish Tragedie; Containing the lamentable end of Don Horaio, and Bel-imperia: with the pittiful death of olde Hieronimo. Newly corrected, amended, and enlarged with new additions of the Painters part, and others, as it hath of late been diuers times acted* (1602), STC 15089.

⁵ Q2 and Q3 are simple reprints of Q1, while Q5-10 embody Q4’s additional material.

⁶ Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch, introduction to *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013), 13.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

against the “temptation to associate them with the 1597 revival.”⁸ Thus, the proposed date ranges for the composition of Q1, and Q4’s additions, remain speculative.

Ben Jonson’s role in the composition of the additions has been debated since 1790, when Edmond Malone partially transcribed the papers of Philip Henslowe, theatrical impresario of the early modern stage. Two entries within them record payments to Jonson for writing the additions:

Lent vnto m^r alleyn the 25 of Septmber 1601 to lend vnto Bengemen
Johnson upon hn writtinge of his adicians in geronymo the some of xxx^s.

Lent vnto bengemy Johnstone at the A poyntement of EAlleyn & w^m birde
the 22 of June 1602 in earneste of A Boocke called Richard crockbacke &
for new alicyons for Jeronymo the some of x^l.⁹

This external evidence seems solid, but scholars have dissected the issues the records raise. The received payments, £2 and £10, seem very large compared to the small length of the additions. Roslyn Knutson points out how “out of fifty revivals between 1594 and 1603, *Henslowe’s Diary* does not record a substantial fee for textual alterations except for the revivals of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Dr. Faustus*.”¹⁰ Additionally, the second payment took place in the same year the additions were printed, and it is unlikely they would have reached the press so quickly considering they are advance payments. Because of these two unusual factors, Philip Edwards doubted whether the additions that survive now are at all the same additions that Jonson was paid for.¹¹ Additionally, it is known that the manuscript of Henslowe’s *Diary* was tampered with by both Edmond Malone and

⁸ Richard Hillman, “Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, ed. Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 568.

⁹ Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe’s Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 182, 203.

¹⁰ Roslyn Knutson, “Influence of the Repertory System on the Revival and Revision of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Dr. Faustus*,” *English Literary Renaissance* 18, no. 2 (1988): 257-8.

¹¹ Philip Edwards, *Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1966), lxi-lxii.

John Payne Collier, which unfortunately puts into question any evidence found within its entries.¹²

Besides unusual external evidence, internal evidence has also been used to discredit Jonson's authorship. In 1808, Charles Lamb concluded that the additions were "the very salt of the old play...There is nothing in the undoubted plays of Jonson, which would authorize us to suppose that he could have supplied the scenes in question. I should suspect the agency of some more potent spirit."¹³ Edward Fitzgerald, referring to the Painter's Scene, later said that its author "was thought Ben Jonson, who could no more have written it than I who read it: for what else of his is like it?"¹⁴ Coleridge stated that "the parts pointed out in 'Hieronimo' as Ben Jonson's bear no traces of his style," (ibid.). It seems most critics do not equally favor Jonson's talent with his contemporaries.

The only nineteenth-century reception that defends Jonson as the author of the additions is highlighted by Frederick Boas in his edition of *The Works of Thomas Kyd: J. A. Symonds*, in 1886, observed how "the scenes may have been written before Jonson had settled down to his distinctively classic manner," (ibid.). This optimism never caught on, and to this day scholars comment on the noticeable differences between Jonson's style and that of the additions. Richard Hillman recently described the differences he felt most substantial and stated that the passages printed are unlikely to be Jonson's work based on stylistic differences.¹⁵

¹² Calvo and Tronch, Appendix 1 to *The Spanish Tragedy*, 320; Richard D. Altick, *The Scholar Adventures* (New York: Macmillan, 1950), 142-75.

¹³ Frederick S. Boas, *The Works of Thomas Kyd* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1901; rev. edn. 1955), lxxxvii-lxxxviii.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Hillman, "Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*," 568.

What seems more likely is that the additions by Jonson were either not finished or not favored, which in both cases would have seen them contracted elsewhere for completion. Boas points out that this idea was first suggested by Herford and Simpson in 1925, who stated that “Both entries indicate transactions not simply between Henslowe and Jonson but through the mediation of third persons.”¹⁶ Boas himself concluded his introduction of the play with his belief that “the work undertaken by Jonson but not yet handed in may have been carried out by someone else.”¹⁷ This stance has been supported since by Arthur Freeman as well as many other later scholars.¹⁸ Todd Lidh has suggested a different explanation for Jonson’s involvement: Henslowe’s entries might relate to Jonson’s writing of an entire other play, *The First Part of Hieronimo*, a prequel to *The Spanish Tragedy* about which very little is known beyond its being published anonymously in 1605.¹⁹

Despite the popular scholarly consensus that Jonson cannot be considered a candidate for authorship, Anne Barton and David Riggs remain convinced that Jonson cannot be ruled out.²⁰ However, the lack of evidence and large amount of conjecture they offer is not compelling. Barton discusses how Jonson suffered the death of his infant daughter, Mary, which links him to one of the themes of *The Spanish Tragedy* and its additions.²¹ In response, Will Sharpe compares how “such biographical speculation of the

¹⁶ Boas, *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, cxxii.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ These include Chambers, Edwards, Murray, Erne, Jackson, Neill, Knutson, Neely, Blamires, and Bate and Rasmussen, among others.

¹⁹ Todd M. Lidh, “To know the author were some ease of grief: Ben Jonson’s Lost Play,” *The Ben Jonson Journal* xvii (2010), 64.

²⁰ Calvo and Tronch, Appendix 1 to *The Spanish Tragedy*, 321. Barton and Riggs follow the train of thought favoring Jonson that was initially pioneered by Isaac Reed in 1803 and supported since by William Gifford in 1816, Boas, Chambers, Greg, and Herford and Simpson.

²¹ Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson, Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 13-28.

ilk claiming that Shakespeare's private feelings about the death of his son [Hamnet] in 1596 are reflected in *King John*, does not supply a solid foundation upon which to build a literary case."²² The strongest pieces of evidence Barton champions are the recorded payments by Henslowe. However, that evidence has been easily challenged and dismissed, which suggests that Barton and other proponents of Jonson's authority have more work to do if their claims are not to be entirely rejected.

Adrian Blamires does not reject Jonson's possible authorship, but is hesitant to accept it. With some contextual evidence and a knack for historical conjecture, he supposes the handful of recorded slights regarding Jonson and the additions "might serve as evidence that Jonson fulfilled his task, but that [they] did not find favour, at least amongst the Blackfriars cognoscenti."²³ But it is difficult to state specifically what Jonson meant when he slighted *The Spanish Tragedy*. He refers to the play in the Induction to *Cynthia's Revels* (printed 1601, dated 1600) as "the old Hieronimo (as it was first acted)" (Ind. 209-11), which some have interpreted as an expression of bitterness toward the play after the additions were incorporated.²⁴ Others have concluded that it only affirms that two versions of the play were performed and that the additions were written before *Cynthia's Revels*. Whether or not Jonson is connected to the additions inserted into the 1602 quarto remains to be determined. See Calvo and Tronch's 2013

²² Will Sharpe, "Authorship and Attribution," in *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 677.

²³ Adrian Blamires, "Ben Jonson's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* as the Subject of Ridicule," *Notes and Queries* 61, no. 2 (2014): 268.

²⁴ Ben Jonson, *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, vol. 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932), 42.

Arden edition for a thorough history of scholarly opinion regarding Jonson and his relationship with the additions.²⁵

Since Coleridge in 1833, “this seems Shakespearean to me” has been a constant mantra in attempting to attribute the additions. He suggested Shakespeare as the anonymous author, saying that the style of the additional text is “very like Shakespeare’s.”²⁶ Freeman corroborates Coleridge’s association when he refers to an anonymous elegy that was printed after the death of Richard Burbage in commemoration of the actor’s most famous roles: “young Hamlett, ould Hieronymoe | King Leer, the Greved Moore, and more beside.”²⁷ This association may simply reflect Burbage’s acting history, but nonetheless demonstrates the public’s association of *The Spanish Tragedy* and Shakespeare’s tragedies.

Further linking the works of Shakespeare with the additions to Kyd’s play is a simultaneous and similar addition to *Titus Andronicus* for the same purpose: a revival.²⁸ Not present in the quarto of 1594, the Folio text has an additional scene, 3.2, in which the development of madness is enacted similar to *The Spanish Tragedy*. In 3.2, Titus stabs a fly at a dinner party and then mourns its death. This bears a close enough resemblance to the Painter’s Scene for Jonathan Bate to state that this parallel is “intriguingly strong” evidence of Shakespeare’s authorship.²⁹ However, without additional examples to support Shakespeare’s possible presence within the text, no single similarity or parallel is

²⁵ Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013).

²⁶ Boas, *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, lxxvii-lxxxviii.

²⁷ Arthur Freeman, *Thomas Kyd: Facts and Problems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 122.

²⁸ Jonathan Bate, introduction to “The Spanish Tragedy (with Additions),” in *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 207-11.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

substantial evidence. This kind of “attribution by instinct” is not unheard of: Tennyson famously distinguished John Fletcher’s style within *Henry VIII*, or *All Is True*, based off of his ear and an adoration for Shakespeare. However, like Coleridge and others, Bate’s claim extends the “attribution by instinct” that has only recently been tested by the emergence of stylistics.

The application of linguistic stylistics within attribution scholarship establishes a more confident means of authorial attribution. But the field is still developing; there is no perfect science to its approach. While better than “attribution by instinct,” the work contains a variety of potential problems. Will Sharpe supplies a wide survey of the possible issues within attribution scholarship:

Attribution work will always be governed partially by the practitioner’s interpretation of evidence, or their theories about how co-authorship works, which may be at odds with what is actually happening in the text. In any instance, a writer could be modifying their style to accommodate the abilities or limitations of their co-author, or closely working together with them to make the play feel more of a piece, and not too jarringly schizophrenic in its linguistic and dramatic energies. In any given passage or play we could be witnessing conscious or unconscious imitation of the style of the other writer on the part of the collaborator (which does not only mean the other writer imitating the superior Shakespeare: we must allow for the possibility for this working the other way as well). We could equally be seeing a writer imitating the style of a writer not involved in the collaboration, or subtly plagiarizing little poetic flourishes or images that appealed to them from another writer’s plays. One writer could be revising the other’s work, or they could both have contributed passages and lines to the same scene as they were composing it, thus commixing and complicating the stylistic data we want or expect to find. If the attribution scholar assumes that the units of individual composition break down as whole scenes or acts then he/she will be blinded to this possibility: we need to consider that both writers may be present within a single scene, or even a single speech.³⁰

³⁰ Sharpe, “Authorship and Attribution,” 648.

