

DAVID KATHMAN'S FALSE PARALLELS BETWEEN THE STRACHEY LETTER,
THE JOURDAIN ACCOUNT, THE ANONYMOUS TRUE DECLARATION AND
SHAKESPEARE'S 'THE TEMPEST'

There are fifty-three alleged parallels in David Kathman's essay *Dating The Tempest*, which has been available for several years on the internet at:

<http://shakespeareauthorship.com/tempest.html>

Each and every one of these is a false parallel, as demonstrated in the analysis below.

There are thus **no true parallels** between the Strachey letter, the Jourdain account, and the anonymous *True Declaration*, and Shakespeare's play, *The Tempest*. Not one. They are as much a mirage as the pageant described in Prospero's speech in *The Tempest*:

*These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. (4.1.148-156)*

When subjected to analysis, David Kathman's false parallels all melt into thin air. They are insubstantial and baseless. They dissolve and fade, leaving 'not a rack behind'.

I. Significant differences between the Strachey letter and The Tempest

Very few readers of David Kathman's essay have read the Strachey letter, the Jourdain account, and the anonymous *True Declaration*. Had they done so, they would long since have noticed the significant differences between these works and *The Tempest*. The differences are so striking that they constitute a prima facie case in themselves for supposing that Shakespeare never saw either the Strachey or Jourdain accounts or the *True Declaration*.

For example, Prospero's island is a single island, whereas Strachey tells us that Bermuda is a whole group of islands:

We found it to be the dangerous and dreaded island, or rather islands, of the Bermuda
(Wright, p. 16)

The Bermudas be broken islands, five hundred of them in manner of an archipelago (at least if you may call them all islands that lie, how little soever, into the sea and by themselves) of small compass, some larger than other, as time and the sea hath won from them and eaten his passage through; and all now lying in the figure of a croissant, within the circuit of six or seven leagues at the most. (Wright, p. 17)

This crescent-shaped group of five hundred islands, large and small, is significantly different from the single isolated island in *The Tempest*. Would Shakespeare have used a tract mentioning a group of five hundred islands as a source for a play about a single isolated island?

Similarly, the flora and fauna in Bermuda as described by Strachey and Jourdain are markedly different from the flora and fauna mentioned by Shakespeare in *The Tempest*. Would Shakespeare have used tracts discussing such unusual plants, animals, fish, and birds as simerons or wild palms, palmettos, prickled pears, mulberries, wild hogs, silkworms, angel-fish, bonitos, sting rays, whales, sharks, swordfish, cormorants, and birds which lived in holes in the ground as sources for a play in which he mentions none of these species?

Perhaps most importantly, there is a vast difference between the circumstances of the wreck of the Sea Venture as described in the Strachey letter and the Jourdain account, and the wreck of the ship in *The Tempest*. The Sea Venture sprang a huge leak which filled the ship with water five feet deep, requiring constant bailing for three days and four nights. The ship was not under sail, and was merely wallowing in the storm-tossed ocean until land was sighted on the fourth day and the sailors deliberately ran it aground in Bermuda, where it wedged itself between two rocks, giving the sailors an opportunity to break out the small boats and row everyone aboard, as well as some provisions and equipment, safely to shore. In contrast, as Lord Mulgrave has shown (see below), the ship in *The Tempest* is under sail attempting to round a point of land when it hits a rock and is 'dashed all to pieces'. At the same time, Ariel creates a magic phenomenon on the ship which is so terrifying that all the passengers jump into the sea and swim for their lives. There is absolutely nothing in common between the two accounts. They are strikingly different and unique in their respective details. It is impossible that Shakespeare could have used the one as a 'source' for the other.

There is also a significant difference between the plots described by Strachey and Jourdain in Bermuda, and the plots in *The Tempest*. The survivors in Bermuda were split by dissension from the outset because some of the survivors immediately began building ships to enable everyone to sail on to their original destination, the Jamestown colony, but many of the others preferred to remain in Bermuda, where there was a pleasant climate, plenty of food, and relative independence. All three plots in Bermuda centered around schemes by some of the survivors to remain on the island. These schemes pitted one group of survivors of the shipwreck against the rest of the group, and were non-violent in nature, apart from some vague remarks made by Strachey about possible violence in connection with the third such plot (see below). In *The Tempest*, none of the survivors wishes to remain on the island, and the plots which are hatched are of an

entirely different order. They involve the premeditated murder of two individuals, King Alonso and Prospero, and are motivated by greed and malice. Again, the scenarios are so different that it is impossible that one could have been the source of the other.

II. The nature of David Kathman's false parallels

David Kathman fails to inform the reader of the existence of all these broad and highly significant differences between the Strachey letter, the Jourdain account, the *True Declaration* and *The Tempest*, and focuses instead on drawing misleading comparisons based on insignificant details. In pursuing this strategy, David Kathman resorts to absurdities such as claiming that a single mention of something as common as toads establishes that one work was the source of the other. Thus, since Strachey mentions toads and Shakespeare mentions toads, David Kathman contends that the Strachey letter must have been a source of *The Tempest* even though toads are mentioned in the Strachey letter as a species *not* found in Bermuda, and in *The Tempest* as one of the charms of the witch Sycorax, so that there is no correspondence whatsoever between the two usages. This approach, i.e. drawing attention to a single mention of something, is a legitimate one when the thing in question is unique. An example is the name of the Patagonian god Setebos, which is found in Antonio Pigafetta's narration of Magellan's voyage. When Shakespeare mentions the god Setebos in *The Tempest*, it can logically be assumed that Pigafetta was Shakespeare's ultimate source. However David Kathman never provides an example of this kind. His alleged parallels involve mention of such common creatures as owls, sparrows, bats, beetles, and toads, or common trees such as cedar and oak. When such common flora and fauna are mentioned in two different works, it is illogical to contend, as David Kathman does, that one work was the source of the other, particularly when Strachey refers to these plants and animals in a strictly literal sense while Shakespeare uses them imaginatively in songs and classical allusions and as magic charms.

In addition to drawing false parallels based on the mention of things which are very common, David Kathman bases some false parallels in *Dating The Tempest* on inaccurate statements of fact, as when he falsely implies that the cutting down of a mast occurs in *The Tempest*, or when he falsely states that there is a 'lengthy passage' in the Strachey letter about 'a bird called the seamew', or that all the ships with the exception of the Sea Venture reunited after the storm and sailed on together to Jamestown, or that the survivors of the shipwrecks on Bermuda and in *The Tempest* 'split up into two groups'.

Other false parallels in *Dating The Tempest* result from David Kathman's misleadingly selective or truncated quotations from the Strachey letter, as when he emphasizes the line in *The Tempest* in which the King's ship is said to be 'safely in harbour', yet fails to quote sufficient text from either the Strachey letter or the Jourdain account to demonstrate that there was *no harbour* or place to anchor where the Sea Venture was run aground.

Still other false parallels involve *differences* between the Strachey and Jourdain accounts and *The Tempest* which David Kathman falsely presents as parallels, as when Strachey speaks of butts of beer which were *staved in* and Stephano speaks of a butt of sack which was *not staved in*, and Jourdain speaks of provisions which were *not* drenched with sea-water and Gonzalo speaks of clothing which *was* drenched with sea-water.

A handful of other false parallels involves comparisons of vocabulary in which David Kathman fails to differentiate between Strachey's use of one part of speech where Shakespeare uses a different part of speech (for example, 'glut'), between Strachey's use of one word where Shakespeare uses a different word (for example, 'bosk' and 'bosky'), between Strachey's use of a word in one sense where Shakespeare uses it in a different sense ('trim'), or between Strachey's literal use of a word where Shakespeare uses it figuratively ('bear up'). At the same time as he concentrates on this misleading handful of vocabulary comparisons, David Kathman ignores the fact that *The Tempest* contains a wealth of rich and varied vocabulary, none of which derives from either the Strachey letter, the Jourdain account, or the *True Declaration*.

III. Oxford as author of *The Tempest*

As he indicates in his essay, David Kathman's false parallels are all designed to establish that the Strachey and Jourdain accounts and the *True Declaration* were sources of *The Tempest*, and that since Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, had been dead for six years when these tracts were written, Oxford could not have written *The Tempest*. As the analysis below demonstrates, David Kathman is wrong. Oxford *could* have written *The Tempest* because it is clear that the Strachey and Jourdain accounts and the *True Declaration* were *not* sources of *The Tempest*. Shakespeare neither read the three tracts nor made use of them in any way in writing *The Tempest*.

IV. Analysis of the fifty-three individual parallels

All fifty-three of the alleged parallels are analyzed below in the order in which they occur in David Kathman's essay *Dating The Tempest*, and in each case the alleged parallel is demonstrated to be false. The analysis is lengthy because it has been necessary to quote extensively from Louis B. Wright's edition of the Strachey letter and Joseph Quincy Adams' edition of the Jourdain account since David Kathman's false parallels depend in large part on the reader's lack of awareness of what Strachey and Jourdain actually said.

(1) David Kathman writes:

The "Sea-Venture" was one of a fleet of nine ships which set out in 1609 to strengthen the English colony in Virginia; it carried Gates, the newly appointed Governor of Virginia, and his entourage. A storm separated the Sea-Venture from the other ships, and the rest of the fleet continued on safely to Virginia, assuming that Gates had drowned.

(2) David Kathman writes:

Strachey describes the storm as "roaring" and "beat[ing] all light from heaven; which like an hell of darknesse turned blacke upon us . . . The sea swelled above the clouds, which gave battel unto heaven" (6-7).

In The Tempest, Miranda describes the waters as being in a "roar," and says that "The sky it seems would pour down stinking pitch, / But that the Sea, mounting to th' welkins cheek, / Dashes the fire out." (1.2.1-5)

Here is a fuller version of the first of David Kathman's quotations from Strachey above:

We had followed this course so long as now we were within seven or eight days at the most, by Captain Newport's reckoning, of making Cape Henry upon the coast of Virginia, when on St. James his day, July 24, being Monday (preparing for no less all the black night before), the clouds gathering thick upon us and the winds singing and whistling most unusually (which made us to cast off our pinnace, towing the same until then astern), a dreadful storm and hideous began to blow from out the northeast, which, swelling and roaring as it were by fits, some hours with more violence than others, at length did beat all light from Heaven; which like an hell of darkness, turned black upon us, so much the more fuller of horrors as in such cases horror and fear use to overrun the troubled and overmastered senses of all, which taken up with amazement, the ears lay so sensible to the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds and distraction of our company as who was most armed and best prepared was not a little shaken. (Wright, p. 4)

Here is a fuller version of the second of David Kathman's quotations from Strachey above, which occurs several pages after the first:

Our sails lay wound up without their use, and if at any time we bore but a hullock, or half forecourse, to guide her before the sea, six and sometimes eight men were not enough to hold the whipstaff in the steerage and the tiller below in the gunner room: by which may be imagined the strength of the storm, in which the sea swelled above the clouds and gave battle unto Heaven. (Wright, pp. 6-7)

The full quotation from Shakespeare mentioned by David Kathman is as follows:

*MIRANDA If by your art, my dearest father, you have
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.
The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
But that the sea, mounting to the welkin's cheek,
Dashes the fire out. O, I have suffered
With those that I saw suffer: a brave vessel,
Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her,
Dash'd all to pieces. O, the cry did knock*

*Against my very heart. Poor souls, they perish'd.
Had I been any god of power, I would
Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere
It should the good ship so have swallow'd and
The fraughting souls within her. (1.2.1-13)*

Strachey's comments relate almost exclusively to the wind, about which Miranda says nothing. Strachey speaks of a dreadful and hideous storm beginning to 'blow', of the wind 'whistling and singing' and 'swelling and roaring as it were by fits', of the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds', of eight men not being able to hold the whipstaff and tiller because of the force of the wind. Conversely, while Miranda mentions the roar of the waters, Strachey does not. In addition, Strachey speaks of total darkness ('a hell of darkness'), whereas Miranda speaks of the waves dashing the 'fire' out. It's not entirely clear what the fire is (perhaps sheet lightning?), but whatever it is, the mention of it indicates that in the storm in *The Tempest* the sky is not totally black, as it is in the Strachey letter.

David Kathman's false parallels can thus be analyzed as follows:

A storm involving winds of exceptionally violent force.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Mention of total darkness during the storm.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(3) David Kathman writes:

*Strachey says that "Our clamours dround in the windes, and the windes in thunder.
Prayers might well be in the heart and lips, but drowned in the outcries of the officers"
(7);*

*in the play the boatswain says, "A plague upon this howling; they are louder than the
weather, or our office" (1.1.36-7), and a few lines later the mariners cry, "To prayers! To
prayers!" (1.1.51).*

joint almost having spewed out her oakum before we were aware (a casualty more desperate than any other that a voyage by sea draweth with it), was grown five foot suddenly deep with water above her ballast, and we almost drowned within whilst we sat looking when to perish from above. (Wright, p. 8)

Our governor, upon the Tuesday morning (at what time, by such who had been below in the hold, the leak was first discovered) had caused the whole company, about 140, besides women, to be equally divided into three parts and, opening the ship in three places (under the forecastle, in the waist and hard by the bittacle) appointed each man where to attend; and thereunto every man came duly upon his watch, took the bucket or pump for one hour, and rested another. Then men might be seen to labour I may well say, for life; and the better sort, even our governor, and admiral themselves, not refusing their turn, and to spell each the other, to give example to other. (Wright, p. 10)

And surely, madam, it is most true, there was not any hour (a matter of admiration) all these days in which we freed not twelve hundred barricos of water, the least whereof contained six gallons, and some eight; beside three deep pumps continually going, two beneath at the capstan and the other above in the half deck, and at each pump four thousand strokes at the least in a watch. So as I may well say, every four hours we quitted one hundred tons of water. And from Tuesday noon till Friday noon we bailed and pumped two thousand ton; and yet, do what we could, when our ship held least in her (after Tuesday night second watch), she bore ten foot deep; at which stay our extreme working kept her one eight glasses, forbearance whereof had instantly sunk us. (Wright, pp. 14-15)

Jourdain's account contains similar information about the desperate nature of the leak:

[W]e were taken with a most sharp and cruel storm upon the five and twentieth day of July, anno 1609, which did not only separate us from the residue of our fleet (which were eight in number), but with the violent working of the seas our ship became so shaken, torn, and leaked, that she received so much water as covered two tier of hogsheads above the ballast, that our men stood up to the middles with buckets, barricos, and kettles to bail out the water, and continually pumped for three days and three nights together without any intermission, and yet the water seemed rather to increase than to diminish, insomuch that all our men, being utterly spent, tired, and disabled for longer labour, were even resolved, without any hope of their lives, to shut up the hatches and to have committed themselves to the mercy of the sea (which is said to be merciless) or rather to the mercy of their mighty God and Redeemer (whose mercies exceed all His works), seeing no help nor hope in the apprehension of man's reason that any mother's child could escape that inevitable danger which every man had proposed and digested to himself of present sinking. (Adams, pp. 4-5)

Given this situation, what an anticlimax it would have been if Shakespeare really had read the Strachey and Jourdain accounts with their descriptions of passengers and crew toiling three days and four nights desperately trying to bail out water which was five feet deep in the ship and had said to himself, Let's see, I could include that in my new play,

mainmast

The principal mast in a ship.

1611 Shakes. Wint. T. iii. iii. 94 *The Shippe boaring the Moone with her maine Mast.*

topmast

A smaller mast fixed on the top of a lower mast; spec. the second section of a mast above the deck, which was formerly the uppermost mast, but is now surmounted by the topgallant mast.

1610 Shakes. Temp. i. i. 37 *Downe with the top-Mast: yare, lower, lower, bring her to Try with Maine-course.*

The mention of the lowering of the topmast in *The Tempest* is an example of Shakespeare's specialized knowledge of seamanship and navigation. An older edition of Shakespeare's plays says of Act I, Scene 1 of *The Tempest*:

The following observations on the maritime technicalities in this scene are extracted from an article by Lord Mulgrave, which will be found at length in Boswell's Variorum edition of Shakespeare, 1821:

The first scene of The Tempest is a very striking instance of the great accuracy of Shakspeare's knowledge in a professional science, the most difficult to attain without the help of experience. He must have acquired it by conversation with some of the most skilful seamen of that time. No books had then been published on the subject.

The succession of events is strictly observed in the natural progress of the distress described; the expedients adopted are the most proper that could have been devised for a chance of safety: and it is neither to the want of skill of the seamen, or the bad qualities of the ship, but solely to the power of Prospero, that the shipwreck is to be attributed.

The words of command are not only strictly proper, but are only such as point the object to be attained, and no superfluous ones of detail. Shakespeare's ship was too well manned to make it necessary to tell the seamen how they were to do it, as well as what they were to do.

He has shown a knowledge of the new improvements, as well as the doubtful points of seamanship; one of the latter he has introduced, under the only circumstance in which it was indisputable.

