

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

'COUNTERFEITING' SHAKESPEARE

Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegye

'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare addresses the fundamental issue of what Shakespeare actually wrote, and how this is determined. In recent years his authorship has been claimed for two poems, the lyric 'Shall I die?' and *A Funerall Elegye*. These attributions have been accepted into certain major editions of Shakespeare's works but Brian Vickers argues that both attributions rest on superficial verbal parallels, isolated words and phrases which were merely commonplace expressions; both use too small a sample, ignore negative evidence, and violate basic principles in authorship studies. Through a fresh examination of the evidence, Professor Vickers shows that neither poem has the stylistic and imaginative qualities we associate with Shakespeare. In other words, they are 'counterfeits', in the sense of anonymously authored works wrongly presented as Shakespeare's. He argues that the poet and dramatist John Ford wrote the *Elegye*: its poetical language (vocabulary, syntax, prosody) is indistinguishable from Ford's, and it contains several hundred close parallels with his work. By combining linguistic and statistical analysis this book makes an important contribution to authorship studies.

BRIAN VICKERS is Professor of English Literature and Director of the Centre for Renaissance Studies at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zürich. He is a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy. His publications on Shakespeare include *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (1968, 1979); a six-volume collection of early Shakespeare criticism, *Shakespeare: the Critical Heritage, 1623–1801* (1974–1981, 1996); *Returning to Shakespeare* (1989); *Appropriating Shakespeare. Contemporary Critical Quarrels* (1993); and *Shakespeare, Co-author. A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (2002). Professor Vickers is also a specialist in rhetoric and stylistics, his publications including *Francis Bacon and Renaissance Prose* (Cambridge, 1968), *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry* (1970, 1989), and *In Defence of Rhetoric* (1988).

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

'COUNTERFEITING' SHAKESPEARE

Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegye

Cambridge University Press
0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye
Brian Vickers
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

‘COUNTERFEITING’
SHAKESPEARE

Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegye

BRIAN VICKERS



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
 0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
 Funerall Elegye
 Brian Vickers
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
 The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
 The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
 Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Brian Vickers 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
 and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
 no reproduction of any part may take place without
 the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Baskerville Monotype 11/12.5 pt *System* L^AT_EX 2 ϵ [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Vickers, Brian.
 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegye /
 Brian Vickers.
 p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 0 521 77243 5

1. W. S. Funerall Elegye in Memory of the Late Vertuous Maister William Peeter of Whipton
 Neere Excester. 2. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616 - Authorship. 3. Ford, John,
 1586-ca. 1640 - Authorship. 4. Poetry - Authorship. I. Title.

PR2873.F86 v53 2002
 822.3'3 - dc21 2001052632

ISBN 0 521 77243 5 hardback

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

For Gwen

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Contents*

<i>Preface</i>	page xi
<i>List of tables</i>	xxii
<i>List of abbreviations and note on references</i>	xxiv
 <i>Prologue.</i> Gary Taylor finds a poem	 I
 PART I. DONALD FOSTER'S 'SHAKESPEAREAN' CONSTRUCT	
1. 'W. S.' and the <i>Elegye</i> for William Peter	57
2. Parallels? Plagiarisms?	80
3. Vocabulary and diction	100
4. Grammar: 'the Shakespearean "who"'	121
5. Prosody, punctuation, pause patterns	139
6. Rhetoric: 'the Shakespearean "hendiadys"'	163
7. Statistics and inference	189
8. A poem 'indistinguishable from Shakespeare'?	204
 PART II. JOHN FORD'S 'FUNERALL ELEGYE'	
9. Ford's writing career: poet, moralist, playwright	263
10. Ford and the <i>Elegye</i> 's 'Shakespearean diction'	302
11. The <i>Funerall Elegye</i> in its Fordian context	363
<i>Epilogue.</i> The politics of attribution	422

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

Contents

APPENDICES

I. The text of <i>A Funerall Elegye</i>	469
II. Verbal parallels between <i>A Funerall Elegye</i> and Ford's poems	484
III. Establishing Ford's canon	494
<i>Notes</i>	509
<i>Bibliography</i>	554
<i>Index</i>	563

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Preface

A fundamental issue in humanistic enquiry concerns the authenticity of the documents we study. In history, philosophy, and many other disciplines, it is essential to know that the texts we use have been properly authenticated. If scholars base theories and interpretations on texts which turn out to be forgeries, or erroneously attributed, their work loses all validity. Arguably, the importance of properly identifying authorship is even greater in literature, since our engagement with the detail of language in poetry, drama, or fiction is far more intense than that of the philosopher or historian. In literary texts the direct confrontation with language is the primary experience, to which we constantly return. We take it for granted that even the most humble writers deserve to have their work correctly identified, an expectation which becomes more exigent the more eminent the author. With a dramatist as universally admired as Shakespeare, the discovery of a so far unknown play or poem would be a cause for great rejoicing. Conversely, the inclusion in his canon of work erroneously attributed to him would be deeply depressing, almost tragic.

