

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DATE AND TEXT OF THE TEMPEST

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
ENGLISH AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF THE KANSAS STATE  
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF EMPORIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

By

Andrew James Deckert

July 1971

Approved for the Major Department

Charles S. Walton

Approved for the Graduate Council

Manuel R. Byrle

<sup>B</sup>  
316041

## PREFACE

In this study I have undertaken an investigation to ascertain the probable composition date of The Tempest and to review the problems of the text. My research opened many avenues of debate and thought; however, there was none as intriguing and involved as Peter Cunningham's "honest forgeries." Detailing and analyzing the elements of orthography and punctuation as a textual study provided a surprise, for I found the compositors of the text exerted a far greater control over the published text than the author.

I wish to express my appreciation to Professor Charles E. Walton, Chairman, Department of English, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, for his guidance, counsel, and infinite patience. I wish also to thank Professor Theodore C. Owen for his much appreciated constructive criticism. Finally, I wish to acknowledge my wife, Nancy, and our two children, Alysun and Ryun, who were blessed with much understanding and patience.

July, 1971

A. J. D.

Salina, Kansas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE COMPOSITION DATE OF <u>THE TEMPEST</u> .....	1
II. TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN <u>THE TEMPEST</u> .....	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	61

## CHAPTER I

### THE COMPOSITION DATE OF THE TEMPEST

Careful literary analysis has provided the scholar with an opportunity to ascertain to some degree of accuracy the composition date of a Shakespearean play by the application of three related methods resting upon the implications of internal, internal-external, and external evidence.<sup>1</sup> The uses of prose, rhyme, run-on lines, double endings, the "straddled line,"<sup>2</sup> light and weak endings, and the extra-syllable line<sup>3</sup> are the elements of internal evidence. On the other hand, internal-external evidence is that which is supplied through allusions in the work to contemporary incidents that can be definitely dated. Finally, contemporary references to individual plays, records of court performances, and entries in the Stationers' Register furnish the background for external evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Marc Parrott, William Shakespeare: A Handbook, pp. 123-125.

<sup>2</sup>Frank Kermode (ed.), The Tempest, p. xvii.

<sup>3</sup>William Allan Neilson (ed.), The Tempest, pp. 39-41.

A.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Parrott, to aid the scholar in the quest for internal evidence, compiled a table of metrical statistics based upon the studies of Fleay, König, and Furnivall.<sup>4</sup> Chambers, although critical of Fleay's haphazard research techniques,<sup>5</sup> did not find fault with König or Furnivall, and used their findings to supplement his own. Resulting differences in the research of Parrott and Chambers involves the problems of individual interpretation and judgment in the employment of different texts. For example, Parrott finds the total number of lines in The Tempest to be 2064<sup>6</sup>; Chambers claims 2062.<sup>7</sup> Parrott finds 458 prose lines; Chambers, 464. Although internal evidence offered by such statistics does not specifically date a play, a comparative analysis, when all of the facts are considered, tends to group a play with others of a similar nature. This group can, then, be fitted comfortably into a given period of Shakespeare's development.

---

<sup>4</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 241.

<sup>5</sup>Sir E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, II, 406.

<sup>6</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 241.

<sup>7</sup>Chambers, op. cit., II, 398.

Hence, the number of prose lines in a play tends to locate it in one of three divisions. For example, during the first period of Shakespeare's composition, encompassing fourteen plays, the number of prose lines is low—specifically, an average of little more than eleven per cent.<sup>8</sup> The second period of twelve plays shows an increase in prose lines from thirty-eight per cent to forty-nine per cent.<sup>9</sup> A considerable decrease, however, is to be found in the last period, in which the number of prose lines falls to eighteen per cent.<sup>10</sup> The Tempest is a member of the third period, using prose construction for twenty-two per cent of its total lines.<sup>11</sup>

Studies show that, as Shakespeare began to excel in blank verse, he depended less on rhyme. Gradually, with no set regularity, the amount of his rhyme dwindled. The first period shows an average of 328 rhymed lines for fourteen plays; the second period, 102 lines for twelve plays;

---

<sup>8</sup>When using percentages, the author has chosen to follow the sound advice of Sir E. K. Chambers: ". . . where percentages are used, they should be rounded off, and not calculated to decimals, which give an appearance of scientific precision far from justified by the nature of the material." Chambers, op. cit., I, 267.

<sup>9</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 241.

<sup>10</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>11</sup>Loc. cit.

and the third, an average of eighty-one for eleven plays. The Tempest has only two rhymed lines, if one disregards the songs and the fifty-four lines of rhyme in the masque.<sup>12</sup>

On the other hand, in the development of English drama, a mastery of blank verse brought about the threat of monotony. A time-worn Elizabethan method of composing blank verse was to structure one line after another as if building a wall of bricks. Each line was "end-stopped,"<sup>13</sup> producing a pause for a mark of punctuation to promote clarity. To add life to his lines, arrest monotony, and create the illusion of natural conversation, Shakespeare's dependence on the "straddled line"<sup>14</sup> (the carrying of the reader from line to line without pause caused by change of idea or punctuation mark) gradually increased until slightly more than one-third of his total lines in the plays composed during the last period of development are of the "straddled" variety.<sup>15</sup> Nearly forty-two per cent of his blank verse lines in The Tempest "overflow."<sup>16</sup> One finds as common examples of such "overflow" the separation of

---

<sup>12</sup>Horace Howard Furness (ed.), The Tempest, p. 300.

<sup>13</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 243.

<sup>14</sup>Kermode, op. cit., p. xvii.

<sup>15</sup>Chambers, op. cit., II, 401.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., I, 262.



the subject from its accompanying verb (V.i.45-46),<sup>17</sup> of a preposition from its object (I.ii.331-332), of a verb from its object (I.ii.341-342), of compound elements (I.ii.472-473). The "run-on" line is introduced by a punctuation pause, directly preceding the end of the line (I.ii.506-507).

Another method used to break up the monotony of the blank verse line is the double ending, one that does not close the line with a stressed syllable as is usual with iambic pentameter, but instead closes it with an unstressed syllable and thereby ". . . gives great variety and charm to the verse . . . ."<sup>18</sup> One is less likely to find the use of the double ending device in passages of thoughtful musings and solemn rhetoric than in exchanges of social dialogue or heated conversation.<sup>19</sup> With little regularity, Shakespeare continually increased his use of the double ending until his utilization of the device in the later plays had almost doubled that of his early plays.<sup>20</sup> His employment of this kind of ending in The Tempest is just

---

<sup>17</sup>Furness, op. cit. All lines in The Tempest noted by the author have been taken from the Variorum edition and will be noted hereafter in the text.

<sup>18</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 244.

<sup>19</sup>Chambers, op. cit., I, 261.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., II, 400.

over thirty-five per cent.<sup>21</sup>

Further suggestive of Shakespeare's early work is his practice of ending a speech at the close of a line and beginning a new speech with the next line.<sup>22</sup> The method of ending a speech in the middle of the line created a more conversational tone. The new speaker finished the line with the opening of his speech. When a change of speaker occurred in the first plays, Shakespeare utilized this technique on the average of just under seven per cent of the time.<sup>23</sup> Gradually, its use grew to an average of thirty-one per cent in the final period.<sup>24</sup> The Tempest employs the technique almost eighty-five per cent of the time.<sup>25</sup> In the first twenty-eight plays, Shakespeare used light and weak endings, which are ". . . nothing more than extreme cases of necessary overflows,"<sup>26</sup> on the average of slightly less than five times per play.<sup>27</sup> The last nine plays reveal an average of slightly more than seventy-nine

---

<sup>21</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 241.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 244-245.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 241.

<sup>24</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>25</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>26</sup>Chambers, op. cit., I, 265.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., II, 401.

per play, with The Tempest having sixty-seven instances.<sup>28</sup>

The light ending is usually in the form of a one-syllable word, such as a pronoun (I.ii.195), auxiliary verb (III.iii.94), or a form of "to be" (I.ii.539), all of which complete the five-foot line with an added unstressed syllable.<sup>29</sup> The weak ending may utilize a preposition (I.ii.547) or conjunction (I.ii.168) to end the line.<sup>30</sup> These two types of endings compel the reader to move from one line to the next, creating a more natural and imaginative flow of conversation. Although the line is essentially characteristic of blank verse, the reader is not overtly aware of its syllabication. He is, thus, led away by the light or weak ending from the monotonous repetition of reading ten syllables, only to pause before reading ten more. As Shakespeare's art matured, his dependence on standard forms lessened to allow greater variety.<sup>31</sup>

During the final stages of his artistic development, Shakespeare deviated from the ten-syllable line in what

---

<sup>28</sup>Parrott, op. cit., p. 241.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 245-246.

<sup>30</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 246.

can best be described as a carte blanche fashion.<sup>32</sup> These extra-syllable lines, sprinkled throughout a play, add a spontaneity to the thought that provides the characters with a more lifelike speaking rhythm. A typical example is the addition of an extra syllable just before the caesura (III.i.64). Next, in an organized chain of development came the addition of an extra syllable before the caesura and at the end of the line (I.ii.47). Still more variety was gained by the use of twelve and thirteen-syllable lines (I.ii.194,354). Consequently, the mechanics of this kind of internal evidence place The Tempest—along with Pericles, The Winter's Tale, and Cymbeline—in a group of plays having similar characteristics.<sup>33</sup>

Not to be ignored as a grouping criterion of the last plays is the "organic compactness,"<sup>34</sup> that Coleridge explained as

. . . the law which all the parts, conforming themselves to the outward symbols and manifestations of the essential principle. . . . we shall observe that trees of the same kind vary considerable, according to the circumstances of soil, air, or position; yet we are able to

---

<sup>32</sup>Neilson, op. cit., pp. 39-41.

