



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Narrative Sources of The Tempest

Author(s): J. M. Nosworthy

Source: *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 96 (Oct., 1948), pp. 281-294

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/510670>

Accessed: 19-05-2020 18:52 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Review of English Studies*

THE NARRATIVE SOURCES OF *THE TEMPEST*

By J. M. NOSWORTHY

THE curiously interesting titles that Shakespeare gave to his comedies fall into two main groups. On the one hand we have *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, all derived from the subject-matter of the plays to which they belong, and superbly relevant: on the other, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, or *What You Will*, exciting, almost predestined, but quite irrelevant. Hence, at the end of his career, *A Winter's Tale* for a play whose two loosely connected plots are not, in themselves, suggestive of any particularly appropriate title, but *The Tempest* for one in which the tempest is, in fact, the most important single circumstance presented. Other titles would have been quite appropriate: *The Enchanted Island*, *The Shipwreck*, *Ferdinand and Miranda*, *The Enchanter*. One can play this game of title-choosing indefinitely and learn, in the end, that there is one perfect title and one only, *The Tempest*. It is the most comprehensive title. It commemorates the play's most spectacular, most magical, and most significant scene. It does so, I suggest, because the storm has a greater intrinsic importance and contributes more to the delicate structure and logic of the play than the critics have usually supposed.

Despite the fact that *The Tempest* preserves all the unities that *A Winter's Tale* wantonly shatters, both plays comprise the same structural components. Both have what may be termed a causal plot and an effectual plot, with a link episode. In *A Winter's Tale* Shakespeare follows the obvious chronological order of presentation and makes his two main components of equal length, so that the play falls into the following pattern:

Causal: Acts I–III.

Link: Time the Chorus (iv. i).

Effectual: iv. ii–v. iii.

The Tempest fits its pieces together quite differently:

Causal: I. ii. 1–375.

Link: The tempest (I. i).

Effectual: I. ii. 376–v. Epilogue.

By following this pattern and presenting the causal plot obliquely the dramatist secures that immediate continuity that has hitherto eluded him in the romantic comedies. He is able, moreover, to carry out a process of dove-tailing that barely admits analysis and, for the first time, to make his link scene commensurable in dramatic intensity and propriety with the rest of the play.

Tempest and shipwreck are, of course, the inevitable link, for the nature of the two plots is such that no other circumstance, least of all the intrusion of Time the Chorus, could unite them. But the logic of the scene goes farther than this. In *A Winter's Tale* the anarchy in the mind of Leontes and its explosive overflow is the true circumstance from which the idyll of Florizel and Perdita and the act of reconciliation spring to life. In *The Tempest*, where the action is dominated by a marooned magician whose sole companions, hitherto, have been his daughter, a spirit of air, a monster of earth, and an indeterminate company of phantasms, the anarchy that releases those forces potent for good is conceived, appropriately, in terms of the elements. Since, as we learn, it is a supernatural tempest devised by Prospero and executed by Ariel it is, ultimately, an illusion as incredible as Leontes's jealousy and almost as unreal as Father Time. Shakespeare's metaphysics do not concern us: the fact that the tempest is a product of magic does, and its implications will be considered later.

The present inquiry is concerned with the sources of *The Tempest*, and this longish preamble has greater relevance than may be immediately apparent. No single source that will cover *The Tempest* as a whole has yet come to light, and it is tolerably certain that none exists. Scholars, who have been excusably deceived by the perfect unity and harmony of the play, have sought far and wide and have recovered merely a few fragments that seem to have some vague connexion with Shakespeare's play. Vague they are bound to be as long as they are measured against the full play. Once, however, we grasp the structural make-up of *The Tempest* and admit the existence of three components and the individual importance of each, certain of these findings fall into place, and the vagueness disappears.

I

The main body of the causal plot is contained in Prospero's narrative in i. ii, and all that is required of the source is that it should furnish the tale of a duke's deposition and banishment. If it also relates that the banished duke sailed to a far country and devoted himself to study, so much the better. The infant daughter and the penchant for necromancy are not required, since both are unifying factors in *The Tempest* and, most decidedly, not requisite details in an account of banishment.