Such an unhappy state of affairs has indeed come about recently, largely as a result of the work of Gary Taylor, who has caused an undated, anonymous short lyric, 'Shall I die?', to be included in both the Oxford and Norton Shakespeare editions, and Donald Foster, whose advocacy of Shakespeare's authorship of *A Funerall Elegye in Memory of the late Vertuous Maister William Peeter of Whipton Neere Excester*, published in 1612 as the work of one 'W. S.', caused it to be included in the Norton Shakespeare, quickly copied by the Riverside and Longman editions. The last two editions maintain a cautious neutrality, with a token reference to arguments for and against the ascription, but to many readers the very presence of these poems in the four most widely used one-volume editions of Shakespeare, which sell thousands of copies every year, may be taken as proof that they have been accepted into the canon. Was this

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

an enlightened step forward, or a dreadful mistake? This book addresses that issue, the 'counterfeiting' of Shakespeare. I use that word not with its primary meaning, the forging of a document with fraudulent intent, but in the metaphorical sense of presenting anonymously authored work as Shakespeare's. The highly publicized 'discoveries' made by Taylor and Foster are, I suggest, 'counterfeits' of the authentic work. I believe that neither poem has any claim to be included in the canon, and that the arguments by which Taylor and Foster have managed to get them accepted fail to meet correct procedures in authorship studies.

The Prologue, 'Gary Taylor Finds a Poem', besides describing the instant controversy surrounding 'Shall I die?', is intended as a brief introduction to the methodology used in attribution studies. (I have discussed this topic more fully in a forthcoming book on Shakespeare's five collaborative plays, called *Shakespeare, Co-author*.) When Taylor first claimed for Shakespeare this anonymous lyric, which he had found in a manuscript collection in the Bodleian Library, many critics objected that he had not used correct scholarly methods. Taylor had compiled a list of words and phrases in the poem for which he cited parallels in Shakespeare, but he made at least three major errors: he failed to check the claimed parallels against the work of other poets working between 1590 and 1620, and so never tested his claim against negative evidence; he worked with atomistic verbal units, instead of comparing longer sequences of language and thought; and he failed to notice that even where the anonymous poet used words that Shakespeare had also used, he did so with quite different connotations. As the controversy continued, several scholars made constructive suggestions concerning the poem's probable date and genre, strengthening the by now unanimous disbelief that Shakespeare had written it. Taylor scaled down some of his claims, but clung to the attribution, and – with the support of his senior editor, Stanley Wells – printed 'Shall I die?' in the Oxford *Complete Works* under the heading 'Various Poems', from which it migrated to the Norton edition, which bought in the Oxford text. This episode, besides illustrating some of the basic principles of authorship studies, also brings out the important role played in modern discussions by institutions and the media, issues to which I return in the Epilogue.

Gary Taylor's claims for 'Shall I die?' aroused instant controversy by the dogmatic terms in which they were formulated: 'this poem belongs to Shakespeare's canon and, unless somebody can dislodge it, it will stay there'. When Donald Foster first published his claim that William Shakespeare wrote the 1612 *Funerall Elegye*, in a revised doctoral

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface*

xiii

dissertation (Foster 1989), it was accompanied by occasional prudent statements disclaiming a positive identification. Anyone who read the book soon discovered that the claims did not represent the real argument, which used a copious repertoire of tests designed to identify the 'W. S.' with Shakespeare, and to disqualify all other candidates. The less dogmatic tone had the disadvantage that Foster's claim excited less interest than Taylor's, a sad comment on the way that media attention is only attracted by extreme positions. But a few years later, apparently urged on by Richard Abrams, Foster restated his case in far more intransigent terms, consciously echoing Taylor's statement: '*A Funerall Elegye* belongs hereafter with Shakespeare's poems and plays . . . because it is formed from textual and linguistic fabric indistinguishable from that of canonical Shakespeare' (Foster 1996a, p. 1082). A gratifying media buzz responded to these newly emphatic assertions, a wave of attention that brought the poem into those three college editions, and even caused the makers of a tote-bag sold by the Folger Shakespeare Library, on which were printed the titles of all Shakespeare's works, to add *A Funerall Elegye*. The dogmatic tone so successful then has never been dropped, and – despite many detailed criticisms of his work – Foster still maintains that he is right, his critics completely wrong.

