The Tempest and Primaleon: A New Source

Hitherto, only two Shakespearean plays have successfully resisted the indefatigable efforts of scholars to discover the sources on which the playwright depended for his main plot: A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Tempest. Perhaps because the latter play is considered by many, including myself, to be his most mysterious, complex, yet profoundly unified work, its undiscovered source or sources have offered a mark at which countless commentators have leveled their aim. Their proposals, summarized by Geoffrey Bullough, have never been very simple nor completely convincing, and this is utterly unsurprising. For Shakespeare's supreme gift was to be able to satisfy several dramaturgical, intellectual, and recreational appetites simultaneously, and in order to do so he inclined toward eclecticism in the composition of his plays. As Bullough concludes, "he was rarely content with one narrative or dramatic source alone" (p. 347). And because Shakespeare was so skillful in subduing his materials to his nature and artistic intentions, they often do what sources ought to do: vanish, if not into thin air, at least into irrelevancy to an audience's experience of the play. H. H. Furness's bemused disgruntlement at the poor success of Tempest source studies, penned in 1892, thus still rings true: "Seeing . . . that no single source of the whole play has yet been discovered, we must forego the pleasure of a forthright, and be restricted to meanders, and need not be surprised if we find as great a maze as e'er we trod."2

The materials that have been adduced as playing a part in the genesis of The Tempest fall roughly into two categories. The first—and here source hunters have, by critical consensus, achieved most success—concerns American colonization, the Gates-Somers shipwreck on Bermuda, firsthand accounts of foreign travels, and related lively topics like cannibalism. Only one document (aside from the Ovidian passage that inspired Prospero's "Ye elves of hills . . .") is given Bullough's highest nomination as a "Source," and it comes from this first category: William Strachey's letter, eventually published in 1625 as A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, Knight. The second category, which it might be said gives the play its Mediterranean ethos, consists of romance literature, as well as plays and masques that employ romance plot-furniture and techniques of moving it about. Source hunters plying the Mediterranean, however, have generally returned with dubious trophies.

1 Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1957–75), Subsequent quotations from Bullough's "Introduction" to documents for The Tempest (pp. 237–74) and from his "General Conclusion" (pp. 341–405) will be made in the text by page number from Volume VIII. Quotations from the play will be made from Frank Kermode's New Arden edition (London: Methuen, 1958).
"No specific source has been found," writes Bullough, "so we must content ourselves with analogues to the setting, plot, and personages of the play" (p. 245). With perhaps one exception—Jonson's masque, Hymenaei—the six "Anallogues" and two "Possible Sources" from this category richly deserve the difﬁdence with which Bullough offers them. Particularly unconvincing are the only analogues from romance literature proper included by Bullough in his compendium, two passages from The Mirrour of Knighthood, to which I will return below. It is my purpose here to offer for consideration a romance that pushes beyond the mildly compelling status of "Analogue" and deserves Bullough's higher nomination as a "Possible" or even "Probable" source. Though it would be folly to urge that this hitherto unnoticed work need have been Shakespeare's sole romance source—and folly likewise to deny that some of its plot elements occur in other romances—it can, I believe, be accounted the most comprehensively plausible romance source for The Tempest now known.

The romance is Primaleon, Prince of Greece, by an anonymous Spanish author, which was translated into English by Anthony Munday from an intervening French version. This translation was almost certainly made in the early 1590s. Book I of the English version appeared in 1595; Book II appeared in 1596. Primaleon next appeared in 1619, when its three books were published together in what Munday called "one small [i.e., quarto] volume" of 726 pages.3

Since many of the episodes that bear most remarkably on The Tempest are in Book III, there is obviously at first blush a bar to its status as a source for a play written in 1610–11. For several reasons I am convinced that Shakespeare could have read Primaleon's third book before writing the play, but explaining these will require an excursion into its publishing history. It would be unreasonable to ask the reader to follow this excursion on mere faith; I propose, therefore, to offer in Part I a brief narrative of those passages in Primaleon that are of present interest. The many resemblances between romance and play will, I hope, embolden the reader to pursue in Part II the intriguing and in some respects mysterious career of Primaleon. Bullough has rightly chidden source-hunters "for not realizing that their pursuit should be the first stage in an investigation of Shakespeare's methods of composition" (p. 342). With this rebuke in view I will offer in Part III some speculations about the genesis of The Tempest that this discovery makes possible.

I

Primaleon is a vast work, but it is in fact part of a far grander narrative extravagaza, which first saw the light in Spain with the publication of Palmerin d'Oliva in 1511. Munday—virtual single-handed translator of the Palmerin romances—called it "the ringleader to all the rest." The next year its sequel, Primaleon, appeared, devoted to the adventures of Palmerin's son. In 1547–48 Palmerin de Inglaterra appeared in Spain in two parts (possibly translated from a Portuguese original), its title character being Primaleon's nephew (and

3 The Famous and Renowned Historie of Primaleon of Greece, Sonne to the great and mighty Prince Palmerin d'Oliva, Emperor of Constantinople, tr. Anthony Munday (1619; STC 20367), Book III, A37. All subsequent quotations will be made from this edition; unless otherwise noted, all page numbers are from Book III. I noted the similarities between Primaleon and The Tempest en passant in Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981), pp. 48–50.
son-in-law). I provide here an abbreviated genealogy that will be helpful below; all names in full capitals indicate figures who were heroes of separate romances:

```
  PALMERIN D’OLIVA
  Emperor of Constantinople
  Gridonia + PRIMALEON OF GREECE
  Emperor of Constantinople
  Poliharda + PALMERIN OF ENGLAND
  Duardos
  FLORTIR
  Emperor of Constantinople
  DUARDOS II
  CLARISOL
```

These massive romances, mentioned of course by Cervantes in *Don Quixote* (I, vi), were extremely popular on the Continent throughout the sixteenth century. Munday speaks of them as meeting “great applause in divers languages,” and Henry Thomas wrote, in his early attempt to make some sense of the Palmerin romances, that *Primaleon* “was as popular in Spain during the sixteenth century as was Palmerin d’Oliva. There were some ten editions in the original language between 1512 and 1588.” These three romances arrived late in England, but, once arrived, they became a very prominent constituent of the romance literature then available. In addition to the editions of *Primaleon* already noted, *Palmerin d’Oliva* is now extant in editions from 1588, 1596, 1615, 1616, and 1637, and *Palmerin of England* is extant in editions from 1596, 1602, 1609, 1616, and 1639. There is evidence to suggest there were other editions for which no copy survives.  

The cynosure of our interest in *Primaleon* will be a Prospero-like figure always referred to as the Knight of the Enclosed Isle. His principal actions occur in Book III, but he is tantalizingly introduced *in absentia* at the opening of Book I and then makes a brief appearance in disguise at the end of Book II. His introduction is important because there are not many effective unifying and suspenseful devices in this sprawling work, and the Knight provides perhaps

---

4 Henry Thomas, “The Palmerin Romances,” *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 13 (1916), 97–144. Thomas’s article gives much information about these romances, including a table of significant editions and a genealogy of the plot, from which the present excerpt is made. Thomas writes, “To us perhaps the most interesting question is whether Shakespeare knew or made use of the Palmerin romances” (p. 130), but he finds next to nothing. Perhaps he and all subsequent readers of *Primaleon* have been thrown off by the 1619 publication date.


It is worth noting that history’s very first apologist for Shakespeare’s personal behavior and skill as a writer—the printer Henry Chettle (see *Kind-Hartes Dreame*, 1592)—was also an apologist for Munday and *Primaleon*. The front matter of the 1596 Book II includes a commendatory letter from Chettle “To his good Friend M. Anthony Mundy” that ends by “wishing you to hasten your Translation of the third part.”
the most successful one of all. In fact, the Knight is responsible for the narrative "hooks" that at first excite and then sustain interest (more or less) in the much bedeviled courtship of Primaleon and Gridonia. The Knight's reassuring prophecies at certain crucial points also encourage optimism that there will be a happy consummation, which finally occurs in Book III.

But to begin at the beginning. In the opening pages of Book I an emissary arrives to greet the Emperor of Constantinople on behalf of the "Knight of the enclosed Isle." He explains that his master—through his "Magicke Art, Necromancy, Cabalist and hidden Philosophy, (wherein he may be named the second Zoroastres)" (I, 14)—knows that the images in the Emperor's "enchanted booke" signify that the empire will some day be destroyed by the Turks. But he assures Palmerin that this "ruine and decadence" will not occur in his lifetime or that of his posterity: "all their lies (euen to the last day) shall be most glorious and triumphall" (I, 15). To Primaleon he brings the "Lord of the enclosed Ile" a "good sword and rich shield, the two best and most exquisite weapons that at this day are to be found in all the world." On the shield is depicted a cloven rock. The emissary explains that the rock signifies "the partiality and little loue" currently existing between Primaleon and his wife-to-be; the rock will magically join together at their "reconciliation" (I, 16). Primaleon names himself "the Knight of the clouen rock," and the emissary departs, leaving general amazement at "the maruaious knowledge of this great Magitian" (I, 18)—i.e., the Knight of the Enclosed Isle. We learn some time later that at the Emperor's court is an enchanted bird capable of revealing treasonous plots "by some token" (I, 102).

The Knight of the Enclosed Isle first appears in person over fifty chapters and several hundred pages later. Gridonia, separated from Primaleon and fearful of his welfare, is suddenly surprised by a "strange deformed Dwarfe" who soon turns into "a Man of a tall stature, olde and wrinkle-faced" (II, 266). This transformation, the man says, was intended to "acquaint ye with my powerfull skill, that the better credit might be gien to my speeches" (II, 267). His purpose is to calm her fears: "be of good cheere, and dismay not, for all your fortunes shall have a successful conclusion" (II, 268). She wants to know more, but he declines, "for more (at this time) may I not reueale vnto ye." He gives her a ring "of very great vertue" to assure her "that whatsoeuer ye haue heard of me, is no dreame, but a sound truth." She gazes at it, then turns to discover "the old Man was vanished." Gridonia refers to him as a "Wizard," but the author tells us that this "olde Man was the Knight of the Enclosed Isle," who had "transported himselfe through the ayre" to her side to comfort her (II, 268). Book II ends shortly after with a "Conclusion of the Translator" that leaves several "doubtfull matters" (II, 281) tantalizingly unresolved.

Book III brings a first meeting with the "Magitian" in propria persona. But, in typical romance style, we must shift attention for a moment to another plot thread that will soon become important. The first chapters of Book III follow the fortunes of Prince Edward of England, enamored of Primaleon's sister, Flerida. On his way to Constantinople he is diverted for two months by the spells of the Lady of the "pleasant and delectable" Isle of Hercania, an evil antithesis to the Enclosed Isle. After the Lady withdraws "her enchantment"—but not before her daughter seduces Edward—he escapes and reaches Constantinople. After a short time he feels constrained, for complicated reasons, to elope with Flerida and sail secretly for England.
After ten days’ sail “with good winde”—i.e., squarely in the Mediterranean Sea—he is driven off course, the weather “falling contrary” (p. 66). Soon he comes upon the ship of one Gresto, who has just hitherto abducted Gridonia and sailed off with her. Edward saves her and takes her aboard his own ship. Soon—such are the ways of romance narratives—Primaleon, in hot pursuit, overtakes Edward’s ship. Reasonably, he assumes Edward is Gridonia’s abductor, and a tremendous sea battle ensues. The synopsis at the head of the thirteenth chapter reads: “How Primaleon and Prince Edward fought a cruel battle at Sea, and how in the end being enchanted by the Knight of the inclosed Island, they were born thither without any feeling or understanding” (p. 73).

The startling appearance of the Knight is carefully arranged to occur at the climax of this battle: “Primaleon had surely been slain in the place, if at that time the Knight of the inclosed Island had not come thither, who leaping out of his barke into that where they fought, strake upon the mast of the ship with his booke that he held in his hand, which he had no sooner done, but all those that were in the ship lay as if they had beene dead, without any feeling at all. The Knight was a good Magician, and caused two sailors that came with him, to enter into the ship, and willed them to conduct that ship to his Island . . . so in short time they arrived at the inclosed Island, and there the Knight that was Lord thereof, caused all that were in the ship to be taken forth, they feeling nothing, because they were enchanted, and laid them in divers faire roomes, where every one being put apart, he healed them of their wounds” (p. 77).

Once on the island, the Knight distributes and dextrously manipulates those in his power. Secondary companions are kept in “several lodgings.” Primaleon’s gardener and his wife, for example, are deposited in a garden to give them “some worke to doe” and are left “marveiling to see so goodly things” (p. 87). Primaleon is ensconced in a “most sumptuous palace,” where the Knight heals him of his wounds. Primaleon expresses his debt to the Knight but is disconsolate at the loss of Gridonia: “I should not complaine, but rather kill my selfe, seeing I have lost the thing that I loued best in all the world” (pp. 79–80). Gridonia is sequestered with her lady-in-waiting Zerphira. They are visited by Cicile, the daughter of the Knight of the Enclosed Isle, and then by the Knight himself, who takes Gridonia to Primaleon. His joy is such that he thinks this reunion “is but a dreame.” Gridonia replies, “My Lord . . . it is true: for it is a strange thing; but beholde heere the Knight that by his Art hath saued mee, which is Lord of the Inclosed Island” (p. 82). As the reunited lovers try to piece together the story of this adventure, the Knight tells them, “Let it suffice . . . we shall haue time enough hereafter, to speake of these things” (p. 83). He then turns his attention to Flerida and Edward, elsewhere on the island.

The Knight’s wife makes one brief appearance to assure Edward, “that which hath beene somewhat delayed, shall haue a happy issue, and such as you desire” (p. 85). Edward asks the Knight to do what he can to make peace between himself and Primaleon: “I pray you, seeing you haue so much knowledge, that you will make such an agrement betweene us, that it may be to both our honours and contentments” (p. 86). The Knight agrees to do so, and Flerida is left in wonderment: “it seemeth the knowledge of the knight that hath done us so inestimable a pleasure, is exceeding great” (p. 87). The Knight approaches Primaleon as peacemaker and extracts a boon in exchange for saving him from death in battle: forgive Edward for marrying Flerida without the Em-
peror’s permission. “I will haue you to agree and make peace together heere in my Island,” says the Knight, “that I may thereby esteeme my selfe to be most happy” (p. 90). With harmony temporarily achieved, the Knight “ceased not to entertaine them with all the pleasantest deues and inventions” (p. 98, misprinted as p. 92).

Thus ends the first portion of the plot sequence involving the mage. The episode immediately following introduces dynastic and ethical components comparable to several in The Tempest. The Knight recounts some family history and asks assistance in righting an old wrong (the equivalent passage is the play’s second scene): “my father was a valiant Knight, and Lord of the Island of Ordan, which is one of the best & richest Islands in this Country, who after that, by his great valour, wan this Island, who hauing two sonnes, I being the yongest, when he died left the Isle Ordan to my elder brother, and this vnto me, that have alwaies beene more addicted to my booke then to armes” (p. 99, misprinted as p. 93). The elder brother, “dying without children left [his wife] the Island, upon condition that shee should not marry againe, which shee observed not,” marrying a Lacedemonian knight within four months. The Knight of the Enclosed Isle has demanded Ordan from him, “as being my patrimony from my father” (p. 100). This second husband has refused to cede Ordan and has also rejected a request to arrange the marriage of one of his sons to the mage’s daughter, the “faire gentlewoman” Cicle, which would assure a proper descent of the patrimony. Primaleon and Edward agree to help the Knight wage war on Ordan.

We next learn that Primaleon’s father, the Emperor Palmerin, has been enlisted under false pretenses on the side of Ordan. A pitched and bloody battle ensues. Fortunately, the Emperor soon discovers he is fighting against his son, and in Chapter 20 another harmonizing action takes place, partly supervised by the Emperor. He pardons Edward for the elopement (“let these things be no more spoken of”) and urges “forgetting all things past” (p. 125). The Knight of Ordan and the Knight of the Enclosed Isle are made to “become friends,” and the Emperor decides in a quasi-judicial proceeding that the Knight of the Enclosed Isle “had the right of the cause of his side” (p. 126, misprinted as p. 124). He is given a third of the revenues from Ordan during his life, and Cicle is espoused to one of Ordan’s sons (Gorman), while his son Purente is espoused to one of Ordan’s daughters (Finee). This plot sequence ends with double hymeneal celebrations, after which “a great feast was holden” (p. 128). Shortly, all the principals but the mage return to Constantinople, where the Emperor’s “inchaunted bird made exceeding great joy.”

The romance moves toward its final denouement. Gridonia discovers that her beloved Knight of the Cliven Rock is in fact Primaleon, whom she thought she hated. With this discovery the two are reconciled, and Primaleon is “exceeding joyfull, to see that all the anger was converted into great loue” (p. 168). The rock on his shield cleaves together as the Knight of the Enclosed Isle had long ago foretold, and after dinner and “the Revels” their marriage is performed. Attention then turns to the other marriage-ripe couple: “How Prince Edward was suddenly married to Flerida, and how the Knight of the Enclosed Island, miraculously appeared in the Hall” (p. 168). The climactic moments here reflect upon Prospero’s fourth-act “vanity” of his art. The nuptials are performed by an archbishop amid great “pleasure and delight.” Supper is followed by “sports and pastimes,” which are suddenly interrupted by a magical entertainment devised by the Knight: a “Wilde man” and a “Serpent” as “big
as Gyants” suddenly appear and engage in “a most fierce combat, which made a great noyse and rumour to rise in the Hall” (p. 170). “Sodainely,” at the battle’s height, “the Serpent vanished away, and there was nothing séene, but a Knight apparelled in a rich Cloake.” It is the Knight of the Enclosed Isle, who approaches the Emperor and explains, “I am your humble servaunt, and therefore I was by great reason bound to doe something at so great a Feast” (p. 171).

Afterward the Emperor causes the Knight to be “lodged in the Pallace, to honour him the more,” and the mage performs one more feat before disappearing from the story. Maiortes, changed into the shape of a dog on the Island of Malfate, solicits the Knight to disenchant him. The Knight agrees and asks for the Emperor’s enchanted book: “the Knight reading in booke, knew how to disenchant him; and presently Maiortes receiued the shape of a man againe, feeling himselfe to be in better disposition then hee was before” (pp. 171–72). After further far-flung events, Book III reaches a distinct closure: the Emperor dies, the enchanted bird that has throughout the story foretold good and bad news also dies, Primaleon ascends the throne and sires four sons—one of whom, Plátir, will carry on the family honor and this endless romance.

In summary, then, here are Primaleon’s most significant parallels to the action of The Tempest: (1) miraculous events occur as a result of a sea storm during a Mediterranean voyage; (2) a ship is commandeered through the instrumentality of a magician’s power; (3) the crew and passengers are magically conveyed to a nearby island “without any feeling at all”; (4) this island is ruled by a benevolent or “white” mage of “exceeding great” and “marvellous” knowledge; (5) the principal action on the island is the manipulation of several isolated groups of detainees; (6) none of these detainees is ultimately harmed—indeed, they are brought from grief to joy, from enmity to amity; (7) the mage’s overriding goals are ethical and harmonizing, the result being in essence a movement from “hatred” to “great love” and, in Primaleon’s and the Emperor’s case, from revenge to forgiveness; (8) the mage has a daughter who is eventually married to a son of his former enemy; (9) the mage is compared invidiously with his brother because he had “alwaies béene more addicted to [his] booke”; (10) the mage has been deprived of his rightful patrimony and is eager to regain it; (11) the conflict between Ordan and the Enclosed Isle (= Naples and Milan) is healed and then ratified by the espousal of the succeeding generation; (12) the mage is a figure of both prescience and auspicious prophecy: “Be comforted” is his usual theme (compare Prospero’s “No harm”); (13) the mage is adept at producing the “pleasantest devises and inventions” and, toward the end of his career in the story, presents a hymneal entertainment for a marriage he has helped to bring about; (14) the mage’s benevolent powers are marshalled with a careful sense of timing: “more (at this time) may I not reveale,” “let that alone till another time,” “when time serveth,” “we shall have time enough hereafter”; (15) there are references to the mage’s powers as creating the feeling of dream experience (II, 268; III, 82); (16) the focus at the end is upon a return to civilization (Milan = Constantinople)—even the Knight is left at the end lodged in the Emperor’s palace; and (17) the mage’s plot sequence ends, both on his island and in Constantinople, on emphatic celebratory notes of happiness, recreation, and social and dynastic solidarity.

In several respects Primaleon is more pertinent to The Tempest than is The Mirrour of Knighthood. In the first Mirrour passage presented by Bullough there is no storm, and the ship—sailing not in the Mediterranean but the Black Sea
(Pontus Euxinus)—is not magically disabled, but runs aground on a magic island and is “rent in pieces.” The island’s mage, Palisteo, is little in evidence (his story is told by his son). The island itself is a Circean locus amoenus, more like Primaleon’s Island of Hercania; here the hero is entertained for twenty years in an adulterous liaison with the mage’s daughter. The island is also dominated by an “enchanted castle” that compares very favorably with “the sumptuous building of Mausolus tombe, or the famous Pyramids of Aegypt” (p. 301), whereas Primaleon’s author gives no specific details of the Knight’s palace or of the geography of the Enclosed Isle. The island in The Mirrour is a venue for deformation rather than renovation, and the plot, in any case, contains no themes of reasserted patrimonial rights, healed enmities, or dynastic stability.

The second Mirrour passage in Bullough tells of the Knight of the Sun being forced by a storm into the vicinity of an island ruled by the evil Artimaga, who is “wise and cunning in the art Magicke” (p. 305). This episode deals mainly with her conception, with the devil, of the “hellish Fauno” and perhaps is relevant to Caliban and his ancestry. Otherwise, there is little to tie this episode to The Tempest: this is an obviously Circean “Iland of the devill”; there is no magically disabled vessel; all interest focuses on a single passenger, the Knight of the Sun; and the climax is a battle between the knight and Fauno, after which the former settles permanently on the island.

Primaleon, to be sure, does not account for many details, large and small, of The Tempest. Nor did it provide Shakespeare substantial hints for Caliban and Ariel (except perhaps in the device of the Emperor’s enchanted bird). Still, Primaleon presents—and, to judge from my perusal of most contemporary romances, presents uniquely—a remarkable complex of the critical aspects of the play’s plot: a Mediterranean island where old wounds are healed, friendships reaffirmed, marriages arranged (most romance islands, like Hercania and Mal- fate, are dangerous places); the central and benevolent mage-cum-master of ceremonies; a central action devoted to the manipulation of groups of isolated mariners; and a story line that is ebulliently harmonizing and keenly attentive to patrimonial issues. Several details—notably the conveyance of entranced mariners and the mage “more addicted” to studies than his brother—are especially suggestive. No other Renaissance romance comes near to shadowing The Tempest as comprehensively as does Primaleon. In Part III I will return to this romance and offer some speculation as to how (and why) Shakespeare might have altered it to conform with other dramaturgical intentions as he prepared his play for the stage.

II

Since the earliest extant English edition of Book III of Primaleon is dated 1619, it remains now to account for Shakespeare’s access to it before he wrote The Tempest, probably between the falls of 1610 and 1611. The known facts of Primaleon’s publishing history (see Appendix) suggest that Book III appeared in a separate edition—either circa 1597 or some time after 6 October 1607—and that all copies of this printing have been lost.6

6 Our knowledge that any books of Primaleon were published prior to 1619 hangs by the slenderest of threads. There is but one copy of Book I extant (its front matter missing) and but one copy of Book II (virtually all of its main text missing)—both now in the British Library. We must entertain the excellent likelihood that Book III failed by one copy of being as lucky as its brethren. Both Turner (p. 104n) and Hayes (p. 69) conclude in favor of an edition prior to 1600. It is perhaps
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The likelihood of the earlier dating depends on our willingness to take Monday at his word. We have two promises from him in the 1596 edition of Book II that a sequel will soon appear. Munday added at the end of Book II a “Conclusion of the ravages of time on Renaissance printers. We learn from the records of the Stationers’ Court that in 1602 there was a pressrun of 2000 copies for Edmund Coote’s English Schoolmaster. Not a single copy from this unusually large pressrun is now extant. See W. W. Greg, “The English Schoolmaster: Dexter v. Burby, 1602,” The Library, 4th ser., 23 (1943), 90–93.

7 Munday had used this same enticing device at the end of Palmerin d’Oliva I. He wrote, on New Year’s 1588, that its sequel “will be so strange as the like was never heard: and all this perfourmes the second parte, which shall be published so soone as it can be printed” (p. 176). The sequel—of which there is no extant copy—appeared in three months’ time (its front matter, dated 9 March 1588, is preserved in a 1616 reissue of the work).

8 How dependable was such a promise from Munday? He wrote, speaking of his promise of a sequel to Palmerin d’Oliva I, that “promise is debt . . . & debt must be paide.” A survey of the front and back matter of all the extant editions of Munday’s many translations suggests that—though his word was not golden nor his memory perfect—he considerably more often than not paid his “debt” with reasonable (occasionally impressive) promptness: (1) On New Year’s 1588 Munday, as noted in note 7 above, made a promise that was fulfilled within a few months: “The second parte goes forward on the Printers presse, and I hope shalbe with you sooner then you expect” (3v). (2) On 9 March 1588 Munday promised Palladine, which duly appeared with front matter dated 23 April. (3) On 9 March 1588 Munday also promised Palmendos, which appeared in 1589 with front matter dated 5 February. (4) On 5 February 1589 he promised Amadis de Gaule, which appeared in 1590 (it had been licensed 15 January 1589). (5) The dedication for the 1596 Primaleon II promises that a reissue of Palmerin of England II “shall bee with you very speedily” and it appears the same year. (6) In a 1597 dedication (preserved in a 1637 reissue) of D’Oliva I, Munday promises D’Oliva II, which appears by 1 August of the same year. (7) Munday publishes Amadis III and IV in 1618 and promises I and II, which appear in 1619. On other occasions it is likely but not certain that Munday’s promises were kept: (1) In his 1580 Zelauto Munday promises the Earl of Oxford Palmerin I and II, which was licensed in 1581, though the first reference to its being in print does not come until 1588. (2) Munday’s 1592 Gerileon II promises Primaleon I, which was licensed on 10 August 1594 and appeared the next year. (3) The 1595 Primaleon I, its dedication not extant, almost certainly contained a promise of Primaleon II, which appeared the next year. (4) In the 1595 Palmerin of England II Munday promises a sequel, which possibly appeared in 1597 (the title-page of the earliest extant edition of 1602 describes Munday as a “Messenger of her Majesties Chamber,” a post he relinquished in 1597). Demonstrably delayed or broken promises made by Munday are relatively few: (1) His long unfulfilled promise of 1588 to produce Primaleon is perhaps rendered understandable by his preoccupation with its prequel D’Oliva and with Palmendos, Palladine, Gerileon, and Amadis. (2) In 1592 Gerileon III was promised but never appeared. (3) Munday’s inability to make good on promises in 1619 to produce a Primaleon IV and Amadis V, VI, VII, and VIII may simply betoken awaning of the sixty-year-old’s energies.
all three books appeared many years earlier. He provides a separate dedication to Henry Vere (1593–1625), 18th Earl of Oxford, for each of the three books. In the first he speaks of “having sometime served that most noble Earle [Edward Vere] your Father” by translating “divers Honourable Histories into English” (A3'). One was Primaleon: “Among the embrions of my then younger braine, these three seuerall parts of Primaleon of Greece, were the tribute of my duetie and seruice to him [he died in 1604]: Which Bookees, hauing long time slept in oblivion, and (in a manner) quite out of memory: by faavour of these more friendly times, comming once more to be seene on the worlds publike Theater; in all duety they offer themselues to your Noble patronage” (A3’). In the dedication for Book III, Munday offers an explanation: “I proceeded no further in translation, when these three Bookes had their prime impressions; for, rumour talking of a fourth Booke, which (as then) by no meanes could be compassed; I remained contented with these, and promised to effect the other when it should come to my hands” (A3’’). Munday reiterates this publishing history in his “To the Reader” for Book I: “Primaleon of Greece ... hauing long since throwne himselfe to the world, in three seuerall Bookes of his famous Historie, within the compasse of some passed yeares; by what occasion I know not, but either thorow negligence in them to whom they appertained, or nice humour of times (which I rather credit) they have long slept in oblivion, although sought for, and desired by many” (A4').

In making his dedication to the 18th Earl, Munday was forgetting, perhaps conveniently and without much fear of being found out, that he had dedicated Book II not to the Earl’s father but to the Youngs (in any case, the first edition of Palmerin of England probably and Palmerin d’Oliva certainly were dedicated to the father). Perhaps, too, Munday was conveniently simplifying the facts of Primaleon’s publishing history. The crucial facts are these: Cuthbert Burby made entrance for only two books of the French version of Primaleon; Burby died in 1607 and his wife, who took over the concern, soon made entrance for a “Third parte” of Primaleon; in 1609, when Mistress Burby gave up the trade, the rights to Primaleon were split between William Welby (first two parts) and Nicholas Bourne (third part). What are we to make of these transactions?

There are at least three possibilities. First, Mistress Burby, in familiarizing herself with her husband’s business, found that he had failed to protect his rights to the already-published book by entrance. She hastened to do so herself.9 Second, it may be that for purposes of entrance the two French installments for which Burby made entrance in 1594 were precisely what issued in a three-book English format.10 Third, Book III was indeed Mistress Burby’s venture

9 Though Burby appears to have been reasonably conscientious about entrance, he was capable of impropriety. In the matter of Dexter v. Burby mentioned in note 5, the Stationers’ Court found that “m’ Burbie hadt broken thordidiances in printinge the same booke w/out Lyke alowance.” See W. W. Greg and E. Boswell, The Records of the Court of the Stationers’ Company 1576–1602 (London: Bibliographical Society, 1930), p. 88.

10 Thus, Mistress Burby’s 1607 entrance may have concerned the rumored “fourth Booke” of Primaleon referred to by Munday in 1619. Such confusion in numbering “parts” and “books” as romances crossed language barriers was not new. The whole of Primaleon, for instance, was first referred to as Palmerin d’Oliva II. On 12 April 1597 Burby made entrance for “the 1.2.3. and 4. parts of the third booke of the myrrour of knighthood” (Edward Arber, Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers in London [London, 1875], III, 82), which he eventually published as the sixth through ninth “books.” One is particularly tempted by this theory that the two “parts” became three “books” (at least for purposes of Stationers’ Register entrance) because the two assignments of Primaleon that took place after 1619—when all three books were well and truly joined in print and clearly in one publisher’s possession—still describe the property as “Primaleon of Greece, 1. and 2. parts” (see Appendix).
and publication occurred between 6 October 1607 and 16 October 1609. She made one other Stationers’ entrance (STC 12985), and this resulted speedily in publication. That rights to Book III went to Bourne may also be telling. Bourne was apprenticed to Cuthbert for seven years, beginning 25 March 1601, and he was left Burby’s stock and the lease on his premises at his master’s death in respect of faithful service. Bourne doubtless helped the widow run her business afterward, and it is reasonable to imagine him being given the pick of half the titles he helped her to publish before her retirement. This would have consisted of ten known books, a likely edition of Sutton’s Godly Medita-
tions, and the hypothetical Book III of Primaleon—a total of twelve books. The six titles that Bourne in fact came away with were well chosen: all were reprinted within ten years, while less than half of Welby’s thirty-eight Burby titles are known to have been reprinted.\textsuperscript{11} The attraction of this third possibility, of course, is that it makes Primaleon a considerably less “mouldy” tale and a book more likely to have been available and discussed in the crucial 1610–11 period.

Before leaving Primaleon’s printing history, I would like to suggest a pos-
sible publishing-world connection with the reports of American voyages in which Shakespeare was manifestly interested. His pursuit of published and unpub-
lished American material is granted on all sides, but how he actually came by
it has evoked wide speculation. The usual assumption is that Shakespeare worked through friends or friends of friends. Thus, Bullough (p. 239) and Kermode
(pp. xxvii–xxviii) mention members of the Virginian Council like the Earls of
Pembroke and Southampton, Sir Dudley Digges, and Christopher Brooke;
investors like Henry Leveson and Sir Henry Rainsford; members of the Essex
group interested in plantation like Sir Robert Sidney, Sir Henry Neville, and
Lord De-La-Warre; and friends of Thomas Gates, “who could have enabled
him to meet Strachey” (Kermode, p. xxviii). This line of thought is eminently
plausible but overlooks a possibility that is to my mind also likely: Shakespeare,
contemplating in 1610–11 an “island play” that might draw upon topical ex-
citement, could have gravitated to the premises of stationers who had estab-
lished a reputation for interest in American titles during the few years following
James’s issuance of the first Virginia charter on 10 April 1606 to Gates, Somers,
Hakluyt, and others.

The stationer perhaps most likely to receive a visit from someone interested
in American literature was William Welby, who, we have seen, was assigned
the rights to two parts of Primaleon in 1609. Welby gained his freedom of the
Stationers’ Company on 26 March 1604, and his career lasted until 1618, when
he assigned his list to Thomas Snodham, the publisher of the complete Pri-
maleon in 1619. Welby operated first at the sign of the Greyhound and then
at the Swan (Burby’s old shop)—both in St. Paul’s churchyard, a few blocks
from the Blackfriars Theatre. Of him McKerrow summarizes, “Welby dealt
largely in theological literature and also published many books relating to the
English colonies in the Bermudas, Guiana, and Virginia” (p. 286). Welby was
indeed prominent in the American field in the crucial pre-Tempest years: on 13
August 1608 he and J. Tappe entered John Smith’s A True Relation of such
occurrences as hath hapned in Virginia (1608; STC 22795), and Welby sold

\textsuperscript{11} I am obliged to Peter Blayney for the suggestion of this possibility and some of the publishing
information on which it is founded. For information on the book trade I have consulted Henry
Blades for the Bibliographical Society, 1907) and R. B. McKerrow’s companion volume for 1557–
it at his shop; in 1609 he published Robert Gray’s *A Good speed to Virginia* (STC 12204); in 1609 he published William Symonds’s *Virginia. A Sermon* (STC 23594); in 1610 and 1611 Welby published two documents for the Virginia Council (STC 24831.7 and 24833.2); in 1611 he published Thomas West’s *Relation of the Lord De-La-Warre, Lord Governour of the colonie planted in Virginia* (STC 25266); on 8 April 1611 he was paid for printing “3 articles for the Councell of Virginia for 300 men to go thither” (STC 24830.6). In 1613 Welby reissued Silvester Jourdain’s *A Plaine Description of the Barmdvas, Now Called Sommer Ilands* (STC 14817), which had first appeared in 1610. This pamphlet has a “close bearing” upon *The Tempest* (Bullough, p. 238), and stock and rights to it could conceivably have come to Welby’s possession as early as late 1610 (there is no Stationers’ Register entry for either printing). Beyond this evidence, it is clear that Welby’s activities during 1608–15 represent the most extensive American involvement of any London stationer.12

I draw attention to Welby for several reasons. By 1610–11 his reputation as a publisher of American matter was secure. After October 1609 he was occupying the premises of the first publisher of *Primaleon*. And Welby, if not himself possessed of old copies of the romance or complete rights to it, must have been intimate with everyone in the small group of stationers who came into possession of *Primaleon*’s “third part”: (1) Mistress Burby, with whose business Welby, as eventual main assignee, must have been familiar; (2) Bourne, a Burby apprentice from 1601 and an associate of Mistress Burby; (3) Thomas Archer, a Burby apprentice until 1603 and in subsequent years a frequent business associate of Bourne; and (4) Thomas Snodham, who married Burby’s daughter and eventually took over the Burby-Welby list (from 1609, incidentally, he also owned the rights to *The Mirrour of Knighthood*). Welby’s shop would have been a plausible and convenient place for Shakespeare to forage in search of material for a “sea-voyage” or “island” play, and it would have been a plausible place to run across *Primaleon* or learn where it could be had.

There may also be a Welby connection with the most important American document of all, the Strachey letter to which Shakespeare apparently gained access before it appeared in print. This letter was first published by Purchas, along with nineteen other documents, under the heading “English Plantations, Discoveries, Acts, and Occvrrents, in Virginia and Svmmer Ilands, Since the Yeere 1606. Till 1624” (*Purchas his Pilgrimes* [1625], Part IV, Book ix, Chapter VI, pp. 1734–58). In a marginal note Purchas writes, “I have many written Treatises lying by me, written by Capt. Smith and others, some there, some here after their returne: but because these have alreadie seene the light, and containe a full relation of Virginian affaires, I was loth to weare the Reader with others of this time” (p. 1705). Purchas’s guarantee was not entirely accurate. Documents III and IV are said to be drawn “from the written notes” of John Smith, but the material is also to be found in Smith’s *Map of Virginia* (1612). Document VIII had also seen the light: it contains three pages taken verbatim from *The Relation of Lord De-La-Warre* (1611), published by Welby. This raises at least the possibility that Welby may have gained early access to “written Treatises” about America—gathered, perhaps, by Richard Hakluyt?13—that eventually fell into Purchas’s possession. Among these might have been the Strachey letter.

12 After 1611 Welby published three other American titles (STC 12754, 12736, and 13919). Other indications of American interests can be found in Arber, III, 484, 485, 489, and 548.

13 Hakluyt was an indefatigable advocate for colonization and gatherer of ultramarine material.
I am encouraged in this speculation by a short address "To the Reader" for Welby's 1613 edition of Jourdain's *A Plaine Description of the Bermudas*. It may have been written by Welby himself:

_Good Reader, this is the first Booke published to the world touching Sommer Ilands: but who shall liue to see the last? A more full and exact description of the Countrie, and Narration of the nature, site, and commodities, together with a true Historie of the great deliuerancie of Sir Thomas Gates and his Companie upon them, which was the first discoverie of them, thou maist surely expect, if God will, to come into thy hands. This short Narration, in the meane time, shall rather prepare thee for it, then preuent thee of it._

(A4v)

Welby apparently never published such a volume.\(^4\) But the promise is tantalizing, for it suggests that Welby had early access to, and commercial interest in, "written Treatises" on the Bermudas. In fact, it is tempting to think that we have here a reference to Strachey's letter, its contents exactly fitting the description just quoted: it is a "more full and exact description" of Bermuda, the shipwreck, and the eventual departure for Virginia (over 11,000 words) than Jourdain's meager one (over 3000 words). Welby's failure to publish, then, left the way open for Purchas. It is also tempting to imagine that the Strachey letter, dated 15 July 1610, fell into Welby's hands a few years before the above promise was made, bringing it and *Primaleon* into close proximity in the crucial period of 1610–11.

This is of course an "ideal" speculation. Shakespeare could have come across these materials through any number of bypaths and indirect, crooked ways. I make it by way of emphasizing that the playwright could well have considered a few strategic visits along London's main stationers' rows the most convenient and efficient way of garnering information for his new play—more convenient, one would think, than seeking himself or through intermediaries after documents from "great ones" interested in plantations.

III

Virgil K. Whitaker, in "one of the best short essays" on Shakespeare's use of his sources (Bullough, p. 344), long ago complained of the seeming loss of critical interest once a source has been "discovered": "One is tempted, in fact, to exaggerate only slightly and say that Shakespeare's sources have been pursued everywhere but into the mind of Shakespeare."\(^15\) Having pursued _Pri-

---

14 He did publish Lewis Hughes's *A Letter sent into England from the Summer Ilands* in 1615. But this letter's date, 21 December 1614, makes a 1613 reference to it impossible.

15 "Shakespeare's Use of his Sources," _Philological Quarterly_, 20 (1941), 377. Whitaker adds that "any attempt to interpret a Shakespearean play must include a detailed comparison of that play with its source,\(^4\) and that such a comparison is perhaps the best single clue to Shakespeare's artistic methods" (pp. 377–78). Whitaker's fourth footnote discloses a scholarly genealogy: "The
maleon thus far in speculation, I would like to assume for the moment that Shakespeare did have it to hand when creating The Tempest, and pursue the work, as it were, into his mind and examine some of the likely artistic consequences.

At the outset, one must say how comfortable the assumption is. First, it is consistent with the playwright’s well-observed creative habits: “Shakespeare commonly used not one source but several” (Whitaker, p. 378); “he liked to build a new construction on something given, not to make up an entirely new plot” (Bullough, p. 351); “He shared the common Elizabethan liking for manifold incident and variety of scenes and characters” (Bullough, p. 358). Primaleon as a source is also consistent with Bullough’s conclusion that “Topical suggestions might come from America, but for Shakespeare romance was mainly of the Mediterranean” (p. 245). It is also consistent with F. D. Hoeniger’s conclusion, which appeared the next year: “it is time to remind ourselves of the echoes from Virgil, Ovid, and St. Paul. Old voyages and ‘wonder,’ not only new, lie behind” Shakespeare’s last plays.16

Pre-eminently, though, Primaleon is attractive as a source because its arrival in Shakespeare’s hand would have provided him with his main plot. Bullough summarizes just how far his New World foraging would have got him: “The playwright in search of a plot found in the Virginian pamphlets promising features, including a tempest; shipwreck; a haunted island of ill repute but beautiful and fertile, though uninhabited and inaccessible; a mingling of social classes—nobles, gentlemen, tradesmen, labourers, mariners, natives well- and ill-disposed—dissensions leading to dangerous divisions and conspiracies” (p. 242). Far from being a plot, all this was no more than plot stuff, unmanageable—perhaps even stultifying—in its abundance. A mere shipwreck and subsequent painstaking construction of “two little ships of Cedar” (A Plaine Description, A4v) for escape from the island was simply not enough for a play. There is besides, we should remember, no shipwreck and no Crusoe-like carpenter’s ingenuity in The Tempest. Shakespeare could have read any one of several exciting descriptions of storms in the New World pamphlets (or Old World literature, for that matter), but what he required was a storm of human passions with which to vitalize all the potentially useful material these pamphlets offered him. He also required something more colorful and extraordinary than the reports from America of truculence, sloth, and rebelliousness among some of the colonists.

Shakespeare seems also to have wanted enchantment. He and many others may at first have credited the notion that Bermuda was truly an “Ile of Divels.” But this superstition was quickly fading. Jourdain raises the possibility in 1610, calling Bermuda “a most prodigious and enchanted place” (A Discovery of the Barmvdas, p. 8), but when Jourdain’s letter was reprinted in 1613 as A Plaine Description, an appended description dashes this view: “For our Inchanted Is-

---

lands . . . will wrong no friend nor foe, but yeeld all men their expectations” (F4v). This reissue carried an optimistic title-page epigraph from Ecclesiastes (“God hath made every thing beautifull in his time”), and its dedication to Sir Thomas Smith makes clear how quickly the aura of enchantment was dissipating: “Who did not thinke till within these foure yeares, but that those Ilands had beene rather a habitation of Diuells, then fit for men to dwell in? . . . If any had said seuen yeares agoe, the Barmuda Islands are not only accessable and habitable, but also fertile, fruitfull, plentifull, and a safe, secure, temperate, rich, sweet, and healthfull habitation for Man and especially for English bodies; oh how loudly would he have beene laught at, and hist out of most mens companies!” (A3v). Strachey’s letter, too, was intended to dispell rather than flame amazement over the island’s flora and fauna. This sobering trend in New World news effectively subverted Bermuda’s reputation as a venue for supernatural “wonder” or magical powers. For such material Shakespeare would have been more likely to turn to romance literature like Primaleon or The Mirrour of Knighthood.

The primary value of having Primaleon before us is that it gives a sense of the ways Shakespeare amalgamated his romance and American materials and produced a play that, while displaying characteristics of its parentage, nevertheless remains splendidly and often palpably sui generis. Take, for example, Prospero’s island. It is notoriously difficult to visualize, in part because, though the island is located en route from Tunis to Naples, Shakespeare leaned toward the New World for what few bits of flora, fauna, and topography he scattered through the action. At the same time, he peopled the island—as in Primaleon—with aristocratic personages and various trappings of Old World civilization. The Knight of the Enclosed Island’s “sumptuous palace” and “several lodgings” are nowhere apparent, because Shakespeare well knew that such edifices would instantly subvert whatever American ambience the play might have. On the other hand, he was not above introducing such sophisticated vanities of the Old World as might have appeared on the Knight’s island: the rich but hasty feast, the discovery at chess, the masque.

The storm in the first scene similarly reflects careful reconciliation of antithetical matter. This scene benefited greatly, as many have observed, from scrupulous attention to achieving realistic nautical activity. But in the careful allegorical manipulation of the voyagers (keeping Ferdinand silent and untainted, for instance, and allowing the two villains their vituperation), Shakespeare places us firmly in the romance tradition, where bad weather at sea commences an adventurous episode that will end at last with “auspicious gales.”

A few of many other instances of skillful mediation between Old World romance narrative style and New World news are here worth noting. For example, work and leisure rest effectively but oddly side-by-side during the action. Much of the propaganda from the colonies concerned the importance of hard work and discipline. Thus, John Smith complained about those “devoted to pure idleness” and the “clamors and the ignorance of . . . ingenious Verbalists” (Purchas, 1704). This theme is part of The Tempest and is perhaps behind Caliban’s constitutional shirking and Ferdinand’s ordeal by woodpile.17 But the essence of the romance genre is leisure. The very purpose of a romance, Munday wrote, was to provide “a frendly companion for the long evenings,

and a fit recreation for other vacant times.” And there is, counterposed against Prospero’s urgent six o’clock deadline, an element of leisure in the play. It pervades the scenes involving the royal party, which has little to do, after all; and leisure is epitomized in Ferdinand’s and Miranda’s pastime of chess. The performance history of Caliban—which shows us that he can, according to directorial intent, be made a very sympathetic or unsympathetic figure—also suggests that he is the product of carefully reconciled New and Old World themes. Behind him are the American Indians’ proprietary instincts over their native land, their sometime hostility and savagery, and their inhospitality to Christianity. But Caliban is just as certainly a figure in the epic and romance tradition: an avatar of all human beings subject to Circean deformation (like Maiortes in Primaleon) and an elaborate allegory of human vice and ignorance.

In sum, with Primaleon in view, we can begin to imagine how The Tempest’s many subtle and finely poised antitheses emerged. From the exotic and “open” Atlantic, in a sense, come the reflexive pressures that urge the play beyond its own boundaries as an imagined fable to touch real-life events; from the well-traveled and “closed” Mediterranean come its settled and complacent closed-form romance elements—its certain happy end, with the best in human nature triumphant. From New World journalism come the play’s suspense and intrigue of the unknown; from Old World romances come its time-honored materials for a plot (love affairs, family problems, combat, and so on). The sloth and viciousness of the play’s villains may owe something to troubles in the colonies, but the careful circumscription of these villains by superior benevolent forces derives from the romance heritage. The island’s “riches” are at once the exploitable natural resources of America and the conspicuous wealth of the old patrimonies in romance narratives. Lastly, the pressures toward social disintegration in The Tempest were of a kind much on the minds of those with a stake in the colonies, but the play’s ultimately prevailing pressures toward social integration lay at the heart of romance wish fulfillment.

Finally, one might venture that Prospero’s richness as a character derives from such forms of mediation as those just mentioned. The appeal of New World pamphlets lay in natural human curiosity about the unknown, the dangerous, the far-off, the unpredictable—and curiosity about those daring souls who would seek them out. The appeal of romances was quite different. In them these same elements were circumscribed by an almost cozy benignity and a certainty that in the end, as the wife of the Knight of the Enclosed Isle promises, “that which hath beene somewhat delayed, shall have a happy issue.” Romances did not subvert the expectation of a satisfying climactic joy and closure. It could well have been Shakespeare’s most perplexing dramaturgical challenge that, having taken over a romance sequence of events in which, typically, “most poor matters / Point to rich ends” (III.i.3–4), he felt the necessity to make “uneasy” the “swift business” of his central action (I.ii.453–54). The principal way he did so was to give Prospero some qualities not present in the Knight of the Enclosed Isle: mercurial edginess, an apparently tyrannical streak, an occasionally weighty melancholy, and an angry resentment at wrongs committed against him. For such traits, as Bullough suggests (p. 242), Shakespeare might have turned to the descriptions of arbitrary and tyrannical behavior in some colonial leaders.

18 Palmerin d’Oliva (1588), sig. *2*.
19 For a recent discussion of Caliban’s stage history, see Virginia Mason Vaughan’s “‘Something Rich and Strange’: Caliban’s Theatrical Metamorphoses,” SQ, 36 (1985), 390–405.
But Prospero’s nobler and more important side brings us back to the Knight, who, in essence, embodies the greatest good to which the “marvelous” resources of human knowledge can be directed. In this, it might be said, he practices along with Prospero the useful and humane “magic” that Sir Francis Bacon defined in his *De Augmentis* as “the science which applies the knowledge of hidden forms to the production of wonderful operations” and those “white” magic powers, praised by Cornelius Agrippa, that are used “for the profit of man, for the turning away of evil events, for the destroying [of] sorceries, for the curing of diseases, for the exterminating of phantasmes, for the preserving of life, honor, fortune.”20 The news from the New World, in contrast, spoke of the frailties into which men are all too accustomed to fall: selfishness, ambition, conspiracy, superstition, and harshness of government. Part of the tension in Prospero’s character—indeed, part of the tension of the entire action—derives from Shakespeare’s manifest intention to create a hero and a play that would encompass this full human spectrum presented to him by his very disparate sources.


APPENDIX
Publication History of *Primaleon*

Parentheses indicate volume and page number from Edward Arber’s *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers in London* (London, 1875).


1595: Burby publishes *The First Booke of Primaleon of Greece*.

1596: Burby publishes *The Second Booke of Primaleon of Greece*.

1607: Between 29 August and 16 September: Burby dies.

6 October: Burby’s widow “Entred . . . A booke called the *Third parte of PRIMALEON of Grece Translated out of Frenche into Englishe*” (III, 360).

1609: 16 October: Burby’s widow assigns rights in thirty-eight titles to William Welby; among these is “*PRIMALEON the .1. and .2. parte[s]*.” She also assigns to Nicholas Bourne the rights to six other works; among these is “*PRIMALEON the Third parte*” (III, 420, 421).

1618: 2 March: William Welby assigns his rights in several volumes to Thomas Snodham, including “*PRIMALEON of Greece j and 2. parte*” (III, 621).


—— Snodham publishes the three books of *Primaleon* in one quarto volume.

1626: 23 February: Snodham’s widow assigns her rights to William Stansby; these include rights to “*PRIMALION of Greece, 1. and 2. parts*” (IV, 152–54).

1639: 4 March: Stansby’s widow assigns her rights to Richard Bishop; these include rights to “*PRIMALION of Greece 1. and 2. part[s]*” (IV, 459).