<sup>33</sup>C. H. Herford (ed.), The Works of Shakespeare, IV, p. 398.

<sup>34</sup>Henry Hudson (ed.), The Tempest, p. 7.

decide at once whether they are oaks, elms, or poplars.<sup>35</sup>

Thus it is with Shakespeare. His last plays are steeped in ". . . the representation of the unnatural rupture of natural ties of oppression, falsehood, and ingratitude."<sup>36</sup> They show the severing and rebuilding of family relationships.<sup>37</sup> They are plays wherein one may ". . . witness a society in which all natural bonds are broken . . . ." <sup>38</sup>

The application of tests concerning meter and rhyme and the compiling of data do not, unfortunately, always result in an accurate date of composition.<sup>39</sup> They do, however, provide one with valuable general information, first, to help determine the order of the plays and, secondly, to arrange the plays in meaningful relationships. This evidence, when applied along with the information produced by means of other evidences, should help to narrow the date of composition for a play to within a single year. Furthermore, this test of internal evidence places The Tempest in the last group of plays, along with those

<sup>35</sup>Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets, pp. 133-134.

<sup>36</sup>G. G. Gervinus, Shakespeare Commentaries, p. 789.

<sup>37</sup>Herford, op. cit., p. 398.

<sup>38</sup>Madeleine Doran, "Elements in the Composition of King Lear," SP, XXX (January, 1933), 47.

<sup>39</sup>Furness, op. cit., p. 301.

that exhibit a similar degree of organic similarity.<sup>40</sup>

B.

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

Chambers cautions that ". . . the hunt . . . becomes dangerous . . ." <sup>41</sup> for the Shakespearean scholar when internal-external evidence is utilized for determining the composition date of any play. Most scholars, however, identify William Strachey's "A True Reportory of the Wreck and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, Knight" and Silvester Jourdain's A Discovery of the Bermudas, Otherwise Called the Isle of Devils as evidence strongly related to the dating of The Tempest. For example, Gervinus was definite: "The date of The Tempest is decided by its undeniable connections with Jourdain's pamphlet . . ." <sup>42</sup> Fleay wrote that The Tempest was composed after Shakespeare learned of Gates's ships escaping destruction. <sup>43</sup> On the other hand, minimizing the importance of Jourdain's and Strachey's writings, Nosworthy considered them contributions of

---

<sup>40</sup>Chambers, op. cit., II, 398-402.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., I, 246.

<sup>42</sup>Gervinus, op. cit., p. 789.

<sup>43</sup>F. G. Fleay, A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare, p. 66.

"circumstantial detail"<sup>44</sup> which influenced only the setting. A look at the two narratives and the incidents that provoked their writing is essential to an understanding of the importance of these events.

William Strachey, along with approximately six hundred others, left Plymouth, for Jamestown on June 2, 1609, aboard a fleet of nine ships.<sup>45</sup> Seven weeks out of Plymouth, the fleet encountered a hurricane which was to separate the Sea Venture, Strachey's ship, from the rest and ground it on the "Isle of Devils," one of the Bermudas.<sup>46</sup> All of the passengers and crew escaped to shore unharmed, and much of the ship's cargo and equipment was saved in a true Robinson Crusoe manner. For eleven months, the colonists built and outfitted two small ships, the Deliverance and the Patience, which were to take them safely to Virginia.<sup>47</sup> Except for occasional severe electrical storms, they lived under ideal conditions, much to their surprise. Upon their arrival at Jamestown, they found the colony there to

---

<sup>44</sup>J. M. Nosworthy, "Narrative Sources of The Tempest," RES, XXIV (October, 1948), 287.

<sup>45</sup>Louis B. Wright (ed.), A Voyage to Virginia in 1609. Two Narratives: Strachey's "True Reportory" & Jourdain's Discovery of the Bermudas, p. x.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. xiii.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. xiv.

be living under extremely hostile circumstances.<sup>48</sup> Indians, disease, laziness, and ignorance had reduced the number of immigrants to a mere fraction of the original population. It was of these ordeals, which ". . . Shakespeare had obviously read before writing The Tempest,"<sup>49</sup> that Strachey and Jourdain wrote.

Notable parallels exist between the two narratives. Indeed, in several instances, Shakespeare used the same word in a context similar to Strachey's.<sup>50</sup> Other examples suggest descriptive details on which Shakespeare focused and incorporated into his own plot.<sup>51</sup> The most important tie between The Tempest and the two narratives, however, occurs when Ariel says to Prospero, "Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew/ From the still-vex'd Bermoothes" (I.ii.268-269). It is conceivable that Shakespeare knew of the island's reputation for hellish storms.<sup>52</sup> Certainly, his patron and several of his friends were involved financially with the development of the Jamestown colony.

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. xv.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. x.

<sup>50</sup>Robert Ralston Cawley, "Shakspeare's Use of the Voyagers in The Tempest," PMLA, XLI (September, 1926), 693.

<sup>51</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>52</sup>James Oscar Campbell (ed.), The Living Shakespeare, p. 1158.



Moreover, Strachey, a friend of Ben Jonson, was a member of the literary clique comprised of Shakespeare and his contemporaries<sup>53</sup> when he wrote his narrative while living in the Blackfriars.<sup>54</sup>

### C.

#### EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

On the other hand, dating The Tempest by means of the external evidence which Shakespeare scholars have amassed immediately erupts into pregnant controversy, and of the four exterior references, only the record of the play's performance in 1612 stands unblemished and unchallenged.<sup>55</sup> Designating the composition date as late 1610 or early 1611 from Ben Jonson's supposed allusions in Bartholmew Fayre and the "honest forgeries" of Peter Cunningham can, at best, be described as questionable. Furthermore, Dryden's reference to the date of the play can not be pinpointed.<sup>56</sup> Unfortunately, the Stationers' Register does not clarify the composition date, since the November 8,

---

<sup>53</sup>Wright, op. cit., p. xi.

<sup>54</sup>The Tempest, p. 2.

<sup>55</sup>Ernest Law, "Shakespeare's Plays in the Revels Accounts," TLS, January 27, 1921, p. 59.

<sup>56</sup>Edmond Malone (ed.), The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, II, 467.

1623, entry notes only the admission of the text of Jaggard's publication.<sup>57</sup>

The nucleus of the scholarly conflict centering around Ben Jonson concerns two presumed allusions to Shakespeare contained in the opening lines in Bartholmew Fayre,<sup>58</sup> which frequently have been interpreted as direct allusions to The Tempest.<sup>59</sup> The first problem is the speech of the stage-keeper in "The Indvction":

. . . and some writer (that I know) had had but the penning o' this matter, hee would ha' made such a Iig-ajogge i' the boothes, you should ha' thought an earthquake had been i' the Fayre!<sup>60</sup>

The second issue is considered to have been ". . . an ironical apology for the absence from his [Jonson's] play of a 'Servant-Monster'."<sup>61</sup>:

If there bee neuer a Seruant-monster i' the Fayre; who can helpe it? he [Ben Jonson] sayes; nor a nest of Antiques?<sup>62</sup> Hee is

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 641.

<sup>58</sup>Bartholmew Fayre was ". . . acted at court on Hal-lowmas [November 1], 1614." G. L. Kitteredge (ed.), The Tempest, p. xvi.

<sup>59</sup>Francis Douce, Illustrations of Shakespeare, I, 7.

<sup>60</sup>Bartholmew Fayre, "Indvction," 23-26. All references to the play are from C. H. Herford and Evelyn Simpson (eds.), Ben Jonson.

<sup>61</sup>Tucker Brooke (ed.), Shakespeare's Principal Plays, p. 920.

<sup>62</sup>Interpreted as an allusion to The Winter's Tale is "a nest of Antiques." Kitteredge, op. cit., p. xvi.

loth to make Nature afraid in his Playes,  
like those that beget Tales, Tempests, and  
such like Drolleries . . . . ("Indvction," 127-130)

Malone wrote, "Ben Jonson . . . has endeavoured to depreciate this beautiful comedy by calling it a follery [the correct word was drollery]." <sup>63</sup> Boswell remarked in a note to "Mr. Malone's Advertisement" in An Account of the Incidents, from Which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest Were Derived; And Its True Date Ascertained that Douce <sup>64</sup> wrote ". . . the play . . . was illiberally and invidiously alluded to in Ben Jonson's Bartholomew-Fair." <sup>65</sup> Kitteredge, in a playful manner, called Jonson's allusions "sportive." <sup>66</sup> Next, Gifford, who felt somewhat intimidated by Malone's statements, rose to the defense, <sup>67</sup> and his refutation began with the erroneous follery. He argued that Jonson's word was drollery and that Malone was wrong; furthermore, he pointedly tied drollery and servant monster together, neatly trying to explain them away as standard entertainments of the day, since a puppet show

---

<sup>63</sup>Malone, op. cit., II, 467.

<sup>64</sup>Douce, op. cit., I, 7.

<sup>65</sup>Malone, op. cit., XV, 383.

<sup>66</sup>Kitteredge, op. cit., p. xvi.

