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Carnegie, David and Gary Taylor, eds.  
*The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play.*  

Documentary evidence of the lost play *Cardenio*, now thought to have been written collaboratively by Shakespeare and John Fletcher, is relatively slight. The *Cardenio*-plot derives from episodes in Cervantes’s 1605 *Don Quixote*, translated into English in 1612 by Thomas Shelton. The adaptation of these episodes into a play may be witnessed by two payments to the King’s Men for performances in 1613. On May 20, the King’s Treasurer paid the King’s Men for their performance of six plays, among which was “Cardenno.” Another payment was made some weeks later on July 9 for performance of a single play, this time identified as “Cardenna.” Forty years later “The History of Cardenio, M’ Fletcher. & Shakespeare” (12) was entered, along with forty-two other titles, into the Stationers’ Register by Humphrey Moseley. After Moseley’s death, his copyrights were sold in 1718, and as “The History of Cardenio” was among these, a manuscript of the play may also have been part of the exchange. In December 1727, Lewis Theobald staged *Double Falsehood; or, The Distrest Lovers*, a play whose action is similar to the Quixote episodes. Theobald published the play that same month, claiming that it was “Written Originally by W. Shakespeare; And Now Revised and Adapted to the Stage” by Theobald himself. In the “Preface by the Editor,” Theobald claimed to possess three (possibly four) manuscript copies of the play, the oldest of which he traced to the actor and “prompter” John Downes, who received the copy from Thomas Betterton. None of these manuscripts is known to have survived, and Theobald’s *Double Falsehood* remains the only text that may bear traces of the lost *Cardenio*.

Recovering what remains of the original *Cardenio* from *Double Falsehood* requires much ingenuity, effort, and close attention to Theobald’s play. Unsurprisingly, three of *The Quest for Cardenio*’s five sections focus on the authorship question, approaching it from several angles. In the first section, the volume’s editors, along with Brean Hammond, editor of the 2010 Arden Shakespeare *Double Falsehood*, valuably survey the play’s critical and editorial reception. The next section approaches the authorship question by assessing the history of editors’ various grappling with the play as well as the history of Theobald’s reputation as forger, adapter, or editor of the play. Tiffany Stern
offers a compelling critique of stylometric analyses that have attempted to attribute authorship to Shakespeare, noting that the styles of other authorship candidates—Massinger and Shirley, for example—have not been addressed adequately. Stern’s essay pivots to the next section, in which several critics address the play’s internal evidence and more or less rescue Theobald from the charge of forgery levelled at him by Alexander Pope. MacDonald P. Jackson and Richard Proudfoot each offer a stylometric analysis of the play, with Jackson concluding that Theobald worked from a Shakespeare-Fletcherian manuscript but “scarcely a line of Shakespeare’s verse survives intact” (161). Proudfoot similarly concludes that the play’s style bears traces of three authors: Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Theobald. David Carnegie’s contribution continues in this vein, analyzing Theobald’s adaptations of The Duchess of Malfi and The Tragedy of King Richard II to assess how Theobald worked when adapting plays for the eighteenth-century stage.

Leaving behind the question of authorship, the volume’s fourth section focuses instead on Double Falsehood’s relationship to other Jacobean plays. Valerie Wayne notes that copies of the Spanish Don Quixote had arrived in England by 1605; Wayne argues that the “turn to dramatic romance”—to which Cardenio contributed—was catalyzed by Don Quixote’s ironic recuperation of romance tales. Double Falsehood, however, omits these meta-textual features. Huw Griffiths compares Double Falsehood’s treatment of male friendship with plays by both Shakespeare and Fletcher, finding that Double Falsehood suppresses the erotic possibilities of male friendship the earlier plays raised.

The volume’s final section assesses the performance history of Double Falsehood and several reconstructions of Cardenio, beginning with the 1613 performances and running up to a 2011 production of Theobald’s Double Falsehood, and the several readings and performances of Gary Taylor’s The History of Cardenio. Notable essays include Taylor’s, in which he details the contexts of the original 1613 performances of “Cardenno” and “Cardenna,” tracing the June performance to the house of Sir John Swinnerton, the Lord Mayor. Taylor also narrows the date of the play’s performance before the king, arguing that the play’s performance would have most likely occurred in February 1613. In his essay, Roger Chartier turns away from the English context to discuss two continental Cardenios: Guillén de Castro’s Don Quixote de la Mancha and Pichou’s Les Folie de Cardenio. Chartier valuably proposes these plays as alternatives that circumvent the authority wielded by Shakespeare’s
ghost over dramatic adaptations of the *Cardenio*-plot. Theobald’s reputation is recuperated in this final section, too. Peter Kirwan favourably reviews two modern productions of *Double Falsehood*, and Gregory Doran praises the play in an essay discussing his preparations in directing the 2011 Royal Shakespeare Company’s production of *Cardenio: Shakespeare’s “Lost Play” Reimagined*.

This collection of essays offers a valuable and comprehensive assessment of what *Cardenio* might have been like, ideas as to how its other features might be recovered, and, importantly, a history of the play’s performance. Necessarily, the volume spends much time discussing *Double Falsehood*, and along the way argues for a more sympathetic understanding of Theobald and his collaborative adaptation. It is ironic, then, that his name has been omitted from this collection’s subtitle, as this volume demonstrates his centrality to—rather than his exclusion from—any quest to recover the lost *Cardenio*.
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**Carvajal y Mendoza, Luisa.**
*The Life and Writings of Luisa Carvajal y Mendoza. Ed. and trans. Anne J. Cruz.*

With the most recent volume in the Other Voice in Early Modern Europe series, Anne J. Cruz comprehensively and elegantly brings to light the life and writings of Spanish noblewoman, author, and religious activist-mystic Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza (1566–1614). Nearly three decades after Cruz first discussed this captivating figure, her 2014 publication makes Carvajal even more widely accessible to scholarly audiences. In keeping with the goal of the Other Voice series, which focuses on women authors (and a few male advocates of women) writing in French, German, Italian, Latin, and Spanish, the volume offers translated and sometimes bilingual editions suitable for scholarly research and general classroom use. The full series includes 187 volumes; to date just over half are published and eleven focus on Spanish writers.