With all the complicated possibilities within playwriting, it is important for attribution scholars to be aware of and look for signs of such complications. Modern scholars continually develop independent methods and adjust their protocols with each new project as computer technologies advance, databases are updated, and past projects reveal issues within their methodologies. Now that computational methods are becoming more advanced, it is all the more possible to experiment with various approaches that identify issues of attribution and lead to answers of authorship questions. But current computational methods are by no means full-proof, and almost all attempts to apply stylistics to the additions of *The Spanish Tragedy* have been inadequate.

As the following evaluation reveals, many Shakespearean attribution scholars marshaled different evidence to a variety of stylistic analysis, all flawed in considerable measures. But the most egregious flaw lies not in their varied, faulty stylistic methods, but in their tendency to assume that all five of the additions were written by the same author.

The first attribution scholarship of its kind to be applied to the additions was Warren Steven's MA thesis. He worked before the emergence of computer technologies, yet his methods laid the foundation for later advanced computational methods. Completing his research in the 1960s, Stevenson supported an attribution to Shakespeare as the author by identifying both rare and unique lexical parallels between the additions and Shakespeare's work.³¹ Rare parallels, of which Stevenson identified many, weigh less heavily than unique parallels, of which Stevenson found only three. As an example, the fourth addition's juxtaposition of the words "minutes" and "jar," as in "minutes

³¹ Stevenson, "Shakespeare's Hand," 312-14.

jarring” (3.12A.146), is echoed in *Richard II*’s “My thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar” (5.5.51).³² The use of these two words together is a rare parallel, because they are also found together in James Shirley’s *Changes; or Love in a Maze* (1632) and in Lewis Sharpe’s *The Noble Stranger* (1639).³³ This parallel is not very useful here, because Shakespeare is not the only writer to have used both words together, despite the fact that the two other playwrights are producing work much later on.

On the other hand, the fourth addition’s “my hand leaning upon his head” (3.12A.119-20) has a unique parallel, in that it is found used only once by one other playwright, in Shakespeare’s *The Rape of Lucrece*, “one man’s hand leaned on another’s head” (1.1415).³⁴ This unique parallel demonstrates the most useful evidence that current attribution scholars look for. The more unique parallels that a playwright shares with the text, the more likely the playwright wrote that text. Stevenson, in identifying three unique parallels within Shakespeare’s work, gathered enough evidence to justify further research. However, it is important to note that all three unique parallels are from the fourth addition, and that Stevenson compared the additions exclusively to Shakespeare’s canon. We know now that his methodology and results were not comprehensive.

This is due largely to the work of Hugh Craig, who re-examined Stevenson’s results with modern methods of computational linguistics. Along with Shakespeare, Craig also considered Jonson, Dekker, and Webster in his research. After two independent studies that compared the preference of lexical words (words that inherently carry

³² Ibid., 313. Throughout, line numbers for *The Spanish Tragedy* coordinate with Calvo-Tronch’s 2013 edition, and line numbers for Shakespeare’s plays coordinate with *The Oxford Shakespeare*’s 2005 second edition.

³³ Craig, “The 1602 Additions,” 170.

³⁴ Ibid., 169; Stevenson, “Shakespeare’s Hand,” 319.

meaning: nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) versus function words (words that create grammatical relationships between lexical words: articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.), Craig concluded that “the Additions are like Shakespeare but not to the point that all doubt is removed...Jonson seems very unlikely... Shakespeare is the likeliest author.”³⁵ Craig’s conclusion, based off of statistical word tests, agreed with Stevenson’s attribution to Shakespeare, though his studies are very different than Stevenson’s search for parallels.

Even so, Craig conducted his own search for parallels to confirm or disconfirm Stevenson’s results. During this, Craig discovered two parallels unknown to Stevenson that the additions share with Shakespeare’s work: the fourth addition’s comparative “as massy as” appears in “As massy as the earth” (3.12A.92) and in *Much Ado About Nothing*’s “as massy as his club” (3.3.133); the fourth addition’s line “all the undelved mines cannot buy | An ounce of justice” (3.12A.84-5) is echoed in *Hamlet*’s “I will delve one yard below their mines” (H.3.4.185.7).³⁶ While not exact, Craig claims the latter parallel is the sole occurrence of the words “delve/undelve” and “mines” used together. However, Nance refutes this, pointing out that the parallel also appears in Marston’s *The Wonder of Women*: “in mines of gold when laboring slaves delve” (1.2.118).³⁷ Though again, the Shakespearean parallels found here are from the fourth addition only.

Craig’s lexical and functional tests are valid explorations in attribution scholarship, however they are not appropriate to apply to *The Spanish Tragedy* additions. His method requires larger amounts of text (2,500-word blocks) than the additions

³⁵ Craig, “the 1602 Additions,” 177-80. Craig found no evidence linking Dekker or Webster to the additions.

³⁶ Ibid., 170. This parallel is from additional lines of *Hamlet*’s that are found only in Q2 (1604).

³⁷ Nance, “Shakespeare and The Painter’s Part,” (forthcoming).

independently supply (According to Nance, all five additions added together come to 2,752 words).³⁸ Craig is therefore only able to test them as one lump of block text and not as separate entities. This unevenly balances the length of the additions within the results; the fourth addition alone, at 1,461 words, accounts for more than half of the material being tested. Though Craig has tried to account for possible alternatives to Shakespeare by considering other authors in his tests, the overwhelming quantity of data from the fourth addition skewed his results, erroneously leading him to conclude Shakespeare to be the most likely candidate of all five of the additions.

Hugh Craig's forthcoming statistical study continues to explore the additions and their relationship to Shakespeare. He assesses the frequency of very common function words in Shakespeare's plays, and plays by other playwrights, in regards to three sets of additions in which his involvement is suspected: *Sir Thomas More*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Mucedorus*. All three plays are similar in that they were revised with additions and collaborated on by multiple playwrights. As Craig explains, "The basis for this is the idea that Shakespeare's personal style in function word use is sufficiently distinctive, and sufficiently consistent, to make a profile which we can use to classify a text of uncertain origin as his or not."³⁹ He tests his method in blocks of 1,550 words with 28 plays generally agreed to be Shakespeare's solo work against a corpus of other Early Modern plays whose authorship has been affirmed, and he finds a shaky 85% success rate in distinguishing Shakespeare from not-Shakespeare.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Hugh Craig, "Shakespeare and Three Sets of Additions," forthcoming in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.

Based on this assessment of his own methods, Craig advises to proceed with caution in interpreting his results. The probabilities the test calculates distinguish Shakespeare as 81.8% likely present in *The Spanish Tragedy* additions, which is the highest likelihood out of all three plays. In *Sir Thomas More*, Craig distinguishes Shakespeare as 65.3% likely, and in *Mucedorus*, the play most biographically linked to Shakespeare through his company, the King's Men, Craig distinguishes a crippling 8.7% likelihood. He concludes that "the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* fit well with the Shakespeare pattern" of very common function word usage.⁴⁰ But as is usual with Craig's statistical studies, his methodology and data can be difficult to decipher and the sizable margin of error is uncomfortable.

The work of Brian Vickers has also concluded that Shakespeare is the likely author, while at the same time claiming that Jonson is not, but his methods are as inherently flawed as Stevenson's and Craig's. His research identifies similar collocations (the occurrence of two or more words used, not in exact order, but within a certain amount of words of one another that then share a similar linguistic context), but his results are not exact. What constitutes a valid collocation for Vickers is not clearly explained; no standard seems to be applied. And though Vickers claims to have researched both authors, he has thus far only published results that support Shakespeare's authorship and offers no evidence whatsoever regarding Jonson.⁴¹ Additionally, his methodology has been criticized as incomplete due to his shortsighted database, which only includes the 64 plays performed between 1580 and 1595.⁴² Considering the

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Vickers, "Identifying Shakespeare's Additions," 29.

⁴² Calvo and Tronch, Appendix 1 to *The Spanish Tragedy*, 326.

additions could have been written any time before 1602, the blind spot of searchable data from 1596 to 1602 that Vickers chooses not to incorporate into his research renders his conclusion invalid.

Douglas Bruster is similarly convinced of Shakespeare's authorship of all of the additions, but he has also insufficiently demonstrated a reliable method. His recent work approaches the additions looking for Shakespearean spelling preferences that match "Hand D" in the manuscript pages of *Sir Thomas More*.⁴³ However, original manuscript pages of the additions have not been found and thus not studied, which makes his comparison an indirect one in being one step removed. Bruster is acting under the assumption that certain spellings within the original manuscript might have carried through to print, an analytic trend with which he credits many other scholars.⁴⁴ As Sharpe points out, "Ralph Crane, a professional scribe who worked for Shakespeare's company, the King's Men, is known to have prepared copies of some of Shakespeare's plays for the Folio including *The Tempest*, into which his spelling and punctuation habits made their way."⁴⁵ Bruster himself admits that this type of evidence "must be taken as suggestive rather than conclusive" since not many spellings "were exclusive to Shakespeare in his own time."⁴⁶ Without original manuscripts, and without first affirming and comparing the spelling preferences of other playwrights of the period, attribution by spelling preferences is a farcical venture. The margin of error is too large. Additionally, we cannot assume

⁴³ Bruster, "Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting," 421.

⁴⁴ Ibid. According to Bruster, spelling preferences used as evidence of authorship has been argued by John Dover Wilson, W. W. Greg, Charles R. Forker, E. A. J. Honigmann, and Eric Sams, who in various ways have traced identical spellings between the quartos of plays and their Folio versions. Bruster claims this suggests the survival of Shakespeare's spelling preferences through printed text.

