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Preface

The aim of this work is to investigate the possibility that Francis Bacon was a contributor in the writing of three Shakespeare plays: *The Comedy of Errors*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and *The Tempest*. In order to proceed, a new Rare Collocation Profiling (RCP) method is developed using Chadwyck–Healey’s Early English Books Online (EEBO) database to identify those collocations in a target text that are rare. This list is then used to suggest the probable sources of a target and the writers who possibly borrowed from it. In this way, a DNA-type profile is obtained in relation to the target text for all frequently occurring writers that are returned by the searches. However, while collocation analysis is traditionally confined to a database of known dramatists, the search is widened to include all fully searchable texts in EEBO. The test case is the long poem *A Funeral Elegye* (1612), and my method supports Brian Vickers’ conclusion that John Ford is a better authorial candidate than William Shakespeare. Two previously unattributed pamphlets are also analysed: the *Gesta Grayorum* (1688), an account of the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels; and the *True Declaration* (1610), a Virginia Company propaganda pamphlet, and the method suggests that Francis Bacon is the only candidate for having compiled the former and that he was a major contributor to the latter.

Two of the Shakespeare plays, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* have previously been associated with the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. The three volumes of Nelson and Elliott’s *Records of Early English Drama: Inns of Court (NE)* are analysed to find that the number of professional companies that played at the Inns of Court (one of which is Gray’s Inn) before 1606 has been overestimated. A document shows that Shakespeare’s company, the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, were playing at Greenwich on 28 December 1594 when, as the *Gesta Grayorum* reports, *The Comedy of Errors* was performed at Gray’s Inn, and the circumstances do not allow Shakespeare to have been present. The evidence suggests that the play was first enacted by Inns of Court players rather than the Lord Chamberlain’s Men. Inns of Court plays were often based on translations of classical works and usually commented on the succession question. It is argued that *The Comedy of Errors* displays both of these characteristics and so was likely written with the revels in mind. Also, due to certain rare parallels between Francis Bacon’s speeches at the revels and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, the play seems to have been intended for performance there but was cancelled. Referring to the results of RCP, I suggest that Francis Bacon not only compiled the *Gesta Grayorum* but also contributed to the writing of these
two plays. It is shown that my new method also identifies two non-members of the Inns of Court, Thomas Heywood and Thomas Dekker, as possible later revisers of these plays.

In the final chapters, the dating evidence for *The Tempest* is improved by showing that Caliban’s speech on edible items relies on knowledge of the Bermudan cahow, a bird whose behaviour was unknown in England before September 1610. The application of RCP to *The Tempest* confirms that William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, a 20,000-word secret report sent back from the Virginia colony to the London Virginia Company, has ‘rare’ matches that add to the evidence that Virginia Company documents served as sources for the play. RCP also reveals Francis Bacon as a contributor to the writing of the play. The new method is also applied to the Virginia Company’s *True Declaration*, a pamphlet that almost certainly relied on ‘True Reportory’, and reveals Bacon as a contributor. This means that he must have inspected Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, a source for *The Tempest*. Strong reasons are given why Shakespeare would have been prohibited from gaining access to Strachey’s restricted company report. Finally, I suggest that *The Tempest* was used as a political tool to promote England’s influence in the New World, and although Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ could not have been released for inspection, the Virginia Company must have cooperated in supplying information for the writing of the play.
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GES  *Gesta Grayorum: or the History of the High and mighty Prince, Henry* (London: Printed for W. Canning, 1688), Wing: C444.
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Key to RCP data tables

{vent near.10 war} Documents will only be returned if they contain ‘vent’ and ‘war’ (including spelling variations) 10 or less words apart.

{throne fby.3 crown} Documents will only be returned if they contain ‘throne’ and ‘crown’ (including spelling variations) where the latter is 3 words or less after the former.

(3<1610) 3 documents were returned by EEBO before the year 1610; ‘<’ with a year to the right means ‘before’; with a number to the right it means ‘less than’.

(2(9)<1610) [given filter] 9 documents were returned before the year 1610 but they have been manually reduced to 2 to satisfy the context in ‘[given filter]’.

25 (3(7)<1610) [given filter] 25 returns before upper limit of search period, 7 returns before 1610, reduced to 3 by filter.

[footnote precedent] A version was available earlier than the target text date, and more details can be found in the footnote.

\( \cap \) ‘Intersection’: records that two searches share.

Key to RCP results tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Collocation number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td>The number of verified works by the author. The number in parentheses is that listed by EEBO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>A match in EEBO after the target text date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>A match in EEBO before the target text date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>A match after the target date located outside EEBO (for example, in Google)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■</td>
<td>A match before target date located outside EEBO (for example, in Google)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Co-author, and so the division of contributions is uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded table cell: translation from Latin to English
Chapter 1

Aims and scope

In December 1594, the first known performance of Shakespeare’s *The Comedy of Errors* took place at the Gray’s Inn Christmas revels. One organiser and speech writer for the revels was Francis Bacon, son of the late Lord Keeper, who later established his reputation as an essayist, philosopher, and Lord Chancellor. Brian Vickers suggests that “this was perhaps the closest contact that Bacon and Shakespeare ever had.” In fact, never once did Bacon hint in his numerous letters that he was ever acquainted with William Shakespeare of Stratford. Nevertheless, he must have been aware of his contemporary because in February 1600–01, Sir Gelly Merrick sponsored a special performance at the Globe Theatre of *Richard II* with the deposition scene included, a move designed to recruit support for the Earl of Essex’s armed rebellion. On 18 February, one of Shakespeare’s company, Augustine Phillips, was hauled in for questioning but none of the players was prosecuted. The Earl of Essex eventually stood trial for treason at Westminster where Francis Bacon, his former adviser, assisted in presenting the case against him that led to his execution. Afterwards, the queen gave Bacon the task of writing an account of the proceedings which appeared as *A Declaration of the practises and treasons* (1601). It is fairly certain from this that Bacon must have known the identity of all the players in the Lord Chamberlain’s Men. Apart from these connections between Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare there seems to be little else to suggest that they were ever directly acquainted. However, I shall show in this study that there is evidence to suggest that there are connections between the work of Francis Bacon and three Shakespeare plays: *The Comedy of Errors*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and *The Tempest*.

It is my view that it is not possible to demonstrate for any of the 36 plays in the First Folio (1623) that William Shakespeare of Stratford made no contribution. Since there are no extant letters or prose-based works under his name, then there is no data to compare the

---

plays with. In other words, the assertion that he contributed to this or that play is unfalsifiable. However, I think that the possibility should remain open that not all of these plays originated from his pen, and that some of them might have arisen out of the Inns of Court, ones which he and others later expanded for the public stage.

Although Francis Bacon’s reputation rests mainly on his system of philosophy, he had more than a casual interest in drama. He not only provided dumb shows for an early Inns of Court play, and devices and speeches for entertainments, but he also produced masques for the nobility. Knapp and Kobialka judge that “there is evidence that at least two, and possibly as many as six, of Shakespeare’s plays were performed in the great halls of the Inns of Court during his lifetime.” Since Bacon was a member of the Inns of Court, it is possible that this provided the opportunity for him to contribute to certain plays.

To assist in the investigation, I have designed a new Rare Collocation Profile (or Profiling) (RCP) method which allows the analysis of texts to a greater extent than has hitherto been possible. When coupled to Chadwyck–Healey’s Early English Books Online (EEBO) database, it is possible to assess which collocations in a target are rare in relation to the contemporary literature. By conducting searches with EEBO and recording which writers used these rare collocations both before and after the target date, a DNA-type profile can be obtained for each frequently recurring writer showing the extent to which they shared rare collocations with the target. Usually, when a text such as a Shakespeare play is analysed, the database is confined to a set of leading dramatists. Using EEBO, a wider search is employed that also includes all published writers whose work is available as fully searchable text. This not only permits sources for the target to be ascertained but also allows the possibility to be investigated that a contributor to the target might lie outside the set of leading dramatists. The justification for this wider search lies entirely in its success in identifying possible contributors. In the present study, the full method is applied to five targets: *Gesta Grayorum* (c.1595, pub. 1688), *The Comedy of Errors* (c.1594), *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (c.1594), *The Tempest* (c.1610), and *True Declaration* (1610). For each of these, a profile is produced for Francis Bacon as well as other writers.

---

6 For example, *Novum Organon* (1620) and *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623), see PHI.
In Chapters 2 and 3, the history of the Inns of Court is examined together with the nature of the drama that was enacted there in the sixteenth century. It turns out that many of the plays were based on translations of classical texts, and took advantage of the public opportunity to pass political comment on the queen’s succession. An assessment is also made of the productions at these law schools in the late sixteenth century in terms of whether or not a professional company or Inns of Court members wrote and enacted the plays. This gives an idea of precedent in respect of writing and performing as the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels approached.

A new RCP method is introduced in Chapter 4, and is tested on A Funerall Elegye (1612), a long poem that has previously been attributed to Shakespeare but was later reassigned to John Ford by Vickers. The fact that this method supports Vickers’ conclusion is taken as evidence of its reliability.

The Inns of Court are revisited in Chapter 5, in particular, the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. The unattributed Gesta Grayorum (1688) gives a detailed contemporary account of the proceedings, including the speeches and entertainments, and it is analysed with RCP to discover the candidates for its contributors. Building on the ground set out in Chapters 2 and 3, the identity of the players who enacted The Comedy of Errors at the revels is examined and it is suggested that they were far more likely to have been Inns of Court players than a professional company such as the Lord Chamberlain’s Men. Finally, in §5.5, the known extent to which Francis Bacon exhibited an interest in drama is assessed.

In Chapter 6, RCP is applied to two Shakespeare plays The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost in order to establish their connections to the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. One of the aims in choosing these two plays is to obtain some idea of the history of the revision of plays that came through the Inns of Court. In doing so, a number of works are identified that served as sources for these plays, and a Rare Collocation Profile (RCP) is constructed for all writers in the searchable EEBO database who frequently share rare collocations with them. In compiling a DNA-type profile for each possible contributor, it is ensured that each collocation was not only rare at the time of its inclusion in the play but also at the later time when the writer who shared it made use of it. As well as suggesting Francis Bacon as a possible contributor to these plays, RCP reveals that Thomas Heywood is a

---

10 See NE.
12 See GES.
strong candidate for having revised *The Comedy of Errors*, and Thomas Heywood and Thomas Dekker for updating *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.

By way of contrast, in Chapter 7, I turn to a Shakespeare play that seems not to have been intended for the Inns of Court, *The Tempest*. Previously, the dating evidence for this play has relied on its correspondences with William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, a secret 20,000-word company report that was sent back from the Virginia colony in July 1610. However, it seems the rarity of these correspondences has not yet been evaluated, a deficiency that I remedy by applying RCP to *The Tempest*. In doing so, it is possible to establish it as a source for the play ‘beyond reasonable doubt’. New dating evidence is also advanced in order to place the date of certain parts of the play on firmer ground. Here the emphasis is moved away from the ‘True Reportory’ and is focused on the uniqueness of the events surrounding the 1609 shipwreck at Bermuda that inspired the play, some of which were unknown in England before September 1610. The oaths of secrecy imposed on Virginia Company members is also examined as well as the company’s negative attitude to players to reach the conclusion that since the ‘True Reportory’ is one of the sources for *The Tempest*, information from it for the play’s performance at Whitehall in November 1611 could not have been supplied without the cooperation of the Virginia Company of which Francis Bacon was a prominent member. The analysis of *The Tempest* with RCP suggests that Francis Bacon was a contributor to the writing of this play.

In Chapter 8, attention is directed to the early seventeenth century Virginia Company publications, in particular, the unattributed *True Declaration* (1610). RCP is applied to this pamphlet to assess the degree to which Francis Bacon contributed to it. Several rare matches with Bacon’s work are revealed. It is shown that the *True Declaration* almost certainly obtained information from Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ so that whoever contributed to the *True Declaration* must also have inspected Strachey’s secret company document which was also a source for *The Tempest*. Finally, the idea of Nuzum’s idea of Nuzum is taken up that *The Tempest* was conceived as a political tool to impress invited foreign ambassadors at court as to England’s influence in the New World. This reinforces the view that the play was likely conceived in cooperation with the Virginia Company.

---

Chapter 2

Players at the Inns of Court

There is both in the Inns of Court, and the Inns of Chancery, a sort of an Academy, or Gymnasium, fit for persons of their station; where they learn singing, and all kinds of music, dancing and such other accomplishments and diversions (which are called Revels) as are suitable to their quality, and such as are usually practised at Court.\(^\text{14}\) (Sir John Fortescue, 1470)

2.1 Preliminary

In this chapter, a history of the Inns of Court is given (§2.2), together with the plays that were performed there (§2.3). There is convincing external evidence that the first known performance of Shakespeare’s \textit{The Comedy of Errors}\(^\text{15}\) was at Gray’s Inn, and by examining precedent an estimate is formed of the likelihood of it being performed by Inns of Court players. A further glance at traditional practice also suggests that one or more Inns of Court members contributed to its writing.

The most comprehensive record of drama at the Inns of Court is contained in the three volumes of \textit{REED} by Nelson and Elliott.\(^\text{16}\) Previous to this publication, researchers had to rely on the separate publications of the Inns.\(^\text{17}\) Nelson and Elliott have unified these records, and appended others previously unpublished, but in §2.4 it is found that they overestimate the frequency with which professional companies performed at the Inns. This occurs on at least six occasions and their judgment seems to rely on an automatic interpretation of a payment to players as being a reward to an outside company. However, since remuneration was also sometimes given to Inns of Court players for acting at court and as a reimbursement for apparel, it seems that Nelson and Elliott are unjustified in this extrapolation.

In §2.5, the known occasions when Inns of Court players and writers were involved in plays is explored. Of the six known plays involving Gray’s Inn in the 50 years leading up to the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels where \textit{The Comedy of Errors} was played, three were written by Gray’s Inn members, two were acted by them, five were played at Gray’s Inn,

\(^{15}\) GES, p.22.
\(^{16}\) Records of Early English Drama, see NE.
\(^{17}\) See CAL, GRA, INN, and LIN.
and none of them are known to have involved an outside writer or playing company. Only Lincoln’s Inn are known to have used professional companies and that was four times in the period 1564–80.

2.2 History of the Inns

The four Inns of Court are Gray’s Inn, the Inner Temple, Lincoln’s Inn, and the Middle Temple, and are situated on the west side of London. The two Temple Inns lie between Fleet Street and the river Thames at the Victoria Embankment, with the Middle Temple slightly to the west of the Inner Temple. To the north of Fleet Street is Lincoln’s Inn and even further north at High Holborn is Gray’s Inn in the manor of Purpoole. Nelson and Elliott note that

the typical Inn (like a Cambridge or Oxford college) was geographically defined by a gated wall which enclosed residential blocks (called ‘chambers’) along with a chapel, yards, walks, gardens, and – the usual site for music, dance, and general entertainment – a hall.

In the sixteenth century, “the sonnes of the best or better sort of Gentlemen of all the Shires” went there to study the common law of England and to practise at the bar. William Harrison’s second book of the “Description of England” (1577) reports that as well as Oxford and Cambridge, the Inns of Court were also known as a university because “To these two [Universities] also we maye in lyke sorte adde the thirde, which is at London (servyng onelye for such as studye the Lawes of the Realme,) where there are sundrye famous heuses, of which three are called by the name of the Innes of the Court.”

The new student spent about six to eight years as an ‘inner barrister’, attending moots and court sessions at Westminster. If he impressed his superiors sufficiently he could rise to an ‘outer’ or ‘utter’ barrister followed by a call to the bar which qualified him to plead in court. If he wished to act in the court of Common Pleas he would need to be elected as a Reader (at Gray’s Inn) or Bencher, high-ranking members who lectured and set the rules by which their Inn functioned. Many members of the Inns of Court had already attended

---

18 NE, p.xiii.
19 Ibid., p.xiv.
22 These were mock arguments which were conducted in the evening at the Inn.
23 Readers and Benchers were also known as ‘Ancients’.
university. In fact, by 1581, 42% of admittees to the Inns of Court had spent one or two years at a university hall or college, a figure that had risen to 56% by 1600.\(^\text{25}\)

The common law courts originally toured the country but following the *Magna Carta Libertatum* (1215) of King John of England, the Court of Common Pleas became resident at Westminster Hall in London.\(^\text{26}\) In December 1234, Henry III prohibited the teaching of law within the City of London and so most lawyers relocated to just outside the western gates.\(^\text{27}\) Edward Waterhouse, writing in 1663, enlightens us about Westminster Hall:

> for there the Courts are fixed when as before they followed the King’s Court, and were removable at the Kings will [...] therefore the Courts wherein the law is debated, considered and adjudged, being at Westminster, the publick lodges of the students so near it, advantage the students to repair more readily to them\(^\text{28}\)

At the start of the reign of Henry II (1133–1189), The Knight’s Templars, a military order who had been protecting pilgrims in the Holy Land, owned the New Temple on the banks of the river Thames between Fleet Street and Essex House. However, in 1312, after pressure from Philip IV of France who was in debt to them, the Order was disbanded by Pope Clement V, and their estates confiscated by the Crown. Eventually, Edward III (1327–77) awarded the New Temple to the Knights Hospitallers of St. John, an Order that had been founded in 1023 to take care of sick pilgrims in the Holy Land. As Waterhouse explains:

> For though the Souldiers had among the Romans their *Hospitia Campestria*, which were their Tents in the Field, yet their *Hospitia Militaria* were fixed to some settled place or other, from which they departed not, but to which resolutely adhered. These were called *Inns* for their receipt and charitable accommodation, because what receipt they gave was free and in an orderly and sutable [sic] manner to such expectations as strangers could hope to receive upon travel. Hence it comes to pass, that because *Hospitia Militaria* are properly intended to receive Military men; the *Inns* of these Military men termed * Templars*, residing in the *Temple, London*, gave name to the

---

27 There is evidence that lawyers were resident outside the western gates of London in 1350, see *GRA*, p.ix.
most ancient and eminent of the *Inns of Court, The Temples*, which became *Inns of Law*. In turn, the Knights Hospitallers rented the New Temple to professors and students of the law who frequented Thavies Inn, one of the Inns of Chancery.

In 1381, Wat Tyler’s rebellion against the poll tax resulted in an attack on the legal profession during which time the New Temple was damaged. Stow’s *Survey* reports that:

> They brake downe the place called the new Temple at the Barre, in which place, Apprentices at the law were lodged: for anger which they had conceived against Sir Robert Hales, Master of Saint Iohns Hospitall, unto which Hospitall of St. Iohns the Temple belonged, where many Monuments, which the Lawyers had in their custody, were consumed with fire.

Since neither Stow nor Holinshed has any particular mention of lawyers as the victims of Cade’s rebellion, it is likely that it was Tyler’s rebellion rather than Captain Jack Cade’s in 1450 that inspired Shakespeare’s “The first thing we do, let’s kill all the Lawyers” in *Henry VI, Pt. 2*, even though the character who delivers the line is Cade. In 1540, the Order’s properties in England were confiscated by Henry VIII after which time the Inner and Middle Temple became his tenants.

The manor and lands of Gray’s Inn had once belonged to the Grays of Wilton. In 1370, Reginald de Grey died leaving a ‘Hospitium’ in Portpool, which was leased to a tenant or tenants who seemed to have changed the manor into an Inns of Court. In fact, there is evidence that Gray’s Inn was an Inns of Court as early as the reign of Edward III (1327–1377). It was inherited by Henry de Grey and stayed with the family until 1506 until it was transferred to one Hugh Denys and his associates who kept it for ten years before

---

33 For the view that it was Cade’s 1450 rebellion that inspired *Henry VI, Pt 2*, see Ellen C. Caldwell, ‘Jack Cade and Shakespeare’s Henry VI, Part 2’, *Studies in Philology*, 92, No. 1 (Winter 1995), pp.18–79.
35 For the suggestion of Wat Tyler’s rebellion, see for example Robert Adger Law, ‘The Chronicles of the three parts of Henry VI’, *The University of Texas Studies in English*, 33 (1954), pp.13–32, in particular p.20.
37 *GRA*, p.xvi–xvii.
39 *GRA*, p.xvii.
selling it to a monastery known as the Carthusian House of Jesus of Bethlehem. In 1539, with the dissolution of the monasteries, like the two Temples, it also became the property of Henry VIII.

In 1422, the northern part of what became Lincoln’s Inn was owned by the Carthusian House of Jesus of Bethlehem while the southern part belonged to the Bishop of Chichester. Since the Earl of Lincoln had moved to the Bishop’s estate, the property became known as Lincoln’s Inn. In 1537, The Bishop’s land was sold to William and Eustace Sulyard, and in 1580 the Benchers of Lincoln’s Inn purchased it for £520.

2.3 Drama at the Inns

Information about drama at the Inns of Court depends on the records that survive. Nelson and Elliott inform us that

while antiquarian records of Furnival’s Inn go back to 1407 and original archival documents of Lincoln’s Inn go back to 1422, records of the Inner and Middle Temples survive only from the sixteenth century [from 1505 and 1502, respectively] (with a gap for the Middle Temple from 1525 to 1550), while the surviving records of Gray’s Inn date only from 1568–9.

Christmas festivities were supervised by a master of the revels, usually an older utter barrister, who was appointed in November and was responsible for the feasting, music,

40 Ibid., p.xxiv.
42 LIN, p.ii.
43 NE, p.xv.
44 There are eight Black Books for Lincoln’s Inn. Those covering the period 1422–1562 (Books 1–4) are in Latin, French, and English, while those for 1562–1668 (Books 5–8) are in Latin and English.
45 The three earliest Inner Temple Parliament Books cover the periods 1505–89, 1589–1638, and 1638–64. The first is in Latin, French, and English and is fire damaged, while the last two are in Latin and English. There is one volume of Treasurer’s account in Latin and English for the period 1606–9.
46 There should be five Middle Temple Parliament Books from 1500–1658 but only four survive, Volume 2 for 1525–1550 being lost. There are also Treasurers’ receipts as loose papers dating from 1613.
47 The Gray’s Inn Pension Book dates from 1569–1678 and is in Latin and English. In Origines Juridiciales (London: 1666), Wing: D2488, William Dugdale gives entries for 1529–30 and 1550–1 from an earlier but now lost Pension Book. The Gray’s Inn Ledger Book contains Treasurer’s accounts from November 1584–1680, with the period 1614–34 missing, and is also in Latin and English.
dancing, and gaming usually with dice. Nevertheless, the entertainments at Christmas time depended on obtaining permission from the Benchers.

One aspect of the celebrations was the ritual of ‘solemn revels’ as described by Sir William Dugdale. Here, after dinner had been cleared from the hall, a ritualistic dance took place featuring two Ancients, one of which held a white staff and the other a white rod. The former stood at the upper end of the Bar table and as soon as the music began, he led the barristers, utter barristers, followed by those of lower rank, in dancing the measures. After several such dances, one of the Judges began a song which the rest of the company then joined in. The Reader took a number of utter barristers into the buttery, some to fetch a towel containing wafers, and some a wooden bowl containing Ipocras. They were then led back into the hall dancing, where they presented the Ipocras to the Judges while performing a solemn Congee.

Such revels usually took place “on the three or four Saturdays leading up to Christmas, and on major post-Christmas holidays such as Holy Innocents Day (28 December), New Year’s Day, Twelfth Night (6 January), and Candlemas [2 February].” Attendance was obligatory and those who were absent were penalised with a fine. For example, in 1549–50, at Lincoln’s Inn “Leonard junior, Grantham junior, Scrope and Kingsmell, [were] put out of commons ‘for goyng out of the Hall on Hallowman evyn at the tyme of the Revelles’.”

There were also more elaborate revels called “Post Revells” which Dugdale informs us were “performed by the better sort of young Gentlemen of the Society, with Galliards, Corrantoe, and other Dances; or else with Stage-plays: the first of these Feasts being at the beginning, and the other at the latter end of Christmas.”

The phrase “Courtlyke pastymes” reveals the main purpose of the Inns of Court Christmas revels, which was to acquaint the students with activities associated with life at the royal court. The Lord Chief Justice, Sir John Fortescue, had made this point as early as 1450,
stating that “there is as it were a school of all the conduct that befits nobles” which included singing, dancing, and performing plays.56

One of the functions of these revels was to provide instruction in rhetoric which was otherwise unavailable at the Inns of Court.57 This was something that Elyot wished for in The Governor (1580) where he points out that lawyers lacked “Eloquation and Pronunciation, two of the princypall parts of Rethoricke” and that if the ancient oratory of the Greeks and Romans could be imitated then lawyers should be in possession of “the sharp wittes of Logicians, the graue sentences of philosophers, the elegency of poetes, the memory of ciuilians, [and] the voyce and gesture of them that can pronounce [act] comedies.”58 So being able to act in a play was seen as good practice for affecting the decision makers in the court room with rhetoric.59 In the case of Gorboduc which was performed at the Inner Temple as well as before the queen at Whitehall during the 1561–2 season, Winston suggests that “The lengthy speeches in the scenes of counsel offered rhetorical training for the participants.”60

The tradition of Inn members writing and performing a Tragedy as part of their training into courtly practices, is pointed out in a report prepared for Henry VIII (c.1534–47) which states that “in some of the houses ordinarily they have some interlude or Tragedy played by the Gentlemen of the same house, the ground, and matter whereof, is devised by some of the Gentlemen of the house.”61 So, traditionally a play performed at one of the Inns of Court was devised and acted by its own members. This point deserves emphasis because in §5.4 it will contribute to my identification of the players who were involved in the first known staging of The Comedy of Errors at Gray’s Inn in December 1594.

Far less frequently, because of the expense involved, a Lord of Misrule was appointed for the Christmas season together with his Counsellors and Officers, and the entertainment

56 John Fortescue, Prenobilis militis (London: 1543), STC: 11193. f. 61v; translation from Latin to English in NE, pp.820–21.
61 Waterhouse, Fortescusus illustratus, op. cit., p.546.
consisted of scripted speeches, knights’ challenges, mock arraignments, ‘ambassadorial’ visits, masques, and plays. These mock-government festivities were usually shared between two Inns: in 1594–95, Gray’s Inn invited members of the Inner Temple to their revels\(^{62}\) and, for 1597–98, the Middle Temple welcomed members of Lincoln’s Inn.\(^{63}\)

### 2.4 Visiting players

This section deals with the Inns of Court records in relation to the employment of visiting players. The aim here is to allow an assessment of the likelihood, based on precedent, that the Lord Chamberlain’s Men performed *The Comedy of Errors* at Gray’s Inn in 1594, a position shall be shown to be unfounded.

In *Records of Early English Drama: Inns of Court*, it seems that Nelson and Elliott frequently and unjustifiably extrapolate the facts in judging that a visiting company was hired by the Inns of Court in 1594.\(^{64}\) Table 2.1 summarizes their list of visiting players to the Inns and I give my own conclusion in italics in Column 6 as to whether or not the Inns of Court records alone support their claim.

*Table 2.1: Plays that Nelson and Elliott claim were performed by visiting players (1416–1602)*\(^{65}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inn</th>
<th>Nelson and Elliott’s view</th>
<th>Evidence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1416–17</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Visiting players</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417–18</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Visiting players</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491–92</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Visiting players (?)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494–95</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Visiting players</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509–10</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Visiting players</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564–65</td>
<td>2 Feb</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Children of the Chapel, Edwards</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565–66</td>
<td>2 Feb</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Children of the Chapel, Edwards</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569–70</td>
<td>2 Feb</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Lord Rich’s players</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579–80</td>
<td>9 Feb</td>
<td>comedy</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Children of the Chapel, Farrant</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594–95</td>
<td>28 Dec</td>
<td>comedy</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Visiting players</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601–2</td>
<td>2 Feb</td>
<td>comedy</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Probably Lord Chamberlaine’s Men</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{62}\) An account is given in *GES*. On 3 January 1489 “ye disgysyng of ye Inner Temple went to grays Inne” which was reciprocated the next Sunday, see *NE*, p.20.

\(^{63}\) Details appear in Benjamin Rudyerd, *Le prince d’amour* (London: William Leake, 1660), Wing: R2189. In 1567–8, Lincoln’s Inn welcomed “many gentlemen of the Middle Temple who came here to dance after the revels with gentlemen of this Inn”, *NE*, p.869.


\(^{65}\) *NE*, pp.xxii, 757–9.
These will now be discussed individually. Furnivall’s Inn (FI), one of the Inns of Chancery affiliated to Lincoln’s Inn (LI), has the following record for expenses relating to Christmas 1416–17, which is probably the earliest for a play at any of the Inns:⁶⁶

For players and their play

They must have had players for the 1417–18 season as well because there is a record for “the players’ dinner”. However, the fact that performers were paid does not necessarily mean that they were an outside company. For example, Lincoln’s Inn sometimes paid members from their own Inn. For 2 February 1499–1500, the accounts of Roger Marten, the Treasurer of Lincoln’s Inn, record “10s. paid to divers of the Society by order of the Governors for an interlude on the feast of the Purification of the Virgin [Candlemas, 2 February].”⁶⁷ Also, in the Gray’s Inn Ledger Book for 1587–8 we find the following entry:

Item deliuered to mr fflower 18 ffebruary ffor and towards the chardges of the Tragedie.⁶⁸

For the 1587–8 Christmas season, Francis Flower contributed two Choruses and parts of dumb shows to The Misfortunes of Arthur, a tragedy played by members of Gray’s Inn.⁶⁹

In the early 1540s, an order was made at Gray’s Inn that “when there shall be any such Comedies, then all the Society at that time in Commons, to bear the charge of the Apparel.”⁷⁰ At the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine in February 1612–13 there was a masque provided by Gray’s Inn and the Inner Temple where “the charge in Apparel for the Actors in which mask, was supported by the Society [of Gray’s Inn].”⁷¹ So Flower, a member of Gray’s Inn, could well have been assigned as the agent to reimburse the players for their acquisition of costume material.⁷²

---

⁶⁶ For Christmas 1412–13 there is the enigmatic “Thomas Thwaites has paid for the interlude 6s 8d” NE, p.819.
⁶⁷ LIN, p.121.
⁶⁸ NE, p.111.
⁶⁹ The title page in Thomas Hughes, Certaine deu[is]es (London: Robert Robinson, 1587), STC: 13921, states “Certaine deuises and shewes presented to her Majestie by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne at her Highnesse Court in Greenewich” and the last page attributes “Francis Flower” with two Choruses and contributions to dumb shows. This suggests that he was a member of Gray’s Inn even though I have failed to locate his name in the admissions register, see Joseph Foster, ed., The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn, 1521–1889 (London: The Hansard Publishing Union Limited, 1889), p.529; Nelson and Elliott record “GI by 1587/8(?)” probably based on Hughes’ appearance in The Misfortunes, see NE, p.1009.
⁷¹ Ibid., p.285.
⁷² At Gray’s Inn, Geoffrey Nightingale (admitted in 1567) regularly attended Pensions starting from 5 May 1592 and throughout the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels (see GRA). The Treasurer’s disbursements for 1594–5 record “Also he demaundeth Allowance of x li. payd to Mr Nightingale 5to die februarij Anno 37mo Elizabeth by Appointment of the Readers towards the Chardges
Also, at a Gray’s Inn Pension dated 5 February 1594–5 we find that:

It ys orderyd that Mr. William Mills shalbe intreatyd to delyver unto Mr. Will
Johnson & Mr. Edward Morrys [Morris] the some of one hundyrd marks to be layd
out & bestowyd upon the gentlemen for their sports & shewes this Shrovetyde at the
court before the Queens Majestie

The *Gesta Grayorum* shows that Morrey [Morris] played the Lord Treasurer, and
Johnson the Lord Chancellor at the 1594–5 revels. So this was a payment to Gray’s Inn
players for a royal court performance. These facts suggest that a payment to players does
not necessarily implicate professional players. However, I suggest that the absence of a
payment for an Inns of Court production in records that are logging payments to outsiders
at the time, strongly hints at Inns of Court players who usually received no reward.

Returning to Table 2.1, the Christmas charges at Furnival Inn’s for 1491–2, gives
“Players” as an item but their identity is unknown. For 1494–5, the Steward’s accounts at
Lincoln’s Inn up to 23 October show a “reward to players”, and also “given to the players
[lusoribus] and for flour [farina], 35s.4d.” This seems to have been a scripted event
because John Wood, the Treasurer, also paid 9d to ‘the King of the “Cokkeneyes”’, the
name given to the Lord of Misrule at Lincoln’s Inn. Again the identity of the players is
unknown. On 3 February 1509–10, the Middle Temple Parliament Book listed “6s 8d for a
reward given to players, which they received from John Fitzjames the younger, the
treasurer at that time” but again they are unidentified.

For the last half of the 1560s, outside companies of players can be found recorded in the
Treasurer’s allowances at Lincoln’s Inn where we find that in 1564–5 the boys of the
Queen’s Chapel were paid for “the play at the feast of the Purification last past [Candlemas
day]” and on the same day a year later for a “pastime”. For Candlemas 1569–70, a fee of
20s was “paid to Lord Rich’s players” and in the 1579–80 season, £3 6s 8d was “paid to

---

73 *GRA*, p.107.
74 Edward Morris was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1581, see Foster, *The Register, op. cit.*, p.552.
75 William Johnson was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1578, see Foster, *The Register, op. cit.*, p.542.
76 *GES*, p.8.
77 *NE*, p.21.
79 *LIN*, p.104.
80 *NE*, p.839.
Mr Farrant, one of the lady queen’s chaplains, for the comedy shown. 83 These records clearly indicate the use of an outside company.

Around the time of the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, a record of payment to an outsider for services rendered appears in the Pension Book for 11 February 1595–6 as follows. 84

It is ordered that there shall bee payed out of thadmittance money to Somersett the Herold reasidue of a debt due xl° iii°.

This was William Segar who did not become a member of Gray’s Inn until 1617. It is clear from a Pension held on 8 July 1595 that he supplied “nyne shields & their emprisses”. 85 This example is included to show that around the time of the 1594–5 revels, the Gray’s Inn Pension Book was recording payments to outsiders. So if a payment had been made to an outside company for performing at the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels it would most likely have appeared in the Pension Book.

Despite the absence of clear evidence, Nelson and Elliott state:

All Inns of Court plays subsequent to 1587/8 seem indeed to have been performed by professionals, including Shakespeare’s Comedy of Errors, given at Gray’s Inn on 28 December 1594; unnamed comedies at the Middle Temple on 28 December 1597 and 2 January 1597/8; and Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night, given at the Middle Temple on 2 February 1601/2 (Candlemas). 86

In my view, this is a extrapolation from two premises, the second of which is dubious: (a) both plays are attributed to Shakespeare in the First Folio (1623), and (b) the company that played Shakespeare’s plays from 1594 was necessarily the Lord Chamberlain’s Men (see Table 2.1). From this they surmise, incorrectly in my view, that the Lord Chamberlain’s Men must have been present.

There is evidence that Shakespeare did not have total control over certain plays in the First Folio, either in the writing or in performance. Several plays have been suspected of containing other contributions: 87 All’s Well That Ends Well (Thomas Middleton), 88 Henry

81 Ibid, p.877.
82 GRA, p.113.
83 GRA, p.111, see especially the first footnote.
As for two plays not in the First Folio, *Pericles* has been partly attributed to the minor dramatist George Wilkins and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was attributed in the 1634 quarto to “Mr John Fletcher and Mr. William Shakespeare” although the latter attribution might have been to enhance sales. Regarding players, the Lord Chamberlain’s Men had not yet been formed for the first known performance of *Henry VI, Part 1* when it was played by Lord Strange’s Men at the Rose Theatre on 3 March 1591–2. Connections between the names of players in Pembroke’s Men and characters in *Henry VI, Part 2; Henry VI, Part 3*; and *Taming of the Shrew*, have been given by Gurr who speculates that this “strongly suggests” that Shakespeare was a member of this company when it disbanded in 1593. I judge this evidence to be weak.

So, in reference to Table 2.1, I maintain that leading up to the 1594–5 Gray’s Inns revels, only Lincoln’s Inn had a clear precedent for hiring an outside company.

### 2.5 Inns of Court players

It will now be shown that, on the basis of precedent, both *The Comedy of Errors* (1594) and *Twelfth Night* (1602) were most likely played by Inns of Court players. To effect this, an analysis is provided of the known participation of writers and players from the Inns of Court in productions prior to the 1594–5 revels (see Table 2.2).

---


94 Jackson, *Defining Shakespeare*, op. cit.


For Christmas 1526–27, a play was performed at Gray’s Inn, mostly written by John Roo (or Rowe) “seriant at the law.xx.yere past”, in which Lord Governance, lost his Lady Weal[th], and by the intervention of a character called Disdain of Wanton Sovereignty, she was eventually restored. However, Cardinal Wolsey took offence.

This plaie was so set furth with riche and costly apparel, with straunge diuises of Maskes & morrishes that it was highly praised of all menne, sauying of the Cardinall, whiche imagined that the plaie had been diuised of hym, & in a great furie sent for the saied master Roo, and toke from hym his Coyfe, and sent hym to the Flete

Table 2.2: Plays written and performed by Inns of Court members (1526–1588)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Players</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1526–7</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>John Roo (GI)</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561–2</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Gorboduc</td>
<td>Norton and Sackville (IT)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 January</td>
<td>Gorboduc</td>
<td>Norton and Sackville (IT)</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Whitehall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566–7</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Jocasta</td>
<td>Gascoigne &amp; Kinwelmarsh (GI)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supposes</td>
<td>Gascoigne (GI)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567–9</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Gismond of Salerne</td>
<td>Wilmot et al. (IT)</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>IT or Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579–80</td>
<td>2 February</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580–81</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587–8</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Sylla Dictator</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 February</td>
<td>Misfortunes of Arthur</td>
<td>Hughes et al. (GI)</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actor who played the Cardinal, Simon Fish, managed to escape “ouer the Sea vnto Tindall.” However, one of the players, Thomas Moyle of Kent, was also sent to the Fleet Prison and was only released, along with Roo, after Cardinal Wolsey had been reassured that he was mistaken in his suspicions.

---

Christmas 1561–62 provided the first Lord of Misrule revels for which a significant record is available when the Christmas Prince at the Inner Temple was Robert Dudley, the 1st Earl of Leicester. Gerard Legh’s *Accedens of Armory* (1562) contains details of Arthur Brooke’s *Masque of Beauty and Desire* that was performed at these revels. Legh’s account relates to matters that took place in December 1561–2 just as he was arriving in London. After hearing the sound of cannon shot he asked a passer-by what it signified, only to be informed that it was “a warning shot to thofficers of the constable Marshall of ye Inner Temple, to prepare to dinner.” The next day, Legh wandered into the Temple Church where he was greeted by “Palaphilos, a kinge of armes” who subsequently entertained him at his lodgings “within ye palace”. They then walked to the Inner Temple Hall where Legh observed a supper in which the Inner Temple’s Christmas Lord of Misrule was surrounded by his mock councillors and officers. After the meal, the Prince created twenty-four Knights of the Order of Pegasus, a speech was read out informing them of their duty, and there was a procession back to the Temple accompanied by music.

The Lincoln’s Inn Black Book hints at there being masques and plays during this season of revels:

> It is ordered yat with [Robert Wythe] guyne lucas manser &c shall take & bryng into this howse at the nex Parliament a Rekenying of all Sommes of mony layd owt by any in Christmas tymes or at Candlemas for any maskes. playes. disgysynges or other lyke

_Gorboduc, or Ferrex and Porrex_, was the first blank verse tragedy in English, and was written by Inner Temple members Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton. It was presented twice for the 1561–2 Christmas season, once at the Inner Temple, most likely by Inner Temple members although I have not located an original source that would raise this conjecture to a fact, and then before the queen at Whitehall on 18 January 1561–2, played this time almost certainly by gentlemen of the Inner Temple. From the title page of

---

102 *NE*, pp.368–371.
103 Pallaphilos Prince of Sophie.
104 *NE*, pp.84–5.
105 Thomas Sackville’s admittance to the Inner Temple was ratified at a Parliament in July 1555: “Admission of Thomas Sacvile, gent., and he is pardoned all offices, etc.”, whereas Thomas Norton was mentioned in the Parliament of 1 Nov 1566 for “disobedience to the Benchers” for which he initially spent time in the Fleet Prison, see *IND*, 186–7.
107 Inderwick claims that _Gorboduc_ was acted “On Twelfth Night of 1560 or 1561” but I have been unable to confirm this date, *IND*, p.lxx.
the 1565 printed edition we learn that “three Actes were wrytten by Thomas Nortone, and 108
the two laste by Thomas Sackuyle.”

*Jocasta* was “A Tragedie written in Greeke by Euripedes, translated and digested into Acte by George Gascoynge and Francis Kinwelmershe of Grayes Inne, and there by them presented, 1566”109 that is, over the 1566–7 Christmas period. However, it was not translated directly from Euripedes’ *Phoenissae* as the 1573 title page suggests, but was taken from Lodovic Dolce’s Italian rendering *Giocasta* (1549).110 The ends of Acts 1 and 4 carry a credit to Kinwelmarsh; Acts 2, 3, and 5 to Gascoigne; and the Epilogue to “Chr. Yeluerton”.111 The performers are unidentified and although one reading of “there by them presented” is that they could have been Gray’s Inn players, I have refrained from promoting this interpretation to a fact. During the same revels season, *Supposes* was given: “A Comedie written in the Italian tongue by Ariosto, and Englished by George Gascoigne of Grayes Inne Esquire, and there presented”112 although the performers are again unknown. Unfortunately, the Gray’s Inn Pension Book only survives from 1569 at the earliest so is unable to instruct us.

*Gismond of Salerne*113 was played c.1567–69 and was published in 1592 as *The Tragedie of Tancred and Gismund* being “Compiled by the gentlemen of the Inner Temple, and by them presented before her Majestie.”114 Robert Wilmot, rector of Hornden in Essex, signed the Epistle Dedicatorie and he is taken to be the “R.W.” on the title page. There is a preface entitled “To the Worshipfyll and learned Societie, the gentlemen Students of the Inner Temple, with the rest of his singular good friends, the Gentlemen of the middle Temple, and to all other courteous readers” also signed by “R. Wilmot”. In “To his friend R.W.” William Webbe refers to “the worshipful company of the Inner temple gentlemen” and states that “The tragedie was by them most pithely framed.” Assignment of the

---

108 The title page also dates the performance before the queen, and states that it was performed at Whitehall “By the Gentlemen of Thynner Temple”, see Thomas Norton, *The Tragedie of Gorbdowe* (London: 1565), STC: 18684. Also, an entry dated 18 January 1561–2 in the diary of Henry Machin, states that “The xvij day of Januarij was a play in the quen ha at Westmynster by the gentyll-men of the Tempull”, John Gough Nichols, ed., *The Diary of Henry Machin* (printed for the Camden Society, 1848), p.275.


110 NE, p.732.

111 This also occurs in a later edition of *Jocasta* in George Gascoigne, *The poesies* (1575), STC: 11636, pp.80, 93, 100, 107, 126, 128.


113 Two British Library manuscripts survive with this title: ‘The Tragedie of Gismond of Salerne’ Hargrave MS 205, ff.9–22, and ‘GISMOND OF SALERNE in loue’, Lansdowne MS 786.

partitions of authorship is problematical: the end of Act 1 is signed “exegit Rod. Staf. [Roderick Stafford]”,115 Act 2 “Per Hen. No. [Henry Noel]”, Act 3 “G. Al.”, Act 4 “Composuit Ch. Hat. [Christopher Hatton]”, and the Epilogue which also seems to include the unsigned Act 5 has “R.W.”.116 The play’s date is deduced from Wilmot’s dedication in which he states “I am now bold to present Gismund to your sights, and vnto yours only, for therfore haue I coniured her, by the loue that hath bin these 24. yeres betwixt vs.”117 There is no entry in the Stationers’ Register, and the publication date 1592 could mean any date in the period 25 March 1592 to 24 March 1593, which takes us back to the period 25 March 1568 to 24 March 1569,118 or allowing for up to one year’s delay before printing, if Wilmot wrote his dedication from 25 March 1591 to 24 March 1592 then it might have been performed from 25 March 1567 to 24 March 1568. Opinion is divided as to whether it was played at Greenwich or the Inner Temple Hall119 and, in my view, there are insufficient facts to decide the matter.

The Gray’s Inn Pension Book has an entry dated 5 February 1579–80 mentioning a list of repairs to be carried out the day after Candlemas:120

ffor a plancke to make a forme in the hall the morrowe after Candellmas day [2 Feb] xij d.

for fower single quarters to make the same forme newe and to amende other formes Broken at the playe xij d.

Another repair is “to amende the tressells and the formes in the hall against Candlemas day” which suggests that a play was enacted in Gray’s Inn Hall on 2 February 1579–80. The following year there are two entries as follows:

Items for Bordes Cut for stoles and seates for the play at Shorvetyde [sic] v s.

Item for half a dayes worke for ij of the Carpenters men in mending and settinge vp the Tables and formes in the hall after the playe xiiiij d.

115 “Roderick Stafford” is suggested by NE, p.733.
116 Inderwick takes “Per. Hen: No:” to be Henry Noel and “Ch. Hat” to be Christopher Hatton, both members of the Inner Temple, IND, p.lxxii.
117 ‘To the Worshipfyll and learned Societie’, R.W., The tragedie, op. cit..
118 On 3 November 1568, a Parliament decided that “The appointment of the officers for the grand Christmas deferred till next Parliament”, IND, p.249. This supports a play being performed for 1568–9.
120 NE, p.102–3.
This also suggests a play at Gray’s Inn Hall at Shrovetide 1580–81, but there is no information in either case as to whether or not Gray’s Inn members were the performers.  

On 16 January 1587–8, a Roman comedy *Sylla Dictator* was delivered at a Gray’s Inn revels in which William Hatcliffe of Lincolnshire was the Prince of Purpoole. A manuscript survives that gives “The Names of ye Ientillmen of Grays In yat played a Commedy there before ye Lord burghley Lord Treasurer”, however, the play’s attribution is unknown. The Readers of Gray’s Inn seem to have been unhappy with the late request for expenses because an order dated 23 January in the Gray’s Inn Pension Book declares:

> Att this pencion there was allowed out of the stocke of the house, towards the charges of the comedy or shew sett forth by the gentlemen of the house this last christenmas xx\textsuperscript{ie} markes with this proviso that ffrom henceforth noe allowanc [sic], be made out of the stock of the house for such lyke occasion vnlesse yt ryste vpon some such charge, agreed vpon by the reders of the house before; And this xx markes is to be payd out of the admyttance money.\textsuperscript{123}

On 28 February 1587–8, *The Misfortunes of Arthur* was “presented to her Maiestie by the gentlemen of Graies-Inn at her Highnesse court in Greenwich.”\textsuperscript{124} Thomas Hughes received the main writing credit, Nicholas Trotte wrote the introduction, and others are acknowledged on the last page of the 1587 printed edition as shown in Figure 2.1. Another part in Act 1, Scene 1 was credited to William Fulbecke of Gray’s Inn. As can be seen in Figure 2.1, “Maister frauncis Bacon” is mentioned for his assistance in devising the dumb shows.

In compiling Table 2.2, I have refrained from extrapolating the facts. For example, the conclusion that the identity of the players for *Jocasta* and *Supposes* is ‘unknown’ is based on the absence of a definite original source statement. For *Jocasta*, “A Tragedie written in Greeke by Euripedes, translated and digested into Acte by George Gascoygne and Francis Kinwelmershe of Grayes Inne, and there by them presented, 1566” could mean that Gascoigne and Kinwelmarsh simply introduced their play to the Gray’s Inn audience, rather than Gray’s Inn players performed it. However, I think that both plays were very


\textsuperscript{122} Lansdowne MS 55, British Library, ff.1, 2\textsuperscript{v}, see NE, pp.112–13, 746–7.

\textsuperscript{123} *NE*, pp.110–11. Francis Bacon was in attendance at the Pension, see *GRA*.

\textsuperscript{124} Hughes, *Certaine deuises*, op. cit.. The Gray’s Inn Pensioner’s accounts dated 13 November 1587 has a payment for “x ffyrre truncheons at the play in Michaelmas term” and the Ledger Book has “Item deliuered to mr fflower [co-writer of *Misfortunes*] 18 ffebruary [1587–8] ffor and towards the chardges of the Tragedie xxli”, see *NE*, p.111.
likely enacted by Gray’s Inn players, simply because an outside company would have brought in their own production, and similarly with the performance of *Gorbuduc* at the Inner Temple.

*Figure 2.1. Credits for writing The Misfortunes of Arthur (1587–8)*

In the period 1522–88, there is only one known precedent for an outsider writing for the Inns of Court. As alluded to in Gerard Legh’s *Accedens of Armory* (1562), Arthur Brooke’s *Masque of Beauty and Desire* was performed at the Inner Temple Hall in the 1561–2 Christmas season.\(^{125}\) Brooke was not an Inn member and a Latin entry in the Inner Temple Admissions Register can be translated as “Arthur Brooke of London specially (admitted) on 18 December, the pledges being Thomas Sackville (and) Thomas Norton.”\(^{126}\) The Inner Temple evidently had a capable company of players at the time who performed *Gorbuduc* for the queen so they very likely presented this masque. This is the only known occasion prior to the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels when an outside dramatist wrote for one of the Inns of Court, and I emphasize the point that in order to do so, it was necessary for him to obtain special admission and it was placed on record. In an Inner Temple Parliament held on 4 February 1561–2 the following was recorded: “Order that Arthur Broke shall have special admission, without payment, in consideration of certain plays and shows at Christmas last set forth by him.”\(^{127}\) Several people were granted special admission to Gray’s Inn for the 1594–5 revels. On 25 December there was John Cooke and Edward Cooke; John Spencer, mayor of London; Anthony Fletcher of Cockermouth; Thomas Thomkins of the city of London; John Lyly of the City of London; and Thomas Smyth of Framingham; while on 6 February we find Edward Devereux of Bromwich Castle; Francis Dethicke of New Hall in Derbyshire; William Pope of Roxton

---

\(^{125}\) For a reconstruction of the 1561–2 Inner Temple revels, see Marie Axton, ‘Robert Dudley and the Inner Temple Revels’, *The Historical Journal*, 13, No.3 (September 1970), pp.365–378.

\(^{126}\) *NE*, p.865.

\(^{127}\) *INN*, p.220; *NE*, p.85 and footnote.
in the county of Oxford; and Francis East of Cambridge. They were all signed in by the mock Prince of Purpoole, Henry Helmes. However, there is no record that Shakespeare was granted such a privilege to provide *The Comedy of Errors* for performance on 28 December 1594. Ben Jonson’s *Works* (1616) record that his play *Every Man Out of His Humour* was performed by “the then Lord Chamberlaine his servants” in 1599. Jonson was not an Inns of Court member but it is clear that he would have liked to have had his play acted at one of their revels because it is dedicated in his *Workes* (1616) “To the Noblest Novrceries of Hvmanity, and Liberty, in the Kingdome: The Innes of Court.” However, there is no evidence that it was played there and some evidence that it was not. Jonson writes:

> I command, it lye not in the way of your more noble, and vse-full studies to the publike. For soe I shall suffer for it: But, when the gowne and cap is off, and the Lord of liberty raignes; then, to take it in your hands, perhaps may make some Bencher, tinted with humanity, reade: and not repent him.

The ‘Lord of liberty’ seems to be a reference both to the Christmas Lord of Misrule that reigned at Inns of Court revels and the recreation time of the Inn members. Jonson seems particularly keen to impress a Bencher because it was they who decided what would be played at the revels. The dedication appears to confirm that a Bencher had not yet taken it in his hands, despite Jonson’s claim that “I had friendship with diuers in your societies.” This suggests that being an outsider as Jonson was, Shakespeare would also have found it difficult to get his work enacted at the Gray’s Inn revels.

The evidence set out in this chapter relating to external and internal players at the Inns of Court, indicates that neither Gray’s Inn for *The Comedy of Errors* (1594) nor the Middle Temple for *Twelfth Night* (1602) can be shown to have employed a professional company prior to these productions (see Table 2.1). For the 1587–8 Gray’s Inn revels, which took place only seven years before *The Comedy of Errors* was presented at Gray’s Inn, both *Sylla Dictator* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* were enacted by Gray’s Inn players. The latter is known to have been written by a team of writers from Gray’s Inn. There is no known precedent for an external author having written a Gray’s Inn play but Roo,

---

131 For the relation of the play to the Inns of Court revels tradition see Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of his Humour*, ed. by Helen Ostovich (Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 28–38.
132 At Gray’s Inn the equivalent was a Reader.
Gascoigne and Kinwelmarsh, and Hughes (in collaboration with seven others), provide examples of previous Gray’s Inn authorship (Table 2.2).
Chapter 3

Productions at the Inns of Court

3.1 Preliminary

By examining in detail the dramatic productions staged at the Inns of Court before the first known performance of *The Comedy of Errors* at Gray’s Inn in 1594, this chapter sets out to establish two characteristics of a play written for the law students: a plot based on translations of one or more Roman, Greek, or Italian plays; and political references to the succession question which accompanied Queen Elizabeth’s reluctance to marry and provide an heir. The latter issue was highly topical in the 1590s and the future rulers of England attending the Inns of Court could not resist commenting on it in their dramatic productions. This chapter provides some of the background for Chapter 5 where it will be argued that *The Comedy of Errors* exhibits both of these features, making it a good candidate for having been conceived specifically for the 1594–5 Christmas revels at Gray’s Inn.

3.2 Translations

When *Gorboduc* first appeared on the stage at the Inner Temple Hall in 1561–2, it was recognised as

the first English tragedy, the first adaptation of the *Mirror for Magistrates* in dramatic form, the first known play written in blank verse, the first known to experiment with dumb shows,133 and the first of a series of dramatic productions at the Inns of Court on the succession [of Queen Elizabeth].134

It was also heavily influenced by Seneca whose work135 stands as “the only contribution to tragedy which has come down to us from the Roman world.”136 Gamble characterizes the Senecan style as being highly verbal, bereft of action, focused on the effect of events on

---

133 At the end of each of the five Acts there is a dumb show dramatizing the moral of the preceding Act. Gamble compares dumb show 2 in *Gorboduc* with the traditional revels at the Readers’ Feast, especially where bread and drink is presented to the judges, and comments “it is in the rituals of the Inn where we may see a possible source for the idea of placing spectacular dumb shows between the courses of a play.” See Gamble, ‘Institutional Drama’, *op. cit.*, p.144.
characters rather than on the events themselves, resulting in reactions that “are expressed in language which is artificial, intense, laced with hyperbole and allusions.”

Jasper Heywood (1535–1598) was a fellow of All Soul’s College, Oxford, who translated three of Seneca’s tragedies: Troas (1559), Thyestes (1560), and Hercules Furens (1561). They concern the downfall of emperors and rulers and shaped later English drama:

The division into five acts, and the introduction of the Chorus, as in Gorboduc, The Misfortunes of Arthur, and Cataline [Sylla Dictator], may be taken as examples of the influence of Seneca on the form of Elizabethan drama.

Certainly, Thyestes, in which brothers challenge for a divided kingdom shares the same theme as Gorboduc. Even The Misfortunes of Arthur, which was performed before the queen on 28 February 1587–8, has lines that are free translations from Seneca, as well as blank verse.

Henry Howard, The Earl of Surrey (1516–1547) in his translation of the Aenid is the first known author to use blank verse in English. Thomas Norton was one of the writers of Gorboduc, and his use of blank verse in this play was evidently inspired by his translation of Calvin’s Institutes of the Christian Religion in which he used blank verse to translate lines from Virgil into English.

Inns of Court plays also relied on other translations. Supposes (1556–7) the first comedy in English prose, is a tale of mistaken identity which George Gascoigne translated from Ariosto’s Italian play I Suppositi (1509). Not only did it influence Shakespeare’s Taming of the Shrew, but it has some similarities to The Comedy of Errors. In Supposes, Erostrato a Sicilian student exchanges identity with his servant Dulypo in order to infiltrate

140 Cunliffe, Early English, op. cit., p.xci.
141 Virgil, The fourth boke of Virgill, intreating of the loue between Aeneas and Dido, translated into English, and drawne into a straûge metre by Henrye late Earle of Surrey (London: John Day, 1554), STC: 24810a.5.
144 Michele Marrapodi, ed., Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & his Contemporaries (Ashgate, 2007), p.88.
Damon’s house and have an affair with his daughter Polynesta. However, Damon intends her to marry the elderly but wealthy Cleander, a doctor of laws. Erostrato’s dilemma is how to prevent this marriage without revealing his own identity and disappointing his father Philagano who thinks he is living as a student in Ferrara. In order to impress Damon, Dulypo who has taken the identity of Erostrato finds a Sienese to pose as Philogano, Erostrato’s father. When the real Philogano of Cathanea arrives at his son’s house he is denied access by Dalio, Erostrato’s cook, who claims that Philogano is already inside. This situation parallels that in *The Taming of the Shrew* (5.1) which has Vincentio arriving in Padua and being refused entry to his son Lucentio’s house by a Schoolteacher who has been persuaded to impersonate Vincentio. Meanwhile, Lucentio is marrying his love interest Bianca in church.

*The Comedy of Errors* also has an imposter denying a visitor entry to a house but in making use of a servant it has more in common with Plautus’s *Amphitryon, or Jupiter in Disguise* than Gascoigne’s *Supposes*. In (3.4) of *Amphitryon*, Mercury informs the audience he is about to play a trick on Amphitryon that Sosia his servant will receive blame for. He enters Amphitryon’s house while he is away, bolts the door, and sits on the roof posing as Sosia while pretending to be drunk. In (4.2), Amphitryon returns, knocks on the door, but Mercury throws a tile and water at him before telling him that someone is in bed with his wife. *The Comedy of Errors* has Antipholus of Ephesus returning to his house accompanied by his servant Dromio of Ephesus only to find his door locked. Here, Dromio of Syracuse, servant to Antipholus of Syracuse, and who is posing as Dromio of Ephesus, is the imposter refusing them entry.

In 1561, Thomas Hoby thought that the translation of Roman and Greek authors into English was a great benefit to learning, especially for those who were unable to understand these authors in their native language. Winston notes that:

> The majority of early Elizabethan classical translators (as well as the majority of the translators of medieval and contemporary Latin works at this time) belonged to a social network involving the universities and the Inns of Court.

It is because the translators were not usually to be found outside the Universities and Inns of Court that “the tragedies themselves stand in much closer relation to the [Inn] Societies

---

than the usual production imported for the purposes of ‘entertainment’ and adhering more closely to the trends of popular taste.” 149 This resulted in two very different streams of influence – that of the native drama with its vigorous hold on popular taste and tradition, and that of Senecan tragedy, which the amateur dramatists of the Inns of Court and the Universities introduced into England, and which the professional playwrights succeeded in adapting to the public stage. 150

I shall now examine the common political motive behind the construction of some of the plays written for the Inns of Court, namely, to comment on the then topical succession problem.

### 3.3 The succession plays

Figure 3.1 shows the various claims to the throne of England after the death of Henry VIII (1491–1557). Henry was the third child of Henry VII (1457–1509) and Elizabeth of York (1466–1503), and in 1534 he disconnected himself from the Church of Rome. He had an older brother Arthur (1486–1502) who died before his father did, an elder sister Margaret who was Queen of Scots (1489–1541), and a younger sister Mary who was Queen of France (1496–1533) and married Charles Brandon, 1st Duke of Suffolk. Mary’s son did not survive childhood, but her elder daughter Frances married Henry Grey, 1st Duke of Suffolk and 3rd Marquis of Dorset. The eldest of their three children who survived childhood, all daughters, was Jane Grey (1536–1554), a claimant to the throne. She was followed by her sister Catherine (1540–1568), who was put in the Tower and whose secret marriage to the Earl of Hertford in December 1560 was declared illegal by Elizabeth. The youngest daughter, Mary (not shown in Fig. 3.1), secretly married Thomas Keyes.

Henry VIII’s older sister Margaret married King James IV of Scotland (1473–1513) and gave birth to James V of Scotland (1512–1542), the only child who reached adulthood. He married Marie of Guise (1515–1560) and had a daughter Mary, Queen of Scots (1542–1587), their only non-illegitimate child. Mary was a Catholic and became a rival claimant to the throne during Elizabeth I’s reign. On 19 June 1566, in her marriage to Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, she gave birth to a son who later changed faith from Catholic to Protestant before becoming James I of England in 1603.

Henry VIII was keen to ensure that the Protestant line continued after his death. His will decreed that should his children Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, produce no heir then rather

---

150 Cunliffe, Early English, op. cit., p.c [page 100].
than the crown pass to his elder sister Margaret, a Stuart, it should instead be inherited by his younger sister Mary, a Suffolk.151

After the Protestant Edward VI died in 1553 aged 15, the Suffolk’s attempted to place Edward’s nominee Jane Grey on the throne, another Protestant, however, she only reigned for nine days and was arrested and executed in 1554. Instead, Henry VIII’s elder daughter Mary, a Catholic, took the crown. When she died in 1558, the two principal rivals to Elizabeth were Jane’s younger sister Catherine Grey, a Suffolk, and Mary, Queen of Scots, a Stuart. Catherine Grey’s marriage to Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hatfield, was conducted in secret without the required permission of the queen, who had the Earl of Arran lined up for her, a claimant to the Scottish throne intended to improve Anglo-Scottish relations. As for Mary, Queen of Scots, the suspicious murder of her husband Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, in 1567, and her subsequent marriage to the Earl of Bothwell, a suspect in the murder, created serious misgivings and led to her forfeiture of the Scottish throne. Also her birth at Linlithgow in Scotland allowed those who opposed her claim to the English throne to see her as a foreigner or alien.

In the 1550s, the legal system had begun to see the monarchy as a company or a corporate body intended to manage the populace, an independent identity from those assigned to represent its interests. However, the main difference was that the monarchical corporation or ‘body politic’ was seen as eternal. The king became incorporate to the crown which followed the blood line of the royal family by ordinary inheritance in common law.152 In February 1606–7, Sir Francis Bacon delivered a speech in the Exchequer Chamber concerning ‘the Post-Nati of Scotland’, pointing out the incongruence of the notion of inheritance in the monarchical corporation:

> it [body politique] causeth the Crowne to goe by descent, which is a thing strange, and contrary to the course of all Corporations, which evermore take in succession, and not by descent, for no man can shew mee in all Corporations of England of what nature soever, whether they consist of one person, or of many: or whether they be Temporall or Ecclesiaticall, any one takes [gives] to him and his heires, but all to him and his successours153

151 Axton, *The Queen’s*, op. cit., p.11.
John Hales (1516–1571) was a Protestant politician who took an interest in the Suffolk line of succession. In 1563, he held the view that Henry VIII’s will which superseded the Act of Settlement (1544), was entirely legitimate in excluding the Stuart line in favour of the Suffolk’s, having been produced with the consent of Parliament and confirmed by oaths. However, he claimed that because the will had been lost, the main argument should be that Mary Stuart, having been born in Scotland, was not born within the allegiance of the King of England and so had no rightful inheritance. He concluded that if Queen Elizabeth died without issue, Catherine Grey, the younger sister of the executed Jane Grey, would be the next and rightful heir. Even though his pamphlet was unpublished, in 1564 he was arrested and committed to the Tower of London. The Suffolk claim opposed foreign birth

154 This limited the crown to the issue of Henry VIII, failing which the crown went to his next collateral heir (e.g. brother or sister) unless otherwise stated in his Will or by Letters Patent.
155 In 1566, Plowden stated that the Marquis of Winchester, Treasurer of England, kept it in a black velvet container, see Axton, ‘The Influence’, op. cit., p.222.
(or alien inheritance), recognised Scottish independence from England, and adopted the validity of Henry VIII’s will which had advocated the Suffolk line. For them, there was no body politic and the monarch had to abide by the same laws as the common man.\footnote{Axton sees Shakespeare’s Henry V as a “king as common man” play, see Axton, The Queen’s, op. cit., p.26n.} Inheritance from a father in common law usually “demanded his son’s age, his legal status, his crimes and natural impediments”\footnote{Axton, The Queen’s, op. cit., p.28.} and arguments of illegitimacy were often the most persuasive in the historical cases cited by both sides. Alien inheritance was also an impediment.

Edmund Plowden (1518–1585) was a prominent lawyer and Catholic, and the author of Les comentaries ou les reportes de Edmund Plowden (1571), case histories that “educated law students to use the theory of the king’s two bodies.”\footnote{Ibid., p.21.} During Christmas 1566–7, Plowden wrote a manuscript in support of the Stuart succession entitled ‘A treatise of the two Bodies of the king, vis. natural and politic […] The whole intending to prove the title of Mary Quene of Scots to the succession of the crown of England and that the Scots are not out of allegiance of England.’\footnote{Ibid., p.222.} It seems to have been motivated by three circumstances: a desire to respond to John Hales’ attack on the foreign birth of Mary Queen of Scots;\footnote{Axton, ‘The Influence’, op. cit., p.209.} Parliament’s inability that year to decide the succession problem; and the desire to accede to a request from the Catholic Anthony Browne, Justice of the Common Pleas, who asked for Plowden’s views on the succession problem. Plowden argued for the king’s body politic, which was immune to arguments about foreign birth (that is, those born outside England or born to non-English parents), and supported a legal union of England and Scotland. Furthermore, it was discovered that Henry VIII had not actually signed his will to recommend a Suffolk succession, it had only been stamped,\footnote{Ibid., p.218.} a fact that allowed its legitimacy to be brought into question.

Plowden was not alone in arguing his case. In 1569, John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, produced A defence of the honour\footnote{John Leslie, A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightie and noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande (London: 1569), STC: 15505.} in which he depicted the crown as corporation but without using

\begin{itemize}
  \item\footnote{There are four manuscripts: BL Cotton Caligula B IV fols 1–94; BL Harley 849 fols. 1–38; Bodley Rawlinson A 124 fols. 1–47; and Bodley Don. e.43. The first is missing the prologues and discussion of the will of Henry VIII which the second and third have, and the fourth has a unique prologue written by Plowden.} Axton, ‘The Influence’, op. cit., p.209.
  \item\footnote{Ibid., p.222.} John Leslie, A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightie and noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande (London: 1569), STC: 15505.
\end{itemize}
the term ‘king’s two bodies’. Here he dealt with questions such as “Whether infantes borne owte of the allegiance of Englande shoulde be able to demaunde any heritage within the same allegiance or no?” Axton makes it clear where Francis Bacon stood on this issue.

