Author v. Character in early modern dramatic authorship: the example of Thomas Kyd and *The Spanish Tragedy*

Kyd's play *The Spanish Tragedy* was most influential play of the early modern English theatre. It was published in ten separate editions between 1594 and 1613 and prompted a kind of prequel play entitled *The First Part of Jeronimo* with which it may have been played in tandem. To revive it for a new audience, Henslowe commissioned additional passages from Ben Jonson at the end of the century. It is known to have been performed at different theatres by different theatre companies, and from an analysis of Henslowe's accounts at the Rose theatre, it can be shown to have been performed almost thirty times between 1592 and 1597, placing it among the three frequently-performed plays of the period.[1] Doubts over its exact date mean that it can be claimed as the first revenge tragedy, the first play to introduce the machiavellian villain to the English stage, even the first modern tragedy.[2] References to the play are dotted through other plays and poems over the century after its first performance.[3]

Given the evidence for the play's popularity, it might be expected that Kyd - or some other playwright - would want to claim authorship, or that an author would be subsequently added to playtexts published after his death. There was, for example, no comparable hush around Marlowe's authorship of *Dr Faustus*, a similarly popular play of the same period which bore its author's name in the (posthumous) quartos of 1604 and 1616, and both Shakespeare and Jonson used, or allowed the usage of, their names to authorise their work in early publication. And yet none of the early editions or references to performances of *The Spanish Tragedy* associates the play with Kyd's name. There is no mention of Kyd on the titlepages of the numerous editions of the play. He does not feature among the actors, playwrights, debtors and other associates listed in Henslowe's papers, despite having apparently provided the theatrical entrepreneur with one of his most assured commercial successes. And while Dekker includes 'industrious Kyd' in his vision of a poetic Elysium in *A Knight's Conjuring* (1607) and Francis Meres states he is 'among our best for tragedy' in Palladis Tamia (1598)[4], nowhere before 1612 are Kyd's gifts evidenced by the statement of his authorship of the play *The Spanish Tragedy*. In fact there is little contemporary evidence for any of his literary activity. A quarto edition of his translation of Robert Garnier's *Cornelia* appeared in 1594 with Kyd's name at the end and with an dedicatory epistle to the Countess of Suffolk signed 'T.K.', but with no attribution on the title page. A second edition the following year, significantly after Kyd's death, is the only publication attributed to Kyd to carry its author's name on its title page. A sixteenth-century reference to this work corroborates Kyd's authorship, while at the same time suggesting that the tragedy was insufficiently valued. In *Polimenteia*, in a complaint at English philistinisim, the author William Covell imagines a better time: 'then should not tragicke *Garnier* have his poor *Cornelia* stand naked upon every poste'. A marginal note adds 'A work howsoever not respected yet excellently done by Th. Kid'[5]. Kyd is listed among those 'moderne and extant Poets, that have liv'd togither'[6] in the 1600 anthology *Bel-védere or The Garden of the Muses*, alongside Spenser, Drayton, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Jonson. The snippets recorded are not identified by author, however, so it is impossible to trace Kyd's contribution, although twenty of the excerpts are from *The Spanish Tragedy* and a similar number from *Soliman and Perseda*, often attributed to Kyd[7]. Another anthology in the same year, Robert Allott's *Englands Parnassus* does attribute extracts to authors, including Kyd, but none of the quoted passages is from *The Spanish Tragedy*. Frederick Boas has noted Kyd's 'seemingly lifelong practice of anonymity'[8] - a practice which extended posthumously - to which Arthur Freeman adds that 'one may well wonder if Kyd sought obscurity'[9]. Even by the standards of what is known about his fellow playwrights, Kyd's traces are hard to recover from the records of the early modern theatre.