Since Foster used many more different approaches than Taylor, I have had to devote correspondingly more space to evaluating his methodology and results. The first seven chapters in Part I discuss the external and internal evidence for his claims, in a systematic and painstaking manner. The results are extremely damaging to Foster's argument. He never presented any evidence that Shakespeare knew William Peter, a young and obscure Devonshire gentleman killed in a drunken quarrel over a horse. Foster concluded that the initials 'W. S.' faithfully represented those of the *Elegye's* actual author, while failing to note abundant evidence that in the early modern period signing works with initials alone was often an act of misattribution, whether for self-protection or deliberate fraud. Foster passed by that and related issues, such as the honesty of Elizabethan publishers, although it is clear that their notion of acceptable business practices was quite different from our own (see chapter 1).

These over-simplifications allowed Foster to present as unproblematic the identification of a writer from initials. In other areas he simply mis-read texts. He cited an Elizabethan play as evidence that Shakespeare was regularly described as a plagiarist: in fact, it proves the opposite, that he was often plagiarized. He quoted Charles Barber to support his claim that Shakespeare was unusual in using the personal pronoun

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xiv

Preface

who to refer to antecedent inanimates ('the knees *who*'), but Barber had actually pointed out that what is, by modern standards, an anomaly, was common usage in the seventeenth century. Foster was so convinced that the use of *who* for inanimate antecedents, also found in the *Elegye*, established Shakespeare's authorship of this poem, that he christened it 'the Shakespearean *who*'. An embarrassing number of scholars believed him, but historians of the English language have long known that the anomalous *who* continued well into the eighteenth century, and was used by Dryden, Swift, and Addison (see chapter 4).

Foster's whole enterprise rested on finding unique verbal quirks in the *Elegye*, shared by 'W. S.' and Shakespeare alone, as if those two writers represented a closed linguistic category. Here he fell into the same error as Gary Taylor, if on a larger scale: his sample was too small, and he failed to look for contrary evidence. Foster compiled an impressive 'Checklist of English Memorial Verse, 1570–1630', which might have constituted a viable database, but his comparative analyses were based on a much smaller 'Cross-Sample' of elegies published between 1610 and 1613, totalling forty poems of varying lengths, amounting to 82,000 lines. But obviously 'W. S.' might have written another elegy between 1600 and 1609, or might have produced other forms of verse. Foster's sample was far too small to justify the absolute claims he made, having identified linguistic habits shared by 'W. S.' and Shakespeare. It was not just the sample that was too small: Foster's own reference-base was too narrow, relying as he did on the few concordances then available for Elizabethan and Jacobean writers. Despite this limitation, Foster made categorical but erroneous pronouncements about Shakespeare's linguistic practices, such as that he was unusual in using the word 'comfortable' to mean 'comforting', or that he used 'opinion' in a special sense. But a less narrow reading experience of English drama, or the Bible, would have prevented both errors (see chapter 3).

Foster seems to have considered only evidence supporting his claim. He made a special point about the nine most frequently recurring words in Shakespeare's vocabulary (*and, but, not, so, that, to, with, by, in*), but only subjected the first four to statistical analysis, which produced a favourable correlation between the *Elegye* and Shakespeare. He did not discuss the results for the remaining five words, which show huge differences. Foster claimed that the high frequency of run-on lines in the *Elegye* correlated with that of Shakespeare's late plays: but this figure relied on his modernization of the poem's punctuation. His figures for the

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface*

xv

poem's sentence-lengths were also based on his modernized text, and are equally invalid. Elsewhere Foster shifted his point of comparison. When comparing the *Elegye's* use of verses having an extra or hypermetric syllable (so-called 'feminine endings'), he no longer cited the late plays – where the difference between 'W. S.' and Shakespeare is glaring – but moved back to Shakespeare's much earlier poems. Foster did not cite other available evidence from the poem's prosody – its use of hexameter lines; its placing of mid-verse pauses; its use of enclitic and proclitic phrases – all of which would have shown that the *Elegye* differs markedly from Shakespeare's verse-style at the end of his career (see chapter 5).

All these, and other failings, are documented in the following chapters. Foster's energetic assertiveness clearly persuaded many readers that a genuine scholarly case had been made. Having been led to accept the existence of 'the Shakespearean *who*', they were equally ready to accept his identification of 'the Shakespearean *hendiadys*'. Foster took over the case made by previous writers that Shakespeare was unusually fond of this rhetorical figure, but in claiming to have found seventeen instances of it in the *Elegye* he showed that he had not understood its function and internal dynamic. Most of those instances are mere noun-doublings, lacking the specifically Shakespearian qualities by which the terms become interfused (see chapter 6). Foster subjected this linguistic detail, like all the others, to statistical analysis, but literary statistics need to be based on a correct identification of the relevant verbal feature. A closer look at the inferences Foster drew from his statistics shows that these are faulty in many respects (see chapter 7). Those are the main conclusions of my examination of Donald Foster's claims. Just like Gary Taylor's, his methodology was based on far too narrow a sample, and he failed to deal properly with contrary evidence. Replying to further objections from critics, Foster stated that his Shakespeare attribution 'now rests on a broad and substantial foundation. What's required to dislodge it is not just the overthrow of a few minor points (though I do not see where even that has happened) but a systematical rebuttal' (Foster 1997, p. 433). I trust that I have provided this.