⁴⁵ Sharpe, "Authorship and Attribution," 649.

⁴⁶ Bruster, "Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting," 421.

that early modern typesetters consistently preserved the spellings of words within the handwritten or printed materials from which they copied.

The work of Stevenson, Craig, Vickers, and Bruster present multiple and varying results that point toward Shakespeare as the author of the additions. But their shared “all or nothing” assumption that one author wrote all five of the additions is not historically accurate. Gary Taylor calls this the “one horse in the race” fallacy. He explains that “the very large Shakespeare canon will provide plenty of evidence for anything: if you look for Shakespeare, and only for Shakespeare, you will always find enough of him to satisfy your desire for more Shakespeare.”⁴⁷ His investigation of fifteenth and sixteenth century playwrights reveals differing realities for authors than the romantics and their successors often imagine. As he points out, the example of *Sir Thomas More*, along with other plays recorded in Henslowe’s account books, “demonstrate that ‘new additions’ for a theatrical revival could be written by two or more professionals, working in collaboration.”⁴⁸ Hence it is imperative to approach attribution scholarship without assumptions of authorship, and to develop and apply methodology that treats the text objectively. Gary Taylor’s approach applies the most objective and reliable methodology to date.

Taylor’s forthcoming work on the first addition is the first to identify Thomas Heywood as a potential collaborator. His experiment was initially sparked by an attempt to survey recent scholarship that supports the inclusion of the additions into Shakespeare’s canon. Taylor’s method, searching for n-grams (word-string sequences of two, three, or four words) and collocations within all dramatic texts between 1576 and 1642, can be applied to much smaller blocks of text and is not concentrated on one factor,

⁴⁷ Taylor, “Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?” (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ Ibid.

such as a playwright or a particular year span. By incorporating all dates between the opening and closing of the London theatres, all playwrights of the period are included.

The same objective approach is utilized in John Nance's forthcoming work on the fourth addition, which confirms Shakespeare's presence by applying the same method of Taylor's: identifying unique n-grams and collocations. Additionally, Nance specializes in Shakespearean prose, making his contribution particularly helpful considering the fourth addition is the only one to contain prose (and a sufficient amount—579 continuous words). *Hieronimo* switches to prose the moment he sits down to speak with the painter, and an escalating madness ensues. Nance points out that Shakespeare is "more inclined to representing madness through dramatic prose in his tragedies than the other candidates,"⁴⁹ and immediately thoughts of *Hamlet* bouncing back and forth from verse to prose come to mind.

In this case, Nance's reliance on identifying Shakespearean prose through the writing habits of other playwrights is a helpful model. Ensuring that other playwrights are equally represented in such studies is currently a difficult task, considering a vast amount of scholarship on Shakespeare outweighs the amount of scholarship completed on his contemporaries. We know a lot about what Shakespeare sounds like, but little to nothing about what his contemporaries sound like. As Nance puts it, "The more we understand Shakespeare's contemporaries, the more we can understand what Shakespeare did or did not write. Until we pay as much attention to playwrights like Heywood as we do to Shakespeare, our understanding of what Shakespeare wrote will be limited."⁵⁰ The more

⁴⁹ Nance, "Shakespeare and The Painter's Part," (forthcoming).

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

we study the not-Shakespeare, the more we can understand what distinguishes his writing style from others.

Part 2: Control Tests

The following explanation and application of methodology is modeled after Taylor and Nance's authorship studies of the early Shakespeare and Marlowe canons. To start, the control tests of the third addition to *The Spanish Tragedy* are broken into sample sizes of at least 173 words. This particular amount has been proven by Taylor and Nance to be enough to correctly identify authorship.⁵¹ The addition is around 370 words, depending on how compounds are counted, which when split in half results in two segments of 185 words.

The two segments were systematically searched in both *Literature Online* (LION) and in *Early English Books Online* (EEBO) in the form of search strings (n-grams) and collocations. Search strings are consecutively used words of bigrams, trigrams, and quadgrams. Collocations are three or four words used not in exact order but within a certain amount of words of one another that share a commonality in their usage with the passage, whether that be a conceptual or grammatical commonality. Searching for collocations involves utilizing the Boolean "NEAR" proximity operator, which is an "AND" search that is expanded to check for all words within a distance of ten words (by default) in each direction.

However, this experiment only considers collocations that are found within five words of one another. This is because (1) both LION and EEBO have difficulty searching

⁵¹ See Gary Taylor and John V. Nance, "Imitation or Collaboration? Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare Canon," *Shakespeare Survey* 68 (2015): 32-47; John V. Nance, "'We, John Cade': Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the authorship of 4.2.33-189 2 *Henry VI*," *Shakespeare* (2015): 1-21; Nance, "Shakespeare and The Painter's Part," (forthcoming); Taylor, "Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?" (forthcoming).

between two different lines of verse, and at rare times even prose, whether the search be for a word-string or a collocation. Thankfully searches for collocations can often bypass this difficulty, but searches for word-strings do not always catch parallels between two lines. Whether or not a parallel between lines is detected usually depends upon the state of the digitally transmitted text in question. (2) The third addition is entirely in verse, and the average word per line is eight words.⁵²

This means that a fair amount of collocation results would be between two lines, which would make the method less comprehensive due to a larger potential for missed parallels. The more words that lie between what is being searched for, the less likely that results will be similar to the conceptual or grammatical contexts within the third addition. Retaining the default of ten words floods the results with matches that have lengths longer than a majority of the lines in the addition. This would create a lot of inaccurate, irrelevant noise. Limiting searches for collocations to within five words produces more accurate results.

As demonstrated in the previous paragraph, LION and EEBO, while being great resources, have their faults. For example, Shakespeare is almost always favored in these tests because (1) his work has been studied more than any other playwright and (2) his canon is overrepresented. The latter is particularly certain within LION, which contains three or more versions of Shakespeare's work: quarto versions, their folio equivalents, and for some reason the mid nineteenth-century nine volume edition edited by William Aldis Wright (whose appearances within the database searches become time consuming

⁵² *The Spanish Tragedie* (1602), STC 15089. 369 words total words divided by 45 lines = 8.2 words per line. In this experiment, compounds are always counted as one word, not two, simply for the sake of consistency. There is no standardization for their usage in Early Modern English, so what constitutes a compound in the third addition is unclear compared to standards today.

to sort through, and thus, extremely annoying). Altogether the database houses 498 pieces of writing by Shakespeare in various forms. Compare this to LION’s archive of works by Thomas Heywood, whose canon is larger than Shakespeare’s but is presented in only 159 pieces: that is 32% representation compared to Shakespeare’s 100%. This is partly due to LION’s lack of non-dramatic text authored by Heywood, which EEBO mostly contains (though not that which has only survived in manuscript form). Additionally, EEBO contains 221 texts by Shakespeare and only 135 by Heywood, despite Heywood’s larger body of work.

Thus, in order to maintain fair interpretation of the results, it is necessary to note relative canon sizes. The larger the canon of a particular playwright, the more likely that playwright is advantaged, depending on the parameters of the tests being administered. Having a greater representation within databases might grant greater likelihood of appearing within results. The following calculations are taken from John Nance’s “*Shakespeare and the Painter’s Part*,” in which Nance separates word counts in terms of dramatic and non-dramatic works.⁵³

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Dramatic</u>	<u>Non-Dramatic</u>	<u>Total</u>
Dekker	324,892	330,952	658,861
Heywood	503,501	291, 847	795,328
Jonson	534,961	77,503	612,464
Shakespeare	740,207	44,488	784,695
Webster	131,890	13,959	145,789

⁵³ Nance, “Shakespeare and The Painter’s Part,” (forthcoming).

For a thorough explanation of what separates dramatic from non-dramatic, as well as the restrictions applied to works that are collaborative and whose exact authorial distribution remains to be determined, I offer Nance's direct explanation, which I have also followed in my experiment:

For the purposes of this study, the category of "drama" or "dramatic" includes all plays, pageants, masques, shows, tilts, and entertainments, etc. That category is applied here in the word counts and in the tests that follow. These word counts include only the collaborative portions of plays if they have been identified. If a play is acknowledged as or suspected of being collaborative but it currently lacks evidence to properly attribute shares, I have included the full counts of the play to each author. I have also included all works that scholars currently attribute to Heywood and Dekker despite the absence of empirical data to confirm or deny some of these attributions. I have included parallels for every author even if they appear in a play with contested or unverified authorship. In following Craig's word counts for Shakespeare, I have only counted parallels from plays included in his totals. For example, Craig counts the 1597 quarto of R2 (not FF), so I will only include unique parallels from the 1597 quarto. I only include one text of each play in Shakespeare's canon.⁵⁴

Referring to the above chart, Nance points out that "Heywood, not Shakespeare, has the largest total canon size, so we are more likely to get a false positive for Heywood than we are for Shakespeare," (ibid.). Theoretically this is true, but as was just discussed, Shakespeare is represented multiple times, and not all of Heywood's work appears in the databases. Strangely, this can make results of Shakespeare's inherently more accurate at the same time that his results are more likely to present false positives. Digital transmissions of text are never perfect, and the more copies a database holds of the same piece of writing, the more likely that errors of transmission will be rendered irrelevant. A

⁵⁴ Ibid.

consistently applied critical acuity is necessary to recognize a false positive or error of transmission when they appear within database results.

Since the addition was tested in two parts, the results and following analyses are interpreted in two parts. All searches in LION were limited to dramatic texts, while searches in EEBO cover all forms of print, including various literature like poetry, pamphlets, sermons, etc. The advantage to utilizing both databases is the ability to specifically target results within playwriting while then weighing those results with how rare or unique their usage was within the general time period. In this case, all searches were limited to the years 1576-1642, the opening of the first London purpose-built sole-function commercial theatre to the closing of the London theaters.