James, when he sought unanimous approval for the union in Parliament [of England and Scotland] in 1604, however, unwittingly reopened the bitter disputes and old wounds of the succession controversy. Though urged by the king himself and Francis Bacon, Parliament refused both the theory of the king’s two bodies and the union. The gentlemen of the Inns of Court found all of this ripe subject matter for their plays but if they were not to follow John Hales to the Tower, they had to take care not to show disloyalty to Elizabeth.

When Elizabeth ascended the throne in 1558, the country had just suffered the religious turmoil surrounding the brief reigns of the Protestant Edward VI (1537–53) and the Catholic Mary I (1516–1558). So encouraging Elizabeth to produce an heir to stabilize the future of the country became high on the political agenda. In 1559, Elizabeth’s first parliament held a debate aimed at encouraging the queen to marry an Englishman. This political debate found its way into Inns of Court drama. The Inner Temple’s Gorboduc (1561–2) portrayed a British king who while still alive divided his kingdom between his two sons Ferrex and Porrex. However, ambition caused the younger to kill the elder, their mother who favoured the elder killed the younger in revenge, and a rebel faction killed both their father and mother to correct the injustice. Unfortunately, the slaughter did not end there. The rebels were cut down by the nobility and since no one could agree on a successor to the throne the country fell into civil war. The idea of a king equally dividing his kingdom amongst his issue while still alive in line with the common law, is also apparent in Shakespeare’s King Lear, and is an example of the problems that might occur when the succession of the king’s ‘body politic’ or crown as corporation is ignored. In Act 5, Scene 1, of Gorboduc, after the king and queen have been murdered, Fergus, the rebellious Duke of Albany, gathers together twenty thousand men to attempt to take the crown for himself. In Act 5, Scene 2, Arostus reminds the audience:

For right will last, and wrong can not endure
Right meane I his or hers, upon whose name
The people rest by meane of Native lyne,
Or by vertue of some former Lawe,

164 Ibid., p.65.
166 Norton, The Tragedie of Gorboduc, op. cit.
Already made their title to advance:
Suche one (my Lordes) let be your chosen kynge
Suche one so borne within your Natyue Lande

Norton and Sackville clearly had Henry VIII’s will in mind, which left the crown to the Protestant Suffolks if his “Native lyne” failed thus preventing the Catholic Mary Stuart from taking power.\textsuperscript{167} \textit{Gorboduc} was presented before Queen Elizabeth on 18 January 1561–2 almost four months after Catherine Grey’s first son Edward was born and two weeks before a commission was appointed that subsequently declared him illegitimate.\textsuperscript{168} In \textit{Gorboduc}, Sackville and Norton seem to fear the consequences of this act:

With that same harte (my Lordes) kepe out also
Unnaturall thraldome of strangeurs reigne,
Ne suffre you against the rules of kinde
Your Mother Lande to serue a forreine Prince

If the crown went to the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, there might be foreign intervention in English affairs from the Pope and Spain. The fact that this was played out at Whitehall before the queen in January 1561–2 renders it more of a caution than an entertainment: marry and produce an heir because if you die without issue the country will descend into civil war, and if a Stuart ascends the throne the country will then be vulnerable to foreign influence.

On 26 January 1562–3, “the Commons once again petitioned her to marry; this time, the petition was read, and probably drafted, by Norton.”\textsuperscript{169} Gamble claims that “in both language and sentiment the Petition is reminiscent of \textit{Gordobuc},”\textsuperscript{170} since in “the text, in the dumb shows, and even in the argument of the tragedy, there are numerous suggestions to Elizabeth that she ought to provide the throne with a heir.”\textsuperscript{171} Being one of the creators of \textit{Gorboduc}, Thomas Norton “capitalized on the unusual circumstances of the Christmas revels of 1561–2 in order to offer a comment on the Elizabethan succession question. At the same time, the performance allowed inns-of-court men to turn themselves into counsellors to the Privy Council, and by extension make themselves part of the political

\textsuperscript{167} For studies on the relation of \textit{Gorboduc} to the succession question see Axton, ‘Robert Dudley’, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.365–378, notably p.366.
\textsuperscript{170} Gamble, ‘Institutional Drama’, \textit{op. cit.}, p.112.
\textsuperscript{171} Cunliffe, \textit{Early English, op. cit.}, p.lxxii.
nation itself.”  

The queen was repeatedly confronted with the issue of succession in dramatic performance. In a letter dated 12 March 1564–5, from the Spanish Ambassador to the King of Spain, he reports “a comedy, which was presented in English” on the 5 March relating to the question of marriage, which was proposed by Juno, and opposed by Diana who was for chastity. “Jupiter gave a verdict in favour of matrimony after many things had passed on both sides in defence of the respective arguments, the queen saying to me ‘All this is against me.’”

When Parliament urged the queen to marry in 1566 she addressed the Lower House with defiance:

There hath been some that have ere this said unto me they never required more than that they might once hear me say I would marry. Well, there was never a greater treason but might be covered under as fair a pretence.

A myrroure for magistrates (1559) is a pedagogical collection of poetry depicting the errors of princes and the nobility in the first half of the fifteenth century, and Winston observes the following connection between Gorboduc, Jocasta, and A myrroure: “In the opening chorus of Gorboduc, we are told that the king, ‘A Mirror shall become to princes all / To learn to shun the cause of such a fall.’ In Jocasta, the final chorus urges princes to take the king as a mirror, commanding that ‘kings and princes in prosperitie’ should ‘example here, lo take by Oedipus’. Both plays, in other words, are mirrors for magistrates […] members of the Inns used the Mirror as a model to create and facilitate their own conversations about the falls of princes and the rule and misrule of the commonwealth] the three works are alike in plot, each recounting tragedies from periods of civil war”.

Gismond of Salerne was enacted by members of the Inner Temple before the queen for the 1567–8 Christmas season and survives in two manuscript copies. It was later rewritten

---

174 NE, p.867. It was presented at court by the gentlemen of Gray’s Inn, 4–6 March 1564–5, p.746.
178 Ibid., p.143.
179 BL Lansdowne 768 and Hargrave 205.
and republished in 1591 by Robert Wilmot as Tancred and Gismond with dumb shows added to the start of each Act except the first. Catherine Grey, a Protestant claimant to the throne in the Suffolk line (see Figure 3.1), secretly married Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford in December 1560 without the queen’s required permission. Their first son Edward was born in September 1561. However, when Elizabeth discovered the marriage in August 1561, both Catherine and her husband were confined to the Tower. Nevertheless, they still managed to consummate their marriage and their second son Thomas was born in February 1563. Both sons were declared illegitimate despite the Earl’s attempts to demonstrate otherwise. In the 1567–8 season, Gismond and Salerne was shown before the queen. A possessive King Tancred tries to prevent his beloved widowed daughter Gismond from marrying an earl so she has a secret affair with him. The king discovers their liaisons and orders that the earl be murdered. In grief, Gismond commits suicide and in her last moments asks to be buried with her deceased lover. The king agrees but plans to commit suicide in the lovers’ tomb so that he may be reunited with Gismond for eternity. If it was meant to draw attention to the injustice of Catherine Grey’s predicament then it came too late. She died on 26 January 1567–8.

The first known performance of Misfortunes of Arthur (February 1587–8) was directed by “Maister Penroodocke and the said Maister Lancaster” while the writing credits went to several Gray’s Inn members with Thomas Hughes given as its main architect. Nicholas Trotte provided the Introduction, William Fulbecke wrote two speeches, Francis Flower contributed two Choruses, while Christopher Yelverton, Francis Bacon, and John Lancaster created the five dumb shows. Cunliffe identifies several sources for the play including Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Histories of the Kings of Britain, Thomas Malory’s Le Morte d’Arthur (1485), and Seneca’s Thyestes. The Misfortunes of Arthur is a tale of usurpation, incest, paternal compassion, and war. Arthur, son of Uther Pendragon, and his twin sister Anne produce a son Mordred. Seventeen years later, Arthur goes to war against Tiberius of Rome but while he is away, Mordred decides to take Arthur’s crown and becomes passionately entwined with his step-mother Guinevere. On receiving news of

---

180 R.W., The tragedie, op.cit.
181 The differences between the two manuscript versions have been examined by Kyoko L. Selden, ‘A Comparison of the Two Versions of Gismond of Salerne’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1965).
182 Axton, The Queen’s, op. cit., p.56.
185 Although Hughes borrowed heavily from Seneca, see Wolfgang Clemen, English Tragedy Before Shakespeare (Methuen, 1980), p.86.
186 This is the same Yelverton who had written the Prologue to Jocasta performed in 1566.
187 Cunliffe, Early English, op. cit., p.xci.
Arthur’s return Guinevere flees to a nunnery, Arthur defeats his son in battle, offers him mercy, but is forced to do battle again. During their last encounter, Mordred is killed and Arthur receives a fatal wound.

The audience are warned in Act 1, Scene 1, that this might be a drama about the safety of England:

And whosoe’r besides ye heauenly pow’rs
(her stately trayne with influence divine,
And milde aspect all prone to Bryttaines good)
Foresee what present plagues doe threate this Isle: 188

When The Misfortunes of Arthur was presented before the queen at Greenwich on the 28 February 1587–8, Mary Queen of Scots, had been executed only a year earlier, and her son James VI of Scotland now had a claim to the throne. So the Union of England and Scotland was now at the forefront of political discussion. Waller sees analogies between Guinevere in Misfortunes and Mary, Queen of Scots: “Both desert their husband for a lover of dubious character, both appear to want their husband dead, both seem to believe in Catholic absolution, and both threaten suicide.” 189 However, I judge that Reese finds a more plausible interpretation in casting Mary as the usurper Mordred, and Elizabeth as the forgiving Arthur: “Arthur finds it hard ‘to bid the battayle’ to his ‘proper bloud’. These words bring to mind the attitude of Elizabeth, who, in defending Mary, frequently called attention to the fact that they were cousins. […] Again the futile recklessness of Mordred is similar to the recklessness with which Mary made one attempt after another to overthrow Elizabeth.” 190

As Mordred states: “What foole, to liue a yeare or twaine in rest, / Woulde loose the state, and honour of a Crowne?” 191 Mary’s guardian while under arrest was Sir Amias Paulet whom Bacon served in France from 1576–79, which indicated to Reese that Francis Bacon “shared the general attitude toward Mary, the one seemingly expressed in this play.” 192 Elizabeth’s compassion towards her cousin seems to be portrayed by Arthur “But as for warres, insooth my flesh abhorres, / To bid the battayle to my proper bloud / Great is the loue, which nature doth inforce / From kin to kin.” 193 In 1572, after the Ridolfi plot, and

188 Hughes, Certaine deu[is]es, op. cit., sig. A2.
191 Hughes, Certaine deu[is]es, op. cit., sig. C.
192 Reese, ‘Political Import’, op. cit., p.89.
again in 1586 after the Babington plot, Parliament applied pressure on Queen Elizabeth to sign Mary’s death warrant but she resisted. This appears to mirror Arthur’s forgiveness towards his son Mordred after defeating him in the first battle, which departs from the legend in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Histories of the Kings of Britain* where Arthur quickly sought revenge on Mordred.\(^{194}\) With Elizabeth in the audience, the play takes care to characterize Arthur as superior to Mordred when the latter is reminded that “he expert, you vntried: / He ripe, you greene.”\(^{195}\)

Gamble summarizes the misconception that literary historians have about the Inns of Court as follows “They seem scarcely to be aware of the prestige of the Societies, their key position in the legal-political community, their proprietary interest in Parliament, and their immense commitment to an orderly commonwealth operating under a rule of law.”\(^{196}\)

A crucial difference between professional plays and Inns of Court drama at this time was that “Professional actors had their own strong traditions and had regularly played morality and social-morality plays throughout the [sixteenth] century”, whereas “enacted political metaphor […] was the hallmark of Inns of Court drama.”\(^{197}\) As mentioned in §3.2, the other main difference was the influence of Roman, Greek, and Italian drama, which if it was not used wholesale in translation, certainly served as a guide to plot and structure. There was also a significant difference between Inns of Court drama and that produced at Oxford and Cambridge Universities where the students acted in Latin. For example, on 4 December 1592, John Still, the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, wrote to Lord Burghley as follows:

> Vpon Saturday last beinge the second of decem\[ber\], wee receaued lettres from Master Vicechamberlain [sic] by A Messinger sent purposely: wherein, by reason that her Maiesties owne servantes, in this time of infection, may not disport her Highnes with theire wonted and ordinary pastimes: his Honor hath moued our Vniuersity (as he writeth that he hath also done the other of Oxford) to prepare A Comedie in Englishe, to be acted before her Highnes, by some of our Studentes in this time of Christmas.

However, the Vice Chancellor, was given to wonder

> How fitt wee shalbe for this that is moued, haveinge no practize in this Englishe vaine, and beinge (as wee thincke) nothinge beseeminge our Studentes, specially oute of the Vniuersity: wee much doubt; and do finde our principale Actors (whome wee haue of

\(^{194}\) Reese, ‘*Political Import*, op. cit., p.85.

\(^{195}\) Hughes, *Certaine deu[is]es*, op. cit., sig. C.

\(^{196}\) Gamble, ‘*Institutional Drama*, op. cit., p.103.

\(^{197}\) Axton, *The Queen’s*, op. cit., p.73.
purpose called before vs) very vnwillinge to playe in Englishe […] Englishe Comedies, for that wee neuer vsed any, wee presentlie haue none: To make or translate one in such shortnes of time, wee shall not be able” and requests “liberty to play in latyn”.

This example illustrates the point that drama at the Inns of Court before 1594 was characterized by adapted translations into English of Roman, Greek, and Italian works, and glances at the succession question. This made it distinct from the public theatre and University plays. It is an issue that will be revisited in §6.2, when discussing The Comedy of Errors.

The next chapter introduces the new method of Rare Collocation Profiling (RCP) which I introduce in order to bring more evidence to the arguments about possible contributors to various plays and pamphlets. It allows a DNA-type profile to be constructed for each possible candidate, not merely confined to known dramatists, but extended also to prose writers.

---

Chapter 4

A new Rare Collocation Profile (RCP) method

Why, Sir, I think every man whatever has a peculiar style, which may be discovered by nice examination and comparison with others: but a man must write a great deal to make his style obviously discernible. (Samuel Johnson)\(^{199}\)

4.1 Preliminary

In this chapter, I introduce my new Rare Collocation Profile (RCP) method which is applied in later chapters to the following targets: *Gesta Grayorum* (c.1595, publ. 1688), *The Comedy of Errors* (c.1594), *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (c.1594), *The Tempest* (1611), and the *True Declaration* (1610). This method involves systematically running through phrases and collocations in a target text, checking them for ‘rarity’ in Chadwyck–Healey’s EEBO database, then identifying those authors who shared their use. This allows probable sources and possible later borrowings to be identified which I suggest provides evidence of contributors to the target.

The method is to be introduced in three stages of increasing complexity, with all three stages being applied to the above-mentioned targets. To begin with, only the first-stage is used on the first 200 lines of *The Troublesome Reign* (1591), and then the second-stage is added to examine *The Funerall Elegye* (1612). The former is of particular interest as Vickers has recently provided an analysis of N-grams in the play and concluded that George Peele had a hand in it.\(^{200}\) The new method supports this conclusion. For the latter, Foster’s initial attribution of *The Funerall Elegye* to William Shakespeare was later revised by Vickers to John Ford and placed in Ford’s *Works*.\(^{201}\) An RCP test also identifies John Ford as the best candidate. These successes support the claim for the reliability of my new method.

An attempt must be made to identify those aspects of a target text that can serve as authorial markers, and I suggest that phrases and collocations are ideal, not only as


signatures of a thinking mind, but also for their relative immunity to editorial, scribal, and compositorial changes. Here I concur with a number of other researchers that it is possible to employ a number of DNA-type markers, which if they can be shown to be rare enough, can be used to obtain a high probability of authorial contribution.\textsuperscript{202} Lancashire’s view that “Authorship attribution becomes the more persuasive the more it focuses on complicated clusters that occur in both the anonymous author's work and in work from or available to the suspected author”\textsuperscript{203} seems to hit the mark.

Since they carry a higher degree of cognitive complexity, phrases and collocations should be regarded as more reliable markers than individual words. Running collocations through Chadwyck–Healey’s Early English Books Online (EEBO) database is common practice. However, innovation is claimed here in producing a rarity test for them. The three stages of the new method are as follows.

\textbf{Stage 1}

\textit{Defining rare collocations.} Unusual collocations in a target are identified by defining a ‘rare’ collocation as one that appears in less than 0.17\% of searchable texts in the EEBO database before the presumed date of the target (see Table 4.1). For example, for the \textit{Gesta Grayorum}, the collocation must appear in less than 6 texts before 1595 to qualify (for a detailed explanation of the construction of Table 4.1, see Appendix A). Unique occurrences in the target are of no interest as they provide no relationship to other texts.

\textit{Table 4.1 Date of text containing collocation against upper limit of number of returns for rarity}

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\hline
<6 & <7 & <8 & <9 & <10 \\
\hline
\hline
<11 & <12 & <13 & <14 & <15 \\
\hline
1637–1640 & 1641 & 1642 & 1643 & \\
\hline
<16 & <17 & <18 & <20 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Table 4.1 shows how the number of returns that define the rarity of a collocation depends on the date of the text that contains it. First, the presumed date of the text containing the


collocation under investigation is selected. The number below that date gives the upper limit of returns for rarity before the date of the text. For example, if the text is dated 1612, a collocation from that text is defined as rare if there are less than 9 returns from the rest of the searchable EEBO database before 1612.\textsuperscript{204} In other words, if less than approximately 0.17\% (about 1 in 588) of the searchable texts before the target date contain the collocation I define it as ‘rare’.\textsuperscript{205}

\textit{Stage 2}

\textit{Grading possible sources.} Each text that includes the ‘rare’ collocation before the presumed target date is graded, assigning it a grade A if it is the only text before the target date, and a grade B if it is one of several texts. For example, for the \textit{Gesta Grayorum}, a grade B is allocated to a return if the collocation appears in 2–3 texts before 1595. All texts graded in this way qualify as possible sources and are listed.

\textit{Obtaining probable sources.} For a possible source to acquire the status of a probable source it must be returned for at least one other collocation. This takes account of possible coincidence. I define a text to be a source ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ if it has at least two grade A assignations or an A and B, and a source ‘on the balance of probability’ if it has two grade B.

\textit{Logging borrowings.} By taking account of frequently recurring authors who share the use of these rare collocations from the target after the presumed target date, it can also be seen which authors are candidates for having borrowed from it. Of particular interest are those authors who were at least 18 years old and alive on the target date, in order to have been available to contribute to it at the time it was conceived. I recognise that this is a simplifying assumption, because it is possible that those who were too young to contribute on the presumed target date but were old enough to have a hand in a later version might be erroneously excluded from consideration.

\textit{Stage 3}

\textit{Rarity of possible borrowings.} While a particular collocation might have been rare on the date it was placed in the target, it might have become commonplace by the time a later writer shared its use. So a test of rarity is also applied at the date of an author’s later use.

\textsuperscript{204} One might conduct 1000 searches for each play to identify the rare collocations in it.

\textsuperscript{205} The percentage does not have to be 0.17\% and so the limits do not have to be as in Table 4.1. It would be an interesting experiment to vary this percentage to see how the profiles are affected. Of course, increasing the limit would result in more returns and there would come a point when the number of returns would be unmanageable, especially for returns after the target date.
This ensures that the unidentified person who inserted a particular collocation in the target, and the author who later shared its use in his known corpus, were both using a collocation that was rare when they employed it.

Using this method, a DNA-type profile can be obtained for each author with a significant number of returns (at least 3), showing which rare collocations might have been sourced from their work, and which ones were later used in their work. If all an author’s matches occur after the target date, then the most that can be claimed is that the author consulted this document, unless the target text was later revised. If all an author’s matches occur before the target date then the largest claim that can be made is that the target borrowed from this author, unless an earlier version of the target was extant. If both circumstances occur, then I suggest that frequent mutual borrowing between the target and a particular author is evidence of that author’s contribution to the target. At the very least, the main candidates for a contribution should be apparent.

4.2 A survey of methods

4.2.1 Need for a textual analysis

It would be an error to uncritically take any attribution on a Renaissance title page at face value because in some cases a name was used merely to generate sales. This appears to have been the case with the 1619 quarto of The first part Of the true & honorable history, of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham206 which has “Written by William Shakespeare” on the title page, a name that by this time had appeared on several quartos.207 However, for 16 October 1599, Henslowe’s diary records a receipt of “ten pownd” by “Thomas downton of phillipp Henchlow to pay m't Monday m't drayton & m't wilsson & haythway for the first pte of the lyfe of S't Jhon Ouldcastell & in earnest of the Second pte for the vse of the company.”208 So the attribution to Shakespeare seems unjustified. However, external evidence is not always at hand to decide the issue. Sometimes there needs to be a reliable test of contribution to bring more evidence to bear on the matter, and it must be a method that deals in textual elements of sufficient complexity to distinguish between the organisation of different minds.

206 The title page bears the year 1600 while an earlier 1600 quarto has no attribution.
207 The 1608 and 1619 quartos of A Yorkshire Tragedie, Not so New as Lamentable and True have ‘written by W. Shakspeare’ and ‘written by W. SHAKESPEARE’ on their title pages even though they are not currently regarded as his, see STC: 22340, and STC: 22341.
4.2.2 Computational stylistics

‘Computational stylistics’ or ‘stylometrics’ involves the statistical analysis of word-frequency data from large samples of machine-readable text. An early pioneer was Burrows in the 1980s who counted ‘grammatical’ or ‘function’ words such as conjunctions, pronouns, and prepositions, as well as ‘lexical’ or ‘content’ words such as nouns, verbs, and modifiers. Practitioners who have followed Burrows in developing this method include Jackson, Taylor, and Craig and Kinney. However, Vickers has disputed the validity of individual word counts as a test of authorship, concluding that such methods can only highlight textual resemblances. In my view, all such methods rely on the unjustified assumption that no more than one contributor is responsible for each word that is being counted. For example, the representation or choice of a particular word might result from an amalgam of later authorial, scribal, editorial, and compositorial intervention, so that the cognitive signature of the word’s original contributor is lost. Yet when the word is found in the corpus of a known dramatist, practitioners automatically associate it with a single hypothetical contributor, even though the person who produced the word’s final version might not even be in the database of possible authors. Extend this consideration to an entire act of a play and the difficulty soon becomes apparent. What one is counting could easily be the average effect of the inseparable contribution of several hands.

For example, consider the case of spelling variants such as the contractions ‘you’re’ and ‘y’are’ which both arose in John Cooke’s Greene’s Tu Quoque, or the Cittie Gallant.

---

(1614). It was printed in two different sections by two different teams, one team using ‘quoque’ and ‘you’re’ only, and the other using ‘Quoque’ and ‘y’are’ only. This shows that printers are capable of modifying individual words. So for both synonyms and spelling variants, unless information about specific scribal and printing practices can be obtained, I share Vickers’ caution in relation to conclusions about authorial resemblances using frequency counts, especially with regard to ratios of word variants.

By extending the units under analysis from individual words to consecutive word strings, Hope and Whitmore have recently used a text-analysis software called DocuScope to redefine the genre divisions of Shakespeare plays. This relies on a dictionary of 40 million word strings which are each associated with one of over 100 rhetorical categories known as language action types (LATs). The frequency of each is recorded and subjected to statistical analysis.

4.2.3 Corpus linguistics

In the 1950s, Firth decided that “words must not be treated as if they had isolated meaning” and declared that “the time has come to try other abstractions using the larger contexts in which words are embedded, necessitating new types of ordered series of words and pieces, and new systems of stylistics.” This initiated the study of collocations, which according to Burrows “emphasizes the proximity, within a specified distance, of the words to be regarded as an entity.” In 1980, Sinclair founded the COBUILD project, which

216 DocuScope is a text analysis and comparison program developed by a team of researchers at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA. The database dictionary of word strings was designed by David Kaufer.
218 After processing the LAT counts with a statistical procedure known as Principal Component Analysis (PCA), patterns of similarity and difference can be established between categories of LATs by correlating their simultaneous presence or absence. For a criticism of PCA see Vickers, ‘Shakespeare and Authorship’, op. cit., pp.117–119.
221 An acronym for Collins Birmingham University International Language Database.
holds a large electronic corpus of English text, and was later expanded into the “Bank of English”. His “principle of idiom” states that “a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-constructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear analysable into segments.” In 1996, Lancashire devised software that could analyse collocations in texts and used the term “phrasal repetends” to denote those collocations or phrases that reoccur in certain plays. He discovered that Shakespeare’s repetends are more frequent than his individual words, as is the case with many other writers, and concluded that “this phrasal lexicon must exhibit traces of Shakespeare’s networked associational memory.” More recently, Vickers has used N-grams, a group of N consecutive words of which Lancashire’s repetends are a sub-group, to search for unique correspondences between The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England and the plays of other dramatists. Vickers has managed to obtain 219 unique matches between the target and the work of George Peele by checking each group of three or more consecutive words in Troublesome Reign against 70 plays dated to before 1596.

4.2.4 The new method

A difficulty with the usual methods of linguistic analysis is that they rely on the unstated assumption that no possible contributor to a play could lie outside a database of known dramatists. In my view, this assumption is in need of interrogation, and so a new method is to be employed using Chadwyck–Healey’s EEBO database in order to considerably widen the list of suspects. This has the advantage of allowing possible sources and possible borrowings from a target to be suggested. Lake states that “Collocations have the advantage, quite often, of high distinctiveness, but usually the disadvantage of low

---

222 In 2004, the “Bank of English” held 254 million words in the form of consecutive strings of words.


229 For example, in 2003, MacDonald P. Jackson limited his collocation searches to the ‘Drama’ section of ‘Literature Online’ to conclude that George Wilkins wrote the first two acts of Pericles and parts of the brothel scene in Act 4. See Jackson, Defining Shakespeare, op. cit., p.215–6.
I maintain that a low frequency is actually instructive because the lower the frequency of the collocation in the searchable database, the more it indicates uniqueness of mind, and the more it limits possible suspects.

For the date range 1473–1700, only 39,869 out of the 124,700 (31.97%) records in EEBO are in the form of fully searchable text. Nevertheless, this is a sufficiently large sample to estimate the rarity of a phrase or collocation in the contemporary published literature. The sample is clearly biased towards significant authors, in other words, those writers who are the most likely to have originated new collocations. This consideration seems to me to lessen the significance of the missing unsearchable texts. Of course, it is possible that one or more contributors to an unattributed target do not appear elsewhere in the EEBO database, this unattributed document containing his or her only contribution to a publication. In that case the style is unavailable for comparison and it would not be possible to argue for an influence or contribution. Such is the case with the corpus of Shakespeare plays and poems outside of which there are no letters or prose works by Shakespeare with which to make a test, in the context of there being several hands in the Shakespeare work. Consequently, my method is incapable of evaluating the extent of Shakespeare’s contribution to his accepted corpus of plays and poems.

In discussing the collaborative work of Anthony Munday and Henry Chettle, Byrne has set out certain “golden rules” for parallel hunters. Consider two texts that uniquely share the same collocation, one that is attributed to a known author A, and one that has no attribution, an unknown author B.

(1) Parallels may be susceptible of at least three explanations: (a) unsuspected identity of authorship [A is B], (b) plagiarism, either deliberate or unconscious [borrowing between A and B, the direction depending on which text is the later], (c) coincidence [both A and B have conceived it independently];

231 The Text Creation Partnership (TCP) creates standardized, accurate XML/SGML encoded electronic editions of early print books. Texts are transcribed and marked-up from page images of ProQuest’s Early English Books Online, Gale Cengage’s Eighteenth Century Collections Online, and Readex’s Evans Early American Imprints. EEBO–TCP Phase I began in 1999 and produced more than 25,000 fully searchable texts. EEBO–TCP Phase II was announced in March 2008 with the aim of converting the remaining 44,000 unique monographs in the EEBO collection. Source http://eebo.chadwyck.com/about/about.htm accessed 1 April 2013.
(2) Quality is all-important, and parallels demand very careful grading — e.g. mere verbal parallelism is of almost no value in comparison with parallelism of thought coupled with some verbal parallelism; [context and specific meaning add weight]

(3) mere accumulation of ungraded parallels does not prove anything; [many parallels that are in common use are inadequate]

(4) in accumulating parallels for the sake of cumulative effect we may logically proceed from the known to the collaborator [we might conclude that a single known author A was one of several collaborating authors which I denote as B], or from the known to the anonymous play [a single author A is the anonymous author B], but not from the collaborative to the anonymous [a number of known collaborators A cannot be separated to find a single anonymous author B of another text];

(5) in order to express ourselves as certain of attributions we must prove exhaustively that we cannot parallel words, images and phrases as a body from other acknowledged plays of the period; in other words the negative check must always be applied [the parallel must be rare].

These rules might be summarized as follows. Consider two authors: A who is known, and B who is unknown. Let us consider two texts $A_1$ from A, and $B_1$ from B, where $A_1$ has almost certain attribution, and $B_1$ is unattributed. Rule (1) asserts that (a) a unique parallel between $A_1$ and $B_1$ might be due to common authorship, but it is possible that (b) $A_1$ and $B_1$ contain a borrowing one from the other, depending on which was earlier. Alternatively, we have (c) that author A might have thought of it independently of B. The probability of (c) can be reduced by selecting a sufficiently complex collocation, that is, one that is used in an unusual context with a particular meaning, or by also having a second rare parallel between A and B. A charge of unilateral borrowing (b) becomes less likely if the author of $A_1$ is also the author of texts $A_2$, $A_3$, $A_4$, …, which all share rare parallels with $B_1$, some of which are earlier and some later than $B_1$. For then, there is evidence of mutual borrowing which argues a common mind.

Rule (2), which refers to grading, is easy to execute with Chadwyck–Healey’s EEBO database, where it is possible to estimate the relative frequency of a presented phrase by dividing the number of records containing it by the total number of records searched. This can only be an estimate in virtue of possible duplicated texts in the records returned which I only count once. Nevertheless, a relative frequency of a collocation calculated in this
way from the number of texts returned prior to the date of the unattributed text would still provide a measure of rarity if not of probability.

The demand for rarity is underlined by Rule (5) which sees correspondences unique to two sets, a corpus $A=\{A_1, A_2, A_3, \ldots\}$ and a target text $B=\{B_1\}$, as attribution markers. However, I would also extend Rule (5) to correspondences that are not unique to the two sets $A$ and $B$. Such correspondences yield important information about possible sources for and possible borrowings from $B$. Of course, the method is limited to those authors who are represented in the EEBO database, and any contributor to a target who appears in no other published text in the database can never be identified by this method. For this reason, it is safer to argue for a contribution to a target rather than for sole authorship.

As stated above, Vickers has searched for unique strings of consecutive word matches between *The Troublesome Reign* (1591) and the plays of other known dramatists resulting in a large number for George Peele. In a criticism of Vickers’ $N$-gram method, Burrows has remarked “only when he makes strict, appropriate, and equitable comparisons will he arrive at the beginning of the beginning.” However, the point should have been made that while a particular collocation or $N$-gram might be unique to two particular dramatists, this does not preclude it from being a commonplace expression in contemporary texts. Without testing for rarity in a database of authors in print, the sharing of a phrase between two dramatists (one unattributed and the other known) could simply be a result of a shared library with common sources, rather than the result of a common unique thought process. To eliminate this possibility, it is important to check all of the contemporary literature that is available to search and to this end, use is made of Chadwyck–Healey’s EEBO database.

In relation to Burrows’ remark about “equitable comparisons”, in his system a word seldom has sufficient cognitive complexity to act as an authorial marker by itself, and so an aggregate of words is presumed to supply the complexity. His idea is that authors can then be ‘fairly’ compared when account is taken of the different sizes of their examined corpus. However, as stated earlier, there is a problem with the assumption that each word stands in its original form, unaltered by later intervention. In contrast, a collocation that has been shown to be rare implicitly carries a far greater cognitive complexity in virtue of the fact that few authors have used it, and so it would only need a small number of such collocations to indicate a common cognitive process. The nature of this process, whether it

---

234 I recognise that an $N$-gram is a string of $N$ consecutive words and that a collocation can entertain separated words, but shall hereafter refer to both as collocations unless I wish to be more specific.
be two authors’ shared preference for a collocation or a common mind, must then be decided.

A few remarks are in order concerning the required size of an author’s corpus to qualify it for a reasonable test against the target. There must be a lower limit on the corpus word count below which there is insufficient data. The present study runs only six tests and many more are required before an estimate of this lower limit can be made.\textsuperscript{235} Above this limit, no matter how large an authorial corpus, if there are \textit{a priori} no shared thought processes between a known author and the unattributed writer of a target text then one can expect virtually no rare collocation matches. For example, for \textit{The Funerall Elegye} (Table 4.3 and footnotes) I show that despite Francis Bacon having 27 searchable works in the EEBO database, he registers only one rare match (No. 18).\textsuperscript{236} This is because the collocations are not chosen at random by authors but are selected according to mostly unconscious rules of preference.

I now state my interpretation of results as follows:\textsuperscript{237}

(1) An author with at least two rare collocations before the date of a target shows evidence of being a source for the target.

(2) An author with at least two rare collocations which were also rare at the date of their use after the target, shows evidence of having borrowed from the target.

(3) An author with at least two rare collocations both before and after the date of the target text shows evidence of mutual borrowing and of a contribution to the target.

Of course, the greater the number of matches, the stronger the case will be for a source or borrowing. Also, if there is a rare collocation that carries sufficient complexity, I suggest that it can serve the function of several lesser ones.\textsuperscript{238}

The first stage of the RCP method is now applied to the first 20 collocations that Vickers lists from \textit{The Troublesome Reign} (first quarto, 1591).\textsuperscript{239} These cover the first 200 lines

\textsuperscript{235} I show later that for the \textit{Gesta Grayorum} (Table 5.3 and footnotes) that Richard Knolles has 3 rare matches despite having only one searchable text in the EEBO database. However, Richard Knolles, \textit{The generall historie of the Turkes} (1603), STC: 15015 contains 1,030,000 words.

\textsuperscript{236} John Ford has 20 rare matches with \textit{A Funerall Elegye} (Table 4.4) whereas the Shakespeare canon has only 6 yet their number of works in EEBO is 9 and 40, respectively.

\textsuperscript{237} I recognise that many documents would need to be analysed by RCP to get an accurate feel for what the data is revealing. For example, does a Ben Jonson play analysed by RCP reveal Ben Jonson as a contributor and how many rare matches before and after the target date occur?

\textsuperscript{238} It would be interesting to see if these \textit{a priori} rules vary after having investigated a large number of targets, including those for which the identity of the author is reasonable certain.
from (1.1). Table 4.2 shows the collocations that Vickers discovered to be a unique match between the target and the work of Peele in a search of works by known dramatists up to 1596. For an RCP check of collocation rarity, I conduct an EEBO search before 1591, the presumed date of the target. Since there are 3155 fully searchable texts in the database from 1471–1590, and my definition of a rare collocation demands that it must appear in <0.17% of texts before the target date, then this amounts to <7 returns before 1591.

Table 4.2 Rare collocation matches from The Troublesome Reign (1591)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>No. EEBO returns &lt;1591</th>
<th>Peele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>the man of</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>all his former</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>in stole of dismal hue (1.1.4)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;240&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>That from this (1.1.6)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>his brother in (1.1.8)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My gracious Mother-Queen (1.1.9)</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;241&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>and barons all (1.1.9)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;242&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>say, my son (1.1.22)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>our brother Philip (1.1.24)</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;243&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>and say the (1.1.27)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>what he means (1.1.39)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;244&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>commend me to my (1.1.52)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a dame that (1.1.56–7)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;245&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>to rule a (1.1.58)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>not in haste (1.1.64)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>of justice and (1.1.80–1)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

244 Peele appears for the following but it lies outside my definition of rarity, George Peele, The old wifes tale (London: 1595), STC: 19545.
245 George Whetstone, An heptameron (1582), STC: 25337; George Turberville, Tragicall tales (1587), STC: 24330.
be commanded hence (1.1.143)

safe in my (1.1.177)

all thou hast (1.1.179)

and my right (1.1.199)

George Peele, The araygnement of Paris (1584), STC: 19530.
Edward More, A lytle and bryfe treatyse (1560), STC: 18067; Philip Sydney, Arcadia (1590), STC: 22539; George Peele, The old wiues tale (1595), STC: 19545.

These specific spellings were not changed.

In Table 4.2, I follow Vickers’s numbering of collocations and indicate in the fourth column which collocations are rare, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii). Only 8 of the 20 are unusual and one of these (No. 13) does not correspond to any work by Peele in the searchable EEBO database before 1650. The rest can be dismissed as too commonplace. With George Peele having 2 rare matches before and 5 after The Troublesome Reign, I conclude that this indicates a mutual borrowing in the first 200 lines of the play, which in turn is evidence of George Peele’s contribution to this section of The Troublesome Reign.

4.3 A test case: A Funerall Elegye (1612)

4.3.1 The methodology

I now introduce Stage 2 in my new collocation method outlined in §4.1 by applying it to A Funerall Elegye (1612). In Stage 1, I introduced the idea of a ‘rare’ collocation and asserted that due to their cognitive complexity or uniqueness of construction, I only require at least two rare matches before and at least two after the date of the target text from a particular author to suggest evidence of an authorial contribution, keeping in view that particularly complex constructs from an author need relatively few examples. In Stage 2, for each rare collocation, all returns from EEBO before the date of the target are recorded to provide data indicating possible sources for the target. Each of these returns is then graded according to its degree of rarity to obtain information about probable sources. I also extend the EEBO upper search limit date to include all possible borrowers from the target, and only consider those who were available to contribute to it. In this way, I can obtain a full picture of all the authors who are candidates for a contribution to the target. Here I omit Stage 3, which I introduce in later applications of the method, and is a procedure that assesses the rarity of a collocation at the time of its later use.
Procedure

In Table 4.3, for *The Funerall Elegye* (1612), I set the upper date limit to 1652 to include all possible contributors, and I count all records returned for a collocation before 1612 (<1612). From Table 4.1, the upper limit of the number of returns is < 9, however, due to the relative shortness of this text, I set it at < 11 to increase the sensitivity of the test. The key to interpreting Table 4.3 is set out on p.viii in ‘Key to RCP data tables’, but to summarise, if 8 records are returned before the presumed target date (1612), and 17 before 1652 this appears in the table as ‘17 (8<1612)’. If a return appears in different editions of a title by a particular author, I only count it as 1 return. A decision on what returns are appropriate might depend on a filtering condition which I impose to take account of the context of the collocation in the target. For example, in the *Elegye* the phrase ‘court opinion’ (collocation No.26, Table 4.3) results in 0 returns before 1612, and 5 returns before 1652 but their contexts are variously ‘the opinion in a court’ and ‘to canvas views’. Since only the latter context is relevant, then only 2 of these are appropriate. In this case, the context is shown in square brackets as ‘[canvas views]’ and the reduction due to context is shown as ‘2(5) (0<1612)’.

It might turn out that a return that EEBO records as being after 1612 is known to have been available in another edition or manuscript before 1612, which is not returned by EEBO, in which case ‘[footnote precedent]’ refers the reader to the footnotes to find details. For example ‘low leueld’ (collocation No. 46, Table 4.3) registers in Michel de Montaigne’s *Essays* (1613) translated by John Florio. Florio’s English translation was first published in 1603 but this edition is not searchable text in EEBO. Although this circumstance is mentioned in the footnotes, the counts shown in Table 4.3 are not modified as a result. However, this does affect the eventual grading of possible sources.

Probable sources

All records returned for a rare collocation before the presumed date of the target are logged as possible sources and graded. For *The Funerall Elegye*, since I define ‘rare’ as appearing in less than 11 unique titles before 1612, a return is given a grade A if it is the only possible source, grade B if it is one of 2–3 possible sources, and a grade C if it is one of 4–

---

249 When there is a filtering condition, each document returned is opened to check the collocation against the context. This can be very time consuming for a large number of documents returned after the target date.

250 STC: 18042.

251 STC: 18041.
10. For example, Henry Smith’s *Satans compassing the earth* (1592)\(^{252}\) occurs for two collocations (Nos 45, 52, Table 4.3), the first of which is awarded grade C and the second grade B, so is logged under ‘Possible sources’ as Smith *Satans* (45C)(52B). I recognise that a single grade A for a possible source text might be a coincidental match, so this text needs to occur more than once to be raised to the status of ‘probable’. For a possible source text in my study of the *Elegye*, I demand at least two grade A matches, or an A and a B for it to be a source ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; and a double B match, or an A and a C to be a source ‘on the balance of probability’.\(^{253}\)

**Possible borrowings**

For rare collocations, I also note texts returned later than the presumed target date and log frequently occurring writers. However, since the aim is to identify possible contributors to the target, they must satisfy the requirement that they were alive and at least 18 years old at this date. In order to simplify the study, it is assumed that an author who becomes of age later than this date contributed to no later version of the target (assuming there is one).

In later applications of the method to *Gesta Grayorum*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, *The Tempest*, and *True Declaration*, Stage 3 of the method is included. Here Table 4.1 is strictly applied to assess the rarity of the collocation under inspection at the date that it was used in a later publication. This allows the identification of rare uses of the collocation at the later time it was used, and avoids including collocations which went on to become commonplace at that time.

Providing that there is no deliberate borrowing between two authors (as occurred in the Nashe–Harvey controversy) mutual borrowing is regarded as far less likely than a contribution. As stated earlier, due to the difficulties inherent in reconstructing the history of contributions to a target (whether they be original author(s), modifying author(s), editors, scribes, or compositors) unless it is a poem, the largest claim that can be made for a single target on the basis of RCP is for a contribution not for exclusive authorship.

**Bias**

Since the aim of the RCP method is to identify whether or not a contribution has been made by this or that author to a target, the notion of ‘bias’ does not arise. It is not the aim here to champion a single author to the exclusion of all others, only to show that there is

---

\(^{252}\) STC: 22692.

\(^{253}\) If a possible source obtains > 3 B grades (which did not occur in the present studies) a decision needs to be made as to whether or not they are of sufficient strength to merit an A grade.
sufficient evidence for this or that author to have made a contribution. To achieve this, it only needs to be shown that a writer has matches with the target of sufficient cognitive complexity both before and after its presumed date. RCP is not about comparing equal size corpora for various authors and neither is it entirely about EEBO. The question is, given a particular target, can a significant rare collocation profile be constructed at all for this or that author taking data from any source, whether it be EEBO, Google, or unpublished letters.

The RCPs produced here (e.g Table 5.4) are not necessarily final. The profile that is constructed for each possible contributor to a target can evolve with time, in that rare collocations that have not been located in a writer’s corpus in EEBO but have been discovered elsewhere, for example, in a collection of letters, can be added to a writer’s RCP at a later time to enhance it. In other words, a profile is always in a state of cumulative evolution. I should add that there has been no attempt in my search of a target in EEBO to neglect evidence for any particular author. Every seemingly rare collocation has been checked and the data recorded without exclusion of any possible source or borrower.254

4.3.2 The test

History

In 1989, the forensic linguist Donald Foster argued that A Funerall Elegye (1612), which was published under the unidentified initials “W.S.”, was Shakespeare’s poem.255 Its subsequent inclusion in the Norton, Riverside, and Longman Shakespeare collections signalled its acceptance into the canon, however, its attribution to Shakespeare was challenged, most notably by Monsarrat256 and Vickers,257 who both argued for the dramatist John Ford (1586–1639). Unfortunately, in 2002, their database was limited and so could not result in an accurate assessment of the rarity of certain stylistic traits in relation to the published literature of the era.

254 Over 1000 searches were carried out on some targets, but the commonplace ones have been omitted from the tables. A particular collocation search that had to conform to a given filter could take several hours while each document returned was opened and the collocation was checked for context. No current computer program could have invented and executed some of the searches given in these tables to reproduce the depth of interrogatation of the EEBO database given here.
There is significant external evidence in favour of John Ford’s attribution. The Elegye relates to the murder of William Peter from Devonshire in January 1612. Ford was born in Ilsington, Devonshire, not far from William Peter. They both attended Exeter College, Oxford, and they were both there in the period 1601–1602, sharing the same tutor, Simon Baskerville. Memorial poems were Ford’s province. He wrote them on the death of the Earl of Devonshire, Sir Thomas Overbury, Ben Jonson, and John Fletcher. As with the Elegye, they set out the subject’s virtues, attacked his enemies, and assured his eternal fame. In support of Foster’s case, Lancashire points out that George Eld, who printed Shake-speare’s sonnets (1609), was also the printer of A Funerall Elegye, however, it seems to have passed unnoticed that he was also the printer of John Ford’s Honor triumphant (1606).

Less than three weeks after the murder, a poem was entered in the Stationers’ Register ‘A funeral Elegye In memory of the late virtuous master WILLIAM PEETER’. With no bookseller’s name on the title page, it had the appearance of a private publication and might well have been “printed in fewer than a dozen copies.” Foster compared the Elegye with all known writing of the period by authors with the initials “W.S.” and reached the conclusion that it was the work of Shakespeare. However, in 2002, Brian Vickers opposed the introduction of the Elegye into the Shakespeare canon, arguing instead for the dramatist John Ford. In the same year, Gilles Monsarrat carried out collocation searches on the Elegye but, like Vickers, did not have the depth of a database such as Chadwyck-Healey’s EEBO in 2013 to test the rarity of his phrases.

I now apply Stages 1 and 2 of RCP (see §4.1) in a systematic search of the Elegye to identify which collocations were rare.

**Application data**

*Date test completed:* 10 October 2012

*Search period:* 1473–1652

*No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period:* 17,348

---

258 Ibid., pp.xxvi–xxvii.
264 The state of the database in May 2013 is that out of 128,070 records, exactly 40,061 are keyed-in searchable text (period 1473–1900).
Presumed date of test document: 1612

No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date: 5,471

Definition of ‘rare’: <11 returns before date of test document

Grading system for a possible source: This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–3 returns; grade C for 4–10 returns.

Probability estimates for possible sources: If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; AC or BB – ‘on the balance of probability’; BC or CC – ‘strong suspect’.

The works of John Ford (1586–c.1640) in Chadwyck-Healey’s EEBO database that are searchable are as follows: Fame’s memorial (1606), The golden meane (1614, 1638), A line of life (1620), Loues sacrifice (1633), ‘Tis pity shee’s a whore (1633), A broken heart (1633), The chronicle historie of Perkin Warbeck (1634), The fancies (1638), and The ladies trial (1639). I note that several plays of John Ford appear in Volume 1 of Collected Works of John Ford which includes A Funerall Elyge.²⁶⁵

Due to the number of possible sources, I have not listed them all in the footnotes, but they have all been taken into account for the estimate of probable sources. Later, when I apply the method to Gesta Grayorum, The Comedy of Errors, Love’s Labour’s Lost, The Tempest, and True Declaration, I list them all.

Table 4.3: Collocation searches in A Funerall Elyge (1612) using EEBO from 1473–1652.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (signature)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns &lt; 1653</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 abridg’d the circuit (A3)</td>
<td>{abridge(d) fby.2 circuit}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 memorable monument (A3)</td>
<td>{memorable near.2 monument}</td>
<td>16 (6&lt;1612)²⁶⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lamentable tomb (A3)</td>
<td>{lamentable tomb}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 fit respect (A3)</td>
<td>{fit respect}</td>
<td>5 (1&lt;1612)²⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [may] pattern out (A3)</td>
<td>{pattern out}</td>
<td>23 (9&lt;1612)²⁶⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶⁵ Monsarrat et al., The Collected Works, op. cit..
²⁶⁶ Earliest in Marcus Tullius Cicero, A panoplie of epistles (1576), STC (2nd ed): 11049; but also in Holinshed’s Chronicles (1587), and Livy’s Romane historie (1600). John Ford, The louers melancholy (1629), STC: 11163, has “Even to thy younger yeeres a Monument / Of memorable Fame”.
²⁶⁷ “Let vowes of fit respect” The Iliads of Homer prince of poets (1611), STC: 13634.
²⁶⁸ “I thought it did fitly patterne out my looking to Mopsa”, Philip Sidney, The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia (1593), STC: 22540; Ben Jonson, The fountain of self-loue (1601), STC: 14773. Also, John Ford, The golden meane (1613), STC: 17757; and “Let mine owne judgement
Such staines, as follyes {stain(s) near.3 folly(ies)}
quick brain’d [suruey](A3) {quick brain(ed)}
faulty errors {faulty error(s)}
spleenfull sence {spleenful sense}
spight of mallice {spight fby.2 malice}
incompast in a mortall frame {encompassed fby.4 frame}
mortal frame {mortal frame}
base fee [of slaues] {base fee}
fortunes wrackt {fortunes wrecked}
vnremembred graues {unremembered graves}
heauen infused {heaven infused}
curious temple [of] {curious temple}
Reasons golden Meane {golden mean near.5 reason(s)}
secured fools (A4) {secure(d) fool(s)}
glad sleights (A4) {glad slight(s)}
insnaring vice (A4) {ensnaring vice(s)}

pattern out my death”, William Shakespeare, ‘Measure for Measure’, Mr William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies (1623), STC: 22272 which is currently dated to 1603–4.

“with the staine of his folie” Robert Greene, Greene’s farewell to folly (1591), STC: 12241; Matteo Bandello, Straunge, lamentable, and tragicall hystories (1577), STC: 1356.5.

Two returns of “spight and malice” were rejected.


“Which le\nt a mortall frame immortall thought” Gervase Markham, The most honourable tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile (1595), STC: 17385; Saint Augustine, Of the citie of God (1610), STC: 916.

John Rastell, An exposition of certaine difficult and obscure words, and termes of the laws of this realme (1579), STC: 20706.5 & 1595, STC: 20709; John Cowell, The interpreter (1607), STC: 5900.

Spelling variations were added “wrackt” and “wrackd”.

Charles Fitz-Geffrey, Sir Francis Drake (1596), STC: 10943.

“Where reason rules, there is the golden meane”, Anon., A pleasant comedie, Shewing the contention between Liberalitie and Prodigalitie (1602), STC: 5593; the following is not in EEBO, “But especially the Christian faith, as in all things, so in this is pre-eminent; holding the golden mean touching the use of reason and discussion”, Francis Bacon, ‘Of the Dignity and Advancement of Learning’, Ninth Book, in James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, eds, The Works of Francis Bacon, Vol. IX, being translations of the philosophical works, Vol. II (Boston: 1877), p.349. This was published in Latin in 1623.

“Open the dore, secure foole, hardie King” William Shakespeare, The tragedie of King Richard the second (1597), STC: 22307; also “Though Page be a secure foole”, William Shakespeare, ‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’, Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies (1623), STC: 22272, first published in 1602, though this line does not appear in the 1602 quarto.

Spelling variations “sleight” and “sleights” were added.

“insnaring vice”, I. F., Christes bloodie sweat (1613), STC: 11076.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>spring of dayes (A4)</td>
<td>spring fby.2 days</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sick desires (A4)</td>
<td>sick desire(s)</td>
<td>12 (4&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>each part exact (A4)</td>
<td>each part exact</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>disgracefull folly (A4)</td>
<td>disgraceful folly</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>courting opinion (A4)</td>
<td>court(ing)(s) opinion(s)</td>
<td>2(5) (0&lt;1612) canvas views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>blushlesse vanities (A4)</td>
<td>blushless vanity(ies)</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>the flote / Of (A4)</td>
<td>the float of</td>
<td>6 (3&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>[his] becoming silence (A4)</td>
<td>becoming silence</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>his judicious parts (A4)</td>
<td>his judicious parts</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>furnisht mind (A4)</td>
<td>furnished mind</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>trim behauiour (A4)</td>
<td>trim behaviour</td>
<td>3 (2&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>offencelesse resolution (A4)</td>
<td>offenceless resolution</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>[Cleane]-temperor’d Moderation (A4)</td>
<td>tempered moderation</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>steddy Trust (A4)</td>
<td>steady trust</td>
<td>7 (3&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>illustrious bloud (B)</td>
<td>illustrious blood</td>
<td>16 (4&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>imbane (B)</td>
<td>imbane</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>witlesse sinne (B)</td>
<td>witless sin</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>vnblushing Truth (B)</td>
<td>unblushing truth</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


281 Raoul Lefevre, *hEre [sic] begynneth the volume* (1473), STC: 15375 and *The auncient historie* (1597), STC: 15379; Thomas Lanquet, *An epitome of chronicles* (1559), STC: 15217.5; As shown by Monsarrat, ‘*A Funeral Eleegye*, op. cit.’, it is also in John Ford, *The golden meane* (1613), STC: 17757, and his *Loues sacrifice* (1633), STC: 11164.


284 “well-tempered moderation”, John Ford, *The golden meane* (1613), STC: 17757. This correspondence was given by Monsarrat, ‘A Funeral Elegy’, *op. cit.*, p.188.

285 Added the variation “steddy”.


right the hopes (B)

Time would to time

fearfull consummation (B)

ripen to a head (B)

gainfull fruit (B)

brittle flesh (B)

time would to

fearful consummation

ripen to a head

gainful fruit

brittle flesh

footnote precedent

seruile breath (B2)

And set thee as a President to

men (B2)

text of malice (B3)

seeming reason (B3)

lamentable spight (B3)

whiles yet he was a man (B3)

besotted fashion (B3)

prompt desires (B3)

“right his Fathers hopes”, Michael Drayton, Englands heroicall epistles (1597), STC: 7193; The barons wars (1603), STC: 7189, and Poems (1605), STC: 7216. Note that “right the author in his hopes” appears in a full-page preface to I. F., Christ’s Bloodie Sweat (1613), STC: 11076, sig. B, printed by Ralph Blower, which has an identical page composition to that in the earlier Alexander Garden, A garden of graue and godlie flowres sonets (1609), STC: 11596, sig. M2, printed by Thomas Finlason.

Paolo Giovo, The worthy tract of Paulus Iouius (1585), STC: 11900.

The earliest is Marcus Cato, Preceptes (1553), STC: 4854. There is also Henry Smith, Satans compassing the earth (1592), STC: 22307.

Michel de Montaigne, Essays, transl. by John Florio (1613), STC: 18042; Florio’s English translation was first published in 1603.


As pointed out by G. D. Monsarrat, ‘A Funeral Elegy’, op. cit., p.189, the whole line appears in John Ford, Fames memoriall, or the Earle of Devonshire deceased (1606), STC: 11158 and even rhymes with ‘pen’. There is also “One example or president to both Noble and vnderstanding men” in John Ford, The golden meane (1613), STC: 17757.

H. R., Haigh for Devonshire A pleasant discourse of six gallant marchants of Devonshire (1600), STC: 21081, the ‘Epistle Dedicatorie’ is signed ‘H. Robarts’; Thomas Bilson, The survey of Christs sufferings (1604), STC: 3070; and Pierre Charon, Of wisdome (1608), STC: 5051.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Lexical Unit</th>
<th>Natural Form</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Language Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>fond dotage</td>
<td>{fond dotage}</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>in both fortunes</td>
<td>{in both fortunes}</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(7&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>bonds of unity</td>
<td>{bonds of unity}</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(4&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>grave immunity</td>
<td>{grave immunity}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>proportional note</td>
<td>{proportionable note}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>unaffected care</td>
<td>{unaffected care}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Frendships Rock</td>
<td>{friendship(s) near.2 rock}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Most true presage</td>
<td>{most true presage}</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>complementall phrase</td>
<td>{complemental(ly) phrase(s)}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>deadly fuell</td>
<td>{deadly fuel}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>wrought his end</td>
<td>{wrought his end}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>slacker in loue</td>
<td>{slack(er) in love}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>[as] time can boast</td>
<td>{time near.1 boast(s)(ing)} or {time can boast}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>within the snares</td>
<td>{within the snare(s)}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>[making] truth a pawne</td>
<td>{truth a pawn}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0&lt;1612)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

301 “O most true presage”, Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (1590), STC: 22539 & (1593), STC: 22540. This will count as one record in the grading.
302 “complemental phrases”, Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, transl. by John Florio (1613), STC: 18042; Florio’s English translation was first published in 1603.
303 Spelling variant “fuel” added.
307 “so make truth a Seducer”, Thomas Morton, *A full satisfaction* (1606), STC: 18185. For the personification of ‘truth’, “He will lie, sir, with such volubility that you would think truth were a fool”, William Shakespeare, *All’s Well That Ends Well*, currently dated 1604–5, not from EEBO search.
The Elegye has “weake opinion; / Which beeing crost, giues matter of bewayling / The vaine designes that weaknesse doth begin?” in The poeticaull essays (1599), STC: 6261, also his The ciuile wars betweene the howses of Lancaster and Yorke (1609), STC: 1134:12; “Great and vaine desseignes of Caesar Borgis”, marginal note in Innocent Gentillet, A discourse (1602), STC: 11743.

Giacomo Affinati, The dumbe diuine speaker (1605), STC: 190.

“when time shall to it ripenesse giue”, William Barlow, The navigators supply (1597), STC: 1445.

“Who when they die, dye all” in the Elegye.


It appears twice as “brought them to see a seeled Doue” and “such a liberty as the seeled doue hath” in Philip Sidney, The Countesse of Pembroses Arcadia (1593), STC: 22540. As shown by Monsarrat, ‘A Funeral Elegy’, op. cit., p.191, John Ford has the same collocation as the Elegye “Ambition? Like a seeled Dove” in The broken heart (1633), STC: 11156.

“Whether ‘tis nobler in the minde”, William Shakespeare, ‘The Tragedie of Hamlet’, Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies (1623), STC: 22273; this also appears in the second quarto of Shakespeare’s Hamlet (1604), STC: 22276, sig. G1, so predates the Elegye.

EEBO shows no returns for ‘predestinated’ <1612, but ‘Praedestinatiio” occurs in Richard Huloet, Huloets dictionarie (1572), STC: 13941, which was compiled from Latin sources.


“this so great and strange remove” in Samuel Purchas, ‘Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the Sea-Coasts and In-land Regions of Africa’, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625), STC: 20509, p.1141. A Portuguese expedition set sail December 1540 (p.1122) and a contemporary report in Portuguese could not have been influenced by the Elegye. Purchas says that “The originall [MS] of which is reported to have beene bought by Sir Walter Raleigh, at sixtie pounds, and by him caused to be done into English from out of the Portugall.” Rayleigh was executed in October 1618. The likeliest scenario is that the author of the Elegye saw Raleigh’s translation before 1612, had an interest in this travel narrative, and likely knew Raleigh well enough to get access.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>lurking whispers (C’) &amp; lurking whisper(s) &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>taintless goodness (C”) &amp; taintless goodness(es) &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>desertfull merit (C”) &amp; desertful merit &amp; 2 (1&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Time shall to [time] (C”) &amp; time shall to &amp; 2 (3) (1&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>dye, dye all (C”) &amp; die all &amp; (1&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>wise posteritie (C”) &amp; wise posterity &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>roofe of fate (C”) &amp; roof of fate &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>bread of rest (C”) &amp; bread of rest &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>like a seeled dove (C2) &amp; seeled dove &amp; 8 (1&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>noble in the mind (C2) &amp; noble(est) in the mind &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>predestinated time (C2”) &amp; predestinated time &amp; 6 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>possibilited (C2”) &amp; possibilited &amp; 1 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>chast imbracements (C3) &amp; chast embracement(s) &amp; 8 (3&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>strange remoue (C3) &amp; strange remove &amp; 2 (0&lt;1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Footnote precedent
Possible sources

I grade the collocations A, B, and C according to the number of records returned before 1612, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

A: Only 1 record, B: Either 2 or 3 records, or C: From 4–10 records

Since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears in two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

AA or AB : Beyond reasonable doubt
AC or BB : Balance of probability
BC or CC : Strong suspect

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1612) I give the collocation number from Table 4.3 followed by its grade.

Affinati speaker (85A), Albott Parnassus (100C), Ammianus Roman (68B), Anon. Liberalitie (18A), Anon. [n]terlude of youth (52B), Anon. newes (57C), Ariosto Orlando (54A), Bacon Certaine considerations (57C), Bale pageant (76C), Bandello Straunge (6B), Barley Celestina (36C), Barlow navigators (86A), Barret moderne warres (36C), Barrow false church (23C), Bilson Chrits sufferings (50B), Bilson effect (68B), Brooke Romeus (35B), Brunschwig apothecarye (78B), Calvin Sermons (32B)(55B), Capucin perfection (95B), Cato Preceptes (45C), Charon wisdome (50B), Church of England

---

327 “And weep vpon those cheeks, which nature fram’d / To be delightfull orbes”.
328 “her cheekes like two orbes of rubies”, Thomas Lodge, The famous, true and historicall life of Robert second Duke of Normandy (1591), STC: 16657.
329 The Elegye did not register in the EEBO search, perhaps because of the apostrophe.
330 Robert Dallington, The view of Fraunce (1604), STC: 6202.
331 Pedro de la Sierra, The second part of the Myrror of knighthood (1583), STC: 18866; R.W., The tragedie of Tancred and Gismund (1591), STC: 25764; Thomas Storer, The life and death of Thomas Wolsey (1599), STC: 23294; Robert Albott, Englands Parnassus (1600), STC: 378; William Blunten, The faithful lovers of the West (1600), Wing: F274; Ovid, Ouid’s elegies (1603), STC: 18931; Nicolas de Montreux, Honours academie (1610), STC: 18053. Appears in John Ford, ’Tis pitty shee’s a whore (1633), STC: 11165.
Probable sources

My first observation is that it is beyond reasonable doubt that ‘W.S.’ read Sidney’s Arcadia and Montaigne’s Essays, and on the balance of probability, he also inspected Calvin’s Sermons. Strong suspects for sources are Ovid’s Elegies, Henry Smith’s Satans compassing the earth, and Shakespeare’s Richard II. The H. R. texts are both printed by Thomas Creede, though it is unclear whether or not they are the same author. The first text, Haigh for Devonshire (50B) exhibits a knowledge of the region where John Ford came from, and the ‘Epistle Dedicatorie’ is signed ‘H. Robarts’, however, without further supporting evidence this text remains as only a source suspect. Two works by William Fulke appear, Samuel Daniel is strongly suggested, and three other Shakespeare plays besides Richard II are represented.
Summary of evidence

The number of correspondences for Ford and Shakespeare far outweigh any other candidate and are represented in Table 4.4, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii).

The number of searchable works (Wks) in the EEBO database for each author is shown at the head of each column while the collocation number (CN) from Table 4.3 is given in the first column.

Table 4.4 Rare collocation matches from A Funerall Elegye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Shakespeare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40&lt;sup&gt;332&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>○○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>○●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>○○○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>332</sup> This consists of the 36 First Folio plays, the Sonnets, Venus and Adonis, Lucrece, and the Pericles quarto
Conclusions

Since all Shakespeare correspondences precede the *Elegye* then the most that can be claimed is that the author of the *Elegye* borrowed from the Shakespeare work. Almost all Ford’s matches follow the *Elegye*, which seems to suggest his use of it as a source. However, the single case No. 48 that precedes it is very strong, this being his use of the entire string “And set thee as a President to Men”. Although I would demand at least two matches preceding the *Elegye* to argue for borrowing by the target from Ford, I conclude that the strength of No. 48 together with Ford’s 20 matches, is mutual borrowing evidence that Ford is a contributor. The likelihood that a contributor to a poem is a sole contributor is far greater than for a play so I would even go so far as to claim that Ford originated the *Elegye*. I can only conclude that Shakespeare was a source for it and that Ford must have consulted this work, almost certainly *Richard II*. It seems to me that the reason it sourced the Shakespeare canon so frequently and was published under the name ‘W. S.’ was that Ford was trying to pass it off as a Shakespeare work.

The *Elyge* also serves as a test of the principle that no matter how many works an author has in the EEBO database, if this author has no common thought with the target then few records will be returned. Francis Bacon has 27 works in the EEBO database and John Ford has 9, yet Ford registers 16 rare collocation matches with the *Elyge* while Bacon has only 1 (No. 57). It might be argued that this deficiency is to be expected when comparing a prose writer like Bacon against a work of poetry, and that this is not a reliable exclusion test for the RCP method, but an inspection of the footnotes to Table 4.3 shows that prose writers produce the majority of returns. This suggests that despite Bacon’s substantial representation in the EEBO database, a significant concordance between his canon and a randomly chosen target is not to be expected.

---

333 A further match from a Latin translation into English (No. 18) is inadmissible.
Chapter 5

The 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels

5.1 Preliminary

Chapters 2 and 3 have already dealt in detail with precedent at the Inns of Court in relation to performers, text translations, and political agenda. Apart from Lincoln’s Inn in the period 1564–80, the players who typically enacted Inns of Court plays prior to 1594 were Inn members, and the type of drama that Inn members wrote for their Christmas revels were adapted translations into English from Roman, Greek, and Italian works, often charged with political statement on the succession question.

The 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels are now examined, for which a detailed contemporary account has been left to us in the *Gesta Grayorum*, a 68-page pamphlet which William Canning published in 1688. These revels are of special interest to Shakespeare studies because after 9pm on Innocents Day, 28 December 1594 “a Comedy of Errors (like to Plautus his Menechmus) was played by the Players,” its first known performance.

In §5.3, Rare Collocation Profiling (RCP) is applied to the *Gesta Grayorum*. This allows an analysis of the view that Francis Bacon both compiled the pamphlet and composed speeches for the revels. Vickers has noted that “The ideas contained in these speeches have many parallels with Bacon’s writings on civic and political philosophy.” It is shown that the second Counsellor’s speech, in particular, has ideas that Bacon developed later in *New Atlantis*. James Spedding, the nineteenth century editor of Bacon’s *Works*, thought that Bacon at least contributed to the writing of the *Gesta Grayorum*, which is essentially an account of the dramatic proceedings at the 1594–5 revels: “Bacon’s name does not appear upon the face of the narrative; and as his connexion with it, though sufficiently obvious,  

---

334 *GES*, Wing: C444. There is a *Gesta Grayorum Part II*, which is not a commentary on the 1594–5 revels, but was printed from a MS in the Harleian Collection, see John Nicols, *The Progresses and Public processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols, Vol. 3 (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1823), pp.320–348. It refers to “The Right High and Mighty Henry the Second” who also appears as “Henry the second Prince of Graya, and Purpoole, &c.,” being the penultimate entry in “A Catalogue and true note” of subscribers to John Minsheu’s “etymologicall dictionarie of XI languages” from 1617.