The events certainly follow too near one another for the strict time of representation: but perhaps, if the whole length of the play was divided by the time allowed by the critics, the portion allotted to this scene might not be too little for the whole. But he has taken care to make intervals between the different operations by exits.

1st Position

Fall to 't yarely, or we run ourselves aground.

[Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the nautical meaning of Shakespeare's words:]

Land discovered under the lee; the wind blowing too fresh to hawl upon a wind with the topsail set. -- Yare is an old sea-term for briskly, in use at that time.

2d Position.

Yare, yare! Take in the top-sail! Blow, till thou burst thy wind, if room enough!

[Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the nautical meaning of Shakespeare's words:]

The topsail is taken in. -- 'Blow till thou burst thy wind, if room enough.' The danger in a good sea-boat, is only from being too near the land; this is introduced here to account for the next order.

3d Position.

Down with the topmast! Yare; lower, lower! Bring her to try with the main-course!

[Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the nautical meaning of Shakespeare's words:]

The gale encreasing, the topmast is struck, to take the weight from aloft, make the ship drive less to leeward, and bear the mainsail under which the ship is laid-to.

4th Position.

Lay her a-hold, a-hold! set her two courses! off to sea again; lay her off!

[Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the nautical meaning of Shakespeare's words:]

The ship, having driven near the shore, the mainsail is hawled up; the ship wore, and the two courses set on the other tack, to endeavour to clear the land that way.

5th Position.

We split! we split!

[Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the nautical meaning of Shakespeare's words:]

The ship, not able to weather a point, is driven on shore.

Lord Mulgrave obviously knew what he was talking about, but more to the point, the author of *The Tempest* knew what he was talking about. Oxford had some knowledge of seamanship. He crossed the Channel several times, and sustained an injury while he was aboard a Venetian galley.

A note is added to the section on the striking of the top-mast:

The striking the top masts was a new invention in Shakspeare's time, which he here very properly introduces. Sir Henry Manwaring says, 'It is not yet agreed amongst all seamen whether it is better for a ship to hull with her topmast up or down'. In the Postscript to the Seamen's dictionary, he afterwards gives his own opinion: 'If you have sea-room, it is never good to strike the topmast.' Shakspeare has placed his ship in the situation in which it was indisputably right to strike the topmast, when he had not sea-room. (p.1573)

Boswell's Variorum edition of Shakespeare of 1821 is obviously something which should be consulted in any discussion of the real sources of *The Tempest* since it contains Lord Mulgrave's remarks in full, and no other expert appears to have addressed this point.

The nautical manoeuvres described in this scene in *The Tempest* are completely different from those described in the Strachey and Jourdain accounts. Strachey writes that when land was sighted, the Sea Venture, which was not under sail, was deliberately run aground because there was no place to anchor:

Indeed the morning, now three quarters spent, had won a little clearness from the days before, and it being better surveyed, the very trees were seen to move with the wind upon the shoreside; whereupon our governor commanded the helm-man to bear up. The boatswain, sounding, at the first found it thirteen fathom, and when we stood a little in, seven fathom; and presently, heaving his lead the third time, had ground at four fathom; and by this we had got her within a mile under the southeast point of the land, where we had somewhat smooth water. But having no hope to save her by coming to an anchor in the same, we were enforced to run her ashore as near the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shore; and by the mercy of God unto us, making out our boats, we had ere night brought all our men, women, and children, about the number of 150, safe into the island. (Wright, pp. 15-6)

Jourdain describes the same events, adding that when the ship was deliberately run aground, it lodged safely between two rocks:

[M]ost wishedly happily descried land, whereupon he most comfortably encouraged the company to follow their pumping, and by no means to cease bailing out of the water with their buckets, barricos, and kettles whereby they were so overwearied, and their spirits so spent with long fasting and continuance of their labour, that for the most part they were fallen asleep in corners and wheresoever they chanced first to sit or lie, but hearing news of land, wherewith they grew to be somewhat revived, being carried with will and desire beyond their strength, every man bustled up and gathered his strength and feeble spirits

together to perform as much as their weak force would permit him, through which weak means it pleased God to work so strongly as the water was stayed for that little time (which, as we all much feared, was the last period of our breathing) and the ship kept from present sinking, when it pleased God to send her within half an English mile of that land that Sir George Sommers had not long before descried, which were the islands of the Bermudas. And there neither did our ship sink, but more fortunately in so great a misfortune fell in between two rocks where she was fast lodged and locked for further budging, whereby we gained not only sufficient time with the present help of our boat and skiff safely to set and convey our men ashore (where were one hundred and fifty in number) but afterwards had time and leisure to save some good part of our goods and provision which the water had not spoiled, with all the tackling of the ship and much of the iron about her, which were necessaries not a little available for the building and furnishing of a new ship and pinnace which we made there for the transporting and carrying of us to Virginia. (Adams, pp. 6-8)

When Lord Mulgrave's explanation of the scene in *The Tempest* is compared with the Strachey and Jourdain accounts, it is obvious, even to those completely inexperienced in sailing and navigation, that the nautical manoeuvres in the two cases are utterly different, the most obvious difference being that the ship in *The Tempest* is attempting to sail around a point of land when it is 'dashed all to pieces' on a rock, while the Sea Venture, not under sail, was deliberately run aground while the passengers and crew were battling a huge leak. Could any two situations be more different? The idea that the one could have been the source of the other is a patent absurdity.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Mention of cutting down the main mast.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

The following false parallels arise out of the foregoing discussion as well, and emphasize the absurdity of the contention that Shakespeare used the wreck of the Sea Venture as the inspiration for *The Tempest*:

While the passengers and crew are battling a huge leak, a ship is deliberately run aground and lodges safely between two rocks.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

While the crew is attempting to round a point of land under sail, a ship strikes a rock and is 'dashed all to pieces'.

**True for The Tempest.
Not true for the Strachey letter.
Ergo: a false parallel.**

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(6) David Kathman writes:

Strachey says that "there was not a moment in which the sodaine splitting, or instant oversetting of the Shippe was not expected" (8);

the mariners in the play cry, "We split, we split!" (1.1.61).

This is sleight of hand on David Kathman's part. As those who have read the Strachey and Jourdain accounts know, the Sea Venture did not 'split' or 'overset', whatever might have been expected by those on board. Strachey writes:

We were enforced to run her ashore as near the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shore; and by the mercy of God unto us, making out our boats, we had ere night brought all our men, women, and children, about the number of 150, safe into the island. (Wright, pp. 15-16)

Jourdain writes:

And there neither did our ship sink, but more fortunately in so great a misfortune fell in between two rocks where she was fast lodged and locked for further budging, whereby we gained not only sufficient time with the present help of our boat and skiff safely to set and convey our men ashore (where were one hundred and fifty in number) but afterwards had time and leisure to save some good part of our goods and provision which the water had not spoiled, with all the tackling of the ship and much of the iron about her. (Adams, pp. 7-8)

In *The Tempest*, in complete contrast, the ship does split (as evidenced by the cry 'We split, we split', and by Miranda's statement that the 'brave vessel' was 'dashed all to pieces'), and everyone is thrown into the sea and has to swim for shore. Despite this, of course, through Prospero's magic the ship is afterwards lodged safely in a 'deep nook' on the island, but that later development is irrelevant to the point at issue, which is that in *The Tempest* the ship, despite the sailors' best efforts to round a point of land while under sail, hits a rock and splits and everyone is thrown into the sea, while in the Strachey letter and the Jourdain account the ship, which is not under sail and which is full of water, doesn't split at all, but is deliberately run aground by the crew and is so secure when run aground that the crew is able to bring out the small boats and row everyone on board, and a great part of the ship's tackle and provisions, to shore.

David Kathman appears never to have considered this point: how could Shakespeare have used accounts by Strachey and Jourdain in which a ship *does not split* as sources for a play in which a ship *does split*? The very idea is an absurdity.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A ship splits on a rock and is 'dashed all to pieces'.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(7) David Kathman writes:

Strachey says that "who was most armed, and best prepared, was not a little shaken" (6)

Prospero asks, "Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil / Would not infect his reason?" (1.2.207-08).

Here is a fuller quotation from Strachey:

We had followed this course so long as now we were within seven or eight days at the most, by Captain Newport's reckoning, of making Cape Henry upon the coast of Virginia, when on St. James his day, July 24, being Monday (preparing for no less all the black night before), the clouds gathering thick upon us and the winds singing and whistling most unusually (which made us to cast off our pinnace, towing the same until then astern), a dreadful storm and hideous began to blow from out the northeast, which, swelling and roaring as it were by fits, some hours with more violence than others, at length did beat all light from Heaven; which like an hell of darkness, turned black upon us, so much the more fuller of horrors as in such cases horror and fear use to overrun the troubled and overmastered senses of all, which taken up with amazement, the ears lay so sensible to the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds and distraction of our company as who was most armed and best prepared was not a little shaken. (Wright, p. 4)

Here's a fuller quotation from *The Tempest*:

*ARIEL All hail, great master! grave sir, hail! I come
To answer thy best pleasure; be't to fly,
To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
On the curl'd clouds, to thy strong bidding task
Ariel and all his quality.*

PROSPERO 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,
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,
I flamed amazement: sometime I'd divide,
And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yards and bowsprit, would I flame distinctly,
Then meet and join. Jove's lightnings, the precursors
O' the dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary
And sight-outrunning were not; the fire and cracks
Of sulphurous roaring the most mighty Neptune
Seem to besiege and make his bold waves tremble,
Yea, his dread trident shake.

PROSPERO My brave spirit!
Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil
Would not infect his reason?

ARIEL Not a soul
But felt a fever of the mad and play'd
Some tricks of desperation. All but mariners
Plunged in the foaming brine and quit the vessel,
Then all afire with me: the king's son, Ferdinand,
With hair up-staring,--then like reeds, not hair,--
Was the first man that leap'd; cried, 'Hell is empty
And all the devils are here'. (1.2.189-214)

These extended quotations demonstrate that there is no parallel. Strachey says that everyone on the Sea Venture, even those possessing great fortitude, was 'somewhat shaken' by the violence of the storm. In *The Tempest*, in contrast, the cause of fear is not the violence of the storm but rather Ariel's creation of a terrifying phenomenon on the ship akin to hell-fire. Moreover the latter does not merely 'shake' the passengers, but drives them almost to madness, so that they all plunge into the sea. The situations are so completely different as to have no points of comparison between them whatever.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A phenomenon akin to hell-fire drives the ship's passengers almost to madness, and they plunge into the sea.

**True for The Tempest.
Not true for the Strachey letter.
Ergo: a false parallel.**

and authority heartening every man unto his labour. It struck him from the place where he sat, and groveled him and all us about him on our faces, beating together with our breaths all thoughts from our bosoms else than that we were now sinking. (Wright, pp. 10-1)

By selectively quoting from a paragraph in which Gates merely offers verbal encouragement, and failing to quote from a relevant paragraph which demonstrates Gates' active leadership, David Kathman misleads the reader and encourages him to see a 'parallel' where none exists. There is no resemblance whatsoever between Sir Thomas Gates' active leadership on the Sea Venture and King Alonso's passive 'Play the men'.

Furthermore, David Kathman fails to mention the very relevant fact that in *The Tempest*, the moment King Alonso utters the words "Play the men", he is ordered below:

ALONSO *Good boatswain, have a care. Where's the master? Play the men.*

BOATSWAIN *I pray now keep below.*

ANTONIO *Where is the master, bos'n?*

BOATSWAIN *Do you not hear him? You mar our labour. Keep your cabins, you do assist the storm.* (1.1.9-14)

In other words, far from encouraging and leading the men like Sir Thomas Gates, King Alonso is told to go back to his cabin because his presence above decks is hindering the seamen in the performance of their duties. Gates undoubtedly saved the Sea Venture from sinking by organizing and personally taking part in the bailing operation. King Alonso, in contrast, is told to get out of the way because his presence on deck is marring the sailors' labour. Yet David Kathman would have us see a parallel here.

Finally, the *Riverside Shakespeare* doesn't consider King Alonso's words to be an encouragement to the men at all, but rather a direction by King Alonso to the boatswain to urge the sailors to do their work. The note to the word 'play' in this line in the *Riverside Shakespeare* reads: Play: ply, urge on(?). This seems a logical interpretation. King Alonso is not speaking to the sailors. He is speaking only to the boatswain, and it seems clear that, as the editors of the *Riverside Shakespeare* suggest, he is urging the boatswain to urge on the men, not doing it himself. Once again, David Kathman fails to draw attention to relevant facts which would make it evident that his alleged parallel does not exist.

In summary, although Strachey demonstrates that Gates was an effective and well-accepted leader, as soon as King Alonso appears on deck with his remark 'play the men', the boatswain tells him he is in the way and should get below immediately. The idea that Shakespeare would have used the one as an inspiration for the other is nonsense.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A leader displays effective organizational skills and encourages his men by example.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(9) David Kathman writes:

Strachey has a description of St. Elmo's fire that corresponds in many particulars to Ariel's description of his magical boarding of the King's ship. Strachey: "Sir George Somers . . . had an apparition of a little round light, like a faint Starre, trembling, and streaming along with a sparkeling blaze, halfe the height upon the Maine Mast, and shooting sometimes from Shroud to Shroud, tempting to settle as it were upon any of the foure Shrouds . . . running sometimes along the Maine-yard to the very end, and then returning . . . but upon a sodaine, towards the morning watch, they lost the sight of it, and knew not which way it made . . . Could it have served us now miraculously to have taken our height by, it might have strucken amazement" (11-12).

*ARIEL I boarded the King's ship; now on the beak,
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,
I flam'd amazement. Sometimes I'ld divide,
And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yards and boresprit, would I flame distinctly,
Then meet and join. Jove's lightning, the precursors
O' th' dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary
And sight-outrunning were not; (1.2.196-203)*

David Kathman is to be commended for accuracy here in that he doesn't claim that what occurred on the ship in *The Tempest* was St. Elmo's fire. He terms it 'Ariel's description of his magical boarding of the King's ship'. In that respect, David Kathman is right. Despite the popular misconception that Shakespeare describes St. Elmo's fire in *The Tempest*, it clearly is not St. Elmo's fire, which has never been described in this way. It is a magical effect created by Ariel to terrify everyone on the ship. And it succeeds.

In order to appreciate this, it is necessary to quote the entire passage, not merely the lines quoted by David Kathman.

*ARIEL To every article.
I boarded the king's ship; now on the beak,
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,
I flamed amazement: sometime I'ld divide,*

*And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yards and bowsprit, would I flame distinctly,
Then meet and join. Jove's lightnings, the precursors
O' the dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary
And sight-outrunning were not; the fire and cracks
Of sulphurous roaring the most mighty Neptune
Seem to besiege and make his bold waves tremble,
Yea, his dread trident shake. (1.2.195-205)*

In other words, Ariel's 'flaming' all over the ship is more like lightning than St. Elmo's fire, but it is not merely lightning. It is accompanied by loud noise and an odious smell ('the fire and cracks of sulphurous roaring'). These 'cracks of sulphurous roaring' are so terrible as to put the ocean in fear ('most mighty Neptune/ Seem to besiege and make his bold waves tremble./ Yea, [make] his dread trident [to] shake'). In other words, the fearful nature of Ariel's apparition on the ship is worse than the storm itself.

This is not, even to the most overactive imagination, St. Elmo's fire. The alleged parallel which is so often claimed between the St. Elmo's fire mentioned in the Strachey letter and the alleged St. Elmo's fire in *The Tempest* is thus a mirage.

The note in *The Riverside Shakespeare* is typical of this popular misconception:

flamed amazement. Struck terror by appearing as the flamelike phenomenon called St. Elmo's fire, the corposant. (p. 1614)

This is a patent absurdity. St. Elmo's fire is nothing at all like Ariel's magical apparition on the ship, and David Kathman is in this respect more accurate than *The Riverside Shakespeare*.

The terrifying nature of Ariel's magical apparition is reinforced in the next few lines:

*PROSPERO My brave spirit!
Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil
Would not infect his reason?*

*ARIEL Not a soul
But felt a fever of the mad, and played
Some tricks of desperation. All but mariners
Plunged in the foaming brine, and quit the vessel,
Then all afire with me; the King's son, Ferdinand,
With hair up-staring (then like reeds, not hair),
Was the first man that leapt, cried, "Hell is empty,
And all the devils are here." (1.2.206-14)*

In other words, Ariel's magical apparition on the ship is a unique phenomenon, nothing like St. Elmo's fire. It resembles hell, with flames everywhere on the ship accompanied

by a sulphurous smell and a roaring noise. It causes men to jump overboard in desperation. Could anything be more different from the St. Elmo's fire described in Strachey?

