

SHAKESPEARE AND THE VOYAGERS REVISITED

BY ROGER STRITMATTER AND LYNNE KOSITSKY

A two-century critical tradition that the 1609 Bermuda shipwreck literature (Jourdain 1610, 'True Declaration' 1610, Strachey 1625) establishes a *terminus a quo* for *The Tempest* is incorrect. Strachey's *True Reportory*, the only Bermuda pamphlet now thought to have significantly influenced *The Tempest*, was put into its only extant form too late to be used as the play's source and probably after the play had already been produced in 1611. Strachey, a notorious plagiarist even by early modern standards, borrowed much that his narrative shares with *The Tempest* from earlier sources also accessible to Shakespeare.

Until recently the mainstream of Shakespeare scholarship has not deviated from the opinion that the composition of *The Tempest* was directly influenced by, if not conceived in response to, the 1609 shipwreck of Sir Thomas Gates in Bermuda, and therefore that it must have been written shortly before its first recorded performance at Whitehall on 1 November 1611 (Chambers 1930 I 491; II 342). The theory originated with Edmund Malone's influential 'Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare Were Written' (1778),¹ and gained wide currency in the 19th and—especially—early 20th century studies, being reiterated and reinforced by Malone (1808, 1821), and, with modifications, by Henry Howard Furness (1892), and many other influential scholars. Malone based the original case for the influence of the 'Sea Venture' episode on alleged parallelisms of thought, image, and language between *The Tempest* and

We would like to thank Andrew Gurr, David Lindley, Martin Hyatt, Tom Reedy and Michael Kositsky for their assistance.

1 'Though some account of the Bermuda Islands, which are mentioned in this play, had been published (as Dr. Farmer has observed), yet *they were not generally known* till Sir George Somers arrived there in 1609', wrote Malone. '*The Tempest* may fairly be attributed to a period subsequent to that year' (cited in Furness 274; our emphasis). Miller (12), curiously, attributes to Farmer the opposite belief that 'the Bermudas'—discovered in or about 1505 by Juan Bermudez—'was in fact a commonplace of the time'. Although we are currently unable to verify Farmer's opinion, there is no doubt that Miller's view regarding the wide currency of knowledge about Bermuda is the correct one. The islands had been well known for nearly a century by the time Sir George Somers and Sir Henry Gates were shipwrecked there in Spring 1609. The 1593 shipwreck of the *Edward Bonaventure* 'upon the isle of Bermuda', printed in Hackluyt's 1599 volume of *Principall Navigations* (Foster 22–30) made the region notorious in England. As early as 1595, in the popular account of Sir Walter Raleigh, the islands acquired a reputation as a 'perilous and fearful place', and 'the sea about the Bermudas [as] a hellish sea for thunder, lightning, and storms' (Raleigh). A map of the islands was printed as early as 1511, in the first Latin edition of Martyr's account of the voyages, *Opera Legatio Babylonica Oceani Decas Poemata Epigrammata*, which contained the first decade of *De Orbe Novo*, six years after Juan Bermudez discovered them. Farmer's second edition of *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare* (1767), however, mentions neither Setebos nor Bermuda.

Sylvester Jourdain's 1610 *Discovery of the Bermudas*, but the theory quickly ran aground,² and the case for the Bermuda link did not become well established in the critical literature until after Furness (1892), responding to the critics of Malone's case, argued that William Strachey's *True Reportory* (f.p. 1625) was actually the primary vector of influence. 25

The new theory swiftly gained wide acceptance, chiefly through the influence of Morton Luce (1902), C. M. Gayley (1917) and R. R. Cawley (1926), and it was eventually endorsed in some form by E. K. Chambers (1930), Frank Kermode (1954), Geoffrey Bullough (1975), and Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (1999), among many others. 'Shakespeare doubtless made use of the prints of 1610', wrote Chambers in 1930, 'but numerous verbal parallels make it clear that his main authority was the *True Reportory*' (I: 492). Bullough, likewise, concludes that 'Shakespeare *probably* read all three published tracts, maybe others too, and incorporated details from them into his comedy; and he *certainly* drew on Strachey's account' (VIII: 239, our emphasis). And Cawley's influential 1926 study assures us that the parallels between Strachey's work and 30 35

2 A survey of the nineteenth century literature reveals how thoroughly Malone's initial version of the Bermuda theory had been discredited by 1892; by the time of Furness' *Variorum*, nearly every element of Malone's case had been successfully challenged. As early as 1839, for instance, Hunter wondered

whether there is anything beyond that similarity which must always exist when the subject is a storm at sea and the wreck of a vessel on the rocky shore of an island, whether the subject be treated in a work of imagination, like *The Tempest*, or in such a pedestrian narrative as that of Jourdan. Mr. Malone has given the argument all the advantage it could derive from the artful aid of capitals and italics, but he seems to me to fail in showing coincidence in anything, except what has been common to all storms and all disastrous shipwrecks from the beginning of the world. For any critical or unusual circumstance, common to both, we look in vain . . .

(34)

Elze (first English translation 1874) confirmed that much of what Malone conceived to be unique to Jourdain could be found throughout the travel narratives of the era:

The points of coincidence between Shakespeare and Jourdan enumerated by Malone are briefly as follows: of the whole fleet, with Shakespeare, only the king's ship is wrecked, just as in the expedition to Virginia, it was only the Admiral's ship that was driven out of its course and destroyed. This circumstance, however, necessarily proceeds from the story of the play, and is besides an event so likely to occur, that it did not require to be borrowed from Jourdan. Not only on Columbus's first voyage of discovery was the flag-ship separated from the others in a similar way, but also in Drake's voyage round the world (1577-1580) the same thing happened in the Straits of Magellan, so that Drake had to sail on alone along the west coast of America.

(10-11)

To Hunter and Elze—among many others—conceded Furness, 'the parallelisms which were to Malone so remarkable and so convincing in Jourdan's pamphlet, were either commonplace or non-existent' (Furness 313). Gayley, agreeing two decades later, concedes that "from none of [the alleged parallels in the first pages] should we conclude that [Shakespeare] was dependent upon Jourdan" and in the remainder of the book 'there is nothing uniquely suggestive of *any feature of Shakespeare's Tempest*' (48: our emphasis).

The Tempest ‘make it virtually certain that Shakspere (sic) was following the document closely’ (690).³ 40

From its inception, however, the Strachey theory suffered from one nearly fatal flaw. Not published until 1625, some wondered how *True Reportory* could have influenced a play written at least fourteen years earlier. Furness solved this problem by inventing an imaginary 1612 publication date for *True Reportory* and supposing that *The Tempest* was not itself written until 1613.⁴ To Gayley (1917) on the other hand, the absence of a published text was not an impediment but a sign of ‘Shakespeare’s intimacy with the leaders of the Virginia Enterprise’ (70); only a prominent and well-connected author would have had access to ‘a letter,’⁵ 45

3 In no other case has the presumption of a source so closely determined the discourse concerning the composition of a Shakespearean play. Evidence from sources can only provide a *terminus a quo*, a date often much earlier than the actual time of composition. In this case, however, the coincidence in date between the first recorded production of the play and the supposed date of the hypothetical source, has served to perpetuate a widespread but misplaced faith in the play’s alleged composition date. But records of performance or publication, unlike sources, establish only a *terminus ad quem*, a date *before which* the play must have been written. Logically, therefore, the case for a 1610 *terminus a quo* rests solely on the alleged influence of the Bermuda shipwreck literature. Thus Kathman, heedless of Chambers’ admonition that ‘as a rule the initial dates are much less certain than the terminal ones’ (1930 I, 245), confidently concludes that ‘*The Tempest* . . . can be dated *with virtual certainty* as having been written between late 1610 and mid-to-late 1611 . . .’ because ‘in writing *The Tempest*, Shakespeare made extensive use of narratives describing the wreck and redemption of the ship the “Sea-Venture” in Bermuda in 1609 . . .’ (n.d. Italics ours).