It was long ago pointed out by Halliwell-Phillipps and Hunter that Thomas's *Historie of Italie* supplies not only the incidents for this section of *The Tempest* but also the names of some of the characters. The facts presented by Thomas are that Prospero Adorno became the Duke of Milan's lieutenant in Genoa, that his relations with Ferdinand, King of Naples, led to his deposition, that Genoa later accepted Milanese rule once more and received Antony Adorno as governor. Thomas also relates how Charles

the Eighth of France attempted to depose Alonzo, King of Naples, how, by his marriage, Alonzo united the houses of Naples and Milan, and how he renounced his estate to his son, Ferdinand, loaded his treasure, and sailed to Sicily, where 'he disposed himself to study, solitariness, and religion'.

These details of Italian history suffice, in themselves, for the causal plot, and the several resemblances can scarcely be fortuitous. It may be argued that Shakespeare does not reproduce these matters exactly as they occurred, but that objection has no substance. In the first place, a process of conflation and selection is necessary before Thomas's data can be turned into a tolerable dramatic sequence: in the second, Shakespeare is not elsewhere notable either for his slavish adherence to sources or for his unimpeachably accurate presentation of the dry bones of history. Moreover, it is with the effectual plot that *The Tempest* is mainly concerned, and if, as we reasonably may, we assume that its conception preceded that of the causal plot, clearly certain changes had to be made before the two plots would hang together. It will also be clear, I think, that the changes made are the only ones that could have been made. The island enchanter has an only daughter, hence Alonzo of Naples, though an island recluse, will not fit, and Prospero Adorno fills the part. Deposition alone accounts for the enchanter's presence on the island, hence Prospero Adorno's successor in Genoa, Anthony Adorno, becomes the usurping brother, Antonio. The union of the two houses of Naples and Milan is required, hence Prospero is transferred from Genoa to Milan. It is a very simple kind of adjustment, beyond the scope of most of the commentators, perhaps, but child's play to Shakespeare.

William Thomas's *Historie of Italie*, of which there were editions in 1549 and 1561, seems, then, a likely source for the causal plot, though we must not ignore the possibility that Shakespeare knew these odd details of Italian history without having to burrow for them in books.

II

The only tolerably close parallel to Shakespeare's effectual plot is found in the fourth chapter of Antonio de Eslava's *Noches de Invierno*, published at Pamplona in 1609 and reprinted in the same year at Barcelona. The narrative is summarized in the Arden edition of *The Tempest* as follows:

Dardanus, King of Bulgaria, a virtuous magician, is dethroned by Nicephorus, Emperor of Greece, and has to flee with his only daughter Seraphina. They go on board a little ship. In mid-ocean Dardanus, having parted the waters, rears by art of magic a beautiful submarine palace, where he resides with his daughter till she becomes marriageable. Then the father, in the disguise of a fisherman, carries off the son of Nicephorus to his palace under the sea. The youth falls in love with the maiden. The Emperor having died in the meantime, Dardanus

returns with his daughter and his son-in-law to his former kingdom, which he leaves the latter to rule over, while he withdraws into solitude.

It can scarcely be denied that *Noches de Invierno* and *The Tempest* tell the same tale, but it is very doubtful whether Shakespeare's source stands here revealed. We may well question whether Shakespeare commanded sufficient Spanish to read Eslava's book, and there are certain reasons for believing that the tale was known to English readers, Shakespeare among them, long before 1609.

The theory that Shakespeare based this part of the play on Jakob Ayzer's *Die schöne Sidea* has never won general acceptance, and rightly so. Yet there are more points of resemblance between the two plays than coincidence can readily account for. In Ayzer's play the counterpart to Prospero is a Prince Ludolff, who has a familiar spirit, Runcifal, and an only daughter, Sidea. Prince Engelbrecht, the son of Ludolff's enemy, Leudegast, Prince of Wiltau, is captured by Ludolff, but Sidea falls in love with him and they elope together. We may note as incidental similarities that Runcifal, like Ariel, is not always a willing servant, that Ludolff charms Engelbrecht's sword, and that Engelbrecht as Ludolff's prisoner is compelled to bear logs for Sidea. But there is no sustained similarity of tone or substance, and the features in which the two plays differ completely are, on the whole, more remarkable than the likenesses.

