

In Defence of Kyd: Evaluating the Claim for Shakespeare's Part Authorship of *Arden of Faversham*

DARREN FREEBURY-JONES

Abstract: MacDonald P. Jackson first argued for Shakespeare's part authorship of *Arden of Faversham* in his university dissertation in 1963. He has devoted several articles to developing this argument, summarized in his monograph *Determining the Shakespeare Canon* (2014). Jackson's part ascription has led to the inclusion of the domestic tragedy in *The New Oxford Shakespeare*. However, Jackson and his *New Oxford Shakespeare* colleagues have either dismissed or neglected the evidence for Thomas Kyd's sole authorship presented by other scholars. This essay focuses primarily on Jackson's monograph and argues that the evidence for adding the play to Kyd's canon, encompassing phraseology, linguistic idiosyncrasies, and verse characteristics, seems solid.

Contributor Biography: Darren Freebury-Jones is Lecturer in Shakespeare Studies (International – USA) at The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust in Stratford-upon-Avon. His 2016 doctoral thesis examined Thomas Kyd's influence on Shakespeare's early plays and he is one of the editors for the first edition of Kyd's collected works since 1901. He has also investigated the boundaries of John Marston's dramatic corpus as part of the *Oxford Marston* project. His recent and forthcoming work on the plays of authors such as Shakespeare, Kyd, Lyly, Marlowe, Peele, Nashe, Marston, Dekker, Fletcher, and others can be found in a range of peer-reviewed journals.

The Authorship of *Arden of Faversham*

He was right after all, and the scholars who for a generation now have ignored or sneered at his evidence, sometimes—when they have condescended to mention it—printing the word *evidence* itself between inverted commas, have not turned out to be our most reliable guides.

So wrote R. H. Barker in 1958.¹ Here he was speaking of E. H. C. Oliphant, who attributed *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606) to Thomas Middleton and was eventually vindicated.² I am confident that, in time, similar sentiments will be expressed with regards to an 'expanded' Thomas Kyd canon. In a general essay published in the *Times Literary Supplement* in 2008, Brian Vickers argued for a new Kyd canon, ascribing to him—alongside the traditionally accepted plays *The Spanish Tragedy* (1587), *Soliman and Perseda* (1588), and *Cornelia* (1594)—some anonymous plays, including *Arden of*

¹ R. H. Barker, *Thomas Middleton* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 166.

² E. H. C. Oliphant, 'The Authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy*', *Studies in Philology*, 23 (1926), 157-168.

Faversham (1590).³ Vickers's attributions were rejected by several scholars using different systems, largely arithmetico-statistical, based on word frequencies. My own researches have collected a wide range of evidence in favour of an 'expanded' Kyd canon. In the course of this study I have scrutinized these ascriptions and the arguments against them. I propose that *The New Oxford Shakespeare* team have made an error by including *Arden of Faversham* in their latest edition.⁴

MacDonald P. Jackson has been the most vehement supporter of Shakespeare's part authorship of *Arden of Faversham*, having first argued for his hand in the domestic tragedy in 1963.⁵ Thus, my primary focus here must be on Jackson's 2014 monograph *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham & A Lover's Complaint*, in which he summarizes his arguments for Shakespeare's authorship of scenes Four to Nine (the middle section of the play, or Act Three in older editions) of *Arden of Faversham*. He ascribes the rest of the play to an unknown co-author who was probably not Kyd. I shall evaluate Jackson's claims concerning verbal parallels, linguistic idiosyncrasies, verse style, and computational stylistics. I aim to demonstrate that the evidence Jackson presented for Shakespeare's part authorship does not stand up to scrutiny when Kyd's candidature is properly acknowledged, whilst evaluating supporting claims made by other scholars. In this article, I therefore explore links between the three traditionally accepted Kyd plays and *Arden of Faversham*.⁶

Verbal Parallels

Jackson acknowledges in his monograph that the 'omission' of *Arden of Faversham* 'from the First Folio argues against Shakespeare's sole authorship'.⁷ However, he dismisses the evidence for Kyd's sole authorship put forward by Charles Crawford,⁸ Walter Miksch,⁹ Paul V. Rubow,¹⁰ and Félix Carrère¹¹ (he gives impressionistic evaluations of some parallels collected by H. Dugdale Sykes, the least comprehensive of the five independent scholars who identified Kyd's hand),¹² and criticizes twentieth-century scholars for their 'haphazard' searches for verbal parallels, which were purportedly 'biased by the scholar's preconceptions'.¹³ Jackson notes that '[w]e need to know how rare such formulas are and who among all dramatists within an appropriate time frame used them'.¹⁴ This is a sensible notion, but Jackson uses the database *Literature OnLine*, or *LION*, to test the rarity of utterances that he himself has selected. It is possible that Jackson had Shakespeare's

³ Brian Vickers, 'Thomas Kyd, Secret Sharer', *Times Literary Supplement*, 13 April 2008, 13-15. I have used Martin Wiggins and Catherine Richardson's *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue: Volume II: 1567-1589* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) and *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue: Volume III: 1590-1597* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) for the most likely dates of first performances.

⁴ *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Modern Critical Edition*, eds. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus and Gabriel Egan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

⁵ MacDonald P. Jackson, 'Material for an edition of *Arden of Faversham*' (B.Litt. thesis: Oxford University, 1963).

⁶ For an examination of the links between all six plays attributable to Kyd as sole author, see Darren Freebury-Jones, 'The Diminution of Thomas Kyd', *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 8 (forthcoming, 2019).

⁷ MacDonald P. Jackson, *Determining the Shakespeare Canon: Arden of Faversham and A Lover's Complaint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 38.

⁸ Charles Crawford, 'The Authorship of *Arden of Faversham*', *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 39 (1903), 74-86; *Collectanea: First Series* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1906).

⁹ Walter Miksch, *Die Verfasserschaft des Arden of Feversham* (Breslau, 1907).

¹⁰ Paul V. Rubow, *Shakespeare og hans samtidige* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1948).