4 From its origins, Furness’ theory was based on a double misconception. Like many from the mid-19th century until Laws (1911) confirmed its authenticity, Furness believed that the 1611–12 revels manuscript was a forgery (Furness 280; for a useful review see Chambers 1923 IV, 136–141) and that the play had not been written until 1612; to accommodate the Strachey theory Furness convinced himself, wrongly, that *True Reportory* might have been published as early as 1612 but still before the writing of the play. Without postulating Shakespeare’s access to the manuscript, both conditions were necessary to reconcile the proposition of Strachey as a source: ‘Malone . . . was convinced that *The Tempest* was written in 1611. Therefore, of all the publications from which Shakespeare may be supposed to have drawn his materials, Malone could use those alone which preceded in date the year 1611. But if we postpone the date of the play to the only year in which we have positive evidence that it existed, viz: 1613, a larger and better account of Sir George Somers [i.e., Strachey] comes within our ken’ (312). Furness’ theory was in advance of its factual support: ‘Whether or not a pamphlet dated 1612, wherof Malone gives merely the title (1821 XV: 390) is identical with that printed in Purchas, I do not know; the latter is the only one accessible to me’ (313). The title given by Malone (XV: 390), *The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia, from 1606 to the present year 1612. By W.S.*, is not even in fact by William Strachey, let alone ‘identical’ with *True Reportory*. None of Strachey’s 20th century editors assign it, as Malone did, apparently on no greater foundation than the initials, to Strachey, and Arber (I: 86) identifies ‘W.S.’ as William Symonds, D.D., the volume’s editor. Reviewing this somewhat embarrassing origin for the Strachey theory, Gayley rescued the Furness conjecture by first noting that ‘until recently historians and editors, not considering [Shakespeare’s] intimacy [with the Virginia Company] and its possibilities, have loosely conveyed the idea that that poet’s source of information was published between 1610 and 1612’ (70) and then went on to propose the view that Shakespeare must have had access to Strachey’s unpublished manuscript.

5 Strachey’s text is addressed to an ‘Excellent lady’ (Wright 3) and contains numerous allusions to this unidentified noble reader. Whether the document was actually conceived as a letter, or as an early experiment in the form which, in the 18th century, became known as the epistolary novel, remains open to doubt. The document’s length (24,000 words), complexity, and laboured literary character all contradict its popular reputation as a piece

jealously guarded from the public, and accessible for long after 1610, long after 50
 1613, only to the inner circle of the Virginia Company' (44). Although Gayley's
 reasoning was circular, and neglected to mention that the letter was not a dispatch
 to the Virginia Company at all, but ostensibly a private communication to a 'noble
 Lady', his argument has proven remarkably durable and influential; however,
 by 1995 Arthur Kinney had noted that the question of the accessibility of the 55
 Strachey manuscript posed a serious difficulty for advocates of the theory:

How Shakespeare could have seen this letter, which circulated at court in one or more
 manuscript copies at the time, is unclear: there is not a shred of evidence, in fact, that
 the playwright, not privy to the court himself, ever did see it... The chief problem
 regarding the Strachey manuscript is the way it has served to block further 60
 investigation, offering enough so that critics of early Stuart culture have not bothered to
 consider [alternatives]..." (166–167)⁶

Even if Kinney's skepticism seems justified, it is ultimately impossible to refute
 the circumstantial logic that Shakespeare, or anyone for that matter, *might have*
 obtained access to a privately circulated manuscript. The real impediment to the 65
 Strachey theory is not the lack of evidence for Shakespeare's access to the docu-
 ment, but the lack of evidence that it ever circulated at court, or even existed in its
 published form until after the earliest recorded *Tempest* performance. The popular
 belief that it was transported back to England on Sir Thomas Gates' ship, which
 left Virginia July 15, 1610, is chiefly due to the misconceptions of C. M. Gayley's 70
 1917 *Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America* and Louis B. Wright's 1964
 edition of *True Reportory*. Asserts Gayley: '[Strachey's letter] reached England
 with... Gates in September 1610' (52). Wright concurs, stating that "Strachey's
 letter was taken to London by Sir Thomas Gates, who sailed around the middle
 of July, 1610 (Wright xvi). A misplaced confidence in the factual character 75
 of Gayley's case has led several generations of scholars down a blind alley: the
 scrutiny of the known facts suggests the implausibility, if not the impossibility,
 of the Gayley-Wright model of textual transmission, for several reasons.

In 1609–1611—the period of the so-called 'third supply'—trips to and from
 Jamestown were infrequent. In recording Gates' return to England in July 80
 Strachey himself states that the ships would only return to Jamestown the
 following spring (Wright 94). Extant records confirm this impression: only two

of correspondence composed in Virginia to transmit 'news' of the colony back to the noble-
 woman. For the various theories on her identity, see Culliford (151–154) and Wright (x–xi).

6 Kinney goes on to argue *in extenso* for the cultural relevance of James Rosier's 1605
 pamphlet, *A True Relation of the most prosperous voyage made this present yeere 1605, by Captaine*
George Waymouth, in the Discovery of the land of Virginia, a work whose possible influence on
The Tempest had earlier been suggested by Cawley (720). Kinney was not alone in his
 skepticism. Kenneth Muir in 1977 had already suggested that 'the extent of the verbal
 echoes of [the Bermuda] pamphlets has been exaggerated' (280); more recently,
 New Cambridge *Tempest* editor David Lindley has also voiced his skepticism that Strachey
 was a necessary source.

documented trips took place between England and Virginia between Gates' departure in July 1610 and Sir Thomas Dale's arrival from England in May 1611 (Smith 1612, reprinted in Lee I: 172). De La Warre's ship left Virginia March 28, 1611 and arrived in England June 11 ('English-America'). Also a small ship called *The Hercules* may have left England sometime after December and arrived in Virginia on or around 20 April 1611 (Culliford 125, 'English-America').⁷ 85

It is unlikely that Strachey's 'letter' was transmitted on the March 1611 ship, for when De La Warre set out from Virginia he intended to travel to the West Indies and back, not to England (Arber II: 506). But even if it had been on that ship, which arrived in London on an 'unexpected returne home' in June (De La Warre, Arber II: 507), this would have left little window of opportunity for Shakespeare to consult its contents in preparing a play staged as early as November 1 of the same year. *The Hercules*, arriving in Virginia shortly after de La Warre departed, is even less likely to have returned in time to account for the alleged influence. It is apparently for this reason that both Gayley and Wright insist that the letter was transmitted on Gates' 15 July 1610 voyage. If it was not, the case for its influence on the Shakespearean play collapses.⁸ 90 95

7 English-America also lists the following ships as arriving in Virginia in 1610: *The Starr*, *The Swan*, *The Tryall*, *The God Speed* (or *Godspeed*), *The Mary & James*, *The Mary Ann Margett*, *The Noah*, and *The Prosperous*. However, none of these ships are mentioned in any of the primary documents of the time, which in fact suggests that no ships arrived in Virginia during the critical period other than those of Gates coming back from Bermuda in May 1610 and De La Warre coming out from England in June 1610. These ships, instead, appear to have arrived during the 1611 season. Southall, confirming this view, writes that "whereas the Muster reports that Cicely [Jordan] came to Virginia in the 'Swan' in 1610, we are led to infer from Samuel Jordan's patent that the year was 1611. The latter is evidently correct, for the 'Swan', the 'Tryall' and the 'Noah' were . . . three [of the six] ships of Sir Thomas Gates's fleet which reached Jamestown towards the end of August 1611 . . ." In May 1611 Sir Thomas Dale also arrived with three ships.

8 Circumstances in Jamestown during the weeks Strachey allegedly composed the letter could not have been worse. When the Bermuda survivors returned to Virginia in May 1610, they had discovered a settlement burnt and in ruins (Wright 63–65; Major xxvi–xxvii). Under such circumstances, paper and books must both have been in limited supply. And yet, Strachey's letter, approximately 24,000 words in length, makes copious use of at least a dozen external sources, some mentioned by name, others silently appropriated. Strachey's biographer, Culliford, does his best to obviate skepticism on this point, arguing from the evidence of *True Reportory* that Strachey must have had the required books in Virginia:

Reportory provides evidence that he had with him [in Virginia] Acosta's *Naturall and moral historie of the East and West Indies*, and Willes' *History of travayle in the West and East Indies*; and since he was sufficiently interested to take these works, it would seem natural that among his books there should also be the most comprehensive and most important of all the English collections of travels, Hakluyt's *Voyages*. (185–86)

Purchas does record that Hakluyt was a standard document carried on ships, and his editor Parks says that it became known as 'the book', being carried on ships of the East India Company as a 'matter of course' (159). But even if this and other books were on board the Gates' voyage, how they survived the calamities described in *True Reportory*, Culliford does not say. Strachey himself records that in the Bermuda storm the Gates' voyagers 'unrigged our ship, threw overboard much luggage, many a trunk and chest (in which I suffered no mean loss) . . . and heaved away all our ordnance on the starboard side' (Wright 13–14). In these circumstances, and also considering the tremendous amount of water that

External evidence of a more definite character confirms that Strachey's letter was not completed by July 1610. Indeed much of *True Reportory*—although not the parts about the storm or Bermuda—appears to have been written in response to a 14 December 1610 letter to Strachey from Richard Martin, a leading shareholder and Secretary of the company. Martin's letter, which cannot have been transmitted to Strachey until the 1611 supply ship arrived in May,⁹ does not mention any prior communication from Strachey, but concludes with

an earnest request, that you would be pleased by the return of this ship to let me understand from you the nature & quality of the soil, & how it is like to serve you without help from hence, the manners of the people, how the Barbarians are content with your being there, but especially how our own people do brook their obedience how they endure labor, whether willingly or upon constraint, how they live in the exercise of religion, whether out of conscience or for fashion, and generally what ease you have in the government there . . . (Culliford 125)

Culliford says that Strachey's answer is 'no longer preserved' (126), but by far the simplest and most elegant solution is that Strachey answered Martin in the manuscript later published as *True Reportory*. If Strachey had already sent a copy of *True Reportory* to the Council, Martin's questions would be redundant, as they are all answered in some detail in that manuscript (see appendix A). At the very least, Martin's nescience disproves the frequent assertion that the Strachey letter circulated widely in the court during the winter of 1610–11.

The most devastating blow to the Gayley-Wright transmission model, however, is the internal evidence of the text itself. It is certain that Strachey's 'letter', at least in the form in which it appeared in print in 1625, was not transmitted on the Gates' voyage—for the letter itself refers to the voyage:

And the fifteenth day of July, in the 'Blessing,' Captain Adams brought [Sasenticum and his son Kainta] to Point Comfort, where at that time (as well to take his leave of the lieutenant general, Sir Thomas Gates, now bound for England, as to dispatch the ships) the lord governor and captain general had pitched his tent in Algernon Fort. The king's son, Kainta, the lord governor and captain general hath sent now into England until the ships arrive here again the next spring . . . (Wright 94)

Logically, these words cannot have been written before the events they describe;¹⁰ nor do they constitute the conclusion of the document, which

overwhelmed the boat, it seems unlikely that the extensive library employed to compose *True Reportory* could have been preserved.

9 Or, possibly, *The Hercules* in late April.

10 The only recourse for the traditional argument is to insist that these words anticipate rather than report the departure of the ship, in which case it remains possible that part, although not all, of the text printed by Purchas in 1625, actually was sent to England with Gates on the 15 July 1610 departure date. On the other hand, it must be noted that the departure is described in the past tense as an event having already taken place at the time of writing. Moreover, this scenario leaves unexplained how Richard Martin could remain ignorant of the contents of *True Reportory*, which supplies detailed answers to questions put to Strachey (see Appendix A) by Martin in his 14 December 1610 letter, which was transmitted to Virginia in early 1611, while Shakespeare, with no documented association with the Virginia Company, purportedly had free access to the same materials.

continues for another seventeen hundred words of text, mostly inserted, with attribution, from *True Declaration* (registered Nov. 1610). The document in which they appear could therefore not have been transmitted on Gates' boat; it was still being written or had not yet been written at all when that ship sailed. 135

It might be hypothesised from these considerations that *True Reportory*, in some form, was written some months later than generally supposed, completed between the sailing of Gates' boat in July and the return of the ships in spring, and then transported back to England during the summer or fall of 1611. But in the introduction to his 1612 *Laws* Strachey himself alludes to an uncompleted work about the Bermudas: 140

I have both in the Bermudas, and since in Virginea beene a sufferer and an eie witnesse, and the full storie of both in due time shall consecrate unto your views... Howbet since many impediments, as yet must detaine such my observations in the shadow of darknesse, untill I shall be able to deliver them perfect unto your judgements... I do in the meane time present a transcript of the Toparchia or State of those duties, by which their Colonie stands regulated and commaunded. ("Laws" 5; emphasis added) ¹¹ 145

Strachey's statement that he had been 'in the Bermudas... a sufferer and an eie witnesse' suggests that he is describing *True Reportory*—or a lost text just like it—as not only unpublished but *incomplete* in 1612. He cannot mean *History of Travel*, a book in which 'Strachey did not repeat the story he had related in the "True Reportory"' (Wright xvii). 150

A second factor relevant to ascertaining the composition date and historical significance of *True Reportory* is William Strachey's reputation as a plagiarist. On its face the work seems to include portions borrowed from other books not published until November 1610 or later. To preserve its July 1610 composition date, Strachey's editors have therefore labored to immunise *True Reportory* from any imputation that Strachey may have actually borrowed these materials at a later date. 155

¹¹ Enigmatically, Raphe Hamor, secretary to the colony immediately after Strachey and also a survivor of the Bermuda shipwreck, writing in 1614, employs very similar language to promise his own narrative of the Bermuda adventure:

Excuse me (curteous Reader) if caried beyond my purpose, I declaime passionately in this passive and innocently despised worke, which I am sure is so full of goodnesse, *and have bin almost six yeers a Sufferer and eye witnes* of his now well nigh atchieved happinesse, *the full and unstained reportory of every accident whereof even from his beginning, together with the causes of the backwardnes*, in prosperity thus long, touching at the miraculous delivery of the scattered company, *cast upon the Bermudas*, when those fortunate Islands like so many faire Neriades which received our wrackt company, with the death of that pure and noble hearted Gentleman Sir George Summers diing there, *my purpose is shortly at large to publish*, that at length some one escaped Leaper, amongst so many saved, may returne backe and pay his vows of thanks giving unto that ever to be praised mercifull providence that brought us thither, until when I wish thy zealous and fervant thoughts and indevours to a businesse so full of piety, as is this our Virginie Plantation.

(emphasis supplied)

No such work of Hamor's, either published or in manuscript, is known to exist. The similarity of phraseology between Hamor and Strachey is sufficient to suggest the possible inference that both texts were composed by the same hand, but how the enigma is to be explained we do not profess to understand.

It is important to note that this special status has been granted only to *True Reportory*; Of Strachey's three major works, *Lams*, *History of Travel*, and *True Reportory*, historians routinely acknowledge that the first two are substantially appropriated. Strachey's role in *Lams*, as Culliford recognises, was that of secretary, not author. There is 'no reason to believe that Strachey had any hand in their compilation (146) . . . His task was solely that of an editor, and although [his] name is connected permanently with *Lams*, it contains nothing, apart from his prefatory verses and his brief introduction, that is his own work' (148); and 'much the same must be said about *The historie of travaile into Virginia Britannia*' (148). Wright concurs with Culliford on this point: After returning to London in the fall of 1611, Strachey 'immediately set about compiling *The History of Travel* . . . He borrowed from various earlier travel narratives and added some observations of his own, but missed the opportunity of giving a full account of what he himself saw and experienced' (xvii: our emphasis). Perhaps the most obvious thefts are from Strachey's competitor, Captain John Smith. Indeed, Warner wonders whether

[Strachey's *History of Travel* was] written before or after the publication of Smith's "Map and Description" at Oxford in 1612. The question is important, because *Smith's "Description" and Strachey's "Travaile" are page after page literally the same. One was taken from the other* . . . It has been usually assumed that Strachey cribbed from Smith without acknowledgment . . . I should incline to think that Smith condensed his description from Strachey, but *the dates incline the balance in Smith's favor.* (Warner, our emphasis)

Smith was, moreover, not the only source Strachey plundered to write *History of Travel*. In 1880 the Maine Historical Society published a previously obscure journal of Mr James Davies, recounting his voyage to Kennebec in 1607. Da Costa notes that 'this journal was found to be the source whence Strachey drew his account of the [Virginia] colony, large portions of which he copied verbatim, giving no credit' (Da Costa).¹²

Many of the sources identified as influences on *History of Travel*, a book written in England between 1612 and 1618, also influenced *True Reportory*, suggesting that this work or parts of it may likewise have been written in England, using the same 'reference library,'¹³ long after July 1610. Wright and Culliford avoid this conclusion only by employing a double standard in evaluating the evidence for Strachey's compositional practices. While admitting that Strachey borrowed extensively from other works to compose *History of Travel*, Wright pursues a contrasting methodology in his study of *True Reportory*: sometimes he notes parallel passages to other sources without comment, sometimes he passes them by without any notice, and when these two methods will not suffice he suggests

12 Corroborating testimony is ubiquitous in the historical literature of the voyages, for example: 'After his return to England [Strachey] compiled a work called the *Historie of Travaile into Virginia* . . . It consists largely of extracts from Smith's previous works, *though without acknowledgment of their origin*' (Adams. Italics supplied).

13 A library which consisted at least of Eden, Acosta, Hakluyt (or Erasmus or Ariosto), Smith, Percy, and possibly other authors on the *History of Travel* list.

<i>Historia Natural</i>	<i>True Reportory</i>
The cacao is a fruit little lesse than almonds , yet more fatte, the which being roasted hath no ill taste. It is so much esteemed among the Indians (yea, and among the Spaniards), that it is one of the richest and the greatest trafficks of New Spain...	Likewise there grow great store of palm trees not the right Indian palms such as in St Juan, Puerto Rico, are called cocos and are there full of small fruits like almonds ... (24–25)

FIG. 1. Strachey's borrowing from Acosta's *Historia Natural*.

Eden (1555)	Strachey, <i>True Reportory</i>
As is redde in the begynnyng of the Romaynes that Eneas of Troye aryved in the region of Italy called Latium, upon the banks of the ryver of Tyber. (124v).	As Vergil writeth Aeneas did, arriving in the region of Italy called Latium, upon the banks of the river Tiber (Wright 78).
They defende them selves ageynste rayne and heate with certeyne great leaves of trees in the steade of clokes (108). Sumtymes also when it rayneth, they cast these [very broad leaves] over their heades to defende them from  ater (198).	Trees of which " so broad are the leaves , as an Italian Umbrella, a man may well defend his whole body under one of them, from the greatest storm raine that falls" (Wright 25)

FIG. 2. Strachey's unacknowledged borrowing from Eden.

that Purchas—not Strachey—must be responsible for material that would not have been available before 15 July 1610. 195

Culliford's survey of the sources of *Travel* (169–184) identifies thirteen works—Eden, Hakluyt, Acosta, Brereton, Rosier, Smith, Cogan, Boemus, Percy, Augustine, Davies and Guicciardini—from which Strachey quotes or which he appropriates. But when writing about *True Reportory*, Culliford suspends his comparative method, citing only those sources that Strachey himself acknowledges in the work. In fact, *True Reportory*, like *History of Travel*, borrows from Eden (or Willes) and Acosta, and even though Strachey mentions these sources by name, he sometimes borrows freely from them without attribution, as in, for example, this *True Reportory* passage adapted from Acosta (Fig. 1). 200

Richard Eden's translation of Peter Martyr's account of the voyages of Christopher Columbus and others published under the title *Decades of the New World* (1555)¹⁴ is another work acknowledged by Strachey as a source for *True Reportory* but, like Acosta, he also uses the work without acknowledgement, as in Fig. 2. 205

In addition, *True Reportory* borrows without acknowledgment from various sources such as Hakluyt¹⁵ or Erasmus (Appendix B),¹⁶ and from other published 210

14 Later republished, with supplemental materials, as R. Willes' *The history of travayle in the West and East Indies* (1577).

15 Tomson and Francis de Ulloa narratives.

16 It is difficult to determine whether Strachey was influenced by Erasmus' dialogue 'Naufragium,' Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, or by Tomson's travel narrative in Hakluyt (which itself was influenced by Erasmus), or ~~both~~ when describing the events of the

Bermuda narratives, just as *History of Travel* takes from other published Virginia narratives. Given the number and character of these sources in *True Reportory*, and the corresponding influence of Eden, Acosta, and Hakluyt in *History of Travel*, it is reasonable to suspect—although it is presently unprovable—that the bulk of the research for Strachey’s 24,000 word ‘letter’ was conducted in London’s after his return from Jamestown. 215

The pattern of Strachey’s plagiarism, however, does more than cast a doubt on the Gayley-Wright transmission model: in fact, it supplies additional evidence that *True Reportory* was not completed in Virginia before July 1610. As previously noted, one of *True Reportory*’s sources, the anonymous *True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virginia*, was not entered into the Stationer’s Register until 8 November 1610 (Wright). As the author refers to this publication by name, acknowledging that it is already published, it might seem that there can be no question that he is the borrower; however, this point has been confused by a critical tradition that attributes to Strachey’s text a seminal influence which it never exercised. Gayley, for example, considers *True Reportory* ‘the common source of the *True Declaration* as a whole and of such portions of *The Tempest* that deal with the expedition of Sir Thomas Gates’ (49). In fact there is no evidence for the influence of Strachey’s ‘letter’ on either *True Declaration* or *The Tempest*. 220 225 230

Instead, on both circumstantial and logical grounds, the evidence is better explained by the presumption that Strachey was the borrower. To take the circumstantial case first, the following writers have all, at one time or another, been accused of borrowing from Strachey’s *True Reportory*: the anonymous author of *True Declaration*, Lord de la Warre,¹⁷ and Shakespeare. Which is more plausible: to suggest that these writers, whose publications *all* preceded his, took from Strachey, or to recognise, based on Strachey’s record of plagiarism as well as the facts of each case, that he took from them? 235

What circumstances suggest, logic dictates. The attributed passage from *True Declaration*—a ‘verbatim quotation’ (Wright 95 fn 123) of around sixteen hundred words—appears in the concluding section of *True Reportory*. Wright, recognising that the passage seems to contradict the theory that the “letter” was transmitted intact to England in July, states that Purchas, not Strachey, must be responsible for the appropriation: ‘Since the *Declaration* was not entered in the Stationers’ Register until November 8, 1610, Strachey could not have had a printed copy at the time he wrote his letter to the “noble lady” in July, so presumably Samuel Purchas tacked this long quotation onto Strachey’s narrative’ (95–96, n. 123). 240 245

Such embroidering of sources was typical of Purchas’ methodology, whose summaries of the writings of Spanish and Portuguese discoverers, for example, are ‘coloured sometimes by his lively imagination’ and whose retelling of Peter 250

storm in Bermuda. These texts each include language belonging to what we have elsewhere described (Stritmatter and Kositsky) as a Renaissance ‘storm scene’ template. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly who is borrowing from whom.

17 According to Gayley, Strachey borrowed from *True Reportory* to draw up the de La Warre dispatch of 7 July 1610 (51).

<p>Wee have an infallible proofe of the temper of the Countrie: for of an hundred and odd, which were seated at the Falles, under the government of Captaine Francis West, and of an hundred to the Sea-Ward on the South side of the river, (in the Countrie of Nansemunds) under the charge of Captaine John Martin; of all these two hundred, there did not so much as one man miscarrie: when in James Towne, at the same time, and in the same moneths, 100. sickened, and halfe the number died.</p>	<p>...If it had been our fortunes to have seated upon some hill, accommodated with fresh springs and clean air, as do the natives of the country, we might have, I believe, well escaped. And some experience we have to persuade ourselves that it may be so, for of four hundred and odd men which were seated at the Falls the last year, when the fleet came in with fresh and young able spirits under the government of Captain Francis West, and of one hundred to the seawards (on the south side of our river), in the country of the Namsemonds, under the charge of Captain John Martin, there did not so much as one man miscarry and but few or none fall sick; whereas at Jamestown, the same time and the same months, one hundred sickened and half the number died.</p>
---	--

FIG. 3. Excerpt copied in *True Reportory* from *True Declaration*, redacted from concluding excerpt of *True Reportory* that acknowledges debt to *TD*.

Carder's narrative 'reads more like fiction than fact and makes one think of the later writings of Defoe' (Robinson and Leyland).  may be worth considering

the unintended implications of Wright's theory. If correct, it raises significant questions concerning *True Reportory's* authenticity and integrity. The text reads: 'After Sir Thomas Gates his arrival, a book called *A True Declaration of Virginia* was published by the Company, out of which *I have here inserted* this their public testimony of the causes of the former evils and Sir Thomas Gates his report upon oath of Virginia' (Wright 95). Wright's theory requires the insertion of the first person pronoun by Purchas into a text ostensibly written in its entirety by Strachey, but once the door has been opened to this theory of multiple authorship, it is impossible to know how much of the document was actually written by Strachey, and how much added at a later date by his editor.

On the other hand, the available evidence does not support Wright's theory that Purchas merely 'tacked' a portion of *True Declaration* onto the end of an otherwise complete, coherent, and independent text. In addition to the acknowledged excerpt cited above, the report is used elsewhere, including an extended passage of around a hundred words that 'is almost identical with one in the *True Declaration*' (Wright 83), reproduced as Fig. 3.

One cannot learn from Wright's commentary that this passage has been redacted from the excerpt of *True Declaration* that appears, acknowledged, in the conclusion of *True Reportory* (95–101). Nor is this an isolated example: Of five *True Declaration* passages in *True Reportory* identified by the authors—(Appendix C), all but one have been redacted (with other material) from the concluding excerpt attached to the end of *True Reportory*, and inserted into the body without attribution.

This pattern raises troubling questions about the actual relationship between the two texts. Wright's theory cannot explain the evidence; as the passages in Appendix C illustrate, *True Declaration* is integral to Strachey's 'letter'. While in theory it may be difficult to conclusively ascertain the direction of

255

260

265

270

275

Jourdain, <i>Discovery</i> , Registered 1610	Strachey, <i>True Reportory</i> , published 1626.
All our men, being utterly spent, tired, and disabled for longer labor, 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... or rather to the mercy of their mighty God and redeemer... (Wright 106)	It wanted little but that there had been a general determination to have shut up hatches, and, commending our sinful souls to God, committed the ship to the mercy of the gale. (Wright 15)
The Bermudas ... lying seven leagues unto the sea ... (108)..This island, I mean the main island, with all the broken islands adjacent, are made in the form of a half moon , but a little more rounder, and divided into many broken islands (113)	The Bermudas be broken islands , five hundred of them in a manner of an archipelago ... and all now lying in the figure of a croissant , within the circuit of six or seven leagues ... (17)
There are an infinite number of cedar trees (the fairest , I think, in the world) and these bring forth a very sweet berry and wholesome to eat. (112)	They are full of shaws of goodly cedar, fairer than ours... the berries whereof our men ... made a kind of pleasant drink (24)
The country yieldeth divers fruits, as prickled pears , great abundance, which continue green upon the trees all the year; also great plenty of mulberries , white and red...(111–112)	Which we therefore called the prickle pear, the outside green , but being opened, of a deep murrey, full of juice like a mulberry and just of the same substance and taste...(26–27)
There are also great store of tortoises ... I have seen a bushel of eggs in one of their bellies...and the tortoise itself is all very good meat... and one of them will suffice fifty men a meal at the least... (111)	The tortoises came in again, of which we...turned up great store... The tortoise is reasonably toothsome (some say), wholesome meat ... one tortoise would go further amongst [our company] than three hogs ... their eggs (of which we would find five hundred at a time in the opening of a she-turtle ... (33–34)

FIG. 4. Strachey's borrowing from Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery*.

influence, the balance of evidence supports the inference that Strachey was, as in so many other instances, the borrower:

1. the document makes explicit reference to the publishing of *True Declaration*
2. material redacted from the concluding excerpt of *True Declaration* is sprinkled throughout Strachey's text, and
3. Strachey has a reputation for appropriating the passages of other writers and distributing them throughout his own work without acknowledgment.

Strachey's text also makes use of other Bermuda narratives, including Jourdain's *Discovery*, without attribution. Like *True Declaration*, this pamphlet was registered several months after we are told Strachey completed his own narrative. Compare, for example, the following parallel passages (Fig. 4).

Since Jourdain went back to England on Gates' boat in July 1610, and his work was registered in October, it seems that he would have had access to Strachey's letter only before sailing with Gates; Stachey, who remained in Virginia,

Smith	Strachey, <i>History of Travel</i>
Virginia is a country in America, that lyeth between the degrees of 30 and 44 of the north latitude. The bounds therof on the east side are the great ocean. On the south lieth Florida; on the north, Nova Francia. As for the west, therof, the limits are unknown (Arber 47).	Virginia Britannia is a country in America; it lyeth between the degrees of 30 and 44 of the north latitude; the bounds wherof may well be thus laid; on the east runneth the great ocean, or main Atlantic Sea; on the south side, Florida; on the north, Nova Francia; as for the west, the limits therof are unknown (Major 23).
The summer is hot as in Spain; the winter cold as in France or England. The heat of the summer is in June, July, and August, but commonly the cool breezes assuage the vehemency of the heat. The chief of winter is half December, January, February, and half March (Arber 47).	The summer here is as hot as in Spain, the winter cold as in France or England; the heat of the summer is in June, July, and August, but commonly the cool breezes assuage the vehemency of the heat; the chief of winter is half December, January, February, and half March (Major 29).

FIG. 5. Strachey's overt plagiarism from Smith's *Map of Virginia*.

and whose work was by its own testimony not transmitted on the Gate's voyage, and was not published until 1625, would have had access to Jourdain's account after the boats began to return in April or May 1611, or when Strachey reached England that fall.¹⁸

Taking all these circumstances into consideration, a more accurate date of composition for *True Reportory* may be arrived at by examining Strachey's practice in writing *History of Travel*, a book written at the earliest in 1612, but not published until the 19th century; Chapters 1–2 of Book I of *Travel* borrow liberally from Smith, Eden, Hakluyt, and others, but most habitually from Smith. Strachey's book begins with a verbatim passage of about 70 words, lifted directly from the opening of Smith's *Map of Virginia* (1612) without attribution, followed by further excerpts of similar length, copied from the same pages and distributed throughout Strachey's first two chapters. The whole of the first two pages of Smith's topographic history are reproduced in this manner in Strachey's book, as the two examples from Fig. 5 illustrate.

18 *True Reportory* also contains numerous parallels to de la Warre's 4000 word dispatch (Harl. m. 7009, reprinted in Major, xxiii–xxxvi) of 7 July 1610, which returned with Gates to the Virginia Company on the 15 July 1610 voyage. Gayley claims that 'From the form as printed by the Hakluyt Society we discover that nine of the thirteen pages are an almost verbatim reproduction of [True Reportory]' (52). In fact, the shared material, while significant, is closer to 1700 of 4000 words. The question is whether, in fact, as Gayley claims, *True Reportory* is the source of the de la Warre dispatch. Since the dispatch is dated eight days before even Gayley says that *True Reportory* was written, this scenario seems at best unlikely. Did Strachey, then, write the de la Warre dispatch? While it is possible that Strachey supplied some segments, as he addressed and dated the letter and signed it along with four others, it is written in the first person of de la Warre, describing among other episodes his voyage from England, and would therefore seem to be largely a product of de la Warre's mind. Finally, Gayley obscures the critical fact that while material also found in *True Reportory* makes up a substantial portion of the dispatch, the opposite cannot be said. Like so much else about Strachey's *True Reportory*, the theory that it is the source for Harl. m. 7009 is transparently lacking in credibility. If anything, Harl. m. 7009 is the source for a significant fraction of Strachey's text.

Smith, 1612 Map	Strachey, <i>History of Travel</i>	Strachey, <i>True Reportory</i>
<p>There is but one entraunce by sea into this country, and that is at the mouth of a very goodly Bay, the widnesse whereof is neare 18 or 20 miles. The cape on the South side is called Cape Henry in honour of our most noble Prince. The shew of the land there, is a white hilly sand like unto the Downes, and along the shores great plentie of Pines and Firres. The north Cape is called Cape Charles in honour of the worthy Duke of Yorke.</p> <p>Within is a country that may have the prerogative over the most pleasant places of Europe, Asia, Africa, or America...This Bay lieth North and South... (Arber 48).</p>	<p>The Cape of this bay, on the south side, we call Cape Henry, in honour of that our most royall deceased prince, where the land shewes white hilly sand, like unto the Downes, and all along the shoare grow great plenty of pines and fires. (Major 28)</p> <p>The coast of south Virginia, from Cape Henry, lieth south and north, next hand some seven leagues, where there goeth in a river.... If we come in with the <i>Chesapeake Bay</i> open...</p> <p>Our two capes, Cape Henry and Cape Charles, do lie northeast and by east, and so-west; and they be distant each from other in breadth (where the sea runs in between both lands, so making our Bay an only entrance into our country), as broad as may be between Queenborough and Leigh (43-4).</p>	<p>This is the famous <i>Chesapeake Bay</i>, which we have called (in honour of our young Prince) Cape Henry, over against which within the Bay lieth another headland, which we called, in honor of our princely Duke of York, Cape Charles; and <i>these lie northeast and by east and southwest and by west, and they may be distant each from the other in breadth seven leagues</i>,¹⁹ between which the sea runs in as broad as between <i>Queenborough and Leigh</i>. Indeed it is a goodly bay and a fairer not easily to be found (Wright 61).</p>

FIG. 6. Smith’s *Map* compared to Strachey’s *History of Travel* and *True Reportory*.²⁰

Another borrowing from the first two pages of Smith’s *Map* is easily recognizable in *History of Travel* (Fig. 6). Culliford identifies this passage as one ‘quoted’ (188, n. 101) from Strachey’s own *True Reportory*, but as our table illustrates, the common origin of both Strachey passages appears instead to be Smith’s *Map*:

A reader of all three documents must conclude that Strachey in each case is indebted to Smith; although each Strachey passage shares some elements with the other, each also reproduces language from Smith *not found in its counterpart*. Based on this pattern of evidence, the only way to extricate Strachey from the implication of having copied a work not likely available to

19 One league = 3.3 miles.

20 A further instance of Strachey’s possible reliance on Smith in *True Reportory*:

Smith, <i>Map of Virginia</i>	Strachey, <i>True Reportory</i>
<p>[The Indians’] houses are built like our Arbors of small young springs bowed and tied, and so close covered with mats or the bark of trees very handsomely, that not withstanding either wind rain or weather, they are as warm as stoves, but very smoky ; yet at the top of the house there is a hole made for the smoke to go into right over the fire.</p>	<p>A delicate wrought fine kind of mat the Indians make...The houses have wide and large country chimneys in the which is to be supposed (in such plenty of wood) what fires are maintained; and they have found the way to cover their houses now (as have the Indians) with barks of trees, as durable and as good proof against storms and winter weather as the best tile...which before in sultry weather would be like stoves... (Wright 81-82)</p>

him until 1612,²¹ would be to presume that Smith first borrowed from *True Reportory* and then Strachey, writing *History of Travel*, copied from Smith. But this theory cannot be sustained, not only because it violates the common sense application of Ockham's razor, but also because Smith's reputation for scrupulous attribution of his sources forms a striking contrast to Strachey's. Smith habitually acknowledged the contributions of fellow adventurers by name (Barbour; Smith), while Strachey in *History of Travel* ambiguously declares his own work 'gathered and observed as well by those who went first thither' (Major t.p). It is therefore much more likely that Strachey was the borrower in both instances. If so, one is forced to conclude that Strachey could not have completed work on *True Reportory* until during or after 1612.

One is left to enquire how Gayley and Wright could be so certain that the 'letter' was transmitted to England on the Gates' voyage, when the available evidence suggests that this scenario is, at best, unlikely and, more probably, impossible. Purchas (1577?–1626)²² in his 1625 publication prefixes to Strachey's text the editorial date: 'July 15, 1610'. There is no known external corroboration for this date; editor Purchas therefore is the sole authority for the statements of Gayley and Wright, and, ultimately, the assumption of many, that the manuscript 'circulated in court' in 1610–11. How could Purchas be so wrong? The most economical construction of the known facts is that Purchas obtained the date from *within the manuscript* but failed to concern himself with the logical problem noted above.²³ Unfortunately, the date has been repeated without reservation as a fact by contemporary scholars.

Kenneth Muir in 1977 had already suggested that 'the extent of the verbal echoes of [the Bermuda] pamphlets has been exaggerated' (280); more recently, New Cambridge *Tempest* editor David Lindley remarked that while 'the Strachey letter is a *possible* source for *The Tempest*, it is not a *necessary* source, in the way that Ovid or Montaigne both are'. In view of the extensive evidence cited here it may safely be concluded, we submit, that Strachey's *True Reportory* is no longer even a *possible* source for Shakespeare's *Tempest*

21 Although it is apparently the case that some version of Smith's *Map* was completed in manuscript as early as November 1608 (Arber I: 42), there is no evidence that Strachey could have or did see a copy before the extant version was published in 1612 by Joseph Barnes at the Oxford University Press. Strachey was not made Secretary of the Virginia Company until summer 1610, so he could not have had access to Smith or his work before that. Meanwhile, Smith left Virginia in 1609, apparently on poor terms with the Virginia Company, so it is improbable that he would have left a copy of his valuable manuscript with them, and in any case they were not the publishers of it. Most significantly, Strachey's *Historie of Travaile* reproduces the version of the map of Virginia as published by Barnes in 1612.

22 The 15 July 1610, date might also have been supplied by Hakluyt, who probably possessed the manuscript before Purchas.

23 Purchas' editorial opportunism is well known. The very first sentence of the edited *True Reportory* refers to 'A most dreadful tempest (the manifold deaths whereof are here to the life described)'. But the narrative contains no such description of a loss of life and no other accounts of the Bermuda wreck record such a loss either.

Bibliography

- A Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virginia, with a Confutation of such Scandalous Reports that have tended to the disgrace of so worthy an enterprise.* Not in STC. 340
- C. H. Adams, *Chapters of Erie, and Other Essays* (New York, 1967). Reprint of 1871 edition. Online at <http://ca.geocities.com/yarmulka.geo/adams/erie04.html>. Accessed 22 May 2006. 345
- Acosta José de, *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (Sevilla, 1590). 345
- E. Arber, *Travels and Works of captain John Smith, President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England 1580–1631*, ed. E. Arber, a New Edition, with a Biographical and Critical Introduction, by A.G. Bradley. Einburgh, 1910. New York: Burt Franklin, II Volumes. 350
- G. Archer, “The relations of Captain Gosnold’s Voyage to the North part of Virginia” (1602). Electronic text reprinted by Virtual Jamestown. Accessed 20 May 2005. Not in STC.
- P. L. Barbour (ed), *The Complete Works of John Smith, (1580–1631)*, 3 vols (Chapel Hill, NC and London, 1986). 355
- F. S. Boas, *The Arden Shakespeare: The Tempest*. (Boston, n.d).
- G. Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. VIII. (London, 1975).
- R. R. Cawley, ‘Shakespeare’s Use of the Voyagers in *The Tempest*’, *PMLA* XLI (1926), 688–726.
- R. R. Cawley, *The Voyagers In Elizabethan Drama* (New York, 1938). 360
- G. Chalmers, *Another Account of the Incidents from which the Title, and part of the story of Shakespeare’s Tempest were Derived, and the true era of it Ascertained, evincing the Original Connexion of the Royal Family With the Poet’s Drama*. (London, 1815).
- E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*. In two volumes (Oxford, 1930). 365
- E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*. Four Volumes. (Oxford, 1923).
- S. G. Culliford, *William Strachey, 1572–1621* (Charlottesville, VA, 1965).
- P. Cunningham, Peter. *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I*. The Shakespeare Society, 1842.
- Rev. B. F. De Costa, ‘Norumbega and its English Explorers’ (1884), in J. Winsor (ed.) *Narrative and Critical History of America*. Vol 3. Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Boston, MA, online at The Davistown Museum. <http://www.davistownmuseum.org/InfoNorumbegaDeCosta.html> 370
- L. De La Warre (Thomas West). *The Relation of the Right Honourable the Lord De-La-Warre, Lord Governour and Captaine Generall of the Colonie, planted in Virginea* (London, 1611). <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1034>. 375
- R. Eden, *The Decades of the Neme Worlde or West India by Pietro Martire d’Anghiera (f.p. 1555)*. Readex Microprint, 1966.

- K. Elze, 'The Date of the Tempest' in *Essays on Shakespeare*. Translated with the Author's Sanction by D. L. Schmitz (London, 1874). 380
- English-America: The Voyages, Vessels, People & Places (nd) <http://english-america.com/places/val61.html>. Accessed 23 June 2005.
- R. Farmer, *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*. (New York, 1966). Reprint of the second edition, 1767. 385
- Sir W. Foster (ed.), 'A briefe note of a voyage to the East Indies, begun the 10 of April 1591 . . . by Henry May, who, in his returne homeward by the West Indies, suffred shipwracke upon the isle of Bermuda . . . ?' in *The Voyages of Sir James Lancaster to Brazil and the East Indies 1591–1603* (London, 1940).
- C. H. Frey, 'The Tempest and the New World', *SQ*, 30 (1979), 29–41. 390
- H. H. Furness, *The Tempest: A New Variorum Edition Shakespeare*. (New York: Dover. 1964 reprint of 1892 edn).
- C. M. Gayley, *Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America* (1917).
- J. Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge, 1994).
- F. Guiccardini, *The History of Italy* (f.p., London, 1561) (Princeton, 1984). 395
- R. Hakluyt, *The Principle Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* (London, 1589).
- R. Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia, and the successe of the affaires there till the 18 of June, 1614*. (London,, 1615).
- T. Hariot, *A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia, Directed to the adventurers, favourers, and welwishers for the Planting There* (London: R. Robinson, 1588). Reprinted by *Virtual Jamestown*. Accessed 20 May 2005. STC #12785. 400
- P. Hulme and T. Youngs. *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge, 2002). Introduction online: <http://assets.cambridge.org/052178/140X/sample/052178140Xws.pdf>. 405
- Rev. J. Hunter, *Disquisition on the Scene, Origin, Date & etc. of Shakespeare's Tempest in a Letter to Benjamin Heywood Bright, Esq.* (London, 1839).
- L. G. Tyler (ed.). *Narratives of Early Virginia, 1606–1625*. (New York, 1959 reprint of Charles Scribners, 1907 edn).
- S. Jourdan. *A Discovery of the Barmudas, otherwise called the Ile of Divels* (London: J. Windet, sold to R. Barnes, 1610) (Reg. Oct 13, 1610). Reprinted in Wright 1964. STC #14816. 410
- D. Kathman, 'Dating *The Tempest*' n.d. *The Shakespeare Authorship Page*. <http://shakespeareauthorship.com/tempest.html>. Last accessed 24 May 2005.
- A. Kinney, 'Revisiting *The Tempest*', *Modern Philology*, 93 (1995), 161–77. 415
- S. M. Kingsbury, *The Records of the Virginia Company of London*, edited by Susan Myra Kingsbury. In three volumes (Washington, 1933).
- D. Lindley, 'Re: Kermode (*Tempest* Reference)', *The Shakespeare Conference: SHK 12.0655*, Tuesday, 20 March 2001. <http://www.shaksper.net/archives/2001/0650.html>. Accessed 28 April 2006. 420
- E. Malone, 'An Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare Were Written' (1778).

