



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Resurrecting Shakespeare's ghost plays
Author(s)	Reid, Lindsay Ann
Publication Date	2018-09-04
Publication Information	Reid, Lindsay Ann. (2018). Resurrecting Shakespeare's Ghost Plays. English: Journal of the English Association, 67(258), 262-283. doi: 10.1093/english/efy029
Publisher	Oxford University Press
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1093/english/efy029
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/14662
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/english/efy029

Downloaded 2024-04-27T02:02:01Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



Resurrecting Shakespeare's Ghost Plays

Lindsay Ann Reid

Abstract

This article draws attention to a group of remarkably similar novels published between 2003 and 2009: William Martin's *Harvard Yard*, Jennifer Lee Carrell's *The Shakespeare Secret* (also known as *Interred with Their Bones*), Jean Rae Baxter's *Looking for Cardenio*, and A. J. Hartley's *What Time Devours*. Each of these mysteries portrays a para-academic protagonist's literary quest to re-discover one of Shakespeare's so-called 'ghost plays' – that is, either *Love's Labour's Won* or *Cardenio*. This article seeks, firstly, to locate these novels' imaginative treatments of lost Shakespearean works in relation to academic trends and ideas about these two plays. It then turns its attention to codifying and analysing the common characteristics of this microgenre. In so doing, it highlights how this group of novels is conspicuously infused with the imagery and discourses of spectrality: they recurrently redeploy metaphors of haunting, liminality, and ephemerality to portray the mechanics and significance of Shakespearean literary discovery.

I pushed the page across to Ben . . .

'*Lost plays*,' it read. Underneath it were two titles. The first was *Love's Labour's Won*. The second was *The History of Cardenio*.

He looked up quickly. '*Lost?*'

'We have the titles, and mentions of performances in court calendars.

We know they once existed. But no one's seen a shred of either story—not so much as two words strung together—for centuries.'¹

Introduction

In bibliographical parlance, a 'ghost' is an ontologically problematic text. Its existence has been recorded in catalogues or other historical sources, yet there is no concrete proof that it ever existed. Arguably, two such textual spectres haunt William Shakespeare's dramatic corpus: *Love's Labour's Won* and *Cardenio*. Scholarly theories about these alluring titles-without-texts abound, and they have provided fruitful fodder for writers of contemporary

fiction, as well. Though Edmund Crispin's *Love Lies Bleeding* (1948) is perhaps the earliest example of a detective novel that centres on the re-discovery of a Shakespearean ghost play – a plotline later echoed at the close of the twentieth century in M.R. Carroll's *Dead False* (1998) – mysteries founded on similar premises have become increasingly common in the new millennium. Apparently reflecting a growing public appetite for Shakespeare-infused academic fiction, they also speak to what has been identified as the 'pervasive presence' of Shakespeariana in detective fiction, more generally.²

In a 2010 article, Douglas Lanier proposed that groups of roughly contemporaneous adaptations 'functioning collectively' or as an 'aggregate' can 'catalyz[e] more general changes in the nature of Shakespeare . . . and the forms of cultural capital' he represents at particular historical moments.³ A similar conviction underpins this study, which turns the bulk of its attention to an 'aggregate' of four post-millennial novels: *Harvard Yard* by William Martin (2003); *The Shakespeare Secret* by Jennifer Lee Carrell (2007; published in the US as *Interred with Their Bones*); *Looking for Cardenio* by Jean Rae Baxter (2008); and *What Time Devours* by A. J. Hartley (2009). Like Crispin's mid-twentieth-century *Love Lies Bleeding*, both Martin's and Hartley's works hinge on the reappearance of *Love's Labour's Won*, while, in the vein of Carroll's earlier *Dead False*, Baxter's and Carrell's imagine the recuperation of *Cardenio*. Attuned to intersections between real-life academic research and the reception of Shakespeare's ghost plays in popular culture, I identify thematic commonalities and recurring patterns within this emergent microgenre in order to query how these novels 'collectively' function. In so doing, I draw particular attention to the way in which the trope of haunting is consistently entwined with the semantics of literary discovery throughout these four conceptually analogous texts.

The Status of the Ghost Plays

Before turning to examine fictive resurrections of Shakespeare's ghost plays, it may be useful to survey the evidence in support of these two texts' historical existence and their status in contemporary scholarly and theatrical circles. The first known mention of *Love's Labour's Won* appears in Frances Meres's *Palladis Tamia* (1598). This piece of Elizabethan literary criticism passingly mentions '*Loue labours wonne*' in a list of twelve Shakespearean play titles.⁴ Since at least the mid-eighteenth century, when Thomas Percy speculated that *Love's Labour's Won* might be 'some play that we have now under an alternate title', scholars have been intrigued by the possibility that this play might be identified as an extant Shakespearean comedy.⁵ By the early twentieth century, the dominant contenders were generally held to be *All's Well That Ends Well*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Tempest*, and *Much Ado About Nothing*, though other prospects have been variously floated.⁶ Such beliefs have even fuelled a recent theatrical experiment: in 2014-15 *Much Ado About Nothing* was provocatively billed by the Royal Shakespeare Company as *Love's Labour's Won* (also known as *Much Ado About Nothing*) and performed as a companion piece to *Love's Labour's Lost*. Despite this long tradition of identifying *Love's Labour's Won* as an extant play, there is a second, distinct alternative: that *Love's Labour's Won* was a discrete comedy, all copies of which were lost.⁷ Though a third possibility, that Meres's reference to *Love's Labour's Won* was spurious, has always remained, a discovery made in the 1950s greatly diminished its likelihood. That is, an antiquarian bookseller unearthed an early modern document containing a second reference to *Love's Labour's Won*. While this fortuitously re-discovered text (which appears not only to corroborate Meres's earlier mention of the work, but also to suggest that *Love's Labour's Won* was printed by the end of the Elizabethan era) was received with much fanfare, including a book of 1957 by T.W. Baldwin, the identity of this play remains inconclusive.⁸

As the work of Brean Hammond has demonstrated, the evidence that a Shakespearean play entitled *Cardenio* once existed is more substantive, if similarly open to debate.⁹ Historically, most scholars have assumed that this play was derived from the Cardenio plotline in Part I of Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, a text translated into English by Thomas Shelton in 1612. Records indicate that Shakespeare's company performed a play entitled 'Cardenno' or 'Cardenna' in 1613.¹⁰ Four decades later, Humphrey Moseley entered 'The History of Cardenio, by Mr. Fletcher. & Shakespeare' into the Stationers' Register.¹¹ The *Cardenio* plot thickened considerably in the early eighteenth century when Lewis Theobald made the unverifiable claim that he had personally consulted manuscript copies of this Jacobean text and used them as the basis for his own *Double Falsehood* (1727). While many subsequent scholars have sought to reconstruct the outlines of a Shakespearean original through the lens of this eighteenth-century adaptation, others assert that Theobald's 'Shakespearean' play was nothing more than an elaborate forgery.¹² Furthermore, as with *Love's Labour's Won*, there have been occasional attempts to identify *Cardenio* with the text of an extant play. Though his theory has been widely discredited since, in 1994 Charles Hamilton, for instance, published an edition titled *Cardenio: Or, The Second Maiden's Tragedy*. In it, he argued that an anonymous manuscript of a play known as *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is, in fact, *Cardenio* and that Shakespeare co-authored this text with Fletcher in 1611.¹⁴