If one reads the *Funerall Elegye* without preconceptions, as I do in chapter 8, its unresemblance to Shakespeare's work stands out clearly. Unlike his two long narrative poems, it lacks any overall design, falling into two halves, the second of which repeats much of the first. It uses a few standard topics from the consolatory tradition in a vague and abstract manner, giving no sense of the deceased's individuality, and getting some biographical details wrong. Unlike any of Shakespeare's

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xvi

Preface

writings, it includes a long theological discussion of Christ's life and death. The poem's diction is highly abstract, Latinate, polysyllabic, far more so than anything Shakespeare wrote between 1609 and 1612. A remarkable number of verse lines begin with low-content function-words (*of, as, which, in*), or with gerunds, an unimaginative formulaic style quite unlike Shakespeare's. It uses many pleonasms, especially in order to provide rhyming words; its syntactical inversions are clumsy, often for the sake of the rhyme; and its rhetoric is dysfunctional in a way that Shakespeare's never was. These and other features allow us to dismiss it as unShakespearean.

Who, then, wrote the *Elegye*? In Part II I present the case, in three stages, for John Ford's authorship. In chapter 9 I first review the biographical evidence, much of it collected by Donald Foster, who failed to see its implications. Ford was born in a Devonshire village not far from William Peter's birthplace. Peter was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, just like John Ford and Ford's cousin William. William Peter and William Ford were at Exeter together from 1601 to 1608, sharing the same tutor, and although John Ford left Oxford in 1602, he must have known Peter well. The two families even owned adjoining estates. The biographical context provides a likelihood for Ford having been in a position to write the poem, where nothing similar can be shown for Shakespeare. I then discuss Ford's writing career, much of which will be unfamiliar to non-specialists, particularly his poems and prose works, produced between 1606 and 1620. Ford's poetry includes two memorial poems to the Earl of Devonshire, *Fames Memoriall* (1606) and a shorter poem, 'In honorable memory'; *Christes Bloodie Sweat* (1613), a long meditative poem in memory of Christ's suffering; a memorial poem on the death of Sir Thomas Overbury; another on the death of Ben Jonson; and yet another (discovered by the late Jeremy Maule) on the death of John Fletcher. In fact, nearly all of Ford's verse consists of memorial poems, which celebrate the deceased's virtues and untimely death, while denouncing his enemies and asserting his lasting fame – exactly the scheme of the *Funerall Elegye*. Ford's poem on Christ reveals an impressive knowledge of the Bible, and a confidence in discussing theological topics, that he shares with 'W. S.'. The other tradition represented in the *Elegye*, with its emphasis on the word 'steady', is Stoicism, a philosophy which celebrated the virtue of *constantia*. Ford contributed substantially to English Neo-Stoicism with his two prose works, *The Golden Meane* (1613; revised 1614), and *A Line of Life* (1620), both of which contain further celebrations of virtue under

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface*

xvii

duress. Ford's competence in this vein would have assured him a firm place in the Christian–classical moralizing tradition, had he not decided in about 1619 to become a dramatist. The plays that he produced over the next two decades range through many emotional states, often sensational, but they retain a strong concern with the link between virtue and constancy in the face of misfortune, William Peter's prime characteristic, according to 'W. S.'.

In chapter 10 I analyse Ford's diction, using the same categories by which Donald Foster pronounced that of the *Elegye* to be 'indistinguishable' from Shakespeare's. I show that for every feature that Foster picked out – words beginning *un-*, or ending with *-ful* and *-less*; *very* as a restrictive adjective; a preference for *whiles* rather than *while*; the use of such old-fashioned forms as *wert*, *hath*, *doth*, and so forth – Ford's diction is actually closer to that of 'W. S.'. I then analyse the *Elegye*'s 'distinctive vocabulary', as Foster termed it, which turns out to be very like Ford's. Foster claimed that 'W. S.' resembled Shakespeare more than any other poet, but he used concordances of poets a generation or more older than 'W. S.': the same set of words shows a far higher correlation with Ford. I then analyse Ford's vocabulary, showing it to be just as Latinate and polysyllabic as that favoured by 'W. S.', with exactly the same fondness for creating past participles from nouns ('possibilited', 'nobilitated', 'monumented', 'conundrumed'). I show that Ford used function-words, especially the preposition *of*, with a frequency and in specific syntactical constructions, in exactly the same way as 'W. S.' did. Both writers were unusually prone to using nouns ending *-ness*, formed from epithets; both liked to begin verse lines with gerunds; both liked syntactical constructions of the kind *If . . . then*. Ford's verse-style in his poems (1606, 1613) was very similar to that of the *Elegye* (1612), showing comparable frequencies in the use of run-on lines, feminine endings, and pleonastic *do* forms. Ford's fondness for noun-doublets, resembling but never quite achieving the true *hendiadys*, is exactly like that of 'W. S.', and their use of rhetoric is dysfunctional in the same way. The cumulative result of these analyses is to show that Ford's use of language, at whatever level one tests it, is indistinguishable from that found in the *Elegye*.