- E. Malone, 'An Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare Were Written' (1790). *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, with the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators: Comprehending the Life of the Poet, and An Enlarged History of the Stage, by the Late Edmund Malone*. In Fifteen volumes. (London, 1821). 425
Account of the Incidents from which The Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest Were derived: and its True Date Ascertained. (London, 1808).
- R. H. Major (ed.), *The Historie of travaile into Virginia Britannia expressing the cosmographie and comodities of the country, together with the manners and customes of the people*. By William Strachey. (London, 1849). 430
- F. A. Mcnutt, *De Orbe Novo, Volume 1 (of 2) The Eight Decades of Peter Martyr D'Anghera, Translated from the Latin with Notes and Introduction*. In Two volumes. Project Gutenberg e-text. Release Date: 24 May 2004 [EBook #12425]. 435
 Accessed 20 May 2005.
- R. L. Miller, "On Dating *The Tempest*," *The Shakespeare Newsletter*. XL: 1, #205 (Spring, 1990), 12.
- W. A. Raleigh, 'The English Voyages of the Sixteenth Century', in Hakluyt, 1598–1600 12 (Glasgow, 1903–5), 10–11. 440
- R. Riche, *News from Virginia of the Happy Ariuall of that famous & worthy knight Sir Thomas Gates and well reputed and valiant Captaine Newport in to England*. STC gives subtitle: The Lost Flock Triumphant. London: E. Aldee, solde by J. Wright. STC #23350. 22 stanzas.
- C. N. Robinson and J. Leyland. 'Seafaring and Travel', Chapter Five, section three, Samuel Purchas, Vol. 4, the *Cambridge History of English and American Literature* (New York, 1907–21). 445
- Captain J. Smith, *A Map of Virginia. With a Description of the Country, The Commodities, People, Government, Religion. Virtual Jamestown*. <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1008>. Accessed 22 May 2006. 450
- J. P. C. Southall, 'Links In A Chain', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 41 (1943), 383–86.
- W. Strachey, *For The colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes divine, morall and martiall, & c*. London: J. Stansby for Walter Burre, 1612. (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1056>) 455
The Historie of Travaile Into Virginia Britannia expressing the cosmographie and comodities of the country together with the manners and customes of the people. ed. R. H. Major, Esq (London, 1849).
- R. Stritmatter, and L. Kositsky, 'Pale as Death: The Fictionalizing Influence of Erasmus's *Naufragium* On the Renaissance Travel Narrative', forthcoming in *Vérité* 11. 460
- R. Tomson, 'The Voyage of Robert Tomson, Marchant, into Nova Hispania in the yeere 1555. with divers observations concerning the state of the Countrey: and certaine accidents touching himselfe', in R. Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, 338–347. Vol. IX. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons Publishers to the University, 1904. 465

- R. Tomson, *A True declaration of the estate of the colonie in Virginia* (London, 1610).
- L. G. Tyler, *Narratives of early Virginia: 1606–1625*. (New York, 1907).
- V. M. Vaughan and T. Alden, *The Arden Shakespeare: The Tempest*. (London, 1999).
- C. D. Warner, ‘The Story of Pocahontas’, *The American History Company*. (<http://www.americanhistory.com/history/StoryofPocohantas/sopl.mgi>). 470
- R. Willes, *The history of travayle in the West and East Indies*. Done into Englyshe by R.Eden. Newly set in order, augmented, and finished by R. Willes (London, 1577). STC # 649.
- J. White, *The fourth Voyage made to Virginia with three ships, in the yere 1587. Wherein was transported the second Colonie*. Virtual Jamestown. Accessed 20 May 2005. Not in STC. 475
- L. B. Wright, *The Elizabethan’s America: A Collection of Early Reports by Englishmen in the New World*. (Cambridge, MA, 1965).
- L. B. Wright, *The True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates* (f.p. 1625). By W. Strachey (Charlottesville, 1964). 480

Appendix A: Comparison of Richard Martin's December 1610 requests for information with passages from Strachey's *True Reportory*

Martin letter	Strachey's <i>True Reportory</i>
<i>The nature and quality of the soil & how it is like to serve you without help from hence</i>	What England may boast of, having the fair hand of husbandry to manure and dress it, God and nature have favourably bestowed upon this country; and as it hath given unto it, both by situation, height, and soil, all those (past hopes) assurances which follow our well-planted native country and others lying under the same influence, if as ours, the country and soil might be improved and drawn forth, so hath it endowed it, as is most certain, with many more, which England fetcheth far unto her from elsewhere. Large fields we have, as prospects of the same, and not far from our palisade. Besides, we have thousands of goodly vines in every hedge and bosk, running along the ground, which yield a plentiful grape in their kind. Let me appeal, then, to knowledge, if these natural vines were planted, dressed, and ordered by skillful vigneronns, whether we might not make a perfect and grape and fruitful vintage in short time. And we have made trial of our own English seeds, kitchen herbs, and roots and find them to prosper as speedily as in England. (Wright 68) [Much of this also in De La Warre's dispatch]
<i>The manners of the people</i>	 <p>not excusing likewise the form of government of some error, which was not powerful enough among so heady a multitude, especially, as those who arrived here in the supply sent last year with us, with whom the better authority and government, now changed into an absolute command, came along and had been as happily established, had it pleased God that we with them had reached our wished harbor. Unto such calamity can sloth, riot, and vanity bring the most settled and plentiful estate. Indeed (right noble Lady) no story can remember unto us more woes and anguishes than these people, thus governed, have both suffered and pulled upon their own heads. (65-66) [and other similar passages]</p>
<i>How the Barbarians are content with your being there</i>	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; as, likewise, they shot two of our people to death after we had been four or five days come in. And yet would they dare then to enter our ports and truck with us (as they counterfeited underhand) when, indeed, they came but as spies to discover our strength, trucking with us upon such hard conditions that our governor might well see their subtlety and therefore neither could well endure nor would continue it. (71) [and further passages]

(continued)

Appendix A: Continued

 Martin letter

 Strachey's *True Reportory*

But especially how our own people do brook their obedience how they endure labor, whether willingly or upon constraint

Only let me truly acknowledge, they are not an hundred or two of debauched hands dropped forth by year after year, with penury and leisure, ill-provided for before they come and worse to be governed before they are here—men of such distempered bodies and infected minds who no examples daily before their eyes, either of goodness or punishment, can deter from their habitual impieties or terrify from a shameful death—that must be the carpenters and workmen in this so glorious a building . . . [All the foregoing is in De la Warre]

. . . I will acknowledge, dear Lady, I have such propenseness already towards the unity and general endeavours. How contentedly do such as labour with us go forth when men of rank and quality assist and set on their labor! I have seen it, and I protest it, I have heard the inferior people with alacrity of spirit profess that they should never refuse to do their best in the practice of their sciences and knowledges when such worthy and noble gentlemen go in and out before them, and not only so but, as the occasion shall be offered, no less help them with their hand than defend them with the sword. (68–69)

[And many other like passages]

How they live in the exercise of religion, whether out of conscience or for fashion

[The repaired chapel] is so cast as it be very light within, and the lord governor and captain general doth cause it to be kept passing sweet and trimmed up with diverse flowers, with a sexton belonging to it. And in it every Sunday we have sermons twice a day, and every Thursday a sermon, having true preachers, which take their weekly turns; and every morning, at the ringing of a bell about ten of the clock, each man addresseth himself to prayers, and so at four of the clock before supper.