It would be reasonable to maintain that Shakespeare and Ayzer derived their plots independently from some lost folk-tale or other common source, but one point of similarity, which is, however, curious rather than decisive, suggests a somewhat closer connexion. The words 'mountain' and 'silver' applied by Prospero and Ariel to the hounds in iv. i are found in close propinquity in Ayzer's play in a speech given to Julia, Engelbrecht's betrothed, whom he has discarded in favour of Sidea:

Alas, I have just learned that Engelbrecht has already plighted his troth to Sidea, the fairest of maidens, the daughter of the Prince of Wiltau. Woe's me, if that is really true, the very first thing that she'll do will be to contest my betrothal, and I shall come off second best, and then remain the jeer and sneer of rich and poor both far and near. Woe's me, of this had I been ware, they'd not have caught me in this snare. The Prince I know will make it good. *He has promised silver, hill, and mountain.* If I do not miss it that way, perhaps I may come off pretty well. But now I'll retire to my chamber.¹

Now it is very strange that in this otherwise intelligible speech one sentence, 'He has promised silver, hill, and mountain', just does not yield

¹ I quote this speech as given in the Furness Variorum edition of *The Tempest*. Furness gives a prose rendering, but the presence of rhyming jingles in the above passage and elsewhere suggests that he was forced to abandon an original intention to translate into verse.

sense. It is quite ludicrous to suppose that Shakespeare batted on two substantives in a German play, turned them into English, and used them as names for his spirit hounds. He had used 'Silver' for that purpose long before in *The Taming of the Shrew*, and it is likely that both names were in general currency among hunting folk. A much more reasonable inference is that Ayler heard these names in the English play, failed to grasp their significance, but reproduced them, nevertheless, at a vaguely appropriate point in his paltry little comedy. In other words, there is just this scrap of evidence to suggest that *Die schöne Sidea* was based on an English original. And this is not unlikely, for the title-page of Ayler's *Opus Theatricum* explicitly states that many of its sixty-six pieces are translations or adaptations, and since they include a version of *The Spanish Tragedy* and also what may be an adaptation of *Much Ado About Nothing*, it seems that Ayler borrowed the plots of certain English plays that he saw performed by strolling players in Germany. Since, however, Ayler died in 1605, he cannot have derived *Die schöne Sidea* from the Folio *Tempest*. We must conclude then that, if he was indebted to an English original, it was to some earlier play written, probably in the fifteen-nineties, by Shakespeare or another.

There is no certain evidence of the existence of such a play, but Professor Dover Wilson has argued, on strictly bibliographical grounds, that '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'.¹ One can support such a view by pointing out that the predilection for dramatized fairy-tales in 1610 was not a new thing but simply a revival of an earlier taste, a taste of which Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* is, perhaps, the most fundamental representative, and one to which Shakespeare himself had made a notable contribution in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. There may have been some such play which served Ayler's purpose, and later Shakespeare's. That Shakespeare was, in fact, its author is also reasonably possible. Francis Meres credits him with a *Love's Labour's Won*, and that title would admirably cover Ferdinand's bondage and ultimate good fortune.²

This is the very froth of conjecture, and the most that can be claimed for it is that it is not wildly improbable. Yet it has the merit of furnishing an interpretation less painful and more credible than those theories which assume Shakespeare's immediate reliance on Ayler. I suggest that some play of the fifteen-nineties served the several purposes of Ayler, Eslava, and Shakespeare. It may have been an early play of Shakespeare's own. Even so, it cannot be regarded as anything more than an intermediate source.

¹ *Vide* his textual analysis in *The Tempest* (New Shakespeare Edition).

² I do not press this identification. I do not think that the title would be very appropriate for any other Shakespeare comedy. But *Love's Labour's Won* suggests, first and foremost, a lost sequel to *Love's Labour's Lost*.

The ultimate source of the effectual plot of *The Tempest*, in other words, has not yet been identified.

III

In isolating the link I have dwelt on its two main incidents, the storm and the shipwreck, but this is not quite adequate. The effectual plot cannot be said actually to have begun until Ferdinand and Miranda have fallen in love with each other. This, I think, will emerge quite clearly from a direct collocation of the causal and effectual plots and a consideration of those details in the one which have to be carried over into the other in order that the denouement can be something more than just the betrothal of the two lovers. The link, then, strictly embraces the tempest, the shipwreck, the particular survival of Ferdinand and his actual meeting with Miranda, so that our search must be for a source comprehensive enough to embrace all these features.

It has long been established that Shakespeare was directly indebted to contemporary pamphlet literature dealing with the wreck of Sir George Somers's fleet off the coast of the Bermudas in July 1609. His borrowings from William Strachey's *Letter*, Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Bermudas*, and *The True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie of Virginia* are obvious, and he clearly found them rich mines of circumstantial detail. Yet, extensive though his debts are, there is really nothing to suggest that these pamphlets were Shakespeare's narrative sources. Editors have, from time to time, allowed themselves to be betrayed into a false position. Thus the Arden editor informs us:

. . . but not a little was supplied by the topics of the time, the stirring events of a year, colonisation, and the disaster to the Virginia fleet of 1609, these suggested the title of the poet's drama; they furnished him with his island, his atmosphere of magic, his Caliban; and . . . the Masque was introduced chiefly in order to perfect the supernatural tone of the whole work.

To the same contemporary sources we may trace such particulars as the isolation of the king's ship, the storm, the shipwreck, and, in fact, almost all its strange accompanying incidents.¹

This is desperate. Are we really to accept the naïve assumption that Shakespeare read his pamphlets and then, inspired by one of Nature's commonplaces, a storm at sea, added a delightful but rather incongruous fairy-tale to it and called the amalgam *The Tempest*? Surely he did not need an actual shipwreck and its concomitant pamphlets to tell him that vessels sometimes come to grief in squally weather. Indeed, he seems to have had something of the kind in mind in *Pericles* and *A Winter's Tale*, where storm and shipwreck find a place without any topical prompting.

¹ *The Tempest* (Arden Edition), ed. Morton Luce, p. xii.

Nor need the fact that the last of his tempests is so much more spectacular than its predecessors lead us to suppose that it had radically different origins. Shakespeare, with all the technical amenities of the indoor stage at his disposal, merely reverts in *The Tempest* to a device that had been elaborately employed in 1583, when William Gager's *Dido* was presented for the delectation of the Prince Palatine of Siradia. Prospero's island derives, I think, from Thomas's *Historie* and the causal plot. Sicily, and not Bermuda, is its dam. And since the carrying through of the effectual plot is dependent on certain characters being present on that island, it is merely logical to assume that storm and shipwreck sprang into Shakespeare's mind, with no external prompting, as one of the few eventualities that could provide for the linking of the two plots with reasonable geographical probability. What Jourdain, Strachey, and the rest contribute, they contribute incidentally, and the bulk of the play's narrative stuff can be better accounted for in other ways. Had the calamities of 1609 never occurred, there would still have been a *Tempest*, less rich, perhaps, in circumstantial detail, but otherwise very much the play that has come down to us.

We may now resume our quest for a narrative thread, the details of which have been outlined. And we do not need to search among the moth-eaten relics of Italian or Spanish romances, for the greatest poets of Greece and Rome can both supply our needs. In other words, the requisite happenings in the requisite order are to be found in the fifth and sixth books of the *Odyssey*, where Ulysses is wrecked on the coast of Phaeacia and there meets Nausicaa, and in the first book of the *Aeneid*, where Aeneas, after a like fate, encounters his mother, Venus.

It does not seem necessary to pursue the question of Shakespeare's possible debt to Homer. It is highly unlikely that he read the original, and there is no reason to suppose that he knew the *Odyssey* in translation. Chapman's version was not printed until the year of his death. The *Aeneid*, on the other hand, was accessible in many forms. The first book is included in the translations of Gavin Douglas, Phaer, and Stanyhurst. It must have served in one or other of these forms as a source-book for the various plays dealing with Dido, and the original, in fact, is followed closely in Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Elsewhere in Elizabethan literature we find renderings of isolated passages, notably in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, where the meeting of Trompart and Belpheobe is directly based on that of Aeneas and Venus.¹ We may take it for granted that Shakespeare was acquainted with most of these works. We may also, I think, take it for granted, *pace* Ben Jonson and the barren controversy for which he has been innocently responsible, that Shakespeare was familiar with a considerable

¹ *The Faerie Queene*, II. iii. 32-3.

part of the original *Aeneid*. Hamlet, we may suppose, speaks for his creator when he says, 'One speech in it I chiefly loved: 'twas Aeneas's tale to Dido'. Certainly, no other tale is alluded to so frequently in the plays.

The Tempest is a play in which we might reasonably expect to find material of classical origin. Indeed, Shakespeare's debt to Ovid, or to Golding's translation of Ovid, has long been recognized. But over and above this, the strict rules of classical comedy are preserved in a way that suggests a valedictory impulse to recapture the grace and proportion of Roman poetry. It is also worthy of note that Shakespeare introduces classical deities in the masque, and that, if we except the dubiously authentic apparition of Jupiter in *Cymbeline*, practically for the first time.¹ In themselves, these features have no special significance, but their collective import is augmented if, as I believe, the *Aeneid* stands as a narrative source and a pervasive influence.

Random observations of the commentators seem to establish that Shakespeare had the early books of the *Aeneid* in mind when he was working on *The Tempest*. It has been suggested that the spectacle in III. iii indicated by the stage direction,

Thunder and lightning. Enter ARIEL like a harpy; claps his wings upon the table; and, with a quaint device, the banquet vanishes.

is a 'translation' of *Aeneid*, iii. 225-8:

at subitae horrifico lapsu de montibus adsunt
Harpyiae et magnis quatiant clangoribus alas,
diripiuntque dapes contactuque omnia foedant
immundo; tum vox taetrum dira inter odorem.²

Part of Ceres's address to Iris (IV. i. 75-83),

Who, with thy saffron wings, upon my flowers
Diffusest honey-drops, refreshing showers;

is palpably based on *Aeneid*, iv. 700-2:

ergo Iris croceis per caelum roscida pinnis,
mille trahens varios adverso sole colores,
devolat et supra caput adstitit.³

¹ Hymen in *As You Like It*, Hecate in *Macbeth*, and Diana in *Pericles* can be cited against me. But the last two are dubiously Shakespearian, so that if these really are exceptions they are of the kind that proves the rule.

² Cf. Phaer:

But sodenly from downe the hills, with grisly fall to syght,
The Harpies come, and beating wings, with great noys out thei shright,
And at our meate they snatch.

Shakespeare was not translating Virgil, as Peck [*New Memoirs of Milton* (1740), p. 207] supposed, but he was obviously indebted to the passage. His verb 'claps' has the ring of Virgil's 'clangoribus' rather than of Phaer's 'beating'.

³ Cf. Phaer:

Dame Rainbow down therefore with saffron wings of dropping sheurs,

Finally, we have the entry of Juno (IV. i. 102),

High'st queen of state,
Great Juno, comes; I know her by her gait—

which may be Virgil's 'divum incedo regina' but more probably reproduces the expression used of Venus in *Aeneid*, i. 405, 'et vera incesso patuit dea'. Here, then, are three details which, though not strong enough to stand by themselves, are clearly favourable to the present thesis.

Shakespeare's tempest and Virgil's storm are analogous in origin and in outcome. Both are provoked by supernatural means to ensure that a certain character shall arrive at a certain requisite locality and there be brought into relation with other characters. Inevitably, both poets effect this requirement by means of shipwreck. These motives are, of course, absent from the accounts of the 1609 disaster, and I do not think that those accounts could possibly have suggested these narrative points. As sources of tributary detail they have already received mention, and their particular virtue is that they enabled Shakespeare to disguise an eminently Virgilian squall, for the salient features of the storm in the *Aeneid* are retained and elaborated in *The Tempest*:

haec ubi dicta, cavum conversa cuspide montem
impulit in latus; ac venti, velut agmine facto,
qua data porta, ruunt et terras turbine perflant.
incubere mari totumque a sedibus imis
una Eurusque Notusque ruunt creberque procellis
Africus et vastos volvunt ad litora fluctus ;
insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum.
eripiunt subito nubes caelumque diemque
Teucrorum ex oculis; ponto nox incubat atra.
intonuere poli, et crebris micat ignibus aether,
praesentemque viris intentant omnia mortem. (i. 81-91)

It would be superfluous to cite the corresponding matters in Shakespeare, but it may be worth pointing out that a disputed passage, the Boatswain's, 'Blow, till thou burst thy wind, if room enough!' may reasonably be an extension of Virgil's 'qua data porta'.

It is significant that what may be termed the execution of the storm in *The Tempest* is carried out by Ariel, who, as the spirit of air, corresponds closely to Aeolus, the ruler of winds, who, in the *Aeneid*, raises the storm

Whose face a thousand sundry hewes against the sunne deuours,
From heauen descending came.

It seems merely perverse to assume that Shakespeare took his 'saffron wings' from Phaer, since it is a more or less inevitable rendering of 'croceis . . . pinnis'. Even the tortuous Stanyhurst fails to produce anything more peculiar than 'the fayre Raynebow saffronlyke feathered'.

at the behest of Juno. A slighter parallel is afforded by the contrivers of disaster in that Virgil presents Juno as a tyrant while Shakespeare's Prospero, as all students of the character observe, has tyrannical propensities.

The respective shipwrecks supply us with parallel fact, and little more can be expected, since shipwrecks are inevitably much of a muchness at all times and in all literatures. We may note, however, that both occur in the Mediterranean, and that both result in the characters being thrown ashore in unfamiliar territory.¹ Shakespeare's island, which we can certainly attribute to his own free choice, has at least a Virgilian counterpart in 'insula portum effecit obiectu laterum' (i. 159-60), while the 'deep nook' in which the king's ship lies hid corresponds to 'est in secessu longo locus' (i. 159). Shakespeare's topography may, I think, owe something to

tum silvis scaena coruscis
desuper, horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbra;
fronte sub adversa scopulis pendentibus antrum,
intus aquae dulces vivoque sedilia saxo,
Nympharum domus. (i. 164-8)

Fresh springs are among 'the qualities o' th' isle' in *The Tempest*, and there is a specific allusion to the nymphs when Prospero commands Ariel, 'Go make thyself like a nymph o' the sea' (i. ii. 301). This metamorphosis must, indeed, be the result of some external, and presumably literary, prompting, for, as the Arden editor reminds us, 'The question is, why should Ariel assume this new shape if he is to be invisible?'² Probably, I think, because Shakespeare, following a hint from Virgil, allows spectacle a free rein.

We learn, in due course, that the mariners in *The Tempest* have, after all, escaped drowning. Thus Prospero:

there is no soul—
No, not so much perdition as an hair
Betid to any creature in the vessel
Which thou heard'st cry, which thou saw'st sink. (i. ii. 29-32)

Thus Ariel:

Safely in harbour
Is the king's ship; in the deep nook, where once
Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew
From the still-vex'd Bermoothes, there she's hid:
The mariners all under hatches stow'd. (i. ii. 226-30)

¹ *Teste* Gonzalo (ii. i. 75 ff.) the sea-routes are almost identical.

² *Op. cit.*, note to i. ii. 302.

And thus the Boatswain:

The best news is, that we have safely found
 Our king and company; the next, our ship—
 Which, but three glasses since, we gave out split—
 Is tight and yare and bravely rigg'd, as when
 We first put out to sea. (v. i. 221–5)

The supernatural preservation of the mariners and rescue of the ships has, as Tucker Brooke noted, a strong Virgilian parallel.¹ In the *Aeneid* Venus assures Aeneas that both men and ships are safe:

namque tibi reduces socios classemque relatum
 nuntio et in tutum versis Aquilonibus actam. (i. 390–1)
 haud aliter puppesque tuae pubesque tuorum
 aut portum tenet aut pleno subit ostia velo. (i. 399–400)

This temporary loss of ships and companions serves, in *The Tempest*, to isolate Ferdinand so that his meeting with Miranda can be effected. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas is never left completely alone, but has Achates with him in the corresponding situation, his encounter with Dido. In view of the exigencies of Shakespeare's plot it would be unsafe to seek any parallel here. We are, in fact, at the point where Shakespeare boldly refashions Virgil's narrative so that it conforms to the requirements of his effectual plot. Once Ferdinand and Miranda have met, the *Aeneid* ceases to be a major shaping force and is, in consequence, gradually replaced by that independent narrative that we have termed the effectual plot. The dissociation is achieved not by a drastic break but by a transference, a change of emphasis that admits a piece of dovetailing of incomparable beauty and delicacy.

Ferdinand has been Shakespeare's Aeneas throughout this early part of the play and we might, therefore, expect the mantle of Dido to fall on Miranda. But this is clearly impossible, for Shakespeare has not set out with the intention of dramatizing Dido's story. Ferdinand, like Aeneas, will eventually sail from the island for ever, but he will not leave Miranda behind to consign herself to the flames. It would be dangerous, therefore, for Miranda even to hint of Dido, and Shakespeare makes sure that she does not do so by taking for his lovers' meeting, not Aeneas's encounter with Dido, but his earlier meeting with his mother, Venus.

When first we meet Miranda, we find her reproaching her father for having raised the tempest and pleading with him to mitigate its effects. The *Aeneid* supplies a valid analogy when Venus makes a similar representation to her father, Jupiter (i. 229–53). Both parents are alike in their assurances: no irremediable harm has been done and the consequences will be entirely favourable.

¹ Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke; note to I. i. 235–7.

The first meeting of Ferdinand and Miranda is, I think, the most obviously Virgilian feature of the play. Miranda, here, is chastity personified, so that she has from the outset some rough approximation to Venus who appears to Aeneas 'virginis os habitumque gerens et virginis arma' (i. 315). Ferdinand gazes on her with admiration and astonishment:

Most sure, the goddess
 On whom these airs attend! Vouchsafe my prayer
 May know if you remain upon this island;
 And that you will some good instruction give
 How I may bear me here: my prime request,
 Which I do last pronounce, is, O you wonder!
 If you be maid or no? (i. ii. 421-7)

Beside this we may place Aeneas's,

o—quam te memorem, virgo? namque haud tibi vultus
 mortalis, nec vox hominem sonat; o dea certe!—
 an Phoebi soror? an Nympharum sanguinis una?—
 sis felix nostrumque leves, quaecumque, laborem,
 et quo sub caelo tandem, quibus orbis in oris
 iactemur, doceas; ignari hominumque locorumque
 erramus, vento huc vastis et fluctibus acti:
 multa tibi ante aras nostra cadet hostia dextra. (i. 327-34)

Farmer, to whom Shakespeare's small Latin and less Greek meant nothing of either, affords the comment, 'It seems that Shakespeare, in *The Tempest*, hath been suspected of translating some expressions of Virgil; witness the *O Dea certe*.' His arguments to the contrary have no substance, however. We may grant that Stanyhurst, in his quaint fashion, rendered 'o dea certe' as 'No doubt, a goddesse', and we may also grant that Ferdinand has already decided that 'these airs' are 'no mortal business', that this music 'waits upon some god o' th' island', but the fact remains that 'most sure, the goddess' is precisely 'o dea certe'. Moreover, the last three lines of Ferdinand's speech, if correctly interpreted, amount simply to this:

o—quam te memorem, virgo?¹

His request for 'some good instruction', though not verbally parallel, is neither more nor less than

et quo sub caelo tandem, quibus orbis in oris
 iactemur, doceas.

¹ The final half-line of Ferdinand's speech is given in F1 as: 'If you be Mayd, or no?' The F2 reading 'made' has little authority and less reason, though it recommended itself to a long line of editors. But F1 reading does not mean, 'Are you, or are you not, virgo intacta?' Ferdinand would hardly ask such an intimate question at this very early stage. He leads up to it in i. ii. 447-9, though these lines may be an aside. The sense required for line 427 is, 'Are you mortal maid or goddess?'

Admittedly Shakespeare paraphrases and omits, but, since he is not specifically engaged on a translation of the *Aeneid*, this is not remarkable. Indeed, Miranda's comment on Ferdinand,

I might call him
A thing divine; for nothing natural
I ever saw so noble— (i. ii. 417-9)

looks as if it, too, derives from Aeneas's speech. Her answer to Ferdinand's question,

No wonder, sir;
But certainly a maid—

may, on the other hand, represent Venus's reply to Aeneas,

haud equidem tali me dignor honore. (i. 335)

At this point in the play the effectual plot begins and, in consequence, the *Aeneid* ceases to be a shaping force. It remains, however, as a minor but pervasive influence. It may well be that the comic dialogue about 'Widow Dido' (II. i. 73-101) is a deliberate device to detach the rest of *The Tempest* from the Virgilian theme. There seems to be no reason why Shakespeare should make Gonzalo confound Claribel's Tunis in Dido's Carthage unless it is to maintain, for the moment, the link with the *Aeneid*. Gonzalo's designation, 'Widow Dido', is challenged by his companions, but it has the authority of Virgil, who tells how, through the murder of Sychaeus by Pygmalion, Dido became a widow (i. 343-52). It may be noted, as indicative of Shakespeare's source, that there is no mention of all this in Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.

For the rest, it is only possible to isolate sporadic features that may have been suggested by the *Aeneid*. The idea of Gonzalo's ideal commonwealth may have originated from Virgil's description of Carthage (i. 418-40), though its matter comes, of course, directly from Montaigne. The banquet in Dido's royal house (i. 637-42) may account for the shadow banquet, which serves no real dramatic purpose, at III. iii. 19. Prospero's famous lines on dissolution (IV. i. 146-58) may owe something to Carthage which, in Virgil's account, has its towers (i. 420), its temples (i. 446 ff.), and its palace (i. 631).¹ It is in the temple of Juno that Aeneas sees depicted the tale of Troy, an 'insubstantial pageant', as Virgil tells us:

sic ait, atque animum pictura pascit inani
multa gemens. (i. 464-5)

¹ The Earl of Sterling's *Tragedie of Darius* (1603) affords, on the whole, a likelier source. It is wiser, however, to attribute the whole speech to 'negative capability' rather than to immediate sources.

Finally, when Alonso sets eyes on Miranda and asks Ferdinand,

Is she the goddess that hath sever'd us,
And brought us thus together? (v. i. 187-8)

there is, perhaps, a stray recollection of Juno's changing purpose to which Jupiter, in the *Aeneid*, makes reference:

quin aspera Iuno,
quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat,
consilia in melius referet. (i. 279-81)

I suggest, then, that *The Tempest* is an amalgam of three narrative sources combined by Shakespeare with the utmost perfection of his art. He set out, in the first place, with an older play or romance covering the adventures on the island, and then elected to lend those adventures a heightened purpose by developing the theme of the earlier wrong done to Prospero. For this he found another source, which may, as we have seen, have been Thomas's *Historie*. Finally, he unified these two plots by adapting a familiar and favourite tale to serve as a link. I will leave it for others to judge whether this is a credible analysis. Pending correction, I feel that it is less wrong than the view which holds that the play blossomed from the barren soil of German melodrama and topical pamphlet. These, Montaigne, and the rest will account for this and for that, but they will not account for the two hours' traffic of dramatic concord that Shakespeare, after due consideration, entitled *The Tempest*.