

**Ben Jonson & *The Tempest*:  
“The Copie may be Mistaken for the Principall”**

by Marie Merkel

Shakespeare-Oxford Society Newsletter, Sept. 2009

*Meanwhile, we make it clear that we do not rest upon these earlier date theories, and that the rejection of "The Tempest" must in our view be incorporated ultimately into the general argument.*

J.T. Looney, *Shakespeare Identified*, 1920

J. T. Looney was quite the optimist. He confidently left the job of collating *The Tempest's* many curious anomalies, and the search for an alternative author who would fit the resultant profile, to his followers. Since scholars and critics routinely acknowledge *The Tempest's* unique departures from what Shakespeare had accomplished in the past, there's a secure foundation of difference for us to build upon. Yet most Oxfordians remain as enchanted by *The Tempest* as their Stratfordian counterparts, who regard the play, often with sentimental awe, as the Bard's final solo work.

As long as we agree to sequester *The Tempest* from authorship interrogation, Stratfordians retain their silver bullet against the earl of Oxford, whose death in 1604 made it impossible for him to write a Jacobean play intricately bound to other works written between 1609 and 1614. Stratfordians have wisely concentrated on the play's apparent connection to Strachey's account of the 1609 shipwreck of the *Sea-Venture*. Why is this wise? Because more often than not, the play's other Jacobean elements revolve around the work of Ben Jonson, the man upon whose word the Stratfordian Monument rests. Proof that he tampered with any part of their ace-in-the-hole against Oxford would be bad news indeed. Stratfordians simply cannot afford to reject *The Tempest*, much less hand one four-beat couplet of it over to Ben.

Oxfordians, on the other hand, do not need *The Tempest* to secure their case. “Spell-stopt” by its charms, however, they have yet to take full advantage of *The Tempest's* strange parody of Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist* of 1610 (Lucking; Murphy 5-8; Sokol 196-98) or the even stranger parody of *The Tempest* found in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* of 1614 (Burnett ch. 5 & 6). *The Tempest's* insistent echoes of Jonson's masques, such as *Hymenaei* of 1606 or his 1609 *Masque of Queens* also await Oxfordian researchers. Overlooked up to now, the presence of at least 37 words, proper names like Prospero and Stephano, and a dozen or more phrases\* that Shakespeare *never* used, but that do appear in *The Tempest* and in Ben Jonson's works, should excite the curiosity of all attribution scholars. As Jonson slyly

---

\* Please see Appendix A for corrections and additions to this statement, post-publication in 2009

insinuated in the induction to *Bartholomew Fair*, there's an awful lot of unexplained heads mixing with other men's heels going on between 1609 and 1614.

In 2001, when I began profiling the elusive sources and other intellectual and prosodic oddities of *The Tempest*, Ben Jonson's name swiftly rose to the top of a very short list of poets capable of crafting drama of this caliber. Last May at the "Symposium: Shakespeare from the Oxfordian Perspective" in Watertown, Massachusetts [2009], I presented a paper entitled "Raising the Dead: Ben Jonson & *The Tempest*." My focus was not on what makes *The Tempest* non-Shakespearean, or non-Oxfordian, but on the many unexplained or overlooked Jonsonian elements in the play. Along with a brief outline of my case for Jonson as author of *The Tempest*, I invited the audience to *entertain* this controversial idea, even if they were sure they disagreed, simply to see what questions might come up. I hope you will do the same.

## THE ARGUMENT

Sometime between 1609 and 1611, Ben Jonson (1572-1637) knowingly forged a new Shakespearean play. By linking *The Tempest* to events and dramatic productions current in 1609-14, Jonson helped to maintain the brand name of William Shakespeare (1564-1616) and direct attention away from Edward Oxenford (1550-1604) as author of the works. By recycling situations and characters or *humours* from his earlier plays, and by employing a wide range of his own dramatic preferences, Ben Jonson left an indelible signature on his forgery.

## JONSON'S POSSIBLE MOTIVE, MEANS AND OPPORTUNITY

**Motive: Why would Ben Jonson want to maintain the brand name of William Shakespeare and direct attention away from Edward Oxenford as author of works?**

There is clear evidence of bad blood between Shakespeare and Jonson during the time of the so-called *Poetomachia* or Poet Wars of 1597-1602, as an unbiased examination of the literary evidence – especially in Jonson's *Poetaster* and Dekker's *Satiromastix* – will confirm. If Shakespeare is Oxford, how does this change the topical narrative in these plays? In 1597 Jonson's collaboration with Nashe on *The Isle of Dogs* landed him in prison, where Elizabeth's infamous torturer, Richard Topcliffe, questioned him and set spies about him. The scandal also eliminated one of The Globe's major competitors, The Swan. Since Oxford (as Master Apis Lapis) appears to have been Nashe's patron, we need to re-assess the earl's stance towards Nashe and Jonson, their risqué comedy, and their association with The Swan and Pembroke's Men at this disruptive juncture.

At the end of Act IV, Prospero unleashes his hellhounds on Caliban; in the seventh scene of Act IV in Jonson's *The Case is Altered*, Jacques de Prie unleashes his mastiff on Peter Onion – another back-talking servant who dares to desire his master's

daughter. “Popular tradition held that the queen kenneled her royal hounds on the Isle of Dogs,” (Riggs 32) a location that resurfaces in *Eastward Ho*, (Jonson’s second provocative collaboration, with Marston and Chapman, publ. in 1605), a topical satire drenched in mockery of both Shakespeare’s work and Oxford’s financial distress. Echoes of these plays, and of *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix* reverberate throughout *The Tempest*, accounting for several of the unique words and phrases shared with Jonson (such as “invisible to every eye” and “care of thee” from *The Case is Altered*; “zenith” and “in case” from *Poetaster*.)

“What’s past is prologue,” *The Tempest*’s villain, Antonio, helpfully informs us (II.ii.249). How far back should we look for that past? “Twelve year since, Miranda, twelve year since,” Prospero insists to his daughter (I.ii.53). For the audience at the play’s first recorded performance of 1611, counting backward would lead them directly into the dark abysm of the *Poetomachia*. This inglorious war of words ended when Shakespeare, along with the poetasters Marston and Dekker, publicly administered a humiliating purge to Jonson, one that made him “bewray his credit” (*Parnassus* 138). For Benjamin the Bricklayer – whose name, like Prospero’s, means *fortunate* (Miles 6; Vaughan 23) – a chance to even the score with the seventeenth earl of Oxford would be well worth the wait of twice twelve years. When Prospero brags about his “potent Art,” we may want to keep in mind Jonson’s famous declaration that “Shakespeare wanted Arte.” (Drummond 4)

Aside from personal grievances, Jonson was also the most prominent member of the Pembroke literary coterie, a circle whose base of reference was the martyred hero and poet, Sir Philip Sidney, “who had been one of Jonson’s earliest formative influences.” (Miles 88) Sir Philip’s brother, Robert, along with Robert’s three children (including the poet Mary, wife of Sir Robert Wroth) as well as William Herbert (son of Sidney’s sister Mary, Countess of Pembroke) all offered Jonson some form of patronage or hospitality, which he reciprocated by immortalizing them in his poems.

Oxfordians will not need an itemization of the many ways in which we know that Lord Oxford and Sir Philip were not the best of friends. Oxford’s mockery of Philip in his plays – long after the knight’s tragic death from a battle wound in 1586 – probably made him more enemies than Oxfordians have been willing to acknowledge. In 1616, Ben Jonson, the most linguistically potent of these overlooked foes, risked public scorn to publish the first collected works of any English playwright. By 1623, he was London’s premier literary authority. As a great poet himself, Jonson knew the greatness in his rival’s works. He may have been the major force behind collecting and preserving the earl’s literary remains; no one else would have known so well their true worth. However, forging a play that helped to disconnect the earl of Oxford’s callous wit from Shakespeare’s name may have been the right thing to do in Jonson’s eyes – a gift to both his patrons and to future readers.

Jonson also had a reputation for being a practical joker. As his host in Scotland, Sir William Drummond remarked, Ben was “given rather to lose a friend than a jest.” (Drummond 27) I think he did it simply to prove that he could. His own comedies did

not always please, and in 1611 his ambitious play *Catiline* flopped. The common sort preferred sweet Shakespeare who'd given them bad-boy rogues like Falstaff to idolize and laugh at. Disgusted by their ignorance, Jonson forged a Shakespearean fantasy guaranteed to thrill these die-hard fans, and King James to boot. But he forged it from his own metal, and purposely left his fingerprints, hairs, spit-and-polish all over the crime scene.

**Means: How did Ben Jonson go about forging a play that most scholars and critics regard as an authentic Shakespearean triumph?**

Jonson was a poetic genius who, "like most Elizabethan schoolboys," learned his trade through devoted *imitation* of his chosen masters (Barton 16). In his *Timber: or Discoveries made upon Men and Matter*, he gives us his *modus operandi* for forging literary masters:

*The third requisite in our Poet, or Maker, is Imitation, to bee able to convert the substance, or Riches of an other Poet, to his owne use. To make choise of one excellent man above the rest, and so to follow him, till he grow very Hee: or, so like him, as the Copie may be mistaken for the Principall. Not, as a Creature, that swallowes, what it takes in, crude, raw, or indigested; but, that feedes with an Appetite, and hath a Stomacke to concoct, devide, and turne all into nourishment (Jonson 93).*

In essence Jonson describes a literary cannibal: one who feeds on the body of another's work, thus transforming the original genius into something uniquely his own. This public confession of his own digestive practices may go some way towards explaining why Ben's contemporaries referred to him in *Satiromastix*, published in 1602, as an *anthropophagite*.

We know that Jonson was sufficiently proficient at *imitation* to earn a living with this art, since on September 5, 1601, he received a generous payment from Henslowe for additions to Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (Miles 65). This journeywork required that, "to some extent, his nature would have to subdue itself to what it worked in, like the dyer's hand." (Barton 15) The play was well-known to London audiences by this time, and Ned Alleyn (the famous actor who played a principal role in the work) "could not have welcomed an Hieronimo who seemed to be two different people, speaking in two radically opposed styles." (Barton 16)

To this day, scholars have trouble finding Jonson's style in these additions, yet Barton gives two persuasive examples of Jonson caught in the "act of ventriloquism." (17) First, there are the "four elegies in *The Underwood* (XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLI) [that] have for long been a subject of critical dispute, precisely because the voice speaking sounds so like Donne's." Three of these, says Barton, "...are credibly the work of a Jonson choosing for the moment to pay his friend the compliment of judicious imitation." (17)

Collaborations also asked the playwright to conform his manners to the group project. Jonson participated in several of these, most notably, *Eastward Ho*, Barton's second

example of style subdued to the work. For all we know, there may be undetected additions by Jonson within Shakespeare's plays, especially in the late Romances, since "even the computer finds it difficult now to distinguish Jonson's hand from that of Chapman, or Marston, in *Eastward Ho*." (Barton 17)

Jonson also indulged in the "verse form called the *recusatio* (refusal). A *recusatio* evokes the style and content of a poem the author refuses to write." (Riggs 77) As David Riggs observes,

This paradoxical combination of disclaimer and imitation crops up repeatedly in *Poetaster*. Jonson disavows Ovid, yet he retells the story of Ovid and Julia in the lovers' own words. . . . In the last act, he brings Virgil on stage, has him recite forty-two lines of the *Aeneid* in Ben Jonson's new English translation, and then abruptly halts the recital. (78)

Riggs concludes his discussion with this subversive recognition: "The whole performance is a staged *recusatio*. Jonson hints that he could write in the style of Ovid, or Shakespeare, or Virgil, *if he felt inclined to do so*; but he does not." (78) (emphasis mine) In other words, there's nothing in the highly Romantic, Ovid-and-Virgil-infused *Tempest* beyond the range of Ben Jonson's "potent Art".

### **Opportunity: How was Ben Jonson in the right place at the right time to pull off his extraordinary hoax?**

Jonson was at the height of his poetic art at the time of the first recorded performance of *The Tempest* in 1611. He had access to the many possible sources of *The Tempest*, including news that reached London in 1610 that all had survived the wreck of the Sea-Venture.

Like Shakespeare, Jonson wouldn't have needed this news to write of shipwrecks and miraculous survivals, or to infuse a flavor of New World adventures into his play. William Strachey – the survivor who wrote the letter that seems most echoed in the play – was, however, Jonson's friend. In 1605 he contributed a prefatory sonnet to Jonson's play, *Sejanus*. As time has proven, select details from his friend's account of the 1609 Bermuda tempest, seemingly interwoven with the text of *The Tempest*, would move Jonson's literary forgery beyond the reach of Edward de Vere, the 17<sup>th</sup> earl of Oxford, should posterity ever find him behind Shakespeare's mask. "He died too soon!" may have been precisely what Ben Jonson had hoped we would say.

How do we know that Shakespeare wrote *The Tempest*? The two records of performance at court (1611 and 1613) do *not* list the names of authors, and before its first appearance in print in 1623, no one anywhere ever referred to *The Tempest* as by Shakespeare. We have only the dubious word of the First Folio collectors for its authenticity. Jonson's proximity to this publication venture would have given him the chance to slip his piece of faux-Shakespeare into the line-up of "Comedies, Histories & Tragedies". The evidence of his active role in the First Folio project is circumstantial but compelling:

- In his own 1616 Folio, Jonson dedicated his Epigrams (a collection he referred to three times within the first page-and-a-half as “my book”, echoing Prospero) to his patron, William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, one of the “incomparable brethren” to whom Shakespeare’s Folio was dedicated.
- Jonson contributed two prefatory poems of surpassing ambiguity to the project, poems which helped to secure William Shakespeare of Stratford on Avon as author.
- As George Greenwood deftly summarized in 1921, the two letters in the Folio signed by Heminges and Condell (both of whom acted in many of Jonson’s plays) bear a suspicious resemblance to Jonson’s prose style.
- Ralph Crane, the scrivener who prepared some texts of the First Folio, worked with Jonson in the years before 1623. Jonson’s editorial preferences show up in Crane’s work as well as in *The Tempest*, a play that stands out from all the other Folio texts for its accuracy and careful preparation. “By comparing Jonson’s holograph of *The Masque of Queens* (1609) with Crane’s earliest known transcript, Jonson’s *Pleasure Reconcild to Virtue* – presumably made under the supervision of Jonson, who may well have “trained” him – Howard-Hill finds a great many of Jonson’s practices to have their counterparts in Crane’s later transcripts.” (McAvoy 80)
- “The scribes who prepared the copy for the Shakespeare folio abandoned the “light pointing” or “playhouse punctuation” of the Shakespeare quartos and adopted the so-called logical pointing that Jonson had employed in his *Works*. The extensive use of parentheses, semicolons, and end-stopped lines in the 1623 folio owes more to Jonson’s example than to Shakespeare’s habits of composition.” (Riggs 276)

With these close ties and working relationships, Jonson was thus in a position to offer the play as genuine Shakespeare with or without the connivance of others, who may not have been capable of judging its authenticity. As David Riggs observes, “the men who prepared the folio for the press (and Jonson may well have been one of them) *remade Shakespeare in Jonson’s image.*” [emphasis added] (276)

#### **FIVE JONSONIAN DRAMATIC ELEMENTS IN *THE TEMPEST*:**

Though there are many more, these five categories should provide a starting place for codifying “the substance, or Riches” of *The Tempest*. Which, if any, of the ingredients in its magic must be unadulterated Shakespeare? Which appear to be Shakespeare-as-digested-by-Ben Jonson? Which are actually anti-Shakespearean, and/or original to Jonson? There are no proofs in these brief glimpses, only

suggestions for research projects designed to re-evaluate, from a Jonsonian point of view, the forged Shakespearean essence of *The Tempest*.

### 1). Character

Exhibit A in the case for Jonson as master-forged of *The Tempest* should be his 1598 hit, *Every Man in His Humour*, where we find the author's first Prospero and his first Stephano, along with Jonson's other perennial humours in their youthful garb. In *The Tempest*, we see the same themes and humours distilled in hindsight and tempered by maturity when revisited by Jonson twelve years later, perhaps concurrent with work on *The Alchemist* in 1610, or shortly thereafter. (Fig. 1)

#### Figure 1

1598 *Every Man in His Humour*

1610-11 *The Tempest*

- 
- Musco (It. for "the fly"), a servant >>> Ariel, "an ayrie Spirit" and servant
  - Cob, part fish/cannibal >>> Caliban, part fish/cannibal
  - Cob, the "water-bearer" >>> Caliban, the log-bearer
  - Lorenzo Jr. + Hesperida = true love >>> Ferdinand + Miranda = true love
  - Stephano, a frippery-loving gull >>> Trinculo, a frippery-loving gull
  - Bobadil, a drunken braggart >>> Stephano, a drunken braggart
  - Clement, an honorable wise man >>> Gonzalo, an honorable wise man
  - Lorenzo Sr., doting father >>> Prospero, doting father
  - Lorenzo Sr., paragon of reason >>> Prospero, paragon of reason
  - Prospero, privileged light wit >>> Antonio, privileged dark wit

As Oxfordian scholar Chuck Berney pointed out in the Q & A session after my Watertown talk, a comparison of Shakespeare's witty clowns with *The Tempest's* buffoons, or his honorable, beloved Antonios with Prospero's villainous brother of the same name, would be a rich vein of inquiry.

### 2). Vocabulary and usage

"Insisting that individuals are best identified through speech, Jonson writes in *Discoveries* that "*Language* most shows the man; speak that I may see thee". We derive our most personal thoughts from public language, but inflections of style identify poets as the creators of the words they use." (Bednarz 28) The 37 words and a dozen or more phrases I've found thus far in *The Tempest* that appear nowhere else in Shakespeare's canon, but do appear in Jonson's works, provide intriguing glimpses into the inter-textual dependence of *The Tempest* on an intimate knowledge of Jonson's published opinions and customary usages.

A few examples of words unique to *The Tempest* but found in Jonson, that an audience may have localized as peculiar to him: "roarers", "furze", "zenith", "correspondent", "imposter", "fens", "marmazet", "totters", "aspersion", "corollary", "Barley", "frippery", "mushrumps" and "chesse". Some unique phrases that are found nowhere else in Shakespeare but do appear in quintessential Jonsonian passages: "use

your authority”, (Tudeau-Clayton 40) “Liberall Artes”, “in case”, “expect it”, “barns and garners”, “My Bird”.

### 3). Prosody and rhetoric

Jonas A. Barish compares the two playwrights thus: “Shakespeare belongs, on the whole, to the older school of rhetorical ornament, Jonson to the new school of anti-rhetorical naturalness. Shakespeare uses a syntax derived from Lyly, in which artful symmetry plays a cardinal role. In Jonson, syntactic effects are equally studied, but with a different purpose: to dislocate symmetry and thus create the illusion of the absence of rhetoric.” (Barish 2)

To my ear, *The Tempest’s* “rough magic” – aggressive enjambment, “weak” or double-endings, syntactic inversions, and an austere use of figures – suggests Ben Jonson’s manly defiance of Shakespeare’s Euphuism. A systematic comparison of *The Tempest’s* prosody and rhetoric with Jonson’s choices may support this impression.

### 4). Classical structure

Two aspects of *The Tempest’s* structure betray a clear Jonsonian influence: its ostentatious use of the unities of time, space and action, and its experimental use of the “four-part structure . . . invented by Terence . . . , revived by Machiavelli . . . and *naturalized* on the English stage by Ben Jonson.” (Boughner 10)

Boughner’s essay, “Jonsonian Structure in *The Tempest*” gives a compelling description of *The Tempest’s* dependence on Jonson’s neo-classical dramatic import: “Before him as he contemplated the disposition of the material of *The Tempest* . . . Shakespeare found an unembarrassing richness of theory and application.” (6) