THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEMPEST

By E. K. Chambers

Disintegrating criticism has approached the problem of The Tempest by four paths.

1. There are certain analogies to the play in Die Schöne Sidea, which forms part of the Opus Theatricum (1618) of Jacob Ayrer of Nuremberg (ob. 1605). Here, as in The Tempest, we find a prince and magician, with a familiar spirit, a fair daughter, and an enemy’s son, whose sword is held in thrall by the magician’s art, who must bear logs for the lady, and who wins release through her love. Such a task and its solution form a common enough theme of romance and folk-tale, from Theseus and Ariadne onwards. The resources of Quellen-forschung have been fully equal to tracing it in Renaissance, especially Spanish, literature. The details of the logs and the stayed sword probably point to some closer community of origin between Sidea and The Tempest. It should perhaps be added that the enemy of Ayrer’s magician has a councillor Franciscus, and in The Tempest a Francisco has a rather shadowy existence, apparently as a “lord” of the usurping duke of Milan. The stage-directions note his entries at II. i. 1, III. iii. 1, v. i. 58; but he only speaks three words at III. iii. 40, and ten lines at II. i. 113, which very probably really belong to Gonzalo. It has been thought that Ayrer used a pre-1605 version of The Tempest as a model. But obviously other explanations are equally plausible; a knowledge by Shakespeare of the German play, or of a report of it brought home...
by English actors from Germany; a common source, dramatic or narrative, now lost. This might be the Celinde und Sedea found in Anglo-German play-lists of 1604 and 1613, although no name resembling Celinde is in Ayrer's play. Certainly, as we have them, The Tempest and Sidea are distinct plays. They have very different local and historical settings. Sidea has no storm and no magic island. And there are no parallels of phrase, such as would suggest a common archetypal text. It is true that in the new Cambridge edition of The Tempest (1921) Sir A. Quiller-Couch tells us (p. xlix) "that 'mountain' and 'silver,' two names of the spirit hounds which Prospero and Ariel set upon the 'foul conspiracy' (iv. i. 256), occur in an invocation of Prince Ludolph's in the German play," and that his colleague, Mr. J. D. Wilson, says more cautiously (p. 104) that "there is an obscure mention of 'silver, hill and mountain' in Die Schöne Sidea which may refer to spirits." But there is surely some misunderstanding here. The phrase does not occur in an invocation of Ludolph's at all, and I cannot find anything obscure or any reference to spirits in it. It is in a speech by Sidea's rival Julia, to whom there is no analogue in The Tempest. Julia is describing her reception by her prospective father-in-law (not the magician Ludolph, but his enemy, Leudegast), and says:

Verheist mir Silber Hügel vnd Berg.

It is simple enough. The silver and land were her promised dower.

2. It has been held that the fragment of a mask in iv. i. is an interpolation into the play as originally written, and by some that it is not Shakespeare's work, but Beaumont's or Chapman's. The motive is supposed to have been a desire to adapt the play to the circumstances of the winter season of 1612-13, which preceded the wedding of the Princess Elizabeth and Frederick the Elector Palatine, on February 14, 1613. No doubt The Tempest is recorded to have been given at court on some unnamed day during this season, and the appropriateness of the hymeneal mask is evident. But we do not know that it was not equally appropriate to the earlier performance which is also recorded on November 1, 1611, and which may also have celebrated, although we do not know that it did celebrate, some courtly wedding. There is only one specific reference in the mask itself which can yield a clue (iv. i. 114):

Spring come to you at the farthest,
In the very end of harvest.
Mr. Dover Wilson tells us that "'Spring' here is clearly a veiled reference to the 'offspring' of the royal marriage (cf. 'issue,' I. 105), since nine months from the beginning of 1613 takes us to 'the very end of harvest.'" I dare say it does, but the royal marriage was on February 14, and even if we accept Mr. W. J. Lawrence's rather arbitrary conjecture (Fortnightly, cxiii. 941) that the play was given at the betrothal on December 27, it would hardly be decent, in view of what Prospero says about "bed-right," to start the calculation from that day. As a matter of fact, the allusion fits the 1611 performance well enough, since the words "at the farthest" allow a little margin over nine months.

3. Mr. Dover Wilson makes use of points 1 and 2, although he does not commit himself upon, and oddly enough does not discuss, the authorship of the mask. In other respects, however, he carries the critical analysis a good deal further. He disclaims an attempt "to frame a hypothetical history of The Tempest MS." But he finds "good reason to suppose that the 'copy' for the Folio text was author's manuscript which had served as prompt-copy in the theatre," lays down the general principle that "prompt-copy in that age might have a long history," and thinks that "the condition of the Folio text appears to show that The Tempest MS. had seen many changes before it reached the printer's hands." Becoming more specific, he makes the following suggestions:

(i) "When Shakespeare took up The Tempest late in his career he had an old manuscript to go upon, possibly an early play of his own, which may have been related to the original of Die Schöne Sídea." This view is based upon (a) traces of cancelled rhymed couplets, and (b) a scrap of doggerel, both of which Mr. Wilson regards as signs of early work.

(ii) "The received text has been clearly abridged, and abridged in the main by Shakespeare himself," and in i. ii. 187–320 (Prospero's first dialogue with Ariel, containing the exposition of Caliban's prehistory) "the abridgment is distinctly cruder and more drastic than elsewhere." The proof of this consists of (a) the shortness of the play; (b) broken lines, taken as indicating "cuts"; (c) incorrect verse-lining, taken as indicating marginal alterations; (d) unsystematic mingling of verse and prose; (e) incomplete or inconsistent handling of minor characters; (f) the immense length of the second scene. It requires, perhaps, some ingenuity to turn the length of a scene into an argument for abridgment. But Mr. Wilson explains
that most of the second scene "is taken up with an account of events which we may assume provided material for pre-wreck scenes in the earlier version;" and goes on to point to the "remarkable" fact that the early scenes of The Tempest contain three separate expositions. "The threefold difficulty is tackled by Shakespeare with consummate skill; but the expositions are there, and they tell their own tale. At some stage of its evolution The Tempest was in all likelihood a loosely constructed drama, like A Winter's Tale and Pericles."

(iii) "The Masque, which we can with certainty date early 1613 or Christmas 1612, appears to be an after-thought inserted into Act 4 when the play had already taken final shape under Shakespeare's hand," and it was perhaps the need to make room for this addition, whether carried out by Shakespeare or another, which led to the crude abridgment of i. ii. 187-320.

If then I understand Mr. Wilson aright, there have been two distinct abridgments, not necessarily for the same production; firstly a general abridgment, entailing the replacement of pre-wreck scenes by expositions, and leaving the play as a whole short, but the second scene immense; and then a further abridgment, to enable the mask-scene (iv. i.) to be expanded without adding to the total length of the play. I will return shortly to an analysis, through several scenes, of Mr. Wilson's evidence.

4. Mr. H. D. Gray, in "Some Indications that The Tempest was Revised" (1921, Studies in Philology, xviii. 129), points out that Act iv., as it stands, would be empty without the mask, and, while accepting this as an insertion, suggests that it replaced matter in which the plots of Caliban and Stephano against Prospero and of Anthonio and Sebastian against Alonso received greater elaboration. This is conceivable, although I do not think that either intrigue is demonstrably incomplete, or could have been carried much further against the omnipotence of Prospero. No doubt the Anthonio theme is left sketchy and rather unmotivated, but its dramatic purpose is served in adding a touch of black to the character of Anthonio. The Caliban plot is of course mere farce, and ends happily enough in the "filthy mantled pool." It is not, and never could have been, serious enough quite to explain Prospero's passion at the mask. The mask, however, had to be broken off abruptly, in order to obviate the necessity of staging the full teams of dancers. The masks brought into plays are rarely completed. Mr. Gray partly
rests his case upon the use of the motive of stealing the magician’s books in *Li Tre Satiri*, one of a group of Italian scenari, which he supposes (1920, “The Sources of the *Tempest*,” in *Modern Language Notes*, xxxv. 321) to be the origin of the play. These scenari were printed by F. Neri, *Scenari delle Maschere in Arcadia* (1913), from the large collection made by Basilio Locatelli and now in the Casanatense at Rome. Unfortunately, this book is now out of print, and so far I have not been able to trace a copy in this country. To judge by Mr. Gray’s description, a number of episodes, spread over half a dozen scenari, do in the aggregate bear such a resemblance to the theme of *The Tempest* as to suggest some kind of connection. But what that connection was remains obscure. Locatelli’s manuscript is dated 1622, according to Mr. Gray, 1618 according to a reviewer in the *Athenæum* (March 20, 1915). Obviously there is no evidence here of priority to *The Tempest*. On the other hand, the scenari might relate to performances of earlier date than that of the manuscript. Mr. Gray says that “there is no reason to doubt that Shakespeare could have seen them acted in London.” The plausibility of this depends upon whether they were acted in London, and surely this is a hazardous conjecture as regards any particular group of seventeenth-century Italian scenari. Visits of Italian actors to this country were not very frequent. The only early Jacobean example known to me, and unfortunately overlooked in writing Chapter XIV. of *The Elizabethan Stage*, was in 1610, when Prince Henry’s privy purse accounts (*S. P. Dom. *Jac. I. lvii. 87*) show payments to “an Italian comedian” of £5 on March 17 and £2 on April 13. On January 9 Henry gave £6 to “Daniell the Italian.” He is not called a comedian, and I cannot trace an actor of that name in the *Accesi* or *Fedeli* or any other known Italian troupe.

I now turn to the play itself. And first for the stage-directions. These are more elaborate than in any other play of the canon, and have sometimes been thought to be the work of a Folio editor for the assistance of readers. I agree, however, with Mr. Wilson that they may very well be substantially due to Shakespeare himself, writing in absence from London, and anxious to replace his personal supervision by careful instructions on apparel and stage-business to the producer. If so, they do not militate against the view that *The Tempest* was printed from prompt-copy. On the other hand, the mere presence of author’s directions does not of itself prove this,
and I am not quite sure what are Mr. Wilson’s reasons for supposing
that the copy used for the Folio had in fact served as prompt-copy.
He does not point to anything clearly due to a book-keeper as distinct
from a playwright. I think, however, that there are in fact some
faint indications of certain alterations in the interests of spectacle,
for which Shakespeare was probably not responsible. I shall come
to these in due course. My quotations are from the Globe text,
except where any purpose is served by keeping the orthography or
punctuation of the Folio.