During all this time the heavens looked so black upon us that it was not possible the elevation of the Pole might be observed; nor a star by night nor sunbeam by day was to be seen. Only upon the Thursday night Sir George Somers, being upon the watch, had an apparition of a little, round light, like a faint star, trembling and streaming along with sparkling blaze, half the height upon the main mast and shooting sometimes from shroud to shroud, 'tempting to settle, as it were, upon any of the four shrouds. And for three or four hours together, or rather more, half the night, it kept with us, running sometimes along the main yard to the very end and then returning; at which Sir George Somers called divers about him and showed them the same, who observed it with much wonder and carefulness. But upon a sudden, toward the morning watch, they lost the sight of it and knew not what way it made. (Wright, pp. 12-3)

In Strachey's description, St. Elmo's fire is a gentle thing compared to Ariel's hellish apparition of flame everywhere on the ship, and there is no accompanying roaring noise or sulphurous smell.

This analysis is supported by a description of the physics underlying St. Elmo's fire.

<http://www.physics.northwestern.edu/classes/2001Fall/Phyx135-2/17/whatisstelmosfire.html>

What is St. Elmo's Fire?

St. Elmo's fire is a plasma (i.e. a hot, ionized gas) that forms around the tips of raised, pointed conductors during thunderstorms. It is known as a corona discharge or point discharge to physicists. The few people that have had the privilege of viewing an actual St. Elmo's fire have given various descriptions. It has been seen with different physical characteristics depending on the conditions of the viewing. It could be blue to bluish-white, silent to emitting a hissing sound, and ghostly to solid.

What are the conditions for its occurrence?

St. Elmo's fire occurs during thunderstorms - generally after the most severe part of the storm has passed - when the air reaches a very high voltage. These conditions are necessary to accumulate a charge large enough to create the phenomenon. It is always found attached to a grounded conductor with a sharp point; the most common are masts of sailing ships, church steeples, airplane wings or propellers, or even horns of cattle.

This description of the physics underlying St. Elmo's fire corresponds closely to the St. Elmo's fire described in the Strachey letter, but is very different from the terrifying phenomenon Ariel creates in *The Tempest*, with its lightning-like appearance and 'cracks of sulphurous roaring'. It is particularly noteworthy that in *The Tempest* Ariel's 'fire'

flames in and on the beak, waist, and deck of the ship and 'in every cabin'. All these are places which do not meet the physical conditions required for St. Elmo's fire outlined above, that is, occurrence 'around the tops of raised, pointed conductors'.

St. Elmo's fire may have given Shakespeare a spark of inspiration for the phenomenon, but what Shakespeare describes in *The Tempest* is not St. Elmo's fire. There is no parallel between the phenomenon created by Ariel in *The Tempest* and the appearance of St. Elmo's fire on the Sea Venture.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A description of St. Elmo's fire (an almost exclusively visual phenomenon which requires a grounded conductor with a sharp point) .

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(10) David Kathman writes:

Jourdain says that "all our men, being utterly spent, tyred, and disabled for longer labour, were even resolved, without any hope of their lives, to shut up the hatches" (4-5) and "were fallen asleepe in corners" (6);

Ariel describes "The mariners all under hatches stowed, / Who, with a charm joined to their suffred labor / I have left asleep" (1.2.230-32).

Here is a fuller quotation from the Jourdain account:

Being in ship called the Sea Venture with Sir Thomas Gates, our governor Sir George Sommers, and Captain Newport, three most worthy honoured gentlemen (whose valour and fortitude the world must needs take notice of, and that in most honourable designs) bound for Virginia, in the height of thirty degrees of northerly latitude or thereabouts, we were taken with a most sharp and cruel storm upon the five and twentieth day of July, anno 1609, which did not only separate us from the residue of our fleet (which were eight in number), but with the violent working of the seas our ship became so shaken, torn, and leaked, that she received so much water as covered two tier of hogsheads above the ballast, that our men stood up to the middles with buckets, barricos, and kettles to bail out the water, and continually pumped for three days and three nights together without any intermission, and yet the water seemed rather to increase than to diminish, insomuch that all our men, being utterly spent, tired, and disabled for longer labour, were even resolved, without any hope of their lives, to shut up the hatches and to have committed

themselves to the mercy of the sea (which is said to be merciless) or rather to the mercy of their mighty God and Redeemer (whose mercies exceed all His works), seeing no help nor hope in the apprehension of man's reason that any mother's child could escape that inevitable danger which every man had proposed and digested to himself of present sinking. So that some of them, having some good and comfortable waters in the ship, fetched them and drunk one to the other, taking their last leave one of the other until their more joyful and happy meeting in a more blessed world, when it pleased God out of His most gracious and merciful providence so to direct and guide our ship (being left to the mercy of the sea) for her most advantage, that Sir George Sommers (sitting upon the poop of the ship, where he sat three days and three nights together without meals meat and little or no sleep), conning the ship to keep her as upright as he could (for otherwise she must needs instantly have foundered), most wishedly happily descried land, whereupon he most comfortably encouraged the company to follow their pumping, and by no means to cease bailing out of the water with their buckets, barricos, and kettles whereby they were so overwearied, and their spirits so spent with long fasting and continuance of their labour, that for the most part they were fallen asleep in corners and wheresoever they chanced first to sit or lie, but hearing news of land, wherewith they grew to be somewhat revived, being carried with will and desire beyond their strength, every man bustled up and gathered his strength and feeble spirits together to perform as much as their weak force would permit him, through which weak means it pleased God to work so strongly as the water was stayed for that little time (which, as we all much feared, was the last period of our breathing) and the ship kept from present sinking, when it pleased God to send her within half an English mile of that land that Sir George Sommers had not long before descried, which were the islands of the Bermudas. (Adams, pp. 3-7)

Here is a fuller quotation from *The Tempest*:

ARIEL *Safely in harbor*
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 stowed,
Who, with a charm join'd to their suff'ring labor,
I have left asleep (1.2.226-32)

There is no parallel. The situations are completely different. In the Jourdain account, *both sailors and passengers*, exhausted from the bailing operation, are asleep while the storm still rages. In *The Tempest*, the storm is over, the ship has split on a rock, has been magically restored, and the *sailors* have been put to sleep by Ariel's magic charm, while the *passengers*, having leapt overboard at the time of the wreck and swum to shore, are now wandering about on Prospero's island. The idea that Shakespeare took his inspiration from Jourdain is a complete non-sequitur.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Stephano says that "I escap'd upon a butt of sack which the sailors heav'd o'erboard" (2.2.121-22), and later tells Caliban to "bear this away where my hogshead of wine is" (4.1.250-51); both Caliban (4.1.231) and Alonso (5.1.299) call the stolen apparel "luggage."

Here is a fuller quotation from Strachey:

But it did not light us any whit the more to our known way, who ran now (as do hoodwinked men) at all adventures, sometimes north and northeast, then north and by west, and in an instant again varying two or three points, and sometimes half the compass. East and by south we steered away as much as we could to bear upright, which was no small carefulness nor pain to do, albeit we much unrigged our ship, threw overboard much luggage, many a trunk and chest (in which I suffered no mean loss), and staved many a butt of beer, hogsheads of oil, cider, wine, and vinegar, and heaved away all our ordnance on the starboard side, and had now purposed to have cut down the main mast the more to lighten her. (Wright, pp. 13-4)

This is another example of David Kathman's sleight of hand in turning a *difference* between *The Tempest* and the Strachey letter into an alleged *parallel*.

Strachey says that the butts of beer and hogsheads of oil, cider, wine, and vinegar were *staved in*, as a result of which the liquid contents would have run out and been lost and the barrel ruined. In contrast, in *The Tempest* Stephano says he 'escaped upon a butt of sack [=Spanish wine] which the sailors heaved overboard'. Obviously this butt of sack was not staved in, or Stephano would not have been able to make use of it as a raft, nor would he have been able to drink the sack later:

TRINCULO O Stephano, hast any more of this?

STEPHANO The whole butt, man. My cellar is in a rock by th' sea-side, where my wine is hid. (2/2/133-5)

The situations are thus exactly opposite.

Incidentally, the first printed use of 'luggage' was by Nashe. From the *Oxford English Dictionary*:

luggage

1. a. In early use: What has to be lugged about; inconveniently heavy baggage (obs.).

1596 Nashe Saffron Walden F 1 b, I hearing the fellow so forlorne and out of comfort with his luggage, gaue him his Charons Naulum or ferry three half pence, & so dismiss him to go to the place from whence he came.

1596 Shakes. 1 Hen. IV, v. iv. 160 Come bring your luggage Nobly on your backe.

Nashe uses the word in the same offhand humorous way in which Shakespeare uses it in *The Tempest* ('stolen apparel' is hardly 'inconveniently heavy baggage'), whereas Strachey

uses the word in the strictly literal sense of heavy baggage. Another *difference* where David Kathman would have us see a *similarity*.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Sailors stave in butts of beer, hogsheads of oil, cider, wine, and vinegar.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(13) David Kathman writes:

Strachey says that "death is accompanied at no time, nor place with circumstances so incapable of particularities of goodness and inward comforts, as at Sea" (6);

Gonzalo says, "Now would I give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground, long heath, brown furze, any thing. The wills above be done! But I would fain die a dry death" (1.1.65-68).

In order to see the falsity of the alleged parallel, it's necessary to quote more fully from Strachey:

For surely, noble Lady, as death comes not so sudden nor apparent, so he comes not so elvish and painful (to men, especially, even then in health and perfect habitudes of body) as at sea; who comes at no time so welcome but our frailty (so weak is the hold of hope in miserable demonstrations of danger) it makes guilty of many contrary changes and conflicts. For, indeed, death is accompanied at no time nor place with circumstances every way so incapable of particularities of goodness and inward comforts as at sea. For it is most true, there ariseth commonly no such unmerciful tempest, compound of so many contrary and divers nations [? motions], but that it worketh upon the whole frame of the body and most loathsomely affecteth all the powers thereof. And the manner of the sickness it lays upon the body, being so unsufferable, gives not the mind any free and quiet time to use her judgment and empire; which made the poet say:

*Hostium uxores, puerique caecos
Sentiant motus orientis Haedi, et
Aequoris nigri fremitum, et trementes
Verbere ripas. (Wright, pp. 4-5)*

From this fuller quotation it is apparent that Strachey's point is that seasickness deprives the body and mind of their powers, and thereby makes death more horrible at sea than on land because seasickness prevents one from composing the mind properly towards death.

This point about seasickness is entirely absent from Gonzalo's lines in *The Tempest*.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Seasickness makes death at sea worse than death on land because it prevents the mind from composing itself towards death.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(14) David Kathman writes:

Strachey tells how "we were inforced to run [the ship] ashoare, as neere the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shoare" (13); Jourdain adds that the ship "fell in between two rockes, where she was fast lodged and locked, for further budging" (7).

Ariel in The Tempest, after confirming for Prospero that the ship was "nigh shore" (1.2.216) says, "Safely in harbor / Is the King's ship, in the deep nook" (1.2.226-27).

David Kathman's truncated quotations are highly misleading and obscure the fact that the Sea Venture was deliberately grounded between two rocks because there was *no harbour in which to anchor*. Strachey writes:

Indeed the morning, now three quarters spent, had won a little clearness from the days before, and it being better surveyed, the very trees were seen to move with the wind upon the shoreside; whereupon our governor commanded the helm-man to bear up. The boatswain, sounding, at the first found it thirteen fathom, and when we stood a little in, seven fathom; and presently, heaving his lead the third time, had ground at four fathom; and by this we had got her within a mile under the southeast point of the land, where we had somewhat smooth water. But having no hope to save her by coming to an anchor in the same, we were enforced to run her ashore as near the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shore; and by the mercy of God unto us, making out our boats, we had ere night brought all our men, women, and children, about the number of 150, safe into the island. (Wright, pp. 15-6)

Jourdain writes:

And there neither did our ship sink, but more fortunately in so great a misfortune fell in between two rocks where she was fast lodged and locked for further budging, whereby we gained not only sufficient time with the present help of our boat and skiff safely to set and convey our men ashore (where were one hundred and fifty in number) but afterwards had time and leisure to save some good part of our goods and provision which the water had not spoiled, with all the tackling of the ship and much of the iron about her, which were necessaries not a little available for the building and furnishing of a new ship and pinnace which we made there for the transporting and carrying of us to Virginia. (Adams, pp. 7-8)

In contrast, the ship in *The Tempest* splits on a rock while under sail trying to round a point of land. The passengers jump into the sea and have to swim for their lives, and it is only through Prospero's magic that the ship in *The Tempest* which had been 'dashed all to pieces' is made whole again and lodged 'safely in harbour' in a 'deep nook' on the island with the sailors (apart from Stephano and Trinculo) asleep in a magic trance and the passengers wandering around on the island. The two situations are in every respect as completely different as it is possible for two situations to be, and in the matter of there being a *harbour*, they are completely opposite. The claim that one was the source of the other is an absurdity.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A ship which has been 'dashed all to pieces' on a rock is magically restored and is 'safely in harbour'.

True for *The Tempest*.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(15) David Kathman writes:

In both cases everybody on board made it safely ashore. Strachey attributes this to the benevolence of God: "that night we must have . . . perished: but see the goodnesse and sweet introduction of better hope, by our mercifull God given unto us" (13); "by the mercy of God unto us, making out our Boates, we had ere night brought all our men, women, and children, about the number of one hundred and fifty, safe into the Iland" (13).

*In *The Tempest*, the safe landing is attributed to the benevolence of Prospero:*

The direful spectacle of the wrack, which touch'd

*The very virtue of compassion in thee,
I have with such provision in mine art
So safely ordered that there is no soul--
No, not so much perdition as an hair
Betid to any creature in the vessel. (1.2.26-31)*

By no stretch of the imagination can divine providence be equated with Prospero's magical powers. The idea that Shakespeare equated the mercy of God with Prospero's magic, and used the one as an inspiration for the other, is one of the silliest of David Kathman's false parallels.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A ship and its passengers and crew are saved by magic.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(16) David Kathman writes:

Jourdain tells how they "had time and leasure to save some good part of our goods and provision, which the water had not spoiled" (7-8);

Gonzalo mentions how "our garments, being (as they were) drench'd in the sea, hold notwithstanding their freshness and glosses, being rather new dy'd than stain'd with salt water" (2.1.62-65).

Here is a fuller quotation from Jourdain:

And there neither did our ship sink, but more fortunately in so great a misfortune fell in between two rocks where she was fast lodged and locked for further budging, whereby we gained not only sufficient time with the present help of our boat and skiff safely to set and convey our men ashore (where were one hundred and fifty in number) but afterwards had time and leisure to save some good part of our goods and provision which the water had not spoiled, with all the tackling of the ship and much of the iron about her, which were necessaries not a little available for the building and furnishing of a new ship and pinnace which we made there for the transporting and carrying of us to Virginia. (Adams, pp. 7-8)

There is no parallel. In fact, the situations are exactly *opposite*. In the Jourdain account, goods and provisions which the sea-water had not spoiled, as well as tackling and iron

from the Sea Venture, were salvaged. In *The Tempest*, nothing was salvaged, since the garments mentioned by Gonzalo were the ones he was wearing when the ship split on a rock and all the passengers plunged into the sea and swam for shore. Moreover, the goods and provisions mentioned by Jourdain were salvaged precisely because they had *not* been drenched in sea-water. In *The Tempest*, although Gonzalo's clothing *was* drenched in sea-water when he swam for shore, it is now magically restored, and like new. It is obvious that the salvaging of provisions in the Jourdain account could not, by any stretch of the imagination, have been Shakespeare's source for Gonzalo's comments in *The Tempest*.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Clothing which was drenched in sea-water, and therefore should have been ruined, magically appears as though newly-dyed.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(17) David Kathman writes:

In Strachey the shipwrecked party is split up into two groups;

in The Tempest they are split up into two main groups, plus Ferdinand.

There is no parallel. David Kathman is once again in error. In *The Tempest*, there are *four* groups of survivors of the shipwreck on the island, not 'two main groups'. The four groups consist of King Alonso and his party; Stephano & Trinculo; Ferdinand; and the sailors who are asleep under a magic spell on the ship. In addition, there is a group (Prospero, Miranda, Ariel, and Caliban) already living on the island prior to the shipwreck, in complete contrast to the situation in Bermuda, which was uninhabited prior to the wreck of the Sea Venture.

David Kathman is also in error in claiming that there were 'two groups' in Bermuda. As evidenced in the Strachey letter, there was only one main group in Bermuda during the nine months the survivors lived there. From that one main group a subgroup was sent off in a small boat soon after the shipwreck to try to reach Jamestown. Three other subgroups split off from the single main group for brief periods of time.

Here is a description of each group:

Soon after arriving in Bermuda the survivors of the shipwreck remodelled the longboat which had been on the Sea Venture, and on the 28th of August Henry Ravens, Thomas Whittingham, and six sailors sailed for Jamestown to let the colony there know that the Sea Venture had been wrecked in Bermuda. (Wright, pp. 35-6)

On the first of September a plot was discovered, and the six men involved (John Want, Christopher Carter, Francis Pearepoint, William Brian, William Martin, and Richard Knowles) were exiled to another of the islands. Upon their repentance shortly thereafter, they were allowed to rejoin the main group. (Wright, pp. 41-2)

When nothing had been heard from Virginia, and Ravens was feared lost, on the 27th of November Sir George Somers, with two carpenters and twenty men, went over to the main island to build another boat in addition to the one Robert Frobisher was building on the island on which the main group lived during the entire time in Bermuda. (Wright, pp. 38-9)

On the 18th of March, another group of men, involved in a plot with one Henry Paine (who was hanged for his part in it), took to the woods and lived like outlaws. (p. 49) Eventually all but two of these men (Christopher Carter and Robert Waters) rejoined the main group. Carter and Waters were left behind when the survivors of the Sea Venture later sailed for Jamestown. (Wright, p. 53)

Two main groups? Absolutely not. Neither in *The Tempest*, nor in Bermuda.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A shipwrecked party splits into two groups.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel (or rather, a completely non-existent parallel).

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(18) David Kathman writes:

Strachey writes about how it had been thought that the Bermudas were "given over to Devils and wicked Spirits" (14); Jourdain calls it "the Ile of Divels" (title page) and "a most prodigious and enchanted place" (8); A True Declaration says that "these Islands of the Bermudos, have ever beene accounted as an enchaunted pile of rockes, and a desert inhabitation for Divels; but all the Fairies of the rocks were but flocks of birds, and all the Divels that haunted the woods, were but heards of swine" (10-11).

Such references certainly could have been the germ which suggested to Shakespeare the magic elements of the play; note that Ariel at 1.2.214-15 quotes Ferdinand as saying, "Hell is empty, / And all the devils are here," and that "devils" are mentioned a dozen times altogether in the play.

Here is a fuller version of what Strachey wrote:

We found it to be the dangerous and dreaded island, or rather islands, of the Bermuda; whereof let me give Your Ladyship a brief description before I proceed to my narration. And that the rather because they be so terrible to all that ever touched on them and such tempests, thunders, and other fearful objects are seen and feared about them, that they be called commonly the Devil's Islands and are feared and avoided of all sea travelers alive above any other place in the world. Yet it pleased our merciful God to make even this hideous and hated place both the place of our safety and means of our deliverance.

And hereby, also, I hope to deliver the world from a foul and general error, it being counted of most that they can be no habitation for men but rather given over to devils and wicked spirits; whereas indeed we find them now by experience to be as habitable and commodious as most countries of the same climate and situation, insomuch as, if the entrance into them were as easy as the place itself is contenting, it had long ere this been inhabited as well as other islands. Thus shall we make it appear that Truth is the daughter of Time, and that men ought not to deny everything which is not subject to their own sense. (Wright, p. 16)

Here is a fuller version of what Jourdain wrote:

But our delivery was not more strange in falling so opportunely and happily upon the land as our feeding and preservation was beyond our hopes and all men's expectations most admirable. For the islands of the Bermudas, as every man knoweth that hath heard or read of them, were never inhabited by any Christian or heathen people, but ever esteemed and reputed a most prodigious and enchanted place, affording nothing but gusts, storms, and foul weather, which made every navigator and mariner to avoid them as Scylla and Charybdis, or as they would shun the Devil himself, and no man was ever heard to make for the place but as against their wills, they have by storms and dangerousness of the rocks lying seven leagues into the sea suffered shipwreck, yet did we find there the air so temperate and the country so abundantly fruitful of all fit necessities for the sustenation and preservation of man's life that most in a manner of all our provisions of bread, beer, and victual being quite spoiled in lying long drowned in salt water, notwithstanding we were there for the space of nine months (few days over or under) not only well refreshed, comforted, and with good satiety contented, but out of the abundance thereof provided us some reasonable quantity and proportion of provision to carry us for Virginia, and to maintain ourselves and that company we found there, to the great relief of them as it fell out in their so great extremities and in respect of the shortness of time, until it pleased God that by my Lord's coming thither their store was better supplied. (Adams, p. 8)

Here is a fuller version from the anonymous *True Declaration*:

These islands of the Bermudas have ever been accounted as an enchanted pile of rocks and a desert inhabitation for devils, but all the fairies of the rocks were but flocks of birds, and all the devils that haunted the woods were but herds of swine. (pp. 10-11)

It can thus be seen that the thrust of the comments in all three sources is that the widely-held belief that the Bermudas were thought to be inhabited by devils had been found to be erroneous.

Ferdinand's comment in *The Tempest* is exactly opposite. Firstly, Ferdinand's words refer to the ship, not to an island. Secondly, in Strachey, Jourdain, and the *True Declaration* the belief that devils inhabited the Bermudas is categorically stated to be erroneous, but there is no such claim of error in Ferdinand's words. Aghast at the fiery phenomenon which Ariel has created on the ship, Ferdinand states emphatically, 'Hell is empty/ And all the devils are here'.

ARIEL *All hail, great master! grave sir, hail! I come
To answer thy best pleasure; be't to fly,
To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
On the curl'd clouds, to thy strong bidding task
Ariel and all his quality*

PROSPERO *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,
Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin,
I flamed amazement: sometime I'd divide,
And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yards and bowsprit, would I flame distinctly,
Then meet and join. Jove's lightnings, the precursors
O' the dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary
And sight-outrunning were not; the fire and cracks
Of sulphurous roaring the most mighty Neptune
Seem to besiege and make his bold waves tremble,
Yea, his dread trident shake.*

PROSPERO *My brave spirit!
Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil
Would not infect his reason?*

ARIEL *Not a soul
But felt a fever of the mad and play'd
Some tricks of desperation. All but mariners*

*Plunged in the foaming brine and quit the vessel,
Then all afire with me: the king's son, Ferdinand,
With hair up-staring,--then like reeds, not hair,--
Was the first man that leap'd; cried, 'Hell is empty
And all the devils are here'. (1.2.189-214)*

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

The widely-held belief that an island is inhabited by devils is found to be in error.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Or, alternatively:

A ship transformed by magic into a fiery inferno is believed to be inhabited by devils.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

David Kathman also comments that 'devils are mentioned a dozen times altogether in the play'. The eleven other usages are listed below. Four of them are merely common phrases:

Where the devil should he learn our language?

The devil take your fingers!

The devil speaks in him.

Thou hast said well; for some of you there present/ Are worse than devils.

One involves speculation by Stephano when he first sees Caliban, and cannot figure out what he is:

What's the matter? Have we devils here?

Similarly, two have to do with Trinculo calling Stephano a devil when he takes him for a spirit because he believes Stephano had been drowned in the wreck.

I should know that voice: it should be--but he is drowned; and these are devils: O defend me!

This is a devil, and no monster: I will leave him; I have no long spoon. (An allusion to the proverb 'He who would sup with the devil must have a long spoon'.)

Another involves speculation by Stephano when he hears Ariel's magical music:

If thou beest a man, show thyself in thy likeness: if thou beest a devil, take't as thou list.

Three others involve Prospero's characterization of Caliban as a devil because of his evil nature:

*Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself/ Upon thy wicked dam, come forth!
A devil, a born devil, on whose nature/ Nurture can never stick
[T]his demi-devil--/ For he's a bastard one--had plotted with them*

It is therefore clear that none of the spirits on Prospero's island are devils, and there is nothing to connect these usages with Strachey, Jourdain, or the *True Declaration*. They consist merely of common phrases, speculation that something not immediately understood must be a 'devil', and characterization of someone with an evil nature as a 'devil'.

Fuller quotations for each usage are as follows:

PROSPERO *Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself
Upon thy wicked dam, come forth! (2.1.319-20)*

STEPHANO *What's the matter? Have we devils here? (2.2.57)*

STEPHANO *This is some monster of the isle with four legs, who hath got, as I take it,
an ague. Where the devil should he learn our language? (2.2.65-7)*

TRINCULO *I should know that voice: it should be--but he is drowned; and these are
devils: O defend me! (2.2.87-8)*

STEPHANO *Doth thy other mouth call me? Mercy, mercy! This is a devil, and no
monster: I will leave him; I have no long spoon. (2.2.97-9)*

TRINCULO *A murrain on your monster, and the devil take your fingers! (3.2.80-1)*

STEPHANO *If thou beest a man, show thyself in thy likeness: if thou beest a devil,
take't as thou list. (3.2.128-30)*

PROSPERO *[Aside] Honest lord,
Thou hast said well; for some of you there present
Are worse than devils. (3.3.33-5)*

PROSPERO *A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains,
Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost; (4.1.188-90)*

SEBASTIAN *[Aside]* *The devil speaks in him.* (5.1.128)

PROSPERO *Mark but the badges of these men, my lords,
Then say if they be true. This mis-shapen knave,
His mother was a witch, and one so strong
That could control the moon, make flows and ebbs,
And deal in her command without her power.
These three have robb'd me; and this demi-devil--
For he's a bastard one--had plotted with them
To take my life. Two of these fellows you
Must know and own; this thing of darkness I
Acknowledge mine.* (5.1.267-76)

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(19) David Kathman writes:

Strachey writes of the "great strokes of thunder, lightning and raine in the extremity of violence" (15).

Trinculo says of Caliban, "I took him to be kill'd with a thunder-stroke" (2.2.108); and earlier Antonio says, "They dropp'd, as by a thunder-stroke" (2.1.204). (These are Shakespeare's only two uses of the word "thunder-stroke"; he usually--seven times--used "thunderbolt.")

There is no parallel. Thunderstroke is a rare word, and Strachey *did not use it*, so wherever Shakespeare got it, it wasn't from Strachey. It could have been from Oxford's uncle, Arthur Golding, whose figurative use of the word 'thunderstroke' is the first usage recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*:

thunderstroke

A stroke of 'thunder' (cf. thunder n. 1 b); the impact of a lightning-flash.

c1600 Chalkhill Thealma & Cl. (1683) 5 The lofty Cedar, and the knotty Oak, Are subject more unto the thunder-stroak, Than the low shrubs.

1610 Shakes. Temp. ii. i. 204 They fell together..as by a Thunder-stroke.

1844 Mrs. Browning Dead Pan vii, At the rushing thunderstroke would No sob tremble through the tree?

b. transf. and fig.

1587 Golding De Mornay xxvi. (1592) 397 The others cutting words which are the thunderstrooks doubled.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Use of the rare word 'thunderstroke'.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(20) David Kathman writes:

Strachey also writes of the "many scattering showers of Raine (which would passe swiftly over, and yet fall with such force and darknesse for the time as if it would never bee cleere again)" (16).

In the course of Trinculo's monologue at 2.2.18-41, a storm with "black cloud[s]" (20) passes over quickly.

David Kathman is in error. His point is that *storms* in the Bermudas and in *The Tempest* 'pass over quickly'. It is necessary to quote more fully from Strachey to demonstrate the falsity of this statement with respect to Bermuda. Strachey writes:

[T]he storms continually raging from them, which once in the full and change commonly of every moon (winter or summer) keep their unchangeable round and rather thunder than blow from every corner about them, sometimes forty-eight hours together. . . . In August, September, and until the end of October we had very hot and pleasant weather; only (as I say) thunder, lightning, and many scattering showers of rain (which would pass swiftly over and yet fall with such force and darkness for the time as it would never be clear again) we wanted not any; and of rain more in summer than in winter. (Wright, pp. 20-1)

From this fuller quotation it is clear that the *storms* in Bermuda, far from passing over quickly, often lasted for forty-eight hours at a time, all year round (although it is true that Strachey says that downpours of rain within these two-day storms passed over quickly).

However this is ultimately irrelevant, because David Kathman's claim that a 'storm' in *The Tempest* 'passes over quickly' is also false. In fact, the storm in *The Tempest* mentioned at the beginning of Act 2, Scene 2 never materializes, although thunder is heard. Trinculo's talk of this storm merely serves as a pretext for his taking cover under Caliban's gaberdine, thus giving rise to the 'monster of the isle with four legs' which Stephano sees when he passes by.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Storms which pass over quickly.

Not true for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel (or rather, a non-existent parallel).

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(21) David Kathman writes:

Strachey mentions palm trees of which "so broad are the leaves, as an Italian Umbrello, a man may well defend his whole body under one of them, from the greatest storm raine that falls" (19).

This suggests Trinculo hiding under Caliban's "gaberdine" (2.2.38) to escape the above rainstorm.

This has to be the silliest of David Kathman's alleged parallels. It is a complete non-sequitur. What does a palm leaf have to do with a gaberdine? Absolutely nothing.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a gaberdine is 'a loose upper garment of coarse material':

gaberdine

1. A loose upper garment of coarse material; a smock frock.

1520 Lanc. Wills (Chetham Soc.) I. 39, I bequeth unto litill Tomas Beke my gawbardyne to make hym a gowne.

1567 Drant Horace's Ep. to Maecenas in Art Poet. C iij a, My cote is bare, my gawberdyne amis.

1610 Shakes. Temp. ii. ii. 40 My best way is to creepe vnder his Gaberdine.

1663 Butler Hud. i. iii. 917 He disrob'd his Gaberdine.

Caliban wears a loose upper garment called a gabardine, and shelters himself from an expected downpour of rain under it. The idea that this has anything to do with a palm leaf is absurd.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Mention of a palm leaf as big as an Italian umbrella under which a man could shelter from the rain.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

rocks and dangers. Notwithstanding they were forced to run their ship on shore, which through God's providence fell betwixt two rocks, that caused her to stand firm and not immediately to be broken. (p. 10)

'Hardly' meant 'with difficulty' to the Elizabethans, and Bermuda is said to be 'hardly accessible', because of the reefs which surround it ('the environing rocks and dangers'). Jourdain makes the same point:

[A]nd no man was ever heard to make for the place [i.e. Bermuda] but as against their wills, they have by storms and dangerousness of the rocks lying seven leagues into the sea suffered shipwreck. (Adams, p. 9)

To say that an island is difficult of access because of reefs is quite different from saying that an island is inaccessible, and David Kathman misleads the reader by equating the two.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

An island difficult to access because of surrounding reefs.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Jourdain account and the True Declaration.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(23) David Kathman writes:

Strachey says that "There are no Rivers nor running Springs of fresh water to be found upon any of [the islands]"; their "Wells and Pits" were "either halfe full, or absolutely exhausted and dry," though eventually the men found "some low bottoms" which "we found to continue as fishing Ponds, or standing Pooles . . . full of fresh water" (20).

*Fresh water is similarly hard to find on the island of *The Tempest*: Caliban reminds Prospero how "I lov'd thee / And show'd thee all the qualities o' th' Isle, / The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile" (1.2.336-38); later he offers to show Trinculo "the best springs" (2.2.160), and still later he threatens, "I'll not show him where the quick freshes are" (3.2.66-67).*

Here is a fuller quotation from Strachey:

Sure it is that there are no rivers nor running springs of fresh water to be found upon any of them. When we came first we digged and found certain gushings and soft bubblings, which, being either in bottoms or on the side of hanging ground, were only fed with rain

water, which nevertheless soon sinketh into the earth and vanisheth away, or emptieth itself out of sight into the sea, without any channel above or upon the superficies of the earth; for, according as their rains fell, we had our wells and pits (which we digged) either half full or absolute exhausted and dry. Howbeit some low bottoms (which the continual descent from the hills filled full, and in those flats could have no passage away) we found to continue, as fishing ponds or standing pools, continually summer and winter full of fresh water. (Wright, p. 27)

Strachey is clear that there were no springs of fresh water in Bermuda, and that the wells which the survivors dug were not wells of the sort which afford a supply of fresh water from underground, but merely pits in which to catch rain water and store it.

David Kathman thus misleads the reader when he claims that 'Fresh water is similarly hard to find on the island of The Tempest'. It is not 'similarly hard to find'. On the island in *The Tempest*, there *are* springs of fresh water, whereas in Bermuda there are none. Caliban says to Prospero:

*And then I lov'd thee
And show'd thee all the qualities o' th' isle,
The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile* (1.2.336-38)

Caliban says to Trinculo:

I'll show thee the best springs (2.2.160)

*And take his bottle from him. When that's gone,
He shall drink nought but brine, for I'll not show him
Where the quick freshes are.* (3.2.65-8)

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

An island containing springs of fresh water.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

There is another false parallel contained in the lines quoted by David Kathman above.

An island containing brine pits.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

And yet another false parallel. Strachey writes:

The soil of the whole island is one and the same; the mold dark, red, sandy, dry, and uncapable, I believe, of any of our commodities or fruits. Sir George Somers in the beginning of August squared out a garden by the quarter (the quarter being set down before a goodly bay upon which our governor did first leap ashore and therefore called it as afore said, Gates his bay, which opened into the east and into which the sea did ebb and flow according to their tides) and sowed muskmelons, peas, onions, radish, lettuce, and many English seeds and kitchen herbs. All which in some ten days did appear above ground, but whether by the small birds (of which there be many kinds) or by flies (worms I never saw any, nor any venomous thing, as toad or snake or any creeping beast hurtful, only some spiders, which, as many affirm, are signs of great store of gold; but they were long and slender-leg spiders, and whether venomous or no I know not – I believe not, since we should still find them amongst our linen in our chests and drinking-cans, but we never received any danger from them; a kind of melantha or black beetle there was which bruised gave a savor like many sweet and strong gums punned [=pounded] together), whether, I say, hindered by these or by the condition or vice of the soil, they came to no proof nor thrived.

It is like enough that the commodities of the other western islands would prosper there, as vines, lemons, oranges, and sugar canes. Our governor made trial of the latter and buried some two or three in the garden mold, which were reserved in the wreck amongst many which we carried to plant here in Virginia, and they began to grow; but the hogs, breaking in, both rooted them up and eat them. There is not through the whole islands either champaign ground, valleys, or fresh rivers. (Wright, pp. 22-4)

Strachey thus thought it likely that the soil in Bermuda was infertile. In contrast, the fertility of the soil is emphasized in *The Tempest*. Caliban says to Prospero:

*And then I lov'd thee
And show'd thee all the qualities o' th' isle,
The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile (1.2.336-38)*

Caliban promises Trinculo:

I'll show thee every fertile inch o' th' island (2.2.148)

There is thus this additional false parallel.

An island containing fertile ground.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(24) David Kathman writes:

Strachey tells of the "high and sweet smelling Woods" (19), yet also mentions "Fennes, Marishes, Ditches, muddy Pooles" and "places where much filth is daily cast forth" (21); A True Declaration similarly tells of the "temperat aire," but also the "fennes" and the "salt water, the owze of which sendeth forth an unwholsome & contagious vapour" (14).

*In the play Adrian says, "The air breathes upon us here most sweetly," to which Sebastian retorts, "As if it had lungs, and rotten ones," and Antonio adds, "Or, as 'twere perfumed by a fen" (2.1.47-9). Fens are mentioned twice more in *The Tempest* -- "from unwholsome fen" (1.2.322); "bogs, fens, flats" (2.2.2) -- but only twice more in the rest of the canon.*

As David Kathman says, Strachey mentions 'high and sweet smelling Woods'. No such woods are mentioned in *The Tempest*. And in fact in *The Tempest*, when Gonzalo speaks of the 'air breathing upon us most sweetly', the location is tawny ground, not 'high and sweet smelling woods':

ADRIAN *The air breathes upon us here most sweetly.*

SEBASTIAN *As if it had lungs and rotten ones.*

ANTONIO *Or as 'twere perfumed by a fen.*

GONZALO *Here is everything advantageous to life.*

ANTONIO *True; save means to live.*

SEBASTIAN *Of that there's none, or little.*

GONZALO *How lush and lusty the grass looks! how green!*

ANTONIO *The ground indeed is tawny.*

SEBASTIAN *With an eye of green in't.*

ANTONIO *He misses not much.*

SEBASTIAN *No; he doth but mistake the truth totally. (2.1.47-58)*

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

An island with high and sweet smelling woods.

**Not true for The Tempest.
True for the Strachey letter.
Ergo: a false parallel.**

Moreover David Kathman's quotation concerning fens from the Strachey letter is highly misleading. Anyone reading it would think that Strachey was describing 'Fennes, Marishes, Ditches, muddy Pooles' and 'places where much filth is daily cast forth' which existed in Bermuda. Instead, what Strachey wrote was this:

For they [= the fish in Bermuda], sucking of the very water which descendeth from the high hills, mingled with juice and verdure of the palms, cedars, and other sweet wood (which likewise make the herbs, roots, and weeds sweet which grow about the banks), become thereby both fat and wholesome; as must those fish needs be gross, slimy, and corrupt the blood which feed in fens, marshes, ditches, muddy pools, and near unto places where much filth is daily cast forth. (Wright, pp. 28-9)

In making this comparison, Strachey is certainly not stating that fens, marshes, ditches, muddy pools, and places 'where much filth is daily cast forth' exist in Bermuda. He is undoubtedly thinking of England, and contrasting conditions in certain places in England with the conditions in Bermuda which give rise to the wholesomeness of the fish there.

David Kathman's quotations above from the *True Declaration* are similarly deceptive. Again, anyone reading them would think that the author of the *True Declaration* was speaking of Bermuda. In fact, in the first instance in the *True Declaration*, the usage is entirely metaphorical:

*Which heroical actions have not been undertaken by so mighty states and princes upon trivial and vulgar motives when by these courses that first blessing (of *crescite and multiplicamini*, increase and multiply) hath been sanctified, the meaner sort have been provided, the matter of plagues, famine and sedition hath been exhausted, the fens of a state politic were drained. (p. 4)*

In the second instance in the *True Declaration*, the fens spoken of are in Jamestown, not in Bermuda:

No man ought to judge of any country by the fens and marshes (such as is the place where Jamestown standeth) except we will condemn all England for the wilds and hundreds of Kent and Essex. (p. 14)

The quotation from the *True Declaration* involving 'temperate air' and 'unwholesome and contagious vapour' is also about Jamestown, not Bermuda:

How is it possible that such a virgin and temperate air should work such contrary effects, but because our fort (that lieth as a semi-island) is most part environed with an ebbing and flowing of salt water, the ooze of which sendeth forth an unwholesome & contagious vapour? (p. 14)

Strachey thus makes it clear that there was no oak on Bermuda. Had there been, the survivors would have built the pinnacle of it, since oak was the traditional wood the English used for shipbuilding. Instead, they had to make do with cedar. Fortunately, however, they had saved some oak from the Sea Venture, and they used that to make beams and some planks in the bow.

Elsewhere Strachey writes:

There is not through the whole islands either champaign ground, valleys, or fresh rivers. They are full of shaws [=thickets] of goodly cedar. (Wright, p. 24)

Strachey goes on to describe the palm trees in Bermuda, and other kinds of trees. But no oak.

Similarly, Jourdain writes:

There are an infinite number of cedar trees (the fairest, I think, in the world). (Adams, p. 16)

Jourdain also describes palm trees, but no oak.

In *The Tempest*, both oak and cedar are mentioned, but not because they exist on Prospero's island. They are mentioned in connection with Prospero's magic. He has cleft Jove's tree, the oak, with Jove's own thunderbolt, and has plucked up pines and cedars by the roots. These allusions have no direct connection with Prospero's island.

PROSPERO *Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves,
And ye that on the sands with printless foot
Do chase the ebbing Neptune and do fly him
When he comes back; you demi-puppets that
By moonshine do the green sour ringlets make,
Whereof the ewe not bites, and you whose pastime
Is to make midnight mushrooms, that rejoice
To hear the solemn curfew; by whose aid,
Weak masters though ye be, I have bedimm'd
The noontide sun, call'd forth the mutinous winds,
And 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault
Set roaring war: to the dread rattling thunder
Have I given fire and rifted Jove's stout oak
With his own bolt; the strong-based promontory
Have I made shake and by the spurs pluck'd up
The pine and cedar: graves at my command
Have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em forth
By my so potent art. But this rough magic
I here abjure* (5.1.33-51)

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

An island with both cedar and oak trees.

Not true for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel (or rather, a non-existent parallel).

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(26) David Kathman writes:

Strachey mentions the "Berries, whereof our men seething, straining, and letting stand some three or four daies, made a kind of pleasant drinke" (18);

Caliban says that Prospero "wouldst give me / Water with berries in't" (1.2.333-34).

This is another false parallel. What Strachey actually wrote was:

[The Bermuda islands] are full of shaws [=thickets] of goodly cedar, fairer than ours here of Virginia, the berries whereof our men, seething, straining, and letting stand some three or four days, made a kind of pleasant drink These berries are of the same bigness and color of corinths [=currants], full of little stones and very restraining [=astringent] or hard-building. (Wright, p. 24)

While Shakespeare is speaking of water with fruit such as raspberries, blackberries etc. dropped whole into it, Strachey is speaking of a drink made from the 'berries' of the cedar tree in which the 'berries' are seethed [=boiled], and then strained. The resulting drink is then left to stand for three or four days before being used. In this boiled and strained drink no trace would remain of the original form of the cedar 'berries'. Moreover, the taste of this astringent drink would not resemble at all the taste of water with fresh fruit dropped into it.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A drink made of boiled and strained cedar berries.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Incidentally, there is information about the medical use of cedar berries on the internet, and a photograph of them at:

http://www.e-hagstrom.com/scenic_web/cedar34.html

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(27) David Kathman writes:

Strachey mentions, among other animals, "Toade" (17), "Beetell" (18), and "Battes" (22);

Caliban curses Prospero with "toads, beetles, bats" (1.2.340).

What Strachey actually said about toads is this:

[W]orms I never saw any, nor any venomous thing as toad or snake. (Wright, p. 23)

Strachey thus mentions toads only to say that he never saw a single one in Bermuda.

Of beetles, Strachey says:

[A] kind of melantha or black beetle there was which bruised gave a savor like many sweet and strong gums punned [=pounded] together. (Wright, p. 23)

Several pages later, Strachey mentions bats in connection with the names of birds found in Bermuda:

White and gray heronshaws, bitterns, teal, snipes, crows and hawks, of which in March we found divers aeries, goshawks and tassels [=tercels, or male peregrine hawks], oxbirds, cormorants, bald coots, moor hens, owls, and bats in great store. (Wright, p. 30)

Strachey thus mentions toads only to state that they are not found in Bermuda, and he mentions bats, not in connection with beetles, but in connection with the names of many different kinds of birds.

In *The Tempest*, Caliban says:

*I must eat my dinner.
This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother,
Which thou takest from me. When thou camest first,
Thou stokedst me and madest much of me, wouldst give me
Water with berries in't, and teach me how
To name the bigger light, and how the less,
That burn by day and night: and then I loved thee
And show'd thee all the qualities o' the isle,*

*The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile:
Cursed be I that did so! All the charms
Of Sycorax, toads, beetles, bats, light on you!
For I am all the subjects that you have,
Which first was mine own king: and here you sty me
In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me
The rest o' the island. (1.2.330-44)*

It is clear from Caliban's speech that he is not identifying toads, beetles, and bats as fauna found on Prospero's island, but as charms used by his mother, the witch Sycorax. And in any event, the idea that Shakespeare would have needed the Strachey letter as a source for the mention of such common creatures as toads, beetles, and bats is nonsensical.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

And island on which there are toads, beetles, and bats.

Not true for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel (or rather, a non-existent parallel).

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(28) David Kathman writes:

Strachey also mentions "Sparrowes" and "Owles" (22), both of which are mentioned in passing in the play (4.1.100, 5.1.90). In fact, the relevant passage of Strachey mentions owls and bats consecutively: "Owles, and Battes in great store";

and Ariel's song in Act 5 mentions them in consecutive lines: "There I couch when owls do cry. / On the bat's back I do fly" (5.1.90-91).

David Kathman's truncated quotation is misleading. He singles these two species out as though they were the only ones mentioned by Strachey. In fact, Strachey mentions sparrows and owls as part of a lengthy catalogue of different types of birds found in Bermuda:

Fowl there is great store: small birds, sparrows fat and plump like a bunting, bigger than ours, robins of divers colors, green and yellow, ordinary and familiar in our cabins, and other of less sort. White and gray heronshows, bitterns, teal, snipes, crows and hawks, of which in March we found divers aeries, goshawks and tassels [=tercels, or male peregrine hawks], oxbirds, cormorants, bald coots, moor hens, owls, and bats in great store. And upon New Year's day in the morning, our governor being walked forth with another gentleman, Master James Swift, each of them with their pieces killed a wild swan

in a great sea-water bay or pond in our island. A kind of web-footed fowl there is, of the bigness of an English green plover or sea mew. (Wright, p. 30)

For David Kathman to single sparrows and owls out from this long list of birds shows a certain degree of desperation in seeking out alleged parallels, but even leaving that point aside, although Strachey says that sparrows and owls are found in Bermuda, it is not stated in *The Tempest* that they are found on Prospero's island.

In *The Tempest*, sparrows are mentioned by the goddess Iris as something Cupid will play with once he gives up making humans fall in love, and becomes a boy again.

IRIS *Of her society*
Be not afraid: I met her deity
Cutting the clouds towards Paphos and her son
Dove-drawn with her. Here thought they to have done
Some wanton charm upon this man and maid,
Whose vows are, that no bed-right shall be paid
Till Hymen's torch be lighted: but vain;
Mars's hot minion is returned again;
Her waspish-headed son has broke his arrows,
Swears he will shoot no more but play with sparrows
And be a boy right out. (4.1.91-101)

Owls are mentioned in Ariel's song:

Where the bee sucks, there suck I:
In a cowslip's bell I lie;
There I couch when owls do cry.
On the bat's back I do fly
After summer merrily.
Merrily, merrily shall I live now
Under the blossom that hangs on the bough. (5.1.88-94)

It is thus neither stated nor implied that sparrows or owls are to be found on Prospero's island. Rather, the sparrow is mentioned by Shakespeare in connection with a classical allusion, and the owl in a lovely song of Ariel's. The idea that Shakespeare needed the Strachey letter as a source for these imaginative usages of the names of two very common birds is absurd.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

An island on which there are sparrows and owls.

True for the Strachey letter.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(29) David Kathman writes:

Strachey has a lengthy passage about a bird called the "Sea-Meawe" which the men caught "standing on the Rockes" (22);

Caliban tells Stephano that "I'll get thee / Young scamels from the rock" (2.2.171-72). "Scamels" is usually taken to be a misprint for "Sea-mells," a variant of "Sea-mews."

David Kathman is in error here. There is no lengthy passage in the Strachey letter about a bird 'called the Sea-Meawe'. Here is a fuller quotation from Strachey:

A kind of web-footed fowl there is, of the bigness of an English green plover or sea mew, which all the summer we saw not, and in the darkest nights of November and December (for in the night they only feed) they would come forth but not fly far from home and, hovering in the air and over the sea, made a strange hollo and harsh howling. (Wright, p. 30)

Strachey did not know what the bird was, but he is clear that it was not a seamew, although, as he says, it was the *size* of a sea mew.

The bird is identified in a marginal note in the text of the Strachey letter, as printed in Purchas in 1625:

They call it of the cry it maketh a cahow. (Wright, p. 30)

This website has further information about the cahow or Bermuda petrel:

<http://www.earthlife.net/birds/shearwaters.html>

The most famous is perhaps the Cahow or Bermuda Petrel (Pterodroma cahow). This species was practically made extinct by over-hunting in the early 17th century; after this it was legally protected but to little avail. During the 18th century the bird was thought to be extinct, but in the early part of the 19th century some new specimens were obtained and in 1951 it was confirmed as breeding on Cooper's Island Bermuda. In 1966 there were only 24 breeding pairs but the population was slowly increasing. It is now off the Critically Endangered species list, but still on the Endangered list with 49 nesting pairs in 1995 and 56 in 1999. For more info see The Cahow Conservation Reports from the Bermuda Audubon Society.

There is no mention of the cahow or Bermuda petrel in *The Tempest*.

moon-calf.

[Cf. *G. mondkalb* (Luther); also *mondkind*, *MLG. maanenkind* (kind = child).]

l. a. An abortive shapeless fleshy mass in the womb; a false conception. Obs.

Regarded as being produced by the influence of the moon.

1565 Cooper Thesaurus, Mola,..a moone calfe (in the womans woumbe).

1594 T. B. La Primaud. Fr. Acad. ii. 387 The moone calves in the womb, which fall out often.

1615 Crooke Body of Man 193 The signes of the Mola or Moon-calfe.

1658 tr. Porta's Nat. Magic ii. ii. 29 A certain woman..brought forth in stead of a child, four Creatures like to frogs... But this was a kind of a Moon-calf.

b. A misshapen birth, a monstrosity. Obs. or arch.

1610 Shakes. Temp. ii. ii. 139 How now Moone-Calfe.

1831 Carlyle Sart. Res. iii. x. (1858) 168 England..offers precisely the elements..in which such moon-calves and monstrosities are best generated.

1837 Fr. Rev. (1872) III. i. vii. 41 This huge mooncalf of Sansculottism.

What the relationship is between a tortoise and a moon-calf David Kathman doesn't explain, nor could he if he tried.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Mention of a moon-calf.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Moreover in the passage from the Strachey letter mentioned by David Kathman above, the tortoise is discussed as a source of food, whereas in *The Tempest*, Caliban is figuratively called 'tortoise' by Prospero because of his slowness in responding to commands:

PROSPERO Come forth, I say! there's other business for thee:

Come, thou tortoise! when? (1.2.315-6)

This second false parallel of David Kathman's can thus be analyzed as follows:

Mention of tortoises as a food which cannot be categorized as either fish or flesh.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

**True for the True Declaration.
Ergo: a false parallel.**

David Kathman also writes:

Elsewhere (8) the same tract speaks of "this tragical Comaediae."