Even in places where one might expect Kyd's authorship of the popular *play The Spanish Tragedy*, or its authorship by another named individual, to be asserted, no such identification is made. The satirical play *The Return from Parnassus* of 1606, for example, contains many references to specific dramatic and poetic writers, naming, among others, Lodge, Marston, Marlowe, Spenser, Watson, Daniell, and Nashe. After an extensive discussion of the relative merits of Jonson and Shakespeare in which both playwrights are referred to by name, the characters Burbage and Studioso begin to discuss *The Spanish Tragedy,* quoting from Act 2 Scene 5:

> Burbage. I thinke your voice would serve for Hieronimo, observe me how I act it and then imitate mee.
> Studioso. Who calls *Hieronimo* from his naked bed? And &c.
> Burbage. You will do well after a while.[10]

There is no allusion in the play to the authorship of these lines, apparently so familiar as to render full transcription unnecessary, nor any mention of Kyd. Not until Thomas Heywood's *An Apology for Actors*, published in 1612, is Kyd's authorship of the play asserted. Heywood's text does not allude to many contemporary plays or playwrights by name, but he does give a casual reference to Kyd in order to support his evocation of the culture of ancient Rome in defence of the theatre:

> Therefore M. *Kid* in the *Spanish* Tragedy, upon occasion presenting it selfe, thus writes
> *Why* Nero *thought it no disparagement*
> *And Kings and Emperours have tane delight*
> *To make experience of their wits in playes*.[11]

As Freeman writes, '[b]eyond this offhand attribution by a member of a later generation, we have no external evidence whatever of Kyd's authorship; by so slender a thread hangs his chief claim to memory.[12]

Kyd's claim to memory does not have an unbroken history, however, as Heywood's slender thread linking Kyd with his most famous work was not always visible. William Winstanley, in his *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (1687), catalogued Kyd as 'a writer that seems to have been of pretty good esteem for versifying in former times' and states `[t]here is particularly remembred his Tragedy, *Cornelia*'.[13] Following the lead of Edward Phillips in *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675), Winstanley does not mention *The Spanish Tragedy* in relation to Kyd, but does ascribe 'a Tragedy entituled *Hieronymo*' to one William Smith, also credited with the play *The Hector of Germany*.[14] No other evidence seems to point to Smith's authorship of *The Spanish Tragedy*, nor of the play published in 1605 as *The First Part of Jeronimo*. Writing in 1691, Gerard Langbaine takes a self-consciously revisionist attitude to his biographical predecessors and this extends to his treatment of Kyd and the Hieronimo play. In Langbaine's entry under Thomas Kyd, he mentions only *Cornelia* by name among the author's tragedies 'which are Nine in Number'[15]. Under 'William Smith', however, Langbaine takes issue with received wisdom: '*Hieronymo* is ascribed by Mr *Philips* and *Winstanley*, thro' their old Mistake, to our Author; it being an Anonymous play'[16]. Langbaine's replacement of a proper name, William Smith, with the decisive and curiously final 'Anomymous' seems to deny that there is, or could ever have been, a named and recoverable author of the play. Kyd's occlusion from history of the reception of *The Spanish Tragedy* which began with his absence from the title pages of the play in print, has reached its apogee.[17]

In outlining the paucity of contemporary material identifying Kyd as the author of *The*

Spanish Tragedy, this article does not propose that we should question Heywood's attribution. There is, however, no reason why we shouldn't, but deciding, in the absence of any more compelling evidence, against Kyd and in favour of William Smith, or Anonymous, or someone else, as author of *The Spanish Tragedy* would be to substitute one arbitrary authorial signifier for another. Whether or not Kyd wrote *The Spanish Tragedy* is of lesser interest (as well as being ultimately unverifiable, in the absence of additional external evidence) than the effects of the absence of a named author-figure in the play's reception. The immense popularity of the play, its familiarity and its availability as a cultural reference point, are entirely independent of any attribution of authorship. As such it offers an example of a dramatic text which is, in real terms, un-authored. Instead of attempting to provide evidence which would confirm or reject Kyd as the author of the play, the demonstrable reticence about the authorship of *The Spanish Tragedy* can be used to sketch out some of the manifestations of what Michel Foucault has famously called 'the author- function'[18] in early modern theatrical culture.

Much recent work on early modern textual culture has been concerned with its construction of authorship and authority, but little of this investigation has addressed itself to dramatic texts and authors. Jeff Masten's important reminder that early modern theatre practice was 'predominantly collaborative', both in its textual and its performative aspects - marks a move to destabilise the idea of the unified and self-identical dramatic author at the same time as the ascendance of his poetic counterpart is being reified[19]. Early modern theatrical texts do defy a post-Romantic scripting of the author-figure: as works frequently attributable to more than one hand, or with later revisions by the author or another writer, with cuts and alterations made by the actors and with changes, rereadings and omissions introduced into printed texts through the so-called 'memorial reconstruction' or the activity of the print-house compositors. Even the later term to suggest indistinct authorship, ‘anonymous’, perpetuates the idea of a single, albeit unknowable, point of authorial origin. As the OED attests, anonymity was a feature of persons not texts during this period, and it is not until the late seventeenth century that the namelessness the word comes to be attached to literary works. The first OED citation of this usage (‘anonymous’, 2) is dated to 1676. Masten describes the dramatic texts on which he focuses as ‘texts [which] began as productions in the theatre, where their writers were not known, and many of them first appeared in print without ascription of authorship (or anonymity); they are thus “pre-anonymous” - that is “anonymous” only in a sense that existed before the word itself emerged with the author to describe their condition’.[20] Langbaine’s insistence on the anonymity of the Hieronimo play marks this shift in the perception of authorship and texts, in which the anonymity which attached itself by omission to printed editions of *The Spanish Tragedy* becomes semantically solidified as a positive textual attribute. Masten’s historical teleology of the interpretation of authorship argues that ‘the author’s emergence is marked by the notice of its absence’[21], thus claiming for anonymity a decisive interest in the ‘who is speaking’[22] of the text. For Langbaine, however, the label of anonymity registers not as the shadowy obverse of authorisation, Masten’s ‘space for identity’, nor as a temporary mystery tolerated ‘in the guise of an enigma’[23], but as an alternative, final, and decisive attribution.

In examining the historical construction of the authorship of *The Spanish Tragedy* I want to discuss the implications of the insistent derogation, or abdication, of the author-function in favour of what might be called a ‘character-function’. Throughout the early modern reception of the play, this discourse of the character-function persistently drowns out that of the author. For when Heywood alludes to ‘M. Kid’, he is, of course, quoting a character from the play rather than its author. Thus an immediate answer to Foucault’s obligatory question ‘who is speaking’ is, in this instance, Hieronimo. Foucault’s specific stress on orality as an index of authorship makes it an appropriate attribute not of the writing subject - the author - but the speaking subject - the actor/character. It is Hieronimo who uses the dark example of Nero's dramatic patronage to encourage the uncertain Spanish court to agree to stage the play through which he will take his revenge, and, in Heywood's example, it is Hieronimo who stands as a metonym for *The Spanish Tragedy* and its implied author. By extension, Heywood's use of Hieronimo's speech in his polemic defence of the stage registers the self-authorising, self-justifying, and habitually self-reflexive mode of early modern dramatic discourse. Similarly, when the character of Burbage in *The Return from Parnassus* refers to *The Spanish Tragedy* he too cites Hieronimo rather than Kyd, following the authorial names 'Jonson' and 'Shakespeare' used to denote those playwrights' works with the significantly contrasted character name 'Hieronimo' to denote the play *The Spanish Tragedy*.

In numerous other references to the play, attesting to its impact on the theatrical culture of the pre-Civil war period, it is Hieronimo who continues to dominate the history of the reception of Kyd's work. A reference in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* (printed 1601), for example, makes a particular joke out of the literary merits of the play, which might be expected to include a sideswipe at its author. It is, after all, hard to believe that Jonson, paid for writing additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, did not know of its author:

> *Bobadilla* What new book have you there? what? *Go by, Hieronimo*.
> *Mathew* I, did you ever see it acted? is't not well pend?
> *Bobadilla* Well pend! I would fain see all the Poets of our times pen such another play as that was: they'll prate and swagger and keepe a stirre of arte and devises, when, (by Gods so), they are the most shallow, pittifull, fellowes, that live upon the face of the earth againe.
> *Mathew* Indeede here are a number of fine speeches in this booke. *O eyes, no eyes but fountaines fraught with teares*! there's a conceit! *fountaines fraught with teares! O life, no life, but lively forme of death*! is't not excellent? *O world, no world. but masse of publique wrongs!* O Gods mee: *Confusde and filde with murther and misdeeds*! Is't not excellent? Is't not simply the best that ever you heard? Ha! how do you like it?

> *Bobadilla* Tis good.[24]

Elsewhere, Jonson, whose interest in the play was abiding however derisive he tried to be about it, makes more than a dozen identifiable references to *The Spanish Tragedy* but never mentions its author. He alludes directly to Kyd only in the enigmatic phrase 'sporting Kid' in 'To the Memory of my beloved, the Author. Mr William Shakespeare: And what he hath left us', his dedicatory poem included in the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare's works. Dekker, Webster, Middleton, Fletcher, and numerous other writers in drama, poetry, and prose, all demonstrate their familiarity with, and assume their readers' familiarity with the play either by quoting or parodying its famous lines or through the mention of its leading protagonist. Occasionally other characters in the play are used to signal an allusion, particularly Don Andrea as in this reference from Chapman, Jonson, and Marston's 1605 play *Eastward Hoe*:

> *Quicksilver When this eternall substance of my soule.*
> *Touchstone* Well said, change your gold ends for your play ends.
> *Quicksilver Did live imprison'd in my wanton flesh.*
> *Touchstone* What then sir?
> *Quicksilver I was a Courtier in the Spanish Court, & Don Andrea was my name.*
> *Touchstone* Good maister *Don Andrea* will you marche?
> Q*uicksilver* Sweete *Touchstone*, will you lend me two shillings?[25]

Less frequently, Horatio, as in the reference from the anonymous *The Wasp, or the Subjects Precedent* dating from the 1630s which quotes 'Thanks good Horatio (but take thy glove Againe, she answers no challenges, I am her champeon'[26], or Bel-Imperia, as in Thomas Dekker's 'How dost thou my smug Belimperia?[27] are cited. In some references, the distinctive rhetorical patterning of *The Spanish Tragedy*'s verse stands as a synecdoche for the whole play, particularly in the numerous parodies of Hieronimo's 'O eyes, no eyes' lament. John Cooke's *Greenes Tu Quoque* (1614) is one example:

> *Geraldine* [Love] shall make you fetch your breath short againe.
> *Rash* And make mee cry, O eyes, no eyes, but two celestiall starres! A Pox ont, Ide as leive hear a fellow sing through the nose[28].

While these allusions draw on the recognisability of the play's characters and language, it is clear that it is Hieronimo who dominates this recognition. Most references to the play substitute the name of the play's central protagonist in place of its implied literary patronym. Apart from Heywood's reference in 1612, no writer links the play with its author[29].

In his essay 'From Work to Text', Roland Barthes distinguishes between the two concepts of his title:

> the work can be seen in bookstores, in card catalogues, and on course lists, while the text reveals itself, articulates itself according to, or against certain rules. While the work is held in the hand, the text is held in language; it exists only as discourse.[30]

Barthes discusses the issue of authorship in terms of the myths of paternity and filiation. 'The author is regarded as the father and owner of his work', whereas 'the Text […] is read without the father's signature […] without its father's guarantee'. Thus the author's self-inscription in the text is always as 'one of his characters, as another figure sewn into the rug; his signature is no longer privileged and paternal, the locus of genuine truth, but, rather, ludic.'[31] If the reception of *The Spanish Tragedy* denies the filiation myth of authorship through the absence of any reference to Kyd, it reinscribes paternity as a crucial governor of dramatic action through its replacement of the author-patriarch with the character-patriarch. Hieronimo's character in the play rests on his paternal relationship to Horatio. It is because of the murder of Horatio that Hieronimo seeks a revenge which is fuelled by and ultimately consumes other sons of other fathers. His blunted purpose is whetted by the grief of Don Bazulto, the old man who comes to him in his legal capacity as Knight Marshall but who touches him in his familial, paternal capacity as a matching bereft father. The Viceroy of Portugal sees his son Balthazar killed in the deadly playlet which also takes the life of Lorenzo, son of the Duke of Castile. The carnage of the final scene is strongly focused on the grief of fathers, from the body of Horatio, which acts as a visual explanation of Hieronimo's action, to the anguish of the Viceroy and Castile. The play may surrender the ultimate paternity of fixed, named authorship, in Barthes's terms, but its thematic inscription of paternity is curiously overdetermined. It is strangely appropriate that this emphasis should be further highlighted in a passage added to the original play by someone other than Kyd, perhaps Jonson, and printed for the first time in the 1602 quarto. The existence of these interpolated passages establish the play's fundamental independence from its author, denying the singularity of a paternal model of authorship. At the same time they stress the particular importance of the father-son relationship as a motif and dynamic of the play. In the additional passages Hieronimo reiterates the paternal bond, in his obsessively circular and recurring musing on 'what's a sonne'[32], and his request that the relationship be resurrected through the art of the painter Bazardo - another bereaved father - whom he commissions to paint a family portrait of his 'speaking looke to my sonne *Horatio* […] God blesse thee, my sweete sonne: and my hand leaning on his head' (sig. H3v^{o}). The final addition underlines the play's stress on the father-son relationship and, indeed, proposes it as an explanatory principle for the whole bloody action, in Hieronimo's penultimate speech:

> You had a sonne (as I take it) and your sonne,
> Should ha'e beene married to your daughter: ha, wast not so?
> You had a sonne too, he was my Lieges Nephew. […]
> Looke you this same hand, twas it that stab'd
> His heart, Doe you see this hand?
> For one *Horatio*, if you ever knew him
> A youth, one that they hanged up in his fathers garden:
> One that did force your valiant sonne to yeelde,
> While your more valiant sonne did take him prisoner. (sig. M)

These additional passages which explicitly challenge the metaphor of paternity as a logic of authorship reinstate it as a logic of dramatic action. Again, the function of external authorship is relegated to a self-authoring dramatic paternity, as Hieronimo occupies centre-stage as the play's patriarch appropriating textual authority from the absent author-father.

References to *The Spanish Tragedy* establish Hieronimo, not Kyd, as its authorising patronymic and metonym. Interestingly, the play also establishes Hieronimo as an author, whose only known oeuvre bears the same title as a play associated with Kyd. Setting the scene for the playlet designed ostensibly to celebrate the marriage of Bel-Imperia and Balthazar, but really guaranteed to turn nuptials into slaughter, Hieronimo remembers his own efforts as a playwright:

> When in *Tolledo*, there I studied,
> It was my chance to write a Tragedie:
> See heere my Lords,
> Which long forgot, I found this other day. (sig. K3-v^{o})

Hieronimo proceeds to outline the plot of his play, the story of Soliman the Turkish emperor who kills a Knight of Rhodes, Erasto, in order to win his beautiful wife, Perseda. This story, apparently derived from Henry Wotton's *A Courtlie Controversie of Cupids Cautels* (1578), is also retold in a play called Soliman and Perseda, entered on the Stationers' Register in 1592 and frequently attributed to Kyd.

The evidence for Kyd's authorship of this play is, as Freeman admits, 'entirely internal'[33], and is based heavily on the plot parallel with Hieronimo's play. Both Freeman and Boas are convinced by perceived similarities of style and expression, and Freeman, arguing that ‘one cannot but sense behind [*Soliman and Perseda*] an author of approximately Kyd’s level of intelligence and artistry’ and that the play is ‘tinged with the stoical melancholy characteristic of Kyd’, concludes that ‘the weight of the evidence is definitely for Kyd’s authorship’. Describing this attribution as ‘a maximal probability’, Freeman distinguishes between the uses of the author-function in different contexts. He admits that ‘by the most conservative standards of cataloguing, of course, the play must remain “anonymous”, but for the special purposes of scholars and readers in the period I think it safe to assign *Soliman and Perseda* to Kyd’[34]. While stylometric and other types of linguistic analysis may indeed discern certain similarities between *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Soliman and Perseda* from which their shared author might be deduced, the main burden of the claims for Kyd’s authorship of *Soliman and Perseda* rests on its similarity with Hieronimo’s play. In a curious twist of artistic precedence, Kyd’s authorship is constructed by Hieronimo’s; ultimately, Hieronimo is seen to write Kyd as author, rather than the other way round, as Kyd becomes an authorial effect rather than effective author. Hieronimo as an actual dramatic author within the play further displaces the idea of an extra-textual writing authority. John Kerrigan has observed in his account of the particular kinship of revenge and drama with reference to *The Spanish Tragedy*:

> If revenge attracts the dramatist because, by submitting characters to a scenario, it does as a matter of course what his own writing does perforce, it also attracts him because the revenger is a surrogate artist. (Kyd himself wrote a play called *Soliman and Perseda* published at about the same time as *The Spanish Tragedy*)[35].

Hieronimo is not, however, merely the surrogate artist in general terms but a surrogate and specific author whose function at once underwrites and overshadows that of Kyd himself.

Hieronimo’s usurpation of the cultural fiction of the author-function in and through *The Spanish Tragedy* can, therefore, point to some interesting questions about the construction of early modern dramatic authorship and authority. Kyd's role in the textual production and reception of the play is absolutely overtaken and overlaid with that of its main protagonist. This is more than a testimony to the effectiveness of dramatic characterisation, although it may indeed register the impact of Hieronimo's role on contemporary audiences and readers. Rather the absence of Kyd from the narrative of the play's popularity and influence represents a distinct and significant figuring of dramatic authorship within a discourse of cultural familiarity. Hieronimo authors his play, both intra-textually in the masque in the final act of *The Spanish Tragedy* and extra-textually as the authority behind the play itself. His name stands as the authority behind and reference for the play, in place of the authorial patronymic. The contrast between Kyd's non-appearance in discourse about *The Spanish Tragedy* and the frequency of references to Hieronimo offers an extreme example of a tendency to divorce dramatic authors from their theatrical creations in the period more generally. There is, in broad terms, a division between a rhetoric of admiration or recognition of named authors - the beginnings of a literary and dramatic canon based on authorship - and an engagement with particular texts, represented not by their playwright but by a fictional character within them. Thus Meres, Jonson, and Dekker all allude to Kyd but with no reference to his works, whereas in other contexts, Jonson, Dekker, and scores of other writers mention Hieronimo independent of an author.

A couple of other examples bear out this suggestion of a bifurcation between dramatic authors and their works. Christopher Marlowe's notoriety ensured that many of the references to him after his death in 1593 were pseudo-biographical in that they were more concerned with the supposed details of his ungodly life than with the literary works produced during it. Thomas Beard's *The Theatre of Gods Judgements* (1597) sets the tone of late sixteenth-century commentary on Marlowe as one whose impiety and wickedness was punished in the moral justice of his death, believed to be with his own dagger. Parallel with this demonising discourse on Marlowe, but separate from it, are references to Tamburlaine and Faustus which are not tagged by an author, even when they are similarly used as moral illustrations. Thus one of Joseph Hall's satires in *Virgidemiaram* (1597-8) refers to 'the Turkish *Tamburlaine*', and Thomas Dekker imagines the plague as a 'stalking Tamburlaine' but neither names Marlowe[36]. Shakespeare allusions offer further illustration of the point. Of over thirty allusions to Falstaff, probably Shakespeare's most popular character, up to 1649, only three associate him with his author, and two of these are in unpublished manuscripts. It is not until 1646 that Robert Wild's comedy *The Benefice* mentions Shakespeare and Falstaff in the same breath. Interestingly, two references included in *The Shakspere Allusion-Book* refer to Falstaff as author. The first, a letter known as 'one friend to another, who shewes much trouble for the miscarriage of a letter' (c.1610) collected by 'Sr Tobie Matthews, Knt' quotes 'that excellent author, Sr *John Falstaff*'[37]. The second, a dedicatory poem to the collection of plays by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher in 1647, inserts Falstaff as a metonym for the author between two named playwrights:

> I could prayse *Heywood* now: or tell how long,
> *Falstaffe* from cracking Nuts kept the throng:
> But for a *Fletcher*, I must take an Age
> And scarce invent the Title for one page.[38]

Such references are quite independent of any attribution: Shakespeare and Falstaff, like Kyd and Hieronimo, seem mutually exclusive rather than inseparably associated.

There is a strong possibility, then, that the relegation of Kyd and the corresponding authority invested in Hieronimo, marks a pattern inscribed elsewhere in the narrative of the consciousness of early modern dramatic authorship. This raises interesting questions about textual authority in dramatic texts of the period. At what point does Kyd, or Marlowe or Shakespeare - the author-function - gain the upper hand over Hieronimo, or Tamburlaine or Falstaff? How can we historicise the decline in the cultural autonomy of dramatic characters and the authorisation of authorship in a metonymic relation to specific texts? When does ‘Kyd’, rather than Hieronimo, come to stand for *The Spanish Tragedy*, and what is the effect of this substitution? Can we account for early modern dramatic authorship in the same terms as other kinds of authorship, or does, as I have been suggesting, the contest between writing author and speaking character make the ‘who is speaking’ altogether more unstable?

[1] See D.F. Rowan, 'The Staging of *The Spanish Tragedy* in G.R. Hibbard (ed.), *The Elizabethan Theatre V*

[2] Arthur Freeman, *Thomas Kyd: Facts and Problems* (Oxford:1967), pp. 70-1.

[3] On the references to the play, see 'Hieronimo's Afterlives' in Emma Smith (ed.), *Thomas Kyd,* The Spanish Tragedie (Harmondsworth: 1998).

[4] Thomas Dekker, *A Knights Conjuring* (London: 1607), sig. K4v^{o}; Francis Meres quoted in Freeman, p.19.

[5] William Covell, *Polimenteia, or, The Meanes lawfull and unlawfull, to judge of the fall of a common-wealth* (Cambridge:1595), sig. Q3v^{o}.

[6] John Bodenham (ed.), *Bel-vedére or The Garden of the Muses* (London:1600), sig, A5v^{o}.

[7] On the identification of passages in *Bel-vedére*, see C. Crawford, 'Belvedere, or the Garden of the Muses', *Englische Studien* 43 (1910-11), pp198-228.

[8] Frederick S. Boas (ed.), *The Works of Thomas Kyd* (Oxford: revised edition, 1955), p.lxxvi.

[9] Freeman, p.49.

[10] Anon., *The Returne from Parnassus* (Tudor Facsimile Texts, n.p.: 1912), sig. G3.

[11] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (New York: 1941), sig. E3v^{o}-E4.

[12] Freeman, p.49.

[13] William Winstanley, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* ed. William Riley Parker (Florida:1963), p.100.

[14] Winstanley, p.218.

[15] Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (Menston:1971), p.316.

[16] Langbaine, p.489.

[17] It is not until 1773 that Thomas Hawkins excavates Heywood's *An Apology for Actors* as evidence for Kyd's authorship of *The Spanish Tragedy* in 1773, accusing Phillips and Winstanley of error in attributing the play to (Hawkin's own mistake) 'Thomas Smith' (*The Origins of the English Drama* vol.2 sig. A2).

[18] Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?' in Josué Harari (transl. and ed.), *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (London: 1980), pp141-60, 148.

[19] In, for example, Kevin Pask, *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: 1996), and Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley and London: 1983).

[20] Jeffrey A. Masten, 'Beaumont and\or Fletcher: Collaboration and the Interpretation of Renaissance Drama' in Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (eds), *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature* (Durham and London: 1994), pp361-399, 363.

[21] Masten, p.361.

[22] Foucault, p.160.

[23] Foucault, p.150.

[24] Ben Jonson, *Every Man in his* Humour in *Ben Jonson* eds C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: 1927), III, p.210.

[25] George Chapman, Ben Jonson, and John Marston, *Eastward Hoe* (London:1605), sig. B3v^{o}.

[26] *The Wasp or Subject's Precedent* (Malone Society Reprints, Oxford:1976), p.51.

[27] Thomas Dekker, *Satiromastix. or, The Untrussing of the Humorous Poet* in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge:1953), I, p.341.

[28] John Cooke, *Greenes Tu Quoque, or the Cittie Gallant* (London: 1614), sig. H2.

[29] Over one hundred allusions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, some of them tenuous, are listed, but not quoted in Claude Dundrap, '*La Tragédie Espagnole* face à la Critique Elizabéthaine et Jacobéene' in Jean Jacquot (ed.), *Dramaturgie et Société* (Paris: 1968), pp 607-31. Full references to the play from 1598 to 1675 are collected in 'Hieronimo's Afterlives' in Emma Smith (ed.), *Thomas Kyd,* The Spanish Tragedie (Harmondsworth: 1998).

[30] Roland Barthes, 'From Work to Text' in Josué Harari (transl. and ed.), *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (London: 1980), pp.73-81, 75.

[31] Barthes, p.78.

[32] Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy with Additions* (Malone Society Reprint, Oxford:1925), sig. G3v^{o}. All subsequent references to the play are to this edition.

[33] Freeman, p.140.

[34] See Freeman, pp 140-6; Boas, pp lvi-lix.

[35] John Kerrigan, *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon* (Oxford:1996), p.17.

[36] On these and other early modern allusions to Marlowe, see Millar MacLure (ed.), *Christopher Marlowe: The*

Critical Heritage (London and New York: 1979), pp 29-50.

[37] *The Shakspere Allusion-Book: A Collection of Allusions to Shakspeare from 1591-1700* (Oxford: 1932), I, p.88.

[38] T. Palmer, quoted in *The Shakspere Allusion-Book*, p.502.