Finally, in chapter 11, honouring the old principle that 'La fin couronne les œuvres', I present a list of more than eighty passages in the *Elegye* for which I have found close parallels in Ford's work. Well aware of the methodological dangers involved, I have only cited individual words where I could show them to be rare or even unique to Ford, and not used by Shakespeare. Otherwise I have limited my claims to longer

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

Preface

units of discourse, verbal sequences that also show recurring thought-patterns. Furthermore, I treat these thought-parallels in a way never done in the statistical methods favoured in recent authorship studies, by drawing on my analysis of Ford's poems and prose works, with their fusion of Christian and Stoic ethics. A word such as 'steadiness' is not simply a linguistic counter that can be found in a concordance or with an electronic search function, but a term having specific connotations within a philosophical system. Its significance is contextual, provided that one recognizes the correct context. By compiling this list, which includes several hundred parallels between the *Funerall Elegye* and Ford's poems, prose works, and plays, I hope to provide the final, clinching evidence that the *Elegye* was written by Ford.

Some open-minded readers may object that I could have presented the evidence for Ford's authorship more briefly. But my aim has been to provide as complete a demonstration as possible, within reasonable limits. I have had three goals in writing this book: to disprove Shakespeare's authorship of 'Shall I die?' and *A Funerall Elegye*; to prove Ford's authorship of the latter; and to give a full demonstration of the methodology used in modern authorship studies. To achieve all three goals I have had to quote both primary texts and critical interpretation in some detail. In normal literary critical discourse an interpretative argument is illustrated by quotations; but in authorship studies the quotations *are* the argument, the primary evidence around which everything revolves. It is inevitable, then, that enquiries such as these depend on full quotation, rather than giving a series of page-references. I want readers to be in possession of the words themselves, so that they can judge whether or not Shakespeare could have written these two poems. The case for Ford's authorship of the *Elegye* seems to me so strong that I cannot think of any other explanation for the multitude of verbal details linking his writing to that poem. I hope that the editors of the three American college editions will now reconsider whether to include 'Shall I die?' and *A Funerall Elegye* in future editions.

That the two poems got into those editions in the first place shows how the acceptance of authorship ascriptions depends not on the individual scholar alone but on a wider community, academic and commercial. This process involves both politics – the behaviour of the *polis*, here the scholarly community – and ethics, as political activity invariably does. In the Epilogue I investigate some reasons for Taylor's and Foster's success: their confident use of the media, which in the English-speaking world quickly express frenzied excitement whenever any new work is

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface*

xix

attributed to Shakespeare, setting up interviews and photo-calls at the right moment; the institutional support they received for their theories (from publishers and journal editors); and the way they sustained their claims in the face of criticism. As I point out, authorship studies, almost more than other branches of literary criticism, is prone to two temptations. One is the pursuit of scholarly disagreement in a personal manner, as if the goal of such disputes was not to establish truth, or probability, but to protect scholarly reputation. The other is the belief that one's own interpretation of the evidence is the only one possible, refusing to consider properly other scholars' arguments. Neither Taylor nor Foster escaped these temptations. This book ends with a reminder that authorship studies, like all forms of research, is best performed with an open mind and a constant readiness to reconsider the evidence for and against an attribution. It especially needs to adopt what C. S. Peirce called a 'concrete fallibilism', the recognition that we are all liable to error, and should extend to other scholars the charity which we may well need ourselves.

Over the five years on which I have worked on this project, with interruptions, I have contracted many debts. Anthony Mortimer (University of Fribourg) and Henry Woudhuysen (University College, London University) answered several appeals for help with the Prologue, concerning 'Shall I die?'. The first version of Part I, analysing Foster's methodology, was read by Tom Clayton (University of Minnesota), Katherine Duncan-Jones (Somerville College, Oxford), Ward Elliott (Claremont-McKenna College), Gwynne B. Evans (Harvard University), A. Kent Hieatt (Emeritus, University of Western Ontario), Jonathan Hope (University of Strathclyde), MacDonald P. Jackson (University of Auckland), Thomas Pendleton (Iona College), and John Tobin (University of Massachusetts). They all encouraged me to continue, and helped improve both my arguments and their presentation. Tom Clayton kindly read the whole typescript for me in its penultimate version, making several acute suggestions and providing me with a sub-title. Jonathan Hope read the same version for the publisher and persuaded me to rearrange the material into its present form, omitting two further chapters.