For a play about which nothing is definitively known, the spectral *Cardenio* has commanded a surprising amount of attention, both scholarly and popular, in the past two decades. In *Cardenio between Cervantes and Shakespeare* (first published in 2011 as *Cardenio entre Cervantès et Shakespeare*), Roger Chartier pertinently remarked:

When I began this research, the enigma of *Cardenio* was discussed only among scholars who either accepted or refused to see in *Double Falsehood* the remnants of a play by Shakespeare. Today that is no longer the case. Over recent years England and America have been gripped by a veritable ‘*Cardenio fever*’.¹⁵

Some this ongoing ‘*Cardenio fever*’ may be linked to Arden Shakespeare’s decision to include an edition of Theobald’s *Double Falsehood* as part of its Shakespeare series in 2010. As Hammond, the play’s editor, has subsequently noted, the release of this controversial edition was ‘trailed by a degree of media publicity unusual for academic research’.¹⁶ Several high-profile theatrical projects have also drawn further attention to this Shakespearean ghost play, including Gary Taylor’s attempted reconstruction of Shakespeare’s *Cardenio* based on Theobald’s script, Stephen Greenblatt and Charles Mee’s reimagining of the Shakespearean text and their establishment of the international *Cardenio Project*, and Gregory Doran’s 2011 production of *Cardenio* for the Royal Shakespeare Company.¹⁷ Moreover, this post-millennial bout of ‘*Cardenio fever*’ can be usefully positioned alongside a mounting scholarly interest in early modernity’s ‘lost plays’, more generally – a trend evinced, for example, by the establishment of the *Lost Plays Database* and David McInnis and Matthew Steggle’s complementary 2014 essay collection dedicated to this emergent research area.¹⁸

Questing for Lost Works

First published nearly seven decades ago, Richard D. Altick’s *The Scholar Adventurers* (1950) opened with the playful claim that ‘[m]any of the men and women who teach English in our colleges and universities lead double lives’.¹⁹ He went on to posit that, while such literary professionals may ‘earn their living . . . doling out facts and opinions . . . to students’, nonetheless, ‘outside the classroom they are scholars: patient delvers into

history and biography whose great design is to add to the world's store of literary knowledge'.²⁰ Seeking to elevate the 'scholar, whose excitements are found . . . in the great research libraries and the mouse-chewed papers of an old family in a dormant English hamlet', Altick endeavoured, through a series of case studies, to illumine how these researchers are regularly 'confronted with . . . tangled puzzle[s]' demanding 'detective talents . . . of the highest order'.²¹

Altick's seminal twentieth-century figuration of literary-research-as-adventure is one that has continued to inform subsequent accounts of the hunt for 'lost books', including recent works by Stuart Kelly and Giorgio van Straten aimed at non-academic bibliophiles (an audience that may, perhaps, overlap significantly with the readership of the post-millennial Shakespeare mysteries here considered). Kelly prefaced his encyclopaedic *Book of Lost Books* (2005) with the hope that his readers might be inspired to 'begin their own peregrinations'.²² In fact, he imagines idealised members of his audience 'set[ting] out on their own adventure[s]' and recommends a 'moderately well-stocked public library' as a plausible launching pad.²³ Van Straten's more recent *In Search of Lost Books* (first published in 2016 as *Storie di libri perduti*) narrates the author's own such expedition 'in search of the traces of eight lost books as legendary as lode-bearing mines during the Gold Rush', including works by the likes of Nikolai Gogol, Sylvia Plath, and Walter Benjamin.²⁴ Drawing again upon the voyage *topos*, he expounds:

Every time I have chanced across the story of a lost book I have experienced something like the feeling that gripped me as a child when reading certain novels which spoke of secret gardens, of mysterious cable-cars, of abandoned castles. I have recognized the opportunity for a quest, felt the fascination of that which

escapes us—and the hope of becoming the hero who will be able to solve the mystery.²⁵

Van Straten, who likens himself to Phileas Fogg from Jules Verne's *Around the World in Eighty Days*, reflects that such feelings have led him 'to follow the clues towards . . . lost books, and to tell their stories, as if they were adventures'.²⁶

It is, no doubt, a consequence of Shakespeare's unique cultural visibility that the search for and recovery of a lost Shakespearean play has a long history of figuration as the ultimate research expedition *à la* Altick, Kelly, and van Straten. To wit, a 1913 quip about the disappointed expectations of university-level composition teachers hyperbolically proclaimed:

He has been taught to look forward to research work. The vision held before him has been that of scholarship. In his dreams he has seen himself the discoverer of the *ur-Hamlet*, of the lost version of *Love's Labour's Won*, or the other six books of the *Faerie Queen*—and the world rising up to call him blessed'.²⁷

Hamilton's edition of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* employs similar imagery, opening with the assertion that *Cardenio* represents 'the Golden Fleece of literature' and poetically continuing: 'The lure of this missing play . . . has led lovers of Shakespeare on a chase through libraries and archives, into attics and antique barns, and even abandoned privies' (p. 1). And Shakespeare biographer Samuel Schoenbaum once imagined the fruits of just such a hunt in a piece entitled 'The Folger at Fifty':

Let me share with you a Shakespearean fantasy I have entertained. I am in Amsterdam, in a little bookshop, tucked away on a side street, and come upon a little quarto copy of *Love's Labour's Won*. . . . I buy the book for a ridiculously low sum (the dealer, poor fellow, being a foreigner doesn't realize its value—the most unlikely ingredient of this pipe dream), and slip by customs. Then I present the book anonymously—the ultimate ego trip—to the Folger Library.²⁸

This tradition of figuring the pursuit of a Shakespearean ghost text as scholarly adventure finds expression in David Carnegie and Gary Taylor's edited collection of 2012, which bears the provocative title *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, and it similarly underlies Gregory Doran's 2012 monograph detailing his experience with the RSC production. Doran's account of how he 'started to delve into [*Cardenio*'s] fascinating history' sounds for all the world like an adventure story.²⁹ As he begins narrating his initial research trip to Oxford, Doran relates: 'I was on the trail of the first written evidence that a play called *Cardenio* actually existed', and he employs topographically resonant imagery to describe his decade of studying the text: 'In researching any play, you are led off down many interesting side roads, and you can find yourself chasing many an odd trail and tangent. *Cardenio* offers a whole map of . . . possibilities'.³⁰

Momentous literary discoveries have often been conceived in similar terms in the more purely imaginative realm of the novel. Crispin's *Love Lies Bleeding* may well be the earliest twentieth-century exemplar of a murder mystery hinging on the presumed rediscovery of a Shakespearean ghost play. Set in and around the fictitious Castrevenford School, the events of Crispin's post-war mystery are set into motion when the teenaged Brenda Boyce goes missing while rehearsing for a production of *Henry V*. Brenda's presumed death is swiftly followed by additional murders. The motive for this chain of disappearances and

killings begins to emerge when a tiny, Elizabethan-era miniature is found alongside the corpse of one victim, Mrs Bly. This work of art leads Gervase Fen – an amateur sleuth and Professor of English at the University of Oxford, who is conveniently on hand to investigate – to suspect that if Mrs Bly had ‘found other things of the same kind’, in her Elizabethan-era cottage, ‘theft might be our motive’.³¹ The proprietor of a local pub is able to confirm that Mrs. Bly recently, when having a new stove put in her kitchen, found an ‘old picture . . . and summat else’.³² These ‘bundles of old yellowed papers’ represent the real treasure: a stash of personal letters (which Mrs. Bly is believed to have ill-advisedly ‘used as firelighters’) and the manuscript of *Love’s Labour’s Won*, which an unscrupulous employee of Castreventford School had secretly agreed to purchase from the widow for a miserly £100 prior to his own untimely death.³³ Another deviant school employee’s attempted escape with *Love’s Labour’s Won* is thwarted when a car chase tragically ends in flames. The ‘one undamaged page’ remaining when the fiery inferno subsides seems to confirm Fen’s professional assessment that ‘*Love’s Labour’s Lost* demands a sequel, when you come to think of it’.³⁴

Later in the twentieth century, Carroll’s *Dead False* similarly opened with the disappearance of a young woman. In this case, it is Carole Rutland, erstwhile housemate of underemployed journalist, ‘bookaholic’, and mystery-solver Mickey Finnegan.³⁶ Mickey quickly finds that his search for Carole intersects with a police investigation for a missing autograph copy of Shakespeare’s *Cardenio*, a document recently acquired by the University of Toronto in a ‘scholarly boodle bag’ of ‘manuscripts, letters, documents, and old books’ purchased ‘from an antiquities dealer in London’.³⁷ Mickey’s citywide quest brings him increasingly into contact with the university’s English faculty (a group who seem to spend decidedly more time writing original works of poetry and undertaking cataloguing activities usually assigned to rare books librarians than conducting more traditional forms of literary research). As the mystery unfolds, the *Cardenio* manuscript is revealed to be a forgery

perpetrated by one Professor Garrett Macpherson, while it is another academic, Mickey's own friend Professor Jack Malone, who is ultimately revealed as the tale's archvillain: he is responsible for a string of murders as well as the sale of this bogus *Cardenio* to an anonymous collector for the tidy sum of '[t]wo million, tax free'.³⁸

Lost Plays and the Post-Millennial *Zeitgeist*

Shakespearean ghost plays haunt the popular fiction of the twenty-first century with surprising frequency. Between 2003 and 2009 at least four relatively high-profile murder mystery novels with strikingly similar plotlines were published in rapid succession: *Harvard Yard*, *The Shakespeare Secret*, *Looking for Cardenio*, and *What Time Devours*. And as much as these novels share with *Love Lies Bleeding* or *Dead False*, they speak even more directly to trends in contemporary academic fiction, evoking novels such as A. S. Byatt's *Possession* (1990), Matthew Pearl's *Dante Club* (2003), or Elizabeth Kostova's *The Historian* (2005), in which it is generally assumed that '[l]iterary critics make natural detectives'.³⁹ As Suzanne Keen has alternatively put it, in such novels 'a version of the exciting textual discoveries that archivists, historians, collectors, and even some members of English Departments find thrilling enough to motivate long careers in scholarship' is made 'available for general readers'.⁴⁰

Perhaps the most significant and highest profile analogue for this group of Shakespearean mystery novels, however, is *The Da Vinci Code*, which emerged concurrently with the earliest of my post-millennial examples, *Harvard Yard*, in 2003. In Graham Holderness's *Nine Lives of William Shakespeare* (2011), he prefaces a fictional piece entitled 'The Shakespeare Code' with the reflection that 'the story of Shakespeare as a writer is a cultural mystery and one obvious form for its exploration is the pseudo-scientific romance thriller so successfully colonized' by Brown.⁴¹ More than one reviewer of *The Shakespeare*

Secret read it in precisely this fashion, as a quest for ‘the holy grail of Shakespearean study’.⁴² Carrell’s novel was persistently – even tediously – hailed as ‘a *Da Vinci Code*-style farrago’, ‘a Shakespearean twist on *The Da Vinci Code*’, and ‘*The Da Vinci Code* . . . with Shakespeare scholarship substituted for religious hokum’.⁴³ Indeed, reviewers typically suggested it would appeal to ‘conspiracy theorists’, who were cheekily advised to ‘[t]ake a break from Templar mysteries and try some poetry for a change’.⁴⁴ Though less widely reviewed than Carrell’s work, Hartley’s 2009 *What Time Devours* generated similar comparisons. As one review echoingly put it, Hartley ‘got our attention with a book that’s better than just a copy of *The Da Vinci Code*’.⁴⁵

Beyond this group of novels’ too-often-remarked similarities to Brown’s writing, the emergence of this Shakespearean microgenre at the turn of the twenty-first century speaks to the *Zeitgeist* of our own era in other ways, as well. Arguably the most celebrated of authors, and ‘popular culture’s favorite sign of high culture’, Shakespeare still manages to command significant attention in the global media four centuries after his death.⁴⁶ Manifesting Lanier’s observation that ‘any claim to the “authentic” or “essential” Shakespeare – the “real thing” – carries with it considerable cultural power’, international headlines trumpet with surprising regularity news of fresh (and almost always materially rather than interpretatively based) discoveries about Shakespeare, his texts, and his early modern English milieu: the body of Richard III is unearthed in a car park; antiquarian booksellers serendipitously purchase the Bard’s dictionary on eBay; excavated pipe shards prove the dramatist used marijuana; new portraits of the author are identified; plagiarism software detects previously unattributed Shakespeare plays.⁴⁷ The list could go on. And novels such as *Harvard Yard*, *The Shakespeare Secret*, *Looking for Cardenio*, and *What Time Devours* are clearly capitalising on the cachet of the great – potentially insurrectionary and allegedly game-changing – Shakespearean discovery as so often represented in the mass media of the twenty-first

century.

Ghost Plays and the Rhetoric of Haunting

One of the crucial differences between Crispin's or Carroll's works and post-millennial novels about Shakespearean ghost plays is a shift in narrative focus, such that the search for the lost text becomes central while that for the murderer(s) becomes subsidiary. In *Love Lies Bleeding*, the idea that a manuscript of *Love's Labour's Won*, in particular, might lie behind Castrevenford School's outbreak of violence is not introduced until page 147 of a 271-page novel. And, though the ghost play is present as a plot element from the outset in *Dead False*, it is Mickey's search for Carole rather than *Cardenio* that predominates. This pattern, whereby a recovered text supplies little more than a clever motive (i.e. a *thing* worth killing for) in Crispin's or Carroll's texts, finds uniform reversal in more recent treatments. Though their action tends to begin with murder, these twenty-first-century novels ultimately foreground the literary quest. And, in these works, the narrative primacy of the deadly – dare I say Brownian? – academic hunt is complemented by a discernible thematic and metaphoric concern with spectrality, whereby the ghost text is invested with a sense of semantic perplexity rooted in the dialectics of discovery and loss.

‘We are all haunted. Not by unexplained rappings of spectral auras, much less headless horsemen and weeping queens – real ghosts pace the battlements of memory endlessly whispering, *Remember me*’ (Carrell p. 9). Thus begins *The Shakespeare Secret*, signalling Carrell's broad thematic interest in apparitions. This is a fascination that not only includes, but also extends far beyond her treatment of the suspenseful search for lost Shakespeariana.⁴⁸ In the first few pages of this text, London-based theatre director Kate Stanley is confronted by a spectre from her own past, her one-time academic mentor Rosalind Howard. This ‘flamboyantly eccentric Harvard Professor of Shakespeare’ (p. 9) spooks Kate

and then gives up the ghost, so she can speak, before she can fully explain her unexpected reappearance in her erstwhile protégée's life, yet she leaves Carrell's heroine a riddling parting gift that, in turn, sparks her trans-Atlantic adventures. With a desire to memorialise the dead fuelling her search (and, in fact, a Victorian mourning brooch in hand), Kate thus finds herself drawn into a paradigmatic scholarly quest.

Carrell's choice of opening lines would seem to speak directly to a so-called 'spectral turn' that is playing an increasingly significant role in contemporary Shakespeare studies.⁴⁹ This is, after all, an academic 'turn' that has extended far beyond the realm of critical theory to cast a long shadow over popular culture, and it is one that increasingly informs our senses of literary-historical recovery and loss. Recent scholarship's fascination with ghosts can be largely traced back to Jacques Derrida's seminal *Specters of Marx*, in which the French theorist, like Carrell, links *Hamlet* to broader questions about cultural and intellectual inheritance.⁵⁰ This theoretical genealogy is made manifest, for instance, in Maurizio Calbi's 2013 monograph *Spectral Shakespeares*, which centrally argues that 'Derrida's notion of spectrality . . . is relevant to an understanding of the increasingly heterogeneous and fragmentary presence of "Shakespeare" in the increasingly digitized and globalized mediascape of the twenty-first century'.⁵¹ Even in cases where Derrida's own spectre is not so conspicuously invoked, the discourse of haunting has increasingly informed discussions of Shakespeare's reception. Marjorie Garber's pioneering *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers* (1987) was aptly described by Peter Stallybrass as being not just 'about the ghosts that haunt *Richard III*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*', but also—and 'even more' so—about the ghost of Shakespeare' and how his 'dead hand . . . continues to write us'.⁵² More recently, Brian Cummings has asserted that, '[f]rom its beginnings, the life story of Shakespeare has been haunted by a sense of loss and a concomitant desire to fill in the gaps', while the first chapter of Paul Franssen's book-length study of Shakespearean biofiction is dedicated to

‘Shakespeare’s Ghosts’.⁵³ Furthermore, in an argument that both anticipates my own observations and felicitously harmonises with Carrell’s contemporaneous fictional approach to this material, Howard Marchitello has posited that *Cardenio* – characterised by ‘its periodic appearance and disappearance over the last nearly four hundred years’ – ‘haunts Shakespeare’s works in the manner of a ghost’.⁵⁴

As in *The Shakespeare Secret*, a key feature of this microgenre is the motif of parallel hauntings wherein the protagonist’s pursuit of a Shakespearean ghost play is set in motion by an unexpected visit from a past acquaintance, an apparition who shortly becomes a literal spectre via murder; thus, like most ghost stories these novels foreground questions of history, perception, authenticity, and belief from the outset. Martin’s mystery opens with Peter Fallon making contact with Ridley Wedge Royce, an ‘old pal’ and fellow Harvard alumnus.⁵⁵ When Ridley meets an untimely end shortly after disclosing that he knows of something ‘worth a mountain of money’, Peter finds himself consulting undergraduate term papers and early modern commonplace books alike in a deadly search for *Love’s Labour’s Won* (p. 27). Baxter’s protagonist, Deirdre Gunn, also reconnects with a former classmate at the outset of *Looking for Cardenio*. Though she has not seen George Pinkus for two decades, he re-materialises in her life promising to make her ‘famous, respectable and rich’.⁵⁶ Shortly before he is found murdered, it is thus that George offers Deirdre exclusive access to *Cardenio*, which he improbably claims to have lifted from ‘the stacks of the old King’s College Library, way down in the basement’ (p. 24). Similarly, literary adventures of Hartley’s Thomas Knight begin when a past acquaintance makes fleeting contact: his former high school student, David Escolme, now the literary agent for famed novelist Daniella Blackstone. After both Blackstone and David mysteriously die, Thomas starts ‘playing sleuth and academic’ in pursuit of *Love’s Labour’s Won*.⁵⁷

Scholarly Spectres

Harvard Yard, *The Shakespeare Secret*, *Looking for Cardenio*, and *What Time Devours* share far more than this self-consciously uncanny opening formula wherein a spectral past acquaintance arrives with information leading to a Shakespearean ghost play and is subsequently murdered. It is not without significance that their protagonists are uniformly defined by their own scholarly liminality. Martin's Peter, now in his late forties and still a frequent visitor to the illustrious Widener Library, completed graduate studies at Harvard and 'spent two years teaching history at Southeast Iowa State' before transitioning into 'a dealer in rare books and documents' (p. 20). Prior to her own 'flight from the ivory tower' and 'the rumor-filled halls of academia' in favour of a promising career in stage directing, Carrell's twenty-something Kate was, like Peter, also engaged in graduate studies at Harvard (pp. 10, 417). And, having analogously 'made a tactical withdrawal ABD', Hartley's Thomas, now a high school English teacher in his late thirties, similarly describes his exit from academia as a 'flight from graduate school and the ivory towers beyond' (pp. 132, 125). The only protagonist of these four texts to be depicted still working in academia, Baxter's Deirdre, is promptly fired from her tenure-track position at Melrose University on page nineteen of *Looking for Cardenio* for 'impropriety involving a student'. Despite a promising early career, at forty, tenure has 'long eluded' Deirdre, who stands poised precariously 'at the threshold of full acceptance' in academia even before her fateful termination (p. 13).