<sup>67</sup>W. Gifford (ed.), The Works of Ben Jonson, IV, 350-351.

was commonly known as a dollery.<sup>68</sup> Accompanying the theatre on many occasions were expositions featuring ". . . beasts and fishes of the most uncouth and monstrous forms,"<sup>69</sup> which had been ". . . taught a thousand antic tricks."<sup>70</sup> Therefore, an oddly formed or unusual animal, disciplined to follow the instructions of its master, could be referred to as a "servant monster." References to such creatures are not difficult to find. For example, Bishop Hall in his second "biting satire" of Book IV reports

Of strange Moroco's dumb arithmetick,  
Or the young elephant, or two-tayl'd steere  
Or the rigg'd camel, or the fiddling frere.<sup>71</sup>

Waspé adds insight, while searching for his master in Bartholmew Fayre, when he exclaims,

I ha' beene at the Eagle, and the blacke  
Wolfe, and the Bull with the fiue legges,  
and two pizzles; (hee was a Calfe at  
Vxbridge Fayre, two yeeres agone) And at  
the dogges that daunce the morrice, and  
the Hare o' the Taber . . . . (V.iv.83-87)

However, Gifford did not stop with one interpretation of the "servant-monster," but also proposed that the Elizabethan

---

<sup>68</sup>Alexander Schmidt, Shakespeare-Lexicon, II, 337.

<sup>69</sup>Gifford, op. cit., p. 351.

<sup>70</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>71</sup>Alexander Chalmers (ed.), The Works of the English Poets, V, 274.

clown, who entertained with ". . . humor and tricks . . . after the play was over,"<sup>72</sup> might reflect Jonson's meaning. Halliwell-Phillipps, advocating the same theory, believed the servant monster to ". . . be an allusion to the fantastic characters so frequently introduced in the masques of that period."<sup>73</sup>

Finally, the unprincipled actions of Peter Cunningham have caused Shakespearean scholars years of controversy. In 1834, at the age of eighteen, Cunningham obtained the post of clerk in the Audit Office.<sup>74</sup> An industrious young man, he quickly rose in rank to Chief Clerk.<sup>75</sup> His position was undoubtedly enhanced by his numerous writings for the Shakespeare Society, the most important of which, written in 1842, was Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court.<sup>76</sup> He ". . . sought in dry repositories, damp cellars, and still damper vaults, for books of accounts, for warrants, and for receipts."<sup>77</sup> His search was rewarded

---

<sup>72</sup>Nathan Drake, Shakespeare and His Times, II, 217.

<sup>73</sup>J. D. Halliwell-Phillipps, Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare, I, 310.

<sup>74</sup>Ernest Law, Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries, 19-20.

<sup>75</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>77</sup>Peter Cunningham, Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I, p. xlv.

when he ". . . had the good fortune to redeem from destructive oblivion a bundle of the Original Accounts of the Masters of the Revels."<sup>78</sup> The three Revels-Books, including those for the years of 1604-5 and 1611-12, listed the performance of several Shakespearean plays whose composition dates had long been questioned. Naturally, Cunningham was excited with his find:

My last discovery was my most interesting; and alighting as I now did upon two official books of the Revels . . . I at last found something about Shakespeare—something that was new, and something that was definitive.<sup>79</sup>

All went well until Cunningham tried to sell the two books for sixty guineas in negotiations begun on April 29, 1868.<sup>80</sup> It was bizarre that Cunningham, who had discovered and published excerpts from the Revels-Books, had tried to sell them when they were obviously not his. The only explanation was that he ". . . had given way hopelessly to drinking, and had seriously impaired his mental powers thereby."<sup>81</sup> When questioned, he answered only, "They belong to me . . . . But for me they would have been destroyed, through sheer

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. xlvi.

<sup>79</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>80</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

ignorance, or sold for waste paper.<sup>82</sup> He was never questioned further and died on May 18, 1869.<sup>83</sup>

These Revels-Books were impounded and held in legal custody by command of the Master of Rolls at the Public Records Office, where their validity went unquestioned until 1868, at which time they were suddenly proclaimed "entirely forged."<sup>84</sup> All examiners who inspected the 1604-5 books concluded immediately that they were spurious; however, the 1611-12 books were not so universally doubted.<sup>85</sup> For example, White advanced the idea that pages three and four in the 1604-5 list had been left blank ". . . into which the forger [had] crammed the whole of the writings referring to Shakespeare."<sup>86</sup> Confident that these pages were forged, he concluded that the 1611-12 list, including Cunningham's observation that The Tempest ". . . was in all likelihood first produced . . . in the summer of 1611,"<sup>87</sup> was also forged, merely because of Cunningham's

---

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>85</sup>Samuel A. Tannenbaum, Shakspeare Forgeries in the Revels Accounts, p. 31.

<sup>86</sup>Grant White, The Galaxy (November, 1868) cited by H. H. Furness (ed.), Othello, p. 352.

<sup>87</sup>Cunningham, op. cit., pp. 225-226.

association with it, and little else. White was the first to point an accusing finger: "And who is the forger? The conclusion that Peter Cunningham is the man seems unavoidable."<sup>88</sup> Furness, however, was not as confident when he wrote, "It is one thing to prove a document's a forgery, but it is another, and a very different thing, to say who is the forger."<sup>89</sup> Law moved to clear Cunningham's name of forgery and prove the authenticity of the two lists when he urged that the youthful Cunningham's inexperience with old records and manuscripts should be taken into consideration.<sup>90</sup>

Malone's unequivocal statement in his Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare has perplexed scholars: ". . . in my opinion beyond a doubt . . . this play [The Tempest]. . . was produced in 1611."<sup>91</sup> Not backed by any evidence or proof, however, the statement had to be passed over. Halliwell-Phillipps found a small piece of paper, hidden away among Malone's notes, cataloguing ". . . Shakespeare's plays, with all the dates of their performances at Court in 1604-5, all but exactly tallying with Cunningham's notorious

---

<sup>88</sup>Furness, op. cit., p. 352.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 348.

<sup>90</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 40.

<sup>91</sup>Malone, op. cit., II, 465.



list."<sup>92</sup> According to one theory, this small piece of paper, now referred to as the "Malone Scrap" (or, unornamented, as just the "Scrap") was obtained in 1791 by Malone, who had secured permission from Sir William Musgrave, First Commissioner of the Board of Audit, to examine documents attributed to the Master of Revels.<sup>93</sup> Halliwell-Phillipps assumed that it was from this visit that Malone obtained the material.<sup>94</sup> Nevertheless, Wood suggested that the list was sent to him after his visit in 1791 by Musgrave, who had copied it before his death in 1800.<sup>95</sup> A thorough analysis revealed that Musgrave's writings contained characteristics similar to those found on the "Scrap," and the watermarks were judged to be identical.<sup>96</sup> Because of Malone's reputation for indisputable integrity, Halliwell-Phillipps found it unbelievable that Malone would have ever accepted such information ". . . without a personal examination of the original."<sup>97</sup> Thus, the catalogue took on great

---

<sup>92</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 48.

<sup>93</sup>D. T. B. Wood, "The Revels Books: The Writer of the 'Malone Scrap,'" RES, I (January, 1925), 74.

<sup>94</sup>Halliwell-Phillipps, op. cit., II, 163.

<sup>95</sup>D. T. B. Wood, "The Suspected Revels Books," RES, I (April, 1925), 166.

<sup>96</sup>Wood, "The Revels Books: The Writer of the 'Malone Scrap,'" op. cit., pp. 73-74.

<sup>97</sup>Halliwell-Phillipps, op. cit., p. 164.

importance, because it had had to be compiled between 1791 and the time of Malone's death in 1812, a quarter of a century before Cunningham's birth.<sup>98</sup>

One of the more intriguing questions about the "honest forgeries" arises at this point. If Malone had had access to concrete evidence about dating The Tempest and other plays, why did he not make it public? He was definite about the date of The Tempest, but he also said in his Variorum edition ". . . that he knew of no Elizabethan Revels Accounts subsequent to those of 1588."<sup>99</sup> Yet, the "Malone Scrap" and the Revels book of 1604-5 show similarities that indicate a common origin.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, it is perhaps significant that Boswell gave no indication of having noted the "Scrap" among Malone's papers when he edited them for the Variorum, published in 1821.<sup>101</sup> These factors substantiate the theory of the "Malone Scrap" as an ingenious plant to substantiate the forgeries.

An important point that condemned the Cunningham Extracts as forgeries was the variant spelling contributed

---

<sup>98</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 49.

<sup>99</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 164.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

to the ". . . mock-antique of . . . seventeenth-century forgery."<sup>102</sup> Although Elizabethan scribes were not famous for the uniformity of their spelling, they did, however, show some consistency.<sup>103</sup> But the writer of the questioned Revels-Books was ". . . more Elizabethan than the Elizabethans!"<sup>104</sup> Not satisfied with merely several variations, he often concocted as many as three, as may be noted in the following examples: Called, Caled, Cauled; play, playe, plaie; yere, year, yeare; Bancketing, Bancketting, Banketing; gett, gaitt, geyt. The variant spelling, Shaxberd, written four times in the column designated for the names of the poets, also created much conjecture about the authenticity of the 1611-12 Revels-Books. Halliwell-Phillipps attributed the crude spellings to an illiterate scribe but was careful to make note of other variant spellings: e. g., Shaxber, Shaxbere, Shaxbeer.<sup>105</sup> Wood, for he was certain the shape of the handwriting belonged to an uneducated scribe, could not accept the spelling ". . . unless the

---

<sup>102</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>103</sup>Alfred W. Pollard, "Variant Spellings in Shakespeare Quartos," TLS, December 9, 1920, p. 838.