Every Sunday, when the lord governor and captain general goeth to church, he is accompanied with all the councilors, captains, other officers, and all the gentlemen, and with a guard of halberdiers in His Lordship's livery, fair red cloaks, to the number of fifty, both on each side and behind him; and, being in the church, His Lordship hath his seat in the choir, in a green velvet chair, with a cloth, with a velvet cushion spread on a table before him on which he kneeleth; and on each side sit the council, captains, and officers, each in their place; and when he returneth home again he is waited on to his house in the same manner. (80)

Appendix B: Comparison of the pattern of shipwreck events in
Erasmus “*Naufragium*” and Strachey’s *True Reportory*

Examples	Erasmus 1606 translation	Strachey’s <i>True Reportory</i>
The sea touching the sky	About midnight the tempest began to increase more and more . . . so often as we were heaved up with [the waves of the sea] we might have touched the moon with our fingers . . . (G1v)	The sea swelled above the clouds
The lightening of the ship by tossing provisions overboard	But first (quoath [the master]) the ship must be disburdened . . . better it is to save our lives, with the loss of our goods, than to lose both goods and life together. The truth prevailed, many vessels were thrown over into the sea, full of rich merchandise. [An] ambassador to the King of the Scots . . . had a chest full of plate, gold rings, cloth, and silk apparel. [The master continues] It is not fit that all we should be in danger for the saving of thy chest . . . so the Italian lost his goods . . . (G4).	[We] 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.
sailors praying	Much loud praying in <i>Naufragium</i> by sailors and passengers: Yes, I heard one . . . promise St. Christopher, a wax candle as big as himself . . . and this he cried out as loud as every he could, for fear he should not be heard, and this he often repeated . . . (G3)	Prayers might well be in the heart and lips, but drowned in the outcries of the officers
The (probable) splitting of the ship	and the master, fearing lest it would be split all in pieces , he bound it together with cables (G3v).	there was not a moment in which the sudden splitting . . . was not expected
The (probable) overturning of the ship	Before it could get free from the great ship, [the boat] was overthrown.	or instant oversetting of the ship . . .
The cutting down of the main mast	he commanded al the ropes to be cut, and the maine-maste to be sawen down close by the boxe wherein it stood, and together with the saile-yardes to be cast overboard into the sea (G2v).	we much unrigged our ship.. and had now purposed to have cut down the maine mast the more to lighten her . . .

(continued)

Appendix B: Continued

Examples	Erasmus 1606 translation	Strachey's <i>True Reportory</i>
St. Elmo's Fire	<p>And in the top of the mast stood one of the mariners in the basket . . . looking about to see if he could spie any land: fast by this man began to stand a certain round thing like a ball of fire, which (when it appeareth alone) is to the shipmen a most fearful sign of hard success, but when two of them appear together, that is a sign of a prosperous voyage. These apparitions were called in old time Castor and Pollux . . . By and by the fiery globe sliding down by the ropes, tumbled itself until it came to the master of the ship . . . it having stayed there a while, it rolled itself along the brimmes of the ship, and falling from thence down into the middle roomes, it vanished away . . . (G-Gv).</p>	<p>Sir George Somers, being upon the watch, had an apparition of a little, round light, like a faint star, trembling and streaming along with a sparkling blaze, half the height upon the maine mast, and shooting sometimes from shroud to shroud, tempting to settle, as it were, upon any of the fore shrouds . . . running sometimes along the maine yard to the very end, and then returning . . . But upon a sudden, towards the morning watch, they lost the sight of it and knew not what way it made. The superstitious seamen make many constructions of this sea fire . . . the same (it may be) which the Grecians were wont in the Mediterranean to call Castor and Pol-lux . . . Could it have served us now miraculously to have taken our height by, it might have strucken amazement . . . (12–13)</p>

Appendix C: *True Declaration* influences on *True Reportory*

<i>True Declaration</i>	<i>True Reportory</i>
<p>the Ship most violently leaked, and though two thousand tunne of water by pumping from Tuesday noone till Fryday noone was discharged, notwithstanding the Ship was halfe filled with water . . . (10). But God that heard Jonas crying out of the belly of hell, he pittied the distresses of his servants; For behold, in the last period of necessitie, Sir George Summers descryed land, which was by so much the more joyfull, by how much their danger was despairefull (10).</p> <p>I will communicate a double comfort: first, Sir George Summers (that worthy Admiral) hath undertaken a dangerous adventure, for the good of the Colony. Upon the fifteenth of June (accompanied with Captaine Samuel Argoll) he returned in two Pinaces unto the Bermudos; promising (if by any meanes God will open a way to that Iland of Rockes) that he would soone returne with sixe moneths provision of flesh, and with live Hogges to store againe Virginia. (21)</p>	<p>We had received likewise a mighty leak . . . (8) 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 . . . she bore ten feet deep . . . (14)</p> <p>But see the goodness and sweet introduction of better hope by our merciful God given unto us: Sir George Somers, when no man dreamed of such happiness, had discovered and cried land. (15)</p> <p>In council, therefore, the thirteenth of June, it pleased Sir George Somers, Knight, admiral, to propose a voyage, which, for the better relief and good of the colony, he would perform into the Bermudas, from whence he would fetch six months-provision of flesh and fish and some live hogs to store our colony againe; and [he] had a commission given unto him the fifteenth of June, 1610, who in his own Bermuda pinnace . . . consorted with Captain Samuel Argall . . . (87) [A similar passage also occurs in the de La Warre dispatch of July 7, 1610].</p>

(continued)

Appendix C: Continued

True Declaration

For the healthinesse and temperatenesse of the Clymate, agreeing to our constitutions, much neede not be related, since in all the former written Treatises, it is expressly observed.

No man ought to judge of any Countrie by the **fennes and marshes** (such as is the place where *James* towne standeth) except we will condemne all England, for the Wildes and Hundreds of **Kent** and Essex. In our particular, wee have an infallible proove of the temper of the Countrie: for of an hundred and odd, which were seated at the Falles, **under the government of Captaine Francis West, and of an hundred to the Sea-Ward on the South side of the river, (in the Countrie of *Nansemunds*) under the charge of Captaine John Martin;** of all these two hundred, there did not so much as one man miscarrie: when in *James Towne*, at the same time, and in the same moneths, 100 sickened, and halfe the number died. (14)

True Reportory

I may not excuse this our fort, or Jamestown, as yet seated in somewhat an unwholesome and sickly air, by reason it is a marish ground, low, flat to the river, and hath no fresh-water springs serving the town but what we drew from a well six or seven fathom deep, fed by the brackish river oozing into it; from whence I verily believe the chief causes have proceeded of many diseases and sicknesses which have happened to our people, who are indeed strangely afflicted with fluxes and agues, and every particular infirmity too: all which, if it had been our fortunes to have seated upon some hill, accommodated with fresh springs and clean air, as do the natives of the country, we might have, I believe, well escaped. And some experience we have to persuade ourselves that it may be so, for of four hundred and odd men which were seated at the Falls the last year, when the fleet came in with fresh and young able spirits **under the government of Captain Francis West, and of one hundred to the seawards (on the south side of our river), in the country of the Namsemonds, under the charge of Captain John Martin, there did not so much as one man miscarry and but few or none fall sick;** whereas at Jamestown, the same time and the same months, one hundred sickened and half the number died.

Howbeit, as we condemn not **Kent** in England for a small town called Plumstead, continually assaulting the dwellers there (especially new comers with agues and fever, no more let us scandal and imputation upon the country of Virginia because the little quarter wherein we are set down (unadvisedly so chosen) appears to be unwholesome and subject to many ill airs which accompany the like **marish places** (82-83).

(continued)

Appendix C: Continued

True Declaration	True Reportory
<p>That the oranges which have been planted did prosper in the winter, which is an infallible argument that lemons, sugar canes, almonds, rice, aniseed, and all other commodities which we have from the Straits, may be supplied to us in our own country. . .(22; Wright, 101)</p>	<p>It is like enough that the commodities of the other western islands would prosper there, as vines, lemons, oranges, and sugar canes . . . (23).</p>