Only unique parallels found in LION are considered valid because they are the most reliable in determining authorship. This differs from the previous studies by Stevenson, Craig, Vickers, and Bruster, which all consider rare parallels in their analyses. A unique parallel means an n-gram or a collocation is used only one other time, while rare parallels are usages that occur less than five or ten times. Focusing on unique parallels has advantages. In Nance's words, "'Rare' and 'unique' are both philosophical and quantitative categories, but unique is arguably a more objective category because it signifies a remarkable and singular occurrence. Rarity is not singular or remarkable," (ibid.). Another advantage, as Taylor explains, is that "any play in the entire period should have an equal chance of generating multiple parallels, and therefore even a playwright with only a single surviving play could outscore a playwright with many

plays.”⁵⁵ Thus, searching only for unique parallels identifies precise linguistic matches and does not favor one author over another relative to the sizes of their canons.

Variant spelling functions were utilized in all searches in order to account for the wide variety of spellings used in the time period. Without standardized English, spelling was done phonetically, and some truly creative spellings resulted. Both LION and EEBO are fairly accurate in searching for multiple spellings, however there are a few cases where more than one search was needed to ensure comprehensive results. For example, the synonymous use of both “ay” and “I” to demonstrate an affirmative was common, therefore both spellings have to be searched because the databases do not consider their relation.

Also, spellings that are more unconventional sometimes need to be modified, such as searching for “foorth,” as printed, as well as its modern spelling, “forth.” The databases do not always recognize double letters as an alternative spelling when one letter is usually used. An additional complication involves contractions, such as within the phrase “you’r wide all” in segment one of the third addition. Both databases do not distinguish punctuation marks like apostrophes in their searches, so in this case it is then necessary to search for all other forms of the contraction found in early modern spelling: “you’re,” “youre,” “your,” “y’are,” “yare,” “y’ar,” “yar,” “you are,” “ye are,” etc.

The following transcripts for segment one and two present the addition’s original spelling and punctuation in Q4.

⁵⁵ Taylor, “Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?” (forthcoming).

First Segment⁵⁶

Tis neither as you thinke, nor as you thinke,
Nor as you thinke: you'r wide all:
These slippers are not mine, they were my sonne *Horatioes*,
My sonne, and what's a sonne?
A thing begot within a paire of minutes, there about:
A lumpe bred vp in darkenesse, and doth serue
To ballace these light creatures we call Women:
And at nine moneths ende, creepes forth to light.
What is there yet in a sonne?
To make a father dote, raue, or runne mad.
Being borne, it poutes, cryes, and breeds teeth.
What is there yet in a sonne? He must be fed,
Be thaught to goe, and speake I, or yet.
Why might not a man loue a Calfe as well?
Or melt in passion ore a frisking Kid,
As for a sonne, me thinkes a young Bacon,
Or a fine little smooth Horse-colt
Should moue a man, as much as doth a sonne.
For one of these in very little time,
Will grow to some good vse, where as a sonne,

⁵⁶ *The Spanish Tragedie* (1602), STC 15089.

The more he growes in stature and in yeeres,
The more vnsquard, vnbeuelled he appeares,

As mentioned, the results from this segment, listed below, are all unique parallels in drama in LION from 1576 to 1642. But to be helpful to the authorship question at hand, they have to meet certain criteria to be considered parallels. Parallels of exact strings were not considered if they included a break not present in the addition. For example, the trigram “sonne, | The more” from Thomas Middleton’s *No Wit/Help Like a Woman’s* would not have been considered a parallel if it did not also duplicate the grammatical break.

Collocation results were considered a parallel only if they had sequencing and grammatical breaks comparable to the third addition. Searching for collocations can be tricky with *Literature Online*, considering the database is not able to search for collocations and word strings at the same time—thus in any search for collocations involving more than two words, each word is considered individually, even if the intention was to search for a bigram plus a single word. This tended to foster inaccurate results that then had to be checked and filtered.

Compounds, such as “there about” and “me thinkes,” were first searched as two separate words and then as a single word. Since there was no standardization of their usage, it was necessary to look for both. Generally parallels cannot be between two speakers, but since this addition is entirely monologue that was not an issue in this experiment. Also, results have to be within dialogue. This means speech tags, stage directions, or any additional text other than dialogue cannot be searched or found within

parallels because these components of a playtext are not necessarily authorial. Proper nouns, such as character names, were also ignored. An asterisk before a result indicates that not only is the parallel unique in LION, but it is also unique in EEBO. An ellipsis between search words indicates that the result is from a search for collocations using the NEAR function, and any corresponding footnotes clarify the search words used if they vary from the Q4 text in bold. All composition dates correspond with Wiggins where available, either known or his “best guess,” which is then distinguished with the symbol “≈” before the date. This test generated twenty-nine parallels.

***you’r wide all]** James Shirley, *The Opportunity* (1634) “You are wide all”

***what’s a sonne]** Anon / William Smith, *The Palsgrave* (≈1613) “What is a sonne”

minutes, there] James Shirley, *The Example* (1634)

bred vp in darknesse] Philip Massinger, *The Duke of Milan* (≈1621) “bred vp in the darknesse”⁵⁷

***in darknesse...these light creatures]** John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida* (≈1599)

“these light creatures lue in darknesse”⁵⁸

and doth serue] William Davenant, *The Platonic Lovers* (1635)

forth to light] Thomas Lodge / Robert Greene, *A Looking-Glass for London and England* (≈1589) “forth to light”

⁵⁷ Found searching for “bred vp” NEAR “darknesse.”

⁵⁸ Found searching for “darknesse” NEAR “creatures.”

a some? | To make] Ben Jonson, *Catiline's Conspiracy* (1611) "a some, to make"

make a father...mad] Philip Massinger / Thomas Dekker, *The Virgin Martyr* (≈1620)

"this would make | A father mad"

raue, or] Thomas Killigrew, *Claricilla* (before 1641)

thaught to goe] Ben Jonson, *The Vision of Delight* (1616) "taught to go"

to goe, and speake] Thomas Campion, *Royal Entertainment at Caversham* (1613)

Why might not a] Anon / Thomas Heywood (?), *Swetnam the Woman-Hater* (1618-19)

man loue a] Thomas Nabbes, *The Bride* (1638)

***melt in passion]** Ben Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598)

***passion ore]** Thomas Heywood, *The Fair Maid of the West* (≈1610) "passion ore"

***passion ore a]** Ben Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598) "passion ouer a"

a frisking] John Fletcher, *The Island Princess* (1621)

Kid, | As] Anon / Thomas Dekker (?), *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (≈1603)

Should mooue a] Thomas Hughes, with contributions by others, *The Misfortunes of*

Arthur (1588)

some...little time] Thomas Kyd, *Suleiman and Perseda* (≈1588), "our some in law, |

Now there is little time"

in very little] Robert Davenport, *The City Night-Cap* (1624)

time, | Will grow] Ben Jonson, *Time Vindicated to Himself and to His Honours* (1622)

grow to some] Thomas Heywood / John Webster, *Appius and Virginia* (1625-6)

sonne, | The more] Thomas Middleton, *No Wit/Help Like a Woman's* (1611)

he growes in] Philip Massinger, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (1625)

in stature and] Thomas Dekker / John Ford, *The Welsh Ambassador* (1624)

and in yeeres] John Lyly, *Midas* (≈1589)

in yeeres, | The more] John Marston / John Webster, *The Malcontent* (≈1603)

Shakespeare is not at all linguistically present in this segment. This means the language is less like Shakespeare's than it is of the eighteen or so playwrights who share parallels with this passage. A few of the playwrights present can be ruled out with a quick search in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* (ODNB).⁵⁹ To start, James Shirley was not born until 1596, making him an impossible candidate for authorship of the third addition. He would have been six years old when Q4 was published in 1602. Possible collaborators would have had to be at least eighteen years old in 1602 to have been writing for professional theatre companies at the time the additions were written. Both of his parallels are then ruled out.

The same goes for Thomas Nabbes, born in 1604-5; William Davenant, born in 1606; and Thomas Killigrew, born in 1612. The parallel "foorth to light" from Lodge and Greene's *A Looking-Glass for London and England* can be dismissed, because both of its authors were not writing plays after 1592. Greene died in 1592, and Lodge is not credited with any theatre work after 1592, though their conceptual usage of "forth to light" is

⁵⁹ Dates throughout referring to the biography of authors correspond with their entries in the ODNB.

curiously matched to the third addition—both describe the act of giving birth. John Lyly is known to have stopped writing in 1590. And Thomas Kyd's parallel in *Suleiman and Perseda* can be ruled out, because we know Thomas Kyd died in 1594 and that he could not have written the later additions to his own play.⁶⁰

Other parallels were disregarded after further research. Thomas Campion's parallel to "to goe, and speake," is from his second publication, a masque, in 1613 (his first being in 1607). According to the ODNB, he was a poet and a musician working well after the authoring of the additions, one who did not write dramatic plays; he is therefore not a likely candidate for authorship. Robert Davenport's biography presents a similar situation. ODNB describes him as "One of the most obscure playwrights of the Caroline era," and he is only active from 1624 to 1640. No birthdate is known, but the fact that he did not write during the Elizabethan era or even the Jacobean era makes him another unlikely candidate.

The parallel to "Should mooue a" from *The Misfortunes of Arthur* is another dead end. Wiggins offers a long list of collaborators, but no other information about the play's authorship is known.⁶¹ Adding to that, the author of the third addition is someone who must have had a connection to professional theatre companies or else his involvement would not make historical sense. Along with Hughes's lack of involvement in professional theatre and his single authorship of an independent play intended for a non-commercial venue, the rest of his known biography does not reveal any evidence of theatre work for his parallel to be considered relative to the third addition.

⁶⁰ Wiggins #799. *Suleiman and Perseda* is attributed to Thomas Kyd.

⁶¹ Wiggins #797. "Thomas Hughes, with contributions by Nicholas Trotte, Francis Flower, Christopher Yelverton, Francis Bacon, John Lancaster, and others, revised by William Fulbecke." Thomas Hughes himself never wrote another play, though ODNB credits him as chief author of *Misfortunes*.

Lastly, “what’s a sonne,” the parallel to *The Palsgrave* unearthed an interesting authorship question. According to Wiggins, “The play was published as the work of ‘W. Smith’ and has alternatively been ascribed to Wentworth Smith, whose claim rests solely on the fact of his being a known dramatist.”⁶² Being a known dramatist is nowhere near acceptable evidence for authorship attribution. If it were, Wentworth Smith might be a potential candidate, seeing as how he wrote collaboratively for Admiral’s Men from April 1601 to November 1602. As for Wiggins’s suggested attribution to William Smith:

There is no contemporary external evidence for William Smith (c. 1550-1618) as a playwright, only Warburton’s late ascription of *Saint George for England* to ‘Will. Smith’, but there are a number of striking coincidences: he had lived in Germany in the 1580s and wrote several topographical works about the country; his other works include literary as well as heraldic writings; he had City of London connections which are congruent with the performance of the play, the dedication of the published edition, and what the author of his previous play-writing career; and he seems to have known Augustine Phillips and Thomas Pope, members of the company which performed ‘W. Smith’s’ earlier play, *The Freeman’s Honour*. He was, however, an old man in his 60s by the time the play was written.⁶³

Despite the age he would have been if and when he wrote *The Palsgrave*, ODNB agrees that William Smith is the most likely author. However any relation to the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* seems impossible. Between 1594 and 1597 he wrote a few known pieces of scholarly work, and by 1595 he was actively campaigning for a position in the College of Arms. He was “prolific in his first years as a herald, transcribing and supplementing several visitations and compiling many heraldic works of his own.”⁶⁴ Outside of his busy schedule and the existence of *The Palsgrave* itself, there is no record of him working as a professional playwright, though he does have one known connection

⁶² Wiggins #1707.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ ODNB.

to the King's Men, who staged *The Palsgrave*: "his 'Brieff discourse' in 1605 mentions two members of that company, Augustine Phillips and Thomas Pope."⁶⁵ So William Smith might have written *The Palsgrave*, and he did have connections to the King's Men, but a possible relation to the composition of the additions is missing.

After narrowing down the results, seventeen parallels remain.

bred vp in darknesse] Philip Massinger, *The Duke of Milan* (≈1621) "bred vp in the darknesse"

***in darknesse...these light creatures**] John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida* (≈1599)

"these light creatures lie in darknesse"⁶⁶

a sonne? | To make] Ben Jonson, *Catiline's Conspiracy* (1611) "a sonne, to make"

make a father...mad] Philip Massinger / [Thomas Dekker], *The Virgin Martyr* (≈1620)

"this would make | A father mad"⁶⁷

taught to goe] Ben Jonson, *The Vision of Delight* (1616) "taught to go"

Why might not a] Anon / Thomas Heywood (?), *Swetnam the Woman-Hater* (1618-19)⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ The sequence is switched here, but this is an interesting double parallel to the third addition within one line. However, there are an abundance of parallels that involve "in darknesse," which is clearly a popular phrase, while "these light creatures" as a trigram is an entirely unique usage.

⁶⁷ Fredson Bowers, *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-1961), vol. 3, 369. This quote is found at 1.1.366-7. Fredson Bowers found Dekker's hand in Act 2, 3.3, 4.2, and 5.1, and Massinger's in Act 1, 3.1, 3.2, and 5.2, with 4.1 and 4.3 uncertain. Further, Bowers states that 1.1 is one of "Massinger's undoubted scenes." This parallel is therefore attributed to Massinger.

⁶⁸ Terence P. Logan and Denzell S. Smith, *The Later Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists: A Survey and Bibliography of Recent Studies in English Renaissance*, ed. Terence P. Logan and Denzell S. Smith (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 212. Thomas Heywood is regarded as the best candidate for *Swetnam*'s authorship: "the language, dialogue, and clownery are all typical of Heywood's style."

***melt in passion]** Ben Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598)

***passion ore]** Thomas Heywood, *The Fair Maid of the West* (≈1610) “passion ore”

***passion ore a]** Ben Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598) “passion ouer a”

a frisking] John Fletcher, *The Island Princess* (1621)

Kid, | As] Anon / Thomas Dekker (?), *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (≈1603)⁶⁹

time, | Will grow] Ben Jonson, *Time Vindicated to Himself and to His Honours* (1622)

grow to some] Thomas Heywood / John Webster, *Appius and Virginia* (1625-6)⁷⁰

sonne, | The more] Thomas Middleton / James Shirley, *No Wit/Help Like a Woman's*
(1611)⁷¹

he growes in] Philip Massinger, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (1625)

in stature and] Thomas Dekker / John Ford, *The Welsh Ambassador* (1624)⁷²

⁶⁹ Wiggins #1392. “Abrams ascribes the play to Thomas Dekker on evidence which is abundant but not conclusive.”

⁷⁰ Macdonald P. Jackson, “John Webster and Thomas Heywood in *Appius and Virginia*: A Bibliographical Approach to the Problem of Authorship,” *Studies in Bibliography* 38 (1985), 231. This parallel is found at 1.3.139. According to Jackson, “substantial evidence of Webster’s hand is found in 2.2, 3.2, and 4.1, and less persuasive evidence in 1.2, 2.3, 3.3, 4.2, 5.1, and the very end of 5.2... typical of Heywood’s latinate diction: 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2... It cannot be coincidental that Heywood’s diction is prevalent in portions of the text free from Webster’s linguistic traces.” This parallel is therefore attributed to Heywood.

⁷¹ Thomas Middleton, *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), vol.2, 1150. This parallel is found at Sc. 8.172-3. James Shirley revived *No Wit/Help Like a Woman's* with a new prologue in 1638. Being from the main part of the play, which Middleton wrote alone, this is attributed to Middleton.

⁷² Bowers, *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, vol. 4, 303; David J. Lake, *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problems of Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 229. This parallel is found at 5.2.22-3. Bowers states that “The source of the attribution to Dekker in Hill’s list is unknown, but as Bertram Lloyd has shown it was certainly a sound one.” He mentions no suspicion of a collaborator. However, as Lake points out, Bowers fails to mention that Lloyd, based on internal evidence, had attributed the whole play to Dekker *except 3.3 and 5.1*, which he attributed to Ford. This parallel is therefore attributed to Dekker.

in yeeres, | **The more**] John Marston / John Webster, *The Malcontent* (≈1603)⁷³

The remaining authors are around the right age to have collaborated on the additions, and they all wrote for professional theatre companies. Philip Massinger, who appears three times on this list, was born in 1583, and was possibly old enough to have contributed. Nance states that Massinger, being between 14 and 17 years old at the time of the writing of the additions, could not have written them because there is no record of anyone writing for the playhouses who was younger than 18.⁷⁴ However, that would place his timeframe for composition from 1597 to 1600, and this experiment is considering any authors 18 or older at the time of publication, 1602. I would rather not limit the possibility considering Massinger was at least 19 in 1602.

Either way, it seems he began working as a playwright a little after the time of the additions. According to ODNB, he went to Oxford in 1601 or 1602 and stayed there for one to four years. Nothing else is known about him until (probably) 1613 when from prison he requested a 5 pound payment from Henslowe for a play that he, Nathan Field, and Robert Daborne had written. Records show that it is after this point in his life that he began writing collaborative drama, however since he was old enough in 1602 and his whereabouts before going to Oxford are unknown, he cannot be ruled out and is theoretically a possible candidate.

⁷³ Wiggins #1391; Marston, John, *The Malcontent*, ed. W. David Kay (London: Bloomsbury New Mermaids, 2014), xvi. This parallel is found within 2.4. *The Malcontent* was revised by Webster, who added two new scenes, 1.8 and 5.1, and, according to Kay, eleven new passages (all within Acts 1 and 5). Webster does not appear to have revised Act 2, therefore this is attributed to Marston.

⁷⁴ Nance, "Shakespeare and The Painter's Part," (forthcoming).

Like Massinger, John Fletcher and Thomas Middleton theoretically cannot be dismissed from being potential collaborators. Nothing is known about Fletcher in the years 1598-1606. His first known plays were for the Children of the Queen's Revels, starting with his collaboration with Beaumont on *The Woman Hater* in 1606.⁷⁵ Having no known record writing before 1606, he is unlikely to have written any of the additions. However, he was twenty-three years old in 1602 and cannot be biographically ruled out. Middleton's situation is similar. He was at Oxford between 1598 and 1600, in London by February 1601, and writing for the Admiral's Men by May 1602. Being twenty-two years old in 1602, there is no reason he could not have been involved with the additions other than the suspicion that they were written before their publication year.

Of John Marston, ODNB states that "It is possible that [his] dramatic career began as early as 1598, though the auspices, exact date, and even the title, remain unknown. By September 1599 his literary fame was sufficient for Henslowe to employ him as a jobbing writer for the public stage although most of his earlier work was written for the Paul's Boys, one of the new 'private' children's companies." Interestingly, one of Marston's two parallels comes from *Antonio and Mellida*, a play that also imitates the fourth addition, the Painter's Scene. Scholars have used this imitation to propose that Marston's play, written around 1599, was produced after the writing of the additions. However no one has mentioned the unique parallel to the third addition found here with "these light creatures." Marston seems to be in the right place and time, and his work can be connected to the additions in more than one way, though with *Antonio and Mellida* it is

⁷⁵ Wiggins #1522.

possible that he was simply imitating the freshly authored additions that would not see print for three more years.

Thomas Dekker, a known collaborator on the additions to *Sir Thomas More* and an active playwright from 1594 to 1602 and afterward, very well could have worked on the additions. However, like John Marston, his name appears only twice on the list of parallels. Tests by Nance and Taylor have shown that two unique parallels in a passage of this length are not reliable evidence. What is important is that three authors appear more than twice on the list: Ben Jonson has five parallels, Thomas Heywood has three parallels, and Philip Massinger also has three parallels.

Jonson's parallels are quite straightforward: four exact trigrams and one quadgram. The quadgram, "a sonne, to make" from *Catiline's Conspiracy*, is the only result that slightly differs from the third addition in that the grammatical break is different: a comma is used instead of a question mark. However, with close examination of the third addition, the question mark stands out as unnecessary as it appears in the middle of a complete sentence and thought. Modern editions remove the mark, thus connecting both lines in one sentence, as it grammatically and contextually makes the most sense. With the mark's removal, the parallel is almost exact. I therefore accept the parallel considering Jonson's unique and compellingly similar usage.