A fuller quotation from the *True Declaration* is as follows:

What is there in all this tragical comedy that should discourage us with impossibility of the enterprise when of all the fleet one only ship by a secret leak was endangered, and yet in the gulf of despair was so graciously preserved? (p. 11)

Since David Kathman doesn't explain what the alleged parallel is, it is pointless to attempt to refute it.

Moreover, David Kathman's comparison of the events which occurred in Bermuda to the two murder plots in *The Tempest* is a patent absurdity. As mentioned earlier, what happened in Bermuda was that a group of the survivors of the wreck of the *Sea Venture* decided that they preferred to stay there rather than travel on to Jamestown, and they therefore banded together to refuse to take part in the labour of shipbuilding and other preparations for leaving Bermuda, and attempted to persuade craftsmen such as the smith and carpenter, whose expertise was vital to the building of the ships, to join them. Reading between the lines of Strachey's account, one gets the strong impression that many of those who left England for Jamestown in 1609 did not really wish to be colonists. Why they joined the expedition, given their attitude, remains unexplained. But having found themselves accidentally shipwrecked on Bermuda where there was food in plenty and a pleasant climate, they decided they wanted to stay there. This put them in direct conflict with Sir Thomas Gates, who as governor of the Jamestown colony had authority over everyone on the expedition, and who was insistent that everyone leave Bermuda together and travel to Jamestown once the ships were built. The situation is summed up by Strachey as follows:

And sure it was happy for us, who had now run this fortune and were fallen into the bottom of this misery, that we both had our governor [=Sir Thomas Gates] with us and one so solicitous and careful whose both example (as I said) and authority could lay shame and command upon our people. Else, I am persuaded, we had most of us finished our days there, so willing were the major part of the common sort (especially when they found such a plenty of victuals) to settle a foundation of ever inhabiting there; as well appeared by many practices of theirs and perhaps of the better sort). (Wright, p. 40)

Strachey describes the first such practice as follows:

And first (and it was the first of September) a conspiracy was discovered of which six were found principals, who had promised each unto the other not to set their hands to any travail or endeavor which might expedite or forward this pinnace. And each of them

had severally (according to appointment) sought his opportunity to draw the smith, and one of our carpenters, Nicholas Bennett, who made much profession of Scripture, a mutinous and dissembling imposter, the captain and one of the chief persuaders of others, who afterward brake from the society of the colony and like outlaws retired into the woods to make a settlement and habitation there, on their party, with whom they purposed to leave our quarter and possess another island by themselves. But this happily found out, they were condemned to the same punishment which they would have chosen (but without smith or carpenter), and to an island far by itself they were carried and there left. (Wright, pp. 42-3)

Strachey then recounts how these men soon repented of their folly, and begged to be readmitted to the colony, which Sir Thomas Gates granted.

Nothing even *remotely* like these plots to remain behind on the island occurs in *The Tempest*, and it is therefore utter nonsense to suggest, as David Kathman does, that 'Many elements of the conspiracies in *The Tempest* are directly suggested by Strachey'.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Some of the survivors of the shipwreck plot to stay on the island rather than travel on to their original destination once ships are built to transport them.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(32) David Kathman writes:

The conspirators in Strachey question the governor's authority and threaten his life: "one Stephen Hopkins" said "that it was no breach of honesty . . . to decline from the obedience of the Governour" (30-31); and we are told that "the life of our Governour, along with many others were threatened" (32).

*Similarly in *The Tempest*, the two sets of conspirators question the authority of, and threaten the lives of, both Alonso and Prospero.*

In *The Tempest*, there are separate conspiracies to murder two specific individuals, King Alonso and Prospero. Nothing even remotely like this occurs in the Strachey letter.

David Kathman writes above that 'one Stephen Hopkins' said 'that it was no breach of honesty . . . to decline from the obedience of the Governour'. From the fact that David Kathman immediately follows this with Strachey's statement that 'the life of our Governour, along with many others were threatened', the reader would naturally infer

that Stephen Hopkins was engaged in a plot to murder the governor, Sir Thomas Gates. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is merely another example of David Kathman's sleight of hand. Here is Strachey's entire account of what transpired with Stephen Hopkins.

Yet could not this be any warning to others, who more subtly began to shake the foundation of our quiet safety; and therein did one Stephen Hopkins commence the first act or overture -- a fellow who had much knowledge in the Scriptures and could reason well therein, whom our minister therefore chose to be his clerk to read the psalms and chapters upon Sundays at the assembly of the congregation under him; who in January, the twenty-fourth, brake with one Samuel Sharp and Humfrey Reed (who presently [=immediately] discovered it to the governor) and alleged substantial arguments both civil and divine (the Scripture falsely quoted) that it was no breach of honesty, conscience, nor religion to decline from the obedience of the governor or refuse to go any further led by his authority (except it so pleased themselves) since the authority ceased when the wreck was committed, and, with it, they were all then freed from the government of any man, and for a matter of conscience it was not unknown to the meanest how much we were therein bound each one to provide for himself and his own family. For which there were two apparent reasons to stay them even in this place: first, abundance by God's providence of all manner of good food; next, some hope in reasonable time, when they might grow weary of the place, to build a small bark with the skill and help of the aforesaid Nicholas Bennett, whom they insinuated to them, albeit he was now absent from his quarter and working in the main island with Sir George Somers upon his pinnace, to be of the conspiracy, that so might [they] get clear from hence at their own pleasures. When in Virginia, the first would be assuredly wanting and they might well fear to be detained in that country by the authority of the commander thereof and their whole life to serve the turns of the adventurers [=the investors in London] with their travails and labors.

This being thus laid, and by such a one who had gotten an opinion (as I before remembered) of religion, when it was declared by those two accusers, not knowing what further ground it had of 'complices, it pleased the governor to let this his factious offense to have a public affront and contestation by these two witnesses before the whole company, who (at the tolling of a bell) assembled before a corps de garde; where the prisoner was brought forth in manacles and both accused and suffered to make at large to every particular his answer, which was only full of sorrow and tears, pleading simplicity and denial. But he being only found, at this time, both the captain and the follower of this mutiny, and generally held worthy to satisfy the punishment of his offense with the sacrifice of his life, our governor passed the sentence of a martial court upon him, such as belongs to mutiny and rebellion. But so penitent he was, and made so much moan, alleging the ruin of his wife and children in this his trespass, as it wrought in the hearts of all the better sort of the company, who therefore with humble entreaties and earnest supplications went unto our governor, whom they besought (as likewise did Captain Newport and myself) and never left him until we had got his pardon. (Wright, pp. 43-5)

That's it. Not a single word in the Stephen Hopkins incident about threats against the life of the governor, Sir Thomas Gates. As stated earlier, lumping the two quotations together is sleight of hand on David Kathman's part.

In fact, the quotation 'the life of our Governour, along with many others were threatened' belongs to the third of the incidents in which survivors of the shipwreck plotted to stay in Bermuda. Strachey writes:

In these dangers and devilish disquiets (whilst the Almighty God wrought for us and sent us, miraculously delivered from the calamities of the sea, all blessings upon the shore to content and bind us to gratefulness), thus enraged amongst ourselves to the destruction each of other, into what a mischief and misery had we been given up had we not had a governor with his authority to have suppressed the same? Yet was there a worse practice, faction, and conjuration afoot, deadly and bloody, in which the life of our governor, with many others, were threatened and could not but miscarry in his fall. (Wright, pp. 45-6)

Strachey goes on to describe in detail this third incident, yet he says not a single word more about any specific threats against the governor's life or anyone's life. What Strachey meant by his vague allusion to threats against the life of the governor and 'many others' is unclear. It seems entirely possible, from other remarks he makes, that it was feared that armed conflict might break out between the group plotting to stay in Bermuda and those going forward with the plan to build ships and leave for Jamestown, and that his remark about a threat to the lives of the governor and 'many others' was made in that context.

Strachey writes that those involved in the third plot to stay in Bermuda could not easily be apprehended because some were with Sir George Somers on the main island where a pinnacle was being built, while others were with Sir Thomas Gates' group on another island where another pinnacle was being built. Strachey and others were therefore ordered to go armed:

But as all giddy and lawless attempts have always something of imperfection, and that as well by the property of the action, which holdeth of disobedience and rebellion (both full of fear), as through the ignorance of the devisers themselves, so in this (besides those defects) there were some of the association who, not strong enough fortified in their own conceits, brake from the plot itself and (before the time was ripe for the execution thereof) discovered the whole order and every agent and actor thereof; who nevertheless were not suddenly apprehended, by reason the confederates were divided and separated in place, some with us and the chief with Sir George Somers in his island (and indeed all his whole company), but good watch passed upon them, every man from thenceforth commanded to wear his weapon, without which before we freely walked from quarter to quarter and conversed among ourselves, and every man advised to stand upon his guard, his own life not being in safety whilst his next neighbor was not to be trusted. (Wright, pp. 46-7)

violence in connection with the third incident, although, as mentioned earlier, he makes a vague statement that 'the life of our Governor, along with many others were threatened'. In his general comments prefacing his description of the three incidents Strachey writes:

Some dangerous and secret discontents nourished amongst us had like to have been the parents of bloody issues and mischiefs. They began first in the seamen . . . (Wright, p. 40)

Strachey then goes on to describe the first of the three incidents, which, as stated earlier, involved no plans for violence. Nor did the second incident. Only the third incident contains any mention of violence, and as stated earlier, Strachey gives no details whatever. His statement that 'Some dangerous and secret discontents nourished amongst us had like to have been the parents of bloody issues and mischiefs' is equally vague. If Strachey knew anything specific about planned violence in connection with the third incident, he said nothing about it in the Strachey letter beyond these two vague utterances. It is thus patently illogical to claim that Shakespeare used the Strachey letter as a source for the plot by Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo to murder Prospero.

Moreover David Kathman's alleged parallel between the Strachey letter and the quotations from *The Tempest* given above is misleading in the extreme. Stephano's statement that 'we will inherit here' is made in Act 2, Scene 2, but the plot to kill Prospero is not discussed until Act 3, Scene 2. Thus Stephano's statement that 'we will inherit here' has no relation to any conspiracy to kill Prospero. In fact, Stephano says that they will 'inherit' the island because King Alonso and the rest of the company have been drowned.

STEPHANO I prithee now, lead the way without any more talking. Trinculo, the king and all our company else being drowned, we will inherit here: here; bear my bottle: fellow Trinculo, we'll fill him by and by again. (2.2.73-5)

It is not until Act 3, Scene 2, that the murder plot is discussed, and Stephano says:

STEPHANO Monster, I will kill this man: his daughter and I will be king and queen--save our graces!--and Trinculo and thyself shall be viceroys. (3.2.106-8)

David Kathman's failure to advise the reader that the first quotation has nothing whatever to do with a murder plot is regrettable.

In addition, David Kathman's emphasis on Strachey's phrase 'the common sort' is misplaced. In Bermuda, the degree of difference in rank was relatively small, despite Strachey's reference to 'the common sort'. The highest-ranking individual in Bermuda had only the title of 'Sir'. And as has been shown, the three non-violent plots in Bermuda all pitted the 'common sort' against *each other*, not against an individual of higher rank. In contrast, in *The Tempest*, the difference in rank is very great: two sailors and a servant plot to murder a duke. It is therefore obvious that the Strachey letter did not serve in any way as an inspiration for the plot to murder Prospero in *The Tempest*.

to furnish each of them with two suits of apparel and contribute meal ratably for one whole year, so much among them as they had weekly now, which was one pound and an half a week (for such had been our proportion for nine months). (Wright, pp. 49-50)

It is clear from Strachey's account that the plotters in George Sommers' group forsook their labour and took to the woods because they feared their plot had been found out, but David Kathman says nothing of this. Moreover, David Kathman, by quoting selectively, puts their motive down exclusively to greed for pearl in order to link it to the 'glistening apparel' in *The Tempest*, although Strachey makes it clear that greed for pearl was but one of their possible motives.

This situation in which a sub-group of plotters forsake their work because they fear their plot has been found out could not be more different from *The Tempest*, in which Caliban stops serving Prospero because he has found someone (Stephano) who will murder Prospero. Moreover, there is no resemblance whatever between the men in Bermuda taking to the woods because they feared their plot to remain on the island had been found out, and Ariel leading Stephano and Trinculo against their wills, not through woods, but through 'tooth'd briars, sharp furzes, pricking gorse, and thorns':

ARIEL *I told you, sir, they were red-hot with drinking;
So full of valour that they smote the air
For breathing in their faces; beat the ground
For kissing of their feet; yet always bending
Towards their project. Then I beat my tabour;
At which, like unback'd colts, they prick'd their ears,
Advanced their eyelids, lifted up their noses
As they smelt music: so I charm'd their ears
That calf-like they my lowing follow'd through
Tooth'd briars, sharp furzes, pricking goss and thorns,
Which entered their frail shins: at last I left them
I' the filthy-mantled pool beyond your cell,
There dancing up to the chins, that the foul lake
O'erstunk their feet.* (4.1.171-84)

How David Kathman could suggest that there is a parallel between taking to the woods for fear that a plot has been found out, and being led involuntarily by magic through thorns and briars is beyond comprehension.

David Kathman also attempts to find a parallel between Strachey's mention of 'muddy pools' and the 'filthy-mantled pool' in *The Tempest*. They could not be more unlike. 'Filthy-mantled' obviously means covered with an algae growth, which is very different from a 'muddy' pool. Moreover, as demonstrated earlier, Strachey's mention of 'muddy pools' in connection with the quality of fish was related to muddy pools in *England*, not 'muddy pools' in Bermuda.

David Kathman's false parallels can thus be analyzed as follows:

A servant stops serving his master because he has found someone who will murder him.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

A spirit leads two sailors against their wills through briars, furze, gorse, and thorns.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Mention of a pool covered with algae growth.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

As for David Kathman's alleged parallel involving 'apparel', there are no points of comparison between the two instances he cites. As noted in the passage from the Strachey letter quoted above, the mention of apparel arose in connection with the third of the plots to remain behind in Bermuda. Carter, Waters, and the others who were now living apart as outlaws sent a petition to Sir Thomas Gates requesting that they be given provisions so that they could survive in Bermuda when the others left, including meal and two suits of clothing apiece.

Strachey records that Sir Thomas Gates replied to this petition by explaining that his promise to supply provisions for a year, including meal and two suits of clothing, had been made when it appeared that they would only be able to build one ship, and would therefore have to leave some of the survivors of the shipwreck behind in Bermuda until they could be rescued later. Now that two ships had been built which were of sufficient size to transport everyone, no-one needed to be left behind and there was thus no need to supply anyone with provisions for a year.

Our governor answered this their petition, writing to Sir George Somers to this effect: that true it was, at their first arrival upon this island, when it was feared how our means would not extend to the making of a vessel capable and large enough to transport all our countrymen at once, indeed, out of his Christian consideration (mourning for such his countrymen who, coming under his command, he foresaw that for a while he was like enough to leave here behind, compelled by tyranny of necessity), his purpose was not yet to forsake them so, as given up like savages, but to leave them all things fitting to defend them from want and wretchedness, as much at least as lay in his power to spare from the

**Not true for *The Tempest*.
 True for the Strachey letter.
 Ergo: a false parallel.**

David Kathman's second false parallel in the quotations above is also an example of sleight of hand. David Kathman links the Henry Paine incident (which was part of the third plot by some of the survivors of the shipwreck to stay behind in Bermuda) to the entirely unrelated killing of a sailor named Edward Samuel by another sailor, Robert Waters. By linking the quotations in a single sentence, David Kathman falsely implies that the killing of Edward Samuel had something to do with one of the plots to stay behind in Bermuda, whereas it was an entirely unrelated act of random violence. Strachey writes:

Likewise we buried five of our company: Jeffery Briars, Richard Lewis, William Hitchman, and my goddaughter, Bermuda Rolfe, and one untimely Edward Samuel, a sailor, being villainously killed by the foresaid Robert Waters (a sailor likewise) with a shovel, who strake him therewith under the lift of the ear. (Wright, p. 54)

Strachey then goes on to say that Waters was apprehended, but that his fellow sailors freed Waters 'in despite and disdain that justice should be showed upon a sailor'. (Wright, p. 55)

There is nothing even remotely like this in *The Tempest*. For David Kathman to suggest that this random violent murder of one sailor by another with a shovel was the inspiration for the plots to murder King Alonso and Prospero in *The Tempest* is unadulterated nonsense.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

In a random act of violence a sailor kills another sailor by hitting him with a shovel, is apprehended, and then freed by his fellow sailors.