<sup>104</sup>Tannenenbaum, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>105</sup>Halliwell-Phillipps, op. cit., p. 165.

clerk was country-bred."<sup>106</sup> Thompson's theory revolved around the difficulty of interpreting Elizabethan handwriting. He suggested that if one were to

Enlarge the e and reduce the d, so that the two letters be of one scale, . . . it will be found difficult to distinguish between them. Further, there was a tendency in quick writing to enlarge the e at the end of a word so that it might easily be mistaken for a d.<sup>107</sup>

In essence, the original spelling of Shaxbere, an accepted spelling of the day, which was misread and written Shaxberd. Tannenbaum respectfully noted that, although there were fifty to sixty ways of spelling the name, "Shaxbere . . . occurs not even once in all the known records pertaining to the poet or his family."<sup>108</sup>

The "rustic phonetics" of the spelling convinced Stopes that she was on the trail of a forger.<sup>109</sup> Not only did she reject Shaxberd spelling, even though remarking that such spellings as Shaxper and Chacksper had been used, but she also spurned the idea of an illiterate scribe.<sup>110</sup> Her two-

---

<sup>106</sup>Wood, "The Suspected Revels Books," op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>107</sup>Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, "Shaxberd," TLS, February 10, 1921, p. 91.

<sup>108</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>109</sup>Charlotte Carmichael Stopes, "The Seventeenth Century Revels Books," TLS, December 2, 1920, p. 798.

<sup>110</sup>Loc. cit.

pronged attack focused, first, on the orthography. Even though odd spellings had been used previously, at no time had there been ". . . a dental sound to close the word,"<sup>111</sup> and she noted that, whenever the name had been used in connection with the Court, it was spelled as Shakespeare.<sup>112</sup> In her second assault, she asserted that the clerks of the Court were educated men not prone to the seeming rusticity of the list.<sup>113</sup> Tannenbaum, attacking the same problem but on a different level, failed to understand how a clerk ". . . could have been so ignorant as not to know the surname of the leading playwright and one of the most important actors of His Majesty's Players."<sup>114</sup> It must be noted that the "Malone Scrap" also used the Shaxberd spelling, implying a common origin.

Law, writing that he wanted ". . . to get to the fountainhead . . . to read the originals,"<sup>115</sup> began his own investigation into the alleged forgeries. His first impression was that pages three and four of Revels-Books were ". . . unlike the skilled penmanship of the rest of the

---

<sup>111</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>112</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>113</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>114</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>115</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 62.

document."<sup>116</sup> However,

. . . there would seem to be little wrong with the form and shape of the letters; . . . no apparent difference in the quality of colour of the ink, nor in its effect on the paper, when compared with the rest of the account-book—the leaf, when . . . carefully scrutinised, [showed] no sign of the ink . . . having been absorbed into the substance of the paper, any more or any less in the one case than in the other; nor any indication of preparatory pencillings, nor any sign of any sort of tamperings.<sup>117</sup>

After examining the 1611-12 book, Law found nothing to support the idea of forgery.<sup>118</sup> Indeed, it seemed that the only condemning note about the book was its physical association with Cunningham.

Desiring scholarly confirmation of his verdict, Law subjected his findings to scientific inquiry. He consulted Sir George Warner, the Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum and a noted expert when dealing with frauds and forgeries, who ". . . saw no reason whatever for supposing that the lists were not . . . absolute genuine writings of the early seventeenth century."<sup>119</sup> Finally, Law referred the documents to the Principal of the Government Laboratories.

---

<sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>118</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

The results were as expected: ". . . there [was] no evidence to support the suggestion that the writing on pages 3 and 4 [was] of a different date from the writing on the remainder of the document."<sup>120</sup>

After these investigations, Law concluded that the documents were not forged by Cunningham, that they were valid in every way, and that the composition date of The Tempest must have been 1610-1611.<sup>121</sup>

It was with the chemist's report, however, that Tannenbaum began to take issue, considering the most important fact to be the omission of a paragraph from the chemist's report and noting that dates and letters had been altered, but that the ink used was the same throughout.<sup>122</sup> Both Wood<sup>123</sup> and Halliwell-Phillips<sup>124</sup> had also noted discrepancies in the composition and application of the ink, but they had explained these away as best they could. The "Malone Scrap" caused Halliwell-Phillips to swallow his skepticism stemming from his belief that the list, judging by ". . . the character of its ink . . . could not have been

---

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>122</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>123</sup>Wood, op. cit., p. 169.

<sup>124</sup>Halliwell-Phillips, op. cit., p. 164.

perpetrated until long after his [Malone's] death in 1812."<sup>125</sup> Wood noted that the ink used to make ". . . unnecessary alterations . . . that . . . occur only in the list and not in the accounts"<sup>126</sup> had a "woolly"<sup>127</sup> image, which he accepted without question because microscopic viewing showed that the ink was applied ". . . like paint and cracked in the same way."<sup>128</sup> Stamp, custodian of documents who was present during the examination of the 1611 manuscript, accounted for the paint-like appearance of the ink when he noted that more gum than was normal had been added to give the ink substance.<sup>129</sup> He explained that the thickness of the ink continually clogged the pen point, causing the writer to repeat his efforts.<sup>130</sup> Furthermore, the handling of the unwieldy ink left ". . . the appearance of rough oak bark full of cracks,"<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>126</sup>Wood, op. cit., p. 169.

<sup>127</sup>Wood, "The Revels Books: The Writer of the 'Malone Scrap,'" p. 72.

<sup>128</sup>Wood, "The Suspected Revels Books," p. 169.

<sup>129</sup>A. E. Stamp, "Revels Accounts," TLS, March 21, 1929, p. 241.

<sup>130</sup>"The Revels Accounts," TLS, March 5, 1931, p. 173. Review of The Disputed Revels Accounts by A. E. Stamp.

<sup>131</sup>Stamp, op. cit., p. 241.



which justified the "woolly" appearance throughout the entire document. Wood also considered as suspicious the color of the fading ink, because he found alterations that had faded to a light brown color, whereas the ink of the original writing had faded to a dark gray.<sup>132</sup>

Tannenbaum's next focal point was the handwriting of the two lists, concluding that the same hand was used throughout the documents, since certain key features, such as ". . . shadowing, pen pressure, movement, speech rhythm, alignment, slant, spacing, and proportions," proved to him that the questioned documents were written by the same person.<sup>133</sup> However, comparison between the handwriting of the writer of the earlier Revels Books showed the former to be ". . . a fairly good imitation, with a few slight intentional variations"<sup>134</sup> of the latter. Differing from Tannenbaum was Thompson: "This list is not written out in the hand of the rest of the M. S."<sup>135</sup> According to him, it was written by a scribe, whose handwriting was characterized by artistry and a variety of styles.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>133</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>134</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>135</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>136</sup>Loc. cit.

Tannenbaum, however, noted as ". . . conclusive evidence of forgery" two alterations in the 1604-5 list.<sup>137</sup> The first, a word written by mistake into the column serving to name the poets, had been erased with excessive rubbing and chemical means.<sup>138</sup> The suspect was so zealous that several small holes were the result of his attempts.<sup>139</sup> The second consisted of barely discernible letters that had been partially covered by the writing of the list.<sup>140</sup> Thompson remarked that a list of this sort ". . . would not have been accomplished without the assistance of a preliminary draft,"<sup>141</sup> over which a scribe later inked the final copy. It was assumed that the preliminary draft, suggested by Thompson, would have resulted in a well-aligned and organized final draft.<sup>142</sup> Wood, noting the fallacy of such a theory, observed that ". . . the lines are often crushed against one another and against the sides"<sup>143</sup> of the sheet. The alterations, ". . . not characteristic of genuine

---

<sup>137</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>138</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>139</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>140</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>141</sup>Thompson, op. cit., p. 91.

<sup>142</sup>Wood, op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>143</sup>Loc. cit.

handwritings,"<sup>144</sup> went unnoticed in the original examination by Law.

In his investigation, Wood, next, considered the type of paper and its distinguishing features. He found the water mark—"a shield bearing a fleu-de-lis"<sup>145</sup>—on all of the sheets to be genuine<sup>146</sup> and concluded that the material was not forged, because it was ". . . inconceivable that a later forger should have been able to make up complete gatherings of paper for his purpose."<sup>147</sup>

The absence in all other Revels Books of the third column for the names of "The poets w<sup>ch</sup> mayd the plaies" was considered a suspicious peculiarity in the 1604-5 document. To understand fully the oddity of this third column, one must undertake a short explanation of court expenditures. Three separate records were kept pertaining to court performances: The Treasurer of the Chamber's Original Accounts, The Acts of the Privy Council, and the books of the Masters of Revels.<sup>148</sup> The books of the Masters of Revels indicated the amounts spent in each department.

---

<sup>144</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>145</sup>"The Revels Accounts," op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>146</sup>Wood, op. cit., p. 167.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., p. 169.

<sup>148</sup>Sir Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 70.

After presentation of these books to the Privy Council, an authorization for payment to the acting company was executed and sent to the Treasurer who made two copies—one in paper for his office and one on parchment for the Exchequer in the Pipe Office<sup>149</sup> where payment was made.<sup>150</sup> As the Master of Revels was concerned only with the production of the play, the name of the playwright was unnecessary in his account.<sup>151</sup> The acting company paid the playwright after receiving its compensation; no mention of the playwright's name was made in any other but the 1604-5 account, making it ". . . anomalous in that regard."<sup>152</sup> Also, particular to the three books associated with Cunningham is the list of plays. Of the eighteen extant Revels Books of the seventeenth century, no other contains this list.<sup>153</sup> An important evidence of the integrity of the books cannot be ignored when one notices that the remainder of the Revels Books, even though suspect because of their peculiarities, coincides with those of the Treasurer and Privy Council.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup>"The Revels Accounts," op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>150</sup>Stopes, op. cit., p. 798.

<sup>151</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>152</sup>Furness, op. cit., p. 356.

<sup>153</sup>Stopes, op. cit., p. 798.

<sup>154</sup>"The Revels Accounts," op. cit., p. 173.