As for Part II, my case for John Ford's authorship of the *Elegye*, I have four people to thank. Ironically enough, Donald Foster himself first drew attention to several parallels between the *Elegye* and Ford's poems, but used them to present Ford as a plagiarist, never considering that he might be the poem's author. This possibility was first raised by Richard J. Kennedy in a new forum for Shakespeare studies, the 'Shakespeare

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xx

Preface

Electronic Conference' ('SHAKSPER'), an online discussion group, where a vigorous controversy took place between January 1996 and February 1998 concerning Foster's ascription of *A Funerall Elegye* to Shakespeare. Anyone wishing to read this material can still do so by accessing the website at www.shakspers.net. It was among the postings of SHAKSPER that I came across the fruitful suggestion of Ford's authorship made by Mr Kennedy, a distinguished author of children's books and short stories. His novel *Amy's Eyes* (1985) won the International Rattenfänger prize for children's literature in 1988; other work appears in both *The Oxford Book of Children's Stories* and *The Oxford Book of Modern Fairy Tales*. Mr Kennedy became involved in this controversy out of a general interest in Shakespeare, and I salute his courage, as a non-academic, in entering an arena sometimes too fiercely conscious of the guild status of professional Shakespearians. As I developed my case for Ford I decided to consult Ward Elliott and Robert J. Valenza, co-authors of several important statistical studies of the Shakespeare authorship problem. I supplied them with electronic texts of Ford's two major poems, which they subjected to rigorously quantitative linguistic analysis, producing the happy result that the odds on the *Elegye* having arisen by chance from one corpus or the other were at least 3,000 times better for Ford than they are for Shakespeare (see chapter 10). (Their essay was published in 2001 in the journal *Literary and Linguistic Computing*.) Finally, in the closing stages of completing the typescript, by a remarkable coincidence, the editor of *Review of English Studies* asked me to referee an essay entitled 'A Funeral Elegye: Ford, W. S., and Shakespeare'. To my great surprise, it proved to be a pithily argued presentation of the case for Ford's authorship, citing dozens of parallels between the *Elegye* and Ford's poems, prose works, and plays, echoing the material which I had collected for my chapter 11, but adding many parallels that I had missed. I warmly recommended the essay for publication, and then discovered that the author was Professor Gilles D. Monsarrat (Université de Dijon), a noted Ford specialist who had produced an excellent treatment of Ford's Stoicism, two valuable essays on his religious poems, and an outstanding edition of his prose treatises in L. E. Stock (ed.), *The Nondramatic Works of John Ford*. Professor Monsarrat is the co-editor of a new French translation of Shakespeare, and had decided to include the *Elegye*, since it had been accepted by the three leading American college editions. While preparing a modernized English text, however, he was struck by the copious parallels with Ford's work which occurred to him in every line. (Needless to say, the French edition will not include this poem.) In authorship studies, as in other forms of intellectual enquiry, it is extremely valuable to receive independent

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Preface*

xxi

confirmations of one's findings. The fact that three separately conceived studies converge on Ford's authorship of the *Elegye* must now put that issue beyond dispute.

At Cambridge University Press I should like to thank my editor, Sarah Stanton, who patiently encouraged the book's various metamorphoses; Margaret Berrill for her meticulous and constructive copy-editing; and Clive Liddiard for some last-minute proof correcting. That I have been able to include so much detail is due to a generous subsidy towards the publishing costs granted me by my university, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich. I wish to thank Professor Albert Waldvogel, Vice President for research programmes, and Dr Maryvonne Landolt for their good services.

I owe a great deal to the three assistants who worked with me while I was writing this book. Margrit Soland, both during her time with me and since her retirement, has proved a penetrating critic, applying her wide knowledge to several philological problems. Katherine Hahn has developed unexpected skills in using electronic databases, and has typed the many intermediate versions cheerfully and efficiently. Annette Baertschi, while sharing the typing, successfully obtained and catalogued a great deal of secondary literature, and compiled the index. Finally, to my wife, Sabine Köllmann, and our children Helen and Philip, I owe gratitude for their love and support, and apologies for appearing so often preoccupied with research problems. They will be especially pleased that this book is finished. I dedicate it to my second-born, Gwen, who has had to wait an unduly long time.

April 2001

Note. Two significant documents appeared in the electronic media as this book went into production. The online journal *Early Modern Literary Studies* (May 2002) brought an essay by Professor Hugh Craig, 'Common-words frequencies, Shakespeare's style, and the *Elegye* by W. S.', <<http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/08-1/craistyl.htm>>, which demolished the Shakespeare attribution. Craig re-ran Foster's tests with a new set of data, revealing 'some damaging inconsistencies' in the way they had been conducted (para. 5). A month later on the SHAKSPER website Abrams and Foster – independently, and within hours of each other – having read Monsarrat's essay, recanted their Shakespearian claims, acknowledging Ford's authorship (SHK 13.1519, 13 June 2002). Conceding that he 'ought to have attended more closely' to Ford's language and style, Foster reported: 'I have [not] yet determined where I went wrong with the statistical evidence'. This book may help.