¹¹ Félix Carrère, 'Introduction', in *Arden de Faversham. Etude Critique, Traduction et Notes*, ed. Félix Carrère (Paris: Moutaigne, 1950), pp. 21-85.

¹² H. Dugdale Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1919).

¹³ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 16.

¹⁴ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 16.

patterns of word associations in mind, and not Kyd's, when conducting his searches, which are thus open to unconscious bias. Jackson concedes that this process of determining 'whether a parallel is close enough to be recorded' involves 'an element of subjectivity' and that 'no doubt some relevant data have been accidentally overlooked'.¹⁵ Moreover, many of Jackson's parallels are not contiguous, as defined by corpus linguistics, and it is questionable whether many instances truly constitute 'formulas' at all. Indeed, Jackson accepts the co-occurrence of a single word as valid evidence for authorship. Jackson's case for Shakespeare's authorship on the basis of verbal parallels is therefore compromised by scholarly 'preconceptions' of the very kind he warns against himself.¹⁶

Jackson gives a summary of *LION* links to *Arden of Faversham's* Quarrel Scene (Scene Eight) and observes that '[l]inks to plays by Shakespeare are overwhelmingly predominant. It is surely of further significance that four of the five plays' (including *Henry VI Part Three* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*) 'with the most links to the Quarrel Scene' are Shakespeare's 'earliest, according to the Oxford chronology'.¹⁷ Below, I explore Jackson's claims regarding verbal links and chronology in relation to Martin Mueller's electronic corpus *Shakespeare His Contemporaries*, which consists of over 500 tagged plays dated between 1552 and 1662.¹⁸ I have profited from Mueller's spreadsheet, 'SHCSharedTetragramsPlus',¹⁹ which lists play pairs that share large numbers of unique tetragrams plus (four-word sequences or more). Mueller notes that 'it is quite rare for two plays—texts that are typically between 15,000 and 25,000 words long—to share more than one or two of the dislegomena' (a sequence of words that occurs within only two plays in Mueller's machine-readable corpus) 'analyzed here'.²⁰

According to Mueller's database, *Henry VI Part Three* (1591) shares ten unique n-grams (contiguous word sequences) consisting of at least four words with Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* and nine with *Soliman and Perseda*. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1594) shares seven unique word sequences with *Soliman and Perseda*.²¹ Jackson concedes that '[i]t is probable that no Shakespeare play tabled above was written before *Arden of Faversham*', but he gives little credence to the notion that Shakespeare was the debtor.²² The chronology currently being produced by Martin Wiggins allows us to give more precise dating than has yet been available. Wiggins assigns *Arden of Faversham* to 1590; the play thus seems to have antedated the whole of Shakespeare's corpus.²³ This suggests to me that the Shakespeare matches with *Arden of Faversham* are indicative of Kyd's influence on him, rather than Kyd's authorship. Elsewhere I have explored the possibility that Shakespeare had acted in some of Kyd's plays and was able to recall their verbal details via his aural memory.²⁴ As Lukas Erne observes: 'Shakespeare, perhaps more than anyone else, seems to have specifically profited from Kyd's works'.²⁵

¹⁵ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 19.

¹⁶ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 16.

¹⁷ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 20.

¹⁸ *Shakespeare His Contemporaries* was subsequently renamed *Early Modern Print*. Its latest incarnation is available at: <https://earlyprint.wustl.edu/> [accessed 4 October 2018].

¹⁹ Martin Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams in *Shakespeare His Contemporaries* (SHC)' <https://scalablereading.northwestern.edu/?p=312> [accessed 28 January 2018].

²⁰ Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams'.

²¹ Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams'.

²² Jackson, *Determining*, p. 23.

²³ Wiggins and Richardson, *British Drama 1533-1642*, III.11.

²⁴ Darren Freebury-Jones, 'Kyd and Shakespeare: Authorship versus Influence', *Authorship*, 6.1 (2017). Available at <http://www.authorship.ugent.be/article/view/4833> [accessed 28 January 2018].

²⁵ Lukas Erne, *Beyond The Spanish Tragedy: A Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 5.

Jackson lists just four rare links between the Quarrel Scene and Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Soliman and Perseda* respectively. During my own investigation of Scene Eight, I listed around twenty verbal links with Kyd's accepted plays that co-occur with no other dramas of the period 1580-1600.²⁶ Yet Jackson detects only eight phrases that occur no more than five times during those decades. Jackson thus seems to have 'overlooked' more than just 'some relevant data'.²⁷ It is worth noting that Jackson points out that one of 'the highest positions on the table' is occupied by Robert Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies* (1595).²⁸ Yarrington 'was apprenticed to the scrivener, Francis Kyd (father to Thomas Kyd) in 1578'.²⁹ An ascription to Kyd could therefore help to explain Yarrington's intimate familiarity with the verbal details of *Arden of Faversham*, for Yarrington may have had access to Kyd's manuscripts and could have been involved in making fair copies of his plays. Jackson's list of parallels for Scene Six is also incomplete, consisting of matches in lines 6-31 (a small sample size; there are forty-six lines in total) and failing to register numerous verbal links with Kyd. Jackson's list frequently omits lines with Kyd matches that would be inconvenient to an argument for Shakespeare's authorship.³⁰ Jackson claims that 'the results point clearly to Shakespeare's authorship of *Arden's* narrative of his dream'.³¹ I find it difficult to share his conviction.