ACT I. SCENE I. (The Wreck Scene)

This is written in alternating sections of prose and verse. Mr.
Wilson regards this as evidence of revision, and thinks that it was
“probably a verse-scene in the original unrevised play.” To me
the alternation appears intentional and dramatic; the emotional
tone rising and falling with the fits of the storm. The more excited
passages, including the boatswain’s cries to the mariners, are in
verse, often rough and broken; during the lulls the boatswain and
the courtiers exchange comments and abuse in prose. This arrange-
ment has misled the compositor, who prints far too much as prose,
and incidentally, after the Folio fashion, tends to elide syllables
which are required by the scansion. To some extent this is admitted
by Mr. Wilson, who recovers seven verse-lines, “partly by expanding
contractions.” I should go farther, and arrange as follows (the
brackets indicate elisions or omissions of the Folio):

A tempestuous noise of Thunder and Lightning heard: Enter a Ship-master,
and a Boteswaine.

MASTER Bote-swaine.
BOTESWAINE Heere Master: What cheere ?
Mast. Good :
Speake to th[e] Mariners: fall too [i]t, yarely,
Or we run our selues a ground, bestirre, bestirre.

Enter Mariners.
BOTES. Heigh my hearts, cheerely, cheerely my harts: yare, yare :
Take in the toppe-sale: Tend to th[e] Masters whistle:
Blow till thou burst thy winde, if roore enough.

Enter Alonso, Sebastian, Antho;io, Ferdinando, Gonzalo, and others.
ALONSO Good Boteswaine haue [a ?] care: where [i]s the Master ?
BOTES. Play the men.
ANTHONIO I pray now keepe below.
ALONSO Where is the Master, Boson ?
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BOTES. Do you not heare him? you marre our labour,  
Keep your Cabines: you do assist the storme.

GONZALO Nay, good be patient.

BOTES. When the Sea is: hence,  
What cares these roarers for the name of King?  
To Cabine; silence: trouble us not.

GON. Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.

BOTES. None that I more love then my selfe. You are a Counsellor, if  
you can command these Elements to silence, and work the  
peace of the present, wee will not hand a rope more, use your  
authoritie: If you cannot, giue thankes you have liued so long,  
and make your selfe readie in your Cabine for the mischance  
of the houre, if it so hap.

Cheerely good hearts: out of our way I say. Exit.

GON. I haue great comfort from this fellow: methinks he hath no  
drowning marke vpon him, his complexion is perfect Gallowes:  
stand fast good Fate to his hanging, make the rope of his  
destiny our cable, for our owne doth little advantage: If he  
be not borne to bee hang'd, our case is miserable. Exit.

Enter Boteswaine.

BOTES. Downe with the top-Mast: yare, lower, lower,  
Bring her to Try with Maine-course.

A plague—  
A cry within. Enter Sebastian, Anthonio & Gonzalo.

upon this howling:

They are lower then the weather, or our office:
Yet againe? What do you heere? Shal we giue ore and drowne,  
haue you a minde to sinke?

SEB. A poxe o' your throat, you bawling, blasphemous incharitable Dog.  
BOTES. Worke you then.

ANTH. Hang cur, hang, you whoreson insolent Noyse-maker, we are  
lesse afraid to be drownde, then thou art.

GONZ. I'le warrant him for drowning, though the Ship were no stronger  
than a Nutt-shell, and as leaky as an unstanched wench.

BOTES. Lay her a hold, a hold, set her two courses  
Off to Sea againe, lay her off.

Enter Mariners wet.

MARI. All lost, to prayers, to prayers, all lost.

BOTES. What must our mouths be cold?

GONZ. The King, and Prince, at prayers, let's assist them,  
For our case is as theirs.

SEB. I am out of patience.

ANTH. We are meerly cheated of our lives by drunkards,  
This wide-chop-rascal, would thou mightst lye drowning  
The washing of ten Tides.

GONZ. Hee'1 be hang'd yet,  
Though euerie drop of water sweare against it,  
And gape at wids to glut him.  
A confused noyse within.

Mercy on vs  
We split, we split. Farewell my wife, and children,  
Farewell brother: we split, we split, we split.

ANTH. Let's all sinke wi[']

SEB. Let's take leave of him. Exit.

GONZ. Now would I giue a thousand furlongs of Sea, for an Acre of  
barren ground: Long heath, Browne firrs, any thing; the  
wills aboue be done, but I would faine dye a dry death. Exit.
Of the thirty-four lines here treated as verse, only six are so treated by the Folio and twenty-two by Mr. Wilson. I must add that the verse does not read to me at all like early work of Shakespeare.

ACT I. SCENE II

1-186 (Prospero and Miranda: the First Exposition).
Only two passages require comment.
(a) Prospero tells Miranda that she knows no more than that he is Prospero and her father. She says (21):

More to know
Did never meddle with my thoughts,

but in her very next speech (33)

You have often
Begun to tell me what I am, but stopp’d,
And left me to a bootless inquisition,
Concluding, “Stay: not yet.”

This is one of those small inconsistencies of dialogue which are frequent in Shakespeare, pass easily on the stage, and must not be pressed as evidence for revision.

(b) 156-60:

Pros. which raised in me
An undergoing stomach, to bear up
Against what should ensue.

Mir. How came we ashore?

Pros. By providence divine,
Some food, we had, and some fresh water, that
A noble Neapolitan, Gonzalo . . . did give us . . .

Mr. Wilson comments: “The isolated half-line and the comma suggest a ‘cut’ here. Prospero never answers Miranda’s question.” But he does. They came ashore, because Providence, acting through Gonzalo, had supplied them with food and water. As for the half-line, it is common enough for a half-line speech, breaking into a longer speech, to do double duty as a member of two successive metrical lines.


Mr. Wilson finds “bibliographical disturbance,” from which he infers “cuts” and insertions, concentrated in this section of the scene.
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(a) There are five broken lines:

(188) Approach, my Ariel, come. Enter Ariel.

(316) Come, thou tortoise! when? Enter Ariel like a water nymph.

Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself

(320) Upon thy wicked dam, come forth! Enter Caliban.

Two (188, 320) are speech-endings, at the other (316) the speaker turns to a new addressee; and in all these cases entries fill the pauses.

Pros. Hast thou, spirit, Perform'd to point the tempest that I bade thee?

Ariel. To every article. I boarded the king's ship, now on the beak . . .

This is rather abrupt, but Ariel may take pause to think before he begins his story. Little, if anything, can be missing, since the twelve lines of Ariel's speech fully answer Prospero's question.

(253) Thou dost, and think'st it much to tread the ooze

Of the salt deep,
To run upon the sharp wind of the north,
To do me business in the veins o' th' earth
When it is baked with frost.

This is certainly abrupt. Mr. Wilson calls it a "glaring 'cut.'" Dr. Greg (M. L. R. xvii. 178) points out that the speech runs too smoothly for a mere cut, and thinks that there may have been a more substantial alteration, from a passage containing a line

Think'st much to tread the ooze of the salt deep,

But again there cannot be much missing: the dialogue as a whole is consistent and adequate.

As a matter of fact, there is a sixth broken line, which Mr. Wilson does not note:

they all have met again,

And are upon the Mediterranean flote,

Bound sadly home for Naples,
Supposing that they saw the King's ship wrecked,
And his great person perish.

The completeness of the grammatical structure makes any substantial cut unlikely.

(b) The lineation of the Folio, as throughout the play, is good, but there is one mis-division (309–10), where

Mr. 'Tis a villain, sir, I do not love to look on.—

contains the end of one line and the beginning of the next. I think
the Folio has a tendency to merge consecutive half-lines, for the saving of space.

(c) Mr. Wilson finds the account of Sycorax in Argier (260–7) obscure, and thinks that a fuller narrative has been cut. Certainly we are left in doubt as to whether the witch was born in Argier and why her life was spared. I doubt whether there is anything in this but the awkwardness due to the attempt (noticeable also in 1–186) to break the exposition by question and answer.

(d) Mr. Wilson thinks that the account of Caliban (281–6), which breaks into the story of Ariel’s imprisonment and release, is “an addition, a piece of patchwork, designed to compensate for a rent elsewhere in this section.” Dr. Greg apparently agrees. Here also I find nothing but rather clumsy exposition.

Both Mr. Wilson and Dr. Greg also find “botchery” in the following, where “correct lining and scansion are impossible,” and the repetition of the prefix Pro. points to a join in the MS.

(298) Pro. Doe so: and after two daies
I will discharge thee.
Ar. That’s my noble Master:
What shall I doe? say what? what shall I doe?
Pro. Goe make thy selfe like a Nymph o’ th’ Sea,
Be subject to no sight but thine, and mine: invisibile
To euery eye-ball else: goe take this shape
And hither come in’t: goe: hence
With diligence. Exit.
Pro. Awake, deere hart awake, thou hast slept well,
Awake.

I am inclined to agree that there has been an insertion, not as part of a recast of the scene, but at the hands of the book-keeper, to lead up to an elaboration of the spectacular element in the play by the momentary and dramatically purposeless apparition of Ariel “like a water nymph” at 1. 316 (v. supra). If so, of course the broken line (316) may after all be part of the alteration.

321–74 (Prospero and Caliban).
(a) Mr. Wilson finds three broken lines:

(324) And blister you all o’er.

A broken line at the end of a speech in a late play is common enough, and no proof of a cut.

Pros. thou didst seek to violate
(348) The honour of my child.
Cal. O ho, O ho! I wouldn’t had been done.
Here we have, not two broken lines, but one complete one. Caliban's laugh is extra-metrical.

(b) The Folio (360–2) reads:

therefore wast thou
Deservedly confin'd into this Rocke, who hadst
Deseru'd more then a prison.

Mr. Wilson redivides:

Deservedly confined into this rock,
Who hadst deserved more than a prison.

And he comments, "The rough verse, the broken line and the echo 'deservedly . . . deserved' all suggest hasty revision." I do not know that his four and a half foot line is any less "rough" than the six footer. If I were given to emendation, I think I should assume that "deseru'd" had caught the compositor's eye twice, and let it run, still with a broken speech ending:

Confin'd into this rock, who hadst deserved
More than a prison.

In any case, the passage looks to me like a misprint, rather than a revision.

376–501 (Prospero, Ferdinand, and Miranda).

Mr. Wilson finds "no bibliographical peculiarities"; neither do I, except a final broken line (501).

ACT II. SCENE I

1–190 (The Third Exposition: Gonzalo's Philosophy).

Prose and verse are a good deal mixed, and a verse line or two may be embedded in prose passages. Mr. Wilson takes the prose for a revision; but such a piecemeal revision wants as much explanation as an original mixture. Certainly the verse, which on the whole is used for the more exalted passages, is not early work.

191–327 (Plot against Alonso).

(a) Mr. Wilson does not note two broken lines, one (218) a speech-ending, the other (275) an exclamation.

(b) There are three cases of misdivided lines (192–3, 195–8, 244–5), but sporadic misdivisions are very poor evidence of revision, and Mr. Wilson's attempt at a reconstruction of an original form for 192–8 suggests that, if there was any revision, it was quite trivial. In 244–5 I only see space-saving, analogous to that of i. ii. 309–10.
(c) In 297–305 Ariel enters and sings a song in Gonzalo’s ear. This seems inconsistent with the conversation after the waking of Alonso and Gonzalo (in itself intelligible enough, pace Mr. Wilson), in which Gonzalo speaks of a “humming” and the disturbed murderers of a “bellowing” or “roare.” Possibly the song, like I. ii. 298–305, may be a theatrical sophistication.

ACT II. SCENE II. (Caliban and Mariners)

The mariners speak prose; Caliban mainly, but not entirely, verse. The Folio compositor, as in i. i., is confused, prints some of Caliban’s lines as prose, and contrariwise has some irregular prose lines with initial capitals. Mr. Wilson thinks that this is the result of revision, but original differentiation, to emphasize the abnormality of Caliban, is just as plausible as differentiated revision.

ACT III. SCENE I. (Ferdinand and Miranda)

Mr. Wilson (p. 84) finds “no marks of revision,” but (p. 79) notes certain traces of rhymed couplets as indicating Shakespeare’s use of “an old manuscript, possibly an early play of his own.” These are:

(24) I’ll bear your logs the while: pray give me that; I’ll carry it to the pile.
(29) With much more ease: for my good will is to it,

Mere carelessness, I think.

ACT III. SCENE II. (Caliban and Mariners)

The arrangement is similar to that of ii. ii., except that occasionally Stephano, as well as Caliban, speaks verse. Trinculo has three lines, probably of doggerel (86–89), although treated by the Globe as prose, which Mr. Wilson thinks “fossil from the earlier version.”

ACT III. SCENE III

Mr. Wilson finds “marks of revision, slight.” These appear to be:

(a) Four broken lines, of which one (19) is a short exclamatory speech, and three (52, 82, 93) are speech-endings, the first two being cut short by thunder.
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(b) One misdivision, due, I think, like I. ii. 309-10, to the merging of what would normally appear as two half-lines in the Folio.

ANT. Doe not for one repulse forgoe the purpose
(13)
That you resolu'd t'effect.

SEB. The next aduantage will we take throughly.

ANT. Let it be to night,

(c) Two buried rhymes, analogous to III. i. 24.

(32) Their manners are more gentle-kind, than of
Our human generation you shall find
Many, nay, almost any.

(50) Although my last: no matter, since I feele
The best is past.

ACT IV. SCENE I

1-193 (The Mask Scene).

(a) One misdivision, clearly to save space.

(166) Pro. Spirit: We must prepare to meet with Caliban.

(b) Seven broken lines, of which one (43) is an independent speech, followed by a change to trochaic metre, three (12, 105, 169) are speech endings, and three, also speech endings (59, 127, 138), are cut short by appearances of the mask. Mr. Wilson does not note 12 and 43, and accepts the others as due to “the exigencies of the masque-verse.”

What then is the evidence for the mask being an interpolation?

(i) I have already shown that the obstetric chronology has no necessary or obvious relation to the circumstances of 1612-13.

(ii) Mr. Wilson thinks that an earlier version of the play only had the dances of Reapers and Nymphs (138), and that the speeches and song of Iris, Ceres and Juno (60-138), together with the preliminary talk of Prospero with Ariel and Ferdinand (48-59), have been added. He argues that all this intermediate matter is inconsistent with Prospero’s “incite them to quick motion” (39) and “Ay: with a twink” (43), and with Ariel’s words (46-7):

Each one, tripping on his toe,
Will be here with mop and mow.—

“which announce the immediate advent of dancers.” This seems to me fantastic literalism, even if it can be assumed that Iris and Ceres and Juno did not themselves come in with dancing measures.
Mr. Wilson goes on to explain the introduction of the intermediate matter, with its second and rather superfluous moral warning to Ferdinand, as due to the fact that Ariel "presented Ceres" (167), and therefore the actor of Ariel needed time to change his costume. As to this Dr. Greg points out that, whatever Ariel says, the parts were not necessarily doubled by the human actors; to which I may add, that "presented" need mean no more than that Ariel stage-managed the show. I do not therefore see any evidence of patching before the mask. According to the usual practice in such entertainments, speaking personages introduce the dancers. And, although I agree that the second sermon to Ferdinand is clumsy, the rest of the preliminary matter fits well enough. Ariel is told to get ready quickly, and then told (49) to delay the actual entry until Prospero gives the word; which in fact he does at 57.

(iii) Is there, then, any more convincing proof of patching after the mask? Again Mr. Wilson applies his wardrobe argument. Ariel must change his dress again, and so Prospero, although he has stopped the mask in order to be getting quickly to grips with the dangerous Caliban conspiracy, has to delay for thirteen lines of "irrelevant philosophical rhapsody" about the "insubstantial pageant" of life. Mr. Wilson suggests that in the original version Prospero's (158) "Sir, I am vexed" was a direct reply to Ferdinand's

(143) This is strange: your father's in some passion
That works him strongly.

This, however, would not give a complete line at the juncture, and Dr. Greg reconstructs the dialogue as follows:

FERD. You do look, my lord, in a moved sort
As if you were dismayed.

PROS. Sir, I am vexed.

My own conviction is that these critics take Prospero's "passion" and the danger of the Caliban conspiracy much more seriously than Prospero did, that the mask was stopped because there had been enough of it for the purposes of a play, and that there has been no patching. If there has, Shakespeare's undeniable authorship of the "insubstantial pageant" passage makes the conclusion that he was the patcher inevitable.

Interpolation, if it could be shown, would however strengthen the hands of those who doubt the Shakespearean workmanship of the mask itself; from the old Cambridge editors with their unspecific
reference to "the writer who composed the masque" to Dr. Greg, who says that it is in "a very distinctive style, quite different from Shakespeare's." Fleay ascribed it to Beaumont, in whose wedding mask of 1613 Iris and the Naiades again appear. In *The Tempest* the Naiades have "sedged crowns" and Ceres has "banks with pioned and twilled brims." In the wedding mask were "four delicate fountains, running with water and bordered with sedges and water-flowers." This is extraordinarily thin. Iris, the messenger of the Gods, and the Naiades show no recondite imagination in a mask-writer. They might well serve twice in a season; it is less probable that the same writer would use them twice in the same season. Nor is it odd that two masks with nuptial themes should both allude to "blessing and increase." Mr. J. M. Robertson (*Shakespeare and Chapman*, 210; *Times Literary Supplement*, March 31, 1921) offers as alternatives Heywood, who is not likely to have written for the King's men, and Chapman, with a leaning towards Chapman, indicated by the bad rhyming, by word-clues, and by the duplication of Juno's mention of "honour" and "riches" in Chapman's own wedding mask, in which "Honour" and "Plutus (or Riches)" are in fact characters. It is suggested that Chapman had already seen Beaumont's mask and took from this some details of imagery; also that he had already seen *The Tempest*, of which there are some echoes in his wedding mask, and took from II. i. 163 the word "foison" for the interpolated mask. It is, however, to the word-clues that Mr. Robertson devotes most attention. He finds in the *Tempest* mask eighteen words (vetches, turfy, stover, pioned, twilled, brims, betrims, broom-groves, lorn, marge, bosky, unshrub'd, bed-right, windring, sedged, sicklemen, furrow, rye-straw) not used elsewhere by Shakespeare, and eight words or phrases (donation, crisp, leas, scandal'd, many colour'd messenger, scarcity, sunburnt, dusky), which Shakespeare only uses two or three times, sometimes in plays in which Mr. Robertson thinks that Chapman or another had a hand. Of the first group he traces three (brims, bed-rites, furrow) and of the second four (leas, scandal'd, sunburnt, dusky), together with, not "many-colour'd," but "thousand-colour'd," as an epithet of Iris, in Chapman. "This," he says, "does not amount to much." It certainly does not, in view of the commonplace character of many of the words and the frequency of once-used words in all Shakespeare's plays. It is therefore a little surprising to find Mr. Robertson reverting to
the matter and telling us (T. L. S.) that the vocabulary clues to Chapman are “rather striking.” Such as it is, the case must be further discounted by pointing out that “brim” occurs, not once, but four times in the plays, and that “furrow” as a noun recurs in the compound “furrow-weeds.” Nor is it helped by pointing out that coupled epithets and such forms as “turfy,” “bosky,” are very much in Chapman’s manner, since they are also very much in Shakespeare’s. And it is rather misleading to suggest that “spongy April” recalls the “Earth, at this spring, spongy and languorsome” of Chapman’s Amorous Zodiac, without also noting the “spongy south” of Cymbeline iv. ii. 349. Iris rhymes “deity” with “society,” and Chapman in the wedding mask with “piety,” but in neither case is an abnormal pronunciation of “deity” involved; the rhyme is only on the last syllable.

Looking at the matter more broadly, I do not think it possible to read the dialogue of the mask side by side with Beaumont’s elegant wedding mask, or Chapman’s extremely cumbrous one, and to believe in any common authorship with either of them. That is an issue, not of analogies of motive, or of word-clues, but of stylistic impression, of which each critic must be the judge for himself. Nor do I see any reason to doubt that this dialogue is Shakespeare’s. Certainly its manner is differentiated from that of the play itself; it had to be pitched in a different key, just as the play in Hamlet is pitched in a different key from that of Hamlet itself. But why should we look for another than Shakespeare in the “banks with pioned and twilled brims,” in the “spongy April” and the “cold nymphs,” in the “rich scarf to my proud earth,” in “Mars’ hot minion” and the “blind boy’s scandal’d company”; above all, in the turn of

“thy broom-groves,
Whose shadow the dismissed bachelor loves,
Being lass-lorn”? 

About the song of Juno and Ceres, with its imperfect rhymes and its emptiness of content, I feel more doubtful; and if any one argues that this, taken by itself, may have been inserted by the book-keeper, to whom I have already allowed a few lines in i. ii. and ii. i., I am not inclined to resist him. Whether the book-keeper thought it worth while to call upon Chapman or anyone else for assistance, I do not know.
THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEMPEST

194–267 (Caliban and Mariners).

The mixture of prose and verse is analogous to that in II. ii. and III. ii.

There are five broken lines (207, 219, 234, 250, 267), all speech-endings.

ACT V. SCENE I. (Reconciliation)

(a) Mr. Wilson notes ten broken lines, "some of which may have arisen from revision." Of these eight (57, 87, 101, 103, 171, 173, 263, 281) are speech-endings, followed in one case (57) by music, in another (87) by a song, and in a third (171) by a discovery; one (299) is an extra-metrical interruption.

The tenth is more abrupt, but explicable by a change of addressee.

A solemn air and the best comforter
To an unsettled fancy cure thy brains,
Now useless boil within thy skull: there stand,
For you are spell-stopped.
Holy Gonzalo, honourable man,

An eleventh, not noted by Mr. Wilson, is filled by a pause of surprise.

Pros. (148) Have lost my daughter. For I
Alonso A daughter?

A twelfth (278), also not noted, is another extra-metrical interruption.

(b) There is one misdivision, for which any reason, other than a misprint, is hard to find.

(95) Why, that's my dainty Ariel: I shall miss
Thee, but yet thou shalt have freedom: so, so, so.

(c) Mr. Wilson says, "The extra-metrical and detached 'No' given to Prospero at l. 130 is curious and can best be explained by a 'cut' in the text, which deprives us of the rest of the retort." It is not, however, unmetrical.

Pros. I will tell no tales. | no tales.
Seb. The devil speaks in | him.
Pros. No!

(d) Prospero says (248):

at pickt leisure
(Which shall be shortly single) I'll resolve you,
(Which to you shall seem probable) of every
These happend accidents:
It is a characteristic involution in Shakespeare's latest manner, but hardly justifies Mr. Wilson's inference that "the extreme awkwardness suggests adaptation."

Finally, Mr. Wilson notes that "this is the only occasion, apparently, in the whole canon where speakers who have concluded one scene appear again at the opening of the next. It is practically certain that some intervening scene has been deleted between iv. i. and v. i." Dr. Greg has already called attention to the analogy of M. N. D. iii.–iv., where Hermia and Helena "sleepe all the Act." In any case I doubt whether Shakespeare had any conscious practice in the matter.

Summary

The "problem," if there is a "problem," of The Tempest resolves itself into three issues.

1. Is there any reason for attributing the verse of the mask to another hand than Shakespeare's?
2. Is there sufficient evidence, "bibliographical" or literary, for inferring abridgment, either to make room for the mask or for any other purpose?
3. Is there any such evidence for one or more recasts of the play as a whole?

To all three questions I give substantially negative answers. As to the first I have nothing to add to my notes on iv. i. Abridgment is claimed on five grounds: (a) the shortness of the play, (b) mute or semi-mute personages, (c) broken lines, (d) misdivision of lines, (e) incoherencies and obscurities.

(a) Shortness.

The play is short, and no doubt a short text is sometimes, as probably in Macbeth, due to abridgment. Some might argue that The Tempest is short because it was written for a court performance, but I have no reason for supposing that court performances were normally shorter than public performances. I would suggest, however, that in this case the length of the actual performance was sensibly increased by the songs and dumb-show episodes, of which several (iii. iii. 20, 53, 83; iv. i. 138, 193, 256; v. i. 57) give opportunity for elaborate treatment.

(b) Mutes and Semi-mutes.

I have referred above to the sketchy treatment of Francisco, who however is required to make up an attendant for each of the
principal nobles; Alonso, who has Gonzalo, Sebastian, who has Adrian, and Anthonio. Mr. Wilson also lays stress upon the fact that no more is heard in the play of a "brave son" of Anthonio, whom Ferdinand (i. ii. 438) saw in the wreck, and thinks him a survival from an earlier version. But I doubt whether such a dropped thread is beyond Shakespeare’s carelessness.

(c) Broken Lines.
There are forty in all. Of these twenty-eight are speech-endings, followed in fourteen cases by an entry, or discovery, or episode of mask or music, or peal of thunder, or by a transition to prose or trochaics. This is a normal phenomenon of Shakespeare’s later work, in which the tendency to depart from the tyranny of the line-unit leads to medial speech endings, with the incidental result that an interruption sometimes leaves these in suspense. Six are self-contained exclamations or interjections, one (i. ii. 159) being of the "amphibious" type which serves as end to one full line and beginning to another. These also are normal. One (v. i. 148) is divided between two speakers, and filled out by a pause of astonishment. There remain five which come in mid-speech. Two (i. ii. 316; v. i. 61) are explained by a change of addressee, or alternatively in the first case by a book-keeper’s insertion; one (i. ii. 195) by a pause for consideration. Only two (i. ii. 235, 253) suggest to me possible cuts, and these probably, from the context, only of small extent. The position is very different from that in Macbeth, with its numerous, abrupt, mid-speech, broken lines, which are, I think, evidence of substantial abridgment.

(d) Mis-divisions.
Blank verse lines are often wrongly divided, both by Quarto and Folio printers, and the confusion sometimes extends over a series of successive lines. In these cases there is plausibility in Mr. Wilson’s explanation that a compositor might be misled by a blank verse insertion, written continuously in a margin of manuscript too narrow to allow each line to be set out at full length. Of course, a marginal insertion is not necessarily evidence of abridgment, still less of wholesale recast. It may be evidence of expansion. On the other hand, its purpose may be to join the edges of a cut. The misdivisions in The Tempest, however, are not, except in one case, of the serial type, and they are really very few in number, compared with those in several other Folio texts. Mr. Wilson (p. 79) says that they “abound,” but, apart from the confusion between prose and
verse in certain scenes, he only notes nine examples. Of these four (I. ii. 309; II. i. 244; III. iii. 13; IV. i. 166) are merely space saving, generally by setting a speech which ends one metrical line and begins another as one print-line instead of two. One (I. ii. 361) is, I think, the sequel of a misprint. One (V. i. 95) is perhaps itself a misprint. Two, one of which is serial (II. i. 192, 195-8), may result from some trivial alteration; and one, involving two separate lines (I. ii. 301, 304), is, I think, possibly part of an insertion by the book-keeper. There is nothing here to support a theory of systematic abridgment.

(e) Incoherencies and Obscurities.

I have dealt with, and dismissed as trivial, in view of Shakespeare's occasional carelessness, the inconsistent replies of Miranda and the rambling pre-history of Sycorax and Caliban, both in I. ii. Nor can I attach much importance, pending a personal study of the Locatelli scenari, to the converging attempts of Mr. Gray and Mr. Wilson to show that some episode or episodes may have dropped out from IV. On the other hand, I think that the desire of the producer to bring in Ariel as a nymph of the sea in I. ii. and to give him a song in II. i. may have led the book-keeper to introduce a slight confusion into each of these scenes.

So much for abridgment. I come now to the question of recasts. And here I find it a little difficult to follow Mr. Wilson's theory, although I must remember that he does not profess to give a complete account of the fortunes of the Tempest copy. At one place (p. 79) he writes as if he regarded the mixture of prose and verse in certain scenes, and also the length of I. ii., as being further evidence of abridgment. I do not see how they can be that; and in fact, when he comes to deal with the "mixed" scenes in detail, his suggestion is clearly that these were verse-scenes "in the original unrevised play" and that "the prose or part-prose sections probably represent pages of the MS. which have undergone revision." I understand him to trace two distinct recasts. The first was when "late in his career" Shakespeare took up "an old manuscript, possibly an early play of his own," which was at any rate partly in rhyme, and revised it by getting rid of the rhyme and turning some verse passages into prose. This still left The Tempest "a loosely constructed drama, like A Winter's Tale and Pericles," in which Prospero's deposition, the birth of Caliban, and Claribel's voyage to Africa furnished material for pre-wreck scenes. I am assuming that
Mr. Wilson would not cite *A Winter's Tale* and *Pericles* as analogies for the form of an early play by Shakespeare, and, if so, it must have been at a second recast that he supposes the pre-wreck scenes to have been omitted and replaced by the three expositions. I am not quite clear whether any part of the general abridgment is supposed to have taken place at this stage, or whether that formed a third stage. Perhaps Mr. Wilson is not quite clear either. In any case, the mask was introduced "when the play had already taken final shape under Shakespeare's hand"; and that apparently involved further abridgment. I am, however, now only concerned with the two general recasts. For the first the evidence is:

(a) The relation of the play to *Die Schöne Sieda*. Some common source is, I think, probable; but it was not necessarily a play, and if a play, it was not necessarily in a relation of "continuous copy" to *The Tempest*.

(b) The "traces of rhymed couplets." I have noted above the four indicated by Mr. Wilson in III. i. and III. iii. He says that others occur "elsewhere." Perhaps he has in mind

\begin{verbatim}
1. ii. 304 And hither come in't: go: hence 
With diligence.
\end{verbatim}

But this is probably the book-keeper. There is also

\begin{verbatim}
iv. i. 123 So rare a wonder'd father and a wise 
Makes this place Paradise.
\end{verbatim}

Here some copies of the Folio read "wife," which Mr. Wilson may be right in regarding as an emendation. But I suppose that in Mr. Wilson's view the lines would have been an insertion with the mask. There may be others. But such accidental rhymes, whether final or internal, seem to me due to Shakespeare's carelessness or whim, and no evidence of revision.

(c) Three lines of doggerel (III. ii. 86–88) in the mouth of Trinculo are, surely, too slight a basis for any argument, although I do not think there is any other doggerel in the plays later than *Lear*, i. v. 55–56.

(d) The "mixed" passages. If Mr. Wilson's theory that these are due to partial revision of an "early" play were correct, I should expect to find the verse sections in "early" verse, and possibly in rhymed verse. But it is not so. The verse is all of a piece with that in the rest of the play, and distinctly late in manner, and if the verse, as well as the prose, belongs to the revision, then the reason
for the differentiation is still to seek. To me it presents no great difficulty. There are other examples in which Shakespeare seems to have thought a variation of medium appropriate to transitions between more and less exalted subject-matter within the same scenes.

There is nothing to bear out this supposed second recast except the length of I. ii. and the three expositions, here and in II. i. Most of the second scene “is taken up with an account of events which we may assume provided material for pre-wreck scenes in the earlier version.” It is indeed an assumption. But “the expositions are there, and they tell their own tale.” I think they do. They tell that Shakespeare, having a great deal of pre-history to narrate, found it less tedious to do it at thrice than at once. But I do not see how they tell Mr. Wilson’s. Shakespeare, at the end of his career, took it into his head to vary the loose construction of such plays as A Winter’s Tale and Pericles by a final experiment on the lines of temporal unity. He reverted to the method of preliminary exposition which he had employed long ago for a similar theme in the Comedy of Errors. Why should we “assume” that he put himself to the superfluous trouble of first writing The Tempest as a loose romance, and then converting it to unity? The break with his immediate past would have been no less deliberate.