It seems hardly coincidental that the group of North American novelists responsible for creating this academically liminal cadre of protagonists themselves share certain biographical similarities with such characters. Indeed, Lisa Hopkins, who examines some of the novels under consideration here in the final chapter of *Shakespearean Allusion in Crime Fiction* (2016), passingly identifies both Carrell and Hartley as Shakespearean 'insiders'.⁵⁸ To a certain degree, this is true of all four post-millennial authors here discussed. Martin studied

English literature at Harvard as an undergraduate, while Carrell received her PhD in English literature from the same institution (following BA and MA studies at Stanford and Oxford). And where Baxter possesses both BA and MA degrees in English from the University of Toronto, Hartley received both his MA and PhD in English Literature from Boston University (following BA studies at Manchester University) and is currently a Distinguished Professor of Shakespeare at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

Interestingly, in a second recent academic publication that has discussed some of my central examples (*The Shakespeare Secret* and *What Time Devours*), Rebecca Bushnell has conversely used the terminology of the ‘outsider’ to describe the ‘position at academia’s fringe [that] typifies’ the protagonists in these novels.⁵⁹ I would alternatively postulate that characters like Martin’s Peter, Carrell’s Kate, Baxter’s Deirdre, and Hartley’s Thomas might better be described as academic insider-outsiders.⁶⁰ They are all highly educated – they hold advanced degrees and possess useful research experience; they know their ways around libraries, archives, and conferences; they can rely on the assistance of academic contacts – yet they are not themselves ensconced in the scholarly community.⁶¹ In purely pragmatic terms, there is an obvious narrative utility to positioning such insider-outsiders at the heart of these Shakespearean mysteries. On the one hand, they possess enough of the fundamental research skills and connections needed to solve literarily resonant puzzles. Yet, on the other hand, they may plausibly possess knowledge gaps (about bibliography, history, literature) that mirror those of the novels’ anticipated non-academic audiences. The insider-outsider’s fictive research activity thus provides each novelist with an opportunity to provide the general, non-academic reading public with crucial background information. More than this, however, the abstruse status of these protagonists, who each stand with one foot in and one foot out of the scholarly world, is also broadly suggestive of the rhetoric of haunting that permeates this microgenre more generally: their ambiguous identities, simultaneously scholars and not-

scholars, both evoke and complement the ontological ambiguities of the Shakespearean apparitions that they vainly pursue.

The Value of Ghost Texts (and Professional Literary Research)

I am not the first to observe that the prevalence of these academic insider-outsiders in Martin's, Carrell's, Baxter's, and Hartley's novels has a direct impact on how Shakespearean discovery is portrayed across these texts. Bushnell, for instance, has likewise argued that the 'status of these novels' protagonists . . . complicates the notion of "what is Shakespeare worth" and to whom' in post-millennial fiction.⁶² Consider, by way of contrast, that in *Dead False* the culprit Malone cites his motivation for stealing *Cardenio* as 'money' – though he does not mind the attendant 'thrill' associated with wrongdoing, which allegedly beats 'spoon-feeding semi-literate undergraduates'.⁶³ And in *Love Lies Bleeding*, too, financial reward is the motivation for murder. Reflecting that 'no original manuscripts' of Shakespeare's plays now exist, 'only printed copies—the quartos and folios and so forth' and also that 'one of those fetches a good many thousands in the saleroom', Crispin's detective offhandedly remarks that the newly rediscovered manuscript of *Love's Labour's Won* might be sold for 'a million pounds'.⁶⁴ Though Carroll's Mickey is aware that *Cardenio*'s forger Macpherson was hoping to become an 'academic superstar' and Crispin's Fen predicts that 'squabbles on the subject' of *Love's Labour's Won* will soon appear 'in academic journals', no sustained consideration is given to the non-fiscal implications of resurrecting a ghost play in either novel.⁶⁵ This is decidedly not the case in my four twenty-first-century examples, which tend to emphasise simultaneously not only the material rewards involved for the discoverer of a 'new' Shakespearean play but also the 'massive cultural, historical, and financial value' of such a find both within and beyond the institutionalised academic sphere (Hartley p. 243).

I do not mean to suggest that the characters in the twenty-first-century novels under consideration are impervious to the pecuniary implications of recovering a Shakespearean ghost play. One reviewer of *Harvard Yard*, in fact, called particular attention to the ‘mercantile element to the quest’.⁶⁶ Another, responding to Baxter’s novel, argued that it thematises ‘the darker nature of acquisition and ownership’ and that its ‘fetishization of material goods’ is suggestive of ‘the ways in which academic enthusiasms can easily shift from the desire to increase knowledge for the benefit of humanity to the desire for one’s own material comfort and fame’.⁶⁷ Indeed, Martin’s Peter, whose business it is to value such items, initially muses that an autograph manuscript of *Love’s Labour’s Won* might be appraised at something in the range of thirty million dollars before settling on a better estimate: ‘Priceless’ (p. 234). A frequently referenced valuation index in these novels is the highly publicised 2001 sale of a First Folio to Microsoft co-founder and billionaire Paul Allen. Baxter’s Deirdre is well aware that ‘a copy of Shakespeare’s *First Folio* fetched nearly six million dollars at a London auction’, and Carrell’s Kate likewise speculates: ‘If a First Folio—one of 230-something copies—had fetched six million dollars at auction a few years ago . . . then a unique manuscript of a lost play could fetch . . . what?’ (Baxter p. 178; Carrell p. 135). Characters in *What Time Devours* are similarly invested in imagining comparables: ‘A quarto of *Hamlet* was auctioned for twenty million U.S. a year ago, and that’s a play we know inside out, and one that exists in multiple early printings. Can you put a price on the only extant version of a lost Shakespeare play?’ (pp. 366, 29).

The implications of Shakespearean discovery in these four post-millennial novels, are, as I have suggested, not simply limited to the financial profits involved for the finder of a ghost play, however. In *Harvard Yard*, Peter’s friend, Professor Tom Benedict is quick to remind him that the real worth of such a find transcends mere marketplace value: ‘if we had a handwritten draft of a Shakespeare play, there’s no end to all we could learn . . . how he

worked, how he thought, who he was' (p. 234). Along similar lines, Carrell's Kate ponders: 'What if [the] manuscript preserved more than just a lost play? What if the manuscript gave us a glimpse of the man?' (p. 213). And Hartley's novel takes the stance that a rediscovered play 'would be a diamond mine for far more than literary academia', for '[e]very Shakespearean in the world has something to gain or lose' (pp. 29, 245).

If these novels collectively highlight the ghost plays' variable valuations by diverse scholarly and non-scholarly agents, so too do they seem to query the value of professional literary research more broadly. The insider-outsider protagonist in Hartley's novel candidly admits that he has 'some unresolved issues with academia', and the same might be said of this microgenre as a whole (p. 102). Bushnell's discussion of *The Shakespeare Secret, What Time Devours*, and other recent Shakespearean mysteries notes 'the distance that these novels typically create between themselves and the world of . . . scholarship, even as they reproduce it', and she submits that in such works we find both engagement with and pointed 'critique [of] the field of Shakespeare scholarship itself'.⁶⁸ But whereas Bushnell attributes this phenomenon primarily to the widely theorised 'contemporary ambivalence about Shakespeare in mainstream culture', I would add to this the further suggestion that a contemporary ambivalence about the relevance, accessibility, and integrity of professional literary scholarship in mainstream culture is equally pertinent.⁶⁹ It is not unrelated that, in a particularly astute review of *Harvard Yard*, Judith Strong Albert described Martin's novel as a narrative of 'the slow development of Harvard College from its dunghill origins in a cow pasture to its insular excellence as an ivory tower where the unquestioned, but questionable, voices of its powerbrokers were invented'.⁷⁰ Hailing it as a 'a provocative, disturbing book', she proposed that Martin's work tests 'our tendency toward blind snobbish trust in New England's edge on intellectual advancement' and requires its readers 'to think again about our own cultural baggage'.⁷¹