Heywood is represented by three exact n-grams: one bigram, "passion ore," one trigram, "grow to some," and one quadgram, "Why might not a."⁷⁶ They are exact and

⁷⁶ A LION or EEBO search for "passion ore" will also produce one single parallel to *Sir Thomas More*, but this hit turned out to be an error of transcription. A reading of the raw Malone Society Reprint (Anthony Munday, *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, edited by W. W. Greg, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911)) transcript shows "take com passion ouer." Gabrieli and Melchiori, in their 1990 Revels edition, discuss how this particular passage, a bill read by the character Lincoln, is in fact "verbatim from the 1587 edn of Holinshed (App. A, p. 230), which differs in minor points and in spelling and punctuation" (Anthony Munday and others, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori,

carry no questions. However, what remains questionable are the parameters of the Heywood canon. Heywood's collected works have been much less explored than other authors, like Shakespeare, Middleton, or Fletcher, hence we know less about his particular style. A few of Heywood's parallels come from texts that he might have not written solo, or at all, but at this point exact authorship cannot be confirmed. If we ruled out parallels from plays like *Swetnam the Woman-Hater*, or *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* and *Thorney Abbey* (both appear within the results of segment two), which are either attributed to Heywood or known to be a Heywood collaboration, we would reduce our ability to identify Heywood by greatly limiting the size of his canon. Therefore, until more research is completed, these results reflect what scholars currently believe to be true about Heywood's body of work.

A search for "creatures" NEAR "call Women" resulted in a unique parallel in EEBO, but a rare parallel in LION, that should be mentioned. The third addition's "creatures we call Women" bears striking resemblance to "these Creatures, women I dare not call 'em?" from Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome's *The Late Lancashire Witches*, or *The Witches of Lancashire* (1634). The authorial distribution of *The Late Lancashire Witches* has not been thoroughly explored, but Heather Hirschfeld believes the two playwrights shared an "equal commitment" to the writing of their collaborations,

The Revels Plays (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 66, and in recognizing this as so, alters the play's manuscript's "com passion" to "compassion." Jowett, in his 2011 Arden edition, also adds "com" to "passion," while noting separately that "ouer" bears the same meaning as "on," and that "The idiom is very unusual. An error of transcription based on 'on' misread as 'ou' is possible" (Anthony Munday and Henry Chettle, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. John Jowett (London: Methuen, The Arden Shakespeare, 2011), 147. Jowett must be referring to the transcription of Holinshed, not *Sir Thomas More*, since Appendix A of the Revels edition reprints Holinshed's direct passage, which reads "take compassion ouer" (230). Considering "compassion" is meant, not "passion," and that "ouer" may have been meant to be "on," the evidence no longer supports what at first glance seems to be a connection between *Sir Thomas More* and *Spanish Tragedy*. However, Heywood and Jonson's usage of this rare idiom strengthens their claim to authorship.

which include the lost plays *The Life and Death of Sir Martin Stink* and *The Apprentice's Prize*, both mentioned in The Stationers' Register and both believed to have been written in 1634—the same year as *The Late Lancashire Witches*.⁷⁷ Like many other collaborations “across generations,” Heywood would have worked as lead playwright, having had thirty years of experience beyond Brome's.⁷⁸

The only other parallel for “creatures we call Women” in LION is from Abraham Cowley's *The Guardian* (1642), “and women, or (as they call ‘um) creatures.” This is not to be confused with Massinger's *The Guardian* (1633), as some in the past have done. According to ODNB, Cowley, born in 1618, wrote his play at Cambridge at the age of 24, residing at the college from 1636 until 1643, when he moved to Oxford. His imitation could have been inspired by either the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* or the phrase's usage in *The Late Lancashire Witches*. In any case, Heywood and Brome's significant collocation cannot be counted in this experiment because of Cowley's similar usage.

Additionally, a search for “stature” NEAR “yeeres” identified three collocations by Heywood that closely resemble the third addition's “stature and in yeeres.”⁷⁹ However these results, like that of *The Late Lancashire Witches*, being rare parallels and not unique, cannot be considered in the final count of this experiment. Though not a rare pairing of words on their own terms (in the general time period, EEBO holds 121 records when searching “stature” NEAR “yeeres” between 1576 and 1642), Heywood's usage of

⁷⁷ Heather Hirschfeld, “Collaborating across Generations: Thomas Heywood, Richard Brome, and the Production of *The Late Lancashire Witches*,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30, no. 2 (2000): 350.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 342.

⁷⁹ *The Four Prentices of London* (≈1602) “his stature, yeares, and all”; *The Fair Maid of the West* (≈1610) “Of what stature and yeares was he”; *Love's Mistress / The Queen's Masque* (1634) “her stature and yeers.”

“stature” with “yeeres” becomes a unique characteristic considering he is the only known playwright of the period to use both words together, paired in three different plays whose solo authorship has not been disputed, and in the same sequence each time as they appear in the third addition.

As mentioned, Massinger cannot be ruled out as a possible candidate, but he is biographically unlikely, and we have already established that more than one unique parallel may be random (as is clearly the case with James Shirley). However, Jonson’s parallels dominate the results. The issues surrounding Jonson’s supposed authorship of the additions have been surveyed, but without the evidentiary proof that this experiment yields. With five unique parallels, Jonson is the most likely to have written the first 185 words of the third addition, with Heywood and Massinger remaining possible candidates.

This supports Anne Barton’s opinion that Jonson did in fact write additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. It is possible that Jonson’s additions were not lost or replaced, but commissioned for revision by another hand. As she explains, Jonson’s original additions were either not up to par with the theatre company’s expectations or Jonson took too long to write them. In either case what Jonson solely produced did not make the final cut, and most likely other writers were sought out.

Setting these results aside, the second segment of 185 words was tested in like fashion. However, before interpreting the results, it is important to mention the shift in language, tone, and style within the addition. The first segment does not use much creative language, but instead relies heavily upon repetition, as well as static theme and emotion, in its representation of madness. The dialogue seems stuck in a circular pattern, reiterating the definition of a son over and over with various comparisons to images

mostly unrelated to the play itself (the birth to balance or ballast women, to drive a father mad, to be taught, to be just as important as a calf/kid/bacon/horse-colt).

However, the second segment moves through metaphors, represents a wider use of language, and develops from one emotion into the next. It correlates the character of Horatio with events actually related to the world of the play: Horatio, being so important that he was the center of his parents' household, hated only by murderers, and young and valiant in his unhorsing of Prince Balthazar, which all seem to be true things, not imagined abstractions. What ends the second segment is Hieronimo's vision of hell's torments upon Horatio's murderers, and at the end of the play, Revenge itself sends them "down to deepest hell | Where none but Furies, bugs and tortures dwell" (4.5.27-8). The clear shift in aesthetic can be the sign of a change in authorship, whether intentional or as part of a revision.

As Gary Taylor specifies in his experiment of the first addition, we should not assume the author of one portion of the text was also the author of the remainder.⁸⁰ This bears truer still when we consider the division within verse, the clear change in language, tone, and style where authorship might have changed. The addition reads suddenly smoother, more mature, and it begins to make movements toward character development. Further, the second segment's language develops distinctly apart from that of the first segment, which hints that a change of authorship may have occurred in mid-conversation. Douglas Bruster, whose work with spelling preferences was previously discussed, believes Shakespeare to have written the third addition.⁸¹ What is compelling about his claim is that he begins his personal reading of the passage at the point in the addition

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Bruster, "Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting," 421.

where the language changes (partitioned here), beginning with “O but my *Horatio*.”⁸²

The metrical irregularity of the line previous to this is probably not coincidental and only further emphasizes the shift in aesthetic.

⁸² Douglas Bruster, “Douglas Bruster Identifies New Shakespeare Prose” (YouTube, The University of Texas at Austin, 13 Aug 2013), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ad2ik_3-Qxs.

Second Segment⁸³

Recons his parents among the rancke of fooles,
Strikes care vpon their heads with his mad ryots,
Makes them looke olde, before they meet with age:
This is a sonne: And what a losse were this, considered truly.

O but my *Horatio*, grew out of reach of these
Insatiate humours: He loued his louing parents,
He was my comfort, and his mothers ioy,
The very arme that did holde vp our house,
Our hopes were stored vp in him.
None but a damned murderer could hate him:
He had not seene the backe of nineteene yeere,
When his strong arme vnhorst the proud Prince *Balthazar*,
And his great minde too full of Honour,
Tooke him vs to mercy, that valiant, but ignoble Portingale.
Well, heauen is heauen still,
And there is *Nemesis* and Furies,
And things called whippes,
And they sometimes doe meete with murderers,
They doe not alwayes scape, that's some comfort.

⁸³ *The Spanish Tragedie* (1602), STC 15089.

I, I, I, and then time steales on: and steales, and steales

Till violence leapes forth like thunder

Wrapt in a ball of fire,

And so doth bring confusion to them all.

The search process for segment two involved implementing the same requirements for what constitutes a valid parallel as demonstrated in segment one. This sample generated twenty-eight parallels.

among the rancke of] John Fletcher, *A Wife for a Month* (1624)

care vpon their] George Whetstone, *2 Promos and Cassandra* (≈1577)

their heads with his] Anon, *Club Law* (≈1600)⁸⁴

with his mad] Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors* (≈1592)

Makes them looke] Thomas Heywood, *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* (≈1601)

olde, before they] Nathan Field / John Fletcher / Philip Massinger, *The Honest Man's Fortune* (1613)

before they meet] Richard Brome, *The Lovesick Court* (1638)

⁸⁴ Siobhan Keenan, *Renaissance Literature* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 74-5. *Club Law* is an anonymous Cambridge University play. University plays were normally performed in schoolrooms, halls, or on makeshift stages elsewhere on campus. Such student productions were not related to London's playhouses, and their authors are usually unknown.

this, considered truly] Thomas Heywood, *A Maidenhead Well Lost* (1634) “this is a
hard case being truly considered”⁸⁵

and his mothers] George Peele, *The Love of King David and Fair Bathsheba* (≈1590)

mothers ioy] John Fletcher / Shakespeare, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (≈1613)

arme that did] Lodowick Carlell, *Arviragus and Philicia* (1639)

vp our house] Richard Brome, *The Sparagus Garden* (1635)

were stored] George Wilkins / Shakespeare, *Pericles* (≈1607)

stored vp in] James Shirley, *The Politician* (≈1639)

damm'd murderer] Anon / Thomas Heywood (?), *Thorney Abbey* (≈1615)

could hate him] Thomas Killigrew, *The Princess* (1636-8)

nineteene yeere] Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* (1614)

strong arme vnhorst] Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age* (≈1613)

strong arme...Prince...great] Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age* (≈1613) “Although the
great Prince of the Mirmidons, | And arme-strong Aiax”⁸⁶

heauen is heauen] Thomas Lodge / Robert Greene, *The Tragical Reign of Selimus*
(≈1591)

⁸⁵ Found searching for “considered” NEAR “truly.”