**Not true for *The Tempest*.
 True for the Strachey letter.
 Ergo: a false parallel.**

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(37) David Kathman writes:

In Strachey, a plot against the Governor is discovered "before the time was ripe for the execution thereof" after which "every man [was] thenceforth commanded to weare his weapon . . . and every man advised to stand upon his guard" (33).

In the play, the plot of Sebastian and Antonio against the King is foiled before they can execute it, after which Gonzalo says, "'Tis best we stand upon our guard, / Or that we quit this place. Let's draw our weapons" (2.1.321-22).

Another example of David Kathman's sleight of hand. His quotations above are from Strachey's description of the third of the plots by some of the survivors of the shipwreck to stay behind in Bermuda. But none of the three plots, included this third plot, was a 'plot against the Governor', as David Kathman falsely claims. It was a plot by one group of the survivors against the rest of the survivors. In the case of this plot, those who wished to stay behind planned to rob the storehouse so that those who were trying to build ships to leave the island would have neither equipment to do so nor provisions for the journey. Strachey writes:

They persevered, therefore, not only to draw unto them such a number and associates as they could work into the abandoning of our governor and to the inhabiting of this island: they had now purposed to have made a surprise of the storehouse and to have forced from thence what was therein either of meal, cloth, cables, arms, sails, oars, or what else it pleased God that we had recovered from the wreck and was to serve our general necessity and use, either for the relief of us while we stayed here, or for the carrying of us from this place again when our pinnace should have been furnished. (Wright, p. 46)

Strachey then writes that this plan on the part of some of the survivors to prevent the rest from leaving by robbing the storehouse was frustrated before it could be executed:

But as all giddy and lawless attempts have always something of imperfection, and that as well by the property of the action, which holdeth of disobedience and rebellion (both full of fear), as through the ignorance of the devisers themselves, so in this (besides those defects) there were some of the association who, not strong enough fortified in their own conceits, brake from the plot itself and (before the time was ripe for the execution thereof) discovered the whole order and every agent and actor thereof; who nevertheless were not suddenly apprehended, by reason the confederates were divided and separated in place, some with us and the chief with Sir George Somers in his island (and indeed all his whole company), but good watch passed upon them, every man from thenceforth commanded to wear his weapon, without which before we freely walked from quarter to quarter and conversed among ourselves, and every man advised to stand upon his guard, his own life not being in safety whilst his next neighbor was not to be trusted. (Wright, pp. 46-7)

Nothing remotely like this occurs in *The Tempest*.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Some of the survivors of the shipwreck plan to rob the storehouse to prevent the other survivors from building ships and leaving the island.

1582 *Stanyhurst Aeneis i. (Arb.)* 27 *Thee gates of warfare wyl then bee mannaled hardly
With steele bunch chayne knob.*

1593 *Shakes. 2 Hen. VI, v. i.* 149 *Wee'l bate thy Bears to death, And manacle the Berard
in their Chaines.*

1610 *Temp. i. ii.* 461 *Ile manacle thy necke and feete together.*

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

A prisoner is brought forth in manacles (i.e. handcuffs).

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(39) David Kathman writes:

Much of Strachey's narrative describes the building of a new ship to reach Virginia, a project which involved much cutting and carrying of wood.

In the play, both Caliban (in 2.2) and Ferdinand (in 3.1) are made by Prospero to carry wood:

The men in Strachey "were . . . hardly drawn to it [chopping and carrying wood], as the Tortoise to the enchantment, as the Proverbe is" (28);

Caliban is similarly reluctant ("I needs must curse" (2.2.4)), but has no choice because of Prospero's magic.

David Kathman is in error in his claim that Strachey describes the building of 'a new ship to reach Virginia'. Strachey describes the building of *two* new ships (pinnaces), as well as the remodelling of one of the original longboats from the Sea Venture. (Wright, p. 35)

However, leaving that point aside, there is no parallel between the Strachey letter and *The Tempest* in terms of what is done with wood. In the Strachey letter, the emphasis is strictly on shipbuilding. Strachey writes:

[Sir George Somers] consulted with our governor that if he might have two carpenters (for we had four, such as they were) and twenty men over with him into the main island he would quickly frame up another little bark to second ours, for the better fitting and conveyance of our people. Our governor, with many thanks (as the cause required) cherishing this so careful and religious consideration in him (and whose experience likewise was somewhat in these affairs), granted him all things suitable to his desire and

to the furthering of the work. Who therefore had made ready for him all such tools and instruments as our own use required not; and for him were drawn forth twenty of the ablest and stoutest of the company and the best of our men to hew and square timber, when himself then, with daily pains and labor, wrought upon a small vessel, which was soon ready as ours. At which we leave him busied and return to ourselves. (Wright, pp. 38-9)

In contrast, Caliban in *The Tempest* gathers firewood for Prospero, a task which obviously has nothing in common with felling, carrying, hewing, and squaring timber for shipbuilding:

PROSPERO But, as 'tis,
We cannot miss him: he does make our fire,
Fetch in our wood and serves in offices
That profit us. What, ho! slave! Caliban!
Thou earth, thou! speak.

CALIBAN [Within] There's wood enough within. (1.2.310-15)

Enter Caliban with a burthen of wood.

Lo, now, lo!
Here comes a spirit of his, and to torment me
For bringing wood in slowly. I'll fall flat;
Perchance he will not mind me. (2.2.14-5)

CALIBAN Do not torment me, prithee; I'll bring my wood home faster. (2.2.71-2)

CALIBAN I'll show thee the best springs; I'll pluck thee berries;
I'll fish for thee and get thee wood enough.
A plague upon the tyrant that I serve!
I'll bear him no more sticks, but follow thee,
Thou wondrous man. (2.2.159-64)

Ferdinand's task in *The Tempest* is the same as Caliban's, to carry and pile firewood, and thus has absolutely nothing in common with felling, carrying, hewing, and squaring timber for shipbuilding:

FERDINAND. I must remove
Some thousands of these logs, and pile them up,
Upon a sore injunction (3.1.9-11)

MIRANDA. I would the lightning had
Burnt up these logs that you are enjoin'd to pile!
Pray set it down and rest you. When this burns,
'Twill weep for having wearied you. (3.1.16-9)

David Kathman's suggestion that Shakespeare equated shipbuilding with gathering firewood because both involve wood is ludicrous.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Men fell, carry, hew, and square timber for shipbuilding.

Not true for The Tempest.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(40) David Kathman writes:

On the other hand, Strachey describes how "the Governour dispensed with no travaile of his body, nor forbare . . . to fell, carry, and sawe Cedar . . . (for what was so meane, whereto he would not himselfe set his hand) . . . his owne presence and hand being set to every meane labour, and imployed so readily to every office, made our people at length more diligent" (28).

Ferdinand is similarly enthusiastic:

*There be some sports are painful, and their labor
Delight in them sets off; some kinds of baseness
Are nobly undergone; and most poor matters
Point to rich ends. This my mean task
Would be as heavy to me, as odious, but
The mistress which I serve, quickens what's dead,
And makes my labors pleasures. (3.1.1-7)*

Here is a fuller quotation from Strachey:

In the mean space did one Frobisher, born at Gravesend, and at his coming forth now dwelling at Limehouse (a painful and well-experienced shipwright and skillful workman) labor the building of a little pinnace; for the furtherance of which the governor [=Sir Thomas Gates] dispensed with no travail of his body nor forbare any care or study of mind, persuading as much and more an ill-qualified parcel of people by his own performance than by authority thereby to hold them to their work, namely to fell, carry, and saw cedar fit for the carpenter's purpose (for what was so mean whereto he would not himself set his hand, being therefor up early and down late?). Yet nevertheless were they hardly drawn to it, as the tortoise to the enchantment, as the proverb is, but his own presence and hand being set to every mean labor and employed so readily to every office

made our people at length more diligent and willing to be called thereunto where they should see him before they came. In which we may observe how much example prevails above precepts and how readier men are to be led by eyes than ears. (Wright, pp. 39-40)

Strachey's point is very clear, particularly with respect to Sir Thomas Gates. The reasons Sir George Sommers and Sir Thomas Gates laboured at the menial functions of felling, carrying, hewing, and squaring timber were twofold: (1) the need to build ships to transport the survivors of the shipwreck to Virginia, and (2) an awareness that the ill-equipped group of survivors would not get the job done without leadership by example. Sir Thomas Gates exhibited the same qualities of leadership by example in organizing and personally taking part in the bailing operation which saved the Sea Venture from sinking before it was run aground in Bermuda.

David Kathman is in error in claiming that Ferdinand is 'similarly enthusiastic' about the work. When Prospero threatens to take him prisoner, Ferdinand draws his sword, but is prevented from using it by Prospero's magic:

*FERDINAND. No,
I will resist such entertainment till
Mine enemy has more power.*

He draws, and is charmed from moving. (1.2.465-8)

Ferdinand is enforced to the work by Prospero's magic, just as Caliban is, although Ferdinand derives some comfort from the fact that it allows him an opportunity to be near Miranda. Moreover Ferdinand no more carries out his menial task to inspire others by his leadership than does Caliban.

David Kathman's suggestion that Shakespeare used Sir Thomas Gates' leadership by example as a model for Ferdinand is thus utterly without merit.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Those in charge undertake menial tasks in order to inspire their men to work by leading by example.

**Not true for The Tempest.
True for the Strachey letter.
Ergo: a false parallel.**

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(41) David Kathman writes:

Strachey tells how in Virginia, the Indians killed one of the Englishmen whose canoe ran aground near their village. This murder troubled Gates, "who since his first landing in the Countrey (how justly soever provoked) would not by any meanes be wrought to a violent proceeding against them, for all the practices of villany, with which they daily endangered our men, thinking it possible, by a more tractable course, to winne them to a better condition: but now being startled by this, he well perceived, how little a faire and noble intreatie workes upon a barbarous disposition, and therefore in some measure purposed to be avenged" (62-63).

This is paralleled in the play by Prospero's initial kindness toward Caliban, turning to anger and revenge after Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda.

*I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other . . . But thy vild race
(Though thou didst learn) had that in't which good natures
Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
Deservedly confin'd into this rock,
Who hadst deserved more than a prison. (1.2.353-62)*

There is no parallel whatsoever between the two incidents. The history between the Jamestown colonists (and it should be noted that this incident in the Strachey letter relates to the Jamestown colony, and not to Bermuda) was entirely different from that between Prospero and Caliban. The Jamestown colonists had not attempted to 'teach' the Indians anything, nor shown them any special favour, and the Indians, for their part, had committed one atrocity after another against the Jamestown colonists. Strachey himself records several such atrocities.

It will be recalled that soon after their shipwreck in Bermuda the survivors remodelled one of the longboats from the Sea Venture and sent Henry Ravens, Thomas Whittingham, and six sailors to Jamestown in it. (Wright, pp. 35-6) They never arrived. Strachey records what happened to them:

True it is, such who talked with our men from the shore delivered how safely all our ships the last year (excepting only the admiral and the little pinnace, in which one Michael Philes commanded, of some twenty ton, which we towed astern till the storm blew) arrived, and how our people (well increased) had therefore builded this fort; only we could not learn anything of our longboat sent from the Bermudas but what we gathered by the Indians themselves, especially from Powhatan, who would tell our men of such a boat landed in one of his rivers and would describe the people and make much scoffing sport thereat: by which we have gathered that it is most likely how it arrived upon our coast and, not meeting with our river, were taken at some time or other at some advantage by the savages and so cut off. (Wright, p. 62)

It would thus appear that Powhatan and his men not only killed Ravens and the others, but considered the killing of them a matter of amusement.

Moreover the *True Declaration* recounts an incident in which some 28-30 colonists broke away from the colony, stole a ship, and angered the Indians by some violence toward them:

Unto idleness you may join treasons wrought by those unhallowed creatures that forsook the colony and exposed their desolate brethren to extreme misery. You shall know that 28 or 30 of the company were appointed (in the ship called the Swallow) to truck for corn with the Indians, and having obtained a great quantity by trading, the most seditious of them conspired together, persuaded some, & enforced others, to this barbarous project: they stole away the ship, they made a league amongst themselves to be professed pirates, with dreams of mountains of gold and happy robberies. Thus at one instant they wronged the hopes and subverted the cares of the colony, who depending upon their return fore-slowed to look out for further provision. They created the Indians our implacable enemies by some violence they had offered. (p. 15)

As a result of this, Powhatan and his men massacred more than 30 of the men in the colony. They also starved the colonists by driving away the deer, killing all the hogs, and refusing to trade with the colonists. Moreover if any of the colonists left the fort at Jamestown to search for food or wood, Powhatan and his men killed them:

The state of the colony by these accidents began to find a sensible declining, which Powhatan (as a greedy vulture) observing, and boiling with desire of revenge, he invited Captain Ratcliffe and about thirty others to trade for corn, and under the colour of fairest friendship he brought them within the compass of his ambush, whereby they were cruelly murdered and massacred. For upon confidence of his fidelity they went one and one into several houses, which caused their several destructions, when if but any six had remained together they would have been a bulwark for the general preservation. After this, Powhatan in the night cut off some of our boats, he drave away all the deer into the farther part of the country, he and his people destroyed our hogs, (to the number of about six hundred), he sent none of his Indians to trade with us, but laid secret ambushes in the woods, that if one or two dropped out of the fort alone they were endangered. (p. 17)

All this occurred before the survivors from Bermuda arrived at Jamestown, but as Strachey records, Powhatan's prohibition against trading was still in effect, as a result of which many of the colonists had starved to death the previous winter and the rest were in imminent danger of dying of starvation. Moreover several more murders by the Indians occurred just before, and just after, Strachey's arrival at Jamestown. Strachey writes:

But after much debating it could not appear how possibly they might preserve themselves (reserving that little which we brought from the Bermudas in our ships and was upon all occasions to stand good by us) ten days from starving. For besides that the Indians were of themselves poor, they were forbidden likewise (by their subtle King Powhatan) at all to trade with us; and not only so, but to endanger and assault any boat upon the river or straggler out of the fort by land, by which (not long before our arrival) our people had a large boat cut off and divers of our men killed, even within command of our blockhouse;

A marriage takes place on the island.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(43) David Kathman writes:

The debate among Gonzalo, Antonio and Sebastian in act 2, scene 1 about the nature of paradise parallels the public debate in England in the wake of the attempted colonization of Virginia beginning in 1607, three years after Oxford's death.

*It is well known that Shakespeare got the wording for Gonzalo's speeches from Florio's English translation of Montaigne's *De Cannibales*, published in 1603, but the references cited in note 3, particularly Cawley and Gayley, show in detail how the debate in the play parallels the public debate in England c. 1610, and how it was explicitly recognized that "Plaiers" were involved in the discussion.*

David Kathman doesn't explain what this point is doing in an essay discussing the Strachey and Jourdain accounts and the *True Declaration* as sources of *The Tempest* since it involves none of the three tracts in question.

In any event, since David Kathman doesn't set out the arguments for his conclusion that the debate among Gonzalo, Antonio, and Sebastian 'parallels the public debate in England c.1610', it is pointless to attempt to refute it.

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(44) David Kathman writes:

Strachey has a digression (55) in which he mentions Aeneas, followed closely (56) by a digression in which he mentions Dido;

the discussion among Antonio, Sebastian, etc. in act 2, scene 1 has a puzzling digression on Dido and Aeneas (77-86).

Despite David Kathman's claims, there is no parallel between the mention of Dido and Aeneas in the Strachey letter, and Shakespeare's mention of Dido and brief allusion to Aeneas in *The Tempest*.

In describing the fort at Jamestown, Strachey writes:

A low level of ground about half an acre (or so much as Queen Dido might buy of King Iarbas, which she compassed about with the thongs cut out of one bull hide and therein built her castle of Byrsa) on the north side of the river is cast almost into the form of a triangle and so palisaded. (Wright, p. 79)

The original source of the myth referred to by Strachey appears to have been Justin:

http://latin204.tripod.com/essays/dido_myth_before_vergil.html

The first source of the pre-Vergil Dido myth is Justin, who in his Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, writes about the mythical founder-queen. Justin writes that Dido's name was originally Elissa and that 'Dido' was a title added onto her name. The name Dido is the Punic word for 'virago, -inis,' which means 'female warrior or heroine'. She was bestowed with the name 'Dido' posthumously because, according to Justin, [she] preferred death to marriage with Iarbus or Iarbus, the King of Gaetulia, a city in northern Africa. Iarbus originally sold Dido the land that became Carthage and later courted her. A myth is attached to the sale of Carthage to Dido. Iarbus, after receiving money from Dido, gave her an ox hide. He told her that she could have all the land that could fit inside the ox hide. Rather than fall victim to his scheming, Dido decided to trick Iarbus himself. She cut the ox hide into very small strips and laid them out around a large area of land. Under their agreement, Iarbus had to give Dido all the land that fit within the ox hide. After the death of Dido's husband Sychaeus, Iarbus courted Dido until the time of her unfortunate death.