Mueller's data reveal that it is Kyd, and not Shakespeare, who shares the densest verbal relations with *Arden of Faversham*. In 2009, Mueller applied a series of statistical tests to the putative Kyd texts that convinced him: 'Vickers is right about [...] *Arden*'.³² In a blog post entitled 'N-grams and the Kyd canon: a crude test', Mueller explained that he 'ran an experiment on 318 early modern plays in the *MONK* corpus' and 'extracted lemma n-grams from bigrams to heptagrams that were repeated at least once'. He computed 'their distribution across plays' and discovered that both accepted and newly attributed Kyd texts were placed above the median (the number separating the higher half of Mueller's data from the lower half) for play pairs suggesting 'characteristic patterns of authorial usage'.³³ Notably, *Soliman and Perseda* and *Arden of Faversham* are placed 'in the top quartile for shared two-play n-grams by the same author', with a percentage of 99.7. This percentage is higher than that found for the uncontested Kyd play pair *Soliman and Perseda* and *Cornelia* (93.5%), and thus provides compelling evidence for common authorship of these texts.³⁴

In another blog post titled 'Vickers is right about Kyd', Mueller applied 'Discriminant analysis to lemma trigrams' (three-word sequences) 'that occur at least 500 times in 318 early modern plays', which 'misclassifies 50 or 16% of 318 plays. It gets 84% right. Of 37 plays by Shakespeare, it gets 34 right'.³⁵ Discriminant Analysis, which establishes 'variance between groups on the basis of the combined effect of multiple

²⁶ Darren Freebury-Jones, "'A raven for a dove': Kyd, Shakespeare, and the Authorship of *Arden of Faversham's* Quarrel Scene', *Archiv fuer das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 253.1 (2016), 39-64.

²⁷ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 19.

²⁸ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 22.

²⁹ G. K. Hunter, *English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 543.

³⁰ See 'Appendix 2', in Jackson, *Determining*, pp. 237-239.

³¹ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 59.

³² Martin Mueller, 'Vickers is right about Kyd'. Available at: <http://www.brianvickers.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Martin-Mueller-on-Brian-Vickers-and-the-Kyd-canon.pdf> [accessed 28 January 2018].

³³ Martin Mueller, 'N-grams and the Kyd canon: a crude test'. Available at: <http://www.brianvickers.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Martin-Mueller-on-Brian-Vickers-and-the-Kyd-canon.pdf> [accessed 28 January 2018].

³⁴ Mueller, 'N-grams and the Kyd Canon'.

³⁵ Mueller, 'Vickers is right'.

variables', assigned *The Spanish Tragedy* to Kyd with a 96.1% chance, while *Soliman and Perseda* and *Cornelia* were given percentages of 85.3 and 79.7 respectively.³⁶ Mueller also applied these tests to plays in the 'extended' Kyd canon: Discriminant Analysis assigned *Arden of Faversham* to Kyd with a 97.4% chance. Mueller concluded that 'Discriminant Analysis very strongly confirms' that the domestic tragedy comes 'from the same stable' as the three accepted Kyd plays, and 'If you combine my evidence from common trigrams' with the evidence 'from rare shared repetitions, you would have to be very sceptical about the power of quantitative analysis not to acknowledge the fact that the claim for an expanded Kyd canon rests on quite solid evidence'.³⁷

Mueller notes that '[i]f we look more closely at shared dislegomena' consisting of at least four words 'by same-author play pairs, we discover that on average plays by the same author share five dislegomena, and the median is four. Roughly speaking, plays by the same author are likely to share twice as many dislegomena as plays by different authors'.³⁸ Mueller has discovered that 4,629 pairwise combinations in his corpus share seven or more dislegomena of this type, and that 22% of these combinations involve plays by the same author. Mueller's corpus therefore creates 'a framework of expectations' within which the evidentiary value of longer word sequences can be evaluated.³⁹ 'SHCSharedTetragramsPlus' reveals that there are eight unique n-grams consisting of four or more words shared between *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Soliman and Perseda*. Given that Mueller's corpus consists of over 500 early modern plays, we cannot suppose that Kyd has been entered into 'a one horse race', as claimed by Jackson.⁴⁰ Mueller's spreadsheet also reveals that the play with the most matches with *Arden of Faversham* is Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda*. The two plays share eighteen unique n-grams of four or more words.⁴¹ Mueller's findings support Charles Crawford's theory, put forward over a century ago, that 'these two plays must have been composed by Kyd much about the same time; and works of the same date by the same writer invariably repeat each other more often than others that are separated by longer intervals of time'.⁴²

More recently, Pervez Rizvi has developed an electronic corpus of 527 plays dated between 1552 and 1657, titled *Collocations and N-grams*,⁴³ which shows that *Soliman and Perseda* shares denser n-gram relations with the domestic tragedy than any other play of the period. The highest authentic Shakespeare text in this publicly accessible Excel spreadsheet is *Richard III* (1593), ranked twenty-first. Rizvi's results are fully automated and enable scholars to check for every contiguous word sequence, as well as all collocations (discontinuous word sequences), shared between plays. Searches of the modernised and lemmatized texts—drawn from Mueller's corpus and the *Folger Shakespeare Editions* website⁴⁴—allow a wider range of matches to be discovered than by searches using original spelling or the unlemmatized forms of words.

³⁶ Mueller, 'Vickers is right'.

³⁷ Mueller, 'Vickers is right'.

³⁸ Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams'.

³⁹ Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams'.

⁴⁰ MacDonald P. Jackson, 'New Research on the Dramatic Canon of Thomas Kyd', *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama*, 47 (2008), 107-127 (p. 108).

⁴¹ Mueller, 'Repeated n-grams'. I have placed all of Mueller's spreadsheets relating to the Kyd canon on my website: <https://darrenfj.wordpress.com/2017/11/> [accessed 12 November 2018].

⁴² Crawford, *Collectanea*, p. 123.

⁴³ *Collocations and N-grams*. Available at: <http://www.shakespearestext.com/can/index.htm> [accessed 27 November 2018]. Rizvi provides detailed explanations for how these play links were recorded and weighted on his website.

⁴⁴ *Folger Shakespeare Library Editions*. Available at: <http://www.folger.edu/folger-shakespeare-library-editions> [accessed 28 January 2018].