335 *GES*, p.22.

has never so far as I know been pointed out or suspected.”

The new RCP method brings significant new evidence to bear on this issue.

In §5.4, an enquiry is presented into the records of payments to players, both for the Inns of Court and for the Treasurer of the [royal] Chamber, to add weight to the argument that it was not Shakespeare’s Lord Chamberlain’s Men that played *The Comedy of Errors* at the 1594–5 revels but players from the Inns of Court. Also, the play’s echoes of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians with its succession theme of alienation, and its reliance on translations from two Roman comedies, mark it out as a play that was at least revised specifically for an Inns of Court revels.

Finally, in §5.5, Francis Bacon’s interest in dramatic productions is explored.

### 5.2 The revels schedule

On 12 December 1594, Henry Helmes was elected as Prince of Purpoole, the Lord of Misrule, to govern his mock state until Shrovetide, three days before the start of Lent on 6 February. To assist in government, he had his own Privy Council, Officers of State, Gentlemen-Pensioners, and a Guard and Captain for the defence of the realm. Over sixty members of Gray’s Inn took part, some being assigned more than one role. For example, Forrest was both one of the ‘Gentlemen for Entertainment’ as well as the ‘Chief Ranger and Master of the Game’, while Damporte doubled as ‘Lord Chief Baron of the Common Pleas’, and ‘Lord Warden of the four Ports’.

On 14 December 1594, an invitation was delivered to the Inner Temple to send an “ambassador” to share in the revelry to which they responded on 18 December with “we yield with all Good Will”. The revels began on 20 December, ran until 5 January, were suspended until 1 February while the Prince pretended to visit Russia, and were suspended again until Shrovetide when Henry Helmes took a masque to Whitehall. The whole cost of the event, which was “rather to be performed by witty Inventions, than chargeable Expences,” was met by the gentlemen of Gray’s Inn together with donations from well-wishers. For example, Lord Burleigh was generous enough to contribute ten pounds and a

---

338 The view that the play was fashioned for the Inns of Court was expounded as early as 1923: “*The Comedy of Errors*, just rewritten by Shakespeare for a great Christmas celebration to be held by the members of Gray’s Inn”, in Joseph Quincy Adams, *A Life of William Shakespeare* (The Riverside Press, 1923), p.209. It also has more recent supporters, albeit with an unsubstantiated implication of an external company: “The *Comedy of Errors* was acted at, and possibly commissioned for, Gray’s Inn in 1594” in Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford University Press, 2001), p.123.
339 *GES*, pp.6–8.
“Purse of fine rich Needlework”. 340

The order of events was as follows:

20th December Prince crowned, Prince’s Champion issues challenge, dancing of measures341

28th The Comedy of Errors with invited nobles342

29th Court hearing for the Sorceror343

3rd January Device demonstrating Amity of Graius and Templarius with invited nobles, twenty-four Knights of the Helmet created, speeches of six Privy Counsellors, dancing344

4th Prince’s process with Inner Temple members to Lord Mayor’s house345

6th masque and dancing with invited nobles, letter from Russian Ambassador, reading of letters of Intelligence346

10th reading of letter from Bridewell harbour347

11th Prince ‘departs’ for Russia348

28th Prince’s ‘return’ from Russia announced349

1st February Prince returns on Thames, letter read out from his ship, dancing350

2nd Masque of Proteus, cancelled Grand Night, and scaffolding removed351

5.3 Application of the RCP method to Gesta Grayorum

There is evidence that whoever wrote the Gesta Grayorum actually took part in the proceedings and was a member of Gray’s Inn. There are two occasions when the author slips out of his objective mask and uses “we”.

Upon the 1st of February, the Prince and his Train were met at Black-wall; from whence they came upon the River of Thames, in a very gallant Shew. Being come so near his own Country, he left his Navy of Ships, as not fit for so short a Cut, and the matter not being very great or dangerous, and he and his Retinue took to them fifteen

340 Ibid., p.2.
341 Ibid., p.9.
342 Ibid., p.20.
343 Ibid., p.22.
344 Ibid., p.25.
345 Ibid., p.42.
346 Ibid., p.43.
347 Ibid., p.49.
348 Ibid., p.53.
349 Ibid., p.53.
350 Ibid., p.54.
351 Ibid., pp.53, 57.
Barges, bravely furnished with Standards, Pendants, Flags and Streamers: There was also in every Barge, Musick and Trumpets; and in some, Ordnance and Shot. Being thus gallantly appointed, we came on our Way by the Stairs at Greenwich\textsuperscript{352}

There letters were dispatched to Sir Thomas Heneage excusing the Prince of Purpoole from attending Queen Elizabeth. The Prince and his Company passed the Tower of London, which was followed by a visit to St. Paul’s School where a Latin oration was read out. The \textit{Gesta} continues “Then we marched on our Way, as before, by Ludgate, and through Fleet-street.”\textsuperscript{353}

On 28 December \textit{The Comedy of Errors} was performed. Fletcher claims that the author of the \textit{Gesta Grayorum} demonstrates “the naïve expression of a low esteem for the ‘Comedy of Errors’ and its author.”\textsuperscript{354} The relevant passage runs as follows:

\begin{quote}
In regard whereof [the disorder in the crowd], as also for that the Sports intended were especially for the gracing of the Templarians, it was thought good not to offer any thing of Account, saving Dancing and reveling with Gentlewomen; after such Sports, a Comedy of Errors (like to Plautus his Menechmus) was played by the Players.\textsuperscript{355}
\end{quote}

Fletcher can be forgiven for interpreting the “not to offer any thing of account” as referring not only to the “Dancing and reveling with Gentlewomen” but also to the “Comedy of Errors”. The compiler of the \textit{Gesta Grayorum} has taken no care to eliminate this reading.

The ambassador of the Inner Temple had been ‘insulted’ by the Night of Errors on 28 December when he was unable to see any part of the show due to the overflow of people onto the stage. However, on the night of 3 January, “there was a most honourable Presence of Great and Noble Personages”, including Lord Burleigh and the Lord Keeper, where a masque of amity was presented to show affection to the ambassador of the Inner Temple. Following the masque, the Ambassador and twenty-four of his retinue were awarded the honour of the Order of the Knighthood of the Helmet. James Spedding, the Victorian editor of Francis Bacon’s \textit{Works}\textsuperscript{356} awards Bacon a hand in the composition of the script for the Articles of the Order: \textsuperscript{357} “These articles present in a strain of playful satire so elegant an

\begin{footnotes}
\item[352] Ibid., p.54.
\item[353] Ibid., p.57.
\item[354] \textit{GRA}, p.108n.
\item[355] \textit{GES}, p.22.
\item[356] See \textit{SEH}, \textit{PHI}, and \textit{LL}.
\item[357] \textit{GES} 27–31.
\end{footnotes}
illustration of the fashions and humours of those days, that I shall transcribe them at length; the rather as [sic] forming part of an entertainment in the preparation of which Bacon certainly had a hand, though not, I think, in the execution of this part of it.”

Following the Articles of the Order on 3 January, the speeches of the six Privy Councillors and the Prince’s response were given which Spedding also attributes to Bacon. The six Privy Councillors advise the Prince of Purpoole on the following:

1. The Exercise of War
2. The Study of Philosophy
3. Eternization and Fame by Buildings and Foundations
4. Absoluteness of State and Treasure
5. Virtue and a Gracious Government
6. Pastimes and Sports

Spedding judges that “All of these councillors speak with Bacon’s tongue and out of Bacon’s brain; but the second and fifth speak out of his heart and judgment also. The propositions of the latter contain an enumeration of those very reforms in state and government which throughout his life he was mostly anxious to see realized. In those of the former may be traced, faintly but unmistakably, a first hint of his great project for the restoration of the dominion of knowledge, – a first draft of ‘Solomon’s House,’ – a rudiment of that history of universal nature, which was to have formed the third part of the ‘Instauratio’.,” He further notes that the Northumberland Manuscripts (c.1597) collection has “Orations at Graie’s Inne revels” listed on the front sheet, although they are not contained in the volume, and remarks that it would be “a correct description” of the speeches of the six councillors.

In order to bring evidence to bear on Spedding’s claims about Bacon’s contribution to the revels entertainments and his role as compiler of the Gesta Grayorum, all three stages of RCP are now applied to locate the pamphlet’s probable sources as well as possible borrowings from it. The first task is to identify which collocations were rare at the date of the target (c.1595). However, due to the relative short length of the text, I do not use the

359 GES, p.32–42.
362 Three of the Counsellors’ speeches and one by the Prince occur elsewhere: Inner Temple Petyt MS. 583, 43, f.294; cited in Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, op. cit., Vol. 4, p.56.
limit < 6 (see Table 4.1) for rarity but instead employ < 11 to encourage a larger number of returns. From the possible sources returned before the target date for rare collocations, a conclusion is reached about probable sources. Stage 3 assesses the possible borrowings from the target (Tables 5.3 and 5.4). Here, only those later authors of any given rare collocation are recorded who were at least 18 years of age and alive at the target date, in other words, they were available to contribute to the target. For frequent possible borrowers (at least 3 collocations) the rarity of the given collocation at the time of its later use is assessed. This allows a judgment on whether or not the collocation was rare at this date.

Application data

Date test completed: 29 November 2012

Search period: 1473–1670

No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period: 24,589

Presumed date of test document: 1595

No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date: 3,521

Definition of ‘rare’: <11 returns before date of test document

Grading system for a possible source: This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–3 returns; grade C for 4–10 returns.

Probability estimates for possible sources: If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; AC or BB – ‘on the balance of probability’; BC or CC – ‘strong suspect’.

I have selected the search period 1473–1670 to allow the inclusion of many of Francis Bacon’s works which were published for the first time after his death, most notably by his chaplain Dr William Rawley.

The footnotes register all references before 1595 if there are less than 11 returns, all significant returns after 1595 (Shakespeare, Bacon, working dramatists, recurring authors), comments on whether or not the return is too late for its author to be a candidate for writing part of the Gesta Grayorum, and they also give a report on additional spelling variations that I have manually added to a search.
One work in Latin that was translated into English during Bacon’s lifetime is admitted, *De Sapientia Veterum* or “The Wisdom of the Ancients”.\(^{363}\) It was rendered into English by Sir Arthur Gorges with whom Bacon was acquainted the year before its publication, and so I think there is justification in presuming that Bacon supervised the translation.\(^{364}\)

---

**Table 5.1 Searchable texts by Francis Bacon in EEBO database**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td><em>Essayes Religious meditations</em></td>
<td>STC: 1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td><em>A letter written out of England to an English gentleman remaining at Padua</em></td>
<td>STC: 10017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td><em>A declaration of the practises &amp; treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex</em></td>
<td>STC: 1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td><em>A briefe discourse, touching the happie vnion of the kingdomes of England, and Scotland</em></td>
<td>STC: 1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td><em>Certaine considerations touching the better pacification, and edification of the Church of England</em></td>
<td>STC: 1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td><em>Sir Francis Bacon his apologie, in certaine imputations concerning the late Earle of Essex</em></td>
<td>STC: 1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td><em>The two booke of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of learning, divinie and humane To the King</em></td>
<td>STC: 1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td><em>A declaration of the demeanor and cariage of Sir Walter Raleigh</em></td>
<td>STC: 20652.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td><em>The wisedome of the ancients, written in Latine by the Right Honourable Sir Francis Bacon Knight, Baron of Verulam, and Lord Chancelor of England. Done into English by Sir Arthur Gorges Knight</em></td>
<td>STC: 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td><em>Apophtheegmes new and old</em></td>
<td>STC: 1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td><em>The translation of certaine psalms into English verse</em></td>
<td>STC: 1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td><em>Sylva sylvarum: or A naturall historie In ten centuries.</em></td>
<td>STC: 1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td><em>The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth</em></td>
<td>STC: 1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td><em>Cases of treason</em></td>
<td>Wing: B274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td><em>The confession of faith</em></td>
<td>Wing: B280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td><em>Three speeches of the Right Honorable, Sir Francis Bacon Knight [...] Concerning the postnati naturalization of the Scotch in England union</em></td>
<td>Wing: B337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{364}\) In the account of Bacon’s ‘gifts and rewards’ dated July 1618, Item 27 reads “To Sir Arthur Gorge’s man that brought your Lp. [Lordship] a book ….. £0 10s 0d”, in *LL*, Vol. 6, p.328.
of the lawes of the kingdomes of England and Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>EEBO</th>
<th>Wing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>An essay of a king</td>
<td></td>
<td>B282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>The learned reading of Sir Francis Bacon [...] upon the statute of uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>B301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Ordinances ... for the better and more regular administration of justice in the Chancery</td>
<td></td>
<td>B316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>The remaines</td>
<td></td>
<td>B318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>A true and historical relation of the poysoning of Sir Thomas Overbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>T2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Resuscitatio, or, Bringing into publick light several pieces of the works, civil, historical, philosophical, &amp; theological</td>
<td></td>
<td>B319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>New Atlantis a work unfinished</td>
<td></td>
<td>B307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>A letter of advice written by Sr. Francis Bacon to the Duke of Buckingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>B302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>A charge given ... at a sessions holden for the verge ... declaring the latitude of the jurisdiction thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td>B276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>True peace</td>
<td></td>
<td>B339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Baconiana, or, Certain genuine remains</td>
<td></td>
<td>B269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Collocation searches in Gesta Grayorum (c.1595) using EEBO from 1473–1670.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (page No.)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns ≤1670</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 And there took his place in his Throne, under a rich cloth of state (9)</td>
<td>{a rich cloth}</td>
<td>5(24) (1(5)&lt;1595)(^{365}) [{} of (e)state] 6(24) (0(5)&lt;1595)(^{366}) [under {} of state]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 proclaimed his style (9)</td>
<td>{proclaim(ed)(s)(eth) (ing) his style}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1595)(^{367})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 was resembled to (10)</td>
<td>{was resembled to}</td>
<td>14 (2&lt;1595)(^{368})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{365}\) None of these returns include ‘under’. A possible source is “ryche clothe of estate” in Geoffrey Chaucer, The workes (1542), STC: 5069. Also Tobie Matthew, Of the love (1622), STC: 17658; and Anon., A Further narrative (1658), Wing: F2560A. None of these three mentions a throne, and Matthew, a close friend of Bacon’s was admitted too late to Gray’s Inn in 1599. Bacon has “he was set upon a Low Throne richly adorned, and a rich cloth of State over his head” in Francis Bacon, ‘New Atlantis’, Sylva sylvarum (1627), STC: 1168 & New Atlantis (1658), Wing: B307.

\(^{366}\) There is “enthroned under a rich cloth of state” in L. P., Gent, The right religion (1658), Wing: P74C; also S. Carrington, The history of the life and death (1659), Wing: C643; and Arthur Wilson, The history of Great Britain (1653), Wing: W2888 which are all too late. Louis Turquet de Mayerne, The generall historie (1612), STC: 17747; Jean de Serres, A general inuentorie (1607), STC: 22244 none of which were Inns of Court members. Fernão Mendes Pinto, The voyages (1653), Wing: M1705 has “on his Throne under” but is a translation from 16\(^{th}\) century Portuguese.

\(^{367}\) “proclaimeth his style” in Arthur Lake, Sermons (1629), STC: 15134.

\(^{368}\) John Foxe, Actes and monuments (1583), STC: 11225; and Lodowick Lloyd, The first part of the diall of daies (1590), STC: 16621. John Godbold, Reports of cases (1652), Wing: G911, was
to be deeply bound to their Merits (11) {deeply bound to} 22 (6<1595) 269

concumbent (16) {concumbent} 0 (0<1595)

occasion of presumption (19) {occasion of presumption} 6 (1<1595) 270

---

Articles Knights of Order

conference and experience (29) {conference fby.2 experience} 3 (1<1595) 271

govern a table (30) {govern a table} 0 (0<1595)
narrow observation 372 (30) {narrow observation(s)} 4 (0<1595) 273

selling of Smoak (30) {sell(ing) smoke} 11(19) (3(4)<1595) 375

inward privately (30) {inward privately} 0 (0<1595)
lend his countenance (30) {lend his countenance} 0 (0<1595)

holden for a certaine rule (31) {holden fby.4 rule} 10(12) (6<1595) 377

admitted to Gray’s Inn in November 1605 which is too late. The reports of that reverend and learned judge Sir Richard Hutton, Knight (1656), Wing: H3843, Hutton was admitted to Gray’s Inn 1580 (see NE, p.1013). The reports of that late reverend and learned judge, Thomas Owen, Esquire (1656), Wing: O832.

“moste deeply bound to her maiestie” Thomas Norton, To the Queenes Maiesties (1569), STC: 18680 (Norton died in 1584) and Anthony Munday, The first book (1590), STC: 541 (not an Inns of Court member). Note “so deeply bound to her Majestie” in Francis Bacon, A declaration (1601), STC: 1133. The only other Inns of Court member is Walter Raleigh, The history (1617), STC:20638 (entered the Middle Temple 1575).

Saint Benedict, Here begynneth the rule (1517), STC: 1859.

“by reading, conference and experience” Thomas Digges, A breife and true report (1590), STC: 7284. Also William Burton, Ten sermons (1602), STC: 4178.5; and T. G., The rich cabinet (1616), STC: 11522. I have found no record of Burton as an Inns of Court man.

“The earliest use after the Gesta is “as men of narrowe obseruation may concyue them” in Francis Bacon, The two booke (1605), STC: 1164, sig. Ff2. Also Richard Rogers, A commentary (1615), STC: 21204; Richard Whitlock, Zootomia (1654), Wing: W2030; and John Goodwin, Prelatique preachers (1663), Wing: G1192. Neither Whitlock or Goodwin were born early enough to attend the 1594–5 revels.

The Item relates to the Prince of Purpoole and seems to be a reference to the case of Alexander Severus who discovered that his secretary was using his position to promise poor men that he would prosecute their suites, receiving their gifts for no intended return. Severus tied his secretary to a post and choked him with smoke declaring that “they which sell smoke should so perish with smoke”, cited in Pierre de La Primaudaye, The French academie (1586), STC: 15233, p.411. Matthieu Coignet, Politique discourses (1586), STC: 5486, does not refer to Court. Pierre de La Primuadaye, The French academie (1586), STC: 15233 relates the story of Alexander Severus (see previous note). The other two possible sources both repeat La Primuadaye’s story about Alexander Severus, namely Robert Greene, farewell to folly (1591), STC: 12241; and Barnabe Rich, The adventuurses of Brusanus (1592), STC: 20977. Later, William Lambarde, The courts of justice (1642), Wing: L86, entered Lincoln’s Inn (1556). In Francis Bacon’s private wastebook Promus (1592–4), he has the Latin Fumos vendere [To sell smoke], British Library, Harley 7017, f.85, cited in Mrs Henry Pott, ed., The Promus of Formularies and Elegencies (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1883), p.116. It originates from the Adages of Erasmus.

“as if he were inward privately with his honour”.

Earliest is Andrew Chertsey, Here foloweth (1502), STC: 5198. Noteworthy are “generall rule” both for Plutarch, The lives (1579), STC: 20066; and Jean Calvin, A harmonie (1584), STC: 2962.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>fortunate island (31)</td>
<td>{fortunate island}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (2&lt;1595)⁷⁷⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince’s opening speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>bent and directed (32)</td>
<td>{bent fb.2 directed}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (5&lt;1595)⁷⁷⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>conclude of their ends (32)</td>
<td>{conclude fb.3 ends}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0(3) (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>took Counsel only of the means (32)</td>
<td>(1) {counsel only of the means}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1&lt;1595)⁸⁰⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>set them the right way to the wrong place (32)</td>
<td>{right way to the}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0(90) (0(30)&lt;1595)⁸¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[{} wrong place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>chance or humour (32)</td>
<td>{chance fb.2 humour}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3(6) (0(1)&lt;1595)⁸³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>liberty and warrant (32)</td>
<td>{liberty fb.2 warrant}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(7) (0&lt;1595)⁸⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[and]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First counsellor’s speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>floating city (32)</td>
<td>{floating city}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1595)⁸⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>unrevocable [Confederation] (33)</td>
<td>{unrevocable}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1595)⁸⁶⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>languish and vanish (33)</td>
<td>{languish fb.2 vanish}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6(7) (4(5)&lt;1595)⁸⁷⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁸¹ “thereby set themselves in the right way to the wrong place” Francis Bacon, ‘Valerius Terminus, or Of the Interpretation of Nature’ (1603), in *PHI*, Vol. III, p.232; British Library, Harley MS 6462. This is not in the EEBO database and is the only other example known to me.

⁸² “leave as little to chance or humour”.

⁸³ All 3 returns are by Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667), too late for the 1594–5 revels.

⁸⁴ Edward Brerewood, *A learned treatise* (1630), STC: 3622; and John Cotton, *Singing of Psalmes* (1650), Wing: C6457. Cotton was born in 1584 and would have been too young for the 1594–5 revels, and I have found no record for Brerewood attending any Inn.


⁸⁶ Only John Smith, *An exposition* (1632), STC: 22801, was alive in 1594–5 but I find no record that he was an Inns of Court member.

24 quench appetite (33) {quench appetite} 2 (0<1595)\textsuperscript{388} [Footnote precedent]
25 marked the Computations of Times (33) {computations of times} 10 (2<1595)\textsuperscript{389}
26 sweet respect (33) {sweet respect} 13 (0<1595)\textsuperscript{390}
27 are but shadows to (33) {are but shadows to} 10 (1<1595)\textsuperscript{391}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
28 & Combustions and Troubles (34) & {combustions fby.3 troubles} 4 (0<1595)\textsuperscript{392} \\
29 & governing faculties of men (34) & {governing faculties} 4 (1<1595)\textsuperscript{393} \\
30 & addicted to philosophy (34) & {addicted to philosophy} 7 (5<1595)\textsuperscript{394} \\
31 & knowledge, than in empire\textsuperscript{395} (34) & (1) {knowledge near.8 empire} \cap {Aristotle near.10 Alexander} \\
& & (2) {Aristotle greeting} 3 (48) (1(18)<1595)\textsuperscript{396} [mention Aristotle and Alexander]
& & 2 (2<1595)\textsuperscript{397} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{388} “But rather, they [Waters of Parnassus] quench Appetite, and Desires” letter to Earl of Essex, in Francis Bacon, \textit{Resuscitatio} (1657), Wing: B319, sig. Mmm. In a marginal note, Dr William Rawley, Bacon’s Chaplain, writes “I am enduced by the Stile, and other Characters, to own them, to be his [Bacon’s].” James Spedding dates this to the turn of 1594–5, see \textit{Ll}, Vol. 1, p.345. Also “And such Humours as are Light, and Cholericke, which quench Appetite most” in Francis Bacon, \textit{Sylva sylvarum} (1627), STC: 1168, p.117, a posthumous publication.

\textsuperscript{389} Possible sources are Pietro Martire d’Anghiers, \textit{The decades} (1555), STC: 647, & \textit{The history of trauayle} (1577), STC: 649. Richard Braithwaite, \textit{The schollers medley} (1614), STC: 3583, was born in 1588 and appears to be the same man who entered Gray’s Inn in 1609, see \textit{NE}, p.814.

\textsuperscript{390} “show me worthy of their sweet respect”, Sonnet 26, William Shakespeare, \textit{Shake-speares sonnets} (1609), STC: 22353; Richard Brathwaite, \textit{The poets willow} (1614), STC: 3578, & \textit{A strappado} (1615), STC: 3588; Thomas Middleton, \textit{Honorable entertainments} (1621), STC: 17886.

\textsuperscript{391} William Hunnis, \textit{Seuen sobes} (1583), STC: 13975.

\textsuperscript{392} All are either translations into English or the author is born too late for 1594–5.

\textsuperscript{393} Justus Lipsius, \textit{Two booke of constancie} (1595), STC: 15695. Bricke Bauderon, \textit{The expert physician} (1657), Wing: B1163, is not mentioned in \textit{NE}, pp.999–1029.

\textsuperscript{394} Horace, \textit{Horace his arte of poetri} (1567), STC: 13797; Richard Edwardes, \textit{The excellent comedie} (1571), STC: 7514; Marcus Tullius Cicero, \textit{A panoplie of epistles} (1576), STC: 11049; John Foxe, \textit{Actes and monuments} (1583), STC: 11225; and Andreas Hyperius, \textit{A speciall treatise of Gods prouidence} (1588), STC: 11760. Also Andrew Willet, \textit{Hexapla} (1633), STC: 25685; and Richard Whitlock, \textit{Zootomia} (1654), Wing: W2030.

\textsuperscript{395} “Alexander the Great wrote to Aristotle, upon publishing of the Physicks, that he esteemed more of excellent Men in Knowledge, than in Empire.”

\textsuperscript{396} “Alexander vnto Aristotle greeting. Thou hast done riglie or well, in putting forth the bookes of the Acroamaticall sciences: for wherein shal I excell any other hereafter, if the science wherein I was instructed by thee, be taught and made common to euerie one. As for my selfe, I woulde thou shouldest know, that I make more account, and had rather doe beyond all men in excellencie of learning and knowledge, then in greatness of power, or deedes of Armes” cited in Plutarch’s \textit{The lives} from Guillaume Telin, \textit{Archaioplutos} (1592), STC:23867, translated from French, p.C2. Also “in his [Alexander’s] letter to Aristotle after hee had set forth his Bookes of Nature; wherein he expostulateth with him for publishing the secrets or misteries of Philosophie. And gave him to vnderstand that himselfe esteemed it more to excell other men in learning & knowledge, than in power and Empire” in Francis Bacon, \textit{The two booke}s (1605), STC: 1164, pp.K–K2; Pierre de La Primauadaye, \textit{The French academie} (1618), STC: 15241, p.33 which was published in 1577 in French. The collocation also appears in 1586 in the earliest version of \textit{The French academie}, STC: 15233, p.80, which EEBO did not return.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the shuffle of things</th>
<th>{shuffle of things}</th>
<th>1 (1&lt;1595)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>two Lakes adjoining, the one of fresh water, and the other of salt (35)</td>
<td>{lakes near.10 fresh} checked against {lakes near.10 salt}</td>
<td>7(64) (1(12)&lt;1595) [must mention salt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>by reason that you shall have discovered their natural causes, your self shall be left the only Miracle and Wonder of the World. (35)</td>
<td>{wonder of the world}</td>
<td>(2(44)&lt;1595) [applied to a person for deciphering Nature] (6(56)&lt;1598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Counsellor’s speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>certain and granted (35)</td>
<td>{certain fby.2 granted}</td>
<td>11(64) (3(11)&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Calamities and Distresses (35)</td>
<td>{calamities fby.2 distresses}</td>
<td>18(26) (2&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ridiculous frustrations (35)</td>
<td>{ridiculous fby.2}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

397 “Alexander to Aristotle greeting. Thou hast not done well to put forth the Acroamatical sciences. For wherein shal we excell other, if those things which thou hast secretly taught vs, be made common to all? I do thee to understand, that I had rather excell others in excellency of knowledge, then in greatness of power.” in Plutarch, *The lives* (1579), STC: 20066, p.725; Guillaume Telin, *Archaioplutos* (1592), STC: 23867, is the other. This and the previous note gives four different returns before 1594, given that *The French academie* appeared prior to that date.


399 “salte and fresh lakes” Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, *The decades* (1555), STC: 647; “[the Mexicans] for sea fish, there were pooles of salt-water, and for river fish, lakes of fresh-water” José de Acosta, *The natural and morall historie of the East and West Indies* (1604), STC: 94; “Lakes, both salt and fresh” Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimage* (1613), STC: 20505; “[in Peru] for sea fish he [Motezuma] he had pooles of salt water, and for the others little lakes of fresh waters” Pierre d’Avity, *The estates* (1615), STC: 988; “We haue great Lakes, both Salt and Fresh;” from ‘New Atlantis’ in Francis Bacon, *Sylua syluarum* (1627), STC: 1168, p.33 & *New Atlantis* (1658), Wing: B307; “[Cuba has] Lakes salt, and fresh” Samuel Clarke, *A geographicall description* (1657), Wing: C4516; “two Lakes, one fresh, the other salt” Denis Petau, *The history of the world* (1659), Wing: P1677B.

400 The queen is “wonder of the world” for her governance in John Lyly, *Pappe with an hatchet* (1589), STC: 17463; George Peele, *A farewell* (1589), STC: 19537; and Leonard Wright, *The hunting of Antichrist* (1589), STC: 26031, but this does not fit the context. Respecting Solomon “Hee sawe more, he did know more, and could tell more then all they. He was in deede the wonder of the world” George Gifford, *Eight sermons* (1589), STC: 11853, p.30. “Salomon, the myrrour of wisedome, the wonder of the world” Henry Smith, *A preparatiue to mariage* (1591), STC: 22685, p.50, & *The sermons* (1593), STC: 22719. Henry Smith died in 1591. “Nauar shall be the wonder of the world” from *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in William Shakespeare, *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies* (1623), STC: 22273.

401 Investigated up to and before 1598. The extra three from 1594–7 are Nicholas Breton, *The wil of wit* (1597), STC: 3705; “Salamon, who was for wisedome, the wonder of the world” Bunny Francis, *A survey of the Popes supremacie* (1595), STC: 4101; and Richard Johnson, *The most famous history* (1596), STC: 14677. A Richard Johnson entered Gray’s Inn in 1618, NE, p.1014.


38 Conceipts and Curiosities (36) {conceipts fby.2 curiosities} frustrations 0 (0<1595)
39 your Coin be stamped with your own Image (36) {be stamped with} 3(0<1595) [‘coin’ and ‘own image’]
40 appetite of fame (36) {be stamped with} 0 (0<1595)
41 [Augustus Caesar] I found the City of Brick, but I leave it of Marble (36) {city of brick} 0(3) (0<1595) [left it marble] [footnote precedent]
42 Constantine the Great was wont to call with Envy the Emperor Trajan, Wallflower, because his Name was upon so many Buildings (36) (1) {wallflower} 1(4) (0<1595) [relating to Trajan] 4(31) (0<1595) [mention of wallflower]

Fourth Counsellor’s speech
43 with an humor of Innovation and Alteration (37) {humour of innovation} 6 (0<1595) 408
44 losers bargain (38) {loser(s)’(s) bargain} 0 (0<1595)

404 “no gol nor siluer be stamped with his Image” Samuel Garey, Great Britans (1618), STC: 11597; “Coines to be stamped with his image” Herodian, Herodian of Alexandria his Historie (1635), STC: 13223; “Coyns of Gold to be stamped with his own Image” Francis Bacon, Resuscitatio (1657), Wing: B319, this was the charge against William Talbot in 1614. Only Bacon has ‘own’ image like the Gesta.
405 “Augustus in turning Rome from a City of brick to a City of marble” Thomas Reeve, God’s plea for Nineveh (1657), Wing: R690, Reeve was born in 1594. However, Bacon is almost identical to the Gesta with “as Augustus said, that he had received the city of brick, and lefte it marble” in ‘Mr Bacon’s discourse in the Praise of his Sovereign’, in LL, Vol. 1, p.131 (British Library, Harley MS 6797, art.5), a piece that Spedding dates to 1592, see LL, Vol. 1, p.119. Bacon’s example like the Gesta’s quotes Augustus.
406 “[Constantine] finding the name of Trajan to be written upon the walls of many of the Palaces, he called him a Wallflower” Marcus Junianus Justinus, The history of Iustine (1654), Wing: J1271.
407 We have “to the memory of Traian, that the great Constantine, succeeding in the Empire about two hundred years after, was wont to call him Herbam parietarium, Pellitory of the wall” George Hakewill, King Dauids vow (1621), STC: 12616, sig. V3; “Constantine the Great did nick-name Traian, Herbam Parietarium, a Wall-flower, because his name was engrauen on euery wall” John Williams, Great Britains Salomon (1625), STC: 25723, p.61. The only other returns that satisfy the condition are John Rogers, Ohel or Beth-shemesh (1653), Wing: R1813, who was born in 1627; and Peter Heylyn, France painted (1656), Wing: H1710 who was born in 1600. The two EEBO searches failed to pick up an entry by Bacon because ‘wallflower’ is separated into two words ‘wall flower’, and the ‘e’ at the end of ‘traiane’ has been incorrectly keyed in as a ‘e’ to make ‘traianc’. So there is also “For Traiane erected many famous monuments and buildings, insomuch as Constantine the Great, in emulation was wont to call him Herbam parietarium, Pallitory of the wall” George Hakewill, King Dauids vow (1621), STC: 12616, sig. V3; “Constantine the Great did nick-name Traian, Herbam Parietarium, a Wall-flower, because his name was engrauen on euery wall” John Williams, Great Britains Salomon (1625), STC: 25723, p.61. The only other returns that satisfy the condition are John Rogers, Ohel or Beth-shemesh (1653), Wing: R1813, who was born in 1627; and Peter Heylyn, France painted (1656), Wing: H1710 who was born in 1600. The two EEBO searches failed to pick up an entry by Bacon because ‘wallflower’ is separated into two words ‘wall flower’, and the ‘e’ at the end of ‘traiane’ has been incorrectly keyed in as a ‘e’ to make ‘traianc’. So there is also “For Traiane erected many famous monuments and buildings, insomuch as Constantine the Great, in emulation was wont to call him Herbam parietarium, Wall flower, because his name was vppon so many walles:” Francis Bacon, The two bookes (1605), STC: 1164, sig. I3. 408 Joseph Hall, An holy panegyrick (1613), STC: 12673; Peter Heylyn, Antidotum (1637), STC: 13267; John Pocklington, Altare Christianum (1637), STC: 20075; John Williams, The holy table (1637), STC: 25725.2; John Saltmarsh, The practice of policie (1639), STC: 21639; George Lawson, An examination (1657), Wing: L706. Not in EEBO, in a speech touching purveyors Bacon has “so far are we from any humour of innovation of encroachment” LL, Vol. 3, p.183, Spedding dates this to 1604, the earliest use after the Gesta, and reports taking it from a manuscript copy which has corrections in Bacon’s hand, British Library, Harley MS 6769, f.170.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>how to strain up your Sovereignty (38)</th>
<th>{to strain up}</th>
<th>7 (0&lt;1595)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Counsellor’s speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>motion and choice (39)</td>
<td>{motion “and” choice}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fame is too light (39)</td>
<td>{fame fby.4 light}</td>
<td>16 (0(1)&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>all suits and vexations, all causeless delays (40)</td>
<td>{vexation(s) near.10 delay(s)}</td>
<td>15(18) (1(2)&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>bridle and spur (40)</td>
<td>{bridele “and” spur}</td>
<td>6 (1&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>remove all stops in traffic (40)</td>
<td>{stops in traffic}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Counsellor’s speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>as of a Prince past (41)</td>
<td>{Prince past}</td>
<td>2(5) (2&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nothing but Tasks, nothing but Working-days? No Feasting, no Musick, no Dancing, no Triumphs, no Comedies, no Love, no Ladies?</td>
<td>(1) {tasks near.20 feast(s)(ing)}</td>
<td>0(2) (0(1)&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {tasks near.20 love}</td>
<td>0(15) (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) {tasks near.20 ladies}</td>
<td>2(3) (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

409 Two are by John Ley, *The newe quere* (1645), Wing: L1885, & *Light for smoke* (1646), Wing: L1883, who being born in 1583 was too young; four are by John Trapp who was born in 1601, and one by Tobie Matthew, *A missive* (1647), Wing: M1322, a regular correspondent of Bacon’s, who was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1599.

410 Henry Vane, *The retired mans meditation* (1655), Wing: V75A, Vane (b.1612) is too late.


413 Thomas More, *A brief fourme* (1576), STC: 11181 is the only possible source EEBO returns. However, there was Pierre de La Primaudaye *Troisiesme Tome de L’Academie Francoise* (1588), and it contains in French “to obey the bridle and spurre”, see Pierre de La Primaudaye, *The third volume* (1601), STC: 15240.

414 Hector Boece, *Heir beginnis the hystory and croniklis of Scotland* (1540), STC: 3203; Antonio de Guevara, *A chronicle conteyning the lives of tenne emperours of Rome* (1577), STC: 12426. “their Lessons were so cumbersome, as if they would make you a King in a Play; who when one would think he standeth in great majesty and Felicity, he is troubled to say his part. What! Nothing but Tasks, nothing but Working-days? No Feasting, no Musick, no Dancing, no Triumphs, no Comedies, no Love, no Ladies?”

415 “O these barraine raskes, too hard to keepe / Not to see Ladyes, study, fast, not sleepe” William Shakespeare, *A pleasant concealed comedie called, Loues labors lost* (1598), STC: 22294 & *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, and tragedies* (1623), STC: 22273.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>the distinction of your honours (41)</td>
<td>{the distinction of your}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>every one of them placed conveniently (43)</td>
<td>{placed conveniently}</td>
<td>22 (2&lt;1595)(^{417})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>effectual regard (45)</td>
<td>{effectual regard}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1595)(^{418})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>to add Beams of honour (45)</td>
<td>{beam(s) of honour}</td>
<td>19 (1&lt;1595)(^{419})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>vagabond in-roads (46)</td>
<td>{vagabond inroads}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>wretched devices (46)</td>
<td>{wretched devices}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Confusion and Combustion (46)</td>
<td>{confusion “and” combustion}</td>
<td>11 (0&lt;1595)(^{420})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>memorable Slaughter (46)</td>
<td>{memorable slaughter}</td>
<td>5 (0&lt;1595)(^{421})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>battable Grounds (46)</td>
<td>{battable ground(s)}</td>
<td>4 (1&lt;1595)(^{422})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>honourable commodity (46)</td>
<td>{honourable commodity}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{418}\) John Maynard, *A memento* (1669), Wing: M1451, Maynard was born in 1600.

\(^{419}\) Stefano Guazzo, *The ciuile conversacion* (1581), STC: 12422, translated out of French by George Pettie. Later use by Robert Pricket, *Honors fame* (1604), STC: 20339; Thomas Dekker, *If it be not good* (1612), STC: 6507; Edmund Campion, *Two histories of Ireland* (1633), STC: 25067; ‘An Ode to James Earle of Desmond writ in Queene Elizabeths time’ Ben Jonson, *The workes* (1641), STC: 14754; Francis Quarles, *Emblemes* (1643), Wing: Q77 (entered Lincoln’s Inn 1610); John Donne, *Fifty sermons* (1649), Wing: D1862. Guidubaldo Bonarelli, *Filli di Sciro* (1655), Wing: B3554, was originated in Italian in 1607. Not found in EEBO, from a letter to King James which Spedding estimates at January 1621, Francis Bacon has “it was your grace to illustrate me with beams of honour” see *LL*, Vol. 7, p.168.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bulwarke of Christendom (46)</td>
<td>{bulwark of christendom}</td>
<td>34 (1&lt;1595)425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Glory of your Vertue (46)</td>
<td>{glory of your virtue}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>everlasting Flourish (46)</td>
<td>{everlasting flourish}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>magnanimous Vertue (46)</td>
<td>{magnanimous virtue}</td>
<td>4 (0&lt;1595)425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>to draw on your speedy Help (47)</td>
<td>{to draw on your}</td>
<td>2(6) (0(1)&lt;1595)426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer of the Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>We joy to hear (47)</td>
<td>{we joy to hear}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from Knights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Devinct (52)</td>
<td>{devinct}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1595)428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mushrooms, sprung up in the night (52)429</td>
<td>{mushroom(s) near.5 night}</td>
<td>33 (0(1)&lt;1595)430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

423 A possible source is Johannes Sleidanus, *A famous chronicle* (1560), STC: 19848A. Sleidanus died in 1556. Later uses are Richard Knolles, *A generall historie* (1603), STC: 15051; Thomas de Fougasses, *The generall historie* (1612), STC: 11207, translated into English by W. Shute; Pierre Matthieu, *The history* (1614), STC: 17662, translated into English by Edw. Grimeston; Paolo Sarpi, *The history* (1626), STC: 21766, translator into English unidentified; Gabriel Richardson, *Of the state* (1627), STC: 21020; George Abbot, *A briefe description* (1636), STC: 32. Bacon has “hitherto been the bulwark of Christendom against the approaches of the Turk” in ‘Draught of a Proclamation for a Parliament’, October 1620, in *LL*, Vol. 7, p.125. Far less reliable is its usage in Francis Bacon, *The felicity of Queen Elizabeth* (1651), Wing: B297, translated from Latin into English, since *The felicity* also appears in Francis Bacon, *Resuscitatio*, 1657, Wing: B319, and the editor, Bacon’s chaplain, Dr William Rawley, translates it as “Bulwark, to all Europe”. 424 Note *gloria virtutem tanquem umbra sequitur* “glory follows virtue as if it were its shadow” (Cicero), in *The Routledge Dictionary of Latin Quotations* (2005), p.36. 425 William Loe, *Come and see* (1614), STC: 16683; I. G., *A refutation* (1615), STC: 12214; James Howell, *Dendrologia* (1640), STC: 13872; and Thomas Southland, *The ungrateful favourite* (1664), Wing: U63. Thomas Southland entered Gray’s Inn in 1632 (see *NE*, p.1024). 426 Thomas Worthington, *Whyte dyed black* (1615), STC: 26001; and James Howell, *Epistolae* (1650), Wing: H3072. 427 Christopher Yelverton entered Gray’s Inn in 1552, became serjeant-at-law in 1589, and assisted with *The Misfortunes of Arthur and Jocasta*. 428 John Spelman, *The case of our affaires in law* (1643), Wing: S4935. He was born in 1594 and entered Gray’s Inn in February 1608 so it is possible that he had access to the *Gesta*. 429 “Shall ill-guided Insurrections trouble Us, that are, like Mushrooms, sprung up in a Night, and rotten before the Morning?” Note “man is a Mushrome of one night, on the morrow rotten” Jean Baptiste van Helmont, *Van Helmont’s works* (1664), Wing: H397, p.34, translated into English, but unpublished in French until 1648. 430 There are many cases of night-grown mushrooms representing transitory behaviour but not in relation to an uprising. Not found in EEBO but relating to popular unrest, Bacon has “The occasion of the distemper which now appears to be in the natives of that realm, is not as a mushroom of a night’s growth, but is rooted in their hearts for many years past” in ‘Brief Relation of the Passages in the Parliament summoned in Ireland in 1613, July 1613’, by Francis Bacon, Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1611–14, pp.392–99, accessed online at http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E600001-015/ on 7 November 2012.
> that there be such Sparks of Dissention and Mischief; but if there be, We will make haste to quench them (52)

| that there be such Sparks of Dissention and Mischief; but if there be, We will make haste to quench them (52) | (1) {sparks of dissention} | 5 (0<1595)<sup>431</sup> 5 (157) (1(30)<1595)<sup>432</sup> ['sparks of some sinister behaviour'] |

### Prince’s letter to Sir Thomas

| as a tender of the zeal (54) | {as a tender of} | 3 (0<1595) |

| [Prince’s return from Russia] I found, my Desire was greater than the Ability of my Body; which by my Journey, and my sickness at Sea, is so weakened (54–55) | (1) {seasick(e) near.80 russian} | 0 (0<1595) |
| (2) {“sea sick(e)” near.80 russian} | 0 (0<1595) |
| (3) {“sea-sick(e)” near.80 russia} | 0 (0<1595) |
| (4) {“sickness” near.80 russia} | 0 (2) (0<1595)<sup>433</sup> [specific to Russia] |
| (5) {seasick(e) near.80 muscovy} | 0 (0<1595)<sup>434</sup> |
| (6) {“sea sick(e)” near.80 muscovy} | 2 (0<1595)<sup>435</sup> |
| (7) {“sea-sick(e)” near.80 muscovy} | 2 (0<1595)<sup>436</sup> |
| (8) {“sickness(e)” near.80 muscovy} | 0(4) (0<1595)<sup>437</sup> |

**Commentary**

| gallantly Appointed (55) | {gallantly appointed} | 11 (2<1595)<sup>438</sup> |

---

431 John Speed, *The history of Great Britaine* (1611), STC: 23045 & *The theatre of the empire* (1612), STC: 23041, is not the same John Speed who entered Gray’s Inn in 1633.

432 Of those born early enough to contribute to the 1594–5 revels, we have “if the smal sparkes of strife be not quenched” John Jewel, *A replie* (1565), STC: 14606; “As might have quench’d all sparkes of former hate” Michael Drayton, *The barrons wars* (1603), STC: 7189; and “quench by degrees, the sparks of sin” John Robinson, *Oberuations* [sic] (1625), STC: 21112; none of whom are in NE. Too late but similar is “quenched, or at least for a time, repressed and smothered those sparks of our civil discord” Charles I, *Eikon basilike* (1648), Wing: E268; and “quench the sparks of our civil discord” John Milton, *Eikonoklestes* (1650), Wing: M2113. Not in EEBO but still the closest is Bacon’s “for the quenching of the sparks of troubles and discords in foreign parts” 18 October 1620, in ‘Draught of a Proclamation for a Parliament’, *LL*, Vol. 7, p.124 (this work is cited in footnote for No. 63).

433 Ibrahim, *The Great Turkes letter* (1645), Wing: 130; and England and Wales, *A collection of the statutes* (1667), Wing (CD-ROM 1996), E898. The first does not refer to Russia and the second is not about seasickness.

434 Added variation ‘muscouie’ to all ‘muscovy’ searches.

435 “why looke you pale? / Sea sicke I think comming from Muscouie” William Shakespeare, *A pleasant conceited comedie called, Loues labors lost* (1598), STC: 22294. The other is the same line and play in William Shakespeare’s First Folio, STC: 22273.

436 Same returns as previous note.

437 Robert Burton, *The anatomy of melancholy* (1621), STC: 4159, refers sickness to an excess of meat; two publications from the Royal College of Physicians from 1649, Wing: C7540 & 1653, Wing C7525, deal with a cure for the “green sicknesse”; and *A collection of statues* (1667), Wing (CD-ROM 1996): E898 is not specific to Muscovy.

Commentary

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>much beholden unto (68)</td>
<td>{much beholden unto}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Principality is determined (68)</td>
<td>{principality is determined}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible sources**

I grade the collocations A, B, and C according to the number of records returned before 1595, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

- **A**: Only 1 record,
- **B**: Either 2 or 3 records, or
- **C**: From 4–10 records

Since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears for two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

- **AA or AB**: Beyond reasonable doubt
- **AC or BB**: Balance of probability
- **BC or CC**: Strong suspect

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1595) I give the collocation number from the table followed by its grade.

William Allen *a letter* (32A), Pietro Martire d’Anghiers *The decades* (25B)(33A), Pietro Martire d’Anghiers *The history of trauayle* (25B), Saint Benedict *Here begynneth* (6A), Hector Boece *Heir beginnis* (51B), Jean Calvin *A harmonie* (13C), Geoffrey Chaucer *The workes* (1A), Andrew Chertsey *here foloweth* (13C), Marcus Tullius Cicero *A panopolie* (30C), Martin Cortes *The arte* (14B), Everard Digby *his dissuasiue* (14B), Thomas Digges *A briefe* (7A), Richard Edwardes *The excellent comedie* (30C), Thomas Elyot *Bibliotheca* (23C), Thomas Elyot *The dictionary* (23C), Thomas Fale *Horologiographia* (54B), Bunny

---


**Probable sources**

As far as sources are concerned, the results show that it is beyond reasonable doubt that the author consulted Pietro Martire d’Anghiers *The decades* (1555, STC: 647), and on the balance of probability Plutarch *The lives* (1579, STC: 20066), while John Foxe *Actes and monuments* (1583, STC: 11225) and Pierre de La Primaudaye’s *The French Academy* (1586, STC: 15233) are strong suspects. There is also the curious double appearance of certain authors, but with different works such as William Fulke, Pierre de La Primaudaye, Raphael Holinshed, and Henry Smith, which hints at their work being consulted. Of particular interest are Plutarch and Pierre de La Primaudaye because in the Articles of the Order of the Knights of the Helmet we find the following:

> Item, Every Knight of this Order shall endeavour to add Conference and Experience by Reading; and therefore shall not only read and peruse Guizo, the French Academy, Galiatto the Courtier, Plutarch, the Arcadia, and the neoterical Writers, from time to time; but also to frequent the Theatre, and such like places of Experience;\(^\text{441}\)

Since RCP identifies the *Gesta*’s relation to Plutarch’s *The lives* and Primaudaye’s *The French Academy*, and they are actually referred to during the revels, then I take this as validation for the method used.

In my chosen searches, *Love’s Labour’s Lost* has 3 rare matches with the *Gesta Grayorum* for Nos 34, 52, and 73 but the direction of influence is unclear. A search that I have not

\(^{440}\) See footnotes for No.31.

\(^{441}\) *GES*, pp.29–30.
conducted here but which I carry out for *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is ‘russia near.5 muscovy’ (No. 66, Table 6.8) which produces yet another rare connection. All four of these appear again in §6.5 when I analyse *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in Table 6.8.

**Summary of evidence**

Table 5.3 gives a summary of the data, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii).

*Table 5.3 Rare collocation matches from Gesta Grayorum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Francis Bacon</th>
<th>Richard Knolles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>● ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Richard Knolles

Apart from Francis Bacon, the only other candidate with 3 or more rare matches is Richard Knolles who does not appear in the Gray’s Inn list of admissions. Knolles’ correspondences all follow the date of the *Gesta* so the most that can be claimed is that he might have borrowed from it, notably two collocations from the Russian Ambassador’s speech (Nos 60 and 63, *GES* pp.46–7).

Francis Bacon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>4&lt;1626</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>8&lt;1601</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Knts of Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>0&lt;1605</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince’s 1st Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>0&lt;1603</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>3&lt;1605</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>7&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>3&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>5&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>6&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>2&lt;1605</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Bacon’s RCP for Gesta Grayorum

---

Table 5.4 shows collocations that were rare at the date of their use in the *Gesta Grayorum* and gives a Stage 3 assessment of the rarity of Bacon’s usage at the later date he is known to have shared it. This means that these collocations were rare, both for the person who inserted them in the *Gesta Grayorum* c.1595, and for Bacon when he later employed them.

**Articles of the Knights of the Order**

There are no matches before the *Gesta* for “narrow observation” (No.9) and only a total of 4 before 1670. Bacon has the earliest use after the *Gesta* in his *Advancement of Learning* (1605) with “as men of narrowe obseruation may concyue them”. The phrase “selling of Smoak” (No.10) originates from *The French academie* (1586), a work that is mentioned in the ‘Articles of the Knights of the Order’ (*GES*, p.29), and appears as the Latin “*Fumos vendere* [To sell smoke]” in Bacon’s private wastebook the *Promus* (c.1592) which presumably only Francis Bacon had access to.

**Privy Counsellors’ Speeches**

The Prince’s speech that precedes the six Privy Counsellors’ speeches has “set them the right way to the wrong place” (No. 18). Bacon has the only discovered match from ‘Valerius Terminus’ (1603), located through Google, which is almost identical as “thereby set themselves in the right way to the wrong place”.

---

443 Francis Bacon, *The two bookes* (1605), STC: 1164, sig. Ff2.
444 *GES* states “The French Academy” in the context of books that should be read, see p.29.
The First Counsellor’s speech has a match unique to Bacon and the *Gesta*, and likely precedes the *Gesta*. This is “quench appetite” (No. 24). In a letter to the Earl of Essex which Spedding\(^{448}\) dates to the turn of 1594–5 Bacon writes “But rather, they [Waters of Parnassus] quench Appetite, and Desires”.\(^{449}\) He uses it again in his posthumous publication *Sylua syluarum* “And such Humours as are Light, and Cholericke, which quench Appetite most.”\(^{450}\)

In the Second Counsellor’s speech we find “Alexander the Great wrote to Aristotle, upon publishing of the Physicks, that he esteemed more of excellent Men in Knowledge, than in Empire” (No. 31). In the *Advancement of Learning* (1605), Bacon writes “in his [Alexander’s] letter to Aristotle after hee had set forth his Bookes of Nature; wherein he expostulateth with him for publishing the secrets or misteries of Philosophie. And gaue him to vnderstand that himselfe esteemed it more to excell other men in learning & knowledge, than in power and Empire.”\(^{451}\) Although the information is sourced from *The lives of the noble Grecians and Romans*, these two quotations correspond to each other far better than either of them with Plutarch’s version.\(^{452}\)

According to Spedding, Bacon’s second Counsellor’s speech reveals “a first hint of his great project for the restoration of the dominion of knowledge, — a first draft of ‘Solomon’s House’” while the fifth speech consists of “an enumeration of those very reforms in state and government which throughout his life he was most anxious to see realized”.\(^{453}\) In other words, on 3 January 1594–5 when the six Counsellors’ speeches were delivered, it seems that Bacon’s aim was to attempt to canvas support for his projects. As Stewart and Knight observe, with many notable guests from Elizabeth’s court in attendance, not least the queen’s main adviser Lord Burleigh, “For Bacon, this was an especially rich opportunity”.\(^{454}\) On the relationship between the second Counsellor’s speech and Bacon’s posthumously published and unfinished work *New Atlantis*, I find the following parallels. The former mentions that “Solymon was a Man so seen in the Universality of Nature, that he wrote an Herbal of all that was green upon the Earth,”\(^{455}\)

---

\(^{449}\) Francis Bacon, *Resuscitatio* (1657), Wing: B319, sig. Mmm.  
\(^{450}\) Francis Bacon, *Sylua syluarum* (1627), STC: 1168, p.117.  
\(^{452}\) “Alexander to Aristotle greeting. Thou hast not done well to put forth the Acroamatical sciences. For wherin shal we excell other, if those things which thou hast secretly taught vs, be made common to all? I do theee to understand, that I had rather excell others in excellency of knowledge, then in greatnes of power.” Plutarch, *The lives* (1579), STC: 20066, p.725.  
\(^{455}\) GES, p.34.
and recommends collecting “Books of worth” from “European or of the other Parts,”456 constructing a garden “to stable in all rare Beasts, and to cage in all rare Birds”457 with “two Lakes adjoining, the one of fresh Water, and the other of salt, for like variety of Fishes,”458 (see No. 33) and “a Still-House so furnished with Mills, Instruments, Furnaces and Vessels.”459 In New Atlantis, the main aim is to give a “Relation of the true State of Salomon’s House”, which was a scientific laboratory for experimentation located underground in caves.460 There are to be “Europaean books” brought by those who “Sayl into Forein Countries”,461 “Parks, and Enclosures of all Sorts of Beasts, and Birds”,462 “great Lakes, both Salt, and Fresh, whereof we have use for the Fish, and Fowl”,463 as well as “Furnaces of great Diversities.”464 So there is a clear correspondence of thought.

In the Third Counsellor’s speech we find “your Coin be stampd with your own Image” (No. 39). There are only 3 matches before 1670 and none before the Gesta, and of these only Bacon follows the Gesta’s use of ‘own image’ with “Coyns of Gold to be stampd with his own Image” in the charge against William Talbot from 1614.465 There is another particularly strong correspondence unique to Bacon and the Gesta from this speech where Bacon predates the Gesta. This is the line attributed to Augustus Caesar in the Third Counsellor’s Speech in the Gesta “I found the City of Brick, but I leave it of Marble” (No.41) which appears almost identical to that in ‘Mr Bacon’s discourse in the Praise of his Sovereign’ (1592) in the form “as Augustus said, that he had received the city of brick, and lefte it of marble.”466 Again from the same speech there is “Constantine the Great was wont to call with Envy the Emperor Trajan, Wallflower, because his Name was upon so many Buildings” (No.42). There are only 5 matches before 1670 that use either ‘Trajan’ or ‘wallflower’ but not both, and Bacon uses both in the Advancement of Learning (1605) with “For Traiane erected many famous monuments and buildings, insomuch as Constantine the Great, in emulation was wont to call him Parietaria, Wall flower, because his name was vppon so many walles.”467

456 Ibid., p.35.
457 Ibid., p.35.
458 Ibid., p.35.
459 Ibid., p.35.
460 Francis Bacon, New Atlantis (1658), Wing: B307, pp.26, 32.
461 Ibid., pp.22,32.
462 Ibid., p.28.
463 Ibid., p.27.
464 Ibid., p.28.
465 Ibid., p.28.
466 Francis Bacon, Resuscitatio (1657), Wing: B319.
467 Francis Bacon, The two bookes (1605), STC: 1164, sig. I3v.
The Fourth Counsellor’s speech has “with an humor of Innovation and Alteration” (No.43). There no matches before the *Gesta*, and only 6 matches for ‘humor of Innovation’ up to 1670, and Bacon has the earliest use after the *Gesta* in a speech from 1604 touching purveyors “so far are we from any humour of innovation of encroachment.”468

The fifth Counsellor says “Fame is too light” (No. 47) whereas in *Advancement of Learning* (1605) Bacon has “Generall fame is light”. Even rarer is the use of ‘vexation(s) near.10 delay(s)’ in the context of law because after the *Gesta*’s “all suits and vexations, all causeless delays” (No. 48), Bacon has the next use of it as “abuses of laws by delays, covins, vexations, and corruptions in informers” in his ‘Maxims of the Law’ (1596–7).

**King at Arms letter**

The *Gesta* has “to add Beams of honour” (No.56) which matches with Bacon’s letter to King James in January 1621, in which he writes “it was your grace to illustrate me with beams of honour.”469

**Russian Ambassador’s Speech**

Collocation No. 63 “Bulwarke of Christendom” also appears in Bacon’s ‘Draught of a Proclamation for Parliament’ (1620). It is the only hint that Bacon wrote this revels speech.

**Prince’s later speech**

A later speech by the Prince (Nos 70 and 71) finds Bacon with two matches that follow the date of the *Gesta*. The second is particularly strong with “that there be such Sparks of Dissent and Mischief; but if there be, We will make haste to quench them” (No. 71). There are only 5 instances before 1670 of ‘sparks near.15 quench(ed)(es)(ing)’ in the context of ‘sinister behaviour’ and Bacon has one of them with “for the quenching of the sparks of troubles and discords in foreign parts” from a ‘Draught of a Proclamation for a Parliament’ (1620).470

468 *LL*, Vol. 3, p.183, Spedding dates this to 1604 and reports taking it from a manuscript copy which has corrections in Bacon’s hand, British Library, Harley MS 6769, f.170.
Compiler of the Gesta Grayorum

Francis Bacon has two matches from the opening commentary of the Gesta (Nos 1 and 4). The first is “And there took his place in his Throne, under a rich cloth of state” (No.1) against Bacon’s “he was set upon a Low Throne richly adorned, and a rich cloth of State over his head.” He is almost unique with the Gesta in mentioning a throne. However, I reject collocation No. 4 “deeply bound to” because although unusual, it is just outside the limit of rarity. In support of the wider claim that Bacon is the best candidate for having compiled the Gesta Grayorum, I offer a passage from it that I have not subjected to a collocation analysis but is nevertheless striking. The final commentary (Gesta, p.68) runs as follows:

But now our Principality is determined; which, although it shined very bright in ours, and others Darkness; yet, at the Royal Presence of Her Majesty, it appeared as an obscure Shadow: In this, not unlike unto the Morning-Star, which looketh very cheerfully in the World, so long as the Sun looketh not on it: Or, as the great Rivers, that triumph in the Multitude of their Waters, until they come unto the Sea. Sic vinci, sic mori pulchrum. [To be conquered is a beautiful death]

Bacon employs this ‘greater lessens the smaller figure’ in A Brief Discourse touching the Happy Union of the Kingdom of England and Scotland (1603), where he makes use of the same two examples of light and water to illustrate it:

The second condition [of perfect mixture] is that the greater draws the less. So we see when two lights do meet, the greater doth darken and drown the less. And when a small river runs into a greater, it loseth both the name and stream

The figure appears again in his revised 1625 essay ‘Of Deformity’ using the same example as the Gesta Grayorum of the Sun overpowering starlight “the stars of natural inclination are sometimes obscured by the sun of discipline and virtue.”

472 I also note the following: “Ner. When the moone shone we did not see the candle / Por. So doth the greater glory dim the lesse, / A substitute shines brightly as a King, / Untill a King be by, and then his state / Empties it selfe, as doth an inland brooke / Into the maine of waters: musique hark” (The Merchant of Venice, 5.1.92–7).
474 Francis Bacon, The Essays or Covnseles, Civill and Morall of Francis Lo. Vervlam. (London: 1625), STC: 1148, sig. Kk3v, this is not as yet fully searchable text in EEBO.
Conclusions

Here RCP has been applied to the parts of the *Gesta Grayorum* performed at Gray’s Inn but the pamphlet also records that they took a ‘Masque of Proteus’ to court at Shrovetide on 3rd or 4th March 1594–5.\(^{475}\) The writers of the two short pieces that preceded the masque were both Gray’s Inn members. Thomas Campion, who was admitted in 1596,\(^{476}\) wrote ‘A Hymn in Praise of Neptune’\(^{477}\) which was sung prior to the masque’s speeches and was later credited to him in Francis Davison’s *A poetical rapsody* (1602).\(^{478}\) Davison, who was admitted in 1593,\(^{479}\) wrote Sonnet III which also appeared later in *A poetical rapsody* and was recited before the hymn was sung.\(^{480}\) There is also some evidence that Davison wrote the masque itself\(^{481}\) although with one of its characters framed as a Squire it is reminiscent of a device that Bacon later wrote for Queen’s Day November 1595 (see §5.5).

So apart from Francis Bacon, the new RCP method reveals that no other candidate appears from the EEBO database of published writers for originating any of the revels entertainments played at Gray’s Inn, unless one considers Richard Knolles who had no membership. At the most, he might have supplied the Russian Ambassador’s speech (p.46) but I judge it to be unlikely. There is mutual borrowing evidence that Francis Bacon contributed to the ‘Articles of the Knights of the Order’, and the evidence for his contribution to at least the first five Privy Counsellors’ speeches together with the Prince’s introduction to their speeches seems strong. The Prince’s later speech (*GES* p.52) has evidence of Bacon’s hand, and there is a hint of Bacon’s thought in the King at Arms letter (*GES* p.45). Since the rare collocation searches show Bacon as the only candidate for writing the first part of the commentary, and I provide evidence for his involvement in the later part, I conclude that with the data available from the searchable contemporary literature, Bacon is presently the strongest candidate for having compiled the *Gesta Grayorum*.

\(^{476}\) Foster, *The Register, op. cit.*, p.516.
\(^{477}\) *GES*, p.58.
\(^{479}\) Foster, *The Register, op. cit.*, p.523.
5.4 The players at the revels

In order to identity the players that performed *The Comedy of Errors* at the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, the records of the Inns of Court are now examined to determine whether the evidence is for, against, or unavailable for each of the following:

(a) The Lord Chamberlain’s Men.
(b) A professional company.
(c) Inns of Court players.

(a) The Lord Chamberlain’s Men. In 1913, Hart suggested that “Shakespeare himself was perhaps not present since he was acting on the same day before the Queen at Greenwich.” However, seven years earlier, Sir Edmund Chambers had asserted that the Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber (Figure 5.1) for the Greenwich performance were in error and that the date Shakespeare was at Greenwich was 27 December, instead of “Innocent’s Day” 28 December as recorded, to allow his performance at Gray's Inn on the 28th.

There were two kinds of accounts that recorded royal performances: the Accounts of the Revels Office, which was concerned with expenditure relating to the material or logistical staging of entertainments in the royal household, and the ‘rewards’ paid to performers by the Treasurer of the Chamber. For the latter, which is the sole concern here, a warrant for payment had to be delivered by the performer to the Privy Council for approval by the Treasurer of the Chamber. There are two independent records of these payments: the [Privy] Council Register; and a more detailed version in the Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber which, unlike the former, usually give the performance dates. There are also two versions of the latter: Original Accounts for declaration in the Exchequer; and Declared Accounts which are abstracts of the Original Accounts prepared by the auditors, one copy of which went to the Pipe office.

Of particular interest is a Pipe Office document (Figure 5.1) recording a payment made “To Willm Kempe Willm Shakespeare Richarde Burbage servants to the Lord

---

Chamberlayne” which was “dated at Whitehall xv^[15th] Martij [March] 1594 [1595] for twoe severall comedies or Interludes shewed by them before her ma^le [majestie] in xpmas tyme laste paste viz upon S^t Stephens daye & Innocents daye.” However, on Innocents Day the Lord Chamberlain's Men could not perform both at Gray's Inn after 9pm\(^{486}\) and for the queen at Greenwich since “the Court performances were always at night, beginning about 10pm and ending at about 1am.\(^{487}\) Their appearance at Greenwich on 28 December 1594 (Innocents Day), was on the same day as a performance by “Edwarde Allen, Richarde Jones & John Synger, seruaunts to the Lord Admiral.”\(^{488}\) So Chambers, believing that having two companies simultaneously at Greenwich was less likely than the absence of the Lord Chamberlain's Men from Gray's Inn, suggested that the “Innocents daye” recorded on the warrant really meant the 27\(^{th}\), a day earlier, freeing Shakespeare to appear at Gray’s Inn on the 28\(^{th}\).

However, any error in this document could not have arisen from a careless slip of the pen, a distracted writing of a “xxvij” [28\(^{th}\)] instead of a “xxvij” [27\(^{th}\)], because we can see (Figure 5.1) that the administrator actually wrote “Innocents daye” [28\(^{th}\)].