Though writing about history, broadly conceived, rather than about historical literary studies *per se*, Jerome de Groot's *Consuming History* draws attention to the fact that, since the 1990s, while 'professional historians [have] busied themselves with theoretical argument, "History" as a leisure pursuit [has] boomed'.⁷² This can be mapped onto, as he observes, a largely technologically driven 'shift in access . . . that [has] allowed the individual to seemingly conceptually and materially circumvent the historical professional and appear to engage with the "past" in a more direct fashion'.⁷³ It has, furthermore, contributed to 'something of a crisis of historical legitimacy as a consequence, and a new—if possibly illusory—popular epistemology'.⁷⁴ These broad cultural shifts described by de Groot are reflected in recent literary portrayals of historical research. A thriller like *The Da Vinci Code*, for example, 'addresses a global culture soaked in conspiracy and keen to see the documents which undermine the lies', and 'presents the hero-adventurer as investigator and iconoclast, pursuing knowledge in order to . . . demonstrate the fallaciousness of the institutions underpinning modern society and civilisation'.⁷⁵ In an era in which the role of universities—and especially of the Humanities—has increasingly been subjected to international public and political debate, we would do well to ask what it may herald for institutionalised literary research if, in Shakespearean mysteries primarily aimed at non-academic audiences, it is consistently spectral, amateur figures who form the newest generation of scholarly adventurers. Should we sense here some of the 'popular hostility towards Shakespearean professionals who have sought to become exclusive hermeneutic gatekeepers for (and drawn their own cultural authority from) "official" Shakespeare' that Lanier has perceived in other recent works of fiction?⁷⁶

That said, despite the implicit critique of stodgily entrenched literary professionals that we may detect in novels such as *Harvard Yard*, *The Shakespeare Secret*, *Looking for Cardenio*, and *What Time Devours*, there is something more complex informing their insider-

outsider protagonists' fraught relationships with traditional academia. That the rediscovery of a lost play represents an occasion for personal glory is also a common thread in this microgenre, and, for all their traipsing outside of the box, the protagonists in these works continue to crave traditional forms of institutionalised recognition. Both Martin's Peter and his ancillary academic associate Tom are acutely aware that 'the scholar who did the editing' of *Love's Labour's Won* 'would never be forgotten', nor would that adventurous 'man who found' this Shakespearean ghost play (p. 235). While Carrell's Kate longs to be the first professional director to stage *Cardenio* in hundreds of years, for both Baxter's Deirdre and Hartley's Thomas, the rediscovery of a ghost play provides a unique opportunity for personal academic self-redemption. Though she fantasises about the 'new BMW' and 'Valentino suit' she will buy with the proceeds, Deirdre is primarily motivated by the thought that publishing a 'critical edition of *Cardenio*' will open 'all academic doors' to her; despite her recent termination, she might 'thumb [her] nose at Melrose and pick [her] next appointment to any university in the English-speaking world' (pp. 117, 23). Likewise, Hartley's Thomas, who struggles with the lingering insecurity 'that he couldn't cut it as a scholar', envisions that the physical recovery of *Loves Labours Won* will transform him into 'luminary' and/or 'cultural hero' (pp. 125, 243, 102). More particularly, he sees it as his grand entrée back into academia: 'He would be able to walk into those Shakespeare conferences, and the scholars . . . would applaud and smile and honor him' (p. 102).

Discovery, Loss, Elegy

The Shakespeare Secret is unique among the novels under my consideration in that it concludes with the successful retrieval and revival of a lost play. The manuscript of *Cardenio*, as Kate summarily reports, is sold 'at private auction for an untold sum' to be held 'in joint custody, [by] the British Library and the Folger' (p. 449). Kate is also justly rewarded, for she is offered, by the 'powers that be', the coveted opportunity to direct

Cardenio at The Globe (p. 445). Perhaps appropriately for a book so explicitly concerned with ghosts, however, another (implicitly more crucial) Shakespearean document is *nearly* recovered along with the play manuscript. This ephemeral personal letter, which promises to resolve the truth of Shakespeare's identity once and for all, is pre-emptively destroyed by Sir Henry Lee – 'one of the graying lions of the British stage' and a '*Shakespearean Defender of the Faith*' of sorts – before its subversive content can reach the public (pp. 18, 431). In an unexpected twist, then, the recovery of *Cardenio* is ultimately overshadowed by the apparition of a critical, revisionary letter that vanishes for all time in the final pages of Carrell's novel.

This dialectic of discovery and loss that we sense in *The Shakespeare Secret* similarly informs the endings of the other novels under my consideration. There is a pervasive tension in this microgenre in which Shakespearean ghost texts are represented as being on the cusp of materialisation, almost in the grasp of their seekers, only to vanish once more. Hartley's novel follows Crispin's lead in that *Love's Labour's Won* disappears in a final puff of smoke. 'The play, of course', our narrator wryly relates, 'had been incinerated utterly' (p. 377). In Martin's novel, the autograph manuscript of this same text – which had, perversely, been miscataloged but present in Harvard's library since the institution's colonial-era founding – also remains ultimately inaccessible. Peter is stymied by a note, found in a locked box, which anticlimactically informs seekers to '*continue the quest until 2036*' when a time capsule will be opened to reveal '*the hand of Shakespeare himself, put to a play that no one has read in four centuries*' (p. 697). *Looking for Cardenio*, too, ends with a bait-and-switch of sorts. Having laboriously transcribed it, Deirdre comes to recognise that she is in possession not of *Cardenio* but a 'manuscript of unknown authorship that might sell to a collector for five thousand . . . on a good day' (pp. 214). In this series of anti-climactic endings, *Love's Labour's Won* and *Cardenio* thus maintain a spectral quality: they are, in the end, destroyed,

still gallingly inaccessible, proven to be fake, or ultimately diminished in significance compared to *something else* of greater literary-historical consequence that has been definitively lost. We might say that there is a consistent play in these novels on paradoxes of illusion and reality, substance and immateriality.

Hopkins has suggested that works of detective fiction ‘in which a lost text by Shakespeare is sought and/or recovered’ tend to raise ‘a number of questions about what exactly has been lost and whether in fact we wish it to be found’, and Bushnell makes the correlative observation that, while ‘mysteries concerned with the recovery of a lost Shakespearean play or documents . . . engage the experience of loss itself, and especially the loss of the past’, they tend to be ‘ambivalent about recovery’.⁷⁷ Such assessments complement my own broader point that *Harvard Yard*, *The Shakespeare Secret*, *Looking for Cardenio*, and *What Time Devours* evince a shared impulse to imbue the semantics of Shakespearean literary discovery with the metaphors of spectrality. The protagonists in these novels are haunted by their own pasts. They are visited by shadowy acquaintances and troubled by memories not only of comrades and competitors murdered in pursuit of Shakespearean ghost plays, but also of the academic spheres they have left behind, willingly or unwillingly – by the spectre of scholarly careers abandoned or unrealised. And the ghost plays themselves, those tantalisingly elusive copies of *Love’s Labour’s Won* and *Cardenio* (or, in the case of Carrell’s novel, the added personal letters), take on a curiously stable set of symbolic resonances in this microgenre. These Shakespearean texts, seemingly resurrected only to be devalued or lost once more, connote promises unfulfilled. With mounting suspense, ghost plays first appear to represent opportunities for personal profit, glory, and redemption, yet, ultimately, they come to figure instead for loss, highlighting the sobering ephemerality of literary culture and the absence of historical certainty. In quests for *Love’s Labour’s Won* or *Cardenio*, new, materially based knowledge about Shakespeare is rendered

ungraspable; the face of contemporary scholarship always remains substantively unchanged. We might say that these fictively resurrected plays are spectral, then, in multiple senses.