In a document on his website titled, ‘*Arden of Faversham* and the Extended Kyd Canon’, Rizvi conducts tests involving unique trigrams and tetragrams, which correctly attribute ‘84 out of 86’ uncontested plays in his corpus. This method assigns the three accepted Kyd plays and *Arden of Faversham* as a whole to Kyd,⁴⁵ which counters Jackson’s claim that the ‘canonical Kyd plays are utterly different’ from the plays that are newly attributed to Kyd.⁴⁶ The verbal evidence, whether rare, unique, common, short word sequences, or longer strings of words, based on a number of weighting measures in large electronic corpora, converges to support the attribution of *Arden of Faversham* to Kyd. On the other hand, as Mueller points out: ‘there is no good reason to assume that relations between *Arden* and Shakespeare are particularly dense’.⁴⁷

Jackson’s argument that ‘it seems almost certain that more than one playwright was involved’ in the composition of *Arden of Faversham* is unconvincing.⁴⁸ Elsewhere I have listed almost forty verbal matches between the Quarrel Scene and scenes that Jackson does not attribute to Shakespeare in *Arden of Faversham*.⁴⁹ Some of these complex collocations of words and ideas appear to belong to a single mind, as we can see in Alice’s declarative, ‘Ay, **now I see, and too soon find it true,** / Which often hath been told me by my friends, / **That** Mosby loves me not but for my wealth, / **Which,** too incredulous, I ne’er believed’,⁵⁰ which gives us an internal match (consisting of a ten-word cluster) with the lines, ‘Ungentle and unkind Alice, **now I see / That which I** ever feared **and find too true**’ (*AF*, i.205-206). These lines (by my argument) belong to Kyd’s mental repertoire and parallel *The Spanish Tragedy*: ‘But **now I see that** words’;⁵¹ ‘Madame, tis **true, and now I find it so**’ (*Sp. T.*, IV.i.35).

In an article titled ‘Exploring Co-Authorship in *2 Henry VI*’, I tested a selection of Shakespeare’s early sole-authored and collaborative plays for internal tetragrams occurring less than five times in plays written between 1580-1600.⁵² I discovered that passages ascribed to George Peele and Shakespeare respectively in *Titus Andronicus* (1594) shared few extended verbal details, while the n-grams shared between the dramatists suggested separate authorial cognitive processes. Conversely, when passages in Shakespeare’s sole-authored plays were tested against each other, there were a substantial number of matches, which indicated associative groupings at the forefront of Shakespeare’s memory as he composed his work. When scenes Four to Nine of *Arden of Faversham* (4800 words in total) are tested against the remainder of the play, plagiarism software highlights twelve rare repeated phrases distributed between ‘Shakespeare’ scenes and Jackson’s conjectured co-author, which gives us a figure of 0.25. The disparities of data are highlighted when we compare this figure to the Peele and Shakespeare portions of *Titus Andronicus*, which share just three n-grams of four or more

⁴⁵ Pervez Rizvi, ‘*Arden of Faversham* and the Extended Kyd Canon’, *Collocations and N-grams*. Available at: https://onedrive.live.com/?authkey=%21AL9ABAX_DAWKjqQ&id=68E79964A7BF0931%2115607&cid=68E79964A7BF0931 [accessed 27 November 2018].

⁴⁶ Jackson, ‘New Research’, p. 121.

⁴⁷ Email correspondence, 9 January 2014.

⁴⁸ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 83.

⁴⁹ Freebury-Jones, “A raven for a dove”.

⁵⁰ *Arden of Faversham*, viii.106-109, in *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham*, ed. M. L. Wine (London: Methuen, 1973). All further references are to this edition and will be given parenthetically.

⁵¹ Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, III.i.17, in *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, ed. Frederick S. Boas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901). All further references to Kyd’s accepted plays are to this edition and will be given parenthetically.

⁵² Darren Freebury-Jones, ‘Exploring Co-Authorship in *2 Henry VI*’, *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 5 (2016), 201-216; ‘A Response to Gabriel Egan’s NYWES 2016’ <https://darrenfj.files.wordpress.com/2017/11/a-response-to-gabriel-egan4.pdf> [accessed 12 November 2018].

words, giving us a percentage of 0.02. My evidence suggests that *Arden of Faversham* is the product of a single author's verbal memory. The word sequences appear to have persisted in a single dramatist's mind as he composed the play. We find a similar pattern of self-repetition in *Soliman and Perseda*. When I tested Act Three of Kyd's Turkish tragedy (amounting to 2226 words in total) against the remainder of the play, plagiarism software highlighted eight repetitions, with an overall percentage of 0.36. In my view, these results attest to the uniformity of both Kyd texts.

Some of the internal repetitions in *Arden of Faversham* could be explained by collaborating authors 'writing dialogue for the same characters in the same settings in a shared plot'.⁵³ For example, the match, 'Now, **Master Franklin, let us go** walk in Paul's' (*AF*, iii.33), with '**Come, Master Franklin, let us go** to bed' (iv.105), and '**Come Master Franklin let us go** softly' (ix.68), could very well be accidental (although it is worth noting that all three instances share the same syntactical formula). However, the majority of these repetitions signify a single author's verbal formulae; eight of the twelve n-grams recur in the same place in the verse line. To instance just one example: Jackson's hypothesized unknown co-author is responsible for the line, '**To let thee know** all that I have contrived' (i.536), while Jackson proposes that Shakespeare was responsible for the line, '**To let thee know** I am no coward, I' (v.25). What we see here, by my argument, is a single author drawing upon his repertoire of ready-made phrases. This tetragram (which also embraces the subject pronoun 'I') cannot be found in Shakespeare's entire dramatic corpus. Kyd employs it as a formulaic line-ending in his Turkish tragedy: '**I have persevered to let thee know**' (*S&P*, I.ii.21).