Also, as Chambers confessed with regard to a double booking at Greenwich “Two plays on one day would not be unprecedented\(^{489}\) or indeed unusual because in the following 1595–6 season both “John Hemynge and George Bryan servuantes to the late Lorde Chamblayne and now servuantes to the Lorde Hunsdon” and “Edwarde Allen and Martyn Slater servuanetes to the Lorde Admyrall” were engaged for performance on 22 February.\(^{490}\)

The only other argument of note that Chambers gives for the dating 'error' is that in the Gesta Grayorum we find that “a company of base and common fellows” performed on the “Night of Errors”, which typically means a professional acting company, such as the Lord Chamberlain's Men. However, Chambers has presented this remark out of context because it appears as a comic charge read by the Clerk of the Crown who referred to “a great Witchcraft used the Night before” at which time “a Sorceror or Conjuror” was accused of “foisting a Company of base and common Fellows, to make up our disorders with a Play of Errors or Confusions.”\(^{491}\)

---

\(^{486}\) GES, p.22.
\(^{488}\) Ibid., p.165.
\(^{489}\) Ibid., p.165.
\(^{490}\) Chambers, Modern Language, op. cit., p.11.
\(^{491}\) GES, p.23.
Figure 5.1. William Shakespeare and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men recorded as being at Greenwich on Innocents Day 1594.
If the Lord Chamberlain's Men had been the target of this jibe then Lord Hunsdon, the Lord Chamberlain, might well have taken offence at this intended ridicule of his servants' humble origins.\footnote{On 3 January, the Lord Keeper, Lord Burghley, and Sir Robert Cecil were among those present at which time they would have learned of this slight.} Taking the context into consideration, the company would have needed not to be “base and common fellows” both to avoid offence and for the jest to work, which I suggest was about the middle-class Gray's Inn players.

So I find no reason connected with the procedure of the court revels why the Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber should be in error and my conclusion is that this document should be given the respect it deserves and should be taken as reliable evidence against the Lord Chamberlain’s Men playing *The Comedy of Errors* at the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels.\(\text{(b) A professional company.}\) There is no evidence that Shakespeare’s company had possession of this play in 1594. The first known association of Shakespeare with the play occurs when Francis Meres mentions Shakespeare and “his Errors” in *Palladis tamia* (1598) and his company are not known to have played it until 28 December 1604 when they performed it at court.\footnote{Charles Whitworth, ed. *The Comedy of Errors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p.10.} For the 1594–5 revels, there is no record in the Pension Book of Gray’s Inn of anyone being paid for a performance on Innocents Day 1594–5, dramatist or company. Neither is there a record in the Gray’s Inn Ledger Book\footnote{NE, pp.121–4.} which only records a payment to William Johnson of Gray’s Inn who had been assigned to distribute money to the gentlemen of the Inn for their show before the queen at Shrovetide:

Mr Johnson by order of the pencion in full discharge of all his disbursementes for the Christmas sportes iij li. xvij s. & x d. [£30.89]\footnote{NE, p.124.}

So I suggest that without evidence in the Gray’s Inn records for 1594–5 — and I have shown earlier in §2.4 that the Pension Book was including records of payments to outsiders around that time — the claim that a professional company played *The Comedy of Errors* has no basis in fact. King summarizes the Inns of Court records “Theatre performances will not appear in financial records unless an exceptional effort is being made to impress guests, a visiting company (professional or amateur) is being rewarded, or damage has been done to the fabric of the household.”\footnote{Ros King, ‘Introduction’, in *The Comedy of Errors*, ed., T. S. Dorsch (Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.31.} In the present case, there is no hint in the
records of a “visiting company”, despite there being “a great Presence of Lords, Ladies and Worshipful Personages”\textsuperscript{497} on the night \textit{The Comedy of Errors} was given.

Gray Inn’s policy on expenditure during the revels is made clear in the \textit{Gesta Grayorum} which notes that “about 12\textsuperscript{th} of December [...] it was determined that there should be elected a Prince of Purpoole [...] which was intended to be for the Credit of Gray’s Inn, and rather to be performed by witty inventions rather than chargeable Expences [sic].”\textsuperscript{498} This suggests that no payment was made to a non-member of the Inns of Court, either for writing or performing, which excludes enactment by a professional company who, in contrast to Inns of Court players, would certainly have demanded a fee.

During the period 1587–1604, professional players were unwelcome at both Oxford and Cambridge Universities. In fact, the authorities were so determined to defend the University stage from professional companies that on 29 June 1593, the Privy Council sent a letter to the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, complaining that “common Plaiers do ordinarily resorte to the Vniuersytie of Cambridge there to recite Interludes and Plaies some of them being full of lewde example” proclaiming that “no Plaies or Interludes of common Plaiers be vsed or sette forth either in the vniuersity or in any place within the compasse of ffeue miles” of the town. It also mentions “The like lettre to Vicechancellor [sic] and Heades of the houses and seuerall colledges of Oxenforde”\textsuperscript{499} but there the companies were protected by the city authorities. In the end Oxford University resorted to bribes. The Vice Chancellor’s account records that companies patronized by the Earl of Leicester, the Queen, Lord Morley, and the Lord Admiral, were actually paid by the University Vice Chancellor to stay away and any Master, Bachelor, or Scholar above the age of eighteen found attending any such performance was sent to prison.\textsuperscript{500} As shown in §2.3, one of the functions of Inns of Court revels was to give the students experience and instruction in royal court etiquette and legal court rhetoric, so I suggest that this attitude of scholars to professional companies also extended to the Third University, the Inns of Court.\textsuperscript{501}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{497}GES, p.20. \\
\footnote{498}Ibid., p.2. \\
\footnote{499}Nelson, \textit{REED: Cambridge, op. cit.}, Vol. 1, pp.348–9. \\
\footnote{500}Frederick S. Boas, \textit{Shakespeare & the Universities} (Oxford: Blackwell, 1923), pp.17–18. \\
\footnote{501}The type of academic mind that attended an Inn of Court was similar to that at Oxford or Cambridge. Finkelpearl notes that “[from] 1587 to 1603, the records of the Middle Temple mention 1,070 names, of whom forty-three percent definitely spent some time at Oxford or Cambridge”, see Philip J. Finkelpearl, \textit{John Marston of the Middle Temple} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), p.6.}
\end{footnotesize}
In addition, after having removed Nelson and Elliott’s unjustified extrapolation of the records (see Table 2.1, §2.4), the only professional companies that were known to have acted at the Inns of Court appeared at Lincoln’s Inn from 1565–80.502 As for Gray’s Inn in particular, of the six known plays involving Gray’s Inn in the 50 years leading up to the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels (Table 2.2, §2.5), three were written by members, at least three were acted by members, all six were played at Gray’s Inn, and none of them are known to have involved an outside writer or playing company. So precedent favours Inns of Court players.

(c) Inns of Court players. Summarizing the information in Table 2.2, Gorboduc, a play penned by two Inner Temple members, Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, was performed before the Queen at Whitehall by members of the Inner Temple although it is unknown who performed it at the Inner Temple earlier that Christmas season. Both Jocasta and Supposes were written by Gray’s Inn members in 1566, but the players who performed at Gray’s Inn remain unidentified although Chambers takes Jocasta to have been performed by Gray’s Inn players.503 Two years later, Gismund and Salerne was “compiled by the gentlemen of the Inner Temple and by them presented before her Majestie” although it is unclear whether Inner Temple Hall or Greenwich provided the location.504

For the 1587–8 Gray’s Inn revels season, the Gray’s Inn Christmas prince or “Dominus [Lord] de purpoole” was named as “[William] Hatchlyff” who in Michaelmas term saw the performance of a Roman comedy, often referred to as Catelyne or Sylla Dictator, given by Gray’s Inn players.505 On 16 January 1587 [1588], a cast of twenty-six presented it before Lord Burghley. This is referred to in The Pension Book of Gray’s Inn 1559–1669 which informs us that on 23 January 1588 “there was allowed out of the stocke of the house towards the charge of the comedy or shew set forth by the gentlemen of this house this last Christmas xx marks” [£13.33 in modern currency].506

The Misfortunes of Arthur was written by several Inn members, most notably Thomas Hughes of Gray’s Inn, and was acted by the Gray’s Inn players at Greenwich before the

503 Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, op. cit., Vol. 3, pp.320–1. Jocasta is recorded as “A Tragedie written in Greke by Euripedes, translated and digested into Acte by George Gascoyne and Francis Kinwelmershe of Grayes Inne, and there by them presented.” Supposes is described as “A Comedie written in the Italian tongue by Ariosto, and Englished by George Gascoyne of Grayes Inne Esquire, and there presented.”
504 See Bellot, The Inner and Middle Temple, op. cit., p.194; Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, op. cit., Vol. 3, p.514.
505 NE, pp.112–3, 746, 926–7.
506 GRA, Vol. 1, p.78.
queen on 28 February 1588. Taking *Sylla Dictator* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* from 1588, these examples provide the best indication of Gray’s Inn policy with respect to the writing and acting of plays as the 1594–5 Christmas revels approached. As far as the use of actors was concerned, the choice of Gray’s Inn players was the immediate precedent for the 1594–5 revels. An entry in the Gray’s Inn Pension Book dated 11 February [1595] states that:

One hundryd markes to be layd out & bestowyd vppon the Gentlemen for ther sportes & shewes this Shrovetyde at the Court before the Queenes Maiestie

which shows that Gray’s Inn had an active playing company during the revels and was proficient enough to entertain the queen, so the enactment of *The Comedy of Errors* at Gray’s Inn would have posed no difficulties. So there is significant circumstantial evidence that Inns of Court players appeared in this play. Green concludes that “the feeling, which was somewhat general during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that the professional actor was tainted because he followed his art for profit was rather strong at the Inns, where the gentlemen acted for amusement only.”

So I conclude that there is substantial evidence not only against the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, but against a professional playing company attending the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, and notable evidence in favour of Inns of Court players.

### 5.5 Francis Bacon and drama

The achievements of Sir Francis Bacon as a politician, essayist, and philosopher have been well documented, but here his speeches or devices for special occasions are addressed as well as the documented records of his production of masques. Francis Bacon was admitted to Gray’s Inn on 27 June 1576, was declared an utter (or outer) barrister on 27 June 1583, and on 10 February 1586 was allowed the privilege of attending Pensions [committee meetings] with the proviso that “Mr. Francis Bacon maie have place with the Readers att the Reders table but not to have any voyce in pencon.” However, in the Lent term of 1587 he was promoted to Reader, a move that would have allowed him to contribute to Pensions and influence the affairs of Gray’s Inn. He was a regular attendee at these meetings from 20 May 1586 and throughout the 1590s, being privy to discussions

---

507 *NE*, pp.121–2.
509 See *LL, PHI, SEH, OFB*.
510 *GRA*, p.72.
regarding such business as the expulsion of undesirable students from the Inn, charitable donations, building alterations, the assignment of members to important posts, and the allocation of funds to Christmas revels and court masques.

In his essay ‘Of Masques and Triumphs’, Bacon begins dismissively by stating that “These Things are but Toyes, to come amongst such Serious Observations” and returns to this tone at the end with “But enough of these Toyes”. Nevertheless, he admits that “Dancing to Song, is a Thing of great State, and Pleasure”, and that “Acting in Song, especially in Dialogues, hath an extreme Good Grace: I say Acting, not Dancing, (For that is a Meane and Vulgar Thing;)” It is clear that by “Dialogues” he means singing for he writes that “the Voices of the Dialogue, would be Strong and Manly, (A Base, and a Tenour; No Treble;) And the Ditty High and Tragicall.” Here it appears that Bacon approves of dance and music; acting, voice, and music; but not dance, voice, and music.

In 1623, Bacon published De Augmentis Scientiarum in Latin, and in Book II, Chapter XIII, he addresses “the second principal branch of Learning, namely, Poesy.” For Bacon, a play presented on the stage should be no idle entertainment, but should be exploited as an educational tool:

And though in modern states play-acting is esteemed but as a toy, except when it is too satirical and biting; yet among ancients it was used as a means of educating men’s minds to virtue. Nay, it has been regarded by learned men and great philosophers as a kind of musician’s bow by which men’s minds be played upon. And certainly it is most true, and one of the great secrets of nature, that the minds of men are more open to impressions and affections when many are gathered together than when they are alone.

Poesy can take mundane historical events, then select and embroider them to highlight what is virtuous:

since the acts and events which are the subjects of real history are not of sufficient grandeur to satisfy the human mind, Poesy is at hand to feign acts more heroical; since the successes and issues of action as related in true history are far from being agreeable to the merits of virtue and vice, Poesy corrects it, exhibiting events and

---

513 Ibid. p.226.
514 Ibid. p.223.
516 De Augmentis Scientiarum, Book 2, see also PHI, Vol. IV, p.316, translated into English from Latin by Robert Leslie Ellis.
fortunes as according to merit and the law of providence; since true history wearies the mind with satiety of ordinary events, one like another, Poesy refreshes it, by reciting things unexpected and various and full of vicissitudes. So that this Poesy conduces not only to delight but also to magnanimity and morality.  

The first record of Bacon’s involvement in a dramatic production occurs in the credits at the end of the printed quarto of *The Misfortunes of Arthur* which was performed at Greenwich before the queen on 28 February 1587–8 (see Figure 2.1, §2.5). By citing the records of the Audit Office which show that the “gentlemen of grayes In” performed “betwixte Christmas & Shrovetid”, Stewart and Knight have queried the date of the enactment pointing out that 28 February was “a full week after Shrovetide”. Although, eight men were involved in the play the main credit went to Thomas Hughes. “The dumbe shows were partly devised by Maister Christopher Yelverton, Maister Frauncis Bacon, Maister John Lancaster and others, partly by the saide Maister flower.” There are five dumb shows in *Misfortunes*, one before each Act, but the precise allocation of credit is unknown. Nicholas Trotte, who wrote the Introduction to *Misfortunes*, featured prominently in Francis Bacon’s financial life in the last years of Elizabeth’s reign. Due to a series of loans from Trotte throughout the 1590s, by 1601 Bacon was indebted to him for £2650 plus £1479 interest.

On 17 November 1592, Queen’s day, the Earl of Essex presented a device before the queen which Francis Bacon had devised. James Spedding, the Victorian editor of Bacon’s *Works*, remarks that in 1734 Robert Stephens published ‘Mr. Bacon’s discourse in prayse of his Soveraigne’ and ‘Mr. Bacon in prayse of knowledge’ from manuscripts written in a fair hand, which were given to him by Robert Harley, the first Earl of Oxford. Stephens thought they had originally been in the possession of Bacon’s Chaplain Dr William Rawley and that “both formed part of some fanciful device presented at the Court of

---

517 Ibid.
518 The title page states that it was presented on “the twenty eighth day of Februarie”.
520 Joseph Foster, ed., *The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn, 1521–1889* (London: Hansard Publishing Union, 1889). There are two entries for Thomas Hughes in the Admissions Register, “Thomas Hughes (or Hayes), of Staple Inn” in 1580 on p.56, and “Thomas Hayes (Feb 9)” in 1580–1 on p.58, see also p.40. Some doubt has been expressed about the extent of Hughes’s contribution, see Stewart and Knight, *The Oxford Francis Bacon, op. cit.*, pp.75–6.
521 Thomas Hughes, *Certaine deujsies* (1587 [1588]), STC: 13921, sig. G2. A dumb show is a pantomime enacted in silence, sometimes to music, and is usually intended to illustrate the theme of the play that incorporates it.
Elizabeth in 1592.” Copies of both speeches entitled ‘Of Tribute, or giving what is dew’ also appear in the Northumberland Manuscripts collection under the name of “M. frauncis Bacon”. The device consists of four parts: ‘The Praise of the worthiest virtue, Fortitude’, ‘The Praise of the worthiest affection, Love’, ‘The Praise of the worthiest power, Knowledge’, and ‘The Praise of the worthiest person, Queen Elizabeth’, the last two corresponding with the two speeches published by Stephens.

For the legal year 1594, The Pension Book of Gray’s Inn 1569–1669, records that Francis Bacon was elected one of the two Treasurers, a post which he held until 26 November 1594, just before that year’s Christmas revels:

Mr Pooley paid to Mr Bacon one of the treasurers of this house by the hands of Mr Lany the somea of xxixixiixvii xi in full discharge of his accompt of his office of Treasurershippe.

This would have allowed him to oversee preparations for the 1594–5 Christmas revels. In 1688, details of the revels and the Shrovetide masque at Whitehall were printed by William Canning as the Gesta Grayorum, although the depth of detail suggests that it was written shortly after the revels while events were still alive in the compiler’s memory. The Gesta Grayorum reports that On Innocents Day, 28 December 1594 “a Comedy of Errors (like to Plautus his Menechmus) was played by the Players” (Gesta 22) which is the first

---

523 Spedding, A Conference, op. cit., pp.v–vi. The evidence for the dating of this is that the first speech was expanded as ‘Certain Observations upon a Libel’ which Bacon published in 1592.

524 Frank J. Burgoyne, ed., Northumberland Manuscripts. Collotype facsimile and type transcript of an Elizabethan manuscript preserved at Alnwick Castle, Northumberland (Longmans, Green & Co., 1902). The collection seems to have been damaged by fire at Northumberland House on 18 March 1780, and was discovered there in a large black box in August 1867 by the antiquarian John Bruce. It is a folio volume of twenty-two sheets, which have been laid together, folded double, and secured with a stitch through the centre which is now missing. The tenth leaf is absent and the fourth appears to have been pasted in. As well as containing ‘Of Tribute’, which is listed on the front sheet, it has copies of various pieces by Bacon which are not listed and pieces which are listed but not present, for example, ‘Orations at Graie’s Inne revels’ and ‘Essaies by the same author’. James Spedding dates the collection to 1597 and asserts that “there is no trace of Bacon’s own penmanship in any part of the volume”, see Spedding, A Conference, op. cit., pp.xxiv–xxv.

525 The structure for ‘Of Tribute’ is as follows. Four friends, distinguished as A, B, C, and D, meet for intellectual amusement. A sets out the direction of their proceedings, and proposes that each in turn shall make a speech in praise of whatever he holds most worthy. Upon which B (after a word or two of protest in favour of satire, as better suited to the humour of that time than praise) begins with a speech in praise of the “worthiest virtue,” namely, Fortitude. C follows with a speech in praise of “the worthiest affection”, namely, Love. D has a speech in praise of “the worthiest power”, namely, Knowledge. And A himself concludes with a speech in praise of “the worthiest person”, namely, the queen. See Spedding, A Conference, op. cit., p.ix.

526 The Gray’s Inn Pension Book shows that around this time, when a record exists, two Treasurers were elected, for example, in November 1586–8, 1590, 1594–96.


528 Nichols thought that “The publisher was Mr. Henry Keepe, who published the ‘Monuments of Westminster’”, see Nichols, Progresses Elizabeth, op. cit., p.262n.
known performance of Shakespeare’s play. As I have shown, it is fairly certain that Bacon wrote the six Counsellors’s speeches for these festivities and in the Inner Temple’s Petyt manuscript collection, there is another albeit incomplete version of Bacon’s Counsellors’ speeches, written alongside miscellaneous verse by other authors in a single italic hand. The first two of the six Counsellors’s speeches are given in full with some of the third, the last part of the fourth, but without the fifth and sixth. According to Stewart and Knight, the differences between this manuscript version and Canning’s text are evidence that the latter has errors.\textsuperscript{529}

For Queen’s Day, Monday 17 November 1595, Francis Bacon composed another device which was presented by the Earl of Essex to Queen Elizabeth. In a letter from Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sydney dated Saturday 22 November 1595, we learn that there was a “dumb shew” and lines for an old Hermit [philosopher], a Secretary of State, a Soldier, and an Esquire who was played by Bacon’s close friend Toby Matthew.\textsuperscript{530} According to Vickers “The ostensible plot, in which Philautia tries to persuade Erophilus not to love the Queen, obviously represents Essex’s own wooing of Elizabeth”\textsuperscript{531} and the intention of Philatia’s orators — the Hermit, Soldier, and Statesman — is to deliver their case to Erophilus’s Squire. Francis Bacon is not credited but there is evidence that this was his work. In Lambeth Palace Library, there exists an unfinished rough draft of a similar device made in Bacon’s hand which informs us of its structure:

The persons [are] to be three: one dressed like an Hermite or Philosopher, representing Contemplation; the second like a Capitain [sic], representing Fame; and the third like a Counsellor of Estate, representing Experience: the third to begin to the Squire, as being the master of the best behaviour or compliment, though he speak last.\textsuperscript{532}

Accompanying the design is a draft of the Hermit’s speech. The actual speeches appear in another volume of the same collection,\textsuperscript{533} fairly copied with no heading, date, or docket. The pre-supper speeches consist of the Squire’s brief introduction followed by the Hermit’s speech in the tilt yard. The after-supper entertainment feature the Hermit again, then the Soldier, the Statesman, and finally the Squire’s summation.\textsuperscript{534} These characters correspond exactly with Rowland Whyte’s description. The Northumberland Manuscripts


\textsuperscript{530} Sydney Papers, i. 362; in LL, p.375; Nichols, Progresses Elizabeth, op. cit., p.371.

\textsuperscript{531} Bacon, Francis Bacon, op. cit., p.xxvii.

\textsuperscript{532} Lambeth Palace Library, Gibson Papers, vol. viii. No. 274; in LL, i:376.


\textsuperscript{534} Stewart and Knight, The Oxford Francis Bacon, op. cit., p.678.
collection omits ‘The Squire’s Speech in the tilt-yard’ which is a brief introduction, but includes ‘the Hermitt’s fyrst speech’ which is a response to it and is an oration that does not appear in the Lambeth Palace manuscript. It is followed by ‘The Hermitt’s second speech’, ‘The soldier’s speech’, ‘The secretarie’s speech’, and ‘The Squyre’s speech’. Stewart and Knight have pointed out correspondences between the Hermit’s speech and Bacon’s *Advancement of Learning* (1605).\(^{535}\) In the former we find “The monumentes of witt survive the monumentes of power. The verses of a Poet endure without a sillable lost, whiles States & Empires passe many periods” while the latter has “wee see then howe farre the monuments of wit and learning, are more durable, than the monuments of power, or of the hands. For haue not the verses of Homer continued 25. hundred yeares, or more, without the losse of a sillable, or letter: during which time, infinite Pallaces, Temples, Castles, Cities haue been decayed, and demolished?”\(^{536}\) This shows that Bacon returned to his own themes while developing his philosophy.

There is a further piece connected with this device that was left unperformed. According to Dixon,\(^{537}\) Bacon wished to keep Essex and Raleigh on good terms and since Raleigh had just returned from the Amazon, Bacon composed “a scene in happy allusion to the regions of the Amazon and to Raleigh’s voyage.” However, clearly affronted by the suggestion, Essex “strikes his pen through Bacon’s lines, which drop from the acted scene and from the printed masque.” There is a manuscript in the “State Paper Office” that is referred to in the original docket as “A Device made by the Earl of Essex for the Entertainment of her Majesty.”\(^{538}\) It is written in a fair hand with no date attached, and consists of two speeches: “The Squire’s Speech”, and “The Attendant or Conductor to the Indian Prince”. An Amazonian king makes sacrifices in his temples to attempt to cure his son, the Indian Prince, of his blindness. Consequently, the king receives an oracle which sends the Prince to England to be remedied by Queen Elizabeth. This piece appears to be the ill-fated invention by Francis Bacon.\(^{539}\)

---


\(^{536}\) Francis Bacon, *The two booke of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement of learning, duine and humane* (London: 1605), STC: 1164, sig. M’.


Bacon was also a producer of Inns of Court masques. In an undated letter discovered in the papers of the first Lord Burghley (see Figure 5.2)\(^{540}\) he writes:

\[\text{Yt may please your good Lordship I am sory the joyn[t] maske from the fowr Innes of Cowrt faileth. Wherin I conceyue thear is no other grownd of that euent but impossibility. Neuerthelesse bycause it falleth owt that at this tyme Graies Inne is well furnyshed, of gallant yowng gentlemen, your lordship may be pleased to know, that rather then this occasion shall passe without some demonstration of affection from the Innes of Cowrt, Thear are a dozen gentlemen of Graies Inne that owt of the honour which they bear to your lordship, and my lord Chamberlayne to whome at theyre last maske they were so much bownden, will be ready to furnyshe a maske wyshing it were in their powers to performe it according to theyr myndes. And so for the present I humbly take my leave resting}\]

This refers to two masques: one that was intended but failed, and another that Bacon proposes as compensation. Spedding notes that “it must have been written before the autumn of 1598 [Lord Burleigh died 4 August 1598], but it seems impossible to determine on what occasion.” He further reports that “on 15\(^{th}\) of October, 1596, Bacon wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury from Gray’s Inn ‘to borrow a horse and armour for some public shew’” and conjectures that “this may possibly have reference to the same.”\(^{541}\) Without stating their reasons, Nelson and Elliott assign the Bacon–Burleigh letter to 1595–6.\(^{542}\)

On Saturday 20 February 1612–13, a procession and masque organised jointly by Gray’s Inn and the Inner Temple, was presented to King James to celebrate the wedding of Frederick Count Palatine and Lady Elizabeth. The masque is credited to Inner Temple member and playwright Francis Beaumont and the printed version has the following dedication to Sir Francis Bacon (see Figure 5.3):

\[\text{Yee that spared no time nor trouell, in the setting forth, ordering, \\& furnishing of this Masque [...] as you did then by your countenance, and louing affection aduance it}^{543}\]

\(^{540}\) British Library, Burghley Papers, Lansdowne MS 107, f.13; in Bacon’s hand, no address, flyleaf missing, docketed “M’ Fra. Bacon”.

\(^{541}\) LL, II:370. The Northumberland Manuscripts collection has a speech listed on the Contents sheet ‘For the Earl of Sufflex at ye tilt an : 96’ (see Burgoyne, Northumberland, op. cit., MS fols 53–4) which appears in the collections, and is “addressed to the Queen being meant apparently to convey an apology for the absence of the Earl of Essex”, see Spedding, A Conference, op. cit., p.xvii. The author is unknown but this might also serve as a candidate for Bacon’s “public shew”.

\(^{542}\) NE, pp.126–7.

\(^{543}\) Francis Beaumont, The Masque of the Inner Temple and Grayes Inne (London: 1613), STC: 1664, sig. B. On the title page we find “By Francis Beamont [sic], Gent.”.
Figure 5.2 Letter of Francis Bacon to Lord Burleigh on failed Inns of Court masque.
TO THE WORTHIE
SIR FRANCIS BACON, HIS MA-
IESTIES SOLICITOR GE-
ERAL, and the grave and learned Bench of
the anciently allied houses of Grayes
Inne, and the Inner Temple, the Inner
Temple, and Grayes Inn.

See that spared no time nor trauel in the
setting forth, ordering, & furnishing of
this Masque, being the first fruits of ho-
or in this kinde, which these two socie-
ties have offered to his Maiestie, I will not think
much now to looke backe-upon the effects of your
owne care and worke: for that whereof the success
was then doubfull, is now happily performed and
gratiously accepted, and that which you were then
to thinke of in straitnes of time, you may now perceive
at deuoure. And you Sir Francis Bacon, especially,
as you did then by your countenance, and loyal
affection advance it, so let your good word grace it
and defend it, which is able to adde value to the
greatest, and least matters.

Figure 5.3 Francis Bacon as producer of the joint Inns masque (Feb 1612–13)
TO THE VERIE HONORABLE KNIGHT, SIR FRANCIS BACON, HIS MAJESTIES ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Honorable Sirs,

His last Maske, presented by Gentlemen of Graies Inne, before his Majestie, in honor of the marriage, and happy alliance betweene two such principall persons of the kingdom, as are the Earle of Suffolk, and the Earle of Sommerset, both received such grace from his Majestie, the Queene and Prince, and such approbation from the generall. As it may well deserve to bee repeated to those that were present, and represented to those that were absent, by committing the same to the Press, as others have been. The dedication of it could not be doubfull, you having beene the Principall, and in effect the onely person, that did both encourage and warrant the Gentlemen, to shew their good affection towards so noble a Conjunction, in a time of such Magnificence, wherein we conceive without giving you false attributes, which little neede where so many are true. That you have graced in generall the Societies of the Innes of Court, in continuing them still as third persons with the Nobilitie and Court, in doing the King honor. And particularly Graies Inne, which as you have formerly brought to flourish both

Figure 5.4 Francis Bacon as producer of the Masque of Flowers (Jan 1613–14)
Unfortunately, after a magnificently lit procession on the Thames involving the king’s royal barge, James declared that he was too tired to concentrate so Bacon postponed the performance of the masque, intended for the banqueting house at Whitehall, until the following Saturday.544

A year later, Sir Francis Bacon was the producer of another theatrical event. On 9 December 1613, John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton:

Sir Francis Bacon prepares a mask which will stand him in above £2000, and although he has been offered some help by the House [Gray’s Inn], and specially by Mr. Solicitor, Sir Henry Yelverton, who would have sent him £500, yet he would not accept it, but offers them the whole charge with the honour.545

So on Twelfth Night, Thursday 6 January 1613–14, the Gentlemen of Gray’s Inn presented ‘The Maske of Flowers’ at Whitehall, on the occasion of the marriage between Robert Carr, the Earl of Somerset, and Lady Frances Howard, daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, the Lord Chamberlain. It was published in 1614 and sold at Robert Wilson’s shop at “Graies-Inne new gate” with Bacon receiving the following credit (see Figure 5.4): “To the verie Honorable Knight, Sir Francis Bacon [...] having beene the principall, and in effect the only person that did both incourage and warrant the Gentlemen, to shew their good affection towards so noble a Coniunction in a time of such magnificence.”546

Adams547 has argued that Bacon not only financed but also wrote The Masque of Flowers. The device opens with the season of Winter being represented by a gowned old man with white hair and a beard, and Spring being attired like a nymph dressed in pearls and flowers. The Sun sends instruction to them through his messenger Gallus. Winter must present two anti-maskes, one in song and the other in dance, on the theme that “Wine is more woorthie then Tobacco, and cheereth mans spirit more.” Spring has a far more elaborate task: “That whereas of auncient time there were certain faire Youths turned into Flowers [...] That they be now returned to Men, and present a Dance.”548 To this end, Spring presents four songs in the setting of a quartered flowered garden, a commendable

construction built on a 40x40sq.ft platform, six feet high at the front rising to eight feet high at the back, with assorted flowers, and trees.

At the centre of the garden, in the middle of a 24ft circumference bowl raised 9ft from the ground, Neptune holds a trident astride a dolphin that was “So cunningly framed, that a Riuuer seemed to streame out of his mouth.” Adams finds parallels in The Maske of Flowers between the presentation of the action and gardens’ construction, and the advice Bacon gives in his essays “Of Masques and Triumphs” (1625) and “Of Gardens”, concluding that “Bacon’s writing style, his garden preferences, and his knowledge of flowers, visible in his two garden descriptions and The Masque of Flowers support other evidence presented here that he [...] was equipped to script and produce one [a masque] with a garden of flowers as its defining theme and visual focus.”

So to summarize, there is evidence that Francis Bacon had an early interest in contributing to a play, and a persisting interest in writing devices, speeches, and perhaps masques for performance. There is certainly evidence here that he was responsible for producing at least three masques.

---

549 Ibid., sig. C.
550 Adams, ‘Francis Bacon’s’, op. cit., p.47.
551 The Masque of Flowers avoids ‘dancing in song’ which Bacon abhorred but has ‘acting in song’ and ‘dancing without song’, the latter involving dancing the measures.
552 Adams, ‘Francis Bacon’s’, op. cit., p.53.
Chapter 6

The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost

6.1 Preliminary

In this chapter, RCP is applied to The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost, two plays that have both previously been associated with the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. Being longer than the A Funeral Elegye and Gesta Grayorum, the definition of collocation rarity in Table 4.1 is strictly applied, which sets out the upper limit for the number of returns as a function of the target date. As with the Gesta Grayorum, all three stages of RCP (see §4.1) are applied so that not only was a collocation rare at the time of its insertion in the target, but it was also rare on the date a later author shared its use.

Detailed tables are given showing the shared use of rare collocations with these plays by the most frequently returned writers after the target date. This allows an assessment of possible contributions to these plays.

6.2 The Comedy of Errors

There are several facts that assist in dating The Comedy of Errors. Although the allusion at (3.2) to the French civil war, which as Chambers points out ended on 19 July 1593, suggests that this date might be a terminus ad quem for the play, Thomas has shown that there was only a temporary truce, and that the war continued well into 1597. Apart from The Comedy of Errors, an EEBO search returns only one example of the name Dromio before 1595 and this arises in John Lyly’s Mother Bombie which, although conceived in 1589, was registered for publication on 18 June 1594. As it will be shown, The Comedy of Errors does not appear to have been conceived for the public theatre, and there is no record of it having been played in one prior to its first publication in the First Folio of 1623. Francis Meres mentions it in Palladis tamia (1598) with an attribution to

553 “Antipholus of Syracuse: Where France? / Dromio of Syracuse: In her forehead [audacity]; armed and reverted [turned the wrong way], making war against her heir [hair]”, see Dorsch, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.38.
Shakespeare, imploring his readers to “witnes his Gêtlemê of Verona, his Errors, his Loue labors lost, his Loue labours wonne, his Midsummers night dreame, & his Merchant of Venice.”

The correspondence between Dr Pinch who was a schoolteacher and conjuror, and the “school-maister” in Cooke’s How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad (1602) has been taken as evidence that Joshua Cooke had seen The Comedy of Errors in performance before 1602. The Council Register for 1604 shows that it was played at court when “On Inosents Night the Plaie of Erors” was performed before the king by the King’s Men, with an attribution to “Shaxberd”. However, the most decisive evidence consists in the reference to the The Comedy of Errors in the Gesta Grayorum (c.1595, published 1688), and there are notable correspondences between the two. This suggested to Dorsch that “the play was chosen, and the words of the Gesta devised, to complement each other.”

Whitworth reaches further, asserting that it was “purpose-written for the Christmas season, 1594”. As for attribution, Chambers believes that the First Folio (1623) version, the only one available to us, shows “the intervention of yet another hand” especially since the “episodes dealing with the history of Egeon and Æmilia (i.1 and parts of v.1) are written in a formal narrative style which contrasts with the more boisterous manner of the greater part of the play.” Foakes highlights Thomas Nashe’s “heart and good-will but never a ragge of money” from Four Letters Confuted (or Strange newes) with its correspondence to “Heart and goodwill you might, / But surely, master not a rag of money” in The Comedy of Errors (4.4.83–4) but rejects it as “possibly a common expression of the early 1590s.”

In §6.3, I apply RCP to The Comedy of Errors, which not only indicates the contrary (No.45, Table 6.1), but also brings more evidence to bear on the possible sources and contributors to the play. I conclude that the play was conceived with an Inns of Court audience in mind but that it was likely revised for a performance by the King’s Men at court in 1604.

The Gesta Grayorum reveals that at 9pm on the night of 28 December 1594, Innocents

558 “When didst thou see the starueling Schoole-maister? / That Rat, that shrimp, that Wren, that sheep-biter, that lean chittiface”. EEBO falsely attributes it to Thomas Heywood, A pleasant conceited comedie, wherein is shewed, how a man may chuse a good wife from a bad (London: 1602), STC: 5594, sig. E’.
560 Dasent et. al., Acts, op. cit., p.204.
561 For example, Whitworth, ed., Comedy of Errors, op. cit., pp.1–2.
562 Dorsch, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.33.
563 Whitworth, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.4.
Day, the invited ‘Ambassador’ of the Inner Temple and his retinue together with “a great Presence of Lords, ladies and worshipful Personages” took their places ready to enjoy the entertainment of the revels. However, the crowds were so great that “there was no convenient room for those that were actors” and “no Opportunity to effect that which was intended.” The Ambassador left disappointed. Nevertheless, after some dancing, “a Comedy of Errors (like to Plautus his Menechmus) was played by the Players” and because of these events the evening was thereafter referred to as the “Night of Errors”.

Although the Ambassador from the Inner Temple left disappointed he was not offended enough to avoid returning on 3 January when members of Gray's Inn performed a Masque of Amity:

> which was devised to that end, that those that were present might understand, that the unkindness which was growing betwixt the Templarians and us, by reason of the former Night of Errors [...] was now clean rooted out and forgotten, and that we now were more firm friends

Hotson argues that there was a contrived disorder to follow a theme of ‘conflict and reconciliation’ and Zurcher concurs, asserting that the errors were “scripted in order to make way for the elaborate restitutions that followed.” This included the mock trial of the sorcerer who was held to be responsible for the chaos, together with the Masque of Amity on 3 January for the benefit of the ‘offended’ Inner Temple guests. Whitworth, in his attempt to identify the sorcerer, claims that “some think it may have been Francis Bacon,” although he gives no sources.

The coincidence of terms between the account of the mock trial in the *Gesta* and *The Comedy of Errors* is striking with ‘conjuror’, ‘sorceror’, ‘witchcraft’, ‘juggling’, and ‘wretch’ being common to both. In fact, Ephesus where Shakespeare’s play is located had a reputation as “a place of magic” in the New Testament. Other correspondences with

---

566 **GES**, p.22.  
569 Three years later [1597–8] this identical program of disorder and lovers’ quarrel with the indignant departure of invited allies [Lincoln’s Inn] is reported from the Kingdom of Love at the Middle Temple under Richard, Prince d’Amour [Lord of Misrule elected over Christmas], see Rudyerd, *Le prince*, op. cit., pp.88–9.  
571 Whitworth, *Comedy of Errors*, op. cit., p.4.  
the *Gesta* include a reference in the play to an Abbess (5.1.49–54)\(^\text{573}\) and various euphemisms relating to prostitution and venereal disease such as ‘nuns’, ‘lamp’, and ‘burning’ (3.2.94–6, 4.3.51–2).\(^\text{574}\)

The evidence will now be discussed that supports the judgment that *The Comedy of Errors* was conceived for an Inns of Court audience.

**Point 1: Staging.**

The staging of the play is unique for a Shakespeare play, requiring three fixed locations at the back of the stage, which from left to right facing the stage are the Priory, the Courtesan’s house (the Porpentine), and the house of Antipholus. Medieval productions of Roman plays used an arcade setting, consisting of a screen with entrances into houses or *domus*, and the “traditional architectural screen of arches and curtains was still the type of background for academic productions in 1605 when Inigo Jones devised a scheme (following Vitruvius) of turning sections of it around for scene changes [at Christ’s Church College, Oxford].”\(^\text{575}\) More significantly, it was a common stage plan for an Inns of Court play.\(^\text{576}\) *Gorboduc*, produced at the Inner Temple in 1561, required two entrance ways and a throne; in 1566, *Jocasta* was played at Gray’s Inn with a central palace doorway flanked by two side doors; and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* at Gray’s Inn in 1588 had the houses of Mordred and Arthur, with a third entrance for the cloister of nuns.\(^\text{577}\) Bevington claims that “I have never seen a production of the *Comedy of Errors* without a stage door of some sort visible throughout. That is the way it would have been done on the ancient Roman stage.”\(^\text{578}\)

---

\(^{573}\) *GES*, p.12.


\(^{575}\) George R. Kernodle, *From Art to Theatre* (University of Chicago Press, 1944), p.164. The arcade façade was already being used in European street theatres in the fifteenth century and consisted of entrances in a background screen to compartments. It was a copied by fifteenth century theatre directors in Rome to accommodate the entrance ways to houses in their stagings of Terence, see pp.160–164.

\(^{576}\) For a reconstruction of the staging of a typical play in Gray’s Inn Hall during the 1594–5 revels see Margaret Knapp and Michal Kobialka, ‘Shakespeare and the Prince of Purpoole: The 1594 Production of *The Comedy of Errors* at Gray’s Inn Hall’ in Miola, *Comedy of Errors*, op. cit., pp.431–445.


\(^{578}\) David Bevington, ‘‘The Comedy of Errors’ as early Experimental Shakespeare’, *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 56, No. 3 (Spring, 2003), pp.13–25, in particular p.23.
Point 2: Translations.

*The Comedy of Errors* was based mainly on two plays, the *Menaechmus* and *Amphitruo*, by the third century Roman dramatist Plautus.\(^{579}\) The William Warner (1558–1609) translation of the *Menaechmi* was registered on 10 June 1594, and published in 1595. Thomas Creede, the printer, reveals the following about Warner in “The Printer to the Readers”:

> The writer hereof (louing Readers) hauing diuerse of this Poettes [Plautus] Comedies Englished, for the use and delight of his priuate friends, who in Plautus owne words are not able to understand them: I haue prevailed so far with him as to let this one go farther abroad, for a publicke recreation\(^{580}\)

So Warner kept various translations of works in manuscript copy, shared them with his friends, and this particular one went to publication. The printed version being too late, *The Comedy of Errors* might well have been composed following the acquisition of a manuscript copy from Warner, in fact, Chambers has noted similarities between the play and the Warner translation.\(^{581}\) Nevertheless, Foakes concludes that there is insufficient evidence to show that *The Comedy of Errors* borrowed from it.\(^{582}\) Although, there is no record of Warner being a member of Gray’s Inn,\(^{583}\) he is known to have served as an attorney in London.\(^{584}\)

As pointed out in §3.2, *The Comedy of Errors* is based on translations of classical works in line with previous Inns of Court plays such as the Senecan *Gorboduc*. Whitworth, realising that the law students would have been familiar with Plautus, suggests that “if Shakespeare was composing with such an audience particularly in mind […] the tight, classical structure

---

\(^{579}\) Forty years earlier, *Jack Juggler* (c.1555) had explored the theme of rogue trickery (coney-catching) in the form of an anonymous adaptation of *Amphitruo*, see Martine van Elk, "Urban Misidentification in ‘The Comedy of Errors’", *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 43, No. 2, Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring, 2003), pp.323–346, notably p.324. The play, which EEBO attributes to Titus Maccius Plautus, was entitled ‘A new enterlued for chyldren to playe, named Iacke Jugler both wytte, and very playsent’, see STC: 14837a.


\(^{582}\) Foakes, *Comedy of Errors, op. cit.*, p.xxii.

\(^{583}\) Foster, *Register, op. cit.*

\(^{584}\) There is an entry from 1609 in Thomas Hassall’s Parish Register of Amwell in Hertfordshire: “Mr. William Warner, a man of good teares and of honest reputation, by his profession an atturnye at the Common Plese, author of Albion’s England, who dijing suddanly in the night in his bedde without any former complaynt or sicksnesse on Thursday night, beeing the the 9\(^{th}\) daye of March” located at http://www.hertsmemories.org.uk/page_id__6058_path__0p4p235p.aspx, accessed online 20 January 2013.
as well as the Plautine plot material must have virtually suggested themselves."\textsuperscript{585} Since "the institutions of learning produced the classical drama, the private theaters the courtly drama, and the public theaters the sensational drama,"\textsuperscript{586} then in this respect, \textit{The Comedy of Errors} has the hallmarks of a play conceived for an academic audience.

\textbf{Point 3: References to the succession question.}

Section 3.3 has argued that \textit{Gorboduc, Gismond of Salerne}, and \textit{The Misfortunes of Arthur} all allude to the succession question. There is also a case for \textit{The Comedy of Errors} following this trend through its references to St Paul’s \textit{Epistle to the Ephesians} with its attendant notion of alienation. After Mary Queen of Scots had been executed in 1587, the Union of Scotland and England moved to the top of the political agenda. An obstacle to Mary’s son James becoming king was the matter of alien inheritance, Scotland being seen as foreign to England. However, there was the notion of the king’s two bodies, where the body politic was granted by God to the king as executor to serve the people. As Plowden pointed out "it can dispense with the impediment of foreign birth,"\textsuperscript{587} the objection that existed in common law to alien inheritance.

Although the \textit{Gesta Grayorum} states that the play performed on Innocents Day was “like to Plautus his Menechmus”\textsuperscript{588} Shakespeare does not place his characters in Plautus’s Epidamnus but instead sets them down in Ephesus.\textsuperscript{589} When St Luke attempted to convert the pagans in Ephesus to Christianity 1600 years earlier, he found ‘exorcists’, ‘curious arts’, and ‘confusion’.\textsuperscript{590} In \textit{The Comedy of Errors} when Antipholus of Syracuse arrives in Ephesus he reveals his expectation:

\begin{quote}
They say this town is full of cozenage,
As nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
Dark-working sorcerors that change the mind,
Soul-killing witches that deform the body,
Disguised cheaters, prating mountebanks,
And many suchlike libertines of sin. (1.2.97–102)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{585} Whitworth, \textit{Comedy of Errors}, op. cit., p.6.
\textsuperscript{587} Axton, ‘The Influence’, \textit{op. cit.}, p.212.
\textsuperscript{588} GES, p.22.
\textsuperscript{589} Although in Scene 1.1 Egeon mentions Epidamnus, now in Albania, and the setting of Plautus’s \textit{Menaechmi}.
Axton has suggested that “Shakespeare at the very beginning of his dramatic career, was revolving and questioning in a comic mode the paradox of the ruler’s two bodies.” In support of this, she cites a passage from St Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians which takes up the theme of alienation and the common law set out in ordinances, both of them to be rejected by identifying with the body of Christ:

12 That at that tyme ye were without Christe, beyng aliauntes from the common wealth of Israel and straungers from the testamentes of promise, hauyng no hope, and without God in this worlde.

13 But nowe in Christe Jesus, ye whiche sometyme stood were farre of[f], are made nye by the blood of Christe.

14 For he is our peace, which hath made both one: and hath broken downe the wall that was a stoppe betwene vs.

15 Taking away in his fleshe the hatred, (euen) the lawe of commaundementes, (conteynd) in ordinaunces, for to make of twayne one newe man in hym selfe, so makying peace,

16 And that he myght reconcile both vnto God in one body through (his) crosse, and slewe hatred thereby. (Bishops Bible, Ephes. II.12–16)

Whitworth points out that passages from these letters were read at Holy Communion from August to October 1594, and at Evening Prayer in late October that year, and being in the public consciousness the play might also have capitalized on their topicality.

In 1604, John Haywood’s Treatise of Vnion revealed a contemporary view of St Paul’s relation to the succession question:

It remaineth onely that wee consider, by what meanes these benefits [e.g. strengthened in foreign enterprise] may be best assured; that is by what meanes both nations [England and Scotland] may bee reduced to an inseparable imbracement. To this purpose we are to respect the two parts of perfect Vnion of diuerse states; The first is, by incorporating the people into one politicke body; the second, by knitting

---

591 Axton, The Queen’s, op. cit., p.81.
592 Kinney notes that “the central theme of the letter to the Ephesians, and one which Elizabethan preachers proclaimed with cogency and simplicity, is not only that of order but that of a reuniting” see Arthur F. Kinney, ‘Shakespeare’s Comedy of Errors and the Nature of Kinds’ in Miola, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.161.
594 Whitworth, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.224.
their minds in one contentment and desire: even according to that which Saint Paul saith: one body, and one spirit. Of these two parts of Vnion, the first may bee termed of law, and the second of loue;

Another aspect of the succession issue was homage. If it could be shown that there was a feudal bond between the Scottish and English monarchs then Scotland could not be seen as a foreign kingdom and the Scottish king would then have a claim to the English throne. This assumes that the ‘two bodies’ is redundant in neutralising the status of ‘alien’. The possible feudal bonds, examples of which might be found in the history of Anglo–Scottish relations, were as follows:

(a) Oath of Allegiance. If the Scottish king refers to the English monarch as his ‘liege lord’ and receives full protection from English law, then he is a subject of the English crown and not an alien. In return, Scotland is entitled to protection from England.

(b) Oath of homage. This applies to the whole of Scotland where English kings distributed land to the Scottish kings. The English monarch is addressed as his ‘superior lord’ and the Scottish king must refrain from opposing him. Again Scotland gains England’s protection.

(c) Limited homage. This case does not offer the protection against claims of alien status that (a) and (b) afford. The admission of superiority is avoided and the Scottish king merely claims to do homage to the English monarch in return for some minor pieces of land in England.

The reason that the issue of homage, an aspect of the succession question, is significant here is that at the 1594–5 revels, the last of the Articles of the Order of the Helmet reads:

All the Knights of this honourable Order, and the renowned Sovereign of the same, shall yield all Homage, Loyalty, unaffected Admiration, and all humble Service, of what Name or Condition soever, to the incomparable Empress of the Fortunate Island.

This might suggest by way of analogy that if King James of Scotland paid homage to the “Empress of the Fortunate Island” Queen Elizabeth, he could not be regarded as a foreigner and his claim to the throne would be justified.

595 A marginal note shows “Ephes.[ians] 4.”
598 GES, p.31.
In fact, reconciliation was a theme of these revels: the conflict on the Night of Errors between the Graians and Temparians is resolved by a Masque of Amity on 3 January; *The Comedy of Errors* was set in Ephesus where St Paul was trying to reconcile the Jews and Christians (Egeon is eventually pardoned in the play reflecting reconciliation between the Ephesians and the Syracusians); and there is a reference to homage in the Articles, a device that would have removed the obstacle of alienation. All this was set against a political background where closer amity with Scotland was being urged upon Queen Elizabeth, and with James having been raised as a member of the Protestant Church of Scotland, there seemed no reason to oppose him as the next natural blood line to the throne.

**Point 4: Contract law for the lawyers**

Several researchers have argued that in the dialogue involving the gold chain, an item that does not appear in the Plautine version, *The Comedy of Errors* provides a test case for the developing law of contract which consisted of the tension between the traditional action of debt and the then recently introduced action of *assumpsit*. This culminated in the settlement of the landmark *Slade’s case* in 1602. The theory is now presented in detail, to show that the complexity of the argument was more suitable for an audience of lawyers than the general public.

Modern contract law awards compensation for a breach of contract but medieval law focused entirely on enforcing a contract’s execution. The difficulties occurred when the litigant had no written agreement (deed) to furnish as proof. The Court of Common Pleas would allow an action of debt based on an oral agreement (parol undertaking) providing that the plaintiff could demonstrate *quid pro quo*, that is, the contract had been activated. An example of this was a down-payment or a supply of goods, for which the plaintiff might reasonably expect a return.

---


600 “[A contract once] denoted a transaction, such as a sale or a loan, which transferred property or generated a debt”, see J. H. Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History*, second edition (Butterworth & Co., 1979), p.263.


603 The defendant was permitted to exercise the right to present 11 assistants to ratify his oath (wager of law), a process that weighed against the plaintiff, for they were sometimes hired to secure a dishonest advantage.
To provide an alternative remedy in law, as early as 1510, the King’s Bench began to hear an action of *assumpsit*, a writ to settle debt claims proceeding from the plaintiff’s injury or loss (law of tort) resulting from his belief that the promise would be kept.\(^{604}\)

In 1530, the more conservative Court of Common Pleas refused to entertain an action on *assumpsit* unless a genuine ‘consideration’ was included, that is, a present or future concession by the plaintiff to the defendant that demonstrated an intent to act on the contract and for which a return might reasonably be expected.\(^{605}\) Without it the agreement was reduced to a ‘naked bargain’ (*nudum pactum*) and they frequently rejected the action.\(^{606}\) In 1585, the Exchequer Chamber was established to deal with disputes arising from *assumpsit* cases, and by 1596 these often resulted in a reversal of King’s Bench judgments. This culminated in the landmark *Slade v Morley* (1597–1602) case, where out of the conflict between the judges of the King’s Bench and Common Pleas, the details of modern contract law were refined.

Referring to incidents in *The Comedy of Errors* (3.1, 3.2), Zurcher concludes that “Angelo [the goldsmith] ought to have action of debt against Antipholus of Ephesus [who orders the chain, does not receive it since it is mistakenly given to his twin, so refuses to pay] (for the original contract)” but with the consideration of forbearance [Angelo delaying acceptance of payment from Antipholus of Syracuse] and his financial injury he would have “an *assumpsit* [in the King’s Bench court] against his brother [Antipholus of Syracuse who mistakenly receives the chain, is perplexed and offers payment, but Angelo delays collecting the debt].” Shakespeare’s play demonstrates the unreliability of the law of contract as it stood in 1594, showing that an action of debt and an action of *assumpsit* were not mutually exclusive but could be brought at the same time by the same party [Angelo] for the same issue. Zurcher remarks that Shakespeare “seems to jeer at the epistemological smugness of the doctrine of consideration.”\(^{607}\)

There is a difference of opinion as to what kind of audience would have been best placed to appreciate these issues. Zurcher believes that “Shakespeare’s awareness of debates over *assumpsit* would probably have gone down as well with termers on the public stage, as

\(^{604}\) For example, a carpenter who had neglected his undertaking to build a house might cause the plaintiff loss in having to rent temporary accommodation, or if the carpenter had built a roof that leaked, this might cause damage to the plaintiff’s furnishings.

\(^{605}\) For example, agreeing to delay the collection of a payment.

\(^{606}\) Apart from its departure from the traditional action of debt, the Court of Common Pleas also objected to the fact that, in *assumpsit* cases before the King’s Bench, the defendant had no prior knowledge of the case against them and no contract details were presented in court.

with lawyers in their hall.” However, Kreps and Raffield find a different emphasis, noting that these matters were especially meaningful to an audience of lawyers. While it is true that plays on the public stage often made use of legal terminology which an audience need not understand to follow the action, I think it is rather a different matter to expect a public audience to grasp a sub-plot that amounts to an exposition of legal theory. So I conclude that this issue was not intended for the public theatre and was aimed at legally trained ears such as those students of law who witnessed the 1594–5 revels.

6.3 Application of the RCP method to The Comedy of Errors

Application data

Date test completed: 14 December 2012

Search period: 1473–1690

No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period: 34,874

Presumed date of test document: 1594

No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date: 3,440

Definition of ‘rare’: <6 returns before date of test document

Grading system for a possible source: This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–5 returns.

Probability estimates for possible sources: If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; BB – ‘on the balance of probability’.

This study presents my results for RCP of The Comedy of Errors. I have selected the search period 1473–1690 to allow the inclusion of many plays that were first published after the writer’s death. These are displayed in chronological order to facilitate a count for before 1594 [<1594] the year of the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, to try to locate possible sources.

---

608 Ibid., p.35.
611 For example, in The Staple of Newes Ben Jonson’s Picklock speaks “In all the languages of Westminster-Hall, Fleas, Bench, or Chancery. Fee Farme, Fee-Tayle […]” in Ben Jonson, ‘The staple of newes’, Bartholmewe fayre, (London: 1631), STC: 14753.5, p.60.
The footnotes log all references before 1594 if there are less than six returns (following Table 4.1), all frequently occurring authors after 1594, comments on whether or not the return is too late for its author to be a contributor to the play, and also additional spelling variations that I have manually added to a search. The condition in square brackets in Column 4 is used as a filter on the returns.

Table 6.1: Collocation searches in The Comedy of Errors using EEBO from 1473–1690.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (line No.)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns ≤1690</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 procure my fall (1.1.1)</td>
<td>{procure my fall}</td>
<td>6 (2&lt;1594)$^{612}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 doome of death (2)</td>
<td>{doom of death}</td>
<td>49 (5&lt;1594)$^{613}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 rancorous outrage (6)</td>
<td>{rancorous outrage}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 rigorous statutes (9)</td>
<td>{rigorous statutes}</td>
<td>6 (1&lt;1594)$^{614}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 intestine iarres (11)</td>
<td>{intestine jars}</td>
<td>39 (1&lt;1594)$^{615}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 seditious Countrimen (12)</td>
<td>{seditious countrymen}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 solemn Synodes (13)</td>
<td>{solemn synods}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 aduerse townes (15)</td>
<td>{adverse towns}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 quit the penalty (22)</td>
<td>{quit the penalty}</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1594)$^{616}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 wrought by nature (34)</td>
<td>{wrought by nature}</td>
<td>21 (2&lt;1594)$^{617}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 vile offence (34)</td>
<td>{vile offence}</td>
<td>21 (4&lt;1594)$^{618}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 my factors death (41)</td>
<td>{factors death}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^{614}$ Holy Roman Empire, *[These ben the ordynau[n]ces]* (1532), STC: 18447.5.

$^{615}$ Robert Greene, *Planetomachia* (1585), STC: 12299; no significant writers use it afterwards.

$^{616}$ Thomas Heywood, *The English traveller* (1633), STC: 13315.


Robert Southwell, *Marie Magdalen’s funeral teares* (1591), STC: 22950 has “O heauen of my eclipsed sunne, receiue into thee this sillie starre, that hath nowe lost all wished light.” Later is “the Sunne brings to them wished light” John Norden, *Vicissitudo* (1600), STC: 18642; “the earely rising Sunne […] The humorous fogges depriue his wished light” Michael Drayton, *The barrons wars* (1603), STC: 7189.


The other 3 are after 1658.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>bruised with adversitie (34)</td>
<td>{bruised with adversity}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>voluble and sharpe discourse (93)</td>
<td>(1) {voluble and}</td>
<td>58 (3(5)&lt;1594)</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {and voluble}</td>
<td>[another adjective after ‘and’]</td>
<td>64 (2&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>gay vestments (95)</td>
<td>{gay vestments}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>He is the ground of my defeatures (98–99)</td>
<td>{defeature(s)}</td>
<td>84 (1&lt;1594)</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>make a common of my serious hours (2.2.29)</td>
<td>{make a common of}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>let foolish gnats make sport (30)</td>
<td>{foolish gnats}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>creepe in crannies (31)</td>
<td>{in crannies}</td>
<td>4 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>by fine and recoverie (74–5)</td>
<td>{fine and recovery}</td>
<td>55 (1&lt;1594)</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

628 The number of possible sources exceeds the limit for rarity but later is William Shakespeare, *The passionate pilgrime* (1599), STC: 22342; and Samuel Rowlands, *The bride* (1617), STC: 21365.5.
629 EEBO did not return *The Comedy of Errors* which has ‘bruised’.
632 Brian Melbancke, *Philotimus* (1583), STC: 17801 a “student at Graies Inne”, however, there is no Melbancke or Milbancke registered at Gray’s Inn nor was there a George Wastnes (or Wastneys) who wrote a commendatory preface, see Foster, *The Register, op. cit.*, p.550; Also William Shakespeare, *Venus and Adonis* (1593), STC: 22354, which means that Melbancke is the *only* possible source for Shakespeare. Later is Samuel Daniel, *Delia and Rosamond* (1594), STC: 6243.4; Edmund Spenser, *The faerie queene* (1596), STC: 23082; Thomas Dekker, *A strange horse-race* (1613), STC: 6528. In reference to the Spanish Armada, Sir Simonds d’Ewes reports on 4 February 1588–9 “because of his late defeature and loss” in *An Exact and perfect Journal of the Passages of the House of Commons*, accessed online at http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=43718 on 25 November 2012.
634 Giovanni Battista Manzini, *Manzinie his most exquisite academicall discourses* (1655), Wing: M558, who was born in 1599.
635 The full context is that gnats hide in crannies when the Sun is obscured “When the sunne shines, let foolish gnats make sport, / But creepe in crannies, when he hides his beames:”
636 Discussing “Visibles, and Audibles” Francis Bacon says “Both of them haue the whole Species in euery small Portion of the Aire, or medium; So as the Species doe passe through small Crippnes, without Confusion: As we see ordinarily in Leuels, as to the Eye; And in Crippnes, or Chinks, as to the Sound” in Francis Bacon, *Sylva syluarum* (1627), STC: 1168, p.68. Philemon Holland translated into English “These birds […] nourish their young ones in crannies and chinks of trees” in Pliny, *The historie of the world* (1634), STC: 20030.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I liue distain’d, thou vndishonoured</td>
<td>{undishonoured}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>the course and drift (164)</td>
<td>{course and drift}</td>
<td>6 (1&lt;1594)</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>put the finger in the eie and weep (207)</td>
<td>{finger in the eye}</td>
<td>135(3(15)&lt;1594)</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACT THREE**

**Scene 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>foul intrusion (3.1.4)</td>
<td>{foul intrusion}</td>
<td>2 (1&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>stirring passage (100)</td>
<td>{stirring passage}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scene 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>spring of love (3)</td>
<td>{spring of love}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Apparell vice like vertues harbenger: / Beare a fair presence, though your heart be tainted, / Teach sinne the carriage of a holy Saint (12–14)</td>
<td>(1) {da mihi fallere} [searches (2)–(5) are confined to 14 major writers, see footnote in Column 2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


642 Earliest record is “for it is a grete sprynge of loue vnto thyself” Walter Hilton, *Scala perfecc[io]nis* (1494), STC: 14042. In a piece written in 1592, Francis Bacon has “then is the season, the opportunity and the spring of love” in James Spedding, ‘The Praise of Love’, *A Conference of Pleasure* (London: 1870), p.10, l.12. However, there are 9 <1592 which exceeds the limit for rarity. It also appears in Desiderius Erasmus, *Paraphrase* (1549), STC: 2854.7; William Tyndale, *The whole works* (1573), STC: 24436; Martin Luther, *Special and chosen sermons* (1578), STC: 16993; Philip Sydney, *Arcadia* (1590), STC: 22539; Pierre de La Primauidey, *The second part of the French academie* (1594), STC: 15238, Robert Greene, *Alcida Greenes metamorphosis* (1617), STC: 12216, the composition of which must have preceded his death in September 1592. No other major dramatist used it.


644 This is due to the large number of returns that would otherwise have to be manually checked for context.
| 40 | sweet breath of flatterie (28) | {breath of flattery} | 5 (0<1594) |
| 41 | The folded meaning of your words deceive (36) | (1) {folded near.5 meaning} | 2(3) (0<1594) |
|   |                              | (2) {folding up}     |         |
|   |                              | (3) {fold(ed)(eth)(ing)  |         |
|   |                              | (ings)(s)}           |         |

**ACT FOUR**

*Scene 1*

645 Earliest is Michel de Montaigne, *Essays* (1613), STC: 18042; also translated as “Oh faire Lauerna, grant me that I may cosine and deceiue: but grant me withall that I may appeare to the world, a iust man, and an holy” in Thomas Heywood, *Gynaikeion* (1624), STC: 13326. Francis Bacon, has “Da mihi fallere da jus

646 No returns for George Chapman, Thomas Dekker, John Fletcher, Ben Jonson, Thomas Kyd, John Lyly, Christopher Marlowe, John Marston, Thomas Nashe, George Peele, and George Wilkins. The following produce a return but not in the correct context: “It [wine] is a sweete sinne” Thomas Heywood, *Philocothonista* (1635), STC: 13356; “[the drink Sack] I could winne a Vestal now, or tempt a saint to sin” Francis Beaumont, *A Preparative to studie, or, The vertue of sack* (1641), Wing: H1790; “almost entice a saint to sin” John Learned, *The rambling justice* (1678), Wing: L797, which is plagiarised from Thomas Middleton.

647 Same set of writers searched as in previous note. None of the following match the context: John Lyly, *Euphues* (1578), STC: 17051; Thomas Middleton, *The wisdome of Solomon* (1597), STC: 17906; Ben Jonson, *The workes* (1616), STC: 14752.

648 None of the 14 writers meet the context.

649 Thomas Heywood, *Gynaikeion* (1624), STC: 13326, & *The generall history of women* (1657), Wing: H1784. Thomas Heywood is not listed as a member of Gray’s Inn, see Foster, *Register*, op. cit., p.538.

650 “But they are worse that send messengers without an errand, that speake, and yet geld their speech of meaning, like a fouled sheete of paper without any inflouding” William Cornwallis, *Essayes* (1600–01), STC: 5775. The other is Shakespeare already noted. A William Cornwallis was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1722, far too late, see Foster, *Register*, op. cit., p.520.

651 “for folding up all that Hooker sayes […] and shrinks up his meaning” William Laud, *A relation* (1639), STC: 15298; & 1673, Wing: L594. A William Laud was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1615, Foster, *Register*, op. cit., p.545. Also “conducing as well to the folding vp, and keeping of things vnder a veil” as well as “And the second (out of the foulds of Poeticall fables) laies open those deep Philosophcall mysteries” in Francis Bacon, *Wisdom of the Ancients* (1619), STC: 1130, trans. into English from Latin by Sir Arthur Gorges Knight, which being done in Bacon’s lifetime he presumebly checked.

652 There is “in riddles fold the vices / Of your best friends” Thomas Dekker, *Satiro-mastix* (1602), STC: 6521; “And this [verse] that to an other dame wood seeme / Perplex and fouled in a rudelesse vaile” George Chapman, *Sir Gyles Goosecappe Knight* (1606), STC: 12050.
| Scene 2 | Time is a verie bankerout (57) | {time near.5 bankrupt} | 3 (40) (0<1594) | [time is bankrupt] |
| Scene 4 | not a ragge of monie (4.4.87) | {rag of money} | 40 (2<1594) | |
| Scene 4 | pale and deadly lookes (94) | {pale and deadly} | 19 (3(6)<1594) | [with noun] |
| Scene 4 | locke me forth (96) | {lock fby.2 forth} | 4 (0<1594) | |
| Scene 4 | loathesome abject scorn (104) | {abject scorn} | 5 (1<1594) | |
| Scene 4 | plucke out these false eyes (105) | {false eyes} | 32 (1<1594) | |
| Scene 5 | outage and displeasure (117) | {outrage “and” displeasure} | 3 (2<1594) | |

ACT FIVE

Scene 1

| 42 | present satisfaction (4.1.5) | {present satisfaction} | 182 (1<1594) | |

---

653 Richard Cosin, *An apologie* (1593), STC: 5821, intended for civil lawyers. William Cornwallis, *Essayes* (1600–01), STC: 5775 is the only other publication that precedes an occurrence in Francis Bacon’s ‘Valerius Terminus’ (1603), see *SEH*, Vol. 6, p.40, and British Library, Harley 6462. Also Francis Bacon, *The two bookes* (1605), STC: 1164, which is fourth when chronologically listed in EEBO. In a search confined to 14 leading writers the only returns are for Thomas Heywood, *Gynaiekon* (1624), STC: 13326, & *The generall history of women* (1657), Wing: H1784.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>reuerent reputation (5.1.5)</td>
<td>{reverent reputation}</td>
<td>4 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>comfortlesse dispaire (80)</td>
<td>{comfortless despair}</td>
<td>8 (3&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>a huge infectious troope / Of pale distemperatures (81–2)</td>
<td>{pale near.5 distemperatures}</td>
<td>4 (1&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>In food, in sport, and life-preserving rest / To be disturb’d, would mad or man, or beast: (84–6)</td>
<td>(1) {exercise near.6 sleep} (2) {sport near.6 sleep} (3) {exercise near.6 rest} (4) {sport near.6 rest}</td>
<td>137 (2(21)&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>branch and parcel of (106)</td>
<td>{branch “and” parcel}</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>place of depth (121)</td>
<td>{place of depth}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>irefull passion (151)</td>
<td>{ireful passion}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>strength and height of (200)</td>
<td>{strength “and” height of}</td>
<td>13 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>greeuous fault (206)</td>
<td>{grievous fault}</td>
<td>42 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>looke on day (210)</td>
<td>{look on day}</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>headie rash prouoak’d (216)</td>
<td>{heady rash}</td>
<td>24 (1(2)&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>A liuing dead man (241)</td>
<td>{living dead}</td>
<td>67 (0(3)&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>time’s deformed hand (298)</td>
<td>{hand of time}</td>
<td>39 (0&lt;1594)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


662 “some of them beeing more pale through distemperature” W. Averell, *A meruailous combat* (1588), STC: 981. Slightly earlier than *The Comedy of Errors* is “discerne the distemperature of their pale clients” Thomas Nashe, *The terrors of the night* (1594), STC: 18379.