In a review of van Straten's *In Search of Lost Books*, Boyd Tonkin perceptively remarks that '[l]aments over the disappearance of masterworks, never to be read again, have become a sub-genre of the elegy that reminds us of the transience of mortal things'.⁷⁸ Certainly, van Straten himself, ever aware of the 'essential fragility' of the material text, waxes elegiac as he ponders 'that combination of impulse and melancholy, of curiosity and fascination, which develops with the thought of something that existed once but that we can no longer hold in our hands'.⁷⁹ In *The Book of Lost Books* – saliently described by its author as 'an epitaph and a wake, a hypothetical library and an elegy to what might have been' – Kelly, too, is mesmerised by the 'vulnerability of . . . substance' that renders the 'entire history of literature . . . the history of the loss of literature'.⁸⁰ And it is possible that the ghostly, absent presences of history's literary lacunae have become only more captivating and alluring to audiences entrenched in a 'perma-fixed cyberspace culture' that renders us, as Kelly puts it, 'almost incapable of believing in loss'.⁸¹ I would thus end by noting that, whereas Kelly, submitting that 'becoming lost' is hardly 'the worst that can happen to a book', proposes that the textual voids of the past can become fruitful sites of fantasy or 'wish fulfilment' in the post-millennial present, van Straten concludes his own literary 'voyage' with a correlative insight (one that is seemingly shared and exploited by Martin, Carrell, Baxter, and Hartley): that is, 'lost books possess something that others do not', for these historical apparitions 'bequeath to those who have not read them the possibility of imagining them, of telling stories about them, of re-inventing them'.⁸²

- ¹ Jennifer Lee Carrell, *The Shakespeare Secret* (2007; London: Penguin, 2008), p. 112. Further references are parenthetical.
- ² Lisa Hopkins, *Shakespearean Allusion in Crime Fiction* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 1.
- ³ Douglas Lanier, 'Recent Shakespeare Adaptation and the Mutations of Cultural Capital', *Shakespeare Studies*, 38 (2010), 104-13 (p. 108).
- ⁴ E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1930), II, p. 194.
- ⁵ Thomas Percy, *The Percy Letters*, ed. by D. Nichol Smith, Cleanth Brooks, and A.F. Falconar, 9 vols (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1944-88), II, p. 68.
- ⁶ On the various attempts to identify *Love's Labour's Won* with an extant Shakespearean play, see G. Harold Metz, 'Wonne is "Lost, Quite Lost"', *Modern Language Studies*, 16 (1986), 3-12.
- ⁷ It has been postulated, for example, that the copies of the playscript had already gone missing by early 1605: Roslyn L. Knutson, 'Love's Labor's Won in Repertory', *Publications of the Arkansas Philological Association* 11 (1985), 45-57.
- ⁸ T. W. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Love's Labor's Won: New Evidence from the Account Books of an Elizabethan Bookseller* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1957).
- ⁹ Lewis Theobald, *Double Falsehood*, ed. by Brean Hammond (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010).
- ¹⁰ Samuel A. Tannenbaum, *Shakespeare Forgeries in the Revels Accounts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928), pp. 55-56.
- ¹¹ W. W. Greg, 'The Bakings of Betsy', *The Library*, 3rd series 2, no. 7 (1911), pp. 225-59 (p. 241).
- ¹² For the forgery/authenticity debate, see Brean Hammond, 'Double Falsehood: The Forgery Hypothesis, the "Charles Dickson" Enigma and a "Stern" Rejoinder', *Shakespeare Survey*, 67 (2014), 165-79.
- ¹⁴ Hamilton's edition contains over 150 pages of justification, much of which is focused on palaeographical evidence suggesting that 'the manuscript . . . is entirely in Shakespeare's own hand' since 'the handwriting is identical down to the very dots on the *i*'s with the script in Shakespeare's holograph will': Charles Hamilton, ed. *Cardenio: Or, The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (Lakewood, CO: Glenbridge, 1994), 2.
- ¹⁵ Roger Chartier, *Cardenio between Cervantes and Shakespeare: The Story of a Lost Play*, trans. by Janet Lloyd (2011; Cambridge: Polity, 2013), p. 170.
- ¹⁶ Brean Hammond, 'After Arden', in *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 62-79 (p. 62). For an example of the media attention that Hammond's edition commanded, see Ron Rosenbaum, 'The Double Falsehood of Double Falsehood', *Slate* [online], 13 May 2010, <http://www.slate.com/articles/life/the_spectator/2010/05/the_double_falsehood_of_double_falsehood.html> [accessed 2 April 2018].
- ¹⁷ See Stephen Greenblatt and Charles Mee, eds, *The Cardenio Project: An Experiment in Cultural Mobility* [online], Harvard University, <www.fas.harvard.edu/~cardenio/> [accessed 2 April 2018].
- ¹⁸ Roslyn L. Knutson, David McInnis, and Matthew Steggle, eds, *Lost Plays Database* [online], University of Melbourne, <www.lostplays.org/> [accessed 2 April 2018]; David McInnis, and Matthew Steggle, eds. *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- ¹⁹ Robert D. Altick, *The Scholar Adventurers* (1950; Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987), p. 1.
- ²⁰ Altick, p. 1.
- ²¹ Altick, pp. 1-2.
- ²² Stuart Kelly, *The Book of Lost Books: An Incomplete History of All the Great Books You'll Never Read* (2005; Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2010), xxiii.
- ²³ Kelly, p. xxii.
- ²⁴ Giorgio van Straten, *In Search of Lost Books: The Forgotten Stories of Eight Mythical Volumes*, trans. by Simon Carnell (2016; London: Pushkin, 2017), p. 3.
- ²⁵ Van Straten, p. 6.
- ²⁶ Van Straten, pp. 10, 6.
- ²⁷ Chester Noyes Greenough, 'An Experiment in the Training of Teachers of Composition for Work with College Freshmen', *The English Journal*, 2 (1913), 109-21 (p. 118).
- ²⁸ Samuel Schoenbaum, 'The Folger at Fifty', in *Shakespeare and Others* (Washington, DC: Folger Library, 1985), pp. 161-68 (p. 168).
- ²⁹ Gregory Doran, *Shakespeare's Lost Play: In Search of Cardenio* (London: Nick Hern, 2012), xxi..
- ³⁰ Doran, pp. 3, 24.
- ³¹ Edmund Crispin, *Love Lies Bleeding* (1948; London: Vintage, 2007), p. 129.
- ³² Crispin, p. 140.
- ³³ Crispin, pp. 146, 266.

- ³⁴ Crispin, pp. 266, 268.
- ³⁶ M. R. Carroll, *Dead False: A Noir Murder Mystery* [e-book] (1998; Tessellate Media, 2014), § 5, loc. 909.
- ³⁷ Carroll, § 4, loc. 639-51.
- ³⁸ Carroll, § 13, loc. 2887.
- ³⁹ A. S. Byatt, *Possession: A Romance* (London: Vintage, 1991), p. 238.
- ⁴⁰ Suzanne Keen, *Romances of the Archive in Contemporary British Fiction* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), p. 47.
- ⁴¹ Graham Holderness, *Nine Lives of William Shakespeare* (London: Continuum, 2011), p. 34.
- ⁴² Peter Millar, 'The Play's a Deadly Thing', *The Times*, 12 January 2008, p. 13; Arifa Akbar, 'After Da Vinci, Readers Rush to Unravel the Secrets of Shakespeare', *The Independent*, 11 April 2008, p. 18.
- ⁴³ Charles Nicholl, 'The Final Act of Mr Shakespeare by Robert Winder', *The Guardian*, 20 Feb 2010, p. 12; Cass Morris, Review of *Interred With Their Bones* by Jennifer Lee Carrell, *American Shakespeare Center* [online], 31 July 2012, <<https://americanshakespearecenter.com/2012/07/book-review-interred-with-their-bones-by-jennifer-lee-carrell/>> [accessed 2 April 2018]; Millar, p. 13.
- ⁴⁴ 'Fall Fiction Roundup', *The Christian Science Monitor*, 2 Nov 2007, p. 13.
- ⁴⁵ C. L. Rossman, Review of *What Time Devours* by A.J. Hartley, *armchairinterviews* [online], n.d., <<http://armchairinterviews.com/reviews/what-time-devours>> [accessed 2 April 2018].
- ⁴⁶ Douglas Lanier, 'Shakespeare™: Myth and Biographical Fiction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*, ed. by Robert Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 93-113 (p. 95).
- ⁴⁷ Douglas Lanier, *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* (2002; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 9.
- ⁴⁸ Arguably, there is an earlier precedent for such imagery in Carroll's *Dead False*, wherein Mickey (who, like Carrell's Kate, is 'fascinated with things occult') refers both to 'phantom Shakespeare' and to himself as 'a phantom . . . flitting around the edges of [a] great big fuck-up' (§ 1, loc. 51; § 2, loc.185; § 12, loc. 2439). Moreover, as one of his associates pointedly remarks: 'This whole business is nothing but ghosts. Look at what we got. A play that's maybe fake but can't be found. A bunch of corpses that look like they're connected but nothing definite to prove it' (§ 12, loc. 2415).
- ⁴⁹ An overview of spectrality can be found in María del Pilar Blanco and Esther Peeren, 'Introduction: Conceptualizing Spectralities', in *The Spectralities Reader: Ghosts and Haunting in Contemporary Cultural Theory*, ed. by María del Pilar Blanco and Esther Peeren (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 1-27.
- ⁵⁰ See Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, trans. by Peggy Kamuf (London: Routledge, 1994).
- ⁵¹ Maurizio Calbi, *Spectral Shakespeares: Media Adaptations in the Twenty-First Century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 2.
- ⁵² Qtd. in Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality* (1987; London: Routledge, 2010), xv.
- ⁵³ Brian Cummings, 'Last Words: The Biographemes of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 65 (2014), 482-90 (p. 484); Paul Franssen, *Shakespeare's Literary Lives: The Author as Character in Fiction and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 11-34.
- ⁵⁴ Howard Marchitello, 'Finding Cardenio', *ELH*, 74 (2007), 957-87 (pp. 959-60).
- ⁵⁵ William Martin, *Harvard Yard* (2003; New York: Warner Books, 2004), pp. 25. Further references are parenthetical.
- ⁵⁶ Jean Rae Baxter, *Looking for Cardenio* (Hamilton, ON: Seraphim, 2008), pp. 22-23. Further references are parenthetical.
- ⁵⁷ A. J. Hartley, *What Time Devours* (New York: Penguin, 2009), p. 170. Further references are parenthetical.
- ⁵⁸ Hopkins, pp. 168, 172.
- ⁵⁹ Rebecca Bushnell, 'Shakespeare Found and Lost', in *Shakespeare and Millennial Fiction*, edited by Andrew James Hartley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 33-45 (p. 36).
- ⁶⁰ In describing these protagonists as paradoxical insider-outsiders, I am thinking, in broad terms, of Pierre Bourdieu's work on individuals' 'insider' and 'outsider' status in relation to defined socio-cultural spaces. See *The Logic of Practice*, trans. by Richard Nice (Cambridge: Polity, 1990).
- ⁶¹ Much the same might be said about Carroll's late twentieth century creation, Mickey. Though this freelancing journalist claims to be 'allergic to tweed', he regularly hobnobs with Torontonians academics (§ 4, loc.740). While his precise pedigree and qualifications are left unclarified, Mickey seems to be well acquainted with both Oxford and Cambridge and is marked as a one-time inhabitant of 'ivy-infested academe' (§ 5, loc.843). As he is

rather scornfully reminded by a fellow journalist, he was ‘made for elbow patches, a briar pipe, and windy dissertations about Swift’s digestive system and its relation to Stella’ (§ 5, loc.843).

⁶² Bushnell, p. 37.

⁶³ Carroll, § 13, loc. 2887.

⁶⁴ Crispin, p. 157.

⁶⁵ Carroll, § 12, loc. 2397; Crispin, p. 268.

⁶⁶ Judith Strong Albert, Review of Geraldine Brooks *March* and William Martin *Harvard Yard*, *Women’s Studies*, 35 (2006), 413-18 (p. 416).

⁶⁷ Judith Leggat, ‘Collecting Bodies’, *Canadian Literature /Littérature canadienne: A Quarterly of Criticism and Review* 207 (2010), 118-19 (p. 118).

⁶⁸ Bushnell, p. 36.

⁶⁹ Bushnell, p. 33.

⁷⁰ Albert, p. 413.

⁷¹ Albert, p. 414.

⁷² Jerome de Groot, *Consuming History: Historians and Heritage in Contemporary Popular Culture* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 2.

⁷³ De Groot, p. 3.

⁷⁴ De Groot, p. 3.

⁷⁵ De Groot, p. 56.

⁷⁶ Lanier, ‘Shakespeare™’, p. 109.

⁷⁷ Hopkins, pp. 16, 150; Bushnell, pp. 42-43.

⁷⁸ Boyd Tonkin, ‘Missing: The Library of Lost Epics’, *Boundless* [online], 4 January 2018, <<https://unbound.com/boundless/2018/01/04/the-lost-books/>> [accessed 2 April 2018].

⁷⁹ Van Straten, pp. 8-9.

⁸⁰ Kelly, pp. xxii, xvii.

⁸¹ Kelly, p. xxi.

⁸² Kelly, p. xxi; van Straten, p. 10.