Jackson states that '[i]f, as seems almost certain, more than one author participated in *Arden of Faversham*, collaboration must have been close, with the co-authors sharing the same grim vision, though one enlivened by humour'.⁵⁴ Yet, as attentive readers of Kyd's works will know, the mixture of comedy and tragedy in *Arden of Faversham* is characteristic of his drama: as Alfred Harbage put it, Kyd tends to combine 'comic methods with tragic materials, thus creating a species of comitragedy'.⁵⁵ One cannot stress the 'innovative nature of Kydian comedy' too much, for, as Erne rightly points out, this aspect of Kyd's drama represents 'a radical generic experiment'.⁵⁶

Linguistic Idiosyncrasies

Jackson notes that the exclamation 'Tush' is 'confined' to the 'earliest and latest scenes' of *Arden of Faversham*.⁵⁷ He suggests it 'can hardly be coincidental that' this non-Shakespearean feature occurs in scenes outside of the middle portion of the play.⁵⁸ However, this exclamation is not to be found in the second act of *The Spanish Tragedy* (there are four instances in total), while the two instances within *Soliman and Perseda* are confined to the play's opening two acts. Should we suppose that Kyd did not write the remaining scenes in these plays? Jackson also argues that as 'none of the nine instances' of 'Ay, but' feature in the middle portion of *Arden of Faversham*, and given that Shakespeare 'seldom used' this colloquialism, the play appears to have been written by

⁵³ Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney, 'Methods', in *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, eds. Hugh Craig and Arthur F. Kinney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 15-39 (p. 33).

⁵⁴ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 84.

⁵⁵ Alfred Harbage, 'Intrigue in Elizabethan Tragedy', in *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*, ed. Richard Hosley (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962), pp. 37-44 (p. 37).

⁵⁶ Erne, *Beyond*, p. 85.

⁵⁷ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 78.

⁵⁸ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 79.

Shakespeare and another dramatist.⁵⁹ All six instances of 'Ay, but' in *The Spanish Tragedy* feature in the play's second act, so, according to Jackson's argument, the remaining acts could be considered Shakespearean. Moreover, on the basis of Jackson's argument, Shakespeare could have written the third and fourth acts of *Soliman and Perseda*. Jackson does not appear to have checked other texts to confirm that every author uses all words uniformly throughout his plays.

Similarly, Jackson's claim that compound adjectives in *Arden of Faversham* are 'more like the early plays of Shakespeare than like those of Marlowe, Greene, or Peele' is symptomatic of the scant attention he has afforded Kyd's candidature.⁶⁰ As Inna Koskenniemi observed: 'The highest number of new compounds is found in Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda*'.⁶¹ Similarly, Alexander Maclaren Witherspoon pointed out that Kyd's 'translation of Garnier's *Cornélie*' is 'brimful of them'.⁶² Nor are Kyd's compounds uninventive: *Soliman and Perseda* contains such examples as 'gold-abounding' (*S&P*, I.iii.59), 'cloud-compacted' (II.i.87), and 'pinky-ey'd' (V.iii.7), while *Cornelia* gives us 'flaxen-hair'd' (*Corn.*, I.i.59) and 'fire-darting' (V.i.179). The examples Jackson gives for Shakespeare's authorship, such as 'hollow-ey'd' (*AF*, ii.48) and 'dry-sucked' (iii.111), are hardly beyond Kyd's capacity. In total, there are forty-two compound adjectives in *Arden of Faversham*, which we can compare to the totals of thirty-seven (by my count) in *The Spanish Tragedy* and fifty-seven in *Soliman and Perseda*. The dramatist responsible for *Arden of Faversham* thus averages one compound adjective every 503 words, which is not as frequent as *Soliman and Perseda*'s one every 330 words. Jackson counts ten examples of compound adjectives formed by noun plus participle in *Arden of Faversham*, and argues that this is a Shakespeare marker.⁶³ However, this total is very close to the seven instances I can find in *Soliman and Perseda*. Moreover, Kyd's Turkish tragedy contains ten compound adjectives formed with a present participle (another purported Shakespeare marker), which we can compare to *Arden of Faversham*'s total of nine. Jackson might have reconsidered his dismissal of Kyd's candidacy for sole authorship had he examined compound formations in Kyd's Turkish tragedy.

Verse Style

In his monograph, Jackson criticizes Marina Tarlinskaja's 2008 paper 'entitled "Kyd Canon"', which was 'posted on the London Forum for Authorship Attribution Studies website' but 'cannot currently be viewed'.⁶⁴ He informs readers that Tarlinskaja 'argued, on metrical grounds, in favour of Vickers's expansion of the Kyd canon'.⁶⁵ He calls Tarlinskaja's analysis 'subjective',⁶⁶ and refers readers to her monograph, which supposedly reveals that 'certain scenes of *Arden*, including 4-8, share metrical features with early Shakespeare'.⁶⁷ Jackson does not mention the fact that Tarlinskaja concludes in her monograph that Scene Nine is 'definitely not by Shakespeare', for it has a dip on position eight, whereas 'early Shakespeare preferred a "dip" on 6'.⁶⁸ Tarlinskaja now

⁵⁹ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 79.

⁶⁰ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 76.

⁶¹ Inna Koskenniemi, *Studies in the Vocabulary of English Drama 1550-1600* (Turku: Turun Yliopisto, 1962), p. 31.

⁶² Alexander Maclaren Witherspoon, *The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1924), p. 171.

⁶³ Jackson, *Determining*, pp. 76-77.

⁶⁴ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 114.

⁶⁵ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 114.

⁶⁶ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 115.

⁶⁷ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 116.