663 “Meate, slepe, al manner of exercise, and al the hole gouernance of the body, must be vsed for the helth therof, and muste not be set vppon pleasure, and delycacye” Juan Luis Vives, *An introduction to wysedome* (1544), STC: 24848, & (1550), STC: 24849; “let the partie vse moderate exercise, temperate sleepe, a quiet minde, meates of good iuyce” Johann Jacob Wecker, *A compendious chyrurgerie* (1585), STC: 25185. “To be free minded, and chearefully disposed at howers of meate, and of sleepe, and of exercise, is the best precept of long lasting” in ‘Of Regiment of Health’ Francis Bacon, *Essayes* (1597), STC: 1137, p.9. Others are either not relevant or under 18 in 1594.

664 Plutarch, *The philosophie* (1603), STC: 20061.

665 “I shame to looke on day” Thomas Heywood, *Pleasant dialogues* (1637), STC: 13358, whose source is Apollo and Daphne in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

666 “heady rash judgementes” George Joyce, *A contrarye* (1549), STC: 14822. Later is “heady rash boldnesse” Richard Greenham, *The workes* (1612), STC: 12318 who seems to have died in 1594.

667 Later is “What is a rich man, but a liuing dead man?” Thomas Lodge, *The diuel coniured* (1596), STC: 16655; “my loue is liuing dead” Nicholas Breton, *The passions* (1599), STC: 3682.5; “I finde my selfe but liuing dead” Nicholas Breton, *Melancholike humours* (1600), STC: 3666; “Here lies two liuing dead” Thomas Heywood, *The first and seconde partes of King Edward the Fourth* (1600), STC: 13342; “this yet liuing dead” Michael Drayton, *The Muses Elizium* (1630), STC: 7210.

Possible sources

I grade the collocations A or B according to the number of records returned before 1594, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

A: Only 1 record, B: From 2–5 records

Since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears for two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

AA or AB: Beyond reasonable doubt

BB: Balance of probability

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1594) I give the collocation number from Table 6.1 followed by its grade.


669 “vertuously accepting all her defeatures” Tobie Matthew, *A missive* (1647), Wing: M1322, see also collocation No. 28.

670 The earliest of these, and the only other dramatist, is “and for all, / Our night of life besides, our Miseries craues, / darke earth would ope and hid vs in our graues” George Chapman, *The conspiracie* (1608), STC: 4968.

**Probable sources**

Beyond reasonable doubt: Briane Melbancke *Philotimus*, and Edmund Spenser *The faerie qveene*. Briane Melbancke is given on the title page of *Philotimus* as a student at Gray’s Inn but there is no record of anyone with this name being admitted.671

On the balance of probability: Barnabe Rich *The adventures of Brusanus*.

**Summary of evidence**

Table 6.2 gives a summary of the data, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii).

*Table 6.2 Rare collocation matches from The Comedy of Errors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Dekker</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Middleton</th>
<th>Nashe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18(40)</td>
<td>24(49)</td>
<td>24(34)</td>
<td>8(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

671 See Foster, *Register, op. cit.*
EEBO attributes 40 distinct works solely to Dekker but many are thought to be collaborations. I have only managed to verify that 18 of them are entirely his. So collocation Nos 35, 48, and 49 are not Dekker’s beyond doubt. A total of 49 texts are given by EEBO to Thomas Heywood but I have only managed to verify that 24 are his. No. 60 is Ovid’s ‘Apollo and Diana’ under Heywood’s name. I have verified 24 of Thomas Middleton’s 34 as being entirely his own work so this renders Nos 26 and 63 doubtful. Only 8 of the 17 texts attributed by EEBO to Thomas Nashe seem to me to be reliable but none of his matches are in doubt as a result.

I now summarise the results in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 by adding a further table for each frequently occurring writer in which I estimate the rarity of usage of a collocation at the later date it was employed.

---

672 This is not Heywood’s but is ‘Apollo and Daphne’ from Ovid.
Thomas Heywood

Table 6.3 Heywood’s RCP for The Comedy of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1&lt;1633</td>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>0&lt;1607</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>3&lt;1607</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>2&lt;1690</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>○ ○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>16&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>28&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>4&lt;1636</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>4&lt;1632</td>
<td>&lt;14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3&lt;1600</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>15&lt;1632</td>
<td>&lt;14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thomas Heywood has returns for 10 collocations but only 7 were rare when he used them. They all follow the 1594 date of The Comedy of Errors which, if there was no later version, would suggest that he borrowed heavily from it. Some of his matches are strong such as No. 9 “quit the penalty” which has no returns before the play and only 1 before his use in 1633. He is the only known dramatist after the play to use No. 18 “Ile limit thee” as well as No. 42 “present satisfaction”, although the latter was not rare when he employed it. However, he is preceded by other dramatists in his use of No. 19 “doomed to die”, No. 43 “stigmaticall”, No. 45 “not a ragge of monie”, No. 48 “loathesome abject scorn”, and No. 63 “time’s deformed hand”.

Francis Bacon

Table 6.4 Bacon’s RCP for The Comedy of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>9&lt;1619</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>3&lt;1620</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>1&lt;1627</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>□○</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1&lt;1598</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>6&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>2&lt;1603</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>3&lt;1597</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bacon has 9 different matches and 2 are from apparently supervised Latin translations into English of his *The wisedome of the ancients* (1619), see text preceding Table 5.1.

No. 19 “doomed to” appears in Bacon’s *The wisedome of the ancients* (1619) as “doomed to perpetuall imprisonment”. There are only two occurrences in the searchable database prior to 1594.

The more complex construction, “hauing so good a meane” (No. 20), has only 1 return before 1594, and only 6 before 1690, and appears in a letter dated 1623 from Bacon to the Earl of Bristol, Ambassador in Spain, as “and where I have so good a mean as Mr. Matthew”.

The association ‘voluble and’ or ‘and voluble’ (No. 26) has 5 returns before 1594 and can be found in Bacon’s private wastebook *Promus* (1592–4) as ‘No wise speech though easy and voluble’.

No. 31 “in crannies” has no returns before 1594, and only 1 before Bacon’s employment in *Sylva syluarum* (1627).

Bacon has two uses of No. 32 “fine and recoverie”, the earliest being from ‘An account of the lately erected service, called, the Office of Compositions for Alienations’ in 1598. This is its third use in the searchable database after Valentine Leigh, *The most profitable* (1577) and *The Comedy of Errors*.

There is also No. 39 “Apparell vice like vertues harbenger: / Beare a fair presence, though your heart be tainted, / Teach sinne the carriage of a holy Saint” which Bacon imitates in Latin from Horace’s *Epistles* “Da mihi fallere da justume sanctumque viderj [grant me to escape detection; grant me to pass as just and upright]” in his private wastebook the *Promus* (1592–4) before the date of *The Comedy of Errors*.673

The use of ‘folded’ to describe an obscure meaning (No. 41) has no returns before 1594, and only 6 before 1670, but Bacon uses it twice in *The wisedome of the ancients* (1619) as “conducing as well to the folding vp, and keeping of things vnder a veil” together with “And the second (out of the foulds of Poeticall fables) laies open those deep Philosophicall mysteries”.

Apart from the play, the phrase No. 42 “present satisfaction” has only two occurrences before Bacon’s use both in ‘Valerius Terminus’ (1603) and *The Advancement of Learning* (1605). These are in Richard Cosin, *An apologie* (1593) and *The Comedy of Errors*.

The sense of the complex construction of No. 54 “In food, in sport, and life-preseruing rest / To be disturb’d, would mad or man, or beast” is only expressed by two authors before Bacon’s “To be free minded, and chearefully disposed at howers of meate, and of sleepe, and of exercise, is the best precept of long lasting” in his *Essayes* (1597).

---

Thomas Nashe

Table 6.5 Nashe’s RCP for The Comedy of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Nashe</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>4&lt;1596</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of Nashe’s matches follows and three precede The Comedy of Errors. The locution No. 35 “put the finger in the eie and weep” is matched by Nashe’s “and then he puts his finger in his eie, and cries” in Pierce Penilesse (1592). There are only three examples before the Errors, one is his, and he was the first known dramatist to use it. For No. 43, the word “stigmaticall” was used in Robert Greene’s Menaphon (1589) before Nashe’s Haue with you to Saffron-walden (1596), and No. 45 “not a ragge of monie” was preceded by Thomas Lodge’s Euphues shadow (1592) before Thomas Nashe’s use in The apologie of Pierce penilesse (1592). However, for No. 53 “a huge infectious troope / Of pale distemperatures”, Nashe precedes The Comedy of Errors with the earliest known match “discerne the distemperature of their pale clients” in The terrors of the night (1594). If Nashe contributed to a later version of the play he must have done so before the King’s Men performed it in 1604 and before his death around 1601.

---

676 Dasent, et.al., Acts, op. cit., p.204.
### Table 6.6 Dekker’s RCP for The Comedy of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Dekker</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>25&lt;1613</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>0&lt;1608</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>6&lt;1670</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>16&lt;1613</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dekker has only 2 verified rare matches because for Nos 35, 48, and 49, he has either uncertain or shared attribution (*The bachelor’s banquet*, *North-ward hoe*, *The famous historie of Sir Thomas Wyat*).

### Thomas Middleton

### Table 6.7 Middleton’s RCP for The Comedy of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Middleton</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middleton has 3 verified rare matches because the returns for Nos 26 and 63 are either uncertain or shared attribution (*The famelie of loue*).

**Conclusions**

As far as the acting of *The Comedy of Errors* is concerned, it was presented at the 1594–5 revels at a time when academic institutions were rejecting professional companies, there is no known precedent for Gray’s Inn hiring a professional company, there is no payment to any such company in the Pension Book or Ledger Book at a time when rewards to outsiders were being recorded, and the Pipe Office document clearly shows that the Lord Chamberlain’s Men were not at Gray’s Inn when the play was enacted there.

As far as the writing of the play is concerned, it follows the Inns of Court tradition of sourcing classical translations and commenting on the succession question, and it seems to allude to the theory of contract law which was far more appropriate for an Inns of Court audience than the public stage. Apart from Arthur Brooke, whose special admittance for the 1561–2 Inner Temple revels was recorded, there is no known precedent for a non-member of the Inns of Court contributing to the writing of revels. If Shakespeare had written for the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, then it is reasonable to expect him to have been one of those who was granted special admittance, but he was not. Even as late as 1600, Ben Jonson seems to have tried and failed to get *Every Man Out of His Humour* accepted by a Bencher for performance. Shakespeare who was still relatively unknown in 1594 would have had even less chance. More importantly, the *Gesta Grayorum* specifically states that the proceedings “were rather to be performed by witty Inventions, than chargeable Expences” and this is supported by the absence of a payment to any writer either in the Gray’s Inn Pension Book or Ledger Book, again at a time when payments to outsiders were being recorded. As shown earlier (see the Conclusions at the end of §5.3), as well as Francis Bacon, two other writers are known to have contributed to the revels and they were also from Gray’s Inn. These were Thomas Campion with ‘A Hymn in Praise of Neptune’ and Francis Davison who wrote ‘Sonnet III’ and perhaps also the ‘Masque of Proteus’. Although these pieces were all performed at the royal court at Shrovetide they

677 *GES*, p.2.
were still considered to be part of the revels. This suggests that only Gray’s Inn writers were contributing to these festivities.

For all of these reasons, it seems unlikely that Shakespeare played any part in these proceedings, either in the acting or the writing. Considering precedent, *The Comedy of Errors* could not have been accepted for performance by Gray’s Inn if a non-member such as Shakespeare had offered it to them. So the evidence strongly points to Inns of Court performers and writers.

The RCP analysis lends additional information to the case. Thomas Heywood’s first known play was “hawodes bocke” from October 1596 for the Admiral’s Men as recorded in Henslowe’s diary that might account for why none of his RCP matches predate The Comedy of Errors. I have not found that he was a member of the Inns of Court so like Shakespeare he is unlikely to have been a contributor in 1594. However, with 7 rare matches he is a strong candidate for having contributed to a later revision of the play once it reached the public domain. For Thomas Nashe, his 4 correspondences are mainly in favour of his work being a source, whereas the 3 matches each for Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton do not suggest a contribution.

RCP also shows that Francis Bacon, who was a member of Gray’s Inn, has 6 matches with the play, with an additional 3 arising from admissible Latin to English translations. Seven follow the date of the play and 2 precede it. Given his role as compiler of the *Gesta Grayorum* and main author of the entertainments, I would suggest that he also made a contribution to the writing of *The Comedy of Errors*. RCP does not identify any other Inns of Court contributors to the play so either they are not represented in the EEBO database or there were no others. Whether or not the play was revised for the revels from an existing original cannot be ascertained either, but if it underwent revision after the revels then the most likely candidate is Thomas Heywood, who I conjecture was employed by the Lord Chamberlain’s Men to revise it for their 1604 production at court.

As far as Shakespeare is concerned, one is reminded of Edward Ravenscroft who in 1687 published his revised version of *Titus Andronicus* which had just played at London’s leading venue, the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane. In his ‘Preface to the Reader’ he presents the following remark about Shakespeare:

---

I have been told by some anciently conversant with the Stage, that it was not originally his, but brought by a private Author to be Acted, and he only gave some Master-touches to one or two of the Principal parts or Characters. It is a possible scenario for *The Comedy of Errors* but without letters or prose works by Shakespeare for comparison, RCP is unable to cast any light on the extent to which he had a hand in a later revision of the play after the Lord Chamberlain’s Men took possession of it.

So the evidence appears to support the conclusion that *The Comedy of Errors* was performed by Inns of Court players at the revels, that it bears the mark of the Inns of Court writing tradition, that it was at least revised by Francis Bacon for the proceedings, and that there was a later revision by Thomas Heywood.

### 6.4 Love's Labour's Lost

Previous commentators have noted (see below) that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* exhibits parallels with the *Gesta Grayorum*. In this section, I shall add a new one and assess the rarity of all these correspondences using RCP. The possibility is explored that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* was intended for performance at the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels but was cancelled due to objections by the Ancients.

The accurate determination of limits for *Love’s Labour’s Lost*’s date of conception has proved to be problematic. The [Privy] Council Register for 1604 records “A Play of Loues Labours Lost” being performed before the king at Court by the King’s Men “Betwin Newers Day and Twelfe Day” with “Shaxberd” being credited as the originator. The first quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is dated 1598, with no entry in the Stationers Register, and bears the title-page hook line “As it was presented before her Highness this last Christmas”. Since the Elizabethan New Year began on 25 March, then 1598 could mean any time from 25 March 1598 to 24 March 1599 so the “last Christmas” could have been either the 1597–8 or the 1598–9 season. To complicate matters, the title page also declares that it was “Newly corrected and augmented” which invites discussion about sales propaganda and the existence of an earlier version. There is Robert Toft's unhappy recollection of attending a performance as recorded in his sonnet sequence *Alba: The Month's Mind of a Melancholy Lover* “Love's Labour's Lost, I once did see a play, /

---

Yclepéd, so, so called to my pain which suggests that he saw it sometime before the end of 1598. On this evidence alone, 1598 would be a reasonable terminus ad quem.

Love’s Labour’s Lost was not the only production to refer to the French court of Navarre in the 1590s. Christopher Marlowe’s Massacre at Paris (1593) also made use of this location as well as adopting a character called Dumaine, and might well have provided the inspiration. There is no doubt that the choice of characters was taken from the religious wars involving the Protestant Henri Bourbon, King of Navarre, and members of the Catholic League. In July 1593, after being installed as Henry IV, Henri Bourbon adopted the Catholic faith to dissolve opposition. Queen Elizabeth was unimpressed and their relationship suffered until an assassination attempt was made on Henri towards the end of 1594. The Queen’s disposition towards Henri Bourbon would certainly have influenced the Privy Council’s assessment of whether or not Love’s Labour’s Lost was suitable for production, and after the end of 1594 it would once again have become feasible. The reference in The Comedy of Errors to the French wars has already been noted, so this means that both The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost contain allusions to Henri of Navarre.

The controversy in print between Thomas Nashe and Gabriel Harvey, especially Gabriel Harvey's Pierce's Supererogation (1593), appears to have inspired several lines in Love’s Labour’s Lost. In fact, Hart has uncovered several points of connection between the controversy and lines in the play. David saw this quarrel as “a solid foundation, the first

---

683 “Yclepéd” means “named”; Love’s Labour’s Lost has “Judas I am, yclipéd Maccabeus” (5.2.591).
684 Robert Toft, Alba The months minde of a melancholy louver (1598), STC: 24096, p.105.
685 Other supposed allusions include those to George Chapman's The Blind Beggar of Alexandria (1596) and An Humourous Day's Mirth (1597), see Woodhuysen, Love’s Labour’s Lost, op. cit., pp.75–6. In Robert Wilson's The Cobbler's Prophecy, which was registered on 8 June 1594 but could well have been written at least six years earlier, the god Mercury visits Ralph the Cobbler, and it has been suggested that this was the inspiration for the closing line “The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of Apollo” (5.2.918–9). There is also Francis Meres's mention of LLL in his Palladis tamia (1598), STC: 17834, and the 1592–3 visitation of the plague is perhaps referenced with “Lord have mercy on us” (5.2.419).
687 Whitworth, Comedy of Errors, op. cit., p.133n.
689 Hart, Love's Labour's Lost, op. cit., pp.xiv–xv. For example, in Gabriel Harvey, Pierce's Supererogation or A new prayse of the old asse (1593), STC: 12903, p.33, Harvey labels Thomas Nashe “a young man of the greenest spring, as beardless in judgement as in face, and as Pennil esse in wit as in purse” with the suggestion to Nashe that his next title should be “Pennyworth of Discretion”. In Love’s Labour’s Lost, Costard the clown calls the page-boy Moth “thou halfpenny purse of wit, thou pigeon-egg of discretion” (5.1.68). See also Willem Schrickx, Shakespeare’s
to be offered to theory builders”690 while Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson691 were confident that when Armado addresses Moth as “my tender juvenal” (1.2.8), the allusion is to Thomas Nashe, the pamphleteer whom Francis Meres later referred to as “gallant young Juvenal” in his Wits Treasurie (1598). In the following, I analyse the First Folio edition of Love’s Labour’s Lost. Apart from spelling variations, it is identical to the 1598 quarto apart from the fact that the First Folio version has approximately 2,900 extra words. Those rare collocations that appear in the First Folio but not in the quarto are flagged in Table 6.9 with the collocation number given in a larger bold typeface. There are a few lines in the quarto that do not appear in the First Folio but no rare collocations occur for these.

6.5 Application of the RCP method to Love’s Labour’s Lost

Application data

Date test completed: 9 May 2013

Search period: 1473–1690

No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period: 34,874

Presumed date of test document: 1594

No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date: 3,440

Definition of ‘rare’: <6 returns before date of test document

Grading system for a possible source: This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–5 returns.

Probability estimates for possible sources: If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; BB – ‘on the balance of probability’.

Table 6.8. Collocation searches in Love’s Labour’s Lost using EEBO 1473–1690

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (line No.)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns ≤1690</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Let fame, that all hunt after</th>
<th>{fame near.5 “hunt after”}</th>
<th>17 (2&lt;1594)$^692$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>brazen Tombes</td>
<td>{brazen tomb(s)}</td>
<td>10 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>make us heyses of all eternitie</td>
<td>{heir(s) fby.3 eternity}</td>
<td>22 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nauar shall be the wonder of the world</td>
<td>{wonder of the world}</td>
<td>(2(42)&lt;1594)$^693$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Still and contemplatiue in liuing Art</td>
<td>{living art}</td>
<td>20 (3&lt;1594)$^694$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The mind shall banquet</td>
<td>{mind near.5 banquet}</td>
<td>6(19) 6(23)&lt;1594$^695$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>though the body pine</td>
<td>{body pine(s)}</td>
<td>36 (1&lt;1594)$^696$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>grosser manner</td>
<td>{grosser manner}</td>
<td>11 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>strict obseruances</td>
<td>{strict observances}</td>
<td>17 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>O, these barren taskes, too hard to keepe, / Not to see Ladies, study, fast, not sleepe</td>
<td>{tasks near.20 ladies}</td>
<td>3(4) (0&lt;1594)$^697$ [deprivation of pleasure]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Your oath is past</td>
<td>{oath is past}</td>
<td>12 (0&lt;1594)$^698$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^693$ The queen’s ability to produce contentment in her subjects is seen as a “wonder of the world” in John Lyly, *Pappe with a hatchet* (1589), STC: 17463. Solomon “sawe more, he did know more, and coulde tell more then all they. He was indeed the wonder of the world.” in George Gifford, *Eight sermons* (1589), STC: 11853. Queen Elizabeth is again a “wonder of the worlde” in virtue of being a “peereles Queene” in George Peele, *A farewell* (1589), STC: 19537; and a “famous woonder of the worlde” for no particular reason in Leonard Wright, *The hunting of Antichrist* (1589), STC: 26031. “When Salomon, the myrror of wisedome, the wonder of the world” in Henry Smith, *A preparatiue to mariage* (1591), STC: 22685 which is exactly repeated in his *The sermons* (1593), STC: 22719. This phrase appears in Francis Bacon’s Second Counsellor’s speech in the *Gesta Grayorum*.


$^697$ Two of the three returns are Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. The third is “Nothing but Tasks, nothing but Working-days? No Feasting, no Musick, no Dancing, no Triumphs, no Comedies, no Love, no Ladies?” *Gesta Grayorum* (1688), STC: C444; this is from Francis Bacon’s sixth Counsellor’s speech. Later in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* ‘ladies’ changes to ‘women’ with “To fast, to study, and to see no woman”.

$^698$ The earliest is “My oath is past” in Hadrian Dorrell, *Willobie his Auisa* (1594), STC: 25755.
12  Small haue continuall plodders euer wonne, / Saue base authoritie from others Bookes
   \{plodders\}  10 (0(1)<1594)\textsuperscript{699} [unimaginative writers]

13  Stands in attainder  \{in attainder\}  7(8) (0<1594) [in English]

14  the musicke of his owne vaine tongue  \{vaine tongue\}  7 (0<1594)\textsuperscript{700}

15  vmpire of their mutine  \{umpire of\}  110 (0<1594) [of an act]

16  childe of fancie  \{child of fancy\}  13 (0<1594)

17  blacke oppressing humour  \{oppressing humour\}  5 (0<1594)

18  wholesome Physicke  \{wholesome physic\}  94 (2<1594)\textsuperscript{701}

19  dutie prickes me on  \{pricks me on\}  12 (3<1594)\textsuperscript{702}

20  the meed of punishment  \{the meed of\}  30 (5<1594)\textsuperscript{703}

21  a man of good repute, carriage, bearing, & estimation
   (1) \{repute near.5 estimation\}  17 (0<1594)\textsuperscript{704}
   (2) \{carriage near.5 estimation\}  12 (0<1594)\textsuperscript{705}
   (3) \{carriage near.5 bearing\}  23 (0<1594)\textsuperscript{706} [qualities of a person]

---

\textsuperscript{699} Lyly does not quite satisfy the context with “wee silly soules are onley plodders at Ergo, whose wittes are claspt vppe with our bookes, & so full of learning are we at home, that we scarce know good manners when wee come abroad” John Lyly, Sapho and Phao (1584), STC: 17086. However, there is “Grosse plodders they were all, that had some learning and reading, but no wit to make use of it. […] A most vaine thing it is in many universities at this daye, that they count him excellent eloquent, who stealeth not whole phrases but whole pages out of Tully.” in Thomas Nashe, The unfortunate traveller (1594), STC: 18380.

\textsuperscript{700} In the context of music there is “Bee dumbe vaine tongue” in John Dowland, The second booke of songs or ayres (1600), STC: 7095.

\textsuperscript{701} John Northbrooke, Spiritus est vicarius Christi in terra (1577), STC: 18670; John Merbecke, A booke of notes (1581), STC: 17299.

\textsuperscript{702} “hope prickes me on” Henry Chillester, Youthes witte (1581), STC: 5137.5; “and forth it prickes me on” Homer, Ten bookes of Homers Iliades (1581), STC: 13630; George Turberville, Tragical tales (1587), STC: 24330. Later is “honor prickes me on” in William Shakespeare, The history of Henrie the Fourth (1598), STC: 22280, and “My dutie prickes me on” in ‘The Two Gentlemen of Verona’ in William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies (1623), STC: 22273.


\textsuperscript{704} Later is “the Athenians were of like repute & estimation” in Thomas Nash, Quaternio (1633), STC: 18382. It is uncertain whether or not this was the dramatist.

\textsuperscript{705} Later is “A gentleman of your sorts, parts, carriage, and estimation” in Ben Jonson ‘Every Man In His Humour’, The workes (1616), STC: 14752.

\textsuperscript{706} Later is “But howsoever succeeded, by a moderate Carriage and bearing the Person of a Common-friend” in Francis Bacon, The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh (1629), STC: 1161 which Bacon finished in October 1621. Here Bacon uses ‘bearing’ in the sense of ‘acting the part of’ not ‘carrying’.
22 welcome the sowre cup of prosperitie
  (1) {sour near.3 cup}  (2) {bitter(ness) near.3 cup}  7 (0(2)<1594)  720 (57<1594)

Scene 2

23 the varnish of a compleat man  {the varnish of}  68 (0<1594)
24 the dancing horse will tell you  {the dancing horse}  5 (0<1594)
25 reprobate thought  {reprobate thought}  4 (0<1594)
26 a light wench  {light wench}  11 (0<1594)
27 the merry dayes of desolation  {days of desolation}  13 (1<1594)
28 The first and second cause will not serue my turne: the Passedo hee respects not, the Duello he regards not  {first “and” second cause}  10 (1<1594)

ACT TWO

Scene 1

29 personal conference  {personal conference}  79 (1<1594)
30 A man of sovereign parts  {sovereign parts}  4 (1<1594)  [parts of a man]
31 sweet and voluble  {sweet “and” voluble}  3 (0<1594)

ACT THREE

Scene 1

---

707 Holinshed is not using a metaphor “by drinking of a soure cuppe, hee lost the best joint of his bodie” in Raphael Holinshed, The firste [laste] volume of the chronicles of England (1577), STC: 13568b & The Second volume, STC: 13569. Later is “death is a sowre cup” in William Jones, A commentary upon the Epistles of Saint Paul (1635), STC: 14739.5.

708 “this bitter Cup of death” in Francis Bacon, A true historical relation of the poysoning of Sir Thomas Overbury (1651), Wing: T2487. However, it is too commonplace.

709 There is “the varnish of your persons” in Francis Beaumont, Wit withovt money a comedie (1661), Wing: B1617; and “Flattery is the varnish of vice” in Francis Bacon’s “De Augmentis Scientiarum’, Sixth Book in The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon, Vol. 7, trans. Peter Shaw from Latin into English (London: 1733), p.167.

710 Thomas Dekker has the first use after Shakespeare in The Owles almanacke (1618), STC: 6515.5.

711 This is used twice in The Comedy of Errors (4.1). Later is Thomas Heywood, The second part of, If you know not me (1606), STC: 13336; Thomas Dekker [and George Wilkins], lests to make you merie (1607), STC: 6541; Edward Sharpham, The fleire (1607), STC: 22384.

712 “the approchyng dayes of desolation” in Edward Hake, A joyfull continuance of the commemoration of the most prosperous and peaceable reigne of our gratious and deare soueraigne lady Elizabeth (1578), STC: 12605.5.

713 Marcello Palingenio Stellato, The zodiacke of life (1565), STC: 19150. It also appears in Romeo and Juliet, discussing Tybalt “a Duellist a Duellist, a gentleman of the very first house of the first and second cause, ahe the immortal Passado” and “Mercutio was slaine for the first and second cause”.

714 Gabriel Harvey, A new letter of notable contents (1593), STC: 12902.

715 “soueraigne partes of the bodie” Richard Mulcaster, Positions wherein those primitiue circumstances (1581), STC: 18253.

716 Later is Nathaniel Baxter, Sir Philip Sydney’s ourania (1606), STC: 1598.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>giue enlargement to the swaine</td>
<td>{give enlargement to}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>the shop of your eies</td>
<td>{shop of your}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>men of note</td>
<td>{men of note}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>How hast thou purchased this experience?</td>
<td>{purchase(d) fby.2 experience}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>And weare his colours like a Tumblers hoope</td>
<td>{tumbers hoop}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A whitly wanton with a velvet brow</td>
<td>{velvet brow}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACT FOUR**

**Scene 1**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Thus dost thou heare the Nemean Lion roare</td>
<td>{Nemean lion}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I my continent of beauty</td>
<td>{continent of}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scene 2**

---

717 “geue enlargement to the perfection thereof” Estienne de Maisonneufve, *The gallant, delectable and pleasanta historie* (1578), STC: 17203.

718 The only other entry apart from *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is “the shop of youe own braine” John Clare, *The converted lew* (1630), STC: 5351.

719 Thomas Bilson, *The true difference* (1585), STC: 3071; Miles Mosse, *The arraignment and conuiction of vsurie* (1595), STC: 12203 who has been attributed with *A good speed to Virginia* (1609), STC: 12204.


721 “by the veluet brow of darknes” Thomas Dekker, *Blurt master-constable* (1602), STC:17876; Christopher Marlowe, *Lusts dominion* (1657), Wing: L3504A. The latter might also be by Thomas Dekker.


723 Its common uses are ‘area/volume of land’ as well as ‘restrained’ as in ‘to be continent of’ (e.g. “ther was a nonne in Sabyne whiche held hyr contynent of her flesshe” in Jacobus, *Legenda aurea sanctorum* (1483), STC: 24873). Here I look for the meaning ‘continent/area of some human characteristic or interest’ (e.g. “continent of beauty”). In relation to Christ “euen the continent of all, and gouernor of mans house” seems to mean ‘restrainer’ in Henry Smith, *The Christians sacrifice* (1589), STC: 22658. The first use appears to be “To my journey’s end I haste, & discend to the second continent of Delicacy, which is Lust, or Luxury” in Thomas Nashe, *Chrisits teares ouer Ierusalem* (1613), STC: 18368 which being conceived in 1593 precedes *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. After the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* there is “the continent of all calamities?” in Robert Kittowe, *Loues load-starre* (1600), STC: 15026; “the continent of all that she possesseth” in William Covell, *A lust and temperate defence* (1603), STC:5881; “For as they [strumpets] are a painted continent of flatterie” Henry Crosse, *Vertues common-wealth* (1603), STC: 6070.5; “it [knowledge] is but a portion of Naturall Philosophy in the continent of Nature” in Francis Bacon, *The two bookes* (1605), STC: 1164; “Whilst loue pursues, in vayne, my absent friend, / Thou continent of wealth” in Thomas Middleton, *The famelie of loue* (1608), STC: 17879.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>the epithethes are sweetly varied</td>
<td>{sweetly varied}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>haud credo</td>
<td>{haud credo}</td>
<td>3(9) (0&lt;1594) [used in English text]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>O thou monster Ignorance</td>
<td>{monster ignorance}</td>
<td>8 (2&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>those parts that doe fructifie in vs</td>
<td>{fructify in us}</td>
<td>9 (2&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>For as it would ill become me to be vaine</td>
<td>{ill become me}</td>
<td>20 (1&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>the gift is good</td>
<td>{gift is good}</td>
<td>11(15) (1&lt;1594) [no punctuation in it and subject is ‘gift’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>vir sapis qui pauc a loquitur</td>
<td>{vir sapis/sapit qui pauc a loquitur}</td>
<td>15 (1&lt;1594) [footnote precedent]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>good luster of conceit</td>
<td>{luster of}</td>
<td>227 (3&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>facile procor gellida, quando pecas omnia sub vmbraminat</td>
<td>{praecor/precor/procor gellida/gelida}</td>
<td>9 (5&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

724 The 1598 quarto is not returned by EEBO due to a misspelling “vatried” for “varied”. Later is William Byrd, *Parthenia* (1651), Wing: B6403A, first published c.1611.

725 Only three texts use this in an English sentence, the two versions of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and *The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of John King of England* (1611), STC: 14646.


729 For example, “that after that age the gift is good” in Christopher Saint German, *The fyrrst dialogue* (1532), STC: 21568.

730 It is a wise man who speaks little.

731 Thomas Linacre, *[Rudimenta grammatices]* (1525), STC: 15637. EEBO returns an incomplete version (title page only) of William Lily, *[A shorte introduction to grammar]* (1585), STC: 15621.5 which is noteworthy because the 1621 edition, STC: 15627.2, contains the Latin tag.


733 For example, “Vt Mantuan. [line break] Fauste, precor, gelida, quado pec omne sub vmbra ruminat” under “Chewe the cudde” in Richard Huloet, *Huloets dictionarie* (1572), STC: 13941. The reduced “Fauste precor gelida” is in Bonaventure Des Périers, *The mirrour of mirth* (1583), STC: 6784.5. Then there is “for his margine is as deeplie learned, as Fauste precor gelida” which is aimed at Thomas Nashe in Gabriel Harvey, *Foure letters, and certaine sonnets especially touching Robert Greene, and other parties, by him abused* (1592), STC: 12900.5; a response by Nashe to Harvey “[Harvey] verdits Pierce Pennillesse for a Grammer Schoole vit; saies his Margine is as deeplie learnd as Faust praeor gelida” in Thomas Nashe, *The apologie of Pierce Pennillesse* (1592), STC: 18378, & repeated in Nashe’s *Strange newes* (1592), STC:18377a. The only other returns by EEBO before 1660 are the 1598 quarto and First Folio versions of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. The Ecologues of Mantuanus from which the Latin quotation is taken, appears to have been a school book in Nashe’s time, so Harvey is not being complementary about Nashe’s wit, see the English translation by George Turberville of Mantuanus Baptista, *The eglogs of the poet B. Mantuan Carmelitan* (1567), STC: 22990.
| 49 | odiferous flowers of fancy | {flower(s) of fancy} | 4 (1<1594) |
| 50 | by the way of progression | {way of progression} | 7 (1<1594) |
| 51 | Trip and go my sweete, deliver this Paper into the hands of the King | {trip “and” go} | 19 (3<1594) |
| 52 | pauca verba | {pauca verba} | 16 (0<1594) |

### Scene 3

| 53 | Nor shines the siluer Moone | {silver moon} | 73 (2<1594) |
| 54 | My teares for glasses | {tears near.3 glasses} | 9 (0<1594) |
| 55 | Perswade my heart to this false periurie | {false perjury} | 11 (2<1594) |
| 56 | How will he triumph, leape, and laugh at it? | {triumph near.2 leap} | 12 (2<1594) |
| 57 | To see great Hercules whipping a Gigge, / And profound Salomon tuning a lygge? / And Nestor play at push-pin with the boyes, / And Critticke Tymon laugh at idle toyes. | {profound near.3 Salomon} | 2 (0<1594) |

---

734 “The flower of fancie wrought such discontent” Thomas Lodge, *Phillis* (1593), STC: 16662.
735 Richard Mulcaster, *The first part of the elementarie* (1582), STC: 18250.
736 ‘A’lice trip and go’ was a character in Titus Maccius Plautus, *An enterlude for children to play named Jack Iugler* (1570), STC: 14837a.5; “and cannot daunce trip and go” Philip Sidney, *Syr P.S. His Astrophel and Stella* (1591), STC: 22536; “shalt not breath a wit, trip and goe, turne ouer” Thomas Nashe, *The apologie of Pierce Pennilesse* (1592), STC:18378, and identically in *Strange newes* (1592), STC: 18377a which was its alternative title. Nashe had also used it in a 1592 play of his “So merrily trip and goe” in *A pleasant come die, called Summers last will and testament* (1600), STC: 18376.
737 The meaning is ‘few words’. The first printed text returned is Thomas Lodge, *Wits miserie* (1596), STC: 16677. It also appears in Shakespeare’s *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, see STC: 22273.
738 Abraham Fraunce, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Yuychurch* (1591), STC: 11340; George Peele, *astraea the device of a l’ageant* (1591), STC: 19532. There is also Shakespeare’s “the clowd that hides the siluer Moon” in *Lucrece* (1594), STC: 22345 around the presumed time of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.
739 Later is “through the Glasses of my Teares” George Sandys, *A paraphrase upon the divine poems* (1638), STC: 21725 and there is a suggestion that it derives from Ovid’s Leander to Hero “My Tears, like Glasses, th’Object nearer drew” see *Ovid’s epistles translated by several hands* (1680), Wing: O659.
741 Cato says “Howe did Plautus in hys Comedie called Truculentus in manner leape & triumphe for ioye?” in Marcus Tullius Cicero, *The worthy booke of old age* (1569), STC: 5294; on Papists oppressing the Gospel in others “how they triumphe and leape for ioy” in Martin Luther, *A very confortable and necessary sermon* (1570), STC: 16997.5.
742 Compare with “thou doest not exceede Sampson in inuincible strength, Hercules in valorous courage, Salomon in profund wysedom, Tullie in powerful perswading eloquence” in Lewes Lewkenor’s translation of Olivier de La Marche, *The resolued gentleman* (1594), STC: 15139. This is the only other return.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ah you whoreson loggerhead</td>
<td>{loggerhead}</td>
<td>43 (0&lt;1594)(^{743}) [footnote precedent]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Promethean fire</td>
<td>{Promethean fire}</td>
<td>48 (0&lt;1594)(^{744})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>vniversall plodding pysons vp / The nimble spirits in the arteries</td>
<td>{plodding}</td>
<td>323 (0(23)&lt;1594)(^{745}) [reading or studying]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACT FIVE**

**Scene 1**

| 61 | your reasons at dinner haue beene sharpe & sententious | {sharp near.3 sententious} | 6 (2<1594)\(^{746}\) |   |

**Scene 2**

| 62 | audacious without impedency | {audacious near.3 impedency} | 13(15) (1(2)<1594)\(^{747}\) [related] |   |
| 63 | thou halfpenny purse of wit, thou Pidgeon-egge of discretion | {purse near.3 wit} | 26 (1(3)<1594)\(^{748}\) [related] |   |
| 64 | Follie in Fools beares not so strong a note, / As fool’ry in the Wise, when Wit doth dote: | {folly near.15 fool(s)} \(\cap\) {folly near.15 wise} | (114<1594) \(\cap\) (214<1594) = (0(55)<1594)\(^{749}\) |   |

---

\(^{743}\)The first known use is c.1590 “And to loggerhead your son, I give a wandering life” in Robert Greene, *The Scottish historie of James the fourth* (1598), STC: 12308. It is also used in Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* “Thou shalt be loggerhead; good Father, ‘tis day”.

\(^{744}\) Not in the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.

\(^{745}\) “and presupposeth a great falshood, that knowledge may be gotten by continual plodding at the booke” in Juane Harte, *Examen de ingenios* (1594), STC: 13890, trans. from Spanish by Camillo Camili. Following collocation No. 12, “Hippocrates might well helpe Almanack makers, but here he had not a worde to saie, a man might sooner catch the sweate with plodding ouer him to no end, than cure the sweat with any of his impotent principles” in Thomas Nashe, *The vnfortunate traveller* (1594), STC: 18380. Also “Some Licosthenes reading (which showes plodding & no wit)” in Thomas Nashe, *Hawe with you to Saffron-walden* (1596), STC: 18369. Not in the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.


\(^{748}\) “as Penniles in witt, as in purse” Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces supererogation* (1593), STC: 12903. It is interesting what Harvey says of Nashe here “that hee vndertaketh to be Greene’s aduocate […] He may declare his deere affection to his Paramour; or his pure honestye to the world; or his constant zeale to play the Diuels Oratour: but noe Apology of Greene, like Greenes Grotes-worth of witt: and when Nash will indeed accomplishe a worke of Supererogation, let him publish, Nashes Penniworth of Discretion.”

\(^{749}\) In *Twelfth Night* there is “For folly that he wisely shows is fit; / But wise men, folly fall’n, quite taint their wit.” There is “Wisdomke maketh fooles, wise, & Folly maketh wise men fooles” in Jean de Cartigny, *The voyage of the wandering knight* (1581), STC: 4700, trans. out of French by William Goodyear. Francis Bacon quotes a parable of Solomon from Ecclesiastes 10:1 “As dead flies do cause the best ointment to stink; so doth a little Folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour” and explains “Hence a little folly in a very wise Man […] detracts greatly from their character and reputation” see Francis Bacon, *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, Chapter 2, No. XI, in James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, eds, *Translations of the*
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>folly passions solemne teares</td>
<td>{solemne tears}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {russians near.5 muscovites}</td>
<td>10 (1&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {russia near.5 muscovy}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Like Muscovites, or Russians</td>
<td>57 (4(6)&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[only these two]</td>
<td>[only these two]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Thou now requests but Mooneshine in the water</td>
<td>{moonshine in the water}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {seasick(e) near.80 muscovy}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {“sea sick(e)” near.80 muscovy}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>White handed Mistris</td>
<td>{white handed}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {trick on it}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>their rough carriage</td>
<td>{rough carriage}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {put(ting) trick(s) upon}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>honie-tongued Boyet</td>
<td>{honye tongued}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {trick on it}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>why looke you pale? / Sea-sicke I thinke comming from Muscouie</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {seasick(e) near.80 muscovy}</td>
<td>0 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {“sea sick(e)” near.80 muscovy}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I see the tricke on’t</td>
<td>{seasick(e) near.80 muscovy}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) {trick on it}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {put(ting) trick(s) upon}</td>
<td>66 (0&lt;1594)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


752 This is not in the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* although both Russians and Muscovites are mentioned in the text separately. The earliest return by EEBO is Abraham Ortelius, *An epitome of Ortelius his Theater of the world* (1601), STC: 18857. It appears as “Emperor of Russia and Moscovy” in *Gesta Grayorum* (1688), Wing: C444, which was written c.1595.

753 The earliest return is David Chytraeus, *A postil or orderly disposing of certeine epistles* (1570), STC: 5263. Also in Jean Calvin, *Sermons* (1574), STC: 4449; and John Foxe, *Acts and monuments* (1583), STC: 11225. This is just outside the ‘rare’ domain but I note it because Francis Bacon wrote it in his *Promus* wastebook (c.1592–4) as “For the moonshyne in the water” see Mrs Henry Pott, ed., *The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1883), p.247.

754 The earliest is “white-handed Fate” Thomas Dekker, *Britannia s honor* (1628), STC: 6493.

755 After the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, the earliest is Francis Beaumont, *The woman hater* (1607), STC: 1693.

756 Not returned by EEBO due to a line break is “so the sweete witty soule of Ouid liues in mellifuous and hony tongued Shakespeare” and mentions “his Loue labors lost” in Francis Meres, *Palladis tamia Wits treasury* (1598), STC: 17834.

757 See collocation No. 73, Table 5.2 in the analysis of the *Gesta Grayorum*.

758 The earliest is “That is the trick on it man” Richard Brome, *The damoiselle* (1653), Wing: B4868.

759 The earliest I have found is “Some build rather vpon abusing others, and as wee now say, putting trickes vpon them”, Francis Bacon, *The essais* (1612), STC: 1141, sig. C, which is not keyed-in text in EEBO but only digital image. See collocation No. 39, Table 7.1 in the analysis of *The Tempest*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>To dash it like a Christmas Comedie</td>
<td>{to dash it}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>the apple of her eie</td>
<td>{apple of her eye}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>You leere vpon me, do you? There’s an eie / Wounds like a leaden sword</td>
<td>{leaden sword}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>And when he [Hercules] was a babe, a childe, a shrimpe, / Thus did he strangle Serpents in his Manus</td>
<td>{strangl(e)(ing)(ed) near.8 serpent(s)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Faith vnlesse you play the honest Troyan</td>
<td>{play the honest}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>though the mourning brow of progenie</td>
<td>{mourning brow}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Let not the cloud of sorrow iustle it</td>
<td>{cloud of sorrow}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>As Loue is full of vnbefitting strains</td>
<td>{unbefitting}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>There stay, vntill the twelve Celestiall Signes / Haue brought about their anuall reckoning</td>
<td>{twelve celestial signs}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{760}\) I note “first inuented the manner how to dash it out of the igniferous flint” Thomas Dekker, *The Owles almanacke* (1618), STC: 6515.5.

\(^{761}\) Edward Hake, *A commemoration of the most prosperous* (1575), STC: 12605; which he copies in *A joyfull continuance* (1578), STC: 12605.5.

\(^{762}\) The first four returns relate to the use of harsh words which “draweth forth a leaden swerd out of an Iuery skaberd” the earliest being from Diogenes and collected by Desiderius Erasmus, *Flores aliquot sententiarum* (1540), STC: 10445. The only example to indicate injury is “you had with this your leaden sword killed God haue mercie on his sowle” in Jerónimo Orsório, *A learned and very eloquent treatie* [sic] (1568), STC: 18889, trans. from Latin by John Fen. In Francis Bacon’s *Promus* wastebock (c.1592-4) he has “Plumbeo jugulare gladio [to kill with a leaden sword]” which departs from Erasmus, see Mrs Henry Pott, *The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1883), p.264. None of the major dramatists are returned for “leaden sword”.

\(^{763}\) “This Hercules whan that he lay yet in the cradel: he strangled & kylled two gret serpentes y’ wold have kylled hym, the which ys stepmother Iuno had brought to hym” Anon., *The deceyte of women* (1557), STC: 6451. “First being but a childe, he stranglde two horrible Serpentes by force of handes” Filippo Beroaldo, *A contention betwene three brethren* (1581), STC: 19618.5. However, earlier than these, and not brought up by EEBO because of the spelling “stranglid” is Raoul Lefèvre, *hEre [sic] begymeth the volume* (1473), STC: 15375.

\(^{764}\) “they play the honest men” John Leslie, *A treatise of treasons against Q. Elizabeth* (1572), STC: 7601; “play the honest man” William Fulke, *Two treatises written against the papistes* (1577), STC: 11458. Thomas Dekker and George Wilkins have “play the honest man” in Thomas Dekker [and George Wilkins], *Iests to make you merie* (1607), STC: 6541.5. However, earlier than these, and not brought up by EEBO because of the spelling “strangl’d” is Raoul Lefèvre, *hEre [sic] begymeth the volume* (1473), STC: 15375.


\(^{767}\) Added spelling variation ‘vnbefitting’.

\(^{768}\) “And termes the habit vnbefitting mee” Anthony Chute, *Beawtie dishonoured* (1593), STC: 5262.

\(^{769}\) Ovid, *The. xv. bookes of P. Ouidus Naso* (1567), STC: 18956; Christopher Ocland, *The valiante actes* (1585), STC: 18777.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 82 | Change not your offer made in the heate of blood | {heat of blood} | 203 (3<1594)
| 83 | Nip not the gaudie blossomes of your Loue | {gaudy blossoms} | 4 (1<1594)
| 84 | Not so my Lord, a twelvemonth and a day | {twelvemonth and a day} | 10 (0<1594)
| 85 | Behold the window of my heart, mine eie | {window fby.3 heart(s)} | 31 (0<1594) [footnote precedent]
| 86 | To moue wilde laughter in the throate of death? | {throat of death} | 11 (0<1594)

From this table I now list the possible sources, that is, those that occur <1594.

**Possible Sources**

I grade the collocations A or B according to the number of records returned before 1594, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

- **A**: Only 1 record, **B**: From 2–5 records

Since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears for two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

- **AA or AB**: Beyond reasonable doubt
- **AC or BB**: Balance of probability

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1594) I give the collocation number from the table followed by its grade.

Ambrosius Autpertus *A monomachie* (20B), Anon. *The deceyte of women* (76B), Gervase Babington *A very fruitfull exposition* (55B), Francis Bacon *Gesta Grayorum*

---


772 The first use after the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is Thomas Dekker, *The wonderfull yeare* (1603), STC: 6535.

773 In “Device of an Indian Prince” dating from November 1595 Francis Bacon has “Your Majesty shall obtain the curious window into hearts of which the ancients speak” in *LL*, Vol. 1, p.390. There are no other later notable writers.

774 Also “Seeking for Richmond in the throat of death” in Shakespeare’s First Folio version of *The Tragedy of Richard the Third*. 
**Probable sources**

From the possible sources, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the following were sources for *Love’s Labour’s Lost*: Edward Hake, *A joyfull continuance* (1578, STC: 12605.5); Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces supererogation* (1593, STC: 12903); and Richard Huloet, *Huloets dictionarie* (1572, STC: 13941).

On the balance of probability I find the following also to be sources: William Fulke, *Two treatises* (1577, STC: 11458); Thomas Nashe, *The apologie of Pierce Pennilesse [or Strange news]* (1592, STC: 18378); Ovid, *The. xv. bookes* (1567, STC: 18956); Philip Sidney, *Astrophel and Stella* (1591, STC: 22536); and Edmund Spenser, *The faerie qveene* (1590, STC: 23081a).

The direction of influence between *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and *Gesta Grayorum* is unclear but there is evidence here with Nos 4, 10, 66, and 71 of a strong connection between them.

**Summary of evidence**

Table 6.9 gives a summary of the data, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii). A first-column enlarged bold number for the collocation number (CN) denotes that it does not appear in the 1598 quarto but was added for the First Folio version.

*Table 6.9 Rare collocation matches from Love’s Labour’s Lost*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Dekker</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Jonson</th>
<th>Nashe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>□□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are four rare correspondences between the *Gesta Grayorum* and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, Nos 4, 10, 66, and 71. First, I discuss a new parallel, the phrase “wonder of the world” (No.4), which I find has only two returns prior to 1594 in the context of it being applied to a person for his wealth of knowledge. In *A preparatiue to mariage* (1591) and *The sermons* (1593), Henry Smith refers to “Salomon, the myrrour of wisedome, the
wonder of the world”, and in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, Ferdinand opens the play with the following speech:

Navarre shall be the wonder of the world;
Our court shall be a little academie,
Still and contemplative in living art. (1.1.12–14)

The phrase “wonder of the world” (No. 4) is used to describe the ‘living art’ or the ethics of the Stoics, which involved unveiling the secrets of the universe. At the 1594–5 revels, Francis Bacon’s second Counsellor’s speech ‘Advising the Study of Philosophy’ applies the same epithet to the Prince:

when all miracles and wonders shall cease, by reason that you shall have discovered their natural causes, yourself [the Prince of Purpoole] shall be the only miracle and wonder of the world.

Collocation No. 10 appears in:

O, these barren taskes, too hard to keepe,
Not to see Ladies, study, fast, not sleepe.

The association of ‘tasks’ and ‘ladies’ does not appear before 1594, but occurs in Bacon’s sixth Counsellor’s speech at the revels:

What! nothing but tasks, nothing but working-days? No feasting, no music, no dancing, no triumphs, no comedies, no love, no ladies?

No. 66 gives “Like Muscovites, or Russians” and Hibbard has suggested that “An even more precise dating would be possible if only it could be shown conclusively that Shakespeare was indebted to the Gray’s Inn revels of Christmas 1594–5 for the idea of the

---

775 Henry Smith, *A preparative to mariage* (1591), STC: 22685, p.50.
776 In 1922, Professor J. S. Reid of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge commented “The whole scene contains, I think reminiscences of certain features of the post-Aristotelian, especially the Stoic, philosophy, as expressed by Latin writers. The Stoic division of philosophy into three portions, viz., φυσική, λογική, ηθική [physical, logical, ethical] was known in every school [...] this ηθική [ethical] is defined [...] in the Latin writers as *ars vitae* or *ars vivendi* [living art] (as in Cic.[ero] De Fin, 1, 42 and Acad. 2, 23). Of these three portions of philosophy the Stoics made the third [living art] overwhelmingly important, so that sometimes *philosophia* was defined itself as *ars vitae* (so in Cic.[ero] de Fin, 3, 4 and in Sen.[eca] Ep. 95, 8). Again the Stoics laid great stress on the moral value of contemplation of the universe”, see J. S. Reid, ‘Shakespeare’s ‘Living Art’’, *The Philological Quarterly*, 1 (July 1922), pp. 226–7.
777 GES, p.35.
778 Ibid., pp.54–5.
779 Ibid., p.41.
Masque of Muscovites in 5.2 of his comedy.”

In *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, when the “blackamoors” musically herald the arrival of the four academy members dressed as Muscovites, it seems to echo the commentary of *Gesta Grayorum* when there arrived an “Ambassador from the mighty Emperor of Russia and Moscovy” who states that they “surprized another Army of Ne-gro-Tartars”. In a search for ‘russians near.5 muscovites’ or ‘russia near.5 muscovy’ there are only 4 examples in total before 1594. These two terms are not connected together in the 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* but they are in the First Folio version.

For No. 71 in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* there is:

> Princess. Amazed, my Lord? Why looks your highness sad?
> Rosaline. Help hold his brows, he’ll swoon. Why look you pale?
> Seasick, I think, coming from Muscovy. (5.2.391–3)

On 1st February, the Prince of Purpoole complains of seasickness on returning from his mock journey to Moscow. In the Prince’s letter to Sir Thomas we find:

> I found, that my Desire [to entertain the Queen at Greenwich] was greater than the Ability of my Body; which, by length of my Journey [from Russia] and my Sicknesse at Sea, is so weakened, as it were very dangerous for me to adventure it.

This example from the *Gesta Grayorum* and the one in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* are the earliest two returns for the association of ‘seasick’ and ‘muscovy’. This I attribute with caution to Bacon in Table 6.9 since it appears in the ‘Prince’s letter to Sir Thomas’ (Table 5.2) that he is only suspected of writing.

There is another connection, though less convincing than the above, that I note here. In the opening lines of the play, the king declares that the aim of the academy members is to establish eternal fame or reputation for themselves:

> Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
> Live registered upon our brazen tombs,
> And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
> When spite of cormorant devouring time,

---

782 *GES*, p.44.
Th’endeavour of this present breath may buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe’s keen edge,
And make us heirs of all eternity. (1.1.1–7)

It is clear from the play that this eternal fame is to be achieved through the study of philosophy (see 1.1.32) which relates back to the “wonder of the world” correspondence. At the revels, Bacon’s second Counsellor advising the ‘Study of Philosophy’ wishes the Prince “Conquest of the Works of Nature” and gives examples of knowledge that leave a lasting memory or monument. He reminds us that “No conquest of Julius Caesar made him so remembered as the Calendar” and “I will commend to your Highness [the Prince of Purpoole] four principal monuments to yourself”: the building of a library containing “Books of worth”; a garden to display “rare Beasts”, plants, and birds; a museum to exhibit works by “the Hand of Man”; and a chemical laboratory furnished with “Mills, Instruments, Furnaces, and Vessels.”

The third Counsellor advertising ‘Eternizement and Fame by Buildings and Foundations’ confirms that both the first and second speakers have “counselled your Excellency to win Fame, and to eternize your name” and in addition to suggesting buildings as monuments of fame he also advises following the example of “the honourable Order of the Helmet.” This again refers to knowledge because among the Articles of the Order are:

Every Knight of this Order shall apply Himself to some or other vertuous Ability or Learning [...] and shall endeavour to add Conference and Experience by reading

The notion that one’s fame or spirit could be immortalised by poetic work had manifest itself in the ‘eternizing poetry’ of the Graeco-Roman world. In the Renaissance, both Edmund Spenser, Samuel Daniel, and Shakespeare continued this theme. However, here

---

785 GES, pp.34–5. In the ‘Summary of evidence’ in §5.3, in my discussion of the Second Counsellor’s speech, I show where these ideas appear in Bacon’s New Atlantis.

786 Ibid., pp. 36–7.

787 Ibid., pp.29–30.

788 The Greek poet Isocrates (Antidoses 7) wished his work to be “a monument nobler than statues of brass”. The Roman Horace (Odes Book III, XXX) declares “And now [my work] ‘tis done: more durable than brass / My monument shall be, and raise its head / O’er royal pyramids” while Ovid has “And now I have completed a great work [...] If Poet’s prophesies have any truth, through all the coming years of future ages, I shall live in fame.” (Metamorphoses, 15, 871).

789 There are many examples of the written word providing etern fame. Thomas Blenerhasset’s ‘The Complaint of Guidericus’ appeared in the second part of the Mirror for Magistrates in 1578 with the lines “As learned Arte doth give a goodly grace / To some: so some by natures giftes do get / Eternal fame, and purchase them a place / Aboue the place where learned men do sit.” However, it seems that “dexterity of wit” was the prerequisite not study. There is also Samuel Daniel’s Delia, Edmund Spenser’s Amoretti (Sonnet 75), and an echo of Horace’s Odes (Book III, XXX) in Shakespeare’s Sonnet 55: “Not marble, nor the gilded monuments / Of Princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme.”
we have the association of the discovery and dissemination of knowledge (philosophy),
either ethical or natural, with the eternization of fame and this occurs both in the second
and third Counsellors’ speeches from the revels, and in Love’s Labour’s Lost.

A further correspondence has been partially identified by White\(^790\) who notes that “it [the
Gesta] has various elaborate edicts couched in the legal terms of ‘Items’ that we find in
Love’s Labour’s Lost.” This is not in itself noteworthy but in investigating it I have found a
similarity between the play and the Articles of the Knights of the Order that were read out
at the revels. One of these Articles is as follows:

\[ \text{Item, No Knight of this Order shall be inquisitive towards any lady or Gentlewoman,}
\]
\[ \text{whether her beauty be English or Italian, or whether, with Care taking, she have added half}
\]
\[ \text{a Foot to her Stature; but shall take all to the best. Neither shall a Knight of the aforesaid}
\]
\[ \text{Order presume to affirm, that Faces were better twenty Years ago, than they are at this}
\]
\[ \text{present time, except such Knight have passed three Climacterical Years.}\]

In Love’s Labour Lost (1.1), Longaville reads out the following edict: “Item, Yf any man
be seene to talke with a woman within the tearme of three yeares, hee shall indure such
publique shame as the rest of the Court can possible devise.”\(^792\) Later, in Act 2 the Queen
decides that “Till painefull studie shall out-weare three yeares, / No woman may approach
his silent Court.”\(^793\) Both the play and the Gesta frame this as a legal ‘Item’ in which there
is a demand not to see a woman for three years. I note also in my discussion of Table 5.4
for the Gesta Grayorum analysis, that Francis Bacon has two matches with the Articles of
the Knights of the Order proceedings. So this parallel also hints at Francis Bacon’s
contribution.

Aware of Nos 10, 66, and 71, but without access to a test of their rarity, Woodhuysen
claimed “there are few if any verbal links”\(^794\) between the Gesta Grayorum and Love’s
Labour’s Lost. I conclude from my addition of No. 4, my evidence as to the rarity of all
four parallels, and the above-mentioned ‘Item’, that it is highly likely that there is a
connection.

\(^790\) R. S. White, Natural Law in English Renaissance Literature (Cambridge University Press,
\(^791\) GES, p.28.
\(^792\) William Shakespeare, Love’s Labour’s Lost (1598), STC: 22294, sig. A3’.
\(^793\) Ibid., sig. B4.
\(^794\) Woodhuysen, Love’s Labour’s Lost, op. cit., p.64.
Francis Bacon

Two of Bacon’s matches with Love’s Labour’s Lost, Nos 4 and 10 which occur in the second and sixth Counsellors’ speeches have already been discussed. I now set out further rare matches between Bacon’s work and the play.

Table 6.10 Bacon’s RCP for Love’s Labour’s Lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>□□</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>10&lt;1626</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>4&lt;1622</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>4&lt;1623</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>7&lt;1610</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>0&lt;1608 [tested to 1608]</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>4&lt;1595</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>0&lt;1595</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1&lt;1612</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>0&lt;1595</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First I discuss the parallels that are in English not Latin.

No. 21 is “a man of good repute, carriage, bearing, & estimation” and a systematic search for correspondences between all possible pairs of these four characteristics reveals that in 1594, any such combination was extremely rare. Bacon has “by a moderate Carriage and bearing” in The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth (1622) which he finished in 1621.

No. 39 is the construction “continent of” in relation to some human characteristic or cognition, such as ‘beauty’, rather than a land mass. Bacon has “continent of Nature” in his
**Advancement of Learning** (1605), although Thomas Nashe precedes him with “the second continent of Delicacy” in *Christ’s teares ouer Jerusalem* (1613) which was written in 1593.

No. 71 relates to the ‘Prince’s letter to Sir Thomas’ (*Gesta*, No. 73, Table 5.2) but despite Bacon compiling most of the revels entertainments it is unclear who wrote this.

Bacon has the earliest return for No. 72 “I see the tricke on’t” with “putting trickes vpon them” in *The essaies* (1612) which is currently only in digital image format and not searchable text in EEBO. This also occurs in *The Tempest* (Table 7.1, No. 39) and is used by no other major writers.

For No. 85, “Behold the window of my heart, mine eie” there are no returns for ‘window fby.3 heart(s)’ before 1594. Bacon has the earliest known example from his 1595 ‘Device of an Indian Prince’ with “Your Majesty shall obtain the curious window into hearts of which the ancients speak” which is not in the EEBO database.

Francis Bacon has several correspondences with the play in translations of his work from Latin into English. For example, No. 1 “Let fame that all hunt after” has only two returns before 1594, the earliest being John Whitgift’s “nor hunt after popular fame” from *A godlie sermon* (1574). In Peter Shaw’s translation of supplements to Bacon’s *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623), in a piece entitled ‘Of Honour and Reputation’, he has “For those who court or hunt after Fame in their Actions, are commonly much talk’d of, but inwardly little admired.”

No. 23 “the varnish of a compleat man” has no returns for “the varnish of” before 1594, but corresponds to Shaw’s translation “Flattery is the varnish of vice” from Bacon’s sixth book of *De Augmentis Scientiarum*.

Collocation No. 64 is the complex “Follie in Fooles beares not so strong a note, / As fool’ry in the Wise, when Wit doth dote.” The idea of folly affecting a wise man more than an ordinary one is echoed in James Spedding’s translation of Bacon’s Proverb 11 in the eighth book of *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623) “Hence a little folly in a very wise Man […] detracts greatly from their character and reputation […] which in ordinary men would be entirely unobserved.” No other searchable text of the period seems to share this view and I judge that the relationship between concepts is not lost in the translation.
Finally, there is No. 75 “You leere vpon me, do you? There’s an eie / Wounds like a leaden sword.” It originates from Diogenes as “draweth forth a leaden swerd out of an Iuery skaberd” and was recorded by Desiderius Erasmus in *Flores aliquot sententiarum* (1540). Only one example before 1594 is in the context of a leaden sword causing injury and this appears as “you had with this your leadden sweard killed God haue mercie on his sowle” in Jerónimo Orsório’s *A learned and very eloquent treatie* [sic] (1568). In Bacon’s wastebook *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies* (c.1592–4), which precedes the play, he has the Latin “*Plumbeo jugulare gladio* [to kill with a leaden sword]” which departs from Erasmus’s version.

So I judge that the sense of Nos 64 and 75 have survived the translation and are admissible as rare matches.

*Thomas Dekker*

*Table 6.11 Dekker’s RCP for Love’s Labour’s Lost*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Dekker</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○○</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>6&lt;1603</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>2&lt;1618</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1&lt;1602</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>5&lt;1600</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>13&lt;1604</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>10&lt;1618</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1&lt;1628</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>3&lt;1618</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1&lt;1603</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The phrase “wholesome Physicke” (No. 18) appears in two different works by Dekker, *The wonderfull yeare* (1603) and *The whore of Babylon* (1607). More notable is “the dancing horse” (No. 24). Dekker has the first use after *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in *The Owles almanacke*, (1618), there are no uses before 1594, and only 5 before 1690. Of similar rarity is “a velvet brow” (No. 37) which Dekker makes use of it in *Blurt master-constable* (1602), with no occurrences before 1594 and only 4 before 1690. He has “trip and go” (No. 51) in the *Shomaker’s holiday* (1600), although Nashe has prior use, stands as the first known dramatist after *Love’s Labour’s Lost* to use “silver moon” (No. 53) in *The magnificent entertainment giuen to King James* (1604), and is preceded in his use of “Promethean fire” (No. 59) in *The Owles almanacke* (1618) by Ben Jonson’s *The characters of two royall masques* (1608) and Thomas Heywood’s *The brazen age* (1613). No. 68, “white handed Mistris” appears as “White-handed Fate” in Dekker’s *Britannia’s honour* (1628) written to celebrate the inauguration of Richard Deane, the Mayor of London. There are no uses of “white handed” before 1594 and only 10 before 1690. The phrase “To dash it like a Christmas comedie” (No. 73) finds Dekker as the only major writer to use it outside *Love’s Labour’s Lost* with “first inuented the manner how to dash it out” in *The Owles almanacke* (1618). Finally, “twelvemonth and a day” (No. 84) has no returns before 1594 and only 10 before 1690. It originates from Chaucer’s “The wife of Bathes Tale”,795 and in *The wonderfull yeare* (1603), Thomas Dekker has the first use and only use amongst the major writers after *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. This gives Dekker a strong case for a contribution.

**Thomas Heywood**

Heywood is the first known dramatist after *Love’s Labour’s Lost* to use No. 7 “body pine” and has No. 19 “pricks me on” in *A woman kilde with kindnesse* (1607), a phrase for which there are only 12 examples before 1690.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3&lt;1600</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>7&lt;1607</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>23&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

795 Geoffrey Chaucer, *The works of our ancient, learned, & excellent English poet* (1687), Wing: C3736.
Even rarer is No. 26 “light wench” which appears only 11 times before 1690 and not at all before 1594 which Heywood uses in *If you know not me* (1606) and *Loves maistresse* (1636). No. 45 “gift is good” is striking with only one return before 1594 and 11 before 1690, Heywood being the only major writer, and he follows Dekker in the use of No. 68 “white handed” in *Loves maistresse* (1636). He follows Ben Jonson in using No. 59 “Promethean fire” and has No. 77 “play the honest” in *Pleasant dialogues* (1637), a phrase that occurs only 12 times before 1690. Of the major writers, Heywood has two exclusive uses of No. 81 “twelve celestial signs” in *Londini artium* (1632) and *The life of Merlin* (1641), and two more of No. 82 “heat of blood” in *A woman kilde with kindnesse* (1607) and *The fair maid of the west* (1631).