The controversy surrounding the play's composition in 1611 became less severe with the investigations of Stamp, whose examination of the ink revealed that the excessive thickening had been caused by the presence of an overabundance of a gum additive which ". . . had not penetrated the paper but lay on the surface . . . like a stream of dried mud, full of cracks, through which the fibres of the paper were clearly visible."<sup>155</sup> As microscopic investigation revealed the same effect throughout the document, Stamp concluded that it was authentic and not the work of a forger. Furthermore, in answer to Thompson's and Tannenbaum's theories that a preliminary draft had first been written to be inked later, thus accounting for the seeming corrections of an underlying writing, Stamp again noted the thickness of the ink. He noted that the excessive gum would not allow the ink to flow properly, causing the pen not to mark at all or to leave only the marks of the nibs. Consequently, he reasoned that the writer had to return, now and then, to rewrite letters and words.<sup>156</sup>

Continuing his attack upon those who "smelled a forger," Stamp next unraveled the awkward spelling of called.

---

<sup>155</sup>A. E. Stamp, The Disputed Revels Accounts, p. 9.

<sup>156</sup>Loc. cit.

Tannenbaum saw the original spelling with one "l" which had been changed with a sickle-shaped mark to its correct spelling with a double "l" as a certain sign of forgery,<sup>157</sup> and concluded that

. . . such a correction of the spelling of so simple a word in a document of no consequence, written in an era when penmen had the utmost latitude regarding orthography, even with proper names, is an instance of gross tampering.<sup>158</sup>

Stamp found, however, that this mark was a favorite of Sir George Buc, employed for such use in his letters discovered among the State Papers in the Public Record Office.<sup>159</sup>

Stamp felt that it was not unusual that the man responsible for the compiling of the records would take the liberty of correcting a scribe's spelling.<sup>160</sup>

Further authenticity for the 1611 composition date of The Tempest is gained by Stamp's recognition of George Stubbs, an official of the Government Chemist's department. Stubbs noted that the heavy ink caused the paper to pucker somewhat.<sup>161</sup> As the paper aged, small cracks appeared,

---

<sup>157</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 36.

<sup>158</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>159</sup>Stamp, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

<sup>160</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>161</sup>Stamp, op. cit., p. 11.

allowing minute particles of ink to become detached from the paper. Had a forger—in 1842, for instance—written on the paper after its many years of deterioration, the ink would have seeped into the cracks to leave them black. Instead, the fissures revealed the white fibers of the paper.<sup>162</sup>

Stamp further attacked "Tannenbaum's forger." He pointed out that holes thought to be caused by excessive erasing were really worm holes, no different from those found in other Elizabethan documents that were beyond question. These holes penetrated paper and ink. If the writing had taken place after the presence of the worms, the ink would have caused a blackening of the holes; however, the ink was cracked, revealing the white paper underneath.<sup>163</sup>

Finally, one last internal bit of evidence has been used to lend an air of credibility to the supposition that The Tempest had been performed at least once and perhaps several times at the Blackfriars before its presentation at Court as noted in Quiller-Couch.<sup>164</sup> An Acte to Restraine Abuses of Players was proclaimed on May 27, 1606. In essence,

---

<sup>162</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>163</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>164</sup>Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson (eds.), The Tempest, p. 109.

it was enacted "For the preventing and avoyding of the greate Abuse of the Holy Name of God in Stageplayes, Inter-ludes, Maygames, Shewes, and such like."<sup>165</sup> The penalty for committing such an act of blasphemy was ten pounds for each offense.<sup>166</sup> In at least two cases, The Tempest failed to follow the guidelines of the act: "Lord, how it lookes about" (I.ii.474) and "Good Lord, how you take it?" (II.i.83). At first glance, ". . . it would presumably have been imprudent not to purge of profanity any manuscript submitted or re-submitted for license . . .,"<sup>167</sup> but, as Greg notes, the prosecution of offenders rested with the Master of Revels.<sup>168</sup> It seems that those attending the plays were not offended by profanity, while those who were withheld their presence.<sup>169</sup> If no one complained, then George Buc, current Master of the Revels, seemed not to have taken offense. When Buc was forced to resign his office because of mental instability on May 16, 1622, the new Master, Henry Herbert, resolved upon a stricter

---

<sup>165</sup>Chambers, op. cit., IV, 338-339.

<sup>166</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>167</sup>Alice Walker, "Quarto 'Copy' and the 1623 Folio: 2 Henry IV," RES, I (July, 1951), 225.

<sup>168</sup>W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 150.

<sup>169</sup>Ibid., p. 150, fn. 1.



enforcement of the act.<sup>170</sup> So forceful was Herbert that he advised the actors not to learn their parts until he had ". . . allowed of the booke."<sup>171</sup> Furthermore, the recommended that

All ould plays ought to bee brought to the Master of Revells, and have allowance of them . . . since they may be full of offensive things against church and state; the rather that in former time the poetts tooke greater liberty than is allowed them by mee.<sup>172</sup>

Clearly, Herbert's influence was felt. Walker noted that a general line of division between those plays containing profanity and those without it could be roughly drawn between the Histories and the Comedies.<sup>173</sup> Study of the Folio reveals that its printing was stopped in 1621 while Jaggard resolved a dispute with a former client and not resumed until 1623, when it was finished with only minor interruptions.<sup>174</sup> During this period when Jaggard was involved elsewhere, as has been shown, Herbert obtained the office of Master of the Revels, and Jaggard, in anticipation

---

<sup>170</sup>Ibid., p. 170.

<sup>171</sup>Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>172</sup>Ibid., p. 151.

<sup>173</sup>Walker, op. cit., p. 225.

<sup>174</sup>Edwin Elliott Willoughby, "An Interruption in the Printing of the First Folio," The Library, IX (December, 1928), 262-266.

of Herbert's firm hand, prepared the text accordingly. The Tempest, as one might logically conclude, was the first play to be printed in the Folio of 1623.

The Use of profanity in The Tempest definitely sets a date anterior to Herbert's acquisition of the office. But the question remains: Was the use of profanity allowed in the Court presentation of 1611 or was it "cut" in deference to the act signed five years earlier? James was characterized as having an air of ". . . uncouthness, a lack of dignity"<sup>175</sup> about him. His conversation around women was said to be ". . . crude and uncivil and to display a lack of proper instruction."<sup>176</sup> It would seem that James, from what little can be surmised from his biographers, would not have been offended by the small amount of profanity in The Tempest, and Buc would not have been either, all of which clears the path for The Tempest, in this one respect, to censorial revision. If the play was, as Quiller-Couch, suggests, presented at the Blackfriars prior to the Court performance, there is no definite proof, but, it must be added, neither is there definite proof to discredit the suggestion.

No further performance of The Tempest is noted until

---

<sup>175</sup>William Lloyd McElwee, The Wisest Fool in Christendom, p. 100.

<sup>176</sup>David Harris Willson, King James VI and I, p. 53.

1612, when the play was presented to celebrate the betrothal and forthcoming marriage on February 14, 1612, of Princess Elizabeth, King James's daughter to Prince Palatine Elector.<sup>177</sup> Chambers notes that ". . . fowerteene severall playes,"<sup>178</sup> among which was The Tempest, were presented. No controversy shrouds the 1612 performance, and it is accepted as genuine.

When all of the evidence is considered, one must conclude that the composition and first-presentation date of The Tempest was 1611. He can argue the validity of Cunningham's "honest forgeries," but he cannot ignore microscopic perusal and scientific investigation and comparison as a valid means of determining the authenticity of the written word. He must remember that the seeming inconsistencies were ". . . made by different people for different purposes."<sup>179</sup> The final assessment of the 1623 Folio edition of the play concerns, therefore, an identification of the texts from which Jaggard worked. Knowing that there is only one text of The Tempest and that it ". . . is of remarkable purity"<sup>180</sup> helps the scholar with his study.

---

<sup>177</sup>H. D. Gray, "Some Indications That The Tempest Was Revised," SP, XVIII (April, 1921), 130, fn. 2.

<sup>178</sup>Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 180.

<sup>179</sup>Stamp, op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>180</sup>Furness, op. cit., p. 271.

## CHAPTER II

### TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN THE TEMPEST

Establishing at least two presentations of The Tempest allows consideration of the possibility that textual changes took place in preparation for the individual stagings. Since only one text of the play exists, presumably that for the 1612 presentations,<sup>181</sup> one is restricted to the play itself in his search for clues of abridgement and interpolation. The exact text of the play used, if the play were to be presented at that time, cannot be definitely ascertained. Chambers argued rather effectively that it was the fair copy, or autography manuscript, licensed by the Master of the Revels with annotations by or for the bookkeeper designating cuts, special stage directions, and other explanatory material.<sup>182</sup> Cutting was usually done to eliminate obscure lines,<sup>183</sup> to shorten lengthy dialogues,<sup>184</sup> or to trim for a reduced cast for travel.<sup>185</sup> Common knowledge of the theatre suggests

---

<sup>181</sup>Campbell, op. cit., p. 1158.

<sup>182</sup>Chambers, op. cit., II, 193.

<sup>183</sup>Greg, op. cit., p. 146.

<sup>184</sup>Chambers, William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, p. 229.

<sup>185</sup>W. J. Lawrence, "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts," TLS, August 21, 1919, p. 449.

that certain lines do not fit special occasions and must be cut: "Two or three hundred lines go, to prevent normal limits from being exceeded,"<sup>186</sup> explains Chambers. The result of such practices was often obvious and crude, as when Prospero entreats, "Soft sir, one word more." (I.ii.524).<sup>187</sup> Because Ferdinand has not tried to stop Prospero from speaking during the previous lines, such a request becomes unwarranted. It seems logical to conclude that something is missing.