⁶⁸ Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of Elizabethan Drama 1561-1642* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), p. 106.

suggests that the ‘stress profile’ of Scene Eight, with its ‘deep “dip” on syllable 6’, points to Shakespeare.⁶⁹ This is somewhat puzzling, given that earlier in the monograph Tarlinskaja points out that Kyd ‘consolidated the stress “dip” on position 6’ in Elizabethan drama.⁷⁰ She notes that ‘Scenes 4-8 contain a substantial “dip” on syllable 6’, which ‘could indicate a typical early Elizabethan text’ or ‘early Shakespeare, and Kyd’.⁷¹ The dip on position six in these scenes therefore provides no evidence for an attribution to Shakespeare and/or deattribution to Kyd. In fact, Tarlinskaja’s figure of 71.8 accords with *The Spanish Tragedy’s* 69.2, *Soliman and Perseda’s* 68.6, and *Cornelia’s* (minus Chorus) 70.4. According to Tarlinskaja’s data, Kyd prefers a dip on position six in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Soliman and Perseda*, while the later stage plays that she tentatively accepts as Kyd’s in her monograph contain almost equal stressing on positions six and eight.⁷² *Arden of Faversham* has an almost equal percentage of missing stresses on six (73.7) and eight (74.5) overall. Furthermore, Tarlinskaja’s figures for the play per scene show that the ‘non-Shakespearean’ scenes Twelve and Thirteen also feature a dip on six, while scenes Fifteen to Eighteen and the Epilogue feature a substantial dip on six, just like scenes Four to Eight.⁷³ Given that there are signs of what Tarlinskaja calls a ‘conscious versification experiment’ in Kyd and his roommate Christopher Marlowe’s plays, it seems questionable to assign Elizabethan play portions with alternating stresses on syllables six and eight to different playwrights.⁷⁴

Tarlinskaja also makes an ‘argument for Shakespearean authorship’ on the basis that ‘Run-on lines prevail’ in scenes Four to Eight.⁷⁵ If we consult Tarlinskaja’s ‘Appendix B’, we find that she records an average of 10.8 run-on lines in these scenes.⁷⁶ She also records an average of 13.6 run-on lines in *Cornelia*. We might ask ourselves: how does the figure of 10.8, which is in fact lower than Kyd’s undoubted play, *Cornelia*, suggest Shakespeare’s authorship rather than Kyd’s? In my view, Tarlinskaja’s data cannot be justifiably interpreted as lending support to Jackson’s argument.

Jackson does not acknowledge Philip Timberlake’s findings in his monograph, which also attest to the uniformity of the domestic tragedy. In 1931, Timberlake provided a comprehensive examination of feminine endings (lines concluding in an unaccented eleventh syllable) in English blank verse drama up to 1595. Timberlake discovered that Kyd ‘was customarily using feminine endings with a frequency surpassing that of any’ pre-Shakespearean ‘dramatist whom we have considered’.⁷⁷ He recorded an average of 10.2% and 9.5% feminine endings for the accepted plays *Soliman and Perseda* and *Cornelia* respectively.⁷⁸ Significantly, Timberlake recorded an average of ‘6.2 per cent of feminine endings’ in *Arden of Faversham*, ‘with a range in long scenes of 0.9-12.9 per cent. *Soliman* has 10.2 per cent, and a range of 5.3-14.8 per cent’.⁷⁹ He concluded that ‘this is not entirely surprising. Kyd was a gifted playwright with a keen perception of dramatic values, and his metrical development may find its explanation in that fact’.⁸⁰

⁶⁹ Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 106.

⁷⁰ Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 67.

⁷¹ Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 109.

⁷² See Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 93, p. 105.

⁷³ I should like to thank Tarlinskaja for sending me her figures for the play per scene. Email correspondence, 21 March 2016.

⁷⁴ Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 74.

⁷⁵ Tarlinskaja, *Versification*, p. 110.

⁷⁶ ‘Appendix B: Table B.3’, in Tarlinskaja, *Versification*.

⁷⁷ Philip Timberlake, *The Feminine Ending in English Blank Verse: A Study of its Use by Early Writers in the Measure and its Development in the Drama up to the Year 1595* (Menasha, WI: Banta, 1931), pp. 52-53.

⁷⁸ Timberlake, *Feminine*, pp. 61-62.

⁷⁹ Timberlake, *Feminine*, p. 52.

⁸⁰ Timberlake, *Feminine*, p. 52.

Given that Shakespeare and Kyd are the only known dramatists of the period with comparably high figures for feminine endings in their dramatic works, we might expect to see such variation in feminine endings between ‘Shakespeare’ portions and those of a co-author in *Arden of Faversham* as to identify the presence of two dramatists. This is certainly not the case: feminine endings are used liberally throughout *Arden of Faversham*. In my computations, the ‘Shakespeare’ scenes average 6.4% feminine endings, while Jackson’s conjectured co-author averages a strikingly similar percentage of 6.1, which would be too high for any known Elizabethan playwright except Kyd or Shakespeare. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Jackson argues Shakespeare was responsible for the scene with the lowest percentage of feminine endings in the whole play: 0.9. I reproduce Timberlake’s findings in the table below in order to show the similarities between percentages for the scenes that constitute Act Three, which Jackson gives to Shakespeare, and the remainder of the domestic tragedy, which Jackson and his *New Oxford Shakespeare* colleagues assign to an older co-author who was not Kyd:

Act, Scene	Full Lines	Feminine Endings Strict Count	Strict %
I.i	607	25	4.1
II.i	55	5	9.1-
II.ii	138	11	7.9
III.i	103	1	0.9
III.ii	59	2	3.3
III.iii	46	2	4.3
III.iv	28	3	10.7
III.v	157	9	5.7
III.vi	131	17	12.9
IV.i	65	3	4.6
IV.ii	Prose	Prose	Prose
IV.iii	31	2	6.4
IV.iv	142	8	4.6
V.i	332	19	5.7
V.ii	11	1	9.9
V.iii	21	3	14.2
V.iv	14	4	28.5
V.v	34	7	20.5
V.vi	16	2	12.5

Table 1: *Feminine Endings in Arden of Faversham*

In 1960, Ants Oras studied ‘the phenomenon of pauses’ and the ‘positions they appear in the verse, and in what ratios compared with other positions in the line’.⁸¹ He suggested that ‘less conscious pause patterns’ could help to answer questions of authorship.⁸² Oras recorded patterns for several Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists ‘formed by all the pauses indicated by internal punctuation’, which he termed A-patterns.⁸³ The remarkable similarities in patterns for same-author plays examined by Oras suggest that punctuation marks, be they authorial or compositorial, ‘keep within the rhythmical climate of the time’,⁸⁴ and are thus useful for identifying a dramatist’s prosodic characteristics. Oras observed that, in *Arden of Faversham*, ‘that distinctly non-

⁸¹ Ants Oras, *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1960), pp. 1-2.