June 2002

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Tables*

3.1	Function-words in <i>A Funerall Elegye</i> and in Shakespeare	<i>page</i> 117
5.1	Feminine endings in Shakespeare's late plays	153
5.2	Hexameters in Shakespeare's late plays	154
5.3	Percentage pauses in Shakespeare's blank-verse line	155
5.4	Pause patterns in the <i>Funerall Elegye</i>	156
5.5	Pause patterns in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Shakespeare: raw figures	157
5.6	Pause patterns in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Shakespeare: percentages	157
5.7	Proclitic and enclitic phrases in Shakespeare and other dramatists	161
5.8	Proclitic and enclitic phrases in Shakespeare and <i>A Funerall Elegye</i>	162
7.1	UnShakespearian word choices in the <i>Elegye</i>	202
8.1	Latinate words in the <i>Elegye</i> and in late Shakespeare	230
8.2	Polysyllabic words in the <i>Elegye</i> and in late Shakespeare	231
8.3	Pleonastic <i>do</i> forms in the <i>Elegye</i>	232
8.4	The function-word <i>of</i> in Shakespeare's poems and in the <i>Elegye</i>	235
8.5	The function-word <i>of</i> in Shakespeare's late plays and in the <i>Elegye</i>	236
8.6	Function-words beginning lines in <i>A Funerall Elegye</i>	240
10.1	'Shakespearian' diction in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Ford	306
10.2	Adjectival suffixes in Ford	307
10.3	Compound words in Ford's poems	308
10.4	Verb forms in seven plays by Ford	313
10.5	Distinctive vocabulary: 'W. S.', Shakespeare, and Ford	319
10.6	Words in <i>A Funerall Elegye</i> not found in Shakespeare	321
10.7	Function-words in the <i>Elegye</i> , Ford's poems, and Shakespeare	329
10.8	The function-word <i>of</i> in Ford's sole-authored plays	330

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*List of tables*

xxiii

10.9	The function-word <i>of</i> in the <i>Elegye</i> , in Ford's poems and prose works	33 ¹
10.10	Nouns ending in <i>-ness</i> in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Ford's poems and sole-authored plays	34 ⁰
10.11	The Elliott–Valenza tests of the <i>Elegye</i>	343
10.12	Run-on lines in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Ford's poems	349
10.13	Feminine endings in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Ford's poems	35 ⁰
10.14	Pleonastic <i>do</i> forms in the <i>Elegye</i> and in Ford's poems	35 ⁰
A1	Ford's linguistic preferences	501
A2	The function-word <i>of</i> in Ford's collaborative plays	502
A3	Nouns ending in <i>-ness</i> in Ford's co-authored plays	504

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Abbreviations and note on references*

The titles of books and journal articles cited for the first time are given in full in the text or notes. Those referred to more often are listed in the Bibliography (pp. 554ff), and are cited in the short form, e.g., 'Greg 1955'. Journal titles are always abbreviated, as are some books, as follows.

I. JOURNALS AND BOOKS

<i>CahiersE</i>	<i>Cahiers Elisabéthains</i>
<i>CHum</i>	<i>Computers and the Humanities</i>
<i>ELN</i>	<i>English Language Notes</i>
<i>ELR</i>	<i>English Literary Renaissance</i>
<i>EMV</i>	<i>English Madrigal Verse</i> : see Fellowes <i>et al.</i> , 1967
<i>ES</i>	<i>English Studies</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Jacobean and Caroline Stage</i> : see Bentley 1941–68
<i>LLC</i>	<i>Literary and Linguistic Computing</i>
<i>MLR</i>	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
<i>NDW</i>	<i>The Nondramatic Works of John Ford</i> : see Stock <i>et al.</i> , 1991
<i>NOWELE</i>	<i>North-Western European Language Evolution</i>
<i>NQ</i>	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
<i>NYT</i>	<i>New York Times, The</i>
<i>NYTBR</i>	<i>New York Times Book Review, The</i>
<i>PBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Renaissance Quarterly</i>
<i>SAB</i>	<i>Shakespeare Association Bulletin</i>
<i>SB</i>	<i>Studies in Bibliography</i>
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900</i>
<i>Sh7B</i>	<i>Shakespeare Jahrbuch</i>