**Ben Jonson and Thomas Middleton**

Of the major writers, Jonson has the first use of No. 59 “Promethean fire” in *The characters of two royall masques* (1608) but follows other major writers with his other correspondences. As for Thomas Middleton, he has the first use of No. 15 “umpire of” in the context of some act in *The ghost of Lucrece* (1600) but in No. 47 “luster of” his *Sir Robert Sherley* (1609) is preceded by Michael Drayton’s *England’s heroicall epistles* (1597).
Table 6.13 Jonson’s RCP for Love’s Labour’s Lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Jonson</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>7&lt;1609</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>4&lt;1616</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>2&lt;1616</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>19&lt;1608</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>3&lt;1608</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14 Nashe’s RCP for Love’s Labour’s Lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Nashe</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scene 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thomas Nashe**

Almost all Nashe’s correspondences appear before *Love’s Labour’s Lost* which suggests that Thomas Nashe was either a source for the play or contributed to an earlier version. The use of “plodders” in relation to unimaginative writers for Nos 12 and 60 finds its earliest use in his *The vnfortunate traveller* (1594). No. 39 “continent of” in the context of some human characteristic or cognition occurs in his *Christs teares ouer Ierusalem* (1613) from 1593. As for multiple uses, Nashe has No. 48 the Latin “praecor gelida” twice in *The apologie of Pierce Pennilesse* (1592) and its duplicate *Strange newes* (1592), and No. 51 “trip and go” twice in a 1592 play *A pleasant comedie, called Summers last will and testament* (1600), and *The apologie of Pierce Pennilesse* [or *Strange newes*] (1592). No. 83 “gaudy blossoms” is in Nashe’s *Christs teares ouer Ierusalem* (1613) from 1593. A phrase which I omit from Table 6.8 being just outside rare is “hard lodging” (7<1594) from *Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell*. EEBO records that, in 1592, Nashe had the sixth use of this phrase.
Conclusions

There is ample evidence that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* was intended for the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. The RCP method delivers 4 rare correspondences between the play and the *Gesta Grayorum* and there are others that are highly suggestive. As with *The Comedy of Errors*, Shakespeare as a non-member must have been absent, and Inns of Court writers must have been involved in preparing the play for the proceedings. Although Thomas Dekker has 8 and Thomas Heywood has 7 rare correspondences, all following the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels, neither was a member of the Inns so could not have been involved in 1594. However, both are good candidates for a later revision of the play if there was one. Unfortunately, the 4 matches that appear to have been added to the 1598 quarto for the First Folio version (see Table 6.9), two of which are used by Bacon, are inconclusive as to who revised the 1598 quarto.

As for Inns of Court writers, only Francis Bacon is identified from RCP. He has 2 rare correspondences that precede the play, 4 that follow, and there are 4 others that have been translated from Latin into English. I judge that the relationship of ideas in two of these Latin examples, Nos 64 and 75, have survived the translation and so are admissible. This gives him 3 that precede the play and 5 that follow and I suggest that this points to his contribution to the writing of the play for the revels.

Thomas Nashe’s 6 matches that precede the presumed date (1594) of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* are striking. Dating from 1592–94, three show repeated use of the same collocation (Nos 48, 51, and 60) and there are others he seems to have coined (Nos 12 and 39). There is also the reference to the Harvey–Nashe controversy at (5.1.68) when Costard the clown calls the page-boy Moth (anagram of ‘Thom’[as]) “thou halfpenny purse of wit, thou pigeon-egg of discretion” (see §6.4). Here Thomas Nashe seems to be represented by the page boy.

---

796 Due to the large number of returns for No. 64 that are to be checked against the context filter, I can only claim that up to 1608, No. 64 was still rare.
Moth and Gabriel Harvey by the Clown. So either there was an earlier version of the play from 1593 in which Nashe contributed to the writing, which raises the difficulty of a non-member’s work being accepted at Gray’s Inn, or the play was provided with deliberate topical references to Nashe and the recent controversy for the revels production. Since the evidence is inconclusive it would be an interesting topic for future research to see if Nashe turns up in an RCP analysis of other early Shakespeare plays.\footnote{It is possible that \textit{Love’s Labour’s Lost} was a Nashe play and was acquired without his consent and revised for the revels. If he was the author of the \textit{Groats-worth of Witte} (1592) letter to the three dramatists (and he was a suspect) then \textit{Henry VI, Pt 3} might have been his. This line of enquiry into stolen Nashe plays used at the Inns of Court merits further investigation.}

\section*{6.6 Love’s Labour’s Lost and the revels}

If \textit{Love’s Labour’s Lost} had been intended for performance at the revels, then it might have been ear-marked for one of the Grand Nights that was cancelled:

\begin{quote}
On the next Morning [7 January] His Highnesse [the Prince of Purpoole] took his Journey towards Russia, with the Ambassador [...] there he remained until Candlemas (2 February); at which time [...] his Excellency returned home again; in which the Purpose of the Gentlemen was much disappointed by the Readers and Ancients of the House; by reason of the Term [c.23 January]: so that very good Inventions, which were to be performed in publick at his Entertainment into the House again, and two grand Nights which were intended at his Triumphal Return, wherewith his reign had been conceitedly determined, were by the aforesaid Readers and Governors made frustrate, for the Want of Room in the Hall, the Scaffolds [theatre galleries] being taken away, and forbidden to be built up again (as would have been necessary for the good Discharge of such a Matter) thought convenient.\footnote{See Sir William Dugdale, \textit{The History and Antiquities of the Four Inns of Court} (London: 1780), pp.24, 52; \textit{LIN}, Vol. 1, pp.352, 374; \textit{INN}, Vol. 2, p.23; John Bruce, ed., \textit{Diary of John Manningham} (Westminster: Nichols and Sons, 1868), p.18.}
\end{quote}

In fact, from 1565–1605, Candlemas (or the Feast of the Purification of Our Lady) was often reserved for the performance of a play at the Inns of Court.\footnote{GES, p.53.} By the 2 February, the audience would have already learnt about the Prince of Purpoole’s “Sicknesse at Sea” (the day before), the second Counsellor’s description of him as a “wonder of the world” (3 January), the advice of his second and third Counsellor for attaining “eternal fame” (3 January), and the sixth Counsellor’s complaint that ‘tasks’ prohibit the entertainment of ‘ladies’ (3 January), all of which would have been recognized when the play referred to them.
This surely has a bearing on the direction of influence between the revels proceedings and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. There is strong evidence that not only does the revels script foreshadow the play, but that the play was at least modified if not composed with the revels proceedings in mind. Unfortunately, although it was intended for performance it was cancelled.
Chapter 7

The Tempest

7.1 Preliminary

The previous chapter has focused on plays associated with the Inns of Court and the possible contributors that might typically be associated with them. By way of contrast, we now turn to a play that seems not to have been intended for the Inns and examine how the list of possible contributors differs. As will be shown, The Tempest is strongly connected with the Virginia Company, and since Francis Bacon was associated with that company then this play seems an appropriate choice for analysis.

In support of there being topical allusions in The Tempest that have a terminus post quem of September 1610, the idea is developed that the 1609 Sea Venture shipwreck at Bermuda is the only shipwreck in the contemporary literature that corresponds with the one in the play. However, in order to inform the discussion, in §7.2 RCP is applied to the play, and in doing so a stricter definition of rarity is employed than that provided by Table 4.1 to lend extra weight to the conclusions. With an assessment of the rarity of certain collocation matches, the strength of previously suggested sources such as William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ can be assessed. It is found that three collocations are sufficiently rare to claim that ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, the ‘True Reportory’ was consulted when The Tempest was written.

In §7.3, new dating evidence is presented for The Tempest. There is Caliban’s reference to his capture of the young ‘scamel’ on the rocks for food. This appears to be a compositor’s error for the ‘seamel’, otherwise known as ‘seamal’, ‘seamew’, or ‘cahow’ which the shipwreck survivors caught on the rocks at Bermuda for food. The unusual characteristics of this bird were unknown in England until the returning mariners reported it in September 1610. This dating evidence is important for establishing a connection between The Tempest and the Virginia Company of which Francis Bacon was a prominent member.

There are several reasons why Shakespeare could not have been allowed unrestricted access to the Virginia Company’s ‘True Reportory’ to write The Tempest. For example, §7.5 gives the oaths of secrecy imposed on the colony secretary, the governor, and the members of the London Virginia Council. This prohibited them from distributing company
information, and having committed their own money to the venture, there was much to lose if this hard-hitting report became advertised and jeopardized the raising of new investment. The Company’s negative attitude to actors is shown in §7.6. There are at least four Virginia Company pamphlets that warned members that players were misrepresenting the colony on the stage, and there was even a prayer read out at the colony every morning and evening that referred to “Papists & players & such other Amonites & Horonits the scum and dregs of the earth.” So it is highly unlikely that Shakespeare could have had unrestricted access to the ‘True Reportory’. Nevertheless, it appears to have been consulted for The Tempest, and later in Chapter 8, there is a discussion of the idea that some information from it might have been released to allow a supervised propaganda play to be performed at King James’s court to impress invited ambassadors.

7.2 Application of the RCP method to The Tempest

Application data

Date test completed: 31 December 2012

Search period: 1473–1690

No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period: 34,874

Date of test document: 1611

No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date: 5,377

Definition of ‘rare’: <6 returns before date of test document

Grading system for a possible source: This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–5 returns.

Probability estimates for possible sources: If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; BB – ‘on the balance of probability’.

Any return later than 1611 that is known to have used a manuscript earlier than 1611 is recorded as a possible source, for example, ‘True Reportory’ (1610) in Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625). Significant returns are also checked for age in 1610 and for membership of the Virginia Company.

---

My definition of a ‘rare’ collocation for the present search of *The Tempest* is tighter than that set out in Table 4.1. There the requirement is <9 matches, but here I demand <6, a choice that results in collocations that are rarer than those that the former would provide.

Table 7.1: Collocation searches in *The Tempest* using EEBO from 1473–1690.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (line No.)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns &lt;1691</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Blow till thou burst thy wind (7)</td>
<td>{burst thy wind}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 worke the peace of the present (22)</td>
<td>{work the peace of}</td>
<td>2 (1&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mischance of the houre (25–6)</td>
<td>{mischance of the hour}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 he hath no drowning marke (29)</td>
<td>{drowning mark}</td>
<td>1 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 His complexion is perfect Gallowes (29–30)</td>
<td>{perfect gallows}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 rope of his destiny (31)</td>
<td>{rope of his destiny}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 our case is miserable (33)</td>
<td>{our case is miserable}</td>
<td>6 (2&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 We are merely cheated of our liues by drunkards (56)</td>
<td>[see footnote]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I would faine dye a dry death (67–68)</td>
<td>{dry death}</td>
<td>33 (0(8)&lt;1611) [dry death not meaning bloody]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scene 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 you haue / Put the wild waters in this Rore (1–2)</td>
<td>{wild waters}</td>
<td>2(7) (1(4)&lt;1611) [in a storm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I would Haue suncke the sea (10–11)</td>
<td>{sunk the sea}</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1611)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

801 “worke the peace of our Consciences” Church of England, *Certaine sermons* (1580), STC: 5685.
802 The other is John Dryden, *The tempest* (1670), Wing: S2944.
803 Dryden.
804 William Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creede of the Apostles* (1595), STC: 19703, & *A golden chaine* (1600), STC: 19646. In Bacon’s essay ‘Of Empire’ he says “It is a miserable State of Minde, to haue few Things to desire, and many Things to feare: And yet that commonly is the Case of kings” Francis Bacon, *The essays or counsels* (1625), STC: 1148, sig.P (p.105), which does not exactly meet the requirement.
805 “So that some of them hauing some good and comfortable waters in the ship, fetcht them, and drunke one to the other, taking their last leaue one of the other” Silvester Jourdain, *A discovery of the Barmudas* (1610), STC: 14816, p.5. This account is not in Strachey’s *True Reportory*.
806 No significant dramatists or writers. Dryden’s *Tempest* records it.
807 Robert Crowley’s rendition of Psalm 93: “Yea more then the wylde waters and the greate stormes of the sea” Robert Crowley, *The Psalter of Dauid newly translated into Englysh metre* (1549), STC: 2725.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>rather like a dreame, then an assurance (45)</td>
<td>{dream(s) near.6 assurance}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thy mother was a piece of vertue (56)</td>
<td>{piece of virtue}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Being once perfected how to graunt suits, / how to deny them: who t’advance and who / To trash for ouertopping (79–81)</td>
<td>(1) {suits near.5 deny}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {grant near.5 suits}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>that now he was / The Iuy which had hid my princely Trunck, / And suckt my verdure out on’t. (86–7)</td>
<td>(1) {ivy near.10 death}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) {ivy near.10 destroy(ing)(s)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) {ivy near.10 kill}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) {ivy near.10 strangleres(ed)(ing)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) {ivy near.10 sucked}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{808}\) In Bacon’s Great Instauration he claims he is “one who maintains not simply that nothing can be known, but only that nothing can be known except in a certain course and way; and yet establishes provisionally certain degrees of assurance […] For God forbid we should give out a dream of our own imagination for a pattern of the world” James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, eds, *The Works of Francis Bacon*, Vol. 4, Translations of the Philosophical Works, Vol I (London: 1858), p.32–3, which does not quite meet the requirement.

\(^{809}\) “I haue some peece of vertew” John Calvin, *The sermons* (1577), STC: 4448; “thou art a peece of vertue” William Shakespeare, *The late, and much admired play, called Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (1609), STC: 22334. Later is “thart a pretious peece of vertue” James Shirley, *The maides revenge* (1640), STC: 22450, who would have been 14 years old in 1610.

\(^{810}\) “to deny their suits with whom he [which beares all the sway] is displeased” in Marcus Tullius Cicero, *The familiar epistles* (1620), STC: 5305, but no mention of granting suits up to 1623. No major writers returned after 1623. Bacon’s letter of 29 September 1620 “To his Majesty concerning his present estate and the means to rectify it” informs the king that “to grant all suits were to undo yourself, or your people. To deny all suits were to see never a contented face.” in *LL*, Vol. 7, p.90, also Harley MS 3787, f.187.

\(^{811}\) “and thy [God’s] power to grant or deny suites made to thee, shall be no less than theirs [Bacchus and Ceres]” in Virgil, *Virgils Eclogues* (1628), STC: 24820, translated into English by W. L. Gent. No mention of denying suits up to 1623. No major writers fit conditions after 1623. In his essay ‘Of Ambition’ Bacon also has “There is Vse also of Ambitious Men, in Pulling downe the Greatnesse, of any Subject that ouer-tops” Francis Bacon, *The essays or counsels* (1625), STC: 1148. There are 28 cases of {overtop(ing)(s)} <1611.

\(^{812}\) “Like the snake, Rome hath bene warmed in the bosome of our greatest kingdomes, till it stung them to death; like iuie [ivy] so long it hath embraced, that it hath eaten vp whole Monarchies!” Thomas Ireland, *The oath of allegiance* (1610), STC: 14267. All other returns were under 18 years old in 1610.

\(^{813}\) Returns either inappropriate or under 18 years old in 1610.

\(^{814}\) “But it was ordained, that this Winding-Iuie of a PLANTAGANET, should kill the true Tree it selfe.” in Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1629), STC: 1161, & (1676), Wing: B300. Bacon completed this work in October 1621. The following is interesting but does not qualify this is Althea Ermina’s woman […] deliver me from her […] she persecutes me worse then frostes do flowers, they blast, or Ivy, trees, they kill with their embraces!” Richard Flecknoe, *Ermina* (1661), Wing: F1220; Flecknoe was only 10 years old in 1610.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>neglecting worldly ends (89)</th>
<th>{wordly ends}</th>
<th>190 (1&lt;1611)(^{816})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>in its contrary</td>
<td>{in its contrary}</td>
<td>10 (0&lt;1611)(^{817})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Like one / Who hauing into truth, by telling of it, / Made such a syner of his memorie / To credite his owne lie, he did beleue / He was indeed the Duke, out o’ th’ Substitution / And executing th’ outward face of Royaltie / With all prerogatiue (99–105)(^{818})</td>
<td>(1) {warbeck near.20 duke}</td>
<td>2(32) (0(2)&lt;1611)(^{819}) [self-deception by repetition]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(34) (0(3)&lt;1611)(^{820}) ['he was indeed']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{815}\) The following appears to be a strong candidate for a source “they [Jesuits] insinuate themselves into Princes Courts, and they enter into their secrets, where being imbraced, they thrive like luie [Ivy], which desists not till it hath suckt the heart out of the most noblest!” R. S., *The Jesuites play at Lyons in France* (1607), STC: 21514. The following misses the mark “such clasping Iuye, sucking out the sap of this my noble Plant, and Tree [Protestants]” Thomas Sanderson, *Of romanizing recusants* (1611), STC: 21711. Neither is the following about Princes “the calling of Frankes into Italie, to whom craftie Popes adhered for aduantage, like the Iuy to the Oke, till they had suckt out from them all the sap of their power” Thomas Thompson, *Antichrist arraigned* (1618), STC: 24025. Up to and including 1623 none refer to leadership and none after are major writers.

\(^{816}\) John Bridges, *The supremacie of Christian princes* (1573), STC: 3737.

\(^{817}\) No major writers.

\(^{818}\) Quiller-Couch sees this as a counterfeit coining metaphor. He suggests replacing “into truth” with “minted truth” — see “mint Truth” in Joseph Beaumont, *Some observations* (1665), Wing: B1628 — and suggests that “‘telling’ (i.e. counting it over), ‘credit his own lie’, ‘out o’th’ substitution’ (i.e. of the baser metal), and ‘executing th’ outward face of royalty, with all prerogative’ (i.e. stamping the coin) — all carry on the idea of ‘minting’” in Arthur Quiller–Couch and John Dover Wilson, *Tempest* (first edition 1921; Cambridge University Press, 1961), p.91.

\(^{819}\) There are two possible sources: “Many honest men did thinke Perkin Warbeck to be Richard Duke of Yorke, King Edward the fourthes sonne, as he professed him selfe to bee: though in deed he was a countefeite” John Rainolds, *The summe of the conference* (1584), STC: 20626; “King Henry the seventh that knew him to be a wise and industrious man, made him Chauncelloe of Ireland, where this counterfeit Duke begun first to play his part” as well as “Perkin Warbeck whom she [Duchess] had taught to name him selfe Richard Duke of Yorke, that was certainly knowen to haue beene murthered by his wicked uncle long before” in Francis Godwin, *A catalogue of the bishops of England* (1601), STC: 11937. Later is Thomas Gainsford, *The true and wonderfull history of Perkin Warbeck* (1618), STC: 11525, but none of these emphasise that Warbeck deceived himself by habit. However, Bacon has “Insomuch as it was generally beleue (aswell amongst great Persons, as amongst the Vulgar) that he was indeed Duke Richard. Nay, himselfe, with long and continuall countefeiting, and with oft telling a Lye, was turned by habit almost into the thing hee seemed to bee; and from a Lyer to a Beleueuer” Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth* (1629), STC: 1161, which Bacon completed in October 1621. Later is “with a false stampe coyned a new Duke of Yorke” Thomas Heywood, *The life of Merlin* (1641), Wing: H1786, but Heywood does not pick up on self-deception by repetition. No other possible dramatist is returned after 1641. James Spedding appears to have been the first to point out this connection between *The Tempest* and Bacon’s *Henry the seventh*, see SEH, Vol. 6, p.139. He does not point out the further connection “To counterfeit the dead image of a King in his Coyne, is an high Offence by all Lawes: But to counterfeit the liuing image of a King in his Person, exceedeth all Falsifications” Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth* (1629), STC: 1161.

\(^{820}\) Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reign of King Henry the Seuenth* (1629), STC: 1161, & 1676, Wing: B300; Henry Wooton, *A panegyrick* (1649), Wing: W3645; John Dryden, *The tempest* (1670), Wing: S2944. No others were under 18 years old in 1610.
to haue no schreene between this part he plaide, / And him he plaide it for (107–8)  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>To haue no schreene between this part he plaide, &amp; him he plaide it for (107–8)</td>
<td>{screen(s)(es)(e) or skreen(s)(es)(e)}</td>
<td>(0(36)&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{821} [person is a screen] (1&lt;1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>bountifull Fortune (178)</td>
<td>{bountiful fortune}</td>
<td>2 (1&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{822}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>the still-vext Bermoothes (229)</td>
<td>{barmuda(s)/barmuda(s)/bermoothes}</td>
<td>(9&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{823}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>the sharp winde of the North (254)</td>
<td>{the sharp wind}</td>
<td>2(22) (0(7)&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{824} [northerly]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>age and envy (258)</td>
<td>{age and envy}</td>
<td>3 (0&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{825}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>vnmittigable (276)</td>
<td>{unmittigable}\textsuperscript{826}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{827}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>vent thy groans (280)</td>
<td>{vent thy}</td>
<td>37 (3&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{828}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>vnestylome fen (322)</td>
<td>(1) {unwholesome fen} (2) {unwholesome}</td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{829} 3 (3&lt;1611)\textsuperscript{830}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{821} Shakespeare’s First Folio has ‘schreene’ in The Tempest so does not register in the returns. There are two examples of screening behaviour: (1) flattery “which is like a Skreene before the grauest judgements” in George Wilkins, The painfull aduentures of Pericles (1608), STC: 25638.5; and (2) simplicity “of the Father, must be the meanes for abusing his Schollerly Son, and a skreene to stand betweene the Priest and his ignorance” in Giovanni Boccaccio, The decameron (1620), STC: 3172. Bacon has people as screens in his essay ‘Of Enuy’ with “And nothing doth extinguish Enuy more, then for a great Person, to preserue all other inferiour Officers, in their full Rights, and Prehenimines, of their Places. For by that meanes, there be so many Skreenes betweene him, and Enuy”. In ‘Of Ambition’ we find “There is also grauest Iudgements” in George Wilkins, The historie of the reign of King Henry the Seuenth (1629), STC: 1161, finished in October 1621. The Tempest has the first occurrence of people as screens, and Bacon the second. Later is “the interposition of my saviour, my best friend in heaven, may screeene mee from the deserved wrath of that great God” Joseph Hall, Occasional meditations (1631), STC: 12688.5. Also “make a screeene of him” in William Rowley, A match at mid-niight (1633), STC: 21421, which was first performed in 1622. The rest are too late to be significant.  

\textsuperscript{822} Thomas Lodge, Catharos (1591), STC: 16654. Lodge was a member of Lincoln’s Inn.  

\textsuperscript{823} The first known mention of Bermuda is “I sayled aboue the Iland of Bermuda otherwise cauled Garza” in Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, The decades (1555), STC: 647. Before 1611, two records are by d’Anghiera, two by Walter Raleigh, one by Jan Huygen van Linschoten, one by Richard Hakluyt, one by Africanus Leo, and two connected with the Virginia enterprise by Silvester Jourdain, and Richard Rich. Bermuda is only mentioned in relation to exploration.  

\textsuperscript{824} In a voyage to Japan “that day we had a sharp wind of the Monson […] and then we had it Northwest” Jan Huygen van Linschoten, discours of voyages (1598), STC: 15691 but this is not northerly. The first occurrence is in The Tempest in First Folio (1623) and the second is in ‘True Reportory’ in Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625). Dryden’s The Tempest (1670) follows The Tempest (1611).  

\textsuperscript{825} Apart from Shakespeare and Dryden there is Anon, The Country miss new come in fashion (1670), Wing: C6564.  

\textsuperscript{826} Added variant ‘vnmittigable’.  

\textsuperscript{827} The other is Joseph Hall, One of the sermons (1628), STC: 12692.  

\textsuperscript{828} “vent thy trace” Henry Chillester, Youthes witte (1581), STC: 5137.5; “vent thy passion” Ben Jonson, The fountain of selfe-lowe (1601), STC: 14773; “vent thy youthfull heate” John Marston, The wonder of women (1606), STC: 17488. Later is “vent thy railing vaine” Homer, The Iliads (1611), STC: 13634; “vent thy worst of Ire” Thomas Heywood, Gynaikeion (1624), STC: 13326.  

\textsuperscript{829} Apart from Shakespeare there is Josua Poole, The English Parnassus (1657), Wing: P2814, but Poole was born c.1632 which is too late for consideration.  

\textsuperscript{830} “The aire of Famagusta is very vnwholesome, as they say, by reason of certaine marish ground adjoyning it” Richard Hakluyt, The principal navigations (1599–1600), STC: 12626a; “This
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>near.15 marish}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27 | Wouldst giue me / Water with berries in’t (333–4) | \{water near.5 berries\} 82 (18<1611)\
| 28 | print of goodnesse (352) | \{print of good(ness)\} 5 (2<1611)\
| 29 | my Dams god Setebos (373) | \{setebos\} 5 (2<1611)\
| 30 | brave form (412) | \{brave form\} 3 (0<1611)\

### ACT TWO

#### Scene One

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31 | Though this island seem to be desert, / Ha, ha, ha! / So, you’re paid. / Uninhabitable and almost | (1) \{uninhabitable near.3 inaccessible\} 1 (0<1611)\n(2) \{habitable near.3\} 3 (0<1611)\

---

fountaine thus flowing out of this grounde, falleth into a marishe (to speake with Ezechiel) where standeth a poole of vnwholesome water” Robert Parker, *A scholasticall discourse* (1607), STC: 19294; “For at that season the aire was generally mishiled, by reason of the diseases of the Inhabitants: because (for the most part) being marish and vnwholesome” Orazio Torsellino, *The history of our B. Lady of Loreto* (1608), STC: 24141. Later, there is “All standing waters, as of pooles, motes, and of pits, which in low and marish places, are very vsuall, are most vnwholesome” Tobias Venner, *Via recta* (1620), STC: 24623. There is a complex connection here. In the ‘True Reportory’ we have “as we condemne not Kent in England, for a small Towne called Plums tead, continually assaulting the dwellers there (especially newcomers) with Agues and Feuers; no more let vs lay scandall, and imputation vpon the Country of Virginia, because the little Quarter wherein we are set downe (vnaduisedly so chosed) appears to be vnwholesome, and subiect to many ill ayres, which accompany the like marish places” which is in Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes*, Vol. 4 (1625), STC: 20509, p.1753. This is framed in the *True Declaration* as “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 Wilds and Hundreds of Kent” Counsel for Virginia, *A true declaration* (1610), STC: 24833, p.32. Caliban revisits this idea at (2.2.1–2) with “All the infections that the sun sucks up / From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall and make him / By inch-meal a disease!” In his essay ‘Of Plantations’ Bacon has “It hath beene a great Endangering, to the Health of some Plantations, that that haue built along the Sea, and Riviers, in marish and vnwholesome Grounds.” in Francis Bacon, *The essays* (1625), STC: 1148, p.203. Clearly, the association of ‘marish’ (or fens) with ‘unwholesome’ is unusual.

---

Too commonplace. In the ‘True Reportory’ it states that “the Berries, whereof our men seething, straining, and letting stand some three or four daies, made a kind of pleasant drinke” Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes*, Vol. 4 (1625), STC: 20509, p.1739. The *True Declaration* has “Lastly they found the berries of cedar […] which sufficed to sustain nature” in Counsel for Virginia, *A true declaration* (1610), STC: 24833. The ‘True Reportory’ declares that “Peter Martin [Pietro Martire d’Anghiero] saith that at Alexandria in Egypt there is a kind of Cedar […] which beare old fruite and newe all the yeere […] but then, neither those there in the Bermudas, nor ours here in Virginia are of that happy kind”, p.1739.

---

“nor geue any printe of good life” John Jewel, *A replie vnto M. Hardinges answeare* (1565), STC: 14606; “hath the print of Good” Francis Bacon, *The two bookees* (1605), STC: 1164. Later, the only other return apart from Shakespeare and Dryden is “the print of good” in G.T., *The legend of Brita-mart* (1646), Wing: T1901, the text states that the author is George Tooke who would have been 15 years old in 1610.

---

The two returns are *The decades*. Setebos, for example “theyr greate deuyll Setebos”, is mentioned four times in Pietro Martire d’Anghier, *The decades* (1555), STC: 647, p.219. There is also mention of “a great ryver of freshe water and certeyne Canibales” at the Cape of St. Marie near Brazil, p.218. The only other occurrence apart from Shakespeare and Dryden is in “their great Deuill Setebos” Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (1625), STC: 20509, in the description of Magellan’s voyage in his ship *San Victoria*.

---

“He tooke the braue forme of a horse” Homer, *The Iliads* (1611), STC: 13634.
32 inaccessible (2.1.35–3) accessible
33 beyond credit (59–60) {beyond credit}
34 the stomach of my sense (108) {stomach of my}
35 Gentlemen of Braue metal (182) {brave metal}
36 hee’s vndrown’d (237) {undrowned}
37 ‘tis best we stand vpon our guard; / Or that we quit this place: let’s draw our weapons (321–2) {stand upon his/our guard} ∩ {weapon(s) near.30 guard}
38 by ynch-meale a disease (2.2.3) {inch meal}

Scene Two

835 “If any had said seuen yeares agoe, the Bermuda Islands are not only accessible and habitable, but also fertile, fruitfull, plentiful [...] oh how loudly would he haue beene laught at” Silvester Jourdain, A plaine description of the Bermudas (1613), STC: 14817. Note “the Bermudas, a place hardly accessable” and “If they had fel by night, what expectation of light, from an uninhabited desart?” in Counsell for Virginia, A true declaration (1610), STC: 24833.
836 Raphael Holinshed, The firste volume (1577), STC: 13568b, & The first and second volumes (1587), STC: 13569; Richard Mulcaster, Positions wherein (1581), STC: 18253; John Hind, Eliosto libudinoso (1606), STC: 13509; Edward Topsell, The historie of serpents (1608), STC: 24124. Later is ‘Consideration Touching a War with Spain’ from 1624 by Francis Bacon, Certain miscellany work (1670), Wing: B275.
838 Later is John Fletcher, The chances a comedy (1682), Wing: F1338, written c.1613.
839 Laurence Humphrey, The nobles (1563), STC: 13964; Ovid, The. xv. bookes (1567), STC: 18956; Arthur Dent, The opening of heauen gates (1610), STC: 6619; Rowland Vaughan, Most approved (1610), STC: 24603.
840 The first occurrence is in relation to the Earl of Essex “For, if his project had taken effect” Francis Bacon, A declaration of the practise (1601), STC: 1133. While this falls outside the limit for being rare in 1611, it receives its first known publication by Bacon in 1601, and so Bacon seems to have originated a phrase that The Tempest used. I take this to be significant.
841 “wee muste alwayes stande vpon our garde armed with spiritual weapons” Arthur Golding, The warfare (1576), STC: 5201; “who had then his weapon at his side, hearing him make these threates, set hand quickly to it to stand vpon his guard” Anthony Munday, The first booke of Primaleon (1595), STC: 20366. Later is “he must stand vpon his guard, yet like a disarmed and weaponlesse man” Godfrey Goodman, The full of man (1616), STC: 12023; Strachey’s report of life at Bermuda has “euer man from thenceforth commanded to weare his weapon, without which before, we freely walked from quarter to quarter, and conuered among our selues, and euyer man aduised to stand vpon his guard” Samuel Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625), STC: 20509. So the ‘True Reporitory’ is only one of three that precedes The Tempest.
842 Horace, A medicinable morall (1566), STC: 13805; John Foxe, Actes and moniments (1583), STC: 11225; John Davies, Humours heau’n on earth (1609), STC: 6332.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Doe you put trickes vpon’s with Saluages (57–8)</td>
<td>{put(ting) trick(s) upon}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>the siege of this Moone-calfe (106)</td>
<td>{moon calf}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Beares Celestiall liquor (117)</td>
<td>{celestial liquor}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Caliban: Ha’st thou not dropt from heauen? (137); Stephano: Out o’ the moon (138); Caliban: I prithee, be my god (149)</td>
<td>{worship the moon}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I’ prithee, let me bring thee where Crabs grow; / And I with my long nayles will digge thee pig-nuts; / Show thee a layes nest and instruct thee how / To snare the nimble Marmozet; I’le bring thee / To clustring Philbirts [hazelnuts],</td>
<td>{crab(s) near.40 filberds/filberts/filbirts/philberts}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT THREE

Scene One

---

843 The earliest I have found is “Some build rather vpon abusing others, and as wee now say, putting trickes vpon them”, Francis Bacon, *The essaies* (1612), STC: 1141, sig. C, which is not currently keyed-in text in EEBO but only digital image. The “as wee now say” seems to suggest it was in common usage but it is rare in the published literature of the period. Later is Thomas Randolph, *The jealous lovers* (1613), STC: 20692, who would have been 5 years old in 1610. A play called ‘The City Wit’ is returned for Richard Brome, *Five new playes* (1653), Wing: B4870, but it dates to 1629.


846 “[The Chinese] worship the Moone, the Sunne, and the Starres” Bernardino de Escalante, *A discourse* (1597), STC: 10529; Diego Ortunez, *The third parte of the first booke* (1586), STC: 18864; “[natives of Bogota or Columbia] they likewise worship the Moone, but not so much as the sun” Jan Huysgen van Linschoten, *discourse of voyages into the Easte & West Indies* (1598), STC: 15691; “they [Mongols or Tartars] call the moone the Great Emperour, and worship it vpon their knees” and “there were other Gentiles in ye Indies which worship the moone” in Richard Hakluyt, *The principal navigations* (1599–1600), STC: 12626a; “he [Christopher Columbus] obserued that they [west Indians] were superstitiously giuen to worship the Moone” Robert Gray (?), *A good speed to Virginia* (1609), STC: 12204. So only Hakluyt and Gray mention Indians.

847 The earliest is “some filberds haue I seene, Crabbes great store” in Ralph Harmor [the younger], *A True Discourse of the present estate of Virginia, and the successe of the affaires there till the 18 of Iune. 1614. (1615), STC: 12736.
**The Mistris which I serue,** quickens what’s dead (3.1.6)  
{quickens near.4 dead/life/alive}  
40 (5<1611)<sup>848</sup>  
[restoration]

45 Vpon a sore injunction (11)  
{upon fby.3 injunction}  
35 (4<1611)<sup>549</sup>

46 Much businesse appertaining (96)  
{business appertaining}  
12 (1<1611)<sup>830</sup>

**Scene 2**

47 for Ile not shew him / Where the quicke Freshes are. (3.2.66–7)  
{freshes}  
31 (2<1611)<sup>551</sup>

48 paunch him with a stake (90)  
{paunch him}  
4 (1<1611)<sup>852</sup>

49 cut his wezand with thy knife (91)  
{wezand}  
47 (9<1611)<sup>853</sup>  
[cut]

---


In the posthumously published ‘Sylva Sylvarum’ written in English he writes “For as Butterflies quicken with Heat, which were benummed with Cold” Francis Bacon, *Sylua syluarum* (1627), STC: 1168. In his essay ‘Of Sutes’ (1597) he has “Secrecie in Sutes is a great meanes of obtaining, for voicing them to bee in forwardnes may discourage some kind of suters, but doth quicken and awake others” Francis Bacon, *Essayes* (1597), STC: 1137. Also in a speech on ‘The Article of Naturalization’ delivered on 17 February 1607 we have “whether it [denial of naturalisation] will not quicken and excite all the envious and malicious humours” Francis Bacon, *The union of the two kingdoms of Scotland and England* (1670), Wing: B340, see also *LL*, Vol. 3, pp.307, 322.


<sup>850</sup> “in all besynesse apertayning to man” Desiderius Erasmus, *A booke called in latyn Enchiridion* (1533), STC: 10479.


| 50 | Cals her a non-pareill (100) | \{nonpareil\(l\) or “non-pareil” or “non-pareill” or “nonpariel”\} | 27 (2<1611)\textsuperscript{854} |
| 51 | the Isle is full of noyses (135) | \{full of noises\} | 4 (1<1611)\textsuperscript{855} |
| 52 | Twangling Instruments (137) | \{twangling\} | 3 (1<1611)\textsuperscript{856} |
| 53 | I would I could see this Tabourer (151) | \{tabourer\} | 6 (1<1611)\textsuperscript{857} |
| 54 | By’r lakin (3.3.1) | \{lakin\} | 21 (1(3)<1611) [not a surname]\textsuperscript{858} |
| 55 | Here’s a maze trod indeede / Through fourth rights (3) | \{fourth rights\} | 2 (1<1611)\textsuperscript{859} |
| 56 | dulling of my spirits (6) | \{dulling near.3 spirits\} | 12 (1(2)<1611)\textsuperscript{860} |
| 57 | excellent dumb discourse (39) | \{dumb discourse\} | 7 (1(2)<1611)\textsuperscript{861} [not Shakespeare] |

\textsuperscript{854} Powhaton’s daughter was “the only Nonpariel of his Country” John Smith, \textit{A true relation} (1608), STC: 22795.5; “then he which is the Non pareil” George Marcelline, \textit{The triumphs of King Iames the First} (1610), STC: 17309. Shakespeare uses it five times in the First Folio the earliest being \textit{Twelfth Night} (1602) “though you were crown’d / The non-pareil of beautie” meaning person without equal. Later, in the play “Novella” [c.1632] there is “the Nonpareil of heires” Richard Brome, \textit{Five new playes} (1653), Wing: B4870, who was born c.1590. Also a play attributed to Marlowe although since it is thought to be c.1600 is likely not his, “he’s the Nonpareil” Christopher Marlowe [?], \textit{Lusts dominion} (1657), Wing: L3504A, probably by Thomas Dekker. The \textit{Nonpareil} was an English ship that was renamed from the \textit{George and Mary} in1584 and fought the Spanish Armada in 1588. Perhaps, the Shakespeare contributor having already used it in \textit{Twelfth Night} only chose to use it in \textit{The Tempest} after seeing it used in Smith’s 1608 Virginia colony pamphlet. So Smith’s \textit{A true relation} remains a possible source.

\textsuperscript{855} Jacques Legrand, \textit{[Here begynneth]} (1487), STC: 15394.

\textsuperscript{856} “a tuneable sound vpon twangling strings” Marcus Tullius Cicero, \textit{A panoplie of epistles} (1576), STC: 11049. It appears again in Shakespeare’s \textit{The Taming of the Shrew} “While she did call me Rascal, Fidler, / and twangling lacke”.

\textsuperscript{857} Richard Huloet, \textit{Huloets dictionarie newly corrected} (1572), STC: 13941. Later is “dancing the Morrisce and a Tabourer” in the play Barten Holyday, \textit{Technogamia} (1618), STC: 13617. Holyday would have been 17 years old in 1610.

\textsuperscript{858} “Yea yea be lakin” Luke Shepherd, \textit{The vpcheringe of the messe} (1548), STC: 17630. Later is “By lakin (Master Granato)” George Chapman, \textit{Two wise men} (1619), STC: 4991; Richard Brome, \textit{Five new playes} (1659), Wing: B4872, performed in 1637.

\textsuperscript{859} John Hardying, \textit{The chronicle of Iohn Hardyng in metre} (1543), STC: 12766.7.

\textsuperscript{860} “by dulling the spirits” Edward Jorden, \textit{A briefe discourse} (1603), STC: 14790.

\textsuperscript{861} Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas, \textit{Babilon} (1595), STC: 21662; the other is Shakespeare’s \textit{Troylus and Cresseida} (1609), STC: 22331.
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to instrument this lower world (54)

proper selves (60)

ministers of Fate (61)

ACT FOUR

Scene One

sweet aspersion (18)

take away the edge (28–9)

The strongest oathes, are straw /
To th’fire ith’blood (52–3)
Thy bankes with pioned, and twilled brims / Which spungie Aprill, at thy hest betrims; / To make cold Nymphs chast crownes

Next two are decisive:

1. {pioned}
2. {maiden piony}  
3. {virgin piony}

April mentioned

[many-coloured Messenger] with thy saffron wings

foul conspiracy

in some passion

That workes him strongly

ACT FIVE

Scene One

high wrongs

nobler reason

printlesse foote

---

870 “that pure virgin snow” Francis Davison, *A Poetical rapsody* (1602), STC: 6373; the second piece is set to music and the lyric is almost certainly an edited version of Davison in Thomas Ford, *Musicke of sundrie kindes* (1607), STC: 11166. There are three editions of Davison returned.

871 Added spelling variations ‘peonie’ and ‘pionie’ to this and following searches.

872 A marginal note in Ovid has “Ratis is most properly a Lighter, made of pieces of timber, pioned together, whereon hay or other like things are dragged or drawen with horses on Riuers” in Ovid, *Ouids Metamorphosis* (1618), STC: 18963, p.53;


874 “his flowers and leaues are much smaller [than usual female piony], and the stalkes shorter, the whiche some call Mayden or Virgin Peonie” Rembert Dodoens, A *niewwe herball* (1578), STC: 6984, pp.244–5. This is doubtless what the Shakespeare contributor is referring to with “Nymphes chaste crownes”. Also “Pionie floareth at the beginning of May, and deliuereth his seed in June” with no mention of April.

875 In Bacon’s 1625 essay ‘Of Gardens’ he has “In Aprill follow […] The Double Piony;” in Francis Bacon, *The essayes* (1625), STC: 1148, p.267. This is not keyed text so is unavailable to an EEBO search. So only the Shakespeare work and Bacon can be found to refer to the piony in April.

876 This return is for the First Folio’s *The Tempest*.

877 “Dame Rainbow down therefore with safron wings of dropping showres” Virgil, *The whole .xii. books of the Aenidos* (1573), STC: 24801.

878 Thomas Middleton, [Ben Jonson, John Fletcher,] *The widdow* (1652), Wing: J1015, c.1615.

879 “to speake in some passion” William Barlow, *The svmme and svbstance* (1604), STC: 1456.5. Later is a romance play “said I in some passion” John Dauncey, *The English lovers* (1662), Wing: D289A, Dauncey was influential in 1663; “where being in some passion that he could not suddenly pass” Francis Bacon, *A collection of apopthegms* (1674), Wing: B278, dictated to his secretary c.1624.

880 “which workes him further syght” Edmund Elviden, *The closet of counsells* (1569), STC: 7622.


883 Later used by John Milton, *Poems* (1646), Wing: M2160; see also his “printlesse feet” *A maske* (1637), STC: 17937.
Possible sources

I grade the collocations A or B according to the number of records returned before 1611, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

A: Only 1 record, B: From 2–5 records

---

Richard Arnold, In this booke (1503), STC: 782; William Neville, The castell of pleasure (1530), STC: 18475; England and Wales Privy Council, Orders (1595), STC: 8243; John Cowell, The interpreter (1607), STC: 5900; William Shakespeare [?], The merry deuill of Edmonton (1608), STC: 7493. The word also appears in Shakespeare’s King Lear.

Horace, A medicinable morall (1566), STC: 13805; Gervase Markham, A health (1598), STC: 17140.

Thomas Heywood, Troia Britanica (1609), STC: 13366.

“How potent art thou” John Marston, What you will (1607), STC: 17487 does not meet the condition.

Josua Poole, The English Parnassus (1657), Wing: P2814.

The following does not refer to a storm “so long as the ship is caried with a good wind [...] then the souldiers & passengers be sleeping and snorting ynder the hatches” Radford Mavericke, Saint Peters chaine (1596), STC: 17683. Later on the 1609 Bermuda shipwreck is Lewes Hughes, A letter (1615), STC: 13919: “many of them being fast asleepe: this vnlooked for welcom e newes [land …] hurried them all aboue hatches” John Smith, The generall historie of Virginia (1624), STC: 22790. There is also the 1591 Thomas Cavendish voyage to the South Sea unpublished until 1625 “the next day the storme ceased, and most of our young Saylers, which we call men of top a yard, being wearied with their nights worke that was past, were vnder Hatches asleepe” Samuel Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625), STC: 20509, p.1205.

“Howe strong he not strongly iustled from aboue The Eagle” John Marston, The metamorphosis (1598), STC: 17482.


“reelyng ripe” Johannes Ferrarius, A woorke (1559), STC: 10831.
Since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears for two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

AA or AB: Beyond reasonable doubt

BB: Balance of probability

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1611) I give the collocation number from the table followed by its grade.

Pietro Martire d’Anghiera *The decades* (29A), Anon *The Byble* (64B), Apuleius *The xi. bookes* (41B), Richard Arnold *In this booke* (75B), Martin de Azpilcueta *The peace* (45B), Francis Bacon *The two bookes* (28B), Richard Bancroft *Certaine demandes* (45B), William Barlow *The svmme* (67A), Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas *Babilon* (54A), Francis Beaumont *The woman hater* (63B), Bishop of Lincoln *Certaine sermons* (2A)(33B), Bishop of Lincoln *Thesaurus linguae* (40B), John Bridges *The supremacie* (16A), Robert Bruce *Sermons* (44B), John Calvin *The sermons* (13A), John Case *The praise* (40B), Henry Chiller...
you will (77A), John Marston The wonder of women (25B), Marcos Martinez The eighth booke (60B), Philippe de Mornay A notable treatise (58B), Richard Mulcaster Positions wherin (32B), Anthony Munday The first booke of Primaleon (37B)(63B), William Neville The castell (75B), Thomas Newton Approved medicines (40B), Ovid The. xv. bookes (35B)(48A), William Perkins An exposition of the Symbole or Creede of the Apostles (7B), William Perkins A golden chaine (7B), William Perkins How to liue (44B), James Pilkington Aggeus (44B), Plutarch The philosophie (63B), Privy Council Orders (75B), Samuel Purchas ‘True Reportory’ Purchas his pilgrimes (22A)(26B)(37B), Robert Rollock Lectures (44B), John Ryckes The true image (60B), R. S. The Iesuites play (15A), Edward Sharpham The fleire (40B), Luke Shepherd The vpcheringe (54A), John Smith A truerelation (47B)(50B), Edward Topsell The historie (32B), Rowland Vaughan Most approued (35B), Virgil The whole .xii. bookes of the Aenidos (68A), Christof Wirsung The general (62B).

**Probable sources**

It is beyond reasonable doubt that the following were sources for *The Tempest*: Bishop of Lincoln Certaine sermons (1580), Ovid The. xv. bookes (1567), and Purchas (Strachey’s) ‘True Reportory’ Purchas his pilgrimes (1610, publ. 1625).

On the balance of probability the following were also sources: Horace A medicinable morall (1566), Anthony Munday The first booke of Primaleon (1595), and John Smith A true relation [Virginia] (1608).

**Summary of evidence**

Table 7.2 gives a summary of the data, see ‘Key to RCP data tables’ (p.viii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Jonson</th>
<th>Marston</th>
<th>Middleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The detailed footnotes for Table 7.1 will provide more information for what follows. In Tables 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5, I apply the definition of rarity given in Table 4.1 at the date of the later use of these collocations.

**Francis Bacon**

There are 6 rare collocation matches for Bacon in (1.2) of *The Tempest* (see Table 7.3) which I shall now discuss. In “Being once perfected how to graunt suits, / how to deny them: who t’advance and who / To trash for ouer-topping” (No. 14), Bacon is the first person after *The Tempest* to use the antithesis of granting and denying suits. In a letter from 1620 to King James he states that “to grant all suits were to undo yourself, or your people. To deny all suits were to see never a contented face.”\(^{893}\) In his essay “Of Ambition” Bacon also has “There is Vse also of Ambitious Men, in Pulling downe the Greatnesse, of any Subiect that ouer-tops”,\(^{894}\) although there are 28 examples of the use of ‘overtop(ping)(s)’ before 1611.

---


\(^{894}\) Francis Bacon, *The essayes or counsels* (1625), STC: 1148.
Table 7.3 Bacon’s RCP for The Tempest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>0&lt;1620</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1&lt;1621</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>4&lt;1690</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>○○○</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1&lt;1621</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>10&lt;1690</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>11&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>0&lt;1612</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>●●○○</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>c.1626</td>
<td>4&lt;1628</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1&lt;1625</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>c.1624</td>
<td>6&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jesuites play at Lyons in France (1607) seems the most likely source for “that now he was / The Iuy which had hid my princely Trunk, / And suckt my verdure [health] out on’t” (No. 15). Bacon has “But it was ordained, that this Winding-Iuie of a PLANTAGANET, should kill the true Tree it selfe” in his The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth which he finished in October 1621.895

The idea of self deception by repetition of a fabricated tale appears as “Like one / Who hauing into truth, by telling of it, / Made such a synner of hi memorie / To credite his owne lie, he did beleue / He was indeed the Duke, out o’ th’ Substitution / And executing th’ outward face of Roialtie / With all prerogatiuie” (No. 18). Only Bacon in Henry the

895 Francis Bacon, The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth (1629), STC: 1161, & 1676, Wing: B300. Bacon completed this work in October 1621.
Seuenth has anything resembling this when discussing the imposter Perkin Warbeck with “Insomuch as it was generally beleueed (aswell amongst great Persons, as amongst the Vulgar) that he was indeed Duke Richard. Nay, himselfe, with long and continuall countefeitng, and with oft telling a Lye, was turned by habit almost into the thing heesee med to bee; and from a Lyer to a Beleeuer.” Quiller–Couch sees these lines from The Tempest as counterfeit coining metaphors and Bacon also made use of it in Henry the Seuenth “To counterfeit the dead image of a King in his coyne, is an high Offence by all Lawes: But to counterfeit the liuing image of a King in his Person, exceedeth all Falsification” (see Table 7.1, No. 18, footnote).

The use of a person as a screen is expressed as “To haue no schreene between this part he plaid, / And him he plaid it for” (No. 19). The Tempest has the first use of a screen in this context and Francis Bacon has the second. In fact, I have found three examples of Bacon’s use, for instance, in his Henry the Seuenth “Their ayme was at Arch Bishop Morton and Sir Reginold Bray, who were the Kings Skreens in this Enuy.” The other two are in his 1625 essays ‘Of Enuy’ and ‘Of Ambition’ (see No. 19, footnote).

The use of the word ‘unwholesome’ to describe marshes or fens (No. 26) is unusual, there being only 3 examples before 1611. It appears in The Tempest as “unwholesome fen” as well as in Bacon’s ‘Of Plantations’ (1625) when he cautions against building a plantation on “marish and vnwholesome Grounds”.

There are only two examples of the phrase “print of goodnesse” (No. 28) before The Tempest when searched as ‘good’ or ‘goodness’. One is John Jewel’s A replie (1565) and the other is Bacon’s “hath the print of Good” in his Advancement of Learning (1605).

From Scene 2.1, Bacon has “beyond credit” (No. 32), and “his proiect” (No. 36). The latter has 10 returns before 1611 so is outside the ‘rare’ range, but EEBO suggests that Bacon was the first to publish this term in 1601, and so I include this as a possible source on the basis that The Tempest made use of a reasonably unusual phrase that Bacon appears to have originated. The former has 5 returns before the play.

A search for ‘put(ting) trick(s) upon’ which derives from The Tempest’s “Doe you put trickes vpon’s with Saluages” (No.39) in (2.2), returns no examples before 1611. The

---

896 John Jewel, A replie vnto M. Hardinges answere (1565), STC: 14606.
897 Francis Bacon, The two bookes (1605), STC: 1164.
898 “For, if his project had taken effect” Francis Bacon, A declaration of the practises (1601), STC: 1133.
earliest I am aware of is Francis Bacon’s “Some build rather vpon abusing others, and as wee now say, putting trickes vpon them” from *The essaies* (1612).\(^{899}\) This is only in digital image form in EEBO so was not returned in the searches.

In Scene 3.1, “The Mistris which I serue, quickens what’s dead” (No. 44) yields 5 examples before 1611 for the search ‘quickens near.4 dead/life/alive’ in the sense that ‘quickens’ signifies revival. There are at least three uses of this by Francis Bacon. In his essay ‘Of Sutes’ (1597), there is “Secrecie in Sutes is a great meane of obtaining, for voicing them to bee in forwardnes may discourage some kind of suters, but doth quicken and awake others.”\(^{900}\) Also in a speech on ‘The Article of Naturalization’ delivered on 17 February 1607 we find “whether it [denial of naturalisation] will not quicken and excite all the envious and malicious humours.”\(^{901}\) In the posthumously published *Sylva Sylvarum* written in English he writes “For as Butterflies quicken with Heat, which were benummed with Cold.”\(^{902}\) Closer, but dependent on a 1858 translation from Latin, is “butterflies stupified and half dead with cold […] the heated pan] quickens and gives them life” from the *Novum Organon* (1620).\(^{903}\)

Scene 3.3 has “Who would beleue that there were Mountayneereres, / Dew-lapt, like Buls whose throats had hanging at ‘em / Wallets of flesh?” (No. 58). A search of ‘mountains/mountaineers near.20 throats’ which I have manually filtered for context produces 2 returns before 1611 and 4 before 1627 in the sense of ‘hanging flesh’. Possible sources are Philliple Mornay’s *A notable treatise* (1579) “as they that haue swilled in the snowe waters from the mountaynes, call those imperfect, which haue not wyde and hanging throte[s] like themselues”\(^{904}\) or Thomas Elyots *Bibliotheca* (1542) “Stiria, A countrey ioyning to Austria and Carinthia in the este parte of Germanye, full of mountaynes sauing a little parte bordrying on Hungary, the people be rude, and the women

---

899 Francis Bacon, *The essaies* (1612), STC: 1141, sig. C. Also Thomas Randolph, *The jealous lovers* (1613), STC: 20692, who would have been 5 years old in 1610.

900 Francis Bacon, *Essayes* (1597), STC: 1137.


902 Francis Bacon, *Sylua syluarum* (1627), STC: 1168.


904 Philippe de Mornay, *A notable treatise* (1579), STC: 18159. Purchas reports on the tribes near Siberia, Samoiedia, and Tingoessia visited by the Muscovites. In the margin he has “The Tingoessies deformed with swellings vnder their throats: a disease attending drinkers of Snow-water” Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (1625), STC: 20509, p.527. Purchas records that “the Tingoesi being well acquainted, doe keepe beyond the Riuer, and in the mountaines, vntill it [flooding of fields by river] decrease, and then returne”, p.527. In a marginal note on p.522, Purchas says “The first and second paragraphs were published in *Latine* by Hessel Gerardus An. 1612. here a little contracted: the last I found in M. *Haklytes* Papers.”
haue so great throtes by the corruption of the water and ayre."905 Taken together, they would account for Bacon’s version “Snow-water is held vnwholesome; In so much as the people who dwell at the Foot of the Snow Mountaines, or otherwise upon the Ascent, (especially the Women,) by drinking of Snow-water, haue great Bagges hanging vnder their Throats.”906

Scene 4.1 has “Thy bankes with pioned, and twilled brims / Which spungie Aprill, at thy hest betrims; / To make cold Nymphs chast crownes” (No. 67). Searches for ‘pioned’, ‘piony’, and ‘april neare.30 piony’, produce no results before 1611. However, noting Shakespeare’s “Nymphs chast crownes”, there is Rembert Dodoens’s *A niewwe herball* (1578) with “his flowers and leaues are much smaller [than the usual female piony], and the stalkes shorter, the whiche some call Mayden or Virgin Peonie” and he goes on to assert that “Pionie floureth at the beginning of May, and deliuereth his seed in June.”907 However, I have only found two examples that mention it in April: *The Tempest*, and Bacon’s essay ‘Of Gardens’ (1625) “In Aprill follow, The Double white Violet; [list of flowers] The Tulippa; The Double Piony.”908

Also in Scene 4.1, “in some passion” (No. 70) has only 1 return before 1611 and 6 before 1690. In *A collection of apophthegms* (1674) dictated to his secretary c.1624, Bacon has “where being in some passion that he could not suddenly pass.”909

**Thomas Heywood**

The construction “vent thy” (No. 25) in (1.2) was used by two dramatists before 1611: “vent thy passion” in Ben Jonson’s *The fountaine of selfe-loue* (1601);910 and “vent thy youthful heate” in John Marston’s *The wonder of women* (1606).911 Heywood has “vent thy worst of Ire” in *Gynaikeion* (1624).912 “Moon-calfe” (No. 40) from (2.2) is mentioned four times in *The Tempest*. The earliest use I have found is in John Fielde’s *Certaine articles* (1572).913 In *Thesaurus linguae* (1578) there is the definition “Plin. A peece of fleshe without shape growen in the womans wombe, which maketh hir to thinke she is with

---

905 Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca* (1542), STC: 7659.5.
908 Francis Bacon, *The essays* (1625), STC: 1148, p.267. This is not keyed text so is unavailable to an EEBO search.
909 Francis Bacon, *A collection of apophthegms* (1674), Wing: B278.
910 Ben Jonson’s *The fountaine of selfe-loue* (1601), STC: 14773.
913 John Fielde, *Certaine articles* (1572), STC: 10850.
childe: a moone calfe”. Thomas Middleton, Michael Drayton, and Ben Jonson all used it before Thomas Heywood in The life of Merlin (1641). However, it was not rare at the date Heywood employed it. In (5.1), “mutenous windes” (No. 77) is especially rare, appearing in only 1 return before 1611 and 4 prior to 1690. Heywood has the earliest use in Troia Britanica (1609).

Table 7.4 Heywood’s RCP for The Tempest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Heywood</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>8&lt;1624</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>20&lt;1641</td>
<td>&lt;17</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ben Jonson

Table 7.5 Jonson’s RCP for The Tempest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Jonson</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>9&lt;1631</td>
<td>&lt;14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>○?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed above, two of the collocations “vent thy” (No. 25) and “Moone-calfe” (No. 40) which Jonson uses are also employed by Thomas Heywood, the first also being used by John Marston. Jonson is the first dramatist returned for “vent thy” from The fountaine of selfe-loue (1601), which is only preceded by Henry Chillester’s Youthes witte (1581). However, Thomas Middleton precedes Jonson for No. 40 with A courtly masque (1620).

The phrase “foul conspiracy” (No. 69) appears in The widdow (1652) which is attributed to Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, and John Fletcher, and so Jonson’s use cannot be confirmed.

---

914 Church of England. Diocese of Lincoln, Thesaurus linguae (1578), STC: 5688.
915 Thomas Middleton, A courtly masque (1620), STC: 17909.
916 Michael Drayton, The battaile of Agincourt (1627), STC: 7190.
917 Ben Jonson, Bartholmew fayre (1631), STC: 14753.5.
918 Thomas Heywood, The life of Merlin (1641), Wing: H1786.
919 Thomas Heywood, Troia Britanica (1609), STC: 13366.
920 Henry Chillester, Youthes witte (1581), STC: 5137.5.
921 Thomas Middleton, A courtly masque (1620), STC: 17909.
922 Thomas Middleton, [Ben Jonson, John Fletcher,] The widdow (1652), Wing: J1015, c.1615.
John Marston

Marston’s use of “vent thy” (No. 25) has already been noted but his use in *The wonder of women* (1606) is later than Jonson’s. In (3.3), there is “proper selves” (No. 60) and although not the first to make use of it, Marston is the first dramatist returned with his use in *The scourge of villanie* (1598) which precedes *The Tempest*. In (5.1), EEBO notes that the first use of “justled from” (No. 81) is by Marston “Hath he not strongly iustled from aboue The Eagle” in *The metamorphosis* (1598).

Thomas Middleton

Middleton’s use of his 3 matches cannot be verified since No. 40 is a collaboration with Rowley, No. 64 with Massinger and Rowley, and No. 69 with Jonson and Fletcher.

Conclusions

Francis Bacon has 10 correspondences that follow and 3 that precede the date of *The Tempest*, some of them multiple usages. All were rare at the time they were inserted in the play (although No. 36 might be debatable) and all were rare at the dates Bacon later made use of them. The complexity of Nos 18, 58, and 67 would make a significant case on their own. With this in mind, I suggest that this is strong evidence in favour of Bacon’s contribution to the writing of *The Tempest*, particularly Scene 1.2. No other writer in the EEBO database records anywhere near the same number of correspondences.

As I shall now show, *The Tempest* is related to the 1609 shipwreck at Bermuda of the *Sea Venture* which was sponsored by the Virginia Company. In Chapter 8, it will become clear that Bacon had strong connections to this company which supports the argument concerning his contribution to *The Tempest*.

7.3 Dating evidence for *The Tempest*

7.3.1 The Bermuda shipwreck

While previous dating evidence for *The Tempest* has focused on the use of William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ (1610) as a source document (see §7.4), new dating evidence will now be presented that relies on details of the 1609 shipwreck at Bermuda as a source event.

---

On 23 July 1609, nine vessels bound for the new Virginia colony hit the tail of a hurricane about 520 miles from the West Indies and Sir Thomas Gates’s flagship, the *Sea Venture*, carrying 150 men, became separated from the rest of the fleet. The storm pounded the ship for 44 hours and despite taking on deep water, the entire crew and most of their provisions miraculously found land at Bermuda. There, despite several attempts at insubordination, they managed to complete two vessels out of cedar wood and resume for Jamestown on 10 May 1610.

When Sir Thomas Gates belatedly arrived on 21 May 1610, illness and famine had left only 60 of the 900 settlers alive. Accompanying him was William Strachey, who with ambitions of publishing a travel narrative, had been taking notes of events as they unfolded on Bermuda. His account, the ‘True Reportory’, only published after his death by Samuel Purchas in 1625, describes the events at Bermuda, how Jamestown was abandoned shortly after Sir Thomas Gates arrived, and how only the fortuitous interception of their boats by the approaching new governor Lord De La Warr on 10 June 1610 restored the settlement to order. The ‘True Reportory’ is widely recognised as an important source for *The Tempest* as well as for its sanitised derivative, the Virginia Company's propaganda pamphlet the *True Declaration*, which in 1610 reframed Strachey's account of events in order to quell rumours of disorder and entice prospective adventurers and planters.

The Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber show that the first known performance of *The Tempest* was on 1 November 1611 before King James at Whitehall by the “Kings

---

926 Gabriel Archer who was on the *Blessing* with Captain Adams in 1609 recorded that the storm began “about one hundred and fiftie leagues distant from the West Indies” which is about 518 statute miles, see ‘A letter of M. GABRIEL ARCHER’ in Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p.1733.

927 Silvester Jourdain who arrived in Jamestown with Gates states that “wee found some threescore persons liuing” and with the newly arrived crew “being all in number two hundred persons” in Silvester Jourdain, *A discovery of the Bermudas, otherwise called the Ile of Diuels* (1610), STC: 14816, p.21. William Crashaw states that when Gates arrived at Virginia they were “in all about 240. persons”, see Alexander Whitaker, ‘Epistle Dedicatorie’, *Good Newes from Virginia* (London: 1613), STC: 25354, sig. B1v. Earlier he says that of Gates’ crew “scarce three died of 150” (sig.B), which would mean there were about 93 survivors at Jamestown, possibly a propaganda figure.

928 When the new governor De La Warre arrived at Jamestown on 10 June 1610, Strachey was made Recorder as well as Secretary and would have been required to take notes.

Players”. There was also a performance in February 1612–13 at the wedding of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector of Palatine which was also by the King’s Men.

The view that the 1609 shipwreck at Bermuda was a source event for *The Tempest* will now be developed. This lends weight to the widely held notion that Strachey’s ‘True Reporitory’ was a source document for the play, a claim that I have already given the status “beyond reasonable doubt” (see §7.2, *Probable Sources*). However, it will be shown that considering the political risk involved, the oaths of secrecy imposed by the Virginia Company on its members, and the Company’s negative attitude to actors, it is highly unlikely that Shakespeare could have been allowed unrestricted access to this document. It is argued that information from ‘True Reporitory’ might have been released to write *The Tempest* which I claim was used to advertise English interest in the New World to invited European ambassadors.

The first person to assert that the ‘True Reporitory’ was the main influence on the play was Luce, a view that was subsequently developed by Gayley and Cawley. Samuel Purchas published Strachey's 20,000-word letter in 1625 with the date “July 15, 1610” in the heading, and since the letter describes no events later than Sir Thomas Gates leaving for England on that date, then it very likely travelled with Gates to England and was delivered to the Virginia Company around 1 September 1610. Stritmatter and Kositsky have tested this position by arguing that it was written later than 1610, after Strachey arrived back in London to lodge at Black Friers around October 1611. They conclude that it was conceived too late to contribute to *The Tempest*. However, Vaughan and Reedy have organised substantial evidence against these objections. For example, Vaughan shows that Strachey’s account in the ‘True Reporitory’ (1610) of sending the Indian king’s

---

son to England with Gates does not correspond with that in his *Historie of Travaile* (1612). Since the 1612 account was easily verifiable by Strachey when writing back in England, then the ‘True Reportory’ seems to be the incorrect version suggesting that Strachey had no opportunity to correct it before its transportation with Gates. Another point that Strachey had no opportunity to correct concerns the death of Henry Frederick Stuart, Prince of Wales, who died on 6 November 1612. Cape Henry at Chesapeake Bay, Virginia, was named after him and Strachey refers to it in his *Historie of Travaile* (1612) as being “in honour of that our most royall deceased prince”\(^{939}\) which means this work was finished or at least amended after the Prince’s death. In the ‘True Reportory’, Strachey has “This is the famous Chesipiake Bay, which wee haue called (in honour of our young Prince) Cape Henrie.”\(^{940}\) This suggests that the Prince was still alive when this was written. If Strachey had written the ‘True Reportory’ after returning to England in October 1611 and had access to it after Henry’s death in November 1612, he would surely have had an opportunity to update this important reference to the Prince. William Strachey reports that he recorded events in the colony as they evolved “I held it as a seruice of dutie [...] during the time [...] of my stay in the colony [...] to propose unto myself to be (though an vnable) Remembrancer of all accidents, occurrences, and undertakings thereunto.”\(^{941}\) So it seems that the reason he did not amend this reference to the Prince when he died is that once the ‘True Reportory’ had been sent to the Virginia Company in London with Gates in July 1610, Strachey lost control of the manuscript. Both of these arguments for the ‘True Reportory’ being sent to England in July 1610 are essentially those given by Vaughan.