⁸² Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 2.

⁸³ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 3.

⁸⁴ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 3.

Shakespearean play’, we can see ‘a period pattern’.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, I reproduce his findings for patterns ‘formed by all pauses indicated by internal punctuation’,⁸⁶ in comparison to *The Spanish Tragedy* (the percentages for *Soliman and Perseda* and *Cornelia* are the results of my own computations), in order to exhibit the close relationships between some of these percentages:

Play	First Half	Even	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>The Spanish Tragedy</i>	78.9	67.5	7.1	15.0	5.7	39.1	15.2	11.4	4.2	1.9	0.4
<i>Soliman and Perseda</i>	60.9	67.8	4.1	9.3	5.5	42.1	19.5	14.5	2.9	1.9	0.2
<i>Arden of Faversham</i>	63.5	71.2	2.2	5.3	3.9	41.5	16.6	22.8	6.1	1.5	0
<i>Cornelia</i>	55.6	58.6	8.2	10.2	5.7	31.6	20.3	13.4	6.4	3.4	0.8

Table 2: Pause Patterns in *Arden of Faversham* and Kyd’s Plays

Assembling this data into one table effectively demonstrates the ‘special physiognomy’ of Kyd’s canon.⁸⁷ Notably, no play in Shakespeare’s entire dramatic corpus reaches as high a percentage for pauses on even-numbered syllables as can be found in *Arden of Faversham*, whereas Kyd’s Turkish tragedy is closer than any of Shakespeare’s early sole-authored plays, nor as high a percentage as that found for the fourth syllable. The pause patterns for the domestic tragedy as a whole are different from Shakespeare’s preferences at the beginning of his career.

I tested the putative ‘Shakespeare’ scenes against the remainder of the play in order to determine whether Oras’s method supports or contradicts the hypothesis that *Arden of Faversham* is co-authored:

Play	First Half	Even	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Arden of Faversham</i> ‘Shakespeare’	56.5	72.0	2.5	3.7	4.9	45.3	16.8	21.1	3.7	1.9	0
<i>Arden of Faversham</i> ‘Non-Shakespeare’	52.3	65.9	3.2	5.6	6.4	37.0	18.9	21.7	5.2	1.7	0.2

Table 3: Pause Patterns in ‘Shakespeare’ and ‘Non-Shakespeare’ Scenes in *Arden of Faversham*

As is the case with feminine endings, the percentages for ‘Shakespeare’ scenes are hardly different to those found for the rest of the play, which we might expect if the domestic tragedy were authored solely by Kyd. Significantly, none of Shakespeare’s plays prior to *The Merchant of Venice* (1597), which has a percentage of 51.7, have as low a figure for pauses in the first half of the line as the scenes Jackson ascribes to Shakespeare in *Arden of Faversham*; on the other hand, the percentage is very close to *Cornelia*’s 55.6. Moreover, no play in Shakespeare’s entire canon has as high a figure for pauses after even-numbered syllables; no early Shakespeare play dips as low as the percentage found for position seven, whereas *Soliman and Perseda*’s percentage of 2.9 is close; and no Shakespeare play reaches as high a percentage as that found for position four: all of the texts ascribed to

⁸⁵ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 31.

⁸⁶ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 3. Oras also produced practically identical frequency polygons for these plays, pp. 41-42.

⁸⁷ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, p. 23.

Kyd are closer in this respect, except *Cornelia*.⁸⁸ In short, the pause patterns do not support the attribution of these scenes to Shakespeare. Given that Jackson has made extensive use of Oras's methodology previously, it is regrettable that he did not examine the prosody of *Arden of Faversham* in his monograph.⁸⁹

Computational Stylistics

Jackson relies heavily on Arthur F. Kinney's conclusion that '*Arden of Faversham* is a collaboration; Shakespeare was one of the authors; and his part is concentrated in the middle portion of the play'.⁹⁰ Kinney's attribution to Shakespeare derives from the results of lexical and function-word tests. Even Jackson criticizes Kinney's failure to recognize Quarto spelling variants, though he asserts that '[w]hether or not anomalous spellings affected Craig and Kinney's lexical tests of *Arden's* Scene 8, the multiplicity of evidence presented' in his monograph 'vindicates Kinney's conclusion'.⁹¹ The question is how are we to trust the results for any single scene in *Arden of Faversham* if the 'Craig-Kinney software' was 'flummoxed' by 'unusual spellings' when it came to Scene Eight?⁹² Moreover, Peter Kirwan points out that the 'lexical-word tests employed by Kinney are questionable', for he 'begins with individual scenes, which he admits are too short for reliable results'.⁹³ I agree with Kirwan that the 'confidence' of Kinney's conclusion is 'not justified'.⁹⁴

Kinney's interpretation of his function-word data leads him to claim that *Arden of Faversham* shows 'no sustained affinities with Kyd'.⁹⁵ However, Lene Buhl Petersen has applied 'discriminant analysis' to 'principal data components' with 'cross-validation' and, according to her use of Principal Component Analysis, '*Arden of Faversham* cross-validates as Kyd'.⁹⁶ Petersen concludes, sensibly, that 'these classifications are by no means to be taken as truths'.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, Jackson emphasizes the significance of Kinney's findings throughout his monograph, while overlooking the findings of other teams.

Brett Greatley-Hirsch and Jack Elliott have extended Kinney's analysis and subjected the Kentish tragedy to a number of computational tests, concluding that '[i]t is impossible to reconcile the results we have found with a belief that Shakespeare had no hand in *Arden of Faversham*'.⁹⁸ However, their tests assign a number of segments in *Arden of Faversham* to Kyd: indeed, their function-word tests give scenes Four to Eight, which Jackson attributes to Shakespeare, to Kyd.⁹⁹ Nonetheless, they do not discuss the Kyd results in their conclusion, while the fact that Zeta 'misclassifies the lone Kyd hold-out segment as not Kyd' reveals that their tests cannot reliably distinguish authentic Kyd

⁸⁸ Oras, *Pause Patterns*, pp. 67-68.