On the other hand, there may be lines that become a part of the text that were never sanctioned by the author: e. g., an actor's slip of the tongue, an inordinate response, a humorous aside, or a line to clarify meaning. As an example of an attempt to ease the dramatic tension, Gray presents the theory that lines in the second act, which do not further the dramatic action of the play, could easily have been added, for Alonso's plea for peace (II.i.13) serves well to introduce his speech, beginning with "You cram these words into mine eares . . . ." (II.i.106) ninety-three lines later.<sup>188</sup> The regular iambic pentameter rhythm

---

<sup>186</sup>Chambers, op. cit., p. 229.

<sup>187</sup>Quotations are from the First Folio. Line numbers are from The Tempest, ed. H. H. Furness.

<sup>188</sup>H. D. Gray, op. cit., p. 129-140.

is not disturbed when the lines are read with the deletion.

The masque, introduced in IV.i. to celebrate the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and Count Palatine,<sup>189</sup> provides the strongest suggestion of interpolation in the existing text. That the masque was ". . . inserted as an interlude when the play was presented at Court . . ." <sup>190</sup> is not surprising, as the correspondence between the marriage of the day and the format of the masque is such that it could not have been written without ". . . conscious intention on the part of the author."<sup>191</sup> In fact, a masque that ". . . immortalises the life of [the] time"<sup>192</sup> as that found in IV was a necessary and welcome addition to royal wedding observances during the Elizabethan period.<sup>193</sup> It allowed the spectators and performers alike to enjoy a fashion show of jewels and resplendent dress, much to James's liking,<sup>194</sup> while providing a respite from the dramatic action with

---

<sup>189</sup>Campbell, op. cit., p. 1158.

<sup>190</sup>G. C. Loud, "Francis Neilson as Shakespearan Scholar," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, XX (July, 1961), 342.

<sup>191</sup>Gray, op. cit., p. 131.

<sup>192</sup>Enid Welsford, The Court Masque, p. 348.

<sup>193</sup>Carol Gesner, "Tempest as Pastoral Romance," SQ, X (Fall, 1959), 538.

<sup>194</sup>T. S. Graves, "On Allegory in The Tempest," MLN, XL (November, 1925), 399.

periods of uninterrupted music.<sup>195</sup> Adding the masque to The Tempest, however, had its disadvantages. For example, Campbell notes that Shakespeare ". . . was obliged to thrust out of the drama most of the action leading to the defeat of Caliban's plot."<sup>196</sup> Moreover, it has been pointed out that the obstruction of the rising action by the masque destroys the climax of Prospero's defeat of Trinculo and Stephano with the "glistening apparel." Internal evidence suggests that the masque was written ". . . under conditions of considerable haste"<sup>197</sup> because of the short duration between presentations. A major problem is the ". . . clumsiness of dovetailing."<sup>198</sup> For example, in III, Caliban promises to yield the sleeping Prospero to Trinculo and Stephano so that they can ". . . knocke a naile into his head" (III.ii.63-64). Ariel, invisible and listening to the construction of the plot, determines to warn his master. But he does not! The reader learns that Prospero busies Ariel with the part of Ceres in the masque (IV.i.191), and Ariel forgets about warning his master until Prospero stops

---

<sup>195</sup>Harley Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, p. 159.

<sup>196</sup>Campbell, op. cit., p. 1158.

<sup>197</sup>W. J. Lawrence, "The Masque in The Tempest," Fortnightly Review, DCXLII (June 1, 1920), 942.

<sup>198</sup>Loc. cit.

the presentation:

I had forgot that fould conspiracy  
Of the Beast Calliban, and his confederates  
Against my life: the minute of their plot  
Is almost come: (IV.i.160-163)

Neilson attempts to explain the abridgement by assuming that Prospero had discovered the plot by means of a kind of mental telepathy.<sup>199</sup> If a man of Prospero's talents were able to ascertain the thoughts of those plotting against his life, it would seem that he could also control their actions as he does those of the mariners by simply putting them to sleep. Furthermore, if Prospero could divine the thoughts of other men, he should have little reason for sending Ariel to be an invisible spy upon the others. It appears, thus, that the interpolation of the masque, here, has caused Ariel's warning to his master to become lost in the rush of hasty revision.

Ariel's entering and exiting while playing the part of Ceres causes additional confusion.<sup>200</sup> The large number of secondary actors needed to present the masque most surely taxed the numbers of the acting company for the court performance.<sup>201</sup> Not only do Iris, Ceres, and Juno

---

<sup>199</sup>Francis Neilson, Shakespeare and The Tempest, p. 165.

<sup>200</sup>Irwin Smith, "Ariel as Ceres," SQ, IX (Summer, 1958), 431.

<sup>201</sup>Quiller-Couch, op. cit., p. 81.



enter briefly, but the stage directions call for an uncertain number of Reapers and Nymphs to join in a dance just before Prospero suddenly remembers that his life is in danger. To meet the requirements of the scene, many of the actors probably had to serve as doubles, including Ariel, who must make two rapid costume changes. The time required for these changes and the fashion in which they are carried out hints strongly that they were ". . . imposed . . . upon a text which made no such provision as initially written."<sup>202</sup> When Prospero commands Ariel to begin the masque by bringing forth the participants (IV.i.42-43), Ariel replies

Before you can say come, and goe,  
And breathe twice; and cry, so, so:  
Each one tripping on his Toe,  
Will be here with mop, and mowe. (IV.i.50-53)

But there is not enough time allowed for Ariel's costume change, and Prospero must caution him to wait until he is called for (IV.i.55-56).

After Ariel's exit, Prospero stalls for time by repeating his warning that no challenge shall be made to Miranda's virginity until after the marriage ceremony, and Ferdinand emphasizes his repeated vow of abstinence. Finally, Prospero calls for Ariel's entrance: "Now, come my Ariell! bring a corolary,/ Rather than want a spirit;

---

<sup>202</sup>Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

appear, & pertly." (IV.i.66-67). But he is not ready yet, and Iris enters, instead, with a fifteen-line prologue to the masque, thus allowing Ariel a total of twenty-five lines in which to complete his costume change so that he can enter as Ceres at line seventy-six.

Prospero interrupts the masque and ends it when he suddenly remembers Caliban's threat that ". . . seems out of character in a man of Prospero's supernatural powers."<sup>203</sup> Prospero, however, does not seem overly alarmed about his personal safety as he philosophizes that the globe and the masque are really ". . . such stuffe/ As dreames are made on" (IV.i.178-179). Finally, twenty-five lines after his interruption of the masque and following Ceres's exit, Ariel is called upon: "Come with a thought; I thank thee, Ariell: come" (IV.i.187).

Further complications arise in the staging of the masque when the Folio stage directions note, "Iuno descends" (IV.i.81-82).<sup>204</sup> Nothing more is detailed about her entry until Ceres remarks, thirty-two lines later: "Great Iuno comes, I know her by her gate." (IV.i.114). Characters of Juno's distinction ". . . invariably made

---

<sup>203</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>204</sup>Furness, The Tempest, p. 204.

their appearance [and exit] ex machina"<sup>205</sup> from ascending and descending clouds.<sup>206</sup> The assumption must be that the masque was presented privately on a stage not adequate to accommodate the trappings of such an extravaganza or that there was not enough time to prepare the machinery for Juno's descension.<sup>207</sup>

Another problem in dovetailing arises just after the close of the masque. Here, the reader finds Prospero admonishing Ferdinand to resolve his gloomy appearance and assume a happy disposition (IV.i.168-169). Ridley suggests that these lines actually belong to Miranda, who is addressing her father.<sup>208</sup> He argues that, during the interpolation of the masque, the lines somehow were transferred to Miranda with "my father" being changed to "my son." To find Prospero addressing his future son-in-law as "sir" lends an air of credulity to the suggestion. Furthermore, Ferdinand has no reason to appear sad or frightened, for it is in his honor that the masque has been performed. It is Prospero who has suddenly recalled that an attempt is

---

<sup>205</sup>Lawrence, op. cit., p. 943.

<sup>206</sup>Welsford, op. cit., p. 310.

<sup>207</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>208</sup>M. R. Ridley (ed.), The Tempest, p. 113.

going to be made shortly on his life, a sobering thought for anyone.

The congratulations by the actors in the masque are aimed directly at the young couple in such a way as not to be ignored or understood as meant for anyone else. A play was written to be acted many times, but a masque was usually written for only one special performance.<sup>209</sup> Shakespeare, to keep the ceremonies as festive as possible and still meet the demands of the occasion, saw to it that the masque would have ". . . not a religious or political note sounded,"<sup>210</sup> even though he was well aware ". . . of the fondness of the age for religious controversy."<sup>211</sup> An unusual thing about the presentation of this masque is ". . . that never again . . . was the masque used simply and solely for a straight-forward presentation of . . . blessing . . . a marriage union."<sup>212</sup>

With each performance, one can expect changes in a play's text which account for a copy ". . . of the original

---

<sup>209</sup>Kermode, op. cit., pp. xi-xii.

<sup>210</sup>Neilson, op. cit., p. 177.

<sup>211</sup>Hardin Craig, An Interpretation of Shakespeare, p. 13.

<sup>212</sup>J. P. Cutts, "Music and the Supernatural in 'The Tempest': A Study of Interpretation," Music and Letters, XXXIX (October, 1958), 355.

author [which] has been patched and interpolated with partial redrafts in a variety of hands . . . ."213 Indeed, one hand that left its imprint on the text of The Tempest in the 1623 Folio can be identified as that of Ralph Crane. An investigation will reveal elements of his influence; however, the many irregularities may cause one to conclude that, if Shakespeare did a hasty revision of the play, Ralph Crane did an even hastier editing of the text. To claim Crane's presence as editor, one needs to examine the following points: (1) neatness and "tidiness" of the text; (2) act and scene division; (3) use of stage directions; (4) ample use of parentheses; (5) substantial use of hyphens and apostrophes; (6) individual spelling characteristics.<sup>214</sup>

(1) Exactly what constitutes a neat and clean and accurate text is open to conjecture. For example, Furness wrote that the play exhibited ". . . more correctness than . . . any other play in the volume."<sup>215</sup> On the other hand, Tannenbaum noted that Crane practiced no ". . . flourishes for merely ornamental purposes . . . ."216 that would,

---

<sup>213</sup>Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, III, 194.