The fleet’s flagship, the *Sea Venture*, was the only vessel of the nine to be permanently separated from the rest and when it failed to appear in Virginia all mariners were assumed lost. The survival of all hands in July 1609 was unprecedented for a Bermuda shipwreck. In February 1613, after the news of their survival had reached England, the Reverend William Crashaw enthused:

> The maruellous and indeed miraculous deliuerance of our worthy Gouernours, Sir Thomas Gates, Liefetenant [sic] generall, and Sir George Somers, Admirall, with all their company, of some hundred and fiftie persons, upon the feared and abhorred Ilands of the *Barmudaes*, without losse of one person, when the same houre nothing was before their eyes, but imminent and ineuitable death; as neuer ship came there

---


that perished not, so neuer was it heard of, that any ship wrackt there, but with the
death of all or most of the people, saue onely this of ours.\textsuperscript{942}

In \textit{The Tempest}, the King’s ship, also the lead vessel, obtains a similar fate. Prospero informs Miranda that:

\begin{verbatim}
I haue with such prouision in mine Art
So safely ordered, that there is no soule
No not so much perdition as an hayre
Betid to any creature in the vessell
Which thou heardst cry, which thou saw’st sinke:
\end{verbatim}

(1.2.28–32)

The spirit Ariel confirms this with “Not a haire perishd” (1.2.217). The other ships continued their voyage, albeit to Naples:

\begin{verbatim}
and for the rest o’ th’ Fleet
(Which I dispers’d) they all haue met againe
And are vpon the Mediterranean Flote
Bound sadly home for Naples
Supposing that they saw the Kings ship wrackt (1.2.232–236)
\end{verbatim}

Apart from the \textit{Sea Venture}, the combination of circumstances surrounding the shipwreck in \textit{The Tempest} seems not to appear elsewhere in the contemporary travel narratives.\textsuperscript{943} To illustrate this, I compare the features of six notable shipwrecks with that in \textit{The Tempest}.

- In the Acts of the Apostles (27:1–44), St. Paul’s unaccompanied ship bound for Italy ran aground in a tempest at a creek near Crete and all 276 on board escaped safely to land.

- On his first voyage in 1492, as Christopher Columbus’s two ships passed Cap Haitien in calm sea and weather, “the currents which were flowing carried the ship upon one of the banks” with no loss of life.\textsuperscript{944}

- In 1555, Andrew Doria anchored the fleet of Charles V off the island of Lampedusa after an engagement with the Turks, but a furious gale drove several of the ships onto the rocks.\textsuperscript{945}

\textsuperscript{942} Whitaker, \textit{Good newes, op. cit.}, sig. A4v.
\textsuperscript{945} Joseph Hunter, \textit{New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare}, Vol. 1
• In 1555, near the port of Mexico, a fleet of eight ships was dispersed in a storm. The *Hulke of Carion* was wrecked against the shore and 75 drowned.  

• On 10 November 1556, the *Edward Bonaventure*, commanded by Richard Chancellor, was anchored alone at Pitslago, near Aberdeen, Scotland. A storm broke the cable, the ship was abandoned, and Chancellor, his wife, and seven Russians drowned in their small boat.  

• On 30 November 1593, Henry May’s ship was wrecked north-west of Bermuda and only half of the “50 and odd Frenchmen and others” survived.

None of these examples possess the combination in *The Tempest* of a storm dispersing a fleet on the high sea, only the flagship being shipwrecked, all hands surviving, and the rest of the fleet continuing their voyage. Even the fictional Italian epic poem *Orlando Furioso* by Ludovico Ariosto published in 1532 falls short because although the vessel is damaged, the ship is not brought to rest as it is in the ‘True Reportory’ and *The Tempest* but continues sailing into the harbour at Syria’s Laiazzo bay. Furthermore, none of these accounts refer to a fatigued crew some of whom were so over-laboured they fell asleep and the hatches closed, for this occurs in *The Tempest*

> The Marriners all vnder hatches stowed,  
> Who, with a Charme ioyned to their suffred labour  
> I haue left asleep (1.2.230–320)

a circumstance that is confirmed by the Boatswain “We were dead of sleep, / And – how we know not – all clapp’d under hatches” (5.1.230–231). Silvestor Jourdain who was on
board the *Sea Venture* when it hit the storm recalled that:

> All our men, being utterly spent, tyred, and disabled for longer labour, were even resolued, without any hope of their liues, to shut up the hatches, and to haue committed themselues to the mercy of the sea.”

951 In Table 7.1, No. 80, a search for ‘tired/asleep/sleeping near.20 hatches’ produces no accounts relating to sleeping under hatches in the context of a ship in a storm published before 1611. Apart from the 1609 Sea Venture wreck,952 there is a report of the Thomas Cavendish voyage to the South Sea in 1591 which gives “the next day the storme ceased, and most of our young Saylers, which we call men of top a yard, being wearied with their nights worke that was past, were vnder Hatches asleepe”, however, the manuscript was not published until 1625.953 The point is, in 1611 the collocation was rare.

In addition, there seem to be features that the island in *The Tempest* shares with Bermuda, providing a strong association between the unprecedented all-hands survival of a shipwreck at Bermuda in 1609 with the shipwreck in *The Tempest*, notwithstanding that Shakespeare might well have conflated characteristics of Bermuda with those from elsewhere.954 Because of the storms that engulfed the island, Bermuda was known as the ‘Ile of Diuels’955 and the spirit Ariel appears to hint at this with “the kings sonne Ferdinand / With haire vp-staring (then like reeds, not haire) / Was the first man that leapt; criye hell is empty, / And all the Diuels are heere.” Ariel even mentions the ‘Bermoothes’ or Bermuda:

> Safely in harbour
> Is the Kings shippe, in the deep Nooke, where once
> Thou calldst me vp at midnight to fetch dewe
> From the still-vext Bermoothes, there she’s hid


954 For example, the “nimble marmoset” (2.2.170) is not found on Bermuda but is a native of Central and South America, and there were no Indians on Bermuda in 1609. Caliban has been depicted as “an allegory of colonial America” in Alden T. Vaughan, ‘Shakespeare’s Indian: The Americanization of Caliban’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (Summer 1998), pp.137–153.

Bermuda was only mentioned in the contemporary literature in relation to exploration (see footnote to No. 21, Table 7.1) while Abrams has pointed out that Richard Rich’s *Newes from Virginia*, registered on 1 October 1610, demonstrates the “first recorded instance of the *ooth*-spelling in English, and Shakespeare’s the second.”956 *The Tempest* also gives Prospero’s island the following characteristics

> Though this island seem to be desert,
> Ha, ha, ha!
> So, you’re paid.
> Uninhabitable and almost inaccessible (2.1.35–3)

In *A plaine description of the Barmudas* published in 1613, Silvestor Jouardin states “If any had said seven yeares agoe, the Barmuda Islands are not only accessible and habitable, but also fertile, fruitfull, plentifull […] oh how loudly would he haue beene laught at”. The association of ‘habitable’ and ‘accessible’ is rare (see footnote to No. 31, Table 7.1) even in Jouardin’s negation of these properties.

Also, according to the *True Declaration*, Bermuda had a reputation for being enchanted rendering it an excellent candidate for Prospero’s island:

> These Islands of the *Bermudos*, haue euere beene accounted as an inchuanted pile of rockes, and a desert inhabitation for Diuels; but all the Fairies of the rocks were but flocks of birds, and all the Diuels that haunted the woods, were but heards of swine.957

So the *Sea Venture* shipwreck and the island of Bermuda appear to be part of the background for *The Tempest*.

The term “freshes” is unusual in the contemporary literature (see footnote to collocation No. 47, Table 7.1):

> for Ile not shew him
> Where the quicke Freshes are. (3.2.66–7)

Bernardino de Escalante has the first known use in *A discourse of the nauigation* [China] (1579) and John Smith the second in *A true relation* [Virginia] (1608). Smith’s *A true relation* also employs the rare “nonpareil” (see footnote to No. 50, Table 7.1) that appears


in *The Tempest* as “Cals her a non-pareill” (3.2.100) and is used even earlier in Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1602) as “though you were crown’d / The non-pareil of beautie”. So not only is the Sea Venture wreck a source event but several examples of Virginia Company literature — Smith’s *A true relation* (1608), ‘True Reportory’ (1610; published 1625), and Rich’s *Newes from Virginia* (1610) — seem also to have influenced the play.

### 7.3.2 Caliban

The following idea hints at the Indians in Virginia worshipping the Moon:

*Caliban:* Ha’st thou not dropt from heauen? (2.2.137)

*Stephano:* Out o’ the moon (2.2.138)

*Caliban:* I prithee, be my god (2.2.149)

This idea is rare (see footnote to No. 42, Table 7.1), and in Robert Gray’s [*A good speed to Virginia* (1609) we find that “he [Christopher Columbus] obserued that they [west Indians] were superstitiously giuen to worship the Moone.” The only other report I have found of this Indian behaviour is in Richard Hakluyt’s *The principal nauigations* (1599–1600) which has “there were other Gentiles in ye Indies which worship the moone.” The term “Moon-calfe” (2.2.135) as a description of Caliban appears four times in *The Tempest* and is unusual (see footnote to No. 40, Table 7.1).\(^{958}\) Stephano appears to be comfortable in the role of Caliban’s God describing himself as “the man i’th’moon” (2.2.136). This evidence supports the view that Caliban represents the West Indian.

Caliban’s following discussion of edible items has already been the subject of much debate:\(^{959}\)

I’ prithee, let me bring thee where Crabs grow;
And I with my long nayles will digge thee pig-nuts;
Show thee a layes nest and instruct thee how
To snare the nimble Marmozet; I’le bring thee
To clustring Philbirts [hazelnuts], and sometimes I’le get thee
Young Scamels from the Rocke. (2.2.167–172)

In Table 7.1, No. 43, the following association registers no returns before 1611: ‘crab(s) near.40 filberds/filberts/filbirts/philbirts/philberts’.\(^{960}\) The earliest is in a book by Ralph

---

\(^{958}\) “Plin. A peece of fleshe without shape growen in the womans wombe, which maketh hir to thinke she is with childe: a moone calfe” Church of England, *Thesaurus linguae, op. cit.*

Harmor, secretary to the colony from 1611–14, published in 1615. Describing Virginia he reports

some filberds haue I seene, Crabbes great store, lesse, but not so sower as ours, which grafted with the Siens of English aple trees, without question would beare very goode fruite, and we doubt not but to haue the Siens enough the next yeere, there being in Sir Thomas Gates his garden at Iames town, many forward apple & peare trees come vp.\footnote{Ralph Harmor [the younger], A True Discourse of the present estate of Virginia, and the successe of the affaires there till the 18 of Iune. 1614 (London: 1615), STC: 12736, p. 23.}

Sir Thomas Gates was at the colony from 24 May to 20 July 1610 and again from August 1611 to March 1614 when he handed over to Sir Thomas Dale. The point here is that the only known published use of this combination of ‘Philberts’ and ‘crabs’ comes from a Virginia Company report which suggests that Caliban’s reference might also allude to what was found at Virginia.

Caliban’s edible items have an additional role to play in dating parts of The Tempest.\footnote{I do not fall into the error here of assuming that a topical allusion date the entire play text. It only dates the topical allusion.} I have failed to locate the term ‘Scamel’ in four contemporary dictionaries.\footnote{Richard Huloet, Huloets dictionarie (London: 1572), STC: 13941; John Rider, Riders dictionarie corrected (Oxford: 1612), STC: 21033 & 1633, STC: 21036a; J. B., An Englis[h] expostor (London: 1621), STC: 4084; “Birds or Fowles” in the Appendix of Henry Hexham, A copious English and Netherduytch dictionarie (Rotterdam: 1647), Wing: H1648.} Both Theobald\footnote{Theobald, Lewis, The Tempest, The Works of Shakespeare, 8 vols, Vol. 1 (London: 1767), p. 39.} and Dyce\footnote{Alexander Dyce, Remarks on Collier’s and Knight’s Editions of Shakespeare (London: 1844), p. 5.} thought that ‘scamel’ should read ‘stannel’, a hawk that breeds on high cliffs. However, there must have been easier ways for Caliban to satisfy his appetite than by fending off an aggressive predatory hawk defending its young on a difficult-to-climb rock face.\footnote{In Henry Stevenson, The Birds of Norfolk – With Remarks on Their Habits, Migration, and Local Distribution, 2 vols, Vol. 2 (London: Jon Van Voorst, 1866), p. 260, Stevenson recollects that in 1848 “at Blakeney [Norfolk, UK …] the bar-tailed godwits are known […] as] ‘Picks’ [male] and ‘Scamells’ [female].” This seems to have been unknown 170 years earlier as John Day exhibits no knowledge of ‘Scamell’ for the godwit, presenting only “Yarwhelp, Yarwip, Stone-Plover, Vetola [Venice], Stone-Curlew [Cornwall]”, see John Day, The Ornithology of Francis Willughby, Fellow of the Royal Society, No.3 (1678), pp. 292–3 located at Douce w Subt. 8, Bodleian Library, Oxford.} Holt has suggested edible limpet shellfish called ‘Scams’ which then

\footnote{The second earliest return is Shakespeare’s The Tempest in the First Folio (1623) followed by Samuel Purchas’ publication of Harmor’s report in 1625, see Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, op. cit.}
raises the question as to why ‘young scamels’ should be preferable. Eventually, Theobald settled on a bird known as the ‘sea-mall’, ‘sea-mell’ or ‘sea-mew’. In 1572, *Huloet’s dictionarie* recorded “Sea mewe. Larus cinerus, Gauis cinereæ” and there is evidence that the ‘Sea-Mall’ and ‘sea mew’ were recognised as the same bird in the seventeenth century. Under ‘M’ in the Index of John Day’s *Ornithology* (1678) there is an entry “Sea-Mall” which refers the reader to ‘TAB. LXXVI’ at the end of the folio volume where a picture of a gull bears the caption “Larus cinereus minor the Common sea mew or Gull”. Elsewhere, Day has “The common Sea-Mall: Larus cinereus minor” which aside from ‘minor’ is the same Latin name as that in *Huloets dictionarie* (1572). So this connects the name ‘Sea-Mall’ to ‘Sea-mewe’. In 1817, Forster recorded the variation ‘Seamal’, followed 70 years later by Newton’s ‘Seamel’, an author who concluded that the First Folio’s compositor who set the word ‘scamel’ erroneously read the first ‘e’ in the scrivener’s copy as a ‘c’.

It is clear that Caliban makes three points about the ‘scamel’. It is edible, the young are taken, and it can be found on the rocks. A number of contemporary documents discuss a bird called the ‘cahow’ endemic to Bermuda which they emphasise above any other livestock in respect of the simplicity with which it could be captured for consumption. For example, in 1615 Lewes Hughes wrote from Bermuda:

> The Cahouze continue til the beginning of lune in great abundance; they are bigger bodied then a Pigeon, & of a very firm & good flesh. They are taken with ease, if one doe but sit downe in a darke night, and make a noise, there will more come to him then hee shall be able to kill

Several years later, he repeated his recollection:

> Fowles of the ayre in great abundance, which did offer themselues to be taken by you, so as if one did but sit on the ground, & make any mournfull noyse, more came to

---

972 “These four comedies (The Tempest, Two Gentlemen, Merry Wives, and Measure for Measure), together with Winter’s Tale are generally accepted as set from scribal copies prepared by Ralph Crane”, see Elizabeth Story Donno, *Twelfth Night, or, What You Will* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.166.
him, then he was able to kill and carry away, so as one man in one houre, hath taken aboue thirty dozen.\footnote{Lewes Hughes, \textit{A Plaine and True Relation of the Goodnes of God towards the Sommer Ilands} (London: 1621), STC: 13920, sig. A4v.}

In 1624, Captain John Smith revealed the additional information that young ones were taken and could be found in holes in the rocks:

The Cahow is a Bird of the night, for all the day she lies hid in holes in the Rocks, where they and their young are also taken with as much ease as may be, but in the night if you whoop and hollow, they will light vpon you, that with your hands you may chuse the fat and leaue the leane\footnote{John Smith, \textit{The generall historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Iles} (London: 1625), STC: 22790a, sig. Z2.}

Like Smith, Strachey’s \textit{True Reportory} (1610) also mentions the nocturnal activity and likens it to a ‘Sea-Mewe’:

A kinde of webbe-footed Fowle there is, of the bignesse of an English greene Plouer, or Sea-Meawe, which all Summer wee saw not, and in the darkest nights of Nouember and December (for in the night onely they feed) they would come forth, but not flye farre from home, and houering in the ayre, and ouer the Sea, made a strange hollow and harsh howling [...] Our men found a prettie way to take them, which was by standing on the Rockes or Sands by the Sea side, and hollowing, laughing, and making the strangest out-cry that possibly they could: with the noyse whereof the Birds would come flocking to that place, and settle vpon the very armes and head of him that so cryed\footnote{Purchas, \textit{Purchas}, Vol. 4, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.1740–41.}

In a 1625 marginal note to Strachey’s above description of the “Sea-Meawe”, the editor Samuel Purchas has added “Web-footed Fowle. They call it of the cry which it maketh a Cohow.”\footnote{The Sea-Meawe’s night-time “strange hollow and harsh howling” reported by Strachey was the same sound that disturbed Diego Ramirez when he sailed past Bermuda without landing in 1603. See H. Wilkinson, ‘Spanish Intentions for Bermuda 1603–15’, \textit{Bermuda Historical Quarterly}, 7 (1950), pp.50–89.} So when Caliban refers to the young being taken on the rocks for food in the context of an uninhabited island, the allusion seems to be to the cahow or ‘seamel’ which was a bird endemic to the uninhabited Bermuda islands and receives emphasis above any other in the travel narratives. It was a bird whose behaviour was unknown in England until information about Bermuda reached London with the returning voyagers at the start of
September 1610 and reinforces the view that *The Tempest* shipwreck alludes to the one at Bermuda in 1609.

### 7.3.3 Stephano Janiculo

There is a further possible dating allusion in *The Tempest* that has not hitherto been pointed out, one which supports the estimate of a *terminus post quem* of 1610. This relates to the purpose of naming two of the characters Stephano and Trinculo, who form a double-act of incompetents. Cawley casts *The Tempest*'s Stephano as a Bermudan conspirator but it is now shown that more can be made of the repeated references to his assumed royalty. I include this construction more as a curiosity related to the dating of *The Tempest* than as evidence to support it.

In August 1607, there was a visitor to King James's court by the name of Stephano Janiculo who falsely identified himself as the Prince of Moldavia (or Bugdania). He was so convincing that in the year 1609–10 he managed to obtain £3000 from King James for expenses. Despite already being married to a Venetian, he took an interest in Lady Arabella Stuart, a first cousin of King James, so much so, that after leaving England for Venice in November 1607, he announced his intention to divorce his wife and marry Arabella. This would have been known in English court circles and Ben Jonson made use of Janiculo's designs on Lady Arabella in *Epicoene* (or *The Silent Lady*), which was produced in 1609–10. At the beginning of Act 5, La-Foole claims that Sir John Daw has instruments to draw maps:

*Cleremont.* How, maps of persons!

*La-Foole.* Yes sir, of Nomentack when he was here and of the Prince of Moldovia, and of his mistris, Mistris Epicoene. (5.1)

---

978 “no man was euer heard, to make for the place, but as against their wils” Jourdain, *A discovery*, *op. cit.*, p.9.
979 I am grateful to Lyn Kositsky for pointing out the following reference about an earlier reported bird known as an ‘Alcatrazzi’. “The number of these *Alcatrazzi* is such, that the Chrystian menne are accustomed to send to certeyne Ilands and rockes which are neare abowte *Panama*, with theyr boates or barkes to take these *Alcatrazzi* whyle they are yet younge and can not flye”. However, unlike Caliban’s ‘scamel’ they are inedible “These younge ones are so fatte and wel fedde that they can not bee eaten. And are taken for none other intent but only to make grease for candels to burne in the nyght” in Pietro Marti re d’Anghiera, *The decades of the newe world or west India*, trans. Rycharde Eden (London: 1555), STC: 647, p.191.
980 Stephano was also the name of Lorenzo’s absurd cousin in Ben Jonson, *Every Man in his Humour* which was acted at the Curtain Theatre in 1598.
981 Cawley, ‘Shakspere's Use’, *op. cit.*, p.714.
Unfortunately, Lady Arabella recognised her image in the play and had it banned, or so it was reported.\footnote{On 18 February 1610, the Venetian ambassadors in England, Francesco Contarini and Marc Antonio Correr, wrote that “Lady Arabella is seldom seen outside her rooms and lives in greater dejection than ever. She complains that in a certain comedy the play-wright introduced an allusion to her person and the part played by the Prince of Moldavia. The play was suppressed.” See, Horatio F. Brown, ed., Calendar of State papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, 11: 1607–10 (1904). For information on Stephano Janiculco, see W. Foster, The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant 1584–1602 (Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1931), pp.xxxx–xxxxv; T. S. Graves, ‘The Political Use of the Stage During the Reign of James I’, Zeits. f r Englische Philologie, Issue 38 (1914), p.147; C. H. Hereford, and P. Simpson, eds. Ben Jonson, Vol. V (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), pp.144–147; and Nichols, Progresses of King James, Vol. II, op. cit., p.288.}

Both Stephano Janiculco, and Nomentack, an Indian from Virginia,\footnote{Namontack arrived in England with Captain Newport on 21 May 1608, see GEN, Vol. 1, p.396n.} the intended destination of the \textit{Sea Venture}, are mentioned in the same line in \textit{Epicoene}. Perhaps \textit{The Tempest} glances at this connection when Trinculo, who I suggest represents Janiculco, mentions the fact that Indians were exhibited in England for profit:

> When they [English] will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian. (2.2.32–4)

So my suggestion is that the incompetent characters Stephano and Trinculo in \textit{The Tempest} combine to refer to the dubious Stephano Janiculco, and his appearance in Jonson's \textit{Epicoene} at the turn of 1610 with the consequent furore it caused. Stephano evidently sees himself as an aristocrat in \textit{The Tempest}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Stephano}. Monster, I will kill this man [Prospero]: his daughter and I will be king and queen (3.2.102–3)
\end{quote}

and at (4.1.214) and (5.1.287–8) he is also humorously referred to as a king. It is clear that Trinculo believes it is an undeserved title:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Trinculo}. [...] They say there's but five upon this island: we are three of them; if th'other two be brained like us, the state totters. (3.2.5–6)
\end{quote}

To assist the audience in registering the connection between Stephano Janiculco and the two characters Stephano and Trinculo, the two names would need to be mentioned together early in the dialogue:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Trinculo}. Stephano! If thou beest Stephano, touch me, and speak to me; for I am Trinculo” (2.2.93–5).
\end{quote}
Here in Act 2, once the court audience had recognised that Stephano Janiculo was the intended target, all later references to his assumed royalty in Acts 3, 4, and 5 would have resonated. King James favoured satire directed at his enemies and so an allusion to the *Epicoene* court scandal with Stephano Janiculo in 1610, who had obtained money from the king under false pretences, would certainly have impressed him.

### 7.4 The ‘True Reportory’ and *The Tempest*

In comparing *The Tempest* and William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, Morton Luce cautioned:

> Before dealing with the subject of parallel passages I may perhaps remind the reader or student that such resemblances will not all of them be equally striking, and that an opinion should be based upon the extracts collectively, not individually.

In 1901, Luce did not have access to Chadwyck-Healey’s EEBO database so had no means of estimating the rarity of his parallels. Unfortunately, unless the parallels are rare it makes little difference whether or not they are considered collectively. While the writing of *The Tempest* seems to have depended on the Sea Venture shipwreck as a source event, the following question deserves a rare collocation test: To what extent did *The Tempest* rely on William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ (1610)?

I first note that a commonly quoted parallel that originated with Cawley “Wouldst giue me / Water with berries in’t” (No. 27, Table 7.1) is not rare according to my definition because EEBO gives 18 returns before 1611. Table 7.6 gives the rarest of the correspondences between the ‘True Reportory’ and *The Tempest* that my method has uncovered (see footnotes to Nos 22, 26, and 37, Table 7.1).

For the first row in Table 7.6, there is the search ‘the sharp wind(s)’ in the context of being northerly. *The Tempest* has “To run vpon the sharpe winde of the North” (2.2) while the ‘True Reportory’ gives “the sharpe windes blowing Northerly”. There are 7 returns from EEBO before 1611 for the above search string but none in the context of it being a north wind. Up to 1625, only two returns satisfy the context. These are the ‘True Reportory’ (1610) first published in *Purchas his pilgrimes* (1625), and *The Tempest* (1611) first published in the First Folio (1623). In other words, the Strachey letter provides the only match with *The Tempest*.

---


*986* Cawley, ‘Shakespere’s Use’, *op. cit.*, pp.688–726.

Table 7.6: Rare collocations comparison of ‘True Reportory’, True Declaration, & The Tempest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True Reportory (1609)</th>
<th>True Declaration (1610)</th>
<th>The Tempest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the sharpe windes blowing Northerly (p.1738)</td>
<td>To run vpon the sharpe winde of the North (2.2)</td>
<td>vnwholesome fen (1.2.322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as we condemne not Kent in England, for a small Towne called Plumstead, continually assaulting the dwellers there (especially newcomers) with Agues and Feuers; no more let vs lay scandall, and imputation vpon the Country of Virginia, because the little Quarter wherein we are set downe (vnaduisedly so choses) appears to be vnwholesome, and subject to many ill ayres, which accompany the like marish [marshy] places (p.1753)</td>
<td>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 Wilds and Hundreds of Kent. (p.32)</td>
<td>Adr. The ayre breathes vpon vs here most sweetly. Seb. As if it had Lungs, and rotten ones. Ant. Or, as ‘twere perfum’d by a Fen. (2.1.47–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every man from thenceforth commanded to weare his weapon, without which before, we freely walked from quarter to quarter, and conuersed among our selues, and every man advised to stand vpon his guard</td>
<td>our fort [...] is most part inuironed with an ebbing and flowing salt water, the owze of which sendeth forth an vnwholsome &amp; contagious vapour (p.33)</td>
<td>All the infections that the sun sucks up / From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall and make him / By inch-meal a disease! (2.2.1–2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second entry, I note that *Huloet’s dictionarie* (1572) does not distinguish between a moor, a fen, and a marsh⁹⁸⁹ so in Table 7.6 I take them as having been used synonymously in 1610.⁹⁹⁰ The phrase ‘unwholesome fen’ (No. 26 and footnote, Table 7.1) is first used in *The Tempest* (1611) and for the search ‘unwholesome near.15 marish [marshy]’ 3 examples are returned before the play, but only 2 are in the context of settlements. These are Hakluyt’s “The aire of Famagusta is very vnwholesome, as they say, by reason of certaine marish ground adiyoynig it,”⁹⁹¹ and Torsellino’s “For at that season the aire was generally misliked, by reason of the diseases of the Inhabitants: because (for the most part)

---

⁹⁸⁸ This correspondence was pointed out by Gayley, *Shakespeare, op. cit.*, p.230.
⁹⁸⁹ “Asia is also a meere, fenne, or marishe, nere to the ryuer Caystrus”, Huloet, *Huloet’s dictionarie, op. cit.*, sig. Cij, and “Moore, fenne, or marishe.”, *Ibid.*, see under ‘M’.
⁹⁹⁰ Our present understanding is that a fen is waterlogged peatland that receives groundwater and rainwater, whereas a marsh generally means waterlogged soil whatever its composition, see Joint Nature Conservation Committee, [http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-3570](http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-3570), accessed online 30 June 2013.
being marish and vnwholesome.” A third example, which existed in manuscript in 1610 but was not published until 1625, is Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’. Having stated that “No man ought to judge of any country by the fens or marshes” the True Declaration mentions an “vnwholsome & contagious vapour” which it attributes to “an ebning and flowing of salt water”. So The Tempest could have sourced either the ‘True Reportory’ or the True Declaration for this information although the former asserts it more directly.

The Tempest goes further by explicitly associating fens [or marshes] with illness when at (2.2.1–2) Caliban says “All the infections that the sun sucks up / From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall and make him / By inch-meal a disease!” The ‘True Reportory’ does likewise in mentioning “Agues and Feuers” in relation to “marish places”. The True Declaration, in the same paragraph as “fens or marshes” mentions that at Jamestown “one hundred sickened”. So as far as references to fens and marshes and consequent illness are concerned, there is little to separate the ‘True Reportory’, the True Declaration, and The Tempest. In his essay ‘Of Plantations’, Francis Bacon writes “It hath beene a great Endangering, to the Health of some Plantations, that they haue built along the Sea, and Riuers, in marish and vnwholesome Grounds.” He must surely have had the Virginia colony in mind when he wrote this in 1625.

The third row in Table 7.6 has “‘tis best we stand vpon our guard; / Or that we quit this place: let’s draw our weapons” (No. 37, Table 7.1) which was first noted by Cawley. A double search was conducted for ‘stand upon his/our guard’ and ‘weapons near.30 guard’. Both conditions were satisfied simultaneously by only 2 texts before 1611: Golding’s The warfare (1576) has “wee muste alwayes stande vpon our garde armed with spiritual weapons;” and Munday’s The first booke of Primaleon (1595) which gives “who had then his weapon at his side, hearing him make these threates, set hand quickly to it to stand vpon his guard.” Strachey’s ‘True Reporitory’ (1610) reports on life at Bermuda with “euery man from thenceforth commanded to weare his weapon, without which before, we freely walked from quarter to quarter, and conuersed among our selues, and euery man

---

992 Orazio Torsellino, The history of our B. Lady of Loreto (English College Press, 1608), STC: 24141.
993 Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, Vol. 4, op. cit., p.1753.
994 Bacon, essayes, op. cit.
995 Cawley, ‘Shakespere’s Use’, op. cit., p.700.
advised to stand vpon his guard." The True Declaration does not mention this and so the ‘True Reportory’ is only one of three examples that precede The Tempest.

There is a further correspondence that is worth considering. The association ‘but/butt of near.12 heaved’ occurs in The Tempest as “I escap’d vpon a But of Sacke, which the Saylors heaued o’re boord” (2.2) while in the ‘True Reportory’ we have “and staued many a Butt of Beere, Hogsheads of Oyle, Syder, Wine, and Vinegar, and heaued away all our Ordnance” although it was the ‘Ordnance’ that was ‘heaued’ here rather than the ‘Butt’. These are the only two texts that share this association up to 1625.

In order to assert that the ‘True Reportory’ was a source for the play, we need the support of §7.3.2 which suggests that The Tempest also relates to the 1609 Bermuda shipwreck.

7.5 Secrecy of letters

When Sir Thomas Gates arrived back in England at the beginning of September 1610, there is no doubt that news about the temporary abandonment of the colony had reached prospective adventurers. Several subscribers were no longer willing to settle their account, so the Company had to issue Bills of Complaint in an attempt to recover the money in the courtroom. It is also clear that the Spanish had designs on the colony. On 30 September 1610, Don Alonso de Velasco of the Spanish Council of State, urged Philip III to exploit the vulnerability of the English by sending a force to “drive out the few people that have remained there.” Philip declined.

It was probably for these reasons that the ‘True Reportory’ was not published but instead formed the basis for the Virginia Council’s True Declaration pamphlet which reframed the events in order to placate potential investors. Sometime after the autumn of 1611, William Strachey wrote a preface to the Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall (1612) from his “lodging in the Black Friers” in which he reveals that during his stay in the colony he was a “Remembrancer of all accidents, occurrences, and undertakings” and then refers to a work of his on Bermuda and Virginia which had “many impediments, [and] as yet must detaine such my observations in the shadow of dar[kness].” This can only be a reference to the ‘True Reportory’, which covers both Bermuda and Virginia, and reveals Strachey's

---

998 Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, Vol. 4, op. cit., p.1745.
999 Ibid., p.1737.
1001 GEN, p.418.
1002 Strachey, For the colony, op. cit., sig. A2.
frustration that its publication had been thwarted by the Council.\textsuperscript{1003} By the time Purchas printed the ‘True Reportory’ out of Richard Hakluyt's collection in 1625, the Third Virginia Company Charter of 1612 had been revoked (1624) by King James and the colony was well established.\textsuperscript{1004}

Despite the ‘True Reportory’ being deemed unsuitable for distribution by the Virginia Council, Furness,\textsuperscript{1005} Gayley,\textsuperscript{1006} Hotson,\textsuperscript{1007} and Vaughan\textsuperscript{1008} all find relationships between Shakespeare and members of the Virginia Council to allow Shakespeare unrestricted access. Morton Luce\textsuperscript{1009} thought that Shakespeare acquired the ‘True Reportory’ from a friend for “In this original MS form Shakespeare must surely have seen it” but at least he recognises that Shakespeare “could not in 1610 have gained any information from the writer in person, for Strachey did not return to England until the close of 1611” and Strachey, with his ambition to publish, would have had good reason to withhold it.\textsuperscript{1010}

When Samuel Purchas informed his readers in 1625 that “M. Strachies copious discourse shall feast you with the liuely expression of others miseries”\textsuperscript{1011} it became clear why the ‘True Reportory’ could not have been made public in 1610. The company were trying to attract new investment. With so much at stake, would the Council really have taken the risk of jeopardising the whole project by allowing Shakespeare — an actor, businessman, and non-Company member — unrestricted access to a document that gave detailed information about the famine, disease, shortage of supplies, and the murderous Indians, in order to represent it on stage at the Globe to an audience of 3,000? How could they know that he would not make copies of the ‘True Reportory’ and distribute them to others? Could anyone really have trusted Shakespeare's discretion with a high degree of

\textsuperscript{1003} The manuscript for The Historie of Travaile into Virginia, which Strachey wrote in 1612 but failed to publish, covered only Virginia. Its first publication was by the Hakluyt Society in 1849.
\textsuperscript{1004} Reedy, ‘Dating William Strachye’s’, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.529–552.
\textsuperscript{1006} Gayley, \textit{Shakespeare, op. cit.}, p.76.
\textsuperscript{1008} Vaughan, ‘William Strachye's', \textit{op. cit.}, pp.225–226.
\textsuperscript{1009} Luce, \textit{The Tempest, op. cit.}, p.154.
\textsuperscript{1010} “the worst case might be if a friend [...] sold it to a printer without their permission. Less distressingly, the friend might copy or have the manuscript copied for him, yet once this happened, the work was in a sense published and the author had to a greater or lesser extent lost control over his work, its text, its presentation, and its readership” in H. R. Woodhuysen, \textit{Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p.17.
\textsuperscript{1011} Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, Vol. 4, \textit{op. cit.}, p.1733.
confidence? An unauthorised publication of the ‘True Reportory’ would have been the greatest danger to the Virginia Company and it was a risk that they could not have taken. As I shall now show, the two biggest obstacles to its circulation were the oaths of secrecy that governed all members, and the fact that actors were regarded as one of the Company’s biggest threats.

In a letter dated 7 July 1610 to the Virginia Company of London, Governor De La Warr writes “I administered an oath of faith, assistance, and secrecy; their names were these [...] William Strachey, Esq. Secretary [and Recorder]”. This would have been the same oath that was administered by Edward Maria Wingfield in 1607:

> You shall keepe [deleted: all] secret all matter Comitted & revealed vnto you [...] & you shall not deliur any thing concerning the affaires of the Counsell to any other person to bee coppyed out or ingrossed, wth out first making the Gournor acquainted therwith and leaue obtayned

The secrecy with regard to letters did not go unnoticed by Spain's secret agent in the colony, Francisco Maguel. In a report dated 1 July 1610 he notes:

> [the English] have issued orders prohibiting any one from taking letters with him beyond the frontiers, and also from sending any, especially to private individuals, without their first being seen and read by the governor.

---

1012 Ben Jonson remarked of Shakespeare “he flow’d with that faculty, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopp’d: Sufflaminandus erat [he had to be repressed]; as Augustus said of Haterius. His wit was in his owne power; would the rule of it had beene so too.” in Ben Jonson, ‘Our fellow countr yman Shakespeare’, Timber: or Discoveries; made upon men and matter (1641) (Cassell, 1889), p.47.

1013 In 1983, the so-called Strachey ‘B’ manuscript was found in a trunk at Bermuda belonging to descendants of Captain Daniel Tucker, Bermuda’s first governor. Entitled ‘Sir George Somers’ Shipwreck / Wreck of the Sea Venture on the Bermudas’, it was written on early nineteenth century paper and was claimed by Ivor Noël Hume to be a transcript of Strachey’s early draft of his ‘True Reportory’. Its errors include referring to the Sea Venture as “Sea Valentine” (lines 85–6) and describing “Powhatun” as “an Indian Chief” (lines 2–3) a term which the OED reports as being unused before 1809. Also it uses ‘rabbit’, and in an EEBO search of documents originated up to and including 1610, only 18 out of 19047 use the term “rabbit” or “rabbit” (singular or plural) while “cony” or “conye” (singular or plural) appears in 257 out of 19047 records. Without an original manuscript or contemporary publication, there is little evidence to show that it is anything other than a poor early nineteenth century transcription of the ‘True Reportory’ from Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, op. cit. See Ivor Noël Hume, ‘William Strachey’s Unrecorded First Draft of His Sea Venture Saga’, Avalon Chronicles, 6 (2001), pp.57–88.

1014 Clarke, ‘Virginia Company’, op. cit.

1015 GEN, pp.407–8; here ‘[Recorder]’ is Brown’s insertion.

1016 This oath dating from 1607 was administered “by the Governor and counsell after Mr Secretarie Dauison death to Edward Sharples” in the winter of 1623, see Kingsbury, Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. 3, Part I, op. cit., p.20a.

1017 GEN, pp.398–9.
The restriction on information that passed out of Virginia also extended to its passage into England. When Sir Thomas Gates set out for Virginia on 10 May 1610, he carried with him sealed instructions from the Virginia Council. Item 27 demanded that:

> You must take especiall care what relačons [information] come into England and what lres [letters] are written & that all things of that nature may be boxed vp and sealed and sent to [sic] first to the Counsell here.\(^{1018}\)

Of course, the prohibition on information leaving Virginia would have been futile if the London Virginia Council of 1610 had not maintained it. In 1619, Council members were required to take an oath of secrecy, and order 8.70 of the ‘Orders and Constitutions’ stated that:

> He shall be bound by oath to keepe secret all matters of secrecy: And not to discover [reveal] the proceedings of the Counseil, and Comitties extraordinary, till such time as themselves shall publish the same.\(^{1019}\)

### 7.6 Attitude to players

There is evidence that actors such as Shakespeare were seen as a threat to the Virginia Company. As noted by Cawley,\(^{1020}\) on 21 February 1610, the Reverend William Crashaw delivered a sermon in London “before the right honourable the Lord LaWarre, Lord Governour and Captaine Generall of Virginia, and others of his Majesties Councell for that Kingdome, and the rest of the adventurers in that plantation”:\(^{1021}\)

> As for Plaiers: [...] nothing that is good, excellent or holy can escape them [...] they abuse Virginea [...] and such as for which, if they speedily repent not, I dare say Vengeance waits for them.\(^{1022}\)
It was a theme that Crashaw would revisit. In his introduction to Alexander Whitaker's *Good Newes from Virginia* (1613) he proclaims:

> These [calumnies and slanders] being devised by the Diuell, and set abroach by idle and base companions, are blowen abroad by Papists, Players and such like, till they haue filled the vulgar eares.

and goes on to refer to "the iests of prophane Players". Crashaw was not the only one to sound a warning. In the Epistle Dedicatory to Robert Johnson's *New Life of Virginia* (1612) we find "the malicious and looser sort (being accompanied with the licentious vaine of stage Poets) haue whet their tongues with scornfull taunts against the action it selfe." William Strachey edited the Virginia Company's *Lawes* (1612), which set out the rules of conduct for the colony, and there is a prayer on the last page that was recited every morning and evening to the colonists with the line:

> O Lord we pray thee fortifie us against this temptation: let Sanballat, & Tobias, Papists & players & such other Amonites & Horonits the scum and dregs of the earth [...] let such swine wallow in their mire.

In other words, the threat posed by players was advertised to the whole colony and the idea that an actor would have been given unrestricted access to a sensitive Virginia Company document seems unrealistic.

So not only did oaths of secrecy restrict William Strachey, the Governor at Jamestown, and the entire Virginia Council in London from distributing or even discussing letters with outsiders, but the Council members were collectively warned in Crashaw's sermon, before De La Warr set out for Virginia and before the 'True Reportory' was sent back to England, that actors were abusing the colony on the stage. There would also have been a political price to pay if the 'True Reportory', which exposed the weaknesses in the colony, had gone beyond the safety of the Virginia Council and fallen into Spanish hands. So it is highly improbable that William Shakespeare, irrespective of the number of Council members he knew, could have gained unrestricted access to the 'True Reportory' before *The Tempest*.

---

1024 Ibid., sig. C2.
1026 Strachey, *For the colony*, op. cit., sig. P4'.
1027 An example of a reference to Bermuda in a play is “Heres the Duke of Calabria sir if you haue made mee tell a lye, theile send me of a voyiage to the yland of Hogs and Diuels, (the Barmudas)” Dekker, *If it be not good*, op. cit.
was performed at Whitehall in November 1611. In the next chapter, I shall present the argument for *The Tempest* being written in cooperation with the Virginia Company for a performance at Court, as a political tool to advertise England’s place in the New World.
Chapter 8

Francis Bacon and the Virginia Company

8.1 Preliminary

The arguments of the previous chapter are now combined with an analysis of Virginia Company pamphlets to explore how close Sir Francis Bacon was to the Virginia Company literature such as the *True Declaration*. I claim that *The Tempest* grew out of this literature and the Sea Venture shipwreck event, and served as a propaganda tool to impress invited ambassadors of English power in the New World.

In §8.2, the Virginia Company pamphlets are surveyed together with their justification for colonization. The *True Declaration* is the most impressive of these pamphlets for its rhetorical expression. The three main candidates that have been cited by other researchers for originating the *True Declaration* are introduced in §8.3, these being Sir Francis Bacon, Sir Dudley Digges, and Sir Edwyn Sandys. Section 8.4 gives strong arguments for William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, which ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ I conclude to be a source for *The Tempest*, also being a source for the propaganda pamphlet *True Declaration*. In §8.5, topics of interest and the use of rhetorical figures are examined, and in §8.5.3, RCP is once again applied to lend more evidence to the issue of who contributed to this pamphlet. The latter study reveals Bacon’s work to have the highest number of rare matches with the *True Declaration* of any author in the searchable EEBO database. The fact that some of these precede the pamphlet allows the conclusion that he at least contributed to it and this means that he must have inspected William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’.

8.2 The Virginia pamphlets

In 1606, the London Virginia Council succeeded in persuading several merchant companies and noblemen to finance a new settlement in Virginia. Assured of a share in the gold that the Spanish had earlier reported, the adventurers committed enough money to despatch three ships and 144 planters across the Atlantic. As the first wave of colonists sailed into Cape Henry on 26 April 1607, the tide of expectation was high, but

---

1028 The voyages sent to Virginia were partly funded by merchant companies such as the Clothworkers Company, the Fishmongers Company, and the Stationer's Company.
after pitching their three-sided fort near marshy ground many fell ill and they soon struggled to support themselves. Disease, native attacks, a divided governing body, but mainly famine, eventually brought them to desperation and only Captain John Smith’s ingenuity and persistence in trading for corn with the Indian chief Powhaton saved the colony from extinction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Stationers’ Register</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nova Britannia</td>
<td>18 February 1609</td>
<td>“R. I.” Robert Johnson (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Speed to Virginia</td>
<td>3 May 1609</td>
<td>“R. G.” Robert Gray (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Britannia</td>
<td>4 May 1609</td>
<td>William Symonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauls Prohibition Staide</td>
<td>28 May 1609†</td>
<td>Daniel Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True and Sincere Declaration</td>
<td>14 December 1609</td>
<td>Unattributed (Virg. Co.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crashaw’s Sermon</td>
<td>19 March 1610</td>
<td>William Crashaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Declaration</td>
<td>8 November 1610</td>
<td>Unattributed (Virg. Co.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the time the third supply weighed anchor at Falmouth on 8 June 1609 with 600 men, the second Virginia Charter had replaced Jamestown’s ineffective President and Council with a single Governor appointed by the Council in London. Thomas West (Baron De La Warr and Captain-General) was to be the first incumbent but, until his arrival the following year, Sir Thomas Gates (Lieutenant-General) was to assume command. On 23 July 1609, the nine vessels of the third supply were hit by a storm, the Sea Venture which carried the colony’s main commanders Gates, Somers, and Newport became separated from the rest of the fleet, and their ship was wrecked at Bermuda with the unprecedented survival of the entire crew. The shipwreck was sensational news in 1610, and it became a source event for Shakespeare’s The Tempest, the writing of which also seems to have relied partly on secretary William Strachey’s 20,000-word company report which was sent back from the Virginia Colony in July 1610. Published Virginia pamphlets such as John Smith’s A true relation (1608) and Richard Rich’s Newes from Virginia (1610) also seem to have been sources.

While the private aim of the Virginia Company was to obtain a financial return at the earliest possible opportunity, their promotional sermons and literature framed matters rather differently. Quinn describes the Virginia Company’s True Declaration (1610)

---


1031 Andrew Fitzmaurice, Humanism and America: An intellectual History of English Colonisation,
as “the most distinguished piece of propaganda for the colony.”

Even though it was keen to emphasise that “our primarie end is to plant religion”, the colony was clearly no charitable venture and a return of valuable commodities was expected:

The Councell of Virginia (finding the smallnesse of that returne, which they hoped haue defraied the charge of a new supply) entred into a deep consultation, and propounded amongst themselues, whether it were fit to enter into a new contribution [continued funding], or in time to send for home the Lord La-ware, and to abandon the action.

As well as the reasons for colonisation, the Virginia literature was concerned with the justification for colonisation and, in 1609, *A Good Speed to Virginia* tackled it head on:

The first objection is, by what right or warrant we can enter into the land of these Savages, and plant themselves in their places [...] the answer to the forsaid objection is, that there is no intendment to take away from them by force that rightful inheritance they have in that Countrey.

Earlier that year, *Nova Brittania* which shares several notable features with *A Good Speed to Virginia*, had taken much the same line:

our coming thither is to plant ourselves in their Countrie yet not to supplant them and roote them out, to bring them from their base condition to a farre better: First in regard of God the Creator, and of Jesus Christ their Redeemer, if they will beleeue in him.

---

1032 The *True Declaration* was entered for publication at Stationers’ Hall on 8 November 1610 by Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Maurice Barkley, Sir George Coppin, and Master Richard Martin, see GEN, Vol. I, p.427.
1037 There are some striking similarities between *Nova Brittania* and the later *A Good Speed to Virginia*. In the former we have “When Christopher Columbus (the first bewrayer of this new world) was to make his proffer where he liked best [...] offering to inuest his Maiestie [Henry the seauenth of England] with the most pretious and richest vaines of the whole earth, neuer known before, as he did also the like, to the kings of Portugale and Spaine, who (as the story saith) for his poore apparel and his simple looks, and for the noueltie of his proposition, was of most men accounted a vayne foole, and utterly rejected” (sig. B3) while the latter has “When Christopher Columbus made proffer to the kings of England, Portugall, and Spaine, to inuest them with the most precious and richest veynes of the whole earth, neuer knowe before; but this offer was not onely rejected, but the man himself, who deserues euuer to be renowned, was (of us English especially) ascornd & accounted for an idle Nouellist. Some thinks it was because of his poore apparel, and simple looks” (sig. B). *Nova Brittania* also has “Our plant we trust, is firmly rooted, our armes and limmes are strong, our branches faire, and much desire to spread themselves abroad.” (sig. B2) while *A Good Speed to Virginia* has “and forreine wars abroad, did cut off the ouer-spreading branches of our people” (sig. B2).
When *A True and Sincere Declaration* appeared in 1610,\textsuperscript{1039} it became the first pamphlet to be officially endorsed by the London Virginia Council. It gives the three “Principall and Maine Endes” of the plantation as “Religious, Noble, and Feaseable”,\textsuperscript{1040} which relate to the propagation of Christianity,\textsuperscript{1041} reducing an expanding English population, and the return of commodities. Although the fate of Sir Thomas Gates and his crew was still unknown, the author speculates that they were “by this time arriued at our Colony”\textsuperscript{1042} and concludes with the hope that God might:

```
nourish this graine of seed, that it may spread till all people of the earth admire the
greatnesse, and sucke the shades and fruite thereof\textsuperscript{1043}
```

This is comparable with Bacon’s “The Kingdome of heauen is compared not to any great kernel, or nut; but to a graine of Musterd, which is one of the least of grains, but hath in it a propertie and spirit hastily to get vp and spread. So are there States that are great in Territory” from his *Essaies* (1612).\textsuperscript{1044} The *True and Sincere Declaration* was mainly occupied with extenuating the difficulties facing the Virginia enterprise, and while the *True Declaration* maintained the façade it also addressed the main concerns of *Nova Brittania* and *A Good Speed to Virginia*, namely, the justification for colonisation. William Symond’s sermon *Virginia Brittania* in April 1609 which was addressed to the “Aduenturers and Planters for Virginia” had relied entirely on biblical precedent to deal with this issue:

\textsuperscript{1038} Robert Johnson, *Nova Brittania. Offring most Excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia* (London: Printed for Samuel Macham, 1609), sig. C’. It was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 18 February 1609. In his essay ‘Of Plantations’, Sir Francis Bacon declares “I like a Plantation in a Pure Soile; that is, where people are not Displanted, to the end, to Plant in Others. For else, it is rather an Extirpation then a Plantation” see Bacon, *The Essays, op. cit.*, p.198. *A Good Speed to Virginia* (sig C2) says much the same “and to apprehend the meanes to saue their soules in the world to come, rather than to destroy them, or utterly to roote them out.” Note Caliban in *The Tempest* “This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou takest from me” (2.2.331–2)

\textsuperscript{1039} *A True and Sincere Declaration of the purpose and ends of the Plantation begun in Virginia. Set forth by the authority of the Gouernors and Councellors established for that Plantation* (London: Printed for I. Stepney, 1610). It was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 14 December 1609.

\textsuperscript{1040} Ibid., sig. C1.

\textsuperscript{1041} “Virginia which now (by God grace) through our English shal heare news of Christ” George Benson, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the seauneth of May M.DC.IX* (London: 1609), STC: 1886, p.92.

\textsuperscript{1042} *True and Sincere Declaration, op. cit.*, sig. C1. News of the missing *Sea Venture* would have reached England with Captain Argall in late October 1609 and the remnants of Gates’ fleet in late November 1609, see Edward D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London* (New York: Joel Munsell, 1869), p.32. Gates arrived back in England on 1 September 1610 at which time his safety would have become known there.

\textsuperscript{1043} *True and Sincere Declaration, op. cit.*, sig. D2.

\textsuperscript{1044} Francis Bacon, *The Essaies of Sr Francis Bacon Knight, the Kings Solliciter Generall* (London: 1612), sig. Q3"
Goe teach (saith he [Christ]) all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost.\footnote{William Symonds, \textit{A Sermon preached at White-chappel, in the presence of many, Honourable and Worshipfull, the Adventurers and Planters for Virginia. 25 April 1609.} [Virginia Britannia] (London: 1609), sig. C. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 4 May 1609.}

However, the \textit{True Declaration} did not see this as sufficient reason:

To preach the Gospell to a nation conquered, and to set their soules at liberty, when we haue brought their bodies to slauerie; It may be a matter sacred in the Preachers, but I know not how justifiable in the rulers. Who for their meere ambition, doe set vpon it, the glosse of religion.\footnote{Counseil for Virginia, \textit{True Declaration, op. cit.}, sig. B2'.}

In fact, this was precisely Bacon’s position which he expressed in a letter to Sir George Villiers (1616) “To make no extirpation of the natives under pretence of planting religion: God surely will no way be pleased with such sacrifices.”\footnote{LL, Vol. 6, p.21.} According to the \textit{True Declaration}, the natives were not to be subdued but instead “by way of marchandizing and trade, [we] doe buy of them the pearles of earth, and sell to them the pearles of heaven.”\footnote{Ibid., sig. B3.} The pamphlet maintained that their chief king Powhaton had invited Captain Newport “to take possession of an other whole kingdome which he gaue vnto him” and if

\begin{quote}
this was done in subtlety, not that they ever meant we should possesse them, but that they might first gaine by vs, and then destroy vs. This makes our cause, much the iuster [...] giuing vnto vs a lawfull possession.\footnote{Ibid., sig. B4. A Broadside from 1609 was issued by the Virginia Company claiming that “their greatest King Powghaton, by the testimony of Captaine Newport, and of other Captaines that haue lately come from thence, hath granted Freedome of Trade and Commerce to our English people, to Plant, fortifie and possesse at our pleasure in any part of his Country, with condition to be louing to his people, and to defend him from his enemies” Virginia Company of London, \textit{Considering there is no publicke action} (1609), STC: 24830.9.} \end{quote}

In fact, as Captain Smith had reported, handing over land was the last thing that Powhaton had in mind.\footnote{On 13 January 1609, Smith recorded that Powhaton told him “many doe informe me, your comming hither, is not for trade, but to invade my people and possesse my Country”, Smith, \textit{The Generall Historie}, op. cit., p.75.} It also claims that Powhaton “receiued voluntarilie a crowne and a scepter, with a full acknowledgement of dutie and submission”\footnote{\textit{True Declaration, op. cit.}, sig. B4.} which seems to me to be a gross distortion of Powhaton’s position.

The \textit{True Declaration} also attempts to sanitize the suffering in the colony by claiming that the colonists had fallen ill because of “intemperate idleness” and that Sir Thomas Gates
had managed to recover their health by “moderat labour”. The Indian aggression was presented as being due to a small number of renegade colonists who “created the Indians our implacable enemies by some violence they had offered” which left Powhaton “boyling with desire of reuenge”. In reality, the planters were struggling with typhoid and dysentery and the Indians had been assaulting them from the outset. There is no doubt that the Virginia colony pamphlets had been designed to portray the English as humane possessors of land and to attribute earlier failures to rectifiable errors rather than to a hostile environment.

It appears that Francis Bacon had an ambivalent attitude to colonisation. On the one hand he saw visiting an unexplored land as an opportunity to obtain new knowledge for the restoration of man’s control over Nature, this being his main motive in constructing his philosophical system. For this, Bacon took his inspiration from the book of Genesis in which Adam forfeits his perfect knowledge of the natural world in the Fall. On the other hand, Bacon held the view that it was unjust to dispossess the natives, and in the fictional New Atlantis there is a hint that he supported the policy of obtaining information from the new territories without disturbing its inhabitants.

Of all the Virginia Company literature, the True Declaration is by far the most accomplished. As I shall show in §8.4, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the True Declaration drew from Jamestown secretary William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ which travelled back to England with Sir Thomas Gates in July 1610. Since this was a restricted Virginia Company document, it is most likely that the author of the True Declaration who consulted it was a member of that company. Also, the main aim of the True Declaration was to dissolve negative reports of the colony given out by returning settlers and attract new investment, and so I suggest that the author of this propaganda pamphlet would have been required to have both rhetorical skill and a track record of published work. This renders the EEBO database an appropriate tool for discovering its contributors.

---

1052 Ibid., sig. E3.
1053 Ibid., sig. F.
1054 Ibid., sig. F3.
1055 Genesis 1:28.
1056 For a detailed analysis of Bacon’s ambivalence about colonisation see S. Irving, “In a pure soil: Colonial anxieties in the work of Francis Bacon”, History of European Ideas, 32 (2006), pp.249–262.
8.3 Francis Bacon, Dudley Digges, and Edwin Sandys

Three main candidates have been advanced as the originator of the *True Declaration*. Fitzmaurice has suggested that it was “probably written by Dudley Digges”\(^{1058}\) while the American classical scholar Charles Mills Gayley thought it was “probably, Sir Edwyn Sandys”.\(^{1059}\) Hotson was undecided choosing “Sir Edwyn Sandys or Sir Dudley Digges”,\(^{1060}\) but James produces a different candidate:

I have no doubt it was the Solicitor–General [Sir Francis Bacon], incomparably the greatest advocate and orator of the age [...] To read over the first book of *The Advancement of Learning* is to see the same style, ordonnance [sic], and learning at work as show themselves in the Declarations [*True and Sincere Declaration* and *True Declaration*].\(^{1061}\)

All three were prominent Virginia Council members with previous publications.\(^{1062}\) Even though, as a company publication, the *True Declaration* must have passed through a committee, I suggest that there was one main contributor and in what follows I use three methods to identify this person.

I compare selected works by Bacon, Digges, and Sandys with the unattributed *True Declaration* in an attempt to decide which one of these three candidates exhibits the closest correspondence. Two methods of comparison are to be used: topics of concern §8.5.1, and elements of style §8.5.2, the latter category examining the frequency of certain rhetorical figures. In §8.5.3, I employ RCP to discover the published author who provides the most matches of rare collocations with the *True Declaration*. This is a wider test than that in §8.5.2, being designed to bring into consideration authors outside the Virginia Company.

Having been held back by Queen Elizabeth and her chief adviser Robert Cecil, after King James came to power Francis Bacon (1561–1626) rose to become Solicitor–General (1607), Attorney–General (1613), and Lord Chancellor (1618). He formed a strong interest in the New World and in February 1607, two months after the first planters had left the Thames for Virginia, he made a speech in Parliament pointing out that “the solitude of

\(^{1058}\) Fitzmaurice, *Humanism*, op. cit., p.177.

\(^{1059}\) Gayley, *Shakespeare*, op. cit., p.52.


\(^{1062}\) The members of the central Virginia Council are listed on Lord de la Warr’s commission into Virginia dated 28 February 1609–10. It bears the following signatures: Southampton, Pembroke, Philip Montgomerie, Theophilus Howard, Edward Cecill, William Waad, Walter Cope, Edward Conoway, Thomas Smith, Baptist Hicks, Dudlie Diggs, Robart Mansill, Christopher Brook, and William Romney”, see *GEN*, p.384.
Virginia was crying out for inhabitants.”¹⁰⁶³ In 1609, he composed a tract entitled “Certain considerations touching the plantations in Ireland”¹⁰⁶⁴ and in the same year the Second Virginia Charter named Bacon as one of 52 Council members, only three of whom were not either a knight or Lord. Keirnan states that the Charter “may have been prepared in part by Bacon in his capacity as Solicitor General,”¹⁰⁶⁵ an assertion that I have been unable to place earlier than the American colonial historian Alexander Brown.¹⁰⁶⁶

Several years later, after completing The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia, William Strachey sent the “Lord High Chancellor of England” Sir Francis Bacon a manuscript copy with the following dedication:

Your Lordship ever approving himself a most noble fautor [supporter] of the Virginia Plantation, being from the beginning (with other lords and earles) of the principal counsell applyed to propagate and guide yt.¹⁰⁶⁷

_TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR FRANCIS BACON,
KNIGHT, BARON OF VERULAM, LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, AND OF HIS MAJESTIES MOST HONORABLE PRIVY COUNSELL._

_Most worthy honor’d Lord,

Your Lordship ever approving yourself a most noble fautor of the Virginian Plantation, being from the beginning (with other lords and earles) of the principal counsell applyed to propagate and guide yt: and my poore self (bound to your observaunce, by being one of the Graies-Inne Societe) having bene there three yeares thither, impioied in place of secretarie so long there present; and setting downe with all my wel-

Figure 8.1: Strachey’s dedication to Bacon in his Historie of Travaile (1612)

Bacon’s interest in exploration also extended beyond the Virginia enterprise. In May 1610, the name “Sir Fran. Bacon” appeared on a Patent for the Newfoundland colony “reserving to all manner of persons of what nation soever, as well as the English, the right of trade and

¹⁰⁶³ “The allusion to Virginia is not in the printed speech but is to be found in the Journals” Gardiner, _History of England, op. cit._, p.333n.
¹⁰⁶⁴ This date is James Spedding’s estimate, see _LL_, Vol. IV, p.116. Michael Kiernan dates it to 1606, Michael Kiernan, ed., _The Essays or Counsels, Civill and Morall_, The Oxford Francis Bacon, Vol. XV (1985; reissued by Oxford University Press, 2000), p.239.
¹⁰⁶⁵ Ibid., p.244.
¹⁰⁶⁶ _GEN_, p.207.
¹⁰⁶⁷ Strachey, _Historie of Travaile, op. cit._ Bacon became Lord Chancellor in January 1618, a date that serves as the _terminus post quem_ for the dedication.
fishing in the parts aforesaid.” Eight years later, he was admitted a free brother of the East India Company. Several travel narratives seem to have aroused Bacon’s curiosity: he exhibited familiarity with details of William Barentz’s third voyage to Novaya Zembla in 1596, Acosta’s History of the Indies, and Matteo Ricci’s Expeditione Christiana apud Simas for information on China. A map of Africa, Peru, and the Magellan Straights seems to have assisted in his discussion on “Conformable Instances” in Novum Organon.

However, the most curious connection between Bacon and the New World was given by his chaplain Dr William Rawley who saw his fall from office in May 1621 and his consequent leisure time to complete new work as echoing the 1609 Sea Venture shipwreck at Bermuda:

Methinks they are [Bacon’s misfortunes] resembled by those of Sir George Sommers [on the Sea Venture], who being bound, by his employment, for another coast [Virginia], was by tempest cast upon the Bermudas: And there a shipwreck’d man made full discovery of a new temperate fruitful region, which none had before inhabited; and which mariners, who had only seen its rocks, had esteem’d an inaccessible and enchanted place.

Dudley Digges (1583–1639) was the son of the mathematician Sir Thomas Digges and Anne St. Leger and, after receiving his knighthood in April 1607, he took his place on the London Virginia Council. In The Defence of Trade (1615) he called Virginia the “goodliest Countrie in the world, were it well inhabited.” In a letter dated 4 December 1611, John Chamberlain reported to Sir Dudley Carelton that Digges was “a great

---

1071 In ‘History of the Winds’ Bacon complains about Acosta, see SEH, Vol. V, p.152. The author of the True Declaration was also familiar with this work, mentioning “Acosta in his first booke of the hystories of the Indies”, True declaration, op. cit., sig. D2.
1073 Cawley notes that Bacon was studying Ortelius map, or some other, to survey Africa and the region of Peru stretching to the Magellan Straights, see Ibid., p.96.
1075 Digges’s name appears with thirteen others on Lord de la Warr’s Commission into Virginia dated 28 February 1610, see GEN, p.384. None of the other signatories are Bacon or Sandys.
1076 Dudley Digges, The Defence of Trade (London: 1615), STC: 6845, sig. E4".
undertaker” in discovering the North West passage and in November 1612 his money assisted in purchasing the Bermuda Islands from the Virginia Company. He also became a member of the East India Company (which he supported in The Defence of Trade) as well as the Muscovy Company, and in the period 1618–19 he was named ambassador to Muscovy and Special Ambassador to Holland. A special committee was assembled in 1619 to produce a State report on the Virginia colony to which he contributed. Five years before his death, he acted as one of the commissioners for Virginia tobacco.

Sir Edwin Sandys (1561–1629) was the son of Dr Edwin Sandys, Archbishop of York, and Cecily Wilford. He was knighted at the Charterhouse in May 1603 two months after King James took the English throne. Sandys became a member of the enlarged London Virginia Council in February 1607 and thereafter his signature appeared on several of their letters. In the opinion of Brown, he “drafted two of the former Virginia charters” and consequently became Treasurer of the Virginia Company in April 1619, however, his re-election was obstructed by the king the following year. In the summer of 1621, he was suspected of trying to separate the Virginia colony from the king’s control and was imprisoned for a month. His most notable work, written at Paris in 1599, was Europae Speculum, or a Survey of the State of Religion in the Western Part of the World which was entered for publication at Stationers’ Hall on 21 June 1605.

8.4 ‘True Reportory’ and True Declaration

Several documents appear to have influenced the True Declaration: William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, Sylvester Jourdain’s Discovery, and a letter dated 7 July 1610 from the Council of Virginia to the Virginia Company of London signed by Lord de la Warr (and others).

Gayley points out with respect to Jourdain’s Discovery that “[the True Declaration compiler] embodies from it some five phrases not found in his other sources” while

---

1079 Sandys’s name appears with four others on a letter from “His Majesties Council of Virginia” to the Plymouth Corporation dated 17 February 1609, GEN, p.240. None of the other signatories are Bacon or Digges.
1082 Jourdain, A discovery, op. cit.
1083 GEN, pp.402–413.
Reedy shows that the *True Declaration* follows the Lord de la Warr letter more closely than other texts when reporting the condition of the colony.\(^{1085}\) However, I focus here on the *True Declaration*’s main influence, William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’, a 20,000-word letter that was first published in 1625 by Samuel Purchas with the date “July 15 1610” in the heading and was very likely sent back with Sir Thomas Gates to the London Virginia Company on that date, arriving in England on 1 September 1610. It contains a detailed account of the July 1609 shipwreck at Bermuda, the survival of the entire crew, the mutinies on the island, and the building of two cedar-wood pinnaces which they used to reach Jamestown in May 1610. The ‘True Reportory’ differs from the *True Declaration* in that it openly discusses the disease and hostility of the environment. Strachey’s account was deemed so sensitive that it was withheld from publication until 1625 when it appeared in Samuel Purchas’s *Purchas his pilgrimes*. Nevertheless, several favourable extracts appear in the Virginia Company’s *True Declaration*.

With respect to the *Sea Venture* crew’s attempt to save themselves during the storm, the ‘True Reportory’ informs us “how mutually willing they were, yet by labour to keepe each other from drowning, albeit each one drowned whilst he laboured.”\(^{1086}\) The *True Declaration* recasts this as “those which laboured to keepe others from drowning were halfe drowned themselves in labouring.”\(^{1087}\) Reedy declares this tightening of Strachey’s antemetabole to be “almost incontrovertible text evidence that the Virginia Company writer follows Strachey.”\(^{1088}\)

One passage in the ‘True Reportory’ relating to rumours about the poor quality of the country is shown below with the version in the *True Declaration* shown in bold type:

> Then *let no rumour of the pouerty of the Country (as if in the wombe thereof) there lay not those elementall seedes, which could produce many fair births of plenty, and increase, and better hopes, then any land vnder the heauen to which the Sunne is no neerer a neighbour* I say, let no imposture rumour, nor any fame of some one, or a few more changeable actions, interposing by the way, or at home, waue any mans

---

\(^{1085}\) Tom Reedy, ‘Dating William Strachey’s’, *op. cit.*, p.540; in fact, the author of the *True Declaration* actually admits using “the letters of the Lord La Ware” in compiling the document, see *True Declaration*, STC: 24833, sig. A3’.


