PART 2

The Tempest as Masque and Romance

THREE SPECTACLES

This section will focus on the three spectacles—the harpy banquet scene, the betrothal masque, and the glistering apparel episode—as well as the sequence of scenes, besides the betrothal masque, that feature Ferdinand. Together these scenes illustrate the high order of craftsmanship exhibited in Shakespeare's imitation of Virgil, as well as the political implications of his repetitions and incursions into the distinct but related idioms of court masque and romance.

That the language of the three scenes of spectacle is that of the court masque has been routinely acknowledged. In rewriting Virgil in that genre, Shakespeare substituted a contemporary heroic language for the heroic language of Virgilian epic, a substitution that places his work squarely in the context of contemporary articulations of ideas about royal power. For to use the language of the masque was to use the king's own language, so identified with the court and its preferred modes of self-representation had the masque come to be. As is already clear, the end toward which my own discussion is moving is not to argue for a Shakespeare who wrote only to confirm and glorify James's power; all the more interesting, then, that in these sections of the play he did use the masque idiom in what can appear to be a most conventional way. Although the three spectacles legitimate the power of the ruler, that legitimation occurs in regard to nonarbitrary categories, the categories which Bourdieu describes as appearing to a society as beyond question, as "self-evident." The harpy banquet scene, the betrothal masque, and the glistering apparel episodes affirm the
self-evident propositions that a ruler is a figure of justice who pun­ishes usurpers and other dangerous and evil people and provides for the future of the realm, in part by fulfilling the patriarchal func­tions of furnishing heirs to the throne and arranging the marriages of his children. The value of these powers to the entire nation is so clear that, as these ideas are here represented in a language that could be identified as the king’s, the play would seem to be speaking in concert with the policies and priorities of James himself. The ideological self-evidence of these three sections is suitably ex­pressed in the masque idiom and by the way in which all three are involved in imitating details from *Aeneid* 6, the book that con­tained explicit glorifications of Augustus. It is during his journey through the underworld that Aeneas hears the prophecy about Augustus, the emperor who will bring a return to the golden age. It is also the book in which the allegorists saw the soul as reaching its highest state of wisdom.

The authorities at issue in the play are not, however, only those of royal policy and court aesthetics. Also at issue are other authors and their idioms. If Shakespeare naturalized Virgil by recasting some sections of the play in the language of King James, he also placed these masque structures within the larger generic category of romance. This most dignified of genres, associated with epic by way of the umbrella term “heroic poetry,” had more than any other become the chosen genre of poets who wished to define themselves as spokesmen for the national community, a position they often claimed by appealing to the role of the poet as prophet and maker and by defining the educative role of poetry. Tasso’s treatise on heroic poetry, Sidney’s *Defence of Poesie*, Harington’s preface to *Orlando furioso*, and Spenser’s Letter to Raleigh show how discussions about romance had become a forum for poets to assert these assumptions. Shakespeare’s turning to romance—as he had in *Cymbeline*, *Pericles*, and *The Winter’s Tale*—was as much an acknowledgment that he too had this stature and served this function as it was anything else. A brief survey of the characteristics of romance as they were defined in Renaissance treatises reveals the several ways in which *The Tempest*, despite its differences from Shakespeare’s other late plays, conforms to romance genre expectations.
We can begin with a more specific reminder of how closely related epic and romance were considered to be. On this point no one is clearer than Tasso who, in defense of his own work, argued that the differences between romance and epic were accidental not essential, and that one category, heroic poetry, could subsume epic and romance as subcategories: "accidental differences cannot constitute different genres . . . romance imitates the same actions [as epic], imitates in the same way, and imitates by the same means; it is therefore of the same genre." As is obvious from his language, Tasso’s basic working assumption was that the writer of romance, practicing the art of imitatio, followed the Virgilian model while also transforming it. His emphasis on what would be the same—"the same actions . . . in the same way . . . by the same means"—refers as well to the requirement that, like epic, romance was to have noble characters performing noble actions that would move readers to wonder. The Tempest, a romance which is the "same" as epic by virtue of its being made piece-by-piece out of one, also shows a commitment to the display of the noble by featuring the aristocratic Prospero, Miranda, and Ferdinand, and a commitment to the evocation of wonder (the marvelous, or "meraveglia," Tasso’s word) both by its use of magic and in the very naming of Miranda.

A feature that romance writers took from Virgil, and then adapted into one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the genre, is the narrative structure in which characters wander from place to place, the feature of romance that is always identified as especially Odyssean. When Spenser described Una’s journey at one point in the first book of The Faerie Queene, it was to the archetypal journeyer Ulysses that he compared her: "Up Una rose, up rose the Lyon eke, / And of their former journey forward pas, / In wayes unknowne, her wandring knight to seke, / With paines farre passing that long wandring Greeke" (1.3.21). This feature Angus Fletcher associates with an "idea of a finally targeted quest, the return home," a concept Patricia Parker complicates by emphasizing instead how the Odyssean pattern of homecoming might also be incorporated into "romance strategies of deferral and delay," in this case "this seeming end" becomes "only a way station." Virgil’s variation on Homer in the first six books of the
Aeneid features first the delay and engrossing distraction of Carthage, a structure that was to be repeated by Ariosto, Tasso, and Spenser, and finally the “way station” experience of the underworld, another section worked over incessantly by imitators.

In the Aeneid, where home no longer exists after the fall of Troy, Aeneas’s nostalgia for his past has to give way to his vision of a greater future, the goal that provides the focus of the forward movement in the work. If any experience that Virgil gave Aeneas can be called a “homecoming” experience, it is the reunion with his father in the underworld and the visions he has there of the end of his journey. But, like the souls in Elysium, Aeneas cannot stay; he must go back to the world and act according to the vision he has been shown. Shakespeare structures The Tempest so that it is evocative of these defining narrative features. There is the deferral that Prospero’s thirteen years on the island represent, the delay that the storm causes in the court party’s journey home, the interruption in routine caused by the love of Ferdinand and Miranda, the sense of homecoming that Ferdinand has during the betrothal masque (“Let me live here ever”), and finally the preparation to return home at the end of the play.

A steady sequence of visionary experiences routinely punctuates this romance pattern of deferral and delay. In Spenser studies, such moments in The Faerie Queene have been identified as the “allegorical cores,” the “temples,” the “houses of recognition,” but again, this feature of romance is traceable to Virgil, “the father of its visionary core.” Revelation—exemplified in the Aeneid in Aeneas’s understanding that the huntress he sees is a goddess (oderce)—recurs throughout the romance tradition, and nowhere more regularly or more powerfully than in Shakespeare’s late plays. This tradition is continued in The Tempest in the three spectacles of the harpy banquet scene, the betrothal masque, and the glistening apparel episode, as well as in the “wonder” that Prospero orchestrates when he finally reveals Ferdinand and Miranda to the court party.

Shakespeare also presents the experience of the castaways on the island itself as a wandering. The Alonso group wanders around looking for Ferdinand. And twice characters compare their expe-
rience to that of being in a labyrinth, a structure important to *The Faerie Queene* and also prominent in *Aeneid* 5, where Virgil sees in the complicated riding formations of Ascanius and the other children an activity that recalls both the labyrinth of Crete and the entangled past and future adventures of their fathers and their successors. In *The Tempest*, Gonzalo, weary of searching for Ferdinand, complains, “Here’s a maze trod, indeed, / Through forth-rights and meanders” (3.3.2-3). After Alonso has been reunited with Ferdinand and after the Boatswain suddenly turns up again, Alonso, too, uses the labyrinth image, this time more metaphorically: “This is as strange a maze as e’er men trod” (6.1.242). As Gonzalo makes clear at the end of the play, the labyrinthine journey has been good for all of them; what has been found is “all of us ourselves / When no man was his own” (5.1.211-12). Like other romances, this one also claims that it has shown how characters can be drawn away from errant ways.

Another feature of the play that formally links it to both romance and Virgil and yet seems antithetical to the motif of wandering is its unity of action. In many discussions that generalize about Shakespeare’s romances, this characteristic is the one that most sets *The Tempest* apart from his other late plays. If, however, one is thinking about the rules for poetry, especially for romance (as that genre was understood as a redaction from epic), then discussion of unity must have a major place. The idea that unity of action was one of the rules for epic originated with Aristotle, who said that epic should have only one action, however complex that action might be. Ben Jonson represented the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century understanding of Aristotle’s position when he explained that Virgil had accomplished this goal for Aeneas by having “pretermitted many things. He neither tells how he was borne, how brought up; how he fought with Achilles; how he was snatch’d out of the battaile by Venus; but that one thing, how he came to Italie, he prosecutes in twelve books.” For the Italians, arguing over the new romances by Ariosto and Tasso, unity of action was considered so important a defining feature of epic that it became the central issue in the entire quarrel. Some critics thought that the new romances fitted the Aristotelian rule; others,
that these works had to be distinguished from epic because of their multiplicity of action. Still others, among them Tasso, Trissino, and Giraldi, argued that different handling and different combinations might still be said to constitute a unity, that if one action by one man was acceptable, so were many actions by one man or many actions by many men.¹⁷

The compression in *The Tempest* may, of course, be both a transformation and an adaptation of the example of Virgil, who condensed twenty-four books of the *Odyssey* and twenty-four books of the *Iliad* into only twelve books. Whatever the case, Shakespeare cast *The Tempest* in a form that adheres to the rule of unity of action as that rule would apply to drama, and in so doing managed a *sprezzatura* display of his own mastery of the language of poetry.

We can interpret this display of mastery in different ways, not least of which might be to see it as a rhetorical strategy Shakespeare employed to make his work conform to tradition and to rules and thus, by implication, offer itself as a model, even a national standard, for behavior. Throughout *The Tempest*, in the many ways in which the play presents austerity and discipline as the standards for thought and action, it can be seen to be performing just such a political platform, which, translated into the terms of contemporary high politics, would be a program for protecting the "ancient" tradition in national politics.¹⁸ It was precisely that tradition—that royal power was limited—to which Parliament was asking James to return.¹⁹

In this context, the significance of the Neoplatonized allegorical commentary on the *Aeneid*, together with the strain of Neoplatonism that runs throughout *The Tempest*—but is especially present in the scenes of spectacle and in the Ferdinand scenes—acquires additional interest. Central to the idiom of the court masque, the hierarchical system of Neoplatonism, wherein a transcendent reason keeps base nature under control, was useful for justifying an absolute and transcendent political power.²⁰ But a competing aspect of Neoplatonism, especially among the Virgilian allegorists, was the emphasis on the acquisition of virtue and wisdom through trial, on the practicing of physical and mental disci-
pline for the high reward of spiritual and intellectual ecstasy. Thus it becomes possible to argue that what gets as much emphasis as anything in the play as a whole, and certainly in the scenes at issue, is not only the affirmation of self-evident powers but also of ideas of correction and discipline—not, in other words, the legitimacy of absolutism, but the legitimacy of restraint. In these scenes, often written in what is ostensibly the king's language, the self-evident value of royal power exists in combination with an articulation of another value, and one that, in the arena of national political debate, was currently in direct competition with the value James had hoped would go unchallenged.²¹

In the following pages, these ideas and the transformations of Virgil through which Shakespeare presents them will occupy the discussion. The method of imitatio exemplified in these scenes is exactly that considered in the opening discussion of imitation, and it is important to recall it here, especially in the context of what has been suggested about how Shakespeare is also working changes on the king's language. When Sturm explained how Virgil imitates Homer, he stated simply that "the imitation of this like matter is hidden by placing, changing, adding, and by varying."²² When Shakespeare imitates the "matter" of Aeneid 6, for example, he retains its essential ideas but selects patterns from earlier books and combines them with those from book 6 in order to represent those ideas in a new form. He moves into one place elements that in Virgil are widely separated. Sometimes he chooses a piece of Virgil's text that, however far it is from book 6, still carries a similar idea. But often he selects a Virgilian kernel opposite in idea to the one to be represented in The Tempest, so that the imitation requires a degree of variation that leads to reversal. Whatever the case, the Virgilian text, handled discontinuously, yields to conflation, recombination, and change.

These concepts can be as helpful to understanding the craft of the Renaissance poet as they are to attaining a better grasp of what the modification of political discourse to effect change requires. They also illustrate how Shakespeare's appropriation of Virgil is similar to what we have come to understand about the appropriations which later periods have made of Shakespeare. Like Shakespeare
in later centuries, Virgil was for the Renaissance the central canonical figure; to rework Virgil signaled "the appropriation of a usable past in relation to some common pursuit of social purpose in the present."  

The Harpy Banquet Scene

Because the play conforms to unity of action while imitating a diverse narrative, the island, where all the action occurs, must function, in relation to the many places in the Aeneid, as more than one place. In Virgil and his romance successors, the hero moves physically from one geographical location to another and at each new place has another new experience. But in The Tempest, one place must function as, and replicate what happened in Troy, Carthage, and the underworld. Coming to the island is like being shipwrecked at Carthage, and also like arriving in Italy. And if the wandering that takes place on this island is experienced as a bewildering maze of endless journeying, it is also experienced as, and constructed in terms analogous to, the specific journey through the underworld and out again. This last characteristic, the one most apparent to Colin Still and also a feature the play shares with The Faerie Queene, is particularly prominent in the scenes of spectacle. Beginning with the harpy banquet, and continuing in successive actions through the glistening apparel scene, Shakespeare makes prominent use of Virgil's underworld material.

Insofar as all of these spectacles are also concerned with the right uses of power, it is important to note that Shakespeare shapes his materials rhetorically so that the representation and discussion of power proceeds in these scenes of spectacle without there ever being any reason to criticize Prospero. Rather, all representations of excessive use of power, as well as the punishment that such abuse demands, are located in other characters. This play never accuses or criticizes the king. Insofar as James is homologous to Prospero, we could say, with Burke, that Shakespeare furnishes the play with a "propagandistic (didactic) strategy" that "provides the charitable attitude towards people that is required for purposes of persuasion and co-operation."
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The harpy banquet scene begins with Alonso still complaining about his lost son—that is, his lost hope—and Sebastian and Antonio still plotting an attack on Alonso, actions that began in act 2, scene 1. Then, almost immediately, follow the solemn and strange music, Prospero "on the top (invisible)," and the Shapes that carry in the banquet. The members of the court party express their amazement and, after some consideration, decide to eat. Suddenly, to the accompaniment of thunder and lightning, Ariel "like a Harpy" appears, the banquet vanishes, and the harpy addresses the "three men of sin." Then the harpy disappears, leaving the sinful men to deal with the guilt of having supplanted the "good Prospero" (3.3.70).

As we know, Shakespeare's punishing harpy originates in the Celaeno episode of Aeneid 3, where the harpies sweep down upon Aeneas and his men and prevent them from feeding on the cattle and goats that they have slain on the Strophades islands.26 The best work on the correspondences between this segment of the Aeneid and The Tempest is that of T. W. Baldwin, who shows that the action of the scene, as well as the language in which it is cast, is owing to Virgil. Baldwin notices that the stage direction indicating that the harpy "claps his wings" is an action rendered in Virgil by "quatiunt . . . alas" (3.226), and he links Ariel's remark that the harpy is "invulnerable" and cannot be injured in one feather, "one dowle," to Virgil's "nee volnera . . . accipiunt" (3.242-43). For both Alonso and his party and Aeneas and his, drawing swords against the harpy is absolutely futile. Baldwin also sees parallels between the curse Celaeno pronounces on Aeneas and the threats Ariel makes, and he notes that, "just as Aeneas and his men repent, so Alonso's conscience begins to stir."

The appropriateness of a harpy and a banquet for The Tempest court party is especially evident when these choices are considered against the background of the allegorists' reading of the Celaeno episode. As Landino explains, this episode signifies "the vice of avarice."27 An important vice for the struggling soul to conquer, avarice was also the sin to which tyranny and usurpation were attributed.28 The allegorists can also help us to make sense of the particular conflation of Aeneid materials that are present in this
scene, which can be shown to contain details from the Celaeno episode of *Aeneid* 3 while at the same time evoking an idea of hell, such as is present in *Aeneid* 6. Though these two places occur far apart in Virgil, both include details which, according to the allegorists, carry the same ideas. Bernardus, for example, does not furnish a direct gloss on the Celaeno episode in his commentary on *Aeneid* 3, but, rather, comments on the significance of Celaeno herself when he gets to *Aeneid* 6. After listing the creatures at the gates of hell and, noting the presence of a harpy among them, he pauses for a long discussion of the many aspects of greed and avarice that Celaeno and her two sisters represent.28 Again in book 6, the concept of avarice is prominent for the allegorists in the Sibyl’s description of hell’s inhabitants: she refers to Ixion and Pirithous, who sit beside a banquet table but are kept from eating by an attending fury who “stays their hands from touch of the table” ("manibus prohibet contingere mensas," 6.606). While this punishment is proceeding, the other sinful creatures in hell, such as Salomeus, Tityus, Theseus, and Phlegyas, are enduring still other everlasting pains relative to the sins of which they are guilty. When Landino glosses the action of the fury who stays the greedy hands from the table of food, he explains that in this particular punishment Virgil “could not have designated more truly nor more clearly avarice” (Stahel, ed., p. 252).

When Shakespeare uses materials from Virgil for his punishment scene, he creates a new configuration that is not exactly like the scene or situation in either *Aeneid* 3 or 6. The harpy episode from book 3 furnishes the most dramatic visual elements for the construction of the new episode, but the overall function of *The Tempest* episode is more like that of the situation in book 6. There in hell sits the judging Rhadamanthus, who, the Sibyl tells Aeneas, “chastises” the guilty, “exacting confession of crimes” from those who “in vain deceit” have put “off atonement for sin” (6.567–69). The situation of Shakespeare’s court party is similar. The three men of sin have not yet faced their guilt; they are, says Ariel, “unfit to live” and certainly ripe for punishment.

In other ways, too, this scene evokes an idea of hell like that in *Aeneid* 6. One of these ways is in the explicit evocation of language.
used in the Sibyl’s description. For example, Alonso’s cry, “O, it is monstrous, monstrous! ... it did bass my trepass” (3.3.95, 99), echoes a sentiment in the summarizing statements the Sibyl utters as she concludes what she has been telling Aeneas of hell: “All dared a monstrous sin” (“ausi omnes immane nefas,” 6.624). But there are other, more general, reminders of a hellish environment. There is Prospero’s remark that classifies some of those in the group as “worse than devils” (l. 35), and there is Ariel’s reference to “this lower world” (l. 54). Later there is Ariel’s pronouncement that, if the men do not repent, they will be punished eternally, made to suffer “Ling’ring perdition—worse than any death / Can be at once” (ll. 77–78). And near the end of the scene is Sebastian’s remark, “But one fiend at a time, / I’ll fight their legions o’er” (ll. 101–2). Also, throughout the scene we are aware of the presence of Prospero “on the top (invisible)” —a presence which in the context of hell suggests the judging power of a deity but in the context of politics suggests the ruler’s power and responsibility to be the chief judge in the land, as well as a model of moral rectitude.

Like the inhabitants of hell, Shakespeare’s “three men of sin” are in a place where they must undergo punishment. Although the infernal imagery of this scene ties it to Aeneid 6, there are, however, other aspects of the scene that lend the Aeneid context a special poignancy. The men’s fate on this island is not eternal punishment but continual wandering; they must progress beyond where they are now. The character to whom this statement is most applicable is the king in the scene—Alonso—whose conscience is most immediately pricked by the harpy’s performance. Present in Alonso’s speech is a detail that recalls one of the most prominent features of the experience that Aeneas the wanderer has with Celaeno. In declaring to Aeneas that he should not be disturbing the inhabitants of the Strophades, the harpy instructs him: “Italy is the goal ye seek” (“Italiam cursu petitis,” 3.253). The reprimand and the instruction send Aeneas and his men hurrying to their ships and the resumption of their sea journey, an adventure that will eventually lead Aeneas to seek communion with his father in the underworld and realize, according to the allegorists, a perfecting of his soul and the renewed pursuit of his destiny. Alonso, similarly impressed by
his own wrongdoing, now contemplates what he must "seek" (3.3.101) and where he will seek it.

That search will involve a variation of the experience Aeneas had upon arriving in Italy. Whereas Aeneas sought his dead father, Alonso will seek his son, whose supposed death he now imagines to be a punishment for his own sins. Whereas Aeneas journeyed to the underworld, Alonso imagines his search will involve going into the ooze, the mud: "Therefor my son i' th' ooze is bedded; and / I'll seek him deeper than e'er plummet sounded, / And with him there lie muddled" (3.3.100–102). Imagining that a return to the sea will be his death, he has yet to discover that it is his awakened conscience, which will direct him to repent for having seized power that was not his, that is the sea-change that will make of him something rich and strange. Thus, Shakespeare not only includes the idea of punishment for abuse of power but the idea of manifold reward for the one who sees the error of his ways.

The Betrothal Masque

The event in the Elysium experience that provides the structure for the betrothal masque is Aeneas's meeting Anchises in the underworld and being shown what his future will hold. This incident, always regarded as an expression of Aeneas's political destiny, was for the allegorists the climax of Virgil's first six books, the point at which the soul finally achieved a union with the truth. To bring Aeneas to the Elysian Fields, said Landino, was to bring him to "the summum bonum . . . the knowledge of the divine" (Stahel, ed., p. 253), "to a knowledge of those things which are in the heavens" (p. 256). Here, said Bernardus, "heavenly things be open to the understanding" (Commentary, p. 106).

The variation of this episode in The Tempest involves replacing both the oracular Sibyl, who leads Aeneas to Elysium, and Anchises with Prospero, who will serve as both oracle and father to the young prince in this scene. Under Prospero's guidance and through the medium of his art, the betrothal masque will celebrate the public union of marriage and the political future to which that marriage leads; it will also give Ferdinand a direct experience with
the spirit world. Thus Shakespeare's variation on the Elysium experience retains both the public and private meanings of the Virgilian pre-text.

The art of the scene is not dependent only on patterns from *Aeneid* 6, however. While its dominating ideas and the overall structure do derive from that section of Virgil, most of the devices in it that convey the traditional meanings of Aeneas's experience have their genesis in *Aeneid* 4, the episode at Carthage. In other words, Shakespeare transforms Carthage—to the point of reversal—so that its details are the ones which present the Elysium experience in this new work. This reversal provides that Ferdinand and Miranda are simultaneously copies of Dido and Aeneas and the antitheses of the ancient lovers.

The central aspect of Virgil’s story that Shakespeare reworks is the behavior of Dido and Aeneas on that fateful day when they satisfy their lust in the cave to which they are driven by Juno’s storm. As the new lovers are permitted betrothal only on the condition that they remain chaste, the idea of discipline underpins the entire scene. Prospero warns Ferdinand that he must not break Miranda’s “virgin-knot” until they are properly married. If he does, “No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall / To make this contract grow; but barren hate / Sour-ey’d disdain and discord shall bestrew / The union of your bed with weeds so loathly / That you shall hate it both” (4.1.18-22). In Prospero’s warning there is an allusion to the possibility of a storm—“No sweet aspersions shall the heaven let fall”—but, unlike in Virgil, the storm is a conditional occurrence, the aftermath of, rather than the prelude to, not remaining chaste. In the new lovers’ world, it is just as possible that the heavens may let “sweet aspersions” fall. Another possibility is that this “contract” may “grow” instead of turning to “barren hate,” details which recall, while standing apart from, the consequences of Dido and Aeneas’s false contract, one that Dido “calls . . . marriage and with that name veils her sin” (“coniugium vocat; hoc praetexit nomine culpam,” 4.1.172).

The emphasis on discipline as the strategy for reversing tragedy and avoiding destruction is also evident when Ferdinand responds to Prospero’s warning with the promise that nothing “shall . . .
melt / Mine honour into lust,” not even the opportunity provided by “the murkiest den.” Here Shakespeare uses den for Virgil’s “speluncam” (4.165), the same word Stanyhurst uses in his translation of the cave episode, although both Douglas and Phaer use “cave.” (In his Thesaurus, Thomas Cooper gives both “den” and “cave” as the English equivalents for “spelunca.”)\(^{31}\)

Speaking in earnest to the imposing father before him, Ferdinand explains exactly why he will stay chaste. Hoping “for quiet days, fair issue and long life, / With such love as ’tis now,” Ferdinand says that he does not want to put such high hopes at risk, or ruin that great anticipated day of consummation. He does not want “to take away / The edge of that day’s celebration.” In “that day’s celebration,” Shakespeare provides an alternative to Virgil’s pronouncement after the episode in the cave: “That day was the first day of death, that first the cause of woe” (“ille dies primus leti primusque malorum / causa fuit,” 4.169–70). The change reverses the Virgilian declaration of woe and death; Ferdinand’s love will be cause for celebration, and the reward for his restraint will be extended day, extended time.

Shortly after the betrothal masque has gotten under way, and after Iris has called Ceres to accompany her and Juno, Shakespeare turns again to the Carthage story, though this time he takes his material not from book 4 but book 1. The target of his art is Virgil’s tale about the plot of Venus to bring about the fall of Dido and Carthage by causing the queen and Aeneas to fall in love (1.657–722). Her scheme involves casting a “wanton charm” (\textit{Tmp.} 4.1.95, and cf. “occultem inspires,” \textit{Aen.} 1.688) upon them through the presence of Cupid, who, on her orders, disguises himself as Aeneas’s son Ascanius, so that he can get close to Dido and work his power.\(^{32}\) For Ferdinand and Miranda, Shakespeare writes a new version of this story. He has Iris assure Ceres that there is no need to fear that Venus and Cupid’s mischievous interference will spoil this affair because they have already left for Paphos:

\begin{verbatim}
I met her deity
Cutting the clouds towards Paphos, and her son
Dove-drawn with her. Here thought they to have done
Some wanton charm upon this man and maid,
\end{verbatim}
Whose vows are, that no bed-right shall be paid
Till Hymen's torch be lighted: but in vain;
Mars's hot minion is return'd again;
Her waspish-headed son has broke his arrows,
Swears he will shoot no more, but play with sparrows,
And be a boy right out.

Shakespeare gives the story a comic twist by portraying Cupid's spoil-sport reaction to having his mischievous plan foiled. Unable to lead Miranda and Ferdinand astray, he has gone off in a mad pout; he has broken his arrows and has sworn to "shoot no more." Here Cupid surrenders both his ability to arouse passion and his power to deceive. He has been defeated by lovers who, surpassing their predecessors in love, can be victimized by neither passion nor deception. The only spells that prompt their love are those cast by Prospero: "It goes on, I see, / As my soul prompts it" (1.2.422-23).

Near the end of the masque Shakespeare draws once more on the Carthage cave episode. After Dido and Aeneas have entered the cave, "Primal Earth and nuptial Juno give the sign; fires flashed in Heaven, the witness to their bridal, and on the mountain-top screamed the Nymphs. That day was the first day of death, that first the cause of woe" ("prima et Tellus et pronuba Iuno / dant signum; fulsere ignes et conscius Aether / conubiis, summopue ulularunt vertice Nymphae. / ille dies primus leti primusque malorum / causa fuit," 4.1.166-70). Though Dido is not yet aware of it, this day seals her ruin. For Ferdinand and Miranda, a different prospect lies ahead, one that Shakespeare signals in the masque in many ways but here by transforming Virgil's nymphs that scream (ulularunt) from the mountain-tops (vertex) into nymphs that come from "the windring brooks" and "crisp channels" to "help to celebrate / A contract of true love" (4.1.128-33). The cacaphony that accompanied the false marriage at Carthage undergoes a metamorphosis into the harmony of a true contract.

Shakespeare's revision of the tragedy at Carthage includes a re-casting of the roles of Venus and Juno, whose divisive quarreling provides the backdrop for the Carthage love affair; Juno wishes to foster the cause of Carthage, Venus the future of her son. Venus sends Cupid to cast a charm on Dido to weaken her, and Juno,
hoping to keep Aeneas in Carthage and at Dido's service, sends the storm that will drive the lovers to the cave (4.160f). The final outcome is the departure of Aeneas and the consequent suicide of Dido. But the struggle between Venus and Juno is not over and will not end until Aeneid 12, where Juno finally agrees to allow Aeneas to defeat Turnus, provided that the stock of the new nation is produced by uniting the Latins and the Trojans. Besides making the new nation stronger, this union also makes it possible for Juno to become patroness of the newly established race.

Frequently in The Tempest, Prospero plays the roles fulfilled in the Aeneid by deities, but in the betrothal masque, Shakespeare incorporates the classical tradition directly by making Juno herself the focal point of the spectacle Prospero is creating; in other words, here Prospero presents and thus is represented by Juno. In the passage that describes Venus and Cupid heading for Paphos, Shakespeare suppresses the tradition of regarding Venus as supportive (especially in the Aeneid) and a figure of divine love and instead accents the tradition which associates Venus and Cupid with the passions. By thus removing Venus to Paphos, Shakespeare allows Juno to obtain sole sovereignty. This strategy permits Juno to be for The Tempest and Prospero a presiding deity of union, the same identity she has in Jonson's Hymenaei (1606), a masque closely related in conception to Shakespeare's betrothal masque. Both masques contain iconographical descriptions of Juno with her peacocks and of the rainbow Iris, a tradition which is associated for both poets with Virgil. This point is documented for Shakespeare by Baldwin, and for Jonson by the notes he left on Hymenaei, which refer repeatedly to the Aeneid as his authority.

In Hymenaei Jonson uses Juno and the idea of unity to represent the union of the soul, the union of marriage, the unity of England and Scotland, as well as the notion of King James as the embodiment of the oneness toward which all in the cosmos strives. Jonson represents James as actually surpassing the powers of Juno; he is the "more than usual light," the "greater dietie" (p. 212). This style of representation resembles Virgil's hyperbolic representation of Augustus in Aeneid 6, where Anchises tells Aeneas, who is
now to go forward and unite the Latins and the Trojans, that his
greatest successor in rule “shall again set up the Golden Age in

When Shakespeare has Juno and Ceres sing of the future that
will belong to Ferdinand and Miranda, he reproduces these traditi­
ons of representation. Juno promises, “Honour, riches, marriage–
blessing, / Long continuance, and increasing,” and Ceres prom­
is es that spring, not winter, will follow every harvest. This last
promise forecasts a return to that golden time of no seasons, a con­
dition that was present on earth before Ceres, prompted by Pluto’s
having stolen away Proserpina to the underworld, caused periods
of infertility to mark the year’s progress. Thus, Gonzalo’s dream of
a rule that would “excel the Golden Age” (2.1.164) is reintroduced,
attached this time to characters who actually are and will be rulers,
and whose bounteous rule will be a device for unifying previously
divided peoples.

The ability to produce this vision is evidence in itself of Pros­
pero’s own capacity for reason and self-control. That Ferdinand’s
capacity for reason is similarly refined is validated in his articula­
tion that he recognizes what he sees: “This is a most majestic vision,
and / Harmonious charmingly. May I be bold / To think these
spirits?” Here, Ferdinand displays the gaze,39 the ultimate certifi­
cation of himself as one whose access to great truths is not a strug­
gle. For him, such knowledge is natural and instinctive.

The importance of reason and discipline is underlined again at
the end of the scene where Prospero’s sudden show of anger de­
stabilizes the vision. During the dance of the Reapers: “PROSPERO
starts suddenly, and speaks” (4.1.5.d.138). From this point in the
text, through the revels speech, and up to the point where Ferdi­
nand and Miranda exit by retiring into Prospero’s cell (l. 163), The
Tempest repeats a structural pattern from the end of Aeneid 6, a
section that begins at the point where Aeneas, seeing the shade of
young Marcellus approach, asks Anchises who he is, and one that
ends at the end of the book, where Aeneas leaves the underworld
through the gate of ivory (6.860–901). In both cases, the sections
of text at issue come after passages where the fathers (Anchises and
Prospero) have told the young heroes (Aeneas and Ferdinand) of the glorious futures that lie ahead. And in both cases, these fathers discuss the implications and value of earthly endeavors.

The passage in Virgil is one of lamentation. Following Anchises’ charge to Aeneas “to crown Peace with Law, to spare the humbled, and to tame in war the proud” (6.852–53), the older “Marcellus advances, glorious in his splendid spoils.” With him is the young Marcellus, this second figure being the adopted son of Augustus and the chosen successor who died before he could attain the seat of power. When Aeneas asks Anchises who the young man is, Anchises, “with upwelling tears” (“lacrimis ingressus obortis,” 6.867), pleads that he “ask not of the vast sorrow of thy people” (“ingentem luctum ne quaere tuorum,” 6.868). Earthly gifts and glories do not last: “Him the fates shall but show to earth, nor longer suffer him to stay. Too mighty, O gods, ye deemed the Roman stock would be, were these gifts lasting” (“ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, nec ultra / esse sinent. nimium vobis Romana propago / visa potens, superi, propria haec si dona fuissent,” 6.869–71). Anchises concludes with the wish that Aeneas might “burst the harsh bonds of fate” (“si qua fata aspera rumpas,” 6.882). Virgil then brings this sixth book to a close. Aeneas ranges about the plains of the underworld for a while before exiting through one of the two gates of sleep.

In Prospero’s display of anger and in the revels speech that accompanies it, Shakespeare wrote a variation on Virgil’s piece on the limits of earthly life. Prospero, too, talks about the transitoriness of life. “All . . . shall dissolve,” he tells Ferdinand, who has just been led to believe that he is on the brink of a great future. Everything will pass away, the towers, the palaces, the temples, “the great globe itself.” But while Anchises’ words emphasize the sorrow and tragedy in human life, Prospero offers his words as comfort to Ferdinand, “You do look, my son, in a mov’d sort, / As if you were dismay’d: be cheerful, sir.” In the rest of the speech, Prospero puts both his frailty and Ferdinand’s future into perspective. Earthly glory, he suggests, is not an end in itself. Ultimately this life is fulfilled not on this earth but in death: “our little life / Is rounded with a sleep.” The speech offers an alternative to An-
chises' pre-Christian lament for man's woes, which is seasoned with the knowledge that the Rome of Virgil and Augustus had itself been a victim of the ravages of time. The speech thus calls attention to the potential for misrecognition in representations and assessments of power. Prospero has access to the world of divine ideas, but that is not to say that he is immortal; he is not a god on earth.

When Shakespeare places the revels speech at the end of the long scene of celebration and prophecy, he is copying a structural characteristic of Virgil's sixth book. He places something in his text that copies the something that Virgil placed in his text at a corresponding point. One feature that makes Shakespeare's imitation different, however, is that he uses the Virgilian material that stands at the end of Aeneid 6 to forge a link between two sharply defined sections in his own text and, still more interesting, to introduce a section of his text—the Caliban episode—which will imitate a somewhat earlier section of Virgil's text. Then, in act 5, he moves all the way back to the beginning of Virgil's epic for his material. Old art exists not merely to be reproduced, but to be dismantled and reassembled.

**The Glistering Apparel Episode**

Like the harpy banquet scene, the glistering apparel episode is another in which characters are punished for not setting appropriate limits. Here, too, is punishment for avarice, excess, and presumption—but with some differences, owing to the unusual combination of characteristics in Caliban, the featured character. Throughout the play, Caliban's role is that of the political subversive, simultaneously in the roles of a "displanted native" and of a "discontent subject" in bondage to an absolute power. These identities (which can themselves be variously described) enrich what Caliban can represent and seriously complicate what must be said about him in other scenes and especially in the context of the politics of 1610. Nevertheless, what will seize our attention first is that at this moment in the play Caliban has come to stage a coup. He plans to kill the ruler and set up someone else in his place; ob-
viously he must be punished. Moreover, insofar as he also fulfills the Neoplatonic categories of the play, Shakespeare links Caliban to moral defect, of which his base physical form is a representation. Thus we could say that subversion is handled rhetorically so that opposition to rule is disgraced.

One qualifier of that attitude is that the play is now set on a course where Prospero will take the initiative to decrease—or we could say, subvert—his own power. But that attitude is also qualified by the scene itself, insofar as the scene tells more than one story. It tells how a ruler gets rid of troublemakers; but it also depicts the undisciplined seizure of power as barbarism and deviance, a notion that is greatly assisted by Shakespeare's use of Virgil.

The *Aeneid* pattern that lies behind Caliban's subversive aspect is, interestingly enough, Virgil's story of the conspiracy against Troy. In this sense, Caliban's plot against Prospero is constructed like the other two conspiracy plots in the play; all of them depend on the central structural features of that fateful night when the Greeks defeated the Trojans by creeping out of the wooden horse and opening the gates to more Greek soldiers. But also in each case, political discontent from within the society itself, not foreign invasion, is involved.

When Prospero tells Miranda of their being expelled from Milan, the description features the key elements of the Trojan tragedy, a treacherous army, a night attack, and an opening of city gates:

A treacherous army levied, one midnight  
Fated to th' purpose, did Antonio open  
The gates of Milan; and, i' th' dead of darkness,  
The ministers for th' purpose hurried thence  
Me and thy crying self.  

(1.2.128–32)

While the army belongs to the king of Naples, the person who initiates and masterminds the plot is Antonio, Prospero's brother. Later in the play, the conspiracy of Antonio and Sebastian against Alonso again repeats the Troy pattern. This repetition does not take place at night, but it does occur while King Alonso sleeps.
“What a sleep were this for your advancement” (2.1.263), says Antonio as he urges Sebastian to join him. Finally agreeing to the plan, Sebastian, Alonso’s brother, calls attention himself to the recurring pattern; their deed, he notes, is analogous to an earlier one: “Thy case, dear friend, / Shall be my precedent; as thou got’st Milan, / I’ll come by Naples” (2.1.285–87). Then, as they draw their swords, Ariel sings in Gonzalo’s ear, repeating both the idea of conspiracy and that of sleeping: “While you here do snoring lie, / Open-ey’d conspiracy / His time doth take” (2.1.295–97).

When Caliban plots to kill Prospero, the familiar features are present once more: conspiracy and sleep, and also internal dissension. Allying himself with the inebriated Trinculo and Stephano, Caliban describes his plan: “I’ll yield him thee asleep” (3.2.59), he tells Stephano, and later reminds him, “Why, as I told thee, ’tis a custom with him / I’ th’ afternoon to sleep: there thou mayst brain him, / Having first seized his books” (3.2.85–87). But, if being modeled on Troy emphasizes Caliban’s antagonism to authority and his competing desire for power, it does not confirm his danger. He is easily contained both by the plot of the play, which makes Prospero and Ariel more powerful than Caliban, and also by generic and stylistic features of the play that downgrade him; in The Tempest his conspiratorial tendencies are discursively limited to a stylistically low, as opposed to high, form.

Elsewhere in the play, the same rhetorical strategies dominate the construction of Caliban’s part. In his having lusted after Miranda, Caliban evokes the Carthage model, but again in a diminished form; he never possesses her. And in the glistening apparel episode, Caliban copies, and not without some irony, some of the most elevated patterns from Virgil’s depiction of Aeneas. Here he becomes yet another version of Aeneas, but this time one who has been stripped of the piety that “pius Aeneas” possesses, the characteristic that legitimizes the actions he performs throughout Virgil’s epic.

To have said this much is immediately to recall how thoroughly Caliban is the antithesis of the obedient Ferdinand. If the betrothal masque, where Ferdinand has an Elysium experience, gives that point a compelling clarity, it is also an action that can be put to
good use for describing the craft of the glistering apparel episode. As we have seen, the central device in the betrothal masque involves a rewriting of the Carthage love affair at its darkest moment so that it becomes a most elevated moment of spiritual enlightenment, an Elysium experience. By contrast, in the glistering apparel episode, Aeneas’s most lofty experience, his sojourn in the underworld, is debased so that it becomes what the allegorists would call a mere Carthage experience. This episode presents an Aeneas figure who is driven not by lofty pursuit of his destiny but by revenge and greed. The preceding two spectacles also feature patterns from *Aeneid* 6, as well as visionary experiences for the characters. In Caliban’s case, Shakespeare handles the patterns from *Aeneid* 6 so that they lose their aura of transcendence. Whereas he provides the other characters with visions, he makes Caliban’s episode into a mock-“temple” experience.

The central pattern for the glistering apparel episode is the section of the *Aeneid* where Aeneas finds the golden bough and enters the cave that leads to Pluto’s domain. Having pleaded with the Sibyl to grant him passage to the underworld so that he might see once more his father, Anchises, Aeneas receives instruction from her on the necessity of first finding in the surrounding forest the golden bough, which he must bring with him to the underworld and present to Proserpina: “There lurks in a shady tree a bough, golden in leaf and pliant stem, held consecrate to nether Juno” (“latet arbore opaca / aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus, / Iunoni infernae dictus sacer,” 6.136–38). Praying that the bough will show itself to him in the thick forest, Aeneas spies his mother’s twin doves in flight above him and follows them, knowing that they will guide him to it (6.191–205). They fly toward the River Avernus, then turn and drop to a grove of trees, lighting on the one where the bough rests. Aeneas plucks the bough and rejoins the Sibyl, who plunges into the open cave while Aeneas follows fearlessly. The howling dogs at the entrance do not deter this powerful pair.

The Shakespearean transposition of this scene involves a systematic leveling of and deflection from the noble and sacred ac-
tions of Aeneas, a process that begins with Ariel describing the Caliban group as standing in a body of stinking water:

at last I left them
I' th' filthy-mantled pool beyond your cell,
There dancing up to th' chins, that the foul lake
O' erstunk their feet.

(4.1.181–84)

Instead of Caliban continuing on his course to Prospero's cave, Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo all go astray. They wind up some distance from the cave and wallowing chin deep in a body of water analogous to the River Avernus, which flows near the entrance to the underworld in the forest where the golden bough is located (6.201). Thomas Phaer described Avernus as a "stinking lake" and as a "lothsome lake," while Gavin Douglas translated "stynkand hellys see" and, as is the pool in The Tempest, "a fowle layk." Landino's remark that "the noisome odor of Avernus" signified "the earth's contagion" (p. 220) also suits well the action that occurs at Shakespeare's foul lake. Instead of being on a sojourn that has a purifying effect, Caliban and his comrades come out of the lake smelling "all horse-piss" (4.1.199).

The next section of the episode involves Prospero sending Ariel for "The trumpery in my house," the "glistering apparel," which he instructs Ariel to "hang . . . on this line." In this action is the device by which the remainder of the episode becomes a reversal of Aeneas's finding of the golden bough. The entire parody is organized around a tree in which the conspirators will find something.

Virgil does not mention what kind of tree harbors the golden bough. But just after Aeneas has found the bough and before he and the Sibyl reach the ferryman Charon, they pass through a forest in the midst of which stands an elm, where "false Dreams hold here and there" ("quam sedem Somnia volgo / vana tenere ferunt," 6.283–84). Landino read this elm as representing a person steeped in "foul deeds" which "show us nothing of substance and which, although they seem great, are in fact nothing" (Stahel, ed.,
p. 227), "And in truth they are comparable to false dreams" (p. 228). Bernardus Silvestris commented similarly: "The elm . . . is leafy, as if laden with false leaves, that is, vain thoughts, under each of which deceptive ideas are conceived" (Commentary, p. 67).

Shakespeare transports this elm into The Tempest but colloquializes it by calling it a line, or linden, tree. The connection between line and elm was ready at hand in sixteenth-century herbals, where the line or linden was often referred to as an elm. In The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes (1577), John Gerarde wrote that the "Line or Linden Tree seemeth to be a kinde of Elme, and the people of Essex . . . do call it broad leafed Elme." In the next century John Parkinson’s discussion of the line tree in Theatrum Botanicum: The Theater of Plants (1640) acknowledged that there are both male and female trees and recorded that "many have judged it to be rather a kind of Elme," citing for evidence the sixteenth-century herbal of Johann Bauhin, who was credited with having added to the title of the masculine line the word "Ulmifolio," or elmleaf. As Kermode glosses, the existence of a female line accounts for Stephano's addressing the tree as "Mistress line" (4.1.235).

In the line tree in The Tempest, Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo find not a golden bough but the trumpery that Prospero has told Ariel to fetch "in my house" (4.1.186). These goods are apparently the "rich garments" (1.2.164) that Gonzalo packed on Prospero’s ship when he fled Milan. The parallel in Virgil to these goods is the precious raiment that Aeneas took with him when he left Troy and that he has Achates bring from his ship to present to Dido as gifts. Those gifts include a scepter, a necklace, a jeweled diadem, as well as both a mantle trimmed with gold and a veil fringed with acanthus that had once belonged to Helen (1.643–56). When transformed in Shakespeare’s play to "stale to catch thieves," such items furnish a suitable reduction of the golden bough that gained Aeneas entrance to the underworld and that represented for Landino “wisdom” (p. 212), for Bernardus Silvestris “philosophy” (p. 57), and for Ficino “the light of the intelligence poured in from above.” In The Tempest that elevated moment has been
The Tempest as Masque and Romance

downgraded to an episode that demonstrates appetite. Unlike Ferdinand, whose journey on the island includes an Elysium experience, no such experience awaits the Caliban group. Their journey is just an unending sequence of Carthage episodes.

The banter about the line tree that goes on while the apparel is being picked off it emphasizes the parody simply by keeping the word line ringing in our ears: “Mistress line. . . . Now is the jerkin under the line . . . we steal by line and level.” All of these references have been glossed by Kermode. The one that can bear most scrutiny in the context of Shakespeare’s imitation is Trinculo’s comment, “Monster, come, put some lime upon your fingers, and away with the rest” (4.1.245). Kermode points out that putting sticky bird lime on their hands will help them hold on to the goods, bird lime also being a commonplace in proverbs on thieving. But we also know that one plant that was compared to bird lime was mistletoe, the plant to which Virgil compared the golden bough when he described the moment that Aeneas laid eyes on it: “As in winter’s cold, amid the woods, the mistletoe, sown of an alien tree, is wont to bloom with strange leafage, and with yellow fruit embrace the shapely stems: such was the vision of the leafy gold on the shadowy ilex” (“quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum / fronde virere nova, quod non sua seminat arbos, / et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos: / talis erat species auri frondentis opaca / ilice,” 6.205–9). Phaer’s marginal gloss on these lines clarifies the connection we are pursuing: “mysteltew callid of some mistelden growing on trees in winter with a yelow slimy berry clamy like byrd lyme, it commeth by donging of birds on the trees” (I4v). Consistent with the structure of the entire glistening apparel episode, the closest these three characters can get to the sacred bough is to find bird dung on a line tree.

Through it all, Caliban resists longer than the others—he does after all have more reason for wanting Prospero dead—but soon he too submits and, like a beast of burden, lets them load him with all their loot: “go to, carry this. And this. Ay, and this.” No sooner have they loaded him up than they are interrupted by the “noise of hunters” and then surrounded and driven off the stage by “divers Spirits in shape of dogs and hounds.” The barking dogs again tie this
action to *Aeneid* 6, evoking the dogs that bark at Aeneas as he enters the underworld but, in that case, do not deter him from his set course (6.257–63).

The victory here is Prospero’s, and so that of established authority. At the same time, that victory has been won by way of a fiction that displays power-grabbing as the behavior of the Other, or we might say, as a characteristic that makes one an Other. In the harpy banquet scene, the rhetoric of exclusion for such trespassers is the language of hell’s punishment; here a comic scene relies on the language and style of mockery. Recalling again that Caliban combines both the Troy conspiracy patterns and the debased Aeneas figure helps to make the point in a different way. The person who debases the proper standard for rule is the cultural equivalent of one who attacks the centers and foundations of human society.

### THE EDUCATION OF FERDINAND AND THE DIALECTIC OF BONDAGE AND FREEDOM

In contrast to Caliban, who is constructed as one whose behavior disrupts normative standards, Ferdinand is constructed so that he presents a notion of the normative. Prospero chooses him as the prospective husband for his wonderful daughter. And Ferdinand responds so perfectly to the discipline Prospero requires that he comes to know the spirit world. The idealization in Ferdinand’s image depends in part on the idiom of the masque, but also on the heroic romance tradition as it had developed through Sidney and Spenser, hand-in-hand with the education of princes and courtesy book traditions. Both Sidney and Spenser used love stories to organize the progress of the heroes’ educational journeys and to represent and mystify the world of politics, rule, and authority. In *The Faerie Queene*, for example, the tested holiness that Red Crosse Knight must exhibit if he is to have Una, and the dependency of Arthegall on Britomart, as figured in the ideological vision at Isis Church, are both part of the same strategy of using love of a
woman to represent education, political virtue, and political promise. In *The Tempest*, where Ferdinand and Miranda fall in love under Prospero's tutelage, both past and contemporary (Elizabethan and Jacobean) rhetorical options for articulating ideological positions are thus present in rich combination and variation.

What distinguishes Shakespeare's rhetoric in the Ferdinand scenes, however, are the various ways in which he manages the contemporary language of royal mystification so that it remains distinctly Jamesian and yet does not replicate an absolutist rhetoric, a characteristic as well of the scenes of spectacle. In those scenes, he appropriates for his own uses the Neoplatonic codes through which absolutism had been naturalized; he acknowledges certain right uses of power while at the same time adding an emphasis on discipline. In the scenes showing the growing love between Ferdinand and Miranda, he retains the strong sense of a patriarchal system, a system central to James's articulation of absolutism, but combines it with yet another emphasis available within the Neoplatonic system, the idea of service. In the central scene, while Prospero looks on, Ferdinand and Miranda in turn declare that each will be the other's servant.

Through this rhetorical move, whereby service and reciprocity (rather than dominance and subordination) become the featured aspects of love, Shakespeare also makes central to the play a dialectic on the relationship between bondage and freedom. That dialectic was, of course, central to contemporary national politics: the dialectic on the relationship of authority (or sovereignty) to liberty. However, it is not only the incorporation of this dialectic into the play that is important, but also Shakespeare's handling of the dialectic so that in these scenes what is being euphemized and normalized is not a hegemonic power but a reciprocal system wherein power is shared. Instead of mystifying absolutism, he mystifies the other choice—the constitutional relationship between subject and ruler that depends on reciprocity, on *meum et tuum*. The Ferdinand scenes represent reciprocity by way of a love relationship in which both parties gain freedom by being bound to each other and in which the mutual obligation makes for perfect harmony. Like the emphasis on discipline and limit all through the play, the emphasis on reciprocity in these love scenes stands as another exam-
people of how epideictic can argue for and seek to increase adherence to a certain position by featuring a value which may, in a different constellation of values, be in danger of not prevailing, but which, when considered on its own, would not be contested. By constructing reciprocity as love and service, as conflict-free, and as normative, this standard is foregrounded as the means by which to reach a perfect state of being, a return to the golden age.

The representation of reciprocity within a narrative that recounts the progress of love and education is, throughout the Ferdinand scenes, also dependent on Shakespeare's transformations of Virgil. Shakespeare sets the sequence of Ferdinand's scenes so that his progress conforms chronologically to the progress of Aeneas from books one through six. At the beginning of the play, Ferdinand shipwrecks on the island, just as Aeneas shipwrecks at Carthage in *Aeneid* I. He immediately meets a woman with whom he falls in love (1.2), he works for her as Aeneas works for Dido at Carthage (3.1), and he eventually has an Elysium experience by way of the show of spirits that Prospero's art provides (4.1). But through this presentation of Ferdinand as an idealized version of Aeneas, the entire presentation can be understood to be passing judgment, however implicitly, on king and court.

**Ferdinand and Miranda**

Shakespeare begins the process of charting Ferdinand's way through the play by recasting for his first moments on stage some of the experiences Aeneas had when he first arrived at Carthage. Here, as elsewhere when Ferdinand is involved, Shakespeare's rewriting suppresses the stronger Virgilian language which presents Aeneas as a blemished and anxious hero. In Ferdinand's first speech, the emphasis is on a dissipating anguish rather than on that sustained state of hopelessness experienced by Aeneas. Aeneas appears calm as he speaks words of encouragement to his men, but Virgil's narrator comments: "So spake his tongue; while sick with weighty care he feigns hope on his face, and deep in his heart stifles the anguish" ("Taliavocerefert, curisque ingentibus aeger / spem voltu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem," 1.208–9). In con-
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trast, Ferdinand feels a calm settle over him as soon as the supernat­
ural music starts:

Sitting on a bank,
Weeping again the King my father’s wrack,
This music crept by me upon the waters,
Allaying both their fury and my passion
With its sweet air.

(1.2.392–96)

We know that the Neoplatonists regarded sight and hearing as "reason’s ministers," as a means to move the soul to higher knowl­
edge. The music that emanates through Ariel is Ferdinand’s intro­
duction to the contact with divine things available to him on this
island: “sure it waits upon / Some god o’ th’ island.”

In the next two speeches, the Virgilian model is from the place
where Aeneas, newly arrived at Carthage, addresses Venus, dis­
guised as a huntress. In his initial greeting to her, in which he re­
marks that she appears to be a goddess (o dea certe), he prays that
she “lighten this our burden” by telling him and Achates where
they have landed: “O goddess surely! . . . Inform us, pray, be­
neath what sky, on what coasts of the world, we are cast; knowing
naught of country or of people, we wander hither driven by wind
and huge billows” (“o dea certe! . . . sis felix nostrumque leves,
quae cumque, laborem, / et quo sub caelo tandem, quibus orbis in
oris / iactemur, doceas; ignari hominumque locorumque / erra­
mus, vento huc vastis et fluctibus acti, 1.328–33). Ferdinand, too,
first addresses Miranda as a goddess—“Most sure the goddess / On
whom these airs attend”—and then prays for her assistance:
“Vouchsafe my prayer / May know if you remain upon this island;
/ And that you will some good instruction give / How I may bear
me here” (1.2.424–28).

In linking Miranda to Venus (in one of the most audible of all
echoes of the Aeneid), Shakespeare enhances Miranda’s double
function of being the one who arouses Ferdinand’s passion and also
leads him to knowledge of divine things. Landino understood Vir­
gil’s use of Venus—in this very meeting with Aeneas—similarly.
Recalling Plato’s discussion in the Symposium of the soul as pos-
In masques, Landino explains that the first is "caught up in apprehending the beauty of God" and the second is associated with procreation. For Ferdinand to love Miranda is to discover for himself the best woman to marry and, at the same time, to pursue the truths that the allegorists saw represented in the educational progress of Aeneas.

Such achievement depends, however, on Ferdinand's compliance with Prospero's plan for testing and disciplining him, a plan that features from the very beginning the loss of freedom: "I'll manacle thy neck and feet together." There will be no banquet for Ferdinand like the one Dido provided for Aeneas. Instead, Prospero puts him on an austere diet: "Sea-water shalt thou drink; thy food shall be / The fresh-brook mussels, wither'd roots, and husks / Wherein the acorn cradled." Ferdinand finds such restrictions liberating, defined as they are within the context of Miranda's love: "Might I but through my prison once a day / Behold this maid: all corners else o' th' earth / Let liberty make use of; space enough / Have I in such a prison." Throughout the rest of the play, Ferdinand accepts every opportunity for more discipline, more self-containment. Never is he an unbridled youth, but, from the outset, a tidied-up Aeneas with passions in check.

We know the extent to which the praise of Prince Henry, self-created as a figure of conquest and chastity, had an idealizing quality similar to the extensive idealizing of Ferdinand. Ferdinand's portrait departs from the preferred image of Henry in its emphases on a reciprocal love and on restriction, differences that are especially marked in the context of contemporary complaints about Henry's excesses. During the debates on supply, when James was using the issue of the prince as one way to woo Parliament and to secure a larger supply, anxiety was expressed about the large amount that Henry (his investiture, his palace, his household) was going to cost the nation, expense that would effectively deprive subjects of liberty. A record of the debates on October 27, 1610, acknowledges that the cost of supporting Henry had already grown so great that this cause alone would have necessitated the calling of a parliament. Other records of his "elaborate regula-
tions for diet and service indicate the luxury by which Henry was surrounded, while his impressive patent roll shows the extensive range of income and patronage rights which he could deploy.”

In 1610, when Salisbury was making his last efforts to reach an agreement with king and parliament on the matter of supply, he instructed James that a necessary part of the “remedy” to James's financial problems was more discipline or, as Salisbury put it, “abatement,” by which he meant “the stay of bounty and the stay of your expense.” Only James himself, he emphasized, could control these two aspects: “it is your hand that holdeth that sluice, which being opened at large, or shut up, will make the stream of all your charges and expenses whatsoever either to keep within the bank or to run over.”

In The Tempest Prospero is the stern father who teaches Ferdinand the value of the prize he seeks by first putting him through trials of abatement. In the real world, Salisbury had told James that, in financial matters, too, he should follow an ideal model: “it is for your Majesty to do as the Roman emperor did . . . when public treasure was much exhausted” (p. 294). Actually, the play has the capacity to say the same thing.

Log-Carrying

The scene of The Tempest (3.1) where Ferdinand carries logs for Prospero and in service to Miranda is the fifth of the play's nine scenes and thus also the centerpiece of the play. The chosen language for the surface texture of the scene is again that of Neoplatonism, but especially as it had developed in the Neoplatonic sonnet and heroic love treatise. This language is conspicuous in Ferdinand's repeatedly calling Miranda “mistress,” the word Neoplatonists used to refer to that for which the soul longs. The references he makes to his heart flying to Miranda's service (3.1.65) and his realization in this scene that Miranda's name means “wonder” (or “meraveglia,” the heroic principle of the marvelous) are part of the same strategy of composition:
Admir'd Miranda!
Indeed the top admiration! worth
What's dearest to the world.

One distinguishing aspect of Shakespeare's replication of these idioms is the degree to which he has humanized, materialized, and literalized these intellectual and spiritual concepts, a process through which he also changes the terms so that they are compatible with the constitutionalist argument of the play. Central to this shift is that this love scene exhibits no struggle to keep passion under control; in other words, the scene does not present a struggle to dominate the base. The component of struggle and discipline, so important to the Neoplatonic system, is nonetheless present, but is displaced to the experience and reward of performing difficult physical work in the world, and for a worthy end:

some kinds of baseness
Are nobly undergone; and most poor matters
Point to rich ends. This my mean task
Would be as heavy to me as odious, but
The mistress which I serve quickens what's dead,
And makes my labours pleasures.

(3.1.1-7)

Moreover, that work is explicitly and repeatedly redefined in the scene as service, and so also as that which defines the relationship of Ferdinand to Miranda. Ferdinand, a prince and future ruler who here performs the same work Caliban does elsewhere in the play, declares that his "heart [did] fly to your service" where it remains a "slave"; "for your sake / Am I this patient log-man." He is eager to commit himself to laboring in the world and for someone else. Nevertheless, Miranda insists that she be his helper: "If you'll sit down, / I'll bear your logs the while . . . give me that; / I'll carry it to the pile." When Ferdinand denies her request, explaining that it would make him look "lazy," she counters that the work is mutually becoming. "It would become me / As well as it does you." Near the end of the scene, when she declares, "I'll be your servant," he reciprocates with, "And I thus humble ever." Understanding his declaration of humility as a definition of the
As we consider the implications of Shakespeare's having placed this display of reciprocity at the very center of the play, it is important not to lose sight of the patriarchal structures that surround it. Prospero, who has arranged the love and assigned the tasks, is even present during this scene. The love proceeds visually and linguistically within the context of patriarchal guidance, and thus also within the context of the language of absolutism, to which patriarchy and its analogous metaphors of dominance and subordination were central. To King James, the king's relationship to the kingdom was analogous to being the head of the body, the god on earth, the father of the family, and even the husband to the wife: "I am the Husband, and all the whole Isle is my lawfull Wife."

But clearly, the particular relationship that Shakespeare constructed for Ferdinand and Miranda is not one that is accounted for in this Jamesian language of dominance, nor in the language of dominance and subjection present in many contemporary treatises on marriage. Nor does the language of this scene belong to the Petrarchan language of love, popular during the reign of Elizabeth and central to the differently gendered political language of that earlier reign. In that language, which foregrounded the ability of the woman to retain mastery, the lover sued a woman who would not respond, would not yield. Instead, Shakespeare inserts here the language of marriage as a contract (the language for marriage in the courts of law) and the language of companionate marriage (as that language had filtered down from the humanists, Catholics, and finally to the protestants).

Whatever relevance that language may have had when The Tempest was selected for the betrothal celebration of Princess Elizabeth, outside a specific marriage context that language contains the idioms for defining the contractual theory of government, which, as J. P. Sommerville has emphasized, espoused "that the
king and his subjects were bound by reciprocal conditions." In the early seventeenth century, when "the vocabulary of contract was almost as common as that of immemorial law," it was thisconsensual theory that "struck at the central doctrine of absolutism—the contention that kings derive their power from God alone." Sommerville continues, "in the Parliament of 1610 the lawyer John Hoskins declared that while regal power itself was from God, the 'actuating thereof is from the people.' In other words, God first gave regal power to the people, who then decided on the form in which it should be exercised." 

For The Tempest, Shakespeare chooses a language of love and marriage that, in its emphasis on mutual dependency (not, we should note, equality), most closely parallels the language of constitutionalism and contract. This incursion, performed as it is within a context rich in patriarchal signifiers, does not display itself as a replacement of or as a challenge to patriarchy; nor does it seem in contradiction to James's own metaphor of king as husband. Here, as often, Shakespeare's method is to speak in language compatible with that of the king—even as he is representing a position that is different from the king's. Thus, insofar as Prospero himself arranges the terms of the love, reciprocity is made to seem a natural extension of patriarchy. Nevertheless, however tactful the rhetoric, for Shakespeare to insert a representation of contract within the context of a representation of patriarchy is to alter the discursive formation so that now mutuality, reciprocity, and contract also have the imprimatur of the normative.

This maneuver is supported intertextually by the way in which this scene works off and reverses one more scene from the affair at Carthage. As Ferdinand carries logs, he is also involved in a refiguration of Virgil's story of how Aeneas, after being in the cave with Dido, turns his energies to the building at Carthage.

For Aeneas to build at Carthage is to reveal how deeply involved he is with Dido. But his building for her and for the valued Carthaginian community is, at the same time, a disregard of his duty to establish a civilization in Italy for his son. His hard work is service for the wrong cause. After being scolded by Mercury for his activities, Aeneas finally orders his men to ready the ships,
while Dido, having heard rumors of Aeneas’s plans to depart, ac­costs him and rages at him for having misled her with shows of affection, predicting that he leaves her a dying woman (4.307-8, 323). Insisting that he never intended to marry her and that he must obey the gods’ commands, he adds the crucial line defining his personal conflict: “Italiam non sponte sequor” (4.361); going to Italy is not something he has chosen for himself.

In changing this scene for The Tempest, Shakespeare retained the idea of service but altered the context so that the service is for a right cause, for a woman whose destiny is compatible with the hero’s. Thus the charges of negligence and betrayal disappear and with them the accompanying tension. Instead of the reprimanding Mercury who comes to tell Aeneas to stop what he is doing, Prospero himself has ordered Ferdinand to do this work and looks on approvingly during the scene. At the end of the scene, Miranda weeps “at what I am glad of” (3.1.74), not, as Dido, for what she has lost. And Miranda’s references to dying (ll. 79, 84) do not refer to an impending tragedy but to how much she loves Ferdinand and how faithful she will be. As Sturm noted, “Imitation is not in things that be all one, but in things that be like, and that which is like, must be, not the same, but another thing” (Hi v).

Still, while Ferdinand is not subject to any censure, either from Prospero or Miranda, he nevertheless speaks here a variation on that most famous of all the lines that Aeneas has in this Carthage episode, in which Aeneas admits to Dido that he resists his destiny: “Italiam non sponte sequor” (“Not of free will do I follow Italy”). Ferdinand makes a similar admission—“I am, in my condition, / A prince, Miranda; I do think, a King; / I would not so” (3.1.59-61)—an admission that injects into this scene the conflict between love and duty that also stands at the center of the Dido-Aeneas crisis. Enraptured with Miranda, Ferdinand, too, wishes he could avoid the duty that he believes now calls him back to Italy. What he does not know is that Miranda will go to Italy with him.

These several reversals contribute in various ways to the dialectic on authority and freedom. One aspect of that contribution is that this time the reversal also involves disrupting a topos—the building of Carthage—that had become a central idiom in Renais-
sance discourse of colonization. To describe the building of the walls of Ross, Stanyhurst had quoted Phaer's translation of the building at Carthage, a text Davies had also quoted when he compared the building that was going forward in Ireland. Appropriated for the symbolization of a civilizing impulse, Virgil's text seemed to justify expansion and domination; as Waswo has written, it furnished "the founding myth that supplies [European] cultural identity."29

In Shakespeare's rewriting of the building at Carthage, however, he replicates the idea of work in the world, but in terms that do not emphasize the notions of expansion and domination associated with colonization. The "thousands of logs" that Prospero has Ferdinand carry are there to test his worth; he must show he can work hard. Within the context of the rest of the play, logs are for making fires, as Prospero suggests when he says that Caliban "does make our fire, / Fetch in our wood" (1.2.313–14). This emphasis on work has an interesting corollary in the plight of the Virginia colony, which was known in 1610–11 to be in a severely threatened state because the colonists had not kept discipline and had refused to do the work that would have met basic needs.30 What was needed most in Virginia, and apparently what is needed on the island of The Tempest, were ways to meet the material conditions of existence.

Thus, while the scene does not emphasize domination,31 and while the characters on the island are not there to colonize it, we are not entirely accurate in saying that it does not, or cannot, represent colonization. But once again, as elsewhere in the play, the action is shaped so that the aspect of colonization to which it might refer is one which can be represented in the same way that issues of limited power can be represented—through images of discipline and restriction. Unlike Prince Henry, a patron of the Virginia plantation project32 and one who favored a conqueror image for himself, Ferdinand is not a conqueror of lands; nor does he sue for Miranda. Rather than one who dominates and colonizes others, Ferdinand is presented as one whose first task is to subdue or limit himself; and, in another variation on the Petrarchan and Neoplatonic tradition, it is he who will remain chaste, not only the woman. His own self is the project.
Thus while colonization is present in the contemporary culture and also in the precursor text, a further possibility remains that the representation of Ferdinand’s subjection is yet one more way to make a discursive inroad into the language of absolutism.

Chess

At the end of *The Tempest*, Shakespeare rewrites the central episode of the Dido and Aeneas story, that of the cave. For this event, he actually places Ferdinand and Miranda in a cave, but it is the cave of Prospero, and so a place of security and regulation. The language he writes for the lovers also sets them against the motifs of betrayal, accusation, and separation that constitute the outcome for Dido and Aeneas. In this new action, falseness and wrangling make up the language of wit and game, not of passion and loss:

MIR.: Sweet lord, you play me false.
FER.: No, my dearest love, I would not for the world.
MIR.: Yes, for a score of kingdoms you should wrangle. And I would call it fair play.

(5.1.172-75)

Chess, the game they are playing, is a game of discipline and negotiation that demonstrates in miniature the activities of rule. This point was emphasized in Caxton’s *Game and Playe of the Chesse* (1474), the main concern of which was the qualities needed for rule. According to Caxton, chess was an activity for philosophers and a game that philosophers taught to kings to help them learn the virtues they needed for good rule. The same point was made in the greeting to the reader that stood at the beginning of *Ludus Scacchiae: Chesse-play* (1597), where it was explained that chess was a “kingly pastime” that “breedeth in the players, a certaine study, wit, pollicie, forecast and memorie, not onely in the play thereof, but also in actions of publike governement, both in peace and warre” (A2). The educational aspect of the game also accounts for the allusion Thomas More made to it in *Utopia*, where he wrote that the game the Utopians played was “not unlike chess”;
in it was “exhibited very cleverly . . . both the strife of the vices with one another and their . . . opposition to the virtues.”

Finally, when Prospero pulls aside the curtain to reveal Ferdinand and Miranda at chess as “a wonder” (5.1.170), there is as well a conflation of the cave episode in Aeneid 4 and the vision of the future Anchises draws for Aeneas in Aeneid 6. But Prospero, unlike Anchises, has had and will have a direct role in bringing into being this promise for the future. The education of Ferdinand in love and service to the reciprocating Miranda are the central codes in that new order. The moment is fittingly emblematic for a nation where negotiations about issues of contract had broken down between king and parliament. The Great Contract of 1610 had already failed; what would become of constitutionalism remained to be seen.