⁸⁶ Found searching for “strong arme” NEAR “Prince.”

Nemesis and] John Mason, *The Turk* (≈1607)

they sometimes doe] James Shirley, *The Politician* (≈1639)

meete with...scape] Thomas Middleton, *More Dissemblers Besides Women* (≈1614)

“You meet with mercy, and you scape with that”

***scape...some comfort]** Thomas Middleton, *A Mad World, My Masters* (≈1605)

“There’s some comfort in that yet, she may scape it”

I, I, I, and] Thomas Dekker, *The Gentle Craft / The Shoemakers’ Holiday* (1599)

violence...Wrapt in] John Fletcher, *The Island Princess*, (1621) “Comes your love

wrapt in violence to seeke us?”

in a ball of] Anon, *A Larum for London*, (≈1602)

a ball of fire] Anon, *Nebuchadnezzar’s fierie furnace*, (???)

A further process of elimination akin to that applied in segment one was applied here. This disqualified nine parallels whose author was not alive in 1602 or those whose known biography makes them impossible candidates for authorship.⁸⁷ Below are the nineteen parallels that remain.

⁸⁷ **care vpon their]** George Whetstone, *2 Promos and Cassandra* (≈1577), died in 1587; **their heads with his]** Anon, *Club Law* (≈1600), an anonymous Cambridge University play; **olde, before they]** Nathan Field / John Fletcher / Philip Massinger, *The Honest Man’s Fortune* (1613), from 2.4.106, which Wiggins attributes to Nathan Field (Wiggins #1719), who was only fifteen years old in 1602; **and his mothers]** George Peele, *The Love of King David and Fair Bathsheba* (≈1590), died in 1596; **arme that did]** Lodowick Carlell, *Arviragus and Philicia* (1639), born in 1601; **stored vp in]** James Shirley, *The Politician* (≈1639), born in 1596; **could hate him]** Thomas Killigrew, *The Princess* (1636-8), born in 1612; **heauen is heauen]** Thomas Lodge / Robert Greene, *The Tragical Reign of Selimus* (≈1591), like in segment one’s parallel from *A Looking-Glass for London and England*, which Lodge and Greene also co-wrote, neither

among the rancke of] John Fletcher, *A Wife for a Month* (1624)

with his mad] Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors* (≈1592)

Makes them looke] Thomas Heywood, *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* (≈1601)⁸⁸

before they meet] Richard Brome, *The Lovesick Court* (1638)

this, considered truly] Thomas Heywood, *A Maidenhead Well Lost* (1634) “this is a hard case being truly considered”

mothers ioy] John Fletcher / Shakespeare, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (≈1613)⁸⁹

vp our house] Richard Brome, *The Sparagus Garden* (1635)

were stored] George Wilkins / Shakespeare, *Pericles* (≈1607)⁹⁰

damned murderer] Anon / Thomas Heywood (?), *Thorney Abbey* (≈1615)⁹¹

nineteene yeere] Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* (1614)

strong arme vnhorst] Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age* (≈1613)

author was writing for the theatre after 1592; **they sometimes doe]** James Shirley, *The Politician* (≈1639), born in 1596.

⁸⁸ Wiggins #1303. *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* is attributed to Thomas Heywood.

⁸⁹ Wiggins #1724. This parallel is at 4.2.63. “Fletcher: 2.1b-5, 3.3-6, 4.1-3, 5.1a, 5.2; Shakespeare: 1.1-5, 2.1a, 3.1-2, 5.1b, 5.3-4.” 4.2 is a Fletcherian scene.

⁹⁰ Wiggins #1555. This parallel is at Sc. 4.28. Wilkins is considered to have written scenes 1-10, and Shakespeare scenes 11-21, with possible Wilkins involvement in scenes 18 and 19. This is therefore attributed to Wilkins.

⁹¹ Wiggins #1776. “Baillie makes a case for William Rowley, but himself acknowledges it is not a strong one.” Wiggins then makes a claim for Heywood’s authorship on account of “a trace of Latinity” in the character Lobster, akin to Heywood’s typical clowns, as well as “the use of a chorus and dumb shows to mark the passage of time,” and other “striking parallels of diction with Heywood’s work.”

strong arme...Prince...great] Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age* (≈1613) “Although the
great Prince of the Mirmidons, | And arme-strong Aiax”

Nemesis and] John Mason, *The Turk* (≈1607)

meete with...scape] Thomas Middleton, *More Dissemblers Besides Women* (≈1614)

“You meet with mercy, and you scape with that”

***scape...some comfort]** Thomas Middleton, *A Mad World, My Masters* (≈1605)

“There’s some comfort in that yet, she may scape it”

I, I, I, and] Thomas Dekker, *The Gentle Craft / The Shoemakers’ Holiday* (1599)

violence...Wrapt in] John Fletcher, *The Island Princess*, (1621) “Comes your love

wrapt in violence to seeke us?”

in a ball of] Anon, *A Larum for London*, (≈1602)

a ball of fire] Anon, *Nebuchadnezzar’s fierie furnace*, (???)

As discussed in segment one, authors who have more than one unique parallel are most important to consider. In this case, Thomas Heywood has five parallels, John Fletcher has three parallels, and both Richard Brome and Thomas Middleton have two. Represented by only a single unique hit, Ben Jonson is not likely to have written the second half of the third addition, while Thomas Heywood’s likelihood strengthens.

Shakespeare, appearing for the first time in this experiment, is also represented with a sole parallel, and therefore not a likely candidate for authorship.⁹²

John Fletcher and Thomas Middleton were discussed in segment one and cannot biographically be ruled out. Neither can Richard Brome, whose conjectured birthdate of 1590 makes him twelve years old in 1602, though according to ODNB he could have been born significantly earlier. His first historical record is in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, 1614. Not much else is known about him other than he possibly worked for Jonson, but in the 1620s he worked with Jonson, Chapman, and Dekker before he moved into playwriting on his own. His theatre work is well past the composition of the additions, making his potential authorship not very likely.

Heywood's five parallels are one exact bigram, "damned murderer," two exact trigrams, "Makes them looke" and "strong arme vnhorst," and two collocations. One collocation from *A Maidenhead Well Lost*, "this is a hard case being truly considered" echoes the third addition's "this, considered truly." The other collocation from *The Iron Age*, "Although the great Prince of the Mirmidons, | And arme-strong Aiax" is similar to the third addition's "strong arme vnhorst the proud Prince *Balthazar* | And his great." Both of these collocations switch the sequence of words, but their commonalities are striking. Heywood uses "strong arme" and "arme-strong" in *The Iron Age*, both of which

⁹² There are two additional unique hits worth mentioning that are related to a Shakespearean play, *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster (2 Henry VI)* (≈1591), that cannot be used in this authorship question:

great...too full] "great Affaires, | Too full of foolish pittie" (3.1.224-5)

***And things called whippes]** (2.1.141)

These results are unfortunately not from the Folio version of *2 Henry VI*, but from the bad quarto, which has not been proven to be authoritative. This means the published text could be a pirated copy, or put together by memorial reconstruction, or assembled some other way, usually through means that derive from performance. Either way, bad quartos lack a link to the author's original manuscript, and various corruptions are undoubtedly found within. Therefore these parallels must be dismissed for the time being.

share connotations with one another and with the third addition: the act of a ‘strong arm’d’ hero juxtaposed with a “great Prince” (third addition and collocation), the strong arm unhorsing (third addition and tri-gram), and both Heywood parallels being found within the same play.

Part 3: Conclusion

As in the first segment, Heywood is present within the results of the second segment, though much more so. The largest change of parallels between both segments is Jonson's disappearance from and Heywood's stronger emergence within the text. This could be explained by considering how Jonson's original additions might have been revised. Both Shakespeare and Heywood could have been commissioned to add to or revise that which Jonson produced: Heywood collaborating on the first and third additions, and Shakespeare stepping in to write the fourth.

Both Heywood and Jonson's biographies are compatible with the authorship of the additions. Heywood is recorded working with Henslowe beginning in October 1596, and Jonson in August 1598. Many of their projects around this time were collaborative. Both playwrights also worked as actors, which was common in Renaissance theatre. Jonson worked with a traveling troupe, though Heywood's acting history can only be speculated.

For certain is Jonson's dominating presence in the first half of the addition and Heywood's equally compelling dominance in the second half. Jonson almost does not appear at all in the second half. He also carries little to no presence within Taylor and Nance's studies of the first and fourth additions. And while Shakespeare is most likely to have written the fourth addition, he is not at all present in the first addition, and is only represented by a single parallel in the third.

Thomas Dekker and John Webster, the two other authors most often proposed as candidates for authorship (though the cases for both are purely conjectural), are not

present enough to be likely collaborators. Dekker, along with Marston, Middleton, and Brome, have only two parallels with the addition, while Webster is responsible for none of the parallels in either segment that belong to plays on which he collaborated. Since two parallels can be strictly coincidental, not enough weight supports these playwrights' claims to authorship. More so than these four, worth keeping in mind are John Fletcher's four unique parallels and Philip Massinger's three unique parallels between both segments.

Gary Taylor states that "any reliable attribution must be based on multiple kinds of evidence, independently investigated."⁹³ That being said, what might benefit this study further is an EEBO experiment that specifically compares n-gram parallels between the third addition and the canons of Jonson and Heywood, the two most likely candidates for authorship, to more solidly determine their likelihood of authorship. Shakespeare could also be included, due to the scholarly enthusiasm to attach him to all five of the additions. Additionally, an independent investigation of the fifth addition that applies Taylor's methodology would be useful in determining its likely author.