<sup>214</sup>John L. Somer, "Ralph Crane and 'an olde play called Winter's Tale,'" The Emporia State Research Studies, XX, 4 (June, 1962), 24.

<sup>215</sup>Furness, op. cit., p. 271.

<sup>216</sup>Samuel A. Tannenbaum, Shakespeare Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, p. 82.

indeed, make for a more easily understood text, as Shakespeare's writing showed a tendency toward flourishes making reading difficult.<sup>217</sup> Several errors of negligence, however, do occur, but they seem to be the fault of the printers rather than the handiwork of Crane. On at least three occasions (I.ii.97, 109, 131), one finds the first line of the poetic dialogue beginning with a lower case letter, a peculiarity never associated with Crane.<sup>218</sup> A problem of The Tempest that is not to be classified as neat and tidy is the amount of prose that occurs periodically in the text. Prose lines dominate I.ii., II.i., II.ii., and III.ii. At first one suspects that the pen of Ralph Crane was not as accurate as previously thought. Signs, however, suggest that these prose lines were indicative of areas of the text that were being revised, work that was not yet completed. Apostrophes dot the prose, suggesting that the ten-syllable line was in the mind of the editor. A careful count shows that, although an individual line may contain twelve to thirteen syllables, several such lines in succession may contain the correct number, or the count may

---

<sup>217</sup>Ibid., pp. 82-82.

<sup>218</sup>John Laddie Somer, "Ralph Crane, Elizabethan Scrivener, and the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare Works" (unpublished Master's thesis, Emporia State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, 1960), p. 68.

vary by only a syllable or two. Moreover, misalignment must be considered as a possible solution, since it seems likely that a scribe preparing a text for print would have made notes in the margin. If he were unable to complete his work or make his intentions totally clear, the printer would probably have printed the material as it appeared in the copy.

(2) The text of The Tempest is clearly divided into acts and scenes, a gesture ". . . not common in the manuscripts of King's plays at this time."<sup>219</sup> Because each of Crane's known manuscripts is divided in such manner,<sup>220</sup> the technique has been diagnosed as a probable sign of Crane's presence.

(3) Peculiar to Crane are directions that provide only the scantiest notice of entrances and exits,<sup>221</sup> which, Wilson notes, ". . . never smack of the theatre."<sup>222</sup> Rhodes observes two types of directions which provide insight for understanding Wilson's observation.<sup>223</sup> A "literary"

---

<sup>219</sup>F. P. Wilson, "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII (September, 1926), p. 211.

<sup>220</sup>W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 144, n. 2.

<sup>221</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 212.

<sup>222</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>223</sup>R. Crompton Rhodes, Shakespeare's First Folio, p. 140.

direction is one given to help the reader ". . . visualize actions, movements and appearances,"<sup>224</sup> whereas a "theatrical" direction is given to instruct the actor. That Wilson's comment is not entirely satisfactory is noted by Tannenbaum who calls attention to two stage directions which especially point to the "theatrical": "A cry within" (I.i.45) and "Solemne and strange Musicke: and Prosper on the top (inuisible:)" (III.iii.23-24).<sup>225</sup> The two directions, "within," suggesting "inside" or "off stage," and "on the top," meaning "on the balcony" or "above the stage area," definitely have a ". . . pronounced flavor of the theatre."<sup>226</sup>

Crane avoided the use of "Enter" when acknowledging entrances,<sup>227</sup> and he tended to mass the names of the characters at the beginning of each scene.<sup>228</sup> In The Tempest, however, one finds all movement onto or from the stage accounted for in the text by the use of "Enter" prevalent throughout. Although the directions contain elements of Crane's mannerisms of punctuation, they are basically

---

<sup>224</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>225</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>226</sup>Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>227</sup>Greg, op. cit., p. 335.

<sup>228</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 214.



". . . what we have come to expect of Shakespeare in his later plays when he was writing instructions for the producer."<sup>229</sup>

(4) Suggestive of Crane's handling of the manuscript is the ample use of parenthesis which is ". . . a feature of his known manuscripts."<sup>230</sup> Only I.i. avoids the use of this mark. Twenty-one sets of parenthesis can be found in I.ii.; II.i. has nineteen sets; II.ii., five sets; III.i., four sets; III.ii., one set; III.iii., sixteen sets; IV.i., eight sets; and V.i. has seventeen sets. The number of times a parenthesis was used for a word for which a lengthy line lack space was not counted, as the author observed that this technique depended more upon the printer than upon the author or scribe.

(5) The ". . . excessive and promiscuous use of hyphens . . ." <sup>231</sup> and the fondness for the use of the apostrophe provide the next two tests of Crane's handiwork. Greg notes eight common uses of the hyphen by Crane, <sup>232</sup> and all may be found in The Tempest. The first, which

---

<sup>229</sup>Greg, op. cit., p. 419.

<sup>230</sup>Ibid., p. 335.

<sup>231</sup>W. W. Greg, "Some Notes on Crane's Manuscript of 'The Witch,'" The Library, XXII (March, 1942), 213.

<sup>232</sup>Ibid., pp. 213-216.

Greg defines as "metrical," links the two words of what, today, is referred to as a compound noun: "Grand-mother" (I.ii.140). Not only does Crane link a verb with a preposition (Greg's next observation), but he adds a proper noun: "bemockt-at-Stabs" (III.iii.84). Next, Greg observes the following: a verb linked to its object, "peg-thee" (I.ii.345); adjectives which are normally separated with a comma, "still-vest Bermoothes" (I.ii.269); a proper noun linked with an adjective, "poore-Iohn" (II.ii.30). Also, Greg found Crane sometimes used a hyphen whenever he felt the letters were linked in some way: "oo-zie" (V.i.176). A complicated use is found between compound epithets. In the following instances, Crane also adds a noun: "wide-chapt-rascall" (I.i.66). The last noted example is the hyphen which is substituted for an apostrophe. Crane inconsistently used five spellings for the following: "Pre-thee" (II.i.120), "'Pre-thee" (II.i.246), "'pre thee" (II.ii.77), "pre'thee" (II.ii.182), and "prethee" (III.ii.35).

The most extensive use of the apostrophe by Crane is in place of the e in the past tense: e.g., "hand'd," "ford'd," "call'd," "arriu'd." At other times, Crane blends three words: "o'th'day" (I.ii.280). His most popular contractions are "was't," "it's," and "on't."

(6) The inconsistent orthography illustrated in The Tempest leads to some curious conjectures. Upon careful reading of Middleton's The Witch, known to have been transcribed by Crane, the scholars have observed characteristics of Crane's spelling: "doe" instead of "do," "goe" instead "go," "yf" for "if," "oh" for "O," and the double initial f on words beginning with the letter.<sup>233</sup> If one undertakes a textual study of the 1623 Folio text of The Tempest with Crane's characteristics at hand, he makes some rather intriguing discoveries. For instance, The Tempest bears approximately fifty spellings of "doe" in pod-like gatherings. Only once is a "do" spelling present in a pod of "doe" spellings. Naturally, if one's curiosity is aroused by the "doe-do" pods, he casts a wistful eye at other known Crane characteristics. Cautiously, he experiments with other similar spellings. The text affords four spellings of "go" and twenty-two spellings of "goe." Again, the spellings are found in pods with only one "go" inserted in a "goe" group. Close scrutiny shows that where one finds a "doe" pod, he will find the "goe" pod, also; likewise, the "go" and "do" spellings coincide. The consistency of these pods of Crane characteristics is lessened, however,

---

<sup>233</sup>W. W. Greg and F. P. Wilson (eds.), The Witch, p. vi.

by other peculiarities. For example, turning to The Witch, one finds Crane's preference for the spelling "Oh." The Tempest has two variant spellings: "Oh" is used nine times and "O", thirty-nine times. Although the two spellings are found in their respective pods, they do not follow the "doe-do" guidelines.

Two points made by Tannenbaum from his observations of Crane's mannerisms<sup>234</sup> deserve some comment, however brief it might be. Tannenbaum estimated that Crane wrote "yf" for "if" about three-fourths of the time when preparing The Winter's Tale; yet, only once in The Tempest is "yf" used (I.ii.62); "if" is written well over one hundred times. A prominent feature of Crane's work is the repeated ". . . doubling of initial f in many words . . . ." <sup>235</sup> Not once in the 1623 Folio version of The Tempest does a doubling of this nature transpire.

The relevance of the doe and do spellings in the text of The Tempest to Ralph Crane's known spelling characteristics becomes immaterial when one understands the printing techniques practiced by Issac Jaggard. Greg estimated that a compositor employed by Jaggard would be occupied ". . . two full working days of twelve hours each" in the preparation

---

<sup>234</sup>Tannenbaum, op. cit., p. 84.