The fact that the original source of myths about Dido, Queen of Carthage, was Justin's *Histories of Trogus Pompeius* is interesting in light of the fact that in 1564 Oxford's uncle, Arthur Golding, dedicated to Oxford his translation of Justin's *Histories of Trogus Pompeius*. We can be fairly certain that Oxford read the book, and was thus very familiar with the myths about Dido.

Shakespeare refers in several different plays to Dido and Carthage. In *The Tempest*, the point of the dialogue is that Tunis, from which King Alonso's ship was sailing on its way back to Naples when it was wrecked on Prospero's island, was on the site of the ancient city of Carthage:

GONZALO Methinks our garments are now as fresh as when we put them on first in Afric, at the marriage of the king's fair daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis.

SEBASTIAN 'Twas a sweet marriage, and we prosper well in our return.

ADRIAN Tunis was never grac'd before with such a paragon to their Queen.

GONZALO Not since widow Dido's time.

ANTONIO *Widow! a pox o' that! How came that widow in? widow Dido!*

SEBASTIAN *What if he had said 'widower Aeneas' too? Good Lord, how you take it!*

ADRIAN *'Widow Dido' said you? you make me study of that: she was of Carthage, not of Tunis.*

GONZALO *This Tunis, sir, was Carthage.*

ADRIAN *Carthage?*

GONZALO *I assure you, Carthage. (2.1.69-86)*

It's also interesting that Shakespeare stresses that Dido was a widow, again showing his familiarity with details of the Dido myths. From the website noted above:

According to Justin, Dido was the sister of Pygmalion, a Tyrian king. After Pygmalion became king, Dido was wed to their uncle, Sychaeus. Sychaeus was murdered by Pygmalion, who discovered that Sychaeus had much wealth that he [had] hidden from Dido and Pygmalion. Sychaeus came to Dido in a dream and told her that he had been murdered by his nephew, her brother the king. The ghost then told Dido to leave Tyre.

Dido was thus the widow of the murdered Sychaeus.

There is therefore no parallel, since Strachey and Shakespeare refer to different aspects of the Dido myths. In describing the size of the palisaded area of the fort at Jamestown, Strachey refers to the stratagem by which Dido purchased from King Iarbus the land on which Carthage was built. In *The Tempest*, Shakespeare has Gonzalo explain that Tunis, from which they have just come, was once Carthage, and refers to Dido's widowed status.

Shakespeare also mentions Aeneas briefly in passing (see above), perhaps alluding lightly to the fact that Dido and Aeneas were lovers in Carthage. Strachey, however, refers to an entirely different aspect of the Aeneas story, a part which belongs to Aeneas' life after he had left Carthage. In this case Strachey is not describing the fort at Jamestown, but rather the colonists' search, when they first landed, for a suitable place to settle. Strachey writes:

At length, after much and weary search (with their barge coasting still before, as Vergil writeth Aeneas did arriving in the region of Italy called Latium, upon the banks of the river Tiber) in the country of werowance called Wowinchapunke (a ditionary [=subject] to Powhatan), within this fair river of Paspahagh, which we have called the King's River, a country least inhabited by the Indian, as they all this way observed, and threescore miles and better up the fresh channel from Cape Henry, they had sight of an extended plain and spot of earth which thrust out into the depth and midst of the channel, making a kind of chersonese or peninsula, for it was fastened only to the land with a slender neck

Indies. He paid five more visits to America before his death, which took place at Valladolid in 1557.

Besides a romance of chivalry entitled Claribalte (1519) Oviedo wrote two extensive works of permanent value: La General y natural historia de las Indias and Las Quinquagenas de la nobleza de España. The former work was first issued at Toledo (1526) in the form of a summary entitled La Natural hystoria de las Indias; the first part of La Historia general de las Indias appeared at Seville in 1535; but the complete work was not published till 1851-1855, when it was edited by JA de los Rios for the Spanish Academy of History.

Though written in a diffuse style, it embodies a mass of curious information collected at first hand, and, the incomplete Seville edition was widely read in the English and French versions published by Eden and Poleur respectively in 1555 and 1556. Las Casas describes it as "containing almost as many lies as pages," and Oviedo undoubtedly puts the most favourable interpretation on the proceedings of his countrymen; but, apart from a patriotic bias which is too obvious to be misleading, his narrative is both trustworthy and interesting. In his Quinquagenas he indulges in much lively gossip concerning eminent contemporaries; this collection of quaint, moralizing anecdotes was first published at Madrid in 1880, under the editorship of Vicente de la Fuente.

The name, as given by Strachey, is the Latinized version of the author's name, and there is therefore no parallel with the Spanish Gonzalo and the English Ferdinand of *The Tempest*.

Moreover, just how common the names Gonzalo Fernandez were is suggested by the fact cited in this biography that Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo y Valdes went to Italy 'and there acted as secretary to Gonzalo Fernandez de Cordoba'.

It should be noted that even Wright says that it is mere 'conjecture' that the Latinized name of the author as given in Strachey could have suggested the names Gonzalo and Ferdinand in *The Tempest*. (p.18)

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Use of the names Gonzalo and Ferdinand.

True for The Tempest.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.

Incidentally, it is interesting that Oviedo (see above) wrote a chivalric romance entitled Claribalte. Could Shakespeare have taken the name of King Alonso's daughter Claribel in *The Tempest* from Claribalte?

as does Shakespeare

"No more amazement" (1.2.14),

"I flam'd amazement" (1.2.198),

"All torment, trouble, wonder, and amazement / Inhabits here" (5.104-05).

David Kathman's contends that using a common word three times in a lengthy tract (the Strachey letter) or in a play (*The Tempest*) constitutes 'repeated' use, which is not true. Moreover to suggest that the use of a word so common among the Elizabethans as 'amazement' constitutes a parallel shows a certain degree of desperation in seeking out alleged parallels.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Repeated use of the word 'amazement'.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

Not true for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel (or rather, a non-existent parallel).

Fuller quotations for Strachey's and Shakespeare's three respective usages of 'amazement' are given below. It will be noticed that Shakespeare uses the word once as the direct object of the verb 'flamed', a very unusual usage, while Strachey's usages are all conventional.

Strachey writes that the storm:

[A]t length did beat all light from Heaven; which, like an hell of darkness, turned black upon us, so much the more fuller of horror as in such cases horror and fear use to overrun the troubled and overmastered sense of all, which taken up with amazement, the ears lay so sensible to the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds and distraction of our company as who was most armed and best prepared was not a little shaken. (Wright, p. 4)

Strachey also writes that when the 'mighty leak' was discovered:

This, imparting no less terror than danger, ran through the whole ship with much fright and amazement, startled and turned the blood and took down the braves of the most hardy mariner of them all. (Wright, p. 8)

Speaking of the appearance of St. Elmo's fire, Strachey writes:

Could it have served us now miraculously to have taken our height by, it might have stricken amazement and a reverence in our devotions according to the due of a miracle. But it did not light us any whit the more to our known way, who ran now (as do hoodwinked men) at all adventures, sometimes north and northeast, then north and by

LEONTES *Thou didst speak but well
When most the truth; which I receive much better
Than to be pitied of thee. Prithee, bring me
To the dead bodies of my queen and son:
One grave shall be for both: upon them shall
The causes of their death appear, unto
Our shame perpetual. Once a day I'll visit
The chapel where they lie, and tears shed there
Shall be my recreation: so long as nature
Will bear up with this exercise, so long
I daily vow to use it. Come and lead me
Unto these sorrows. (The Winter's Tale, 3.2.232-43)*

PROSPERO *O, a cherubim
Thou wast that did preserve me. Thou didst smile.
Infused with a fortitude from heaven,
When I have deck'd the sea with drops full salt,
Under my burthen groan'd; which raised in me
An undergoing stomach, to bear up
Against what should ensue. (The Tempest, 1.2.152-8)*

These two 'examples' are thus mere padding, and all David Kathman has to work with is the two examples from Strachey and the one from *The Tempest* in which 'bear up' is used in a nautical sense:

*37. a. esp. in Nautical phraseology: To sail in a certain direction; hence, to bear away: to sail away, leave. to bear down (upon or towards): to sail with the wind (towards). to bear off: see quot. to bear up: to put the helm 'up' so as to bring the vessel into the direction of the wind. to bear up for, or bear with (a place): to sail towards.
1605 Shakes. Temp. iii. ii. 3 Beare vp, & boord em.
1611 Bible Acts xxvii. 15 The ship. .could not beare vp into [Geneva make way against] the winde.*

The nautical meaning of 'bear up' is therefore 'to put the helm up so as to bring the vessel into the direction of the wind'.

How often would this happen on an Elizabethan ship? All the time. This is not an obscure nautical term. Anyone who knew anything about sailing (and Shakespeare obviously knew a lot) would know this term because it describes one of the most common of nautical manoeuvres.

Strachey uses the term in this strictly nautical sense:

Once, so huge a sea brake upon the poop and quarter upon us as it covered our ship from stern to stem like a garment or a vast cloud; it filled her brim full for a while within, from

the hatches up to the spardeck. This source or confluence of water was so violent, as it rushed and carried the helm-man from the helm and wrested the whipstaff out of his hand, which so flew from side to side that when he would have seized the same again it so tossed him from starboard to larboard, as it was God's mercy it had not split him. It so beat him from his hold and so bruised him as a fresh man hazarding in by chance fell fair with it and, by main strength bearing somewhat up, made good his place, and with much clamor encouraged, and called upon others; who gave her now up, rent in pieces and absolutely lost. (Wright, p. 10-1)

Indeed the morning, now three quarters spent, had won a little clearness from the days before, and it being better surveyed, the very trees were seen to move with the wind upon the shoreside; whereupon our governor commanded the helm-man to bear up. (Wright, p. 15)

Strachey's use of the nautical phrase 'bear up' is completely literal. He is merely describing one of the most common of nautical manoeuvres on a sailing ship of the time.

In contrast, Shakespeare's usage in *The Tempest* is very different from Strachey's. Here is the note from *The Riverside Shakespeare*:

bear up and board 'em: stand firm and attack. Stephano uses naval jargon as an encouragement to drink. (p. 1625)

The editors of *The Riverside Shakespeare* seem to have misunderstood the term 'bear up'. As Shakespeare uses the phrase, it means 'bear up into the wind so as to get close to a neighbouring ship, and then board it'. It is not certain whether Shakespeare was thinking of Elizabethan warfare, or piracy, or both, but that is certainly the image he is conjuring up, i.e. bringing a vessel up into the wind so as to be in position to board a neighbouring ship and attack it.

Although the editors of *The Riverside Shakespeare* have misconstrued Shakespeare's image, there can be no doubt that they are correct in stating that, as Shakespeare uses the phrase, it is an encouragement to drink. The entire context of the passage in *The Tempest* makes that clear:

STEPHANO Tell not me; when the butt is out, we will drink water; not a drop before: therefore bear up, and board 'em. Servant-monster, drink to me. (3.2.1-3)

Where then is the alleged parallel between the Strachey letter and *The Tempest*? Vanished into thin air. Two of David Kathman's examples are mere padding having to do with an entirely different non-nautical meaning of the phrase 'bear up'. Moreover David Kathman fails to mention that the phrase 'bear up' describes one of the most common nautical manoeuvres on an Elizabethan sailing ship, and that no-one would need a 'source' for it. And indeed, how could Strachey have been a source since Strachey doesn't explain what the nautical term 'bear up' means? Finally, David Kathman fails to inform the reader that Shakespeare's is a figurative and humorous usage, not a literal one

trim, n.

I. Nautical and Aeronautical senses.

1. The state of being trimmed or prepared for sailing; esp. the condition of being 'fully rigged and ready to sail' (Onions Shaks. Gloss.).

1590 Shakes. Com. Err. iv. i. 90 The ship is in her trim, the merrie winde Blowes faire from land.

1595 Capt. Wyatt R. Dudley's Voy. W. Ind. (Hakl. Soc.) 59 Our good shipp beinge putt in her best trym..Captaine Jobson caused the collers..to be advanced in the topps, poope and shrowdes of our shipp.

1628 Digby Voy. Medit. (Camden) 36, I found my shippe to be in perfect good trimme.

Incidentally it is highly ironic that David Kathman suggests that Shakespeare used the Strachey letter as a source for the word 'trim' in the nautical sense in *The Tempest* in 1610 when, according to the OED, Shakespeare was the first writer ever to use 'trim' in the nautical sense in *The Comedy of Errors* in 1590!

But in fact David Kathman is wrong in suggesting that Shakespeare uses 'trim' in *The Tempest* in a nautical sense. According to the wording in *The Tempest*, it is the sailors who are in their 'trim', not the ship:

*BOATSWAIN We were dead of sleep,
And (how we know not) all clapp'd under hatches,
Where, but even now, with strange and several noises
Of roaring, shrieking, howling, jingling chains,
And moe diversity of sounds, all horrible,
We were awak'd; straightway, at liberty;
Where we, in all our trim, freshly beheld
Our royal, good, and gallant ship; our master
Cap'ring to eye her. (5.1.230-8)*

Shakespeare thus appears to use the word 'trim' in the sense of attire:

4. a. Adornment, array; equipment, outfit; dress: usually in reference to style or appearance; hence sometimes nearly = guise, aspect.

1596 Shakes. 1 Hen. IV, iv. i. 113 They come like Sacrifices in their trimme.

1623 Massinger Bondman i. i, I'd court Bellona in her horrid trim As if she were a mistress.

In fairness, it seems not unreasonable to suspect an error in the *First Folio*. The line should perhaps have read

*Where we, in all her trim, freshly beheld
Our royal, good, and gallant ship.*

1610 *Shakes. Temp. iv. i. 206* For the prize Ile bring thee too Shall hudwinke this mischance.

hoodwinked, ppl. a.

Blindfolded, blinded. lit. and fig.

1640 *Bp. Hall Chr. Moder. (Ward) 26/2* If an hood-winked man had reeled upon him heedlessly in his way.

In addition, David Kathman is wrong in claiming that Shakespeare used 'hoodwink' only three times in the canon. Shakespeare used it six times, three times as a verb, and three times as a participial adjective.

SECOND LORD I, with a troop of Florentines, will suddenly surprise him; such I will have, whom I am sure he knows not from the enemy: we will bind and hoodwink him so, that he shall suppose no other but that he is carried into the leaguer of the adversaries, when we bring him to our own tents. (*All's Well*, 3.6. 22-7)

FIRST SOLDIER The general is content to spare thee yet;
And, hoodwink'd as thou art, will lead thee on
To gather from thee: haply thou mayst inform
Something to save thy life. (*All's Well*, 4.1.80-3)

CAIUS LUCIUS Away, boy, from the troops, and save thyself;
For friends kill friends, and the disorder's such
As war were hoodwink'd. (*Cymbeline*, 5.2.14-6)

BENVOLIO The date is out of such prolixity:
We'll have no Cupid hoodwink'd with a scarf,
Bearing a Tartar's painted bow of lath,
Scaring the ladies like a crow-keeper (*Romeo and Juliet*, 1.4.3-6)

CALIBAN Good my lord, give me thy favour still.
Be patient, for the prize I'll bring thee to
Shall hoodwink this mischance: therefore speak softly.
All's hush'd as midnight yet. (*The Tempest*, 4.1.204-7)

MACDUFF But fear not yet
To take upon you what is yours: you may
Convey your pleasures in a spacious plenty,
And yet seem cold, the time you may so hoodwink.
We have willing dames enough: there cannot be

1297 R. Glouc. 547 Hii houede vnder boskes.

1300 Prov. Hendyng xx, Vnder boske shal men weder abide, quoth Hendyng.

1325 E.E. Allit. P. B. 322 Bothe boskez & bourez & wel bounden penez.

While 'bosk' is a noun, the word Shakespeare used, 'bosky', is an adjective, which according to the OED first appeared in print in 1593 in Peele's play *Edward I*, followed by Shakespeare's use of it in *The Tempest*:

bosky, *a.1*

[*f. bosk* (not recorded between 14th and 19th c., but preserved in dial.) + -y; or alteration of *busky*, after *It. boscoso*.]

Consisting of or covered with bushes or underwood; full of thickets, bushy. (Also transf.)

1593 Peele *Chron. Edw. I.* (1874) 407 In this bosky wood Bury his corpse.

1610 Shakes. *Temp.* iv. i. 81 My boskie acres, and my vnshrubd downe.

1634 Milton *Comus* 312 And every bosky bourn.

David Kathman's false parallel can thus be analyzed as follows:

Use of the noun bosk, a word otherwise unknown in print between the 14th and 19th centuries.

Not true for *The Tempest*.

True for the Strachey letter.

Ergo: a false parallel.