\(^{1087}\) *True Declaration*, STC: 24833, sig. D1’.

There is yet another unique correspondence between the ‘True Reportory’ and True Declaration of some 70 words relating to the health of the colonists. The relevant passage from the ‘True Reportory’ is given below with the version in True Declaration shown in bold type.

for of foure [some] hundred and odde men, which were seated at the Fals, the last yeere when the Fleece came in with fresh and yong 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 Nansamundes, under the charge of Captaine John Martin, there did not so much as one man miscarry, and but very few or none fall sicke, whereas at James Towne, the same time, and the same monethes, one hundred sickned, & halfe the number died

It is clear from this that if the ‘True Reportory’ relied on the True Declaration then the additional facts must have arisen from elsewhere, even though the ‘True Reportory’ contains the most comprehensive account of the events on Bermuda. However, if the True Declaration sourced the ‘True Reportory’ then the reduction in detail seems natural because the author of the former would have simply edited down these accounts in the ‘True Reportory’.

Given that the Strachey letter was first published with the date “July 15, 1610” in the heading and that the True Declaration was registered at Stationers’ Hall on 8 November 1610, it seems to me to be beyond reasonable doubt that the author of the True Declaration had the ‘True Reportory’ in front of him when he compiled it and that it arrived back in England with Sir Thomas Gates in September 1610.

8.5 The main contributors to the True Declaration

The True Declaration is a work of about 10,800 words and in the opinion of Luce it “was penned with considerable literary skill.” It is written from the point of view of one main author “And though it bee not for a theoreticall Schollar, to circumscribe the dominions of Princes, yet a few proofes from antiquity, shall suffice to controel the ignorant or

1089 Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, Vol. IV, op. cit., p.1750; True Declaration, op. cit., p.31. The compiler of the True Declaration states that these are “the words and phrase of that noble Gounenour, the Lo. Laware, as it is warranted to mee by the copie of his Letters sent to the Virginian Councell.”

1090 Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, op. cit., p.1753; True Declaration, op. cit., sig. E2v.

1091 Luce, The Tempest, op. cit., p.167.
presumptuous follie.”\textsuperscript{1092} A “Schollar” seems to be how Bacon viewed himself when writing to George Villiers in 1616:

You know I am no courtier, nor versed in state affairs. My life hitherto rather hath been contemplative than active. I have rather studied books than men.\textsuperscript{1093}

However, it hardly seems to have been an appropriate description of Sandys or Digges. The compiler also declares that he has been privy to “the secrets of the iudiciall counsell of Virginia”,\textsuperscript{1094} a qualification that would have applied equally well to all three candidates.

Three aspects of the *True Declaration* will now be addressed here: topics of interest in §8.5.1, rhetorical figures in §8.5.2, and rare collocations in §8.5.3.

8.5.1 Topics of interest

In Bacon’s *Essayes* (1625), he comments on “the hastie drawing of Profit”, the need for a single governor, and his desire not to displant the natives.\textsuperscript{1095} However, there is a further concern that is particularly striking for it appears in *Good Speed to Virginia* and *True Declaration*, as well as in work by Bacon. In 1609, *Good Speed to Virginia* declared that:

There is nothing more daungerous for the estate of common-wealths, then when the people do increase to a greater multitude and number then may justly parallel with the largenesse of the place and country [...] many States-men haue thought nothing more profitable for populous common-wealths, then to haue forreigne and externe warres, to the ende that thereby the superfluous braunches may be cut off. This was the cause why Scipio when he had conquered Carthage, would not haue it utterly ruinated, least saith he, the Romaines hauing no warres abroad, moue civill warres amongst themselves at home.\textsuperscript{1096}

The *True Declaration* echoes the reference to Carthage and asks for a better way of reducing the population of England:

He is ouer blinde that doth not see what an inundation of people doth overflow this little Iland: Shall we vent this deluge by indirect and vnchristian policies? Shal we imitate the bloody and heathenish counsel of the Romanes, to leaue a Carthage standing, that may exhaust our people by forraine warre?\textsuperscript{1097} Or shall we nourish domesticall faction, that as

\textsuperscript{1092} *True Declaration*, op. cit., sig. C2.
\textsuperscript{1093} *LL*, Vol. VI, p.27.
\textsuperscript{1094} *True Declaration*, op. cit., sig. A3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{1096} Gray, *Good Speed*, op. cit., sigs B3\textsuperscript{v}, B4; *Virginia Brittania*, Crashaw’s Sermon, and *True and Sincere Declaration* all address the issue of overpopulation in England but none of them discusses war as a means of reducing it.
\textsuperscript{1097} *True Declaration*, op. cit., sig. I.
in the dayes of Vitellus and Vespasian, the sonne may imbrew his hands in the blood of the father [in a civil war]?\footnote{1098}

In his *History of Henry VII* (1622) Bacon reports a speech that Henry VII made to Parliament in the seventh year of his reign to incite war against France, containing the following line: “And if there should bee any bad Bloud left in the Kingdome, an Honourable Forraine Warre will vent it, or purifie it.”\footnote{1099} An EEBO search for the use of ‘vent near.10 people’ (in the sense of reducing a population by war) and ‘vent near.10 war’ finds no returns before 1610 (see No.52, Table 8.4, §8.5.3). The first occurs in the Virginia Company’s *True and Sincere Declaration* “transplanting the rancknesse and multitude of increase in our people; of which there is no vent, but age”\footnote{1100} and the second in the *True Declaration* as quoted above “He is ouer blinde”.

In a letter of advice to the Earl of Rutland dated 4 January 1595 [1596], Bacon proposes that a foreign war can be used to prevent civil war:

If it seems strange that I account no state flourishing but that which hath neither civil wars nor too long [external] peace, I answer, that politic bodies are like our natural bodies, and must as well have some exercise to spend their humours, as to be kept from too violent or continual outrages which spend their best spirits.\footnote{1101}

Again, in Bacon’s 1609 treatise on the Irish plantation, we find:

An effect of peace in fruitful kingdoms, where the stock of people, receiving no consumption nor diminution by war, doth continually multiply and increase, must in the end be a surcharge or overflow of people more than the territories can well maintain; which many times, insinuating a general necessity and want of means into all estates, doth turn external peace [absence of a foreign war] into internal troubles and seditions [civil unrest].\footnote{1102}

Then in ‘Of the greatnesse of Kingdomes’ (1612), he returns to this theme again:

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1098} *Ibid.*, sigs I–I
\item \footnote{1099} Francis Bacon, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (London: 1622), STC: 1160, p.98.
\item \footnote{1100} Counsell for Virginia, *A true and sincere declaration of the purpose and ends of the plantation begun in Virginia of the degrees which it hath received* (London: 1610), STC: 24832, sig. A4.
\item \footnote{1101} *LL*, Vol. II, p.12.
\item \footnote{1102} *LL*, Vol. IV, p.118.
\end{itemize}
No body can be healthfull without exercise, neither naturall body, nor politike; & to the politike body of a Kingdome or estate, a ciuill warre is as the heate of a feuer: but a forraine warre is like the heate of exercise.\textsuperscript{1103}

It is clear that Bacon entertained this view for well over a decade before it appeared in the Virginia Company’s \textit{Good Speed to Virginia} and \textit{True Declaration}. However, Dudley Digges also addressed this issue. \textit{Foure Paradoxes, or politique Discourses} (1604),\textsuperscript{1104} is divided into two parts, the first two essays are ‘Concerning Militarie Discipline, written long since by Thomas Digges, Esquire’ while the remaining two are ‘Of the worthinesse of warre and warriors, by Dudly Digges, his sonne’. Dudley Digges has ample opportunity in these two pieces to set out his views on the benefits of war. In the fourth piece, he lists them as being to “procure his Kings Honour, his countries safetie, or his own reputation” and hopes that “wee may not suffer our enemies or neighbours to grow too mightie, whilest carelesly wee ourselues waxe weake and degenerate through sloth and ease.”\textsuperscript{1105} He then cites the examples of Silla and Alcibiades who “carried themselues most lasciuously, most wantonly in peace, till the warres taught them to liue like souldiers.”\textsuperscript{1106} Digges notes that in “peace [which is] the patron of their baseness” when there is a “want of forraine warres”, men are prone to theft and civil contentions and that the acquisition of wealth is better obtained “by the sworde from forraine enemies, like our worthy Auncestors, then so to haue growen great, through their Countrimens [civil] contentions.”\textsuperscript{1107} He argues that peace makes disease more likely leading to “the distempering of most healthful bodies.”\textsuperscript{1108} However, it also gives men the opportunity to plot the overthrow of government, to harbour dangerous enmities that “steale on vs by degrees hidden in the deepnesse of our rest, like the consumption in a body vnpurged, vnexercised […] they are as plentifully bred in peace as Crocodiles in Egypt.”\textsuperscript{1109} He remarks that “forreigne warre,

\textsuperscript{1103} Bacon, \textit{The essayes, op. cit.}, sig. Q6. As of 3 January 2013, this has not yet been keyed into the EEBO database. In 1624, Bacon wrote a treatise ‘Considerations touching a War with Spain’ in which he declares ‘if a state, out of the distemper of their own body, do fear sedition and intestine troubles to break out amongst themselves, they may discharge their own ill humours upon a foreign war for a cure’ in \textit{LL}, Vol. VII, p.469.

\textsuperscript{1104} Thomas Digges and Dudley Digges, \textit{Foure Paradoxes, or politique Discourses} (London: 1604), STC: 6872.

\textsuperscript{1105} \textit{Ibid.}, p.99.

\textsuperscript{1106} \textit{Ibid.}, p.101.

\textsuperscript{1107} \textit{Ibid.}, p.102.

\textsuperscript{1108} \textit{Ibid.}, p.102.

\textsuperscript{1109} \textit{Ibid.}, p.103.
[is] a souereigne medicine for domesticall inconueniences”\textsuperscript{1110} and writes that in the time of Coriolanus, civil faction led the Senate of Rome to seek warre with the Volsces to ease their City of that dearth [famine], by diminishing their [own] number.\textsuperscript{1111} This was as Plutarch wel oberues a wise remedy, the Romans euer vsed to disperse abroad like good Physitions the ill humours that troubled the quiet state of their Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{1112}

He also mentions Scipio’s desire “to have Carthage stand” relating it to “the Athenians [who] had them of Samos whose inuasion appeased their domesticall tumults.”\textsuperscript{1113} However, unlike Francis Bacon and the \textit{True Declaration}, he does not use the word “vent” to describe the population reduction.\textsuperscript{1114}

\subsection*{8.5.2 Rhetorical figures}

The \textit{True Declaration}, a work of 10,800 words (or 10,434 with Gates’s quotations removed), was registered in November 1610 and if we wish to test work that has not been influenced by it, then it is preferable to use comparison texts for our three candidates from before 1610. Both Bacon’s \textit{The two books} and Sandys’s \textit{A relation} date from 1605 and so are ideal for this study. Digges’s \textit{Fata} dates from 1611 and since it is shorter than the \textit{True Declaration}, I have appended the initial 6,401 words from \textit{The Defence} (1615) to arrive at the required sample size, having disregarded the lengthy quotations that Digges includes from another author. Both of these post-date the \textit{True Declaration}. Being a member of the Virginia Council he undoubtedly read the \textit{True Declaration} and so it might have influenced his rhetorical choices and raised his counts in Table 8.3, column 4. However, if his expected inflated counts are below other candidates who are below the \textit{True Declaration} then this should not influence the conclusion as to who has the best correspondence to the pamphlet.

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{1110} Ibid., p.104.
\bibitem{1111} Ibid., p.104.
\bibitem{1113} Digges, \textit{Foure}, \textit{op. cit.} p.107.
\bibitem{1114} Bacon might have obtained ‘vent’ from Gray’s Inn’s \textit{The Misfortunes of Arthur}, Chorus (III.iv), “And better were still to preserve our peace, / Then thus to vent for peace through waging warres”, in Thomas Hughes, \textit{Certaine deu[is]es, op. cit.}, p.55.
\end{thebibliography}
My first test consists in counting certain rhetorical figures that occur in the four equal-size samples from the three candidates and the *True Declaration*. For Digges, the distribution of results for the *Fata* and *Defence*, respectively, are shown in parentheses in Column 4, Table 8.3.

I encountered particular difficulty in identifying examples of metaphor so any doubtful cases were not recorded and all counts for Metaphor in Table 8.3 are below their real values. Seven rhetorical features will be considered here as shown in Column 1, Table 8.3, for a frequency comparison between the works listed in Table 8.2.\textsuperscript{1115}

Table 8.2: Works used in comparison of frequency of rhetorical figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td><em>A True Declaration of the estate of the Colony in Virginia, with a</em></td>
<td>10,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>confutation of such scandalous reports as have tended to the</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>disgrace of so worthy an enterprise</em>\textsuperscript{1116}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Francis Bacon</td>
<td><em>The two books of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement</em></td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>of learning, divine and humane to the King</em>\textsuperscript{1117}</td>
<td>10,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Dudley Digges</td>
<td><em>Fata mihi totvm mea sunt agitanda per Orbem (in English)</em>\textsuperscript{1118}</td>
<td>4,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Defence of Trade</em>\textsuperscript{1119}</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edwin Sandys</td>
<td><em>A relation of the state of religion</em>\textsuperscript{1120}</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: Frequency of rhetorical figures and Latin tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Figure</th>
<th>True Declaration (10,434)</th>
<th>Bacon (10,434)</th>
<th>Digges (10,434)</th>
<th>Sandys (10,434)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphora</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (1+4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antemetabole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0+0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiplosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0+0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antithesis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0+0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypophora</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (0+10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin tags</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11 (1+10)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1115} Examples of each type of rhetorical figure in the *True Declaration* can be found at the following locations: Anaphora “Partlie because there is no trust […] Partlie because there is room sufficient […]” (*True Declaration, op. cit.*, sig. B3') [repetition of phrase or word at the start of successive clauses]; Antemetabole “let hime now reade with judgement, but let him not judge before he hath read” (sig. E3') [pair of words repeated in reverse order]; Antidiplosis “how the heauens heare the earth, the earth heare the corne and oyle,” (sig. F1v, p.46) [repetition of end of last phrase at start of next]; Antithesis “why that should bee lawfull for France, which (in vs) is vnlawfull” (sig. B–B') [opposition of ideas]; Hypophora “Is it vnlawfull because wee come to them?” (sig. B3) [raises a question then answers it]; Metaphor “The broken remainder” (sig. E3').

\textsuperscript{1116} STC: 24833.

\textsuperscript{1117} STC: 1164.

\textsuperscript{1118} STC: 6846.

\textsuperscript{1119} STC: 6845.

\textsuperscript{1120} STC: 21717.
In the 4,033 words of Fata (1611), I take the first number in parentheses in Column 4, Table 8.3, and find that Digges gives only a single anaphora, one Latin tag, and none of the other above-mentioned rhetorical figures. His later work The Defence (1615) is the second number in parentheses and carries a more liberal expression. In the first 6,401 words that are his, there are 4 anaphora, 10 reasonable metaphors, and 10 Latin tags. However, the absence of antemetabole, antiplosis, and antithesis set it apart from the True Declaration. The sample from Sandys’ A relation is deficient in metaphor, makes no use of Latin tags, but has more antiplosis than the True Declaration. In contrast, Bacon’s The two books (1605) has almost the same frequency of Latin tags as the True Declaration and all other rhetorical figures apart from hypophora\textsuperscript{1121} are reasonably represented. So I conclude from this limited study that Francis Bacon has the best match of rhetorical figures with the True Declaration.

8.5.3 Application of the RCP method to True Declaration

Application data

\textit{Date test completed:} 11 January 2013

\textit{Search period:} 1473–1670

\textit{No. keyed-in searchable texts in search period:} 24,589

\textit{Date of test document:} 1610

\textit{No. keyed-in searchable texts prior to test document date:} 5,268

\textit{Definition of ‘rare’:} <6 returns before date of test document

\textit{Grading system for a possible source:} This depends on whether a return before the date of the test document is unique or is one of a group of returns: grade A for 1 return; grade B for 2–5 returns.

\textit{Probability estimates for possible sources:} If a text occurs as a possible source on two occasions and thereby receives two grades, I estimate its probability for being a source for the test document as follows: AA or AB – ‘beyond reasonable doubt’; BB – ‘on the balance of probability’.

Any return later than 1610 that is known (but not revealed by EEBO) to have used a manuscript earlier than 1610 is recorded as a possible source, for example, ‘True Reportory’ (1610) in Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes (1625).\textsuperscript{1122} I also classify a collocation as ‘rare’ if a major writer provides its first known occurrence. Returns between

\textsuperscript{1121} Bacon is aware of hypophora because he employs one later in the work: “For doth anie of them in handeling Quantititie [...]”?Bacon, The two books, op. cit., sig. Ff.

\textsuperscript{1122} Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimes, Vol. IV, op. cit., pp.1734–58.
1611 and 1670 inclusive are logged to identify recurring authors. All returns for rare collocations have been checked against the 660 names on the Second Virginia Charter for membership of the Virginia Company. Table 4.1 suggests <9 returns for the rarity of a collocation in 1610 but, as with The Tempest, I tighten this requirement to <6 to give greater rarity to the collocations.

Table 8.4: Collocation searches in True Declaration (1610) using EEBO from 1473–1670.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation (page No.)</th>
<th>EEBO search</th>
<th>Returns ≤1670</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 the iudicious apprehension (1)</td>
<td>{judicious apprehension}</td>
<td>9 (1&lt;1610)1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 breath of fame (1)</td>
<td>{breath of fame}</td>
<td>32 (2&lt;1610)1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 carried away with the tide of vulgar opinion (2)</td>
<td>{of vulgar opinion}</td>
<td>10 (0&lt;1610)1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to be shuffled over (2)</td>
<td>{shuffled over}</td>
<td>15 (3&lt;1610)1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 supine negligence (2)</td>
<td>{supine negligence}</td>
<td>105 (12&lt;1610)1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 gouvernment politcall (3)</td>
<td>{government political}</td>
<td>9 (2&lt;1610)1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Salmanasar transporting the Babilonians (3)</td>
<td>{Salmanasar near.10 Babylonians}</td>
<td>3 (1&lt;1610)1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 black envy (5)</td>
<td>{black envy}</td>
<td>17 (3&lt;1610)1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I marshall all those reasons (6)</td>
<td>{marshal near.5 reasons}</td>
<td>4(9) (1(2)&lt;1610)1131 [marshal as verb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 subalternate (6)</td>
<td>{subalternate}</td>
<td>64 (3&lt;1610)1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1123 Humphrey Leech, Dutifull and respective considerations (1609), STC: 15362.5.
1124 Thomas Rogers, Celestiall elegies (1598), STC: 21225; William Cornwallis, Essayes (1600–1), STC: 5775.
1125 Barnabe Rich, Opinion deified (1613), STC: 20994; Francis Bacon, The charge (1614), STC: 1125 which is the second return after True Declaration.
1127 Noteworthy because Edwin Sandys, A relation (1605), STC: 21716, predates True Declaration as the eighth in chronological order of use. There is also use by Francis Bacon ‘Of Violent and Projectile Motion’ in Peter Shaw, ed., The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon, 3 vols, Vol. III (London: 1733), p.606, but this is a translation from Latin. The collocation is too commonplace to merit grading.
1131 Thomas Bilson, The suruey of Christs sufferings (1604), STC: 3070.
1132 Annibale Romei, The courtiers (1598), STC: 21311; Samuel Daniel, Certaine small poems (1605), STC: 6239; Pierre Charon, Of wisdome (1608), STC: 5051.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Term</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>a nation conquered (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11(16) (2(4)&lt;1610)$^{1133}$ [adjective]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>imprinted footsteps (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1610)$^{1134}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sanguinarie (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>168 (11(22)&lt;1610)$^{1135}$ [not ‘blood stone’ but adjectival]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>inherit and inhabit (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (0&lt;1610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>dutie and submission (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (2&lt;1610)$^{1136}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a place vnholesome (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (0&lt;1610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>firebrand of iniquitie (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0&lt;1610)$^{1137}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>fanne away (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (5&lt;1610)$^{1138}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>When we neuer intend to play the Rehoboams, and to scourge them with scorpions (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (1&lt;1610)$^{1139}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>vpon the action (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 (5&lt;1610)$^{1140}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>to controwle ignorant or presumptuous folly (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (5&lt;1610)$^{1141}$ (10&lt;1610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>the vnholesomenesse of the climate$^{1143}$ (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1&lt;1610)$^{1142}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^{1134}$ Robert Gordon, *Encouragements* (1625), STC: 12069, has lifted whole passages out of *True Declaration*.

$^{1135}$ One of those that precedes the *True Declaration* is “the sanguinarie prosecutions of his Predecessors” in Francis Bacon, *The two bookes* (1605), STC: 11644. However, I judge this as too commonplace to be significant.

$^{1136}$ John Penry, *A vieue* (1589), STC: 19613; *& Iohn Penry* (1593), STC: 19608.

$^{1137}$ The other is Robert Gordon, *Encouragements* (1625), STC: 12069, who also features in collocations 14 and 16.


$^{1139}$ “Foolish Rehoboams thinke it the most prudent course, to scourge them with scorpions” Peter Moffett, *A commentarie vpon the booke of Prouerbes of Salomon* (1592), STC: 18245. This is a strong match for a possible source so I assign this grade A.


$^{1142}$ This arises from a comparison of what the sets have in common and this is Thomas Bilson, *The surveie* (1604), STC: 3070.

$^{1143}$ See Table 7.1, No. 26.
the price of time (20) {price of time} 10 (2<1610) 1144
clouds of fear (21) {clouds of fear} 19 (1<1610) 1145
disconsolate people (24) {disconsolate people} 4 (0<1610)
fens “and” marshes (32) 1146
{fens “and” marshes} (9<1610)
ambitious discord (34) {ambitious discord} 3 (1<1610)
1147
presumptuous disobedience (35) {presumptuous disobedience} 13 (2<1611)
1148
barbarous project (37) {barbarous project} 3 (1<1610)
implacable enemies (37) {implacable enemies} 187 (2<1610)
scum of men (37) {scum of men} (1) {scum of people} (2) 22 (2<1610) 1150
scandalous reports (39) {scandalous reports} 76 (4<1610) 1151
noble resolutions (39) {noble resolutions} 36 (2<1610) 1152
Vnto Treasons, you may joine (40) {you may join} 54 (1(14)<1610) 1153
[the form is “to * you may join”]
And not to dissemble their folly (40) {dissemble fby.2 folly} 5 (2<1610) 1154

1144 Thomas Wilson, A discourse (1572), STC: 25807; John Merbecke, A booke of notes (1581), STC: 17299.
1145 Richard Martin, A speech deliuered (1603), STC: 17510.
1146 See Table 7.1, No.26.
1147 Not rare enough.
1148 Jean Bodin, The six bookes of a common-weale (1606), STC: 3193.
1150 Robert Cecil, An answere to certaine scandalous papers (1606), STC: 4895. The later record is a copy of Cecil’s letter in A true coppy of a bold and most peremptory letter, sent to the Honourable Earle of Salisbury [Robert Cecil] (1641), Wing: C13.
1152 Christopher Marlowe, Tamburlaine (1590), STC: 17425; Jean de Serres, A general inventorie (1607), STC: 22244. An unkeyed text in the EEBO database “It is a Shamefull and Vnblessed Thing, to take the Scumme of People, and Wicked Comdemned Men, to be the People with whom you Plant” Francis Bacon, The essays (1625), STC: 1148. Being in the context of colonisation I take this to be very strong.
1153 Thomas Kyd, The Spanish tragedie (1592), STC: 15086; Ercole Tasso, Of mariage (1599), STC: 23690; Samuel Daniel, The Queenes Arcadia (1606), STC: 6262; Jean Francois Le Petit, A generall historie (1608), STC: 12374. It is also used in a 1610 Virginia Company Broadside, STC: 24831.7.
1154 Guillaume Du Vair, The moral philosophie (1598), STC: 7374; Alexandre de Pontaymeri, A womans worth (1599), STC: 11831.
1155 “To that you may ioyne this conclusion” Thomas Bilson, The true difference (1585), STC: 3071.
1156 “manerly to dissemble the folly of other men” Desiderius Erasmus, The ciuilitie of childehode (1560), STC: 10471.3; “he could not dissemble his folly” Thomas Bilson, The true difference (1585), STC: 3071. Apart from the True Declaration and its copy in Purchas, the only other return is Giovanni Diodati, Pious annotations (1643), STC: Wing: D1510. This and the last collocation appear in Bilson, but Erasmus is not a possible source for the last.
| 36 | sensible declyning (41) | {sensible declining} | 7 (1<1610)  |
| 37 | boyling with desire of reuenge (41) | {boiling near.5 revenge} | 22 (2(3)<1610) [connected with revenge] |
| 38 | spangled Canopie of heauen (46) | {spangled Canopie} | 34 (2<1610) |
| 39 | cast themselues at the foot-stoole of God and to reuerence his mercy (46–7) | {footstool of God} | 23 (12<1610) |
| 40 | chalke out the path (49) | (1) {chalk* out/forth the way/path}  
(2) {chalk* out} | 35 (2<1610)  
(4<1616)  
293 (11(20)<1610) [a path or way] |
| 41 | the sappe of their bodies (49) | {sap near.5 bodies} | 9 (0<1610) |
| 42 | yet may the stayde spirits of any condition (50) | (1) {the/a staid}  
(2) {his/her/their staid} | 78 (4(18)<1610) [mental]  
21 (0(5)<1610) [mental] |
| 43 | force of knowledge (50) | {force of knowledge} | 6 (2<1610) |
| 44 | assure the inhabitants (50) | {assure the inhabitants} | 7 (3<1610) |
| 45 | succinct narration (53) | {succinct narration} | 6 (1<1610) |

---

1157 Livy, *The Romane historie* (1600), STC: 16613.
1159 Both returns contain a poem by “Ed. Fairfax” which runs “Now spread the night her spangled canopie” in Robert Albott, *Englands Parnassus* (1600), STC: 378; Torquato Tasso, *Godfrey of Bulloigne* (1600), STC: 23698 which was “Done into English heroicall verse, by Edward Fairfax Gent”.
1161 Bacon has “make trial of the way we chalk out” in Francis Bacon, *Novum organum scientiarum* (1620), trans. from Latin by Peter Shaw, 2 vols, Vol. I, Introduction, Section 4 (London: 1818), p.xxiii. However, the collocation is not rare enough.
1162 The earliest after *True Declaration* is John Smith, *The generall historie of Virginia* (1624), STC: 22790 which contains large parts of *True Declaration*. The next in chronological order is “All Plants, that put forth their Sap hastily, haue their Bodies not proportionable to their Length” in Francis Bacon, *Sylva sylvarum* (1627), STC: 1168. However, this is not in the context of a human body so I find it inadmissable.
1166 Thomas Bell, *The tryall* (1608), STC: 1832.
| 46 | which is an infallible argument that (56) | (1) {which is an infallible argument that} | 6 (1(2)<1610) \textsuperscript{1167} [requires this exact construction with ‘that’] |
| 46 | (2) {which to me is an infallible argument} | 0 (0<1610) |
| 46 | (3) {which still is an infallible argument} | 2 (0<1610) \textsuperscript{1168} |
| 47 | one of the goodliest countries (56) | \{goodliest countries\} | 7 (3<1610) \textsuperscript{1169} |
| 48 | enterueined with five main rivers (56) | \{enterueined\} | 14 (0<1610) |
| 49 | fruitfully tempered (59) | \{fruitfully tempered\} | 2 (1<1610) \textsuperscript{1170} |
| 50 | inconsiderate ignorance (59) | \{inconsiderate ignorance\} | 3 (1<1610) \textsuperscript{1171} |
| 51 | golden slumber (60) | (1) \{golden slumber\} | 17 (9<1610) \textsuperscript{1172} (1<1594) \textsuperscript{1173} (22<1610) \textsuperscript{1174} |
| 51 | (2) \{golden sleep\} | |
| 52 | what an inundation of people doth ouerflow this little Iland: Shall we vent this deluge, by indirect and vnchristian policies? Shal we imitate the bloody and heathenish counsell of the Romanes, to leaue a Carthage standing, that may exhaust our people by forraine warre? (61) | (1) \{vent near.10 people\} | (0(7)<1610) (5<1621) \textsuperscript{1175} [people being vented] (0<1610) (1<1644) \textsuperscript{1176} [people being vented] |
| 52 | (2) \{vent near.10 war\} | |

\textsuperscript{1167} Just missing the mark is “which is an infallible argument of” Rudolf Gwalther, *An hundred* (1572), STC: 25013; the following is admissible “which is an infallible argument that” John Lyly, *Euphues* (1578), STC: 17051.

\textsuperscript{1168} In a speech used by Francis Bacon in the Lower House of Parliament in 1606–7 concerning the general Naturalization of Scotland he remarks “which still is an infallible argument, that our Industry is not awaked” in Francis Bacon, *Resuscitatio* (1657), Wing: B319, see also *LL*, Vol. 3, p.313. The other record is the same speech by Bacon.


\textsuperscript{1170} Thomas Palfreyman, *[Divine meditations]* (1572), STC: 19136.

\textsuperscript{1171} Desiderius Erasmus, *The seconde tome* (1549), STC: 2854.7.

\textsuperscript{1172} Thomas Dekker has it 3 times (two of these are *The wonderfull yeare*), and it also appears in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* and *Pericles*.


\textsuperscript{1174} Bacon has “golden sleep” in his *Promus* wastebook 1592–4, Harley 7017, British Library, f.111.

\textsuperscript{1175} In the same year as *True Declaration* but earlier was another Virginia Company pamphlet “by trans-planting the rancknesse and multitude of increase in our people; of which there is left no vent, but age;” *A true and sincere declaration* (1610), STC: 24832. Later is “And by this immoderate vent [of garrisons]” Samuel Daniel, *The first part* (1612), STC: 6246, & (1618), STC: 6248.

\textsuperscript{1176} “And if there should bee any bad Bloud left in the Kingdome, an Honourable Forrain Warre will vent it” Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1629), STC: 1161, which dates to 1621. The rarity of this collocation makes this highly significant.
when procrastinating delayes and lingering counsels, doe lose the opportunity of flying time (67)

Possible sources

I grade the collocations A and B according to the number of records returned before 1610, shown in parentheses in Column 4:

A: Only 1 record, B: Either 2–5 records

For A, since it is possible for two authors to invent a collocation independently, I intend to rely on two or more in combination. So if a text appears for two collocations I rank its strength as follows.

AA or AB : Beyond reasonable doubt
BB : Balance of probability

In what follows, for each candidate source (<1610) I give the collocation number from the table followed by its grade.

Henry Ainsworth A defence (6B), Robert Albott Englands (38B), Richard Becon Solon (11B), Thomas Bell The tryall (45A), John Bernard The tranquillitie (42B), Thomas Bilson The true (34A)(35B), Thomas Bilson The suruey (9A)(21A), Jean Bodin The six bookes (27A), Hugh Broughton A concent (6B), Heinrich Bullinger Fiftie (18B), Jean Calvin The institution (37B), Robert Cecil An answere (18B)(29A), Pierre Charon Of wisdome (10B), William Cornwallis Essayes (2B), William Crashaw The sermon (4B), Samuel Daniel Certaine (10B), Samuel Daniel The poeticall (28B), Samuel Daniel The Queenes (32B), John Davies Humours (18B), John Elliot Advise (44B), John Eliot The suruay (47B), Desiderius Erasmus The ciuititie (35B), Desiderius Erasmus The seconde (50A), Martin Fumée The historie (47B), Geffrey Gates The defence (30B), Charles Fitz-Geffry Sir Francis (18B), Innocent Gentillet A discourse (20B), Stephen Gosson The trumpet (20B), Edward Grimeston A true (44B), Francesco Guicciardini The historie (20B), Rudolf Gwalther An hundred (46B), Joseph Hall Two guides (37B), Robert Hitchcock The quintescence (42B), Roger Hutchinson The image (7A), Joannes The fardle (30B), Thomas Kyd The Spanish (32B), Humphrey Leech Dutifull (1A), Richard Linche The fountain

1177 The earliest is “Time when it is once flowen awaye (and it flyeth awaye very quickly) may be called againe by no inchauntmentes” Richard Sherry, A treatise (1550), STC: 22428. Bacon has exactly this Latin tag in Francis Bacon, The two bookees (1605), STC: 1164, sig. Dd2”. He also has “time is flying, time which cannot be retrieved” in PHI, Vol. V, p. 74. This is a translation out of Latin from De Augmentis (1620) but I judge the relationship of ideas to be unaffected, especially as Bacon checked the manuscript. It originates from Virgil, Georgica, Book III, lines 284–5, sed fugit interea, fugit irreparabile tempus [but times flies meanwhile, flies irretrievable].
Probable sources

It appears to beyond reasonable doubt that the following are sources for True Declaration: Thomas Bilson The suruey (1604), Thomas Bilson The true difference (1585), Robert Cecil An answere to certaine scandalous papers (1606), Peter Moffett A commentarie vpon the booke of Prouerbes of Salomon (1592) [due to the rarity and complexity of No. 19].

On the balance of probability, the following is also a source: Jean de Serres A general inventorie (1607).

Summary of evidence

Table 8.5 gives a summary of the data, see ‘Key to RCP results tables’ (p.viii).

Table 8.5 Rare collocation matches from the True Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Bolton</th>
<th>Braithwaite</th>
<th>Reynolds</th>
<th>Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Francis Bacon

Table 8.6 Bacon’s RCP for True Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Bacon</th>
<th>Usage date</th>
<th>No. returns</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>3&lt;1614</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>5&lt;1625</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>‘people’ 5&lt;1621 ‘war’ 1&lt;1644</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>poss. source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6 shows which of the collocations in the *True Declaration* were rare at the date of Bacon’s later use of them. No. 3 “of vulgar opinion” seems to have been first used in *True Declaration*. Bacon has its third use in *The charge* (1614)\(^{1178}\) after Rich’s *Opinion deified* (1613).\(^{1179}\)

\(^{1178}\) Francis Bacon, *The charge* (1614), STC: 1125.
The phrase “scum of men/people” (No. 31) registers two returns before 1610: Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* (1590); and Serres’s *A general inventorie* (1607). There are a total of 5 returns before Bacon’s use in 1625 which is notable because he uses it in the context of a plantation: “It is a Shamefull and Unblessed Thing, to take the Scumme of People, and Wicked Comdemned [sic] Men, to be the People with whom you Plant.”

For No. 42, “yet may the stayde spirits of any condition”, I have searched EEBO for “the/a staid” and “his/her/their staid” in the context of ‘mental function’ and both are rare. In ‘Short Notes for a civill conversation’, which the Oxford Francis Bacon dates to 1596–7, Bacon opens with “To deceive mens expectations generally (with Cautell) argueth a staid mind”.

The rare construction “which is an infallible argument that” (No. 46) appears in exactly this form in Lyly’s *Euphues* (1578). In a speech used by Francis Bacon in the Lower House of Parliament in 1606–7 concerning the general Naturalization of Scotland, he demonstrates the second returned use of this, albeit with the insertion of ‘still’, as “which still is an infallible argument, that our Industry is not awaked.” I note that this precedes the *True Declaration*.

I quote No. 52 in full here “what an inundation of people doth ouerflow this little Iland: Shall we vent this deluge, by indirect and vnchristian policies? Shal we imitate the bloody and heathenish counsell of the Romanes, to leaue a Carthage standing, that may exhaust our people by forraine warre?” I have searched EEBO with ‘vent near.10 people’, and earlier in 1610 another Virginia Company pamphlet *A true and sincere declaration* has “by transplanting the rancknesse and multitude of increase in our people; of which there is left no vent, but age.” The only other use before 1623 is “And by this immoderate vent [of garrisons]” in Daniel’s *The first part of the historie of England* (1612). The search ‘vent near.10 war’ yields one further return before 1623 and that is Bacon’s “And if there should bee any bad Bloud left in the Kingdome, an Honourable Forrain Warre will vent it” in *King...*
Henry the Seventh (1629) which he completed in 1621.\textsuperscript{1188} This satisfies the condition of ‘vent’ being used in relation to ‘people’ which Bacon represents by ‘bad Bloud’.

No. 53 is “when procrastinating delayes and lingering counsels, doe lose the oportunity of flying time.” I have conducted a search of EEBO using ‘flies/flieth/flying near.10 time’, manually filtering out the returns to satisfy the context that time does not return, and have found only 4 examples prior to 1610. The notion originates from Virgil’s Georgica\textsuperscript{1189} as 
\textit{sed fugit interea, fugit irreparabile tempus} [but time flies meanwhile, flies irretrievable]. A Latin search of EEBO reveals that only Fraunces’s The Arcadian rhetorike (1588)\textsuperscript{1190} precedes Bacon’s exact use of Virgil’s Latin tag in The two bookes (1605).\textsuperscript{1191} It predates the True Declaration. I also note that the line in True Declaration uses it in reference to “procrastinating delays and lingering counsels” and Bacon similarly applies it in a legal context stating “and that is the cause why those which take their course of rising by professions of Burden, as Lawyers, Orators painefull diuines, and the like, are not commonlie so politique for their owne fortune, otherwise then in the ordinary way, because they want time to learne particulars, to waite occasions, and to deuise plottes.” These considerations give Bacon 6 rare matches with the True Declaration, 3 before and 3 after.

Bolton, Braithwaite, Reynolds, and Taylor

None of Robert Bolton, Richard Braithwaite, John Reynolds, Thomas Taylor are mentioned in the Second Virginia Charter\textsuperscript{1192} and the following entry in the Charter is inconclusive as a suggestion of John Reynolds:

\begin{verbatim}
John Jones, merchant,  
_______ Reynolds, Brewer,\textsuperscript{1193}
\end{verbatim}

I think it highly unlikely that a non-member of the Virginia Company would be allowed the necessary access to company documents to contribute to the True Declaration. I also note that their matches all post-date the Virginia Company pamphlet so that without any evidence of prior use it would be difficult to argue for mutual borrowing which I claim is evidence of a contribution.

\textsuperscript{1188} Francis Bacon, The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seuenth (1629), STC: 1161.
\textsuperscript{1189} Virgil, Georgica, Book III, lines 284–5.
\textsuperscript{1190} Abraham Fraunce, The Arcadian rhetorike (1588), STC: 11338.
\textsuperscript{1191} Francis Bacon, The two bookes (1605), STC: 1164, sig. Dd2'. See also Bacon’s De Augmentis (1620) in PHI, Vol. V, p. 74.
\textsuperscript{1192} GEN, Vol. 1, pp.209–228.
\textsuperscript{1193} GEN, Vol. 1, p.228.
Conclusion

As noted, the True Declaration narrative hints at there being a single author. The RCP investigation suggests that with 3 matches before and 3 after, Francis Bacon at least contributed to the True Declaration and that he has the strongest case for doing so of all the other possible candidates. Even though internal evidence suggests a single main author, the final form of True Declaration must have been passed by committee, some of whom might not have been published authors and so are unavailable for search in EEBO. These other contributors might never be identified. Nevertheless, in attempting to reconstruct the history of contributions to the True Declaration, Bacon’s mark on the document seems to me to be quite clear. This means that he must have had access to company letters regarding the state of the Virginia colony, including William Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ which was a source for The Tempest.

It might be maintained that Shakespeare could have gleaned all the information that he needed for The Tempest from returning voyagers. In 1917, Gayley claimed that “the close verbal and literary coincidences between the play and the letter ‘True Reportory’ are of such a kind as could not be accounted for by any mere conversation that Shakespeare may have had with Strachey”\(^{1194}\) although unlike the present work, Gayley could provide no data to support his conclusion that the True Reportory was consulted. The rarity of the combinations of terms used in Nos 22, 26 and 37 (see Table 7.1) suggests that it is ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ that the ‘True Reportory’ was a source for The Tempest. However, there is a further consideration. Whoever contributed Caliban’s speech about edible items to The Tempest (see §7.3.2) seems to have had knowledge about the behaviour of the cahow on Bermuda and the presence of ‘philberts’ and ‘crabs’ at Virginia before this information was published. There is also the matter of being familiar with Virginia Company pamphlets such as Smith’s A true relation (1608), and Rich’s Newes from Virginia (1610) (§see 7.3.1).\(^{1195}\) This favours the notion that to facilitate writing The Tempest, information was supplied by one or more people who were familiar with the affairs of the Virginia colony.

---

\(^{1194}\) Gayley, Shakespeare, op. cit., p.75.

\(^{1195}\) Luce names three Virginia Company sources: “Jourdain’s Discovery, the True Declaration, and Strachey’s letter”, see Luce, The Tempest, op. cit., Appendix I, p.158.
8.6 *The Tempest* as a political tool

The king had an active role in the Virginia colony, putting his signature to three Virginia Charters in 1606, 1609, and 1611. Lucas notes that:

> The attention of King James was so favourably directed to the advantages attending the plantation of colonies, in consequence of certain experiments of his in the Highlands […] that he readily harkened to the applications which were made to him.\(^{1196}\)

However, his interest in the colonies was more than just a sociological experiment, he realised that they also provided a political advantage. David Nuzum\(^{1197}\) has suggested that William Strachey’s ‘True Reporitary’ was purposely lent to Shakespeare by the Company “as part of a concerted scheme of propaganda to support the London Company in its enterprise.”\(^{1198}\) About eighteen months after the first known performance of *The Tempest* at Whitehall, a masque was devised precisely for this purpose.

On the evening of 15 February 1612–13 at the wedding of Princess Elizabeth of England to Frederick V, Elector Palatine of the Rhine in Germany, a masque\(^{1199}\) credited to George Chapman was given by Middle Temple and Lincoln’s Inn.

> It proclaimed the English interest in America, and prophesied for the married pair honour and riches such as they believed would come from the great gold mines of Virginia.\(^{1200}\)

After mentioning Virginian priests and Princes, and “a rich Island lying in the South-Sea” it contains the line

> In which Island (being yet in command of the Virginian continent.) A troupe of the noblest Virginians inhabiting, attended hether the God of Riches, all triumphantly shyning in a Mine of gould.\(^{1201}\)

---


\(^{1199}\) George Chapman, *The memorable masque of the two honovrable Hovses or Innes of Court; the Middle Temple and Lyncolnes Inne* (1614), STC: 4982.

\(^{1200}\) Mary Sullivan, ‘Court masques of James I’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nebraska, 1913), p.73, see also pp.67–81.

\(^{1201}\) Chapman, *The memorable*, *op. cit.*, sig. D2². The masque has a phrase “flintie-hearted” in the Presentment which appears in Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis* as “O! pity,” ‘gan she cry, ‘flint-hearted boy”. This was rare in 1593. An EEBO search on ‘flint/flinty hearted’ with spelling variations returns (1<1593), this being Augustin Marlorat, *A catholique and ecclesiastical exposition* (1575), STC: 17406.
The intention seems to have been to present the invited ambassadors at the masque with an impression of the riches available to the English in the New World, and riches meant political power. So when *The Tempest* was played at Whitehall in November 1611 and also at the same Elizabeth–Palatine marriage celebrations in February 1612–13, I concur with Nuzum that it was intended to remind the invited ambassadors of England’s influence in the New World as Chapman’s masque would do.

Nuzum has declared that “Their giving a public dramatist [Shakespeare] access to a confidential report so dangerous that they were even then seeking by royal charter to suppress such intelligence implies that no mere chance placed this material in Shakespeare’s hands; and indeed the Company would hardly have permitted him to use it but for some excellent reason; and no one but the Council of the Company could have put it into his hands.” Where I differ with Nuzum is in the idea that Shakespeare would have been given unrestricted access to Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ and Nuzum seems to acknowledge the absurdity of the suggestion. In fact, there is evidence that not even the secretary of the Virginia Company had seen it. On 14 December 1610, just over three months after Strachey’s report had reached the Virginia Company, the company secretary Richard Martin despatched a letter to Strachey in Virginia with the *Hercules* requesting that

> You wold be pleased by the return of this shippe to let me vnderstand from you the nature & qualitie of the soyle, & how it is like to serue you without helpe from hence, the manners of the people, how the Barbarians are content with your being there, but especially how our owne people doe brooke their obedience how they endure labor, whether willingly or vpon constraint, how they live in the exercise of Religion, whether out of conscience or for fashion, And generally what ease you have in government there, & what hope of sucesse, wherein I desire & conjure you, by our auncient acquaintance & good intentions, to deale Clearely with me, as I wold do with you in the like case, that thereby I may truly able to satisfie others, & to direct my counsells & endevors for prevention of evill, if there be any.

---

1202 The Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber lists a payment to John Heminge dated “1613, May 20” for playing *The Tempest* at the wedding (MS Rawl. A., 239, Bodleian Library, Oxford).
Strachey’s ‘True Reportory’ had already arrived at the Virginia Company and had already answered these questions in detail which suggests that Martin had no knowledge of its contents.\textsuperscript{1205}

This leaves the question as to how material from a sensitive company document such as ‘True Reportory’ found its way into \textit{The Tempest} which only a select committee of Virginia Company members would have had access to. Shakespeare could not have seen it but the evidence suggests that Francis Bacon did. Furthermore, Bacon is known to have been a producer of masques and devices and, as I have already shown, he was commended for producing two masques at Whitehall:

- **20 February 1612–13**: Elizabeth–Palatine marriage celebrations, jointly played by Gray’s Inn and Inner Temple players, writing credited to Francis Beaumont.\textsuperscript{1206}

- **6 January 1613–14**: Earl of Somerset–Lady Frances Howard marriage celebrations, played by Gray’s Inn members, writing credited to George Chapman.\textsuperscript{1207}

The first of these was about 18 months after \textit{The Tempest} was played at Whitehall in November 1611 and Bacon was also a close adviser to King James. It is not my purpose here to investigate the history of how masques and plays were produced at Whitehall in the reign of King James. I mention these facts only because Table 7.3 shows that Francis Bacon shares a considerable number of correspondences of rare collocations with \textit{The Tempest}. In view of this combination of circumstances, I think that Francis Bacon contributed to the writing of the play.

As far as Shakespeare is concerned, considering the attitude of the Virginia Company to actors, it is highly unlikely that he could have had any involvement in the staging of the play at court without the Virginia Company’s cooperation. Due to the absence of his letters and prose works, the extent of his involvement in the writing cannot be decided.

\textsuperscript{1205} This point has already been made by Stritmatter and Kositsky, ‘Shakespeare and the Voyagers’, \textit{op. cit.}, p.452, however, these authors use it to argue, incorrectly in my view, that ‘True Reportory’ post-dates \textit{True Declaration}.

\textsuperscript{1206} Francis Beaumont, \textit{The masque of the Inner Temple and Grayes Inne} (London: 1613), STC: 1664, sig. B.

\textsuperscript{1207} Chapman, \textit{The memorable masqve, op. cit.}
Chapter 9
Conclusions

This study appears at a time when the reputation of William Shakespeare as an author is being subjected to increasing scrutiny. However, there are usually two assumptions implicit in these criticisms, ones which betray a lack of research and insight: (1) there was a single contributor/author to each play in the First Folio (1623); and (2) the identity of this person was someone other than William Shakespeare the Stratford actor. The second point can only be addressed if the first is admitted, but it cannot be admitted. At the end of §2.4, several plays have been identified where academic researchers have provided evidence for contributions by writers other than Shakespeare. In addition, the present work suggests that Francis Bacon, and perhaps Thomas Heywood and Thomas Dekker can be appended to this list. This renders the assumption of a single contributor redundant. Furthermore, it will never be possible to show that Shakespeare made no contribution to this or that play. Without extant letters or prose works by William Shakespeare, RCP cannot test the hypothesis that Shakespeare had no hand in the writing of a target text. However, if an author has several works in the EEBO database, then a reasonable test can be carried out but if this author then fails to appear in the searches on a target, then absence of evidence is indeed evidence of absence.1208

Was it possible for Bacon to contribute to three Shakespeare plays without his involvement being advertised? The fact is, in Renaissance times the author was far less important than now1209 and many plays in circulation were unattributed.1210 It is a credible proposition that some of the plays that later appeared in the First Folio (1623) were acquired, and then revised and expanded for a two-hour stage performance by

1208 For example, Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford has often been suggested as a contributor to the Shakespeare canon. He has eight published poems in Richard Edwards, The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises (1576), STC: 7516 (searchable in EEBO) and there are 77 extant letters of his containing some 50,000 words (see www.oxford-shakespeare.com/oxfordsletters.html accessed 2 July 2013). I doubt that this is enough to test the hypothesis that he contributed to this or that play in which case his claim can never be grounded in fact.
1210 Chambers identifies 88 plays that were unattributed, see Chambers, Elizabethan, Vol. 4, op. cit., pp.1–55.
Shakespeare and dramatists employed by him, so that as a producer Shakespeare felt entitled to assert ownership. There is no need for a conspiracy theory.

Since RCP reveals Francis Bacon to have 13 rare matches with The Tempest, 3 of which precede the play (Table 7.3), then I suggest that he was involved in the 1611 production at Whitehall as a writer and perhaps also as a producer. Certainly the external evidence relating to the Virginia Company and the RCP results for True Declaration place him in an ideal position. I also suggest that he contributed to the writing of The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost for the 1594–5 Gray’s Inn revels. If these conclusions seem radical then it is only because no one has previously taken the trouble to subject these plays to a rare collocation analysis using a database that includes prose writers. The results in this study can easily be reproduced by accessing Chadwyck–Healey’s Early English Books Online database.

While The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost appear to have been intended for the Inns of Court, The Tempest seems not to have been, and RCP shows that its number of possible contributors is smaller than for the first two plays. It remains a task for the future to investigate whether or not other Inns of Court connected plays such as those suggested by Knapp and Kobialka, namely Twelfth Night, Troilus and Cressida, Timon of Athens, and Measure for Measure, also exhibit evidence of several hands. If Shakespeare had originated these Inns of Court plays in the 1590s and this had been known, then the evidence is against them being accepted for performance there. It is far more likely that they were conceived by Inns of Court writers and later acquired by Shakespeare’s company for revision and expansion.

Finally, in relation to author profiles for a particular target, if any rare collocations have been overlooked in constructing RCPs, it is by accident and not design. Perhaps an author’s letters that are not in the EEBO database might be introduced for additional searches against the target. The RCPs can only be enlarged by including such omissions and Bacon’s correspondences with the three Shakespeare plays cannot be diminished as a result.

1211 Margaret Knapp and Michal Kobialka, ‘Shakespeare and the Prince of Purpoole: The 1594 Production of The Comedy of Errors at Gray’s Inn Hall’, in Miola, The Comedy of Errors, op. cit.
1212 See W. R. Elton, Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida and the Inns of Court revels (Ashgate: 2000).
Appendix A

Calculations for Table 4.1

Table A.1. Calculations for the upper limit of number of returns for rarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;date&gt;</th>
<th>No. records</th>
<th>0.17041%</th>
<th>&lt;nearest whole No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td><strong>3521</strong></td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>3639</td>
<td>6.201</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>6.372</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>6.518</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td>6.678</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>6.845</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>4149</td>
<td>7.070</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>4233</td>
<td>7.213</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>4339</td>
<td>7.394</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>7.675</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>4628</td>
<td>7.887</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>4746</td>
<td>8.088</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>4877</td>
<td>8.311</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>5017</td>
<td>8.549</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>5126</td>
<td>8.735</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>5268</td>
<td>8.977</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>5377</td>
<td>9.163</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>5471</td>
<td>9.323</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>9.545</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>5764</td>
<td>9.822</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>5873</td>
<td>10.008</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>6031</td>
<td>10.277</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>10.492</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>6258</td>
<td>10.664</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>6455</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>6574</td>
<td>11.202</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>6742</td>
<td>11.489</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>6921</td>
<td>11.794</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>7077</td>
<td>12.060</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>7213</td>
<td>12.292</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>7389</td>
<td>12.592</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>7607</td>
<td>12.963</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>7726</td>
<td>13.166</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>7828</td>
<td>13.340</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>7978</td>
<td>13.595</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1, column 1, shows the upper limit of the search date in EEBO before which date the searches were conducted. For example, before 1595, 3521 fully searchable records exist. I decided that for 1595, less than 6 returns was to serve as the definition of rarity. In other words, if less than 6 records were returned out of 3521 for a particular collocation search before 1595, then this collocation was taken to be rare. This amounts to 6×100/3521=0.17041% or approximately 1 in 587 of the fully searchable records before
All other upper limits calculated in column 4 were then based on this percentage. So for example, before 1617 there are 6157 fully searchable texts available. The calculation of 0.17041% of 6157 then yields 10.492 which is rounded to the nearest whole number as 10. So if a search is conducted on a collocation before 1617 and less than 10 records are returned then this collocation is taken to be rare.
Appendix B

Thoughts on the RCP method

Introduction

In stylometrics, the method of comparing candidates depends on a fair comparison of their frequencies of using a particular word, prefix, or ending, carried out with equal size canon samples. Here, habitual use of a phrase is the authorial marker and statistics are used. In contrast, with the RCP method the count used is an EEBO document count to establish whether or not a phrase in the target is rare. However, it is not its frequency that is the marker. It is whether or not this ‘rare’ phrase is used or not. In binary language, each ‘rare’ phrase that is identified in the target relates to a possible contributor as a ‘1’ or a ‘0’ and it is the number of ‘1’s that is counted for a possible candidate. Since the frequency of occurrence of a marker is not being counted but only the number of markers, statistics are not employed.

Identifying a contributor

Let us suppose we have a text before us consisting of 10,000 words in English. Suppose also that it has been written by one of ten suspects who we might label A–J. How do we deal with the question as to which person was the contributor to this text? Assuming complete integrity of all information, if there is a photograph of the contributor on the target document then no further questions need be asked. Moving towards a more unusual method of identification, if instead there was attached to the text a complete brain map of the neural connections for that contributor this would also suffice, assuming the availability of technology to verify it. If there is no photograph and no brain map attached and we had only the text to work with how then could we proceed? Sinclair’s ‘principle of idiom’ refers to a language user’s personal set of phrases which are repeatedly used. There will be a set of neural connections in the brain devoted to the retention of this set and if our target text has a set that is sufficiently unique amongst our ten suspects then it could be compared with the hypothetical map for each and used to identify our contributor.

Now let us see how this might not work. Suppose our ten suspects were largely uneducated, read the same newspapers, watched the same TV programmes, and, because of their wish to be part of the herd, have recourse to the same set of commonly used phrases to express themselves. It is unlikely that there would be enough unique phrases in a suspect’s linguistic database to separate him from the other nine suspects. In other words,
if all phrases (which for simplicity we define as all pairs of two consecutive words) in the target text were checked against each person’s own set of phrases we should not expect there to be enough matches that are unique to one particular suspect.

So who might this method be applied to? Suppose our ten suspects were published authors, educated people who think for themselves and pride themselves on their individuality. Such people will have either invented or memorized a set of phrases that would reflect their own unique personality, and which would be represented in their own unique set of neural connections. If one of these ten had written the text we could be more certain that enough unique matches would occur to identify the contributor.

On the topic of the type of objects or the degree of ‘cognitive complexity’ under comparison the following applies. The most elementary case would be a seemingly meaningless five-letter string such as ‘necou’. One could attempt to scan a target for these and they would most likely occur when the last few letters of one word join with the start of the next. Surely though, no author can be expected to have chosen such a string according to intellectual preference. The next level up would perhaps be a meaningful noun, verb, adverb, or adjective. The decision to integrate a single word such as ‘rotten’ into one’s personal database would have required less thought than that for a phrase like ‘rotten times’. Even higher up the scale of linguistic construction would be a collocation such as ‘the link between the number of our tentacles and decimals is … well … more than tenuous’. There is a constructive thought process involved here because ‘decimals’, ‘tentacles’, and ‘tenuous’ are related by the idea of ‘ten’. Such a construction would be a strong authorial marker.

This brings us onto the ‘DNA profiling’ analogy. With our ten educated suspects, like the commonly used forensic procedure, while most of the phrases/sequences from the text will be shared, there should be sufficient uniqueness in the remainder of the matching to identify the contributor. However, it needs to be said that the target text itself requires a certain level of uniqueness, and each of the ten suspects would need a minimum size personal database of phrases available for search to allow a reasonable comparison. In my RCP method, the target text is the play under examination and the personal database is the set of documents known to have been originated by a particular author.

The problem is how to transform this idea into a repeatable test that might identify contributors to a Renaissance text.

1213 From the opening of Chapter 3 in Alan Graham, Mathematics Made Easy (Hodder Education, 2011).
The EEBO database

Chadwyck-Healey’s Early English Books Online (EEBO) database was chosen because it contains prose writers, poets, and dramatist and has an easy-to-use search engine. Of course, there is no access to the complete set of phrases that an author living 400 years ago or even now might have selected from, simply because mapping that person’s neural connections to identify this set is impossible. The best we can do is take the phrases and collocations in the surviving texts by that author in the EEBO database as representing the set of phrases he would have selected from when alive. The problem with this is evident. If only one or two texts by a particular author survive then the data is insufficient to be representative and a test for this author becomes redundant. On the other hand, if a large number of texts survive then an informative test should be possible, one that should rule that author either in or out of contributing to a given target.

Problems with defining a probability

The following outlines a stylometric method which RCP does not follow. To define a probability one would need to be clear what is being counted. If phrases are being counted in EEBO, which for simplicity we might define as all consecutive pairs of words whether meaningful or not, then it should be possible by a systematic search algorithm to log every single phrase from every single searchable document and record its frequency of occurrence. However, the search is date specific, in that we are interested in the phrases that were available to an author in a particular year of authorship. So we would need to search all documents before the date of the target under analysis. The probability of occurrence of a certain phrase in EEBO is then the frequency of its occurrence in all documents divided by the total frequency of all phrases. The scale of this task becomes clear when we consider the following. Before 1594, there are 3440 searchable texts in EEBO. Assuming the average length of a document to be 40000 words this gives approximately 3440 times 40000 pairs of consecutive words (phrases) to be logged and sorted, that is, 137 million. An algorithm could be produced to perform this task but the unhappy fact of the matter is that phrases are not the most informative constructs. Collocations almost certainly carry a higher level of intellectual thought and so their distinctiveness renders them more useful as authorial markers. How can an algorithm be made to identify these with their many nuances? For example, take the following from my analysis of *The Tempest*:

*The Jesuites play at Lyons in France* (1607) seems the most likely source for “that now he was / The Iuy which had hid my princely Trunck, / And suckt my verdure [health] out on’t”
(No. 15). Bacon has “But it was ordained, that this Winding-Iuie of a PLANTAGANET, should kill the true Tree it selfe” in his *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh* which he finished in October 1621.  

The human mind should have no difficulty recognising that in both quotations ‘royalty’, ‘a tree’, ‘ivy’, and ‘strangulation by ivy’ are all represented, but could an algorithm be designed that would recognise this? Considering all possible collocations in EEBO before 1625, say, the chance that these four ideas coincide in one sentence must be extremely slim. However, could we automate their identification in order to include this in a collocation count for a probability calculation? Could we identify a large range of collocation types with this algorithm? At present, human judgment must play a role and even if an investigator claims to have been thorough and perceptive, others with differing degrees of perception should also conduct the test. The effect of this must mainly be to amplify the results of other investigators by including collocations for test that have not already been detected by previous investigators. There might also be disagreement between investigators as to the weakness of certain matches but the expectancy is that the effect of introducing other minds will be to amplify the number of matches not reduce them. Of course, there must be certain ground rules for selection. Consider the following from the analysis of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*:

No. 21 is “a man of good repute, carriage, bearing, & estimation” and a systematic search for correspondences between all possible pairs of these four characteristics reveals that in 1594, any such combination was extremely rare. Bacon has “by a moderate Carriage and bearing” in *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622) which he finished in 1621.

Here four attributes were connected to ‘a man’ so all combinations of two from these four were searched for. The next is also from the same play:

No. 39 is the construction “continent of” in relation to some human characteristic or cognition, such as ‘beauty’, rather than a land mass. Bacon has “continent of Nature” in his *Advancement of Learning* (1605), although Thomas Nashe precedes him with “the second continent of Delicacy” in *Christ’s teares ouer Ierusalem* (1613) which was written in 1593.

In this case, we have three words where ‘continent’ is used outside its usual meaning of ‘land mass’. Again, could we construct an algorithm that could recognise this aberration? A human would have no difficulty. In principle a list could be compiled of types of connections that an investigator could look out for.

---

1214 Francis Bacon, *The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1629), STC: 1161, & 1676, Wing: B300. Bacon completed this work in October 1621.
**Definition of ‘rarity’**

A count of the number of documents is only conducted to estimate the ‘rarity’ of a phrase. The frequency of occurrence of a phrase is not taken as an authorial signature. Only the existence or not of a ‘rare’ phrase in an author’s canon is of interest. As stated earlier, in binary terms, the authorial markers are the sets of ‘1’s (rare phrases) that a possible candidate’s canon shares with the target.

A statement such as “The phrase ‘beyond credit’ from *The Tempest* occurs in less than 0.17% of the searchable EEBO database documents before 1611” is a fact. It doesn’t matter if some of those texts searched have corrupted text (which is not searched), and it doesn’t matter if it might also occur undetected in those texts that are not searchable. This statement is still a fact and is one that is verifiable by repetition. One could relax the 0.17% (1 in 588) and admit returns that occurred in less than 0.5% (1 in 20). All that would happen is that there would be many more of them and many more possible contributors. It would not be particularly informative. What would be informative would be to gradually tighten the boundary for admissible phrases maybe from 0.5% to 0.4% to 0.3% and so on, and as the number of returns decreases see which authors are left standing from our returned records. It should be evident that as we reduce this percentage, we are considering phrases that are rarer than those admitted by the previous boundary. So to define one particular value as ‘rare’ (0.17%) seems reasonable in that we are only interested in those possible contributors who still remain near the end of our percentage reduction process. If the above factual statement were based on the number of searchable words in the EEBO database before 1611 then one could talk about error. In that case, the total number of corrupted words in those texts would need estimating. However, the statement is about the number of documents.

The ideal situation would to have the non-searchable texts in EEBO available for search too. We could then recast our statement as being about the number of extant documents rather than the number of searchable ones. With more documents available it would give a better idea of rarity. It is possible that a phrase that appears ‘rare’ with the 62% of searchable documents becomes relatively common when the other 38% is introduced. The remedy is to make these texts searchable because otherwise their effect on the status of certain ‘rare’ phrases can only be discovered by a time-consuming and impractical visual inspection of them all.
Target text variables: type, genre, date, document length

Document length. An author A who has more words in EEBO than another B evidently has a better representation in the database of his personal set of phrase choices than B. One might argue then that A has a better chance of recording rare matches with a target text than B. This is not true. Given that both are contributors, it is then true that A can be expected to record more matches than B. However, a non-contributor can only be expected to record an insignificant number of ‘rare’ matches no matter how many documents he has in EEBO. So if A has a certain number of minimum words/documents in EEBO (yet to be determined) to reasonably represent his personal set of phrase choices, then if few matches are recorded with the target we can assert his non-contribution. (He had enough representation to be detected.) Below this minimum number he cannot be ruled out by an absence of matches. (There isn’t enough data for him.) However, if he still has a significant number of matches even when below this minimum, his contribution can still be ascertained. For example, with A Funerall Elegye, John Ford had 16 rare phrase matches even though he only had 9 works in the database. There were authors with no returns who were far better represented in the database than Ford. This shows that a small number of documents in EEBO can still be informative.

Target document length is important only in the sense that there must be a sufficient number of ‘rare’ phrases available in it to generate matches. It is not important in the slightest that the length of the target should correspond to the length of those documents searched. As stated earlier, in stylometric testing one would want an equal number of words from each possible contributor to test against the target. The frequency of a certain phrase would then be ascertained both in the target and in each contributor’s normalised canon. However, this is not what RCP is doing. The habitual use of phrases is not the issue. What is being looked for is the existence or non-existence of the unusual. The test is about whether or not a ‘rare’ phrase in the target is shared by the candidate’s canon. As stated earlier, if it is not found in a substantial canon this is evidence for elimination as a contributor. If it is not found in a small canon nothing can be decided. (There is insufficient data.) If it is found in either a small or large canon it is evidence of contribution.

Genre and type. The genre and type of the target is irrelevant. Whether comedy or tragedy, poem or play, we are only interested in who shares its ‘rare’ phrases. Poets, prose writers, and dramatists are all available in the EEBO database for matches. In stylometrics, one might expect certain phrases to occur with a greater frequency in comedy than tragedy.

I would define this as three or less.
However, as already stated, the signature of contribution is not the relative frequency of use of a phrase but whether or not a ‘rare’ phrase is shared.

*Date.* Searches should be conducted in the EEBO database before the target document date because we are interested in the phrases available to a possible contributor before that date.

**Controls**

From the nature of ‘rare’ phrase matching, it is to be expected *a priori* that even though an author has a large number of documents in the EEBO database, he has little prospect of being identified by RCP as a contributor to a document that he is known not to have contributed to. For this reason, *A Funerall Elegye* (hitherto only associated with Ford or Shakespeare) was used to show that Francis Bacon, despite having 27 works in the EEBO database, had an insignificant number of rare matches with the poem. Perhaps several plays close in length, date, and genre to *The Tempest* would be better controls. The proposition that Bacon should not ordinarily be expected to manifest in plays similar to *The Tempest* might then rest on firmer ground.

**Conclusion**

The main difference between stylometric testing and RCP testing lies in what constitutes an authorial marker. In the former, it is the relative frequency with which this or that phrase occurs. A correlation statistic is obtained between the target and possible contributors for relative frequency matchings. However, this is not how RCP functions. Here, a frequency count for a phrase in the target is only used to establish its rarity in the EEBO database. Once the set of rare phrases have been identified for the target, for each such phrase a ‘0’ (unshared) or ‘1’ (shared) is assigned to each possible contributor, and when all phrases have been considered the number of ‘1’s for a possible contributor are counted as a marker of his contribution. In this sense, RCP has similarities to DNA profiling.

Consideration must also be given to whether or not possible contributor matches occur before or after the target document date. A state of mutual borrowing, where both occur, is required in order to argue for contribution. Otherwise, one can only assert that the possible contributor is either a source or a borrower.
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