For the third addition as a whole, Heywood has eight unique parallels and Jonson has six, despite the fact that Jonson's dramatic canon is 31,460 words longer than Heywood's. If the third addition was written by one playwright, that playwright would seem to be Thomas Heywood—who was certainly not Shakespeare.

⁹³ Taylor, "Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?" (forthcoming).

Bibliography

- Altick, Richard D. *The Scholar Adventures*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Barton, Anne. *Ben Jonson, Dramatist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Bate, Jonathan and Eric Rasmussen. Introduction to "The Spanish Tragedy (with Additions)." In *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, 207-11. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Blamires, Adrian. "Ben Jonson's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* as the Subject of Ridicule." *Notes and Queries* 61, no. 2 (2014): 265-8.
- Boas, Frederick S. *The Works of Thomas Kyd*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1901; rev. edn. 1955.
- Bowers, Fredson. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, edited by Fredson Bowers, vols. 1-10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966-1996.
- . *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers, vols. 1-5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-1961.
- Bruster, Douglas. "Douglas Bruster Identifies New Shakespeare Prose." YouTube, The University of Texas at Austin, 13 Aug 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ad2ik_3-Qxs.
- . "Shakespearean Spellings and Handwriting in the Additional Passages Printed in the 1602 *Spanish Tragedy*." *Notes and Queries* 60, no. 3 (2013): 420-4.
- Calvo, Clara and Jesús Tronch. Introduction and Appendix 1 to *The Spanish Tragedy*, edited by Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013.
- Calvo, Clara. "Thomas Kyd and the Elizabethan blockbuster: *The Spanish Tragedy*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, edited by Ton Hoenselaars, 19-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Cannon, Charles K. "The Relation of the Additions of *The Spanish Tragedy* To the Original Play." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 2, no. 2 (1962): 229-39.
- Craig, Hugh. "Authorial Styles and the Frequencies of Very Common Words: Jonson, Shakespeare, and the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Style* 26, no. 2 (1992): 199-220.

- . “Shakespeare and Three Sets of Additions.” Forthcoming in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.
- . “The 1602 Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*.” In *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, edited by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney, 162-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . “The three parts of *Henry VI*.” In *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, edited by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney, 40-77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Craig, Hugh and Arthur F. Kinney. *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, edited by Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Dawson, Anthony B. “Madness and Meaning: *The Spanish Tragedy*.” *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 2 (1987): 53-67.
- Day, John. *The knave in grain*, edited by R. C. Bald. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- “Early English Books Online (EEBO).” *eebo.chadwyck.com*. Last modified August 2015.
- Edwards, Philip. *Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1966.
- Erne, Lucas. *Beyond The Spanish Tragedy: A Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Freeman, Arthur. “The Printing of *The Spanish tragedy*.” *Library*, 5th series, 24, no. 3 (1969): 187-99.
- . *Thomas Kyd: Facts and Problems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe’s Diary*, edited by R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Hillman, Richard. “Botching the Soliloquies in *The Spanish Tragedy*: Revisionist Collaboration and the 1602 Additions.” *Elizabethan Theatre* 15, no. 1 (2002): 111-29.
- . “Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker. 566-83. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hirschfeld, Heather. “Collaborating across Generations: Thomas Heywood, Richard

- Brome, and the Production of The Late Lancashire Witches.” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30, no. 2 (2000): 339-74.
- . “‘For the Author’s Credit’: Issues of Authorship in English Renaissance Drama.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*, edited by Richard Dutton. 441-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hoy, Cyrus. “The Shares of Fletcher and His Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (IV).” *Studies in Bibliography* 12 (1959): 91–116.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. “John Webster and Thomas Heywood in *Appius and Virginia*: A Bibliographical Approach to the Problem of Authorship.” *Studies in Bibliography* 38 (1985): 217-235.
- Jonson, Ben. *Ben Jonson*, edited by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, vols. 1-11. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925-1952.
- Keenan, Siobhan. *Renaissance Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Knutson, Roslyn L. “Influence of the Repertory System on the Revival and Revision of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Dr. Faustus*.” *English Literary Renaissance* 18, no. 2 (1988): 257-74.
- Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*, edited by Clara Calvo and Jesús Tronch. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013.
- Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy: Authoritative Text, Sources and Contexts, Criticism*, edited by Michael Neill. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- Lake, David J. *The Canon of Thomas Middleton’s Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problems of Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Levin, Harry. “An Echo from *The Spanish Tragedy*.” *Modern Language Notes* 64, no. 5 (1949): 297-302.
- Lidh, Todd M. “‘To know the author were some ease of grief’: Ben Jonson’s Lost Play.” *The Ben Jonson Journal* xvii (2010), 60-75.
- “Literature Online (LION).” *literature.proquest.com*. Last modified May 2016.
- Logan, Terence P., and Denzell S. Smith. *The Later Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists: A Survey and Bibliography of Recent Studies in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by Terence P. Logan and Denzell S. Smith. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Marston, John. *The Malcontent*, edited by W. David Kay. London: Bloomsbury New

- Mermaids, 2014.
- Middleton, Thomas. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Munday, Anthony. *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, edited by W. W. Greg. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911; 1961.
- Munday, Anthony and Henry Chettle. *Sir Thomas More*, edited by John Jowett. London: Methuen, The Arden Shakespeare, 2011.
- Munday, Anthony and others. *Sir Thomas More*, edited by Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori. The Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Murray, Peter B. *Thomas Kyd*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.
- Nance, John V. "From Shakespeare 'To y^e Q.'" (forthcoming)
- . "Shakespeare and The Painter's Part." Forthcoming in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.
- . "'We, John Cade': Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the authorship of 4.2.33-189 2 *Henry VI*." *Shakespeare* (2015): 1-21.
- Nardizzi, Vin. "'No Wood, No Kingdom': Planting Genealogy, Felling Trees, and the Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Modern Philology: Critical and Historical Studies in Literature, Medieval Through Contemporary* 110, no. 2 (2012): 202-25.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Neill, Michael. Introduction to *The Spanish Tragedy: Authoritative Text, Sources and Contexts, Criticism*, edited by Michael Neill. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- "Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online (ODNB)." *oxforddnb.com*. Last modified May 2016.
- Price, Hereward T. "'Titus Andronicus' and the Additions to 'The Spanish Tragedy'." *Notes and Queries* 9 (1962): 331.
- Reiman, Donald. "Marston, Jonson, and the 'Spanish Tragedy' Additions." *Notes and Queries* 7 (1960): 336-7.
- Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1989.

- Ross, Thomas W. "Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*: A Bibliographical Hypothesis." *Bulletin of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association* 22, no. 2 (1968): 13-21.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, edited by Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987; 2005.
- Sharpe, Will. "Authorship and Attribution." In *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. 641-50, 671-80. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Smith, Emma. "Author v. Character in Early Modern Dramatic Authorship: The Example of Thomas Kyd and *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 11 (1999): 129-42.
- The Spanish Tragedie; Containing the lamentable end of Don Horaio, and Bel-imperia: with the pittiful death of olde Hieronimo. Newly corrected, amended, and enlarged with new additions of the Painters part, and others, as it hath of late been diuers times acted (1602), STC 15089.*
- Stevenson, Warren. *Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy: A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions*. Lewiston, NY; Queenston, Ontario; Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008.
- . "Shakespeare's Hand in *The Spanish Tragedy* 1602." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 8, no. 2 (1968): 307-21.
- Tassi, Marguerite A. "The Player's Passion and the Elizabethan Painting Trope: A Study of the Painter Addition to Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 26, no. 1 (2000): 73-100.
- Taylor, Gary. "Did Shakespeare Write *The Spanish Tragedy* Additions?" Forthcoming In *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*.
- . "Empirical Middleton: Macbeth, Adaptation, and Microauthorship." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (2014): 239-272.
- Taylor, Gary and John V. Nance. "Imitation or Collaboration? Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare Canon." *Shakespeare Survey* 68 (2015): 32-47.
- Vickers, Brian. "Identifying Shakespeare's Additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1602): A New(er) Approach." *Shakespeare* 8, no. 1 (2012): 13-43.
- . "Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62, no. 1 (2011): 106-42.

- Walton, Charles E. "Shakespeare and *The Fatal Maryage*." *Emporia State Research Studies* 13, no. 1 (1964): 24-39.
- Webster, John. *The Works of John Webster*, edited by David Gunby, David Carnegie, Antony Hammond, Doreen DeVecchio, and MacDonald P. Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995-2007.
- Wells, Stanley. *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Fletcher and the Other Players in His Story*. New York; London: Allen Lane, 2006.
- Wiggins, Martin, and Catherine Richardson. *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue*, vols. 1-6. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012-.

Curriculum Vitae

Keegan Cooper

Education

Master of Arts, English Oct 2016
Graduate Certificate in Professional Editing May 2016
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Bachelor of Arts, English
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis May 2014

Thesis

“Here lay my hope’: Attribution, Collaboration, and the Authorship of the Third Addition to *The Spanish Tragedy* (in progress)

Fellowships

Research Assistantship, The New Oxford Shakespeare, 2013-2016.
Duties: Transcribe, proofread, and code Shakespearean text; modernize transcriptions of plays; update textual commentaries, notes, bricolages, and bibliographies; compile research data using online databases; act as liaison between the project, its performance company, and various university affiliates; manage undergraduate volunteers for performances.

Awards

“Best of” *genesis* Poetry Scholarship, 2015
Outstanding English Major Award, 2014
Marie Louise Rea Short Story Award, 2014
Eric Sharp Creative Writing Award, 2013
L’Alliance Française d’Indianapolis IUPUI Student of the Year Award, 2013

Professional Experience

Graduate Research Assistant, The New Oxford Shakespeare, 2013-2016
Senior and Managing Editor, *genesis*, 2013-2014

Publications

“Stephen King’s *IT* and the Oppression of Queerness” (*The OUTsiders Ally*, Aug 2016)
“Her House”; “Last Chug of Whiskey Before Tying the Knot” (*genesis*, 2012; 2015)

Conferences

IUPUI Research Day, 2014, 2015, 2016