<sup>235</sup>Ibid., p. 85.

of one full sheet for the 1623 Folio.<sup>236</sup> Further investigation revealed that Jaggard's press could print approximately 1,000 copies of a folio sheet each day, or enough copies of one sheet for one addition.<sup>237</sup> Thus, two compositors were required to keep up their pace with the press. Each compositor, however, apparently was not required to follow the capitalization, punctuation, or spelling of the author or scrivener.<sup>238</sup>

It becomes clear as one peruses the Folio text that the spellings ". . . are unquestionably . . . [those] of the compositors who set them into type."<sup>239</sup> Consequently, the role of the scrivener or author as a direct influence upon the printing of the text diminishes considerably. Further study reveals that the type of the 1623 Folio was set by no less than five compositors, each of whom exhibited his own spelling idiosyncrasies.<sup>240</sup> The identification of each compositor depends entirely upon his spelling habits.<sup>241</sup> Compositor A preferred doe, goe, and here,<sup>242</sup> whereas

---

<sup>236</sup>Greg, op. cit., p. 457.

<sup>237</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>238</sup>Ibid., p. 467.

<sup>239</sup>Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, I, 180.

<sup>240</sup>Ibid., I, 193.

<sup>241</sup>Ibid., I, 181.

<sup>242</sup>Ibid., I, 183.

Compositor B elected do, go and heere.<sup>243</sup> Much like A was C who preferred doe and goe but constantly spelled heere instead of here.<sup>244</sup> Compositor D elected to use do and go but differed from B in his use of here for heere.<sup>245</sup> Compositor E was much like Compositor B in his preference for do, go, and heere, but he differed by spelling young, griefe, and Traytor.<sup>246</sup> Compositor B spelled yong, greefe, and Traitor.<sup>247</sup> Compositor E played a part in setting six plays: Titus Andronicus, Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Gressida, Hamlet, Othello, and King Lear.<sup>248</sup> Compositor D helped compose several of the comedies but was not involved with The Tempest.<sup>249</sup> Compositors A, B, and C were all involved with The Tempest as will be illustrated.

To discover who was responsible for setting the type, each page of the text must be carefully studied to identify the spelling habits of the compositor. After the statistics have been compiled, one finds that pages two, nine, ten,

---

<sup>243</sup>Ibid., I, 182.

<sup>244</sup>Ibid., I, 193.

<sup>245</sup>Ibid., I, 197.

<sup>246</sup>Ibid., I, 202.

<sup>247</sup>Ibid., I, 203.

<sup>248</sup>Ibid., I, 214-215.

<sup>249</sup>Ibid., I, 193.

thirteen, fourteen, and eighteen were set up by Compositor A. Pages one, five, six, seven, eight, eleven, and twelve were prepared by Compositor B. Compositor C instigated the setting of type for pages three, four, fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen. The compositor of page nineteen, the last page in the text of The Tempest was not definitely established by Hinman, because the evidence ". . . is too meagre to permit confident attribution to either A or C . . . ." <sup>250</sup> The evidence that can be observed, however, suggests C for the work on the page. <sup>251</sup>

Throughout the nineteen Folio pages of The Tempest, one finds the compositor straying from characteristic spelling habits, now and again. One finds that the circumstances caused by the length of the line influenced what spelling would be used. <sup>252</sup> A short line allowed the compositor the freedom of spelling as he wished, but a line of considerable length could have to be condensed if the type were to be aligned exactly to fit the margins.

The result of this study of The Tempest in the 1623 Folio tends to discredit the influence of Ralph Crane on the text. The free hand, allowed to the compositors as

---

<sup>250</sup>Ibid., I, 402.

<sup>251</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>252</sup>Ibid., I, 186.

they set the type of The Tempest, must cast a serious shadow of doubt on any characteristic attributed to Crane until more extensive study can be undertaken of each compositor's habits. A conclusion of this kind is not meant to check all belief that Crane had a hand in the preparation of the text, but to suggest to those who see ". . . something that [is] definitive"<sup>253</sup> that their conclusion is suspect until the characteristics of Crane and the Folio compositors can be definitely separated.

---

<sup>253</sup>Cunningham, op. cit., p. xlv.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brooke, Tucker (ed.). Shakespeare's Principal Plays. New York: The Century Company, 1927.
- Campbell, Oscar James (ed.). The Living Shakespeare. New York: Macmillan, 1949.
- Cawley, Robert Ralston. "Shakspeare's Use of the Voyagers in The Tempest," PMLA, XLI (September, 1926), 688-726.
- Chalmers, Alexander (ed.). The Works of the English Poets. In XXI Vols. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.
- Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. In IV Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. In II Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Lectures and Notes on Shakspeare and Other English Poets. London: George Bell and Sons, 1904.
- Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York: The Dryden Press, 1949.
- Cunningham, Peter. Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court, in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. London: The Shakespeare Society, 1842.
- Cutts, J. P. "Music and the Supernatural in 'The Tempest': A Study in Interpretation," Music & Letters, XXXIX (October, 1958), 347-358.
- Doran, Madeleine. "Elements in the Composition of King Lear," SP, XXX (January, 1933), 34-58.
- Douce, Francis. Illustrations of Shakspeare. In II Vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807.
- Drake, Nathan. Shakspeare and His Times. In II Vols. London: A. Strahan, 1817.
- Fleay, F. G. A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare. London: John C. Nimmo, 1886.

- Furness, Horace Howard (ed.). Othello. New York: Dover Publications, Incorporated, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Tempest. New York: Dover Publications, Incorporated, 1964.
- Gervinus, G. G. Shakespeare Commentaries. New York: Scribner, Welford & Armstrong, 1875.
- Gesner, Carol. "Tempest as Pastoral Romance," SQ, X (Fall, 1959), 531-539.
- Gifford, W. (ed.). The Works of Ben Jonson. In IX Vols. London: Bickers and Son, 1875.
- Granville-Barker, Harley, and G. B. Harrison. A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. New York: Macmillan, 1940.
- Graves, T. S. "On Allegory in The Tempest," MLN, XL (November, 1925), 396-399.
- Gray, H. D. "Some Indications That The Tempest Was Revised," SP, XVIII (April, 1921), 129-140.
- Greg, W. W. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Notes on Crane's Manuscript of 'The Witch,'" The Library, XXII, 4 (March, 1942), 208-222.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and F. P. Wilson (eds.). The Witch. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Halliwel-Phillipps, J. D. Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. In II Vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907.
- Herford, C. H. (ed.). The Works of Shakespeare. In II Vols. New York: Macmillan, 1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Evelyn Simpson (ed.). Ben Jonson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Hinman, Charlton. The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. In II Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

- Hudson, Henry N. (ed.). The Tempest. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1880.
- Kermode, Frank (ed.). The Tempest. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Kitteredge, G. L. (ed.). The Tempest. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1939.
- Law, Ernest. "Shakespeare's Plays in the Revels Accounts," TLS, January 27, 1921, 59-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1911.
- Lawrence, W. J. "The Masque in The Tempest," Fortnightly Review, DCXLII (June 1, 1920), 941-946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts," TLS, August 21, 1919, 449.
- Lee, Sir Sidney. A Life of William Shakespeare. New York: Dover Publications, Incorporated, 1968.
- Loud, G. C. "Francis Neilson as Shakespearan Scholar," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, XX (July, 1961), 341-354.
- Malone, Edmund (ed.). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. In XV Vols. New York: AMS Press, Incorporated, 1966.
- McElwee, William Lloyd. The Wisest Fool in Christendom. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958.
- Neilson, Francis. Shakespeare and The Tempest. Rindge, New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith Publisher, Incorporated, 1956.
- Neilson, William Allan (ed.). The Tempest. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1914.
- Nosworthy, J. M. "Narrative Sources of The Tempest," RES, XXIV (October, 1948), 281-294.
- Parrott, Thomas Marc. William Shakespeare: A Handbook. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

- Pollard, Alfred W. "Variant Spellings in Shakespeare Quartos," TLS, December 9, 1920, 838.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, and John Dover Wilson (eds.). The Tempest. New York: Macmillan, 1921.
- "The Revels Accounts," TLS, March 5, 1931, p. 173. Review of The Disputed Revels Accounts by A. E. Stamp.
- Rhodes, R. Crampton. Shakespeare's First Folio. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923.
- Ridley, M. R. (ed.). The Tempest. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1948.
- Schmidt, Alexander. Shakespeare-Lexicon. In II Vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1886.
- Smith, Irwin. "Ariel as Ceres," SQ, IX (Summer, 1958), 430-432.
- Somer, John Laddie. "Ralph Crane, Elizabethan Scrivener and the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare's Works." Unpublished Master's thesis, Emporia State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ralph Crane and 'an olde play called Winter's Tale,'" The Emporia State Research Studies, XX, 4 (June, 1962), 22-28.
- Stamp, A. E. The Disputed Revels Accounts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revels Accounts," TLS, March 21, 1929, 241.
- Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael. "The Seventeenth Century Revels Books," TLS, December 2, 1920, 798.
- Tannenbaum, Samuel A. Shakspeare Forgeries in The Revels Accounts. New York: Columbia University Press, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Shaksperian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.
- The Tempest. New York: The University Society, 1901.
- Thompson, Sir Edward Maunde. "Shaxberd," TLS, February, 1921, 91.

- Walker, Alice. "Quarto 'Copy' and the 1623 Folio: 2 Henry IV," RES, I (July, 1951), 217-225.
- Welsford, Enid. The Court Masque. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- Willoughby, Edwin Elliott. "An Interruption in the Printing of the First Folio," The Library, IX (December, 1928), 262-266.
- Willson, David Harris. King James VI and I. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1956.
- Wilson, F. P. "Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players," The Library, VII (September, 1926), 194-215.
- Wood, D. T. B. "The Revels Books: The Writer of the 'Malone Scrap,'" RES, I (January, 1925), 72-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Suspected Revels Books," RES, I (April, 1925), 166-172.
- Wright, Louis B. (ed.). A Voyage to Virginia in 1609. Two Narratives: Strachey's "True Reportory" & Jourdain's Discovery of the Bermudas. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1964.