⁸⁹ MacDonald P. Jackson, *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 64-65.

⁹⁰ Arthur F. Kinney, 'Authoring *Arden of Faversham*', in *Shakespeare, Computers, and the Mystery of Authorship*, pp. 78-99 (p. 99).

⁹¹ Jackson, *Determining*, p. 51.

⁹² Jackson, *Determining*, p. 51.

⁹³ Peter Kirwan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 150-151.

⁹⁴ Kirwan, *Idea of the Apocrypha*, p. 151.

⁹⁵ Kinney, 'Authoring', p. 99.

⁹⁶ Lene B. Petersen, *Shakespeare's Errant Texts: Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean 'Bad' Quartos and Co-authored Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 213-214.

⁹⁷ Petersen, *Errant*, p. 214.

⁹⁸ Brett Greatley-Hirsch and Jack Elliott, '*Arden of Faversham*, Shakespearean Authorship, and "The Print of Many"', in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*, eds. Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 139-181 (p. 181).

⁹⁹ Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott, "'The Print of Many'", p. 173.

texts anyway.¹⁰⁰ They concede that their methods are ‘more likely to give a false negative for Kyd’s authorship than a false positive’.¹⁰¹ Rizvi observes that Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott evade ‘the failure’ of their tests, ‘instead concluding that the method is largely dependable’,¹⁰² despite a ‘misunderstanding of the mathematics’ involved in interpreting their graphs.¹⁰³ Rizvi reproduces the authors’ Zeta method and shows that it cannot be relied upon to correctly classify *Richard III* as Shakespeare’s. He concludes that the results obtained by Kinney (and Hugh Craig) are based on ‘a demonstrably unsound procedure’ and ‘should be treated with extreme caution’,¹⁰⁴ and that ‘all’ of Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott’s ‘test results’ are ‘unreliable’.¹⁰⁵ While Rizvi focuses on Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott’s misuse of the Zeta method, David Auerbach provides a telling critique of the ways in which the authors employ Delta, Nearest Shrunken Centroid, and Random Forests.¹⁰⁶ Joseph Rudman agrees that there are ‘methodological flaws’ in Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott’s essay.¹⁰⁷

In the *Authorship Companion*, Jackson extends his work on the play by conducting a ‘supplementary lexical test’, which supposedly ‘distinguishes between *Arden*, scenes 4–9 and the rest of the play’, and ‘unequivocally classifies scenes 4–9, with their exceptionally high score of 86.7 per cent, as Shakespeare’s’.¹⁰⁸ However, the scarcity of data and the fact that only Shakespeare’s, and not Kyd’s, plus and minus words are examined, hardly invites readers to share Jackson’s confidence in the test’s verdict. In an essay titled, ‘Small Samples and the Perils of Authorship Attribution for Acts and Scenes’, Rizvi demonstrates that were we to take Jackson’s lexical test seriously, we would have to admit several plays by Peele, Marlowe, Robert Greene, John Lyly, and George Chapman into Shakespeare’s canon, while apportioning large sections of twelve plays that no scholar suspects to have been written ‘by anyone other than Shakespeare’ to different dramatists, including *The Merchant of Venice*, the two *Henry IV* plays (1597), *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598), *Julius Caesar* (1599), *Henry V* (1599), and *Hamlet* (1600). He notes that results obtained ‘from tiny samples—Jackson used only nine words—are not reliable. Authorship tests on acts and, especially, scenes require great caution, because authors do not use all words in the same proportions in every act and scene, and yet the outcome of the test can turn on the presence or absence of only a handful of words’. Rizvi therefore concludes that a ‘method which has been validated on whole plays cannot be applied to parts of plays without, as we have seen, the risk of going badly astray’.¹⁰⁹

Conclusion

In this essay I have presented some of the evidence I have collected in favour of expanding Kyd’s canon. More evidence could be cited, such as Kyd’s use of distinct rhyme forms (a

¹⁰⁰ Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott, “‘The Print of Many’”, p. 159.

¹⁰¹ Greatley-Hirsch and Elliott, “‘The Print of Many’”, p. 159.

¹⁰² Pervez Rizvi, ‘The Interpretation of Zeta Test Results’, *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* (forthcoming, 2018), p. 8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqy038> [accessed 25 August 2018].

¹⁰³ Rizvi, ‘Interpretation’, p. 14.

¹⁰⁴ Rizvi, ‘Interpretation’, p. 6.

¹⁰⁵ Rizvi, ‘Interpretation’, p. 16.

¹⁰⁶ David Auerbach, “‘A cannon’s burst discharged against a ruined wall’: A Critique of Quantitative Methods in Shakespearean Authorial Attribution”, *Authorship*, 7.2 (2018).

¹⁰⁷ Joseph Rudman, ‘Review of *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*’, *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* (forthcoming).

¹⁰⁸ MacDonald P. Jackson, ‘A Supplementary Lexical Test for *Arden of Faversham*’, in *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*, pp. 182–193 (p. 193).

¹⁰⁹ Pervez Rizvi, ‘Small Samples and the Perils of Authorship Attribution for Acts and Scenes’, *American Notes and Queries* (forthcoming).

feature of not only the accepted plays, but also the plays newly attributed to Kyd),¹¹⁰ intensifiers, rhetorical devices, stage direction formulae,¹¹¹ use of sources, and overall dramaturgy. I submit that Kyd remains the strongest candidate for the sole authorship of *Arden of Faversham*.

¹¹⁰ James E. Routh Jr., 'Thomas Kyd's Rime Schemes and the Authorship of *Soliman and Perseda* and of *The First Part of Jeronimo*', *Modern Language Notes*, 20.2 (1905), 49-51.

¹¹¹ Darren Freebury-Jones, 'Corresponding Stage Directions in Plays Attributable to Kyd', *American Notes and Queries* (forthcoming). Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0895769X.2018.1457940> [accessed 12 November 2018].