List of abbreviations and note on references

xxv

SHK	<i>The Shakespeare Electronic Conference: www.shaksper.net</i>
ShN	<i>Shakespeare Newsletter, The</i>
ShQ	<i>Shakespeare Quarterly</i>
ShS	<i>Shakespeare Survey</i>
ShStud	<i>Shakespeare Studies</i>
SP	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
TxC	<i>William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion:</i> see Wells <i>et al.</i> , 1987
TLS	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>
TNSS	<i>Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society</i>
WSB	<i>World Shakespeare Bibliography: see Harner 2000</i>

2. WORKS BY WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

<i>Ado</i>	<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>
<i>AWW</i>	<i>All's Well That Ends Well</i>
<i>AYLI</i>	<i>As You Like It</i>
<i>Cor.</i>	<i>Coriolanus</i>
<i>Cym.</i>	<i>Cymbeline</i>
<i>Err.</i>	<i>The Comedy of Errors</i>
<i>Ham.</i>	<i>Hamlet</i>
<i>1H4</i>	<i>The First Part of King Henry the Fourth</i>
<i>2H4</i>	<i>The Second Part of King Henry the Fourth</i>
<i>H5</i>	<i>King Henry the Fifth</i>
<i>1H6</i>	<i>The First Part of King Henry the Sixth</i>
<i>2H6</i>	<i>The Second Part of King Henry the Sixth</i>
<i>3H6</i>	<i>The Third Part of King Henry the Sixth</i>
<i>H8</i>	<i>King Henry the Eighth</i>
<i>JC</i>	<i>Julius Caesar</i>
<i>John</i>	<i>King John</i>
<i>LLL</i>	<i>Love's Labour's Lost</i>
<i>Lear</i>	<i>King Lear</i>
<i>Luc.</i>	<i>The Rape of Lucrece</i>
<i>Mac.</i>	<i>Macbeth</i>
<i>MM</i>	<i>Measure for Measure</i>
<i>MND</i>	<i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>
<i>MV</i>	<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>
<i>Oth.</i>	<i>Othello</i>

<i>Per.</i>	<i>Pericles</i>
<i>PP</i>	<i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i>
<i>R₂</i>	<i>King Richard the Second</i>
<i>R₃</i>	<i>King Richard the Third</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>
<i>Shr.</i>	<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>
<i>Son.</i>	<i>The Sonnets</i>
<i>STM</i>	<i>Sir Thomas More</i>
<i>Temp.</i>	<i>The Tempest</i>
<i>TGV</i>	<i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i>
<i>Tim.</i>	<i>Timon of Athens</i>
<i>Tit.</i>	<i>Titus Andronicus</i>
<i>TN</i>	<i>Twelfth Night</i>
<i>TNK</i>	<i>The Two Noble Kinsmen</i>
<i>Tro.</i>	<i>Troilus and Cressida</i>
<i>Ven.</i>	<i>Venus and Adonis</i>
<i>Wiv.</i>	<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i>
<i>WT</i>	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>

3. WORKS BY JOHN FORD

<i>BH</i>	<i>The Broken Heart</i>
<i>Bj</i>	'On the best of English Poets, Ben: Jonson, Deceased' (<i>NDW</i> , pp. 357–8)
<i>CBS</i>	<i>Christes Bloodie Sweat</i>
<i>FCN</i>	<i>The Fancies, Chaste and Noble</i>
<i>FE</i>	<i>A Funerall Elegye In Memory of the late Vertuous Maister William Peeter</i>
<i>FM</i>	<i>Fames Memoriall</i>
<i>FMI</i>	<i>The Fair Maid of the Inn</i> (with Massinger and Webster)
<i>GM</i>	<i>The Golden Meane</i>
<i>HT</i>	<i>Honor Triumphant</i>
<i>JF</i>	'To the Memory of the late Excellent Poet John Fletcher' (Vickers 1999, pp. 541–5)
<i>LC</i>	<i>The Laws of Candy</i>
<i>LL</i>	<i>A Line of Life</i>
<i>LM</i>	<i>The Lover's Melancholy</i>
<i>LS</i>	<i>Love's Sacrifice</i>
<i>LT</i>	<i>The Lady's Trial</i>

Cambridge University Press

0521772435 - 'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's
Funerall Elegye

Brian Vickers

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*List of abbreviations and note on references*

xxvii

<i>PW</i>	<i>Perkin Warbeck</i>
<i>Q</i>	<i>The Queen</i>
<i>SD</i>	<i>The Sun's Darling</i> (with Dekker)
<i>SG</i>	<i>The Spanish Gypsy</i> (with Dekker)
<i>TO</i>	'A Memoriall, offered to that man of virtue, Sir Thomas Overburie' (<i>NDW</i> , pp. 339–44)
<i>TPW</i>	<i>'Tis Pity She's a Whore</i>
<i>WA</i>	<i>The Welsh Ambassador</i> (with Dekker)
<i>WE</i>	<i>The Witch of Edmonton</i> (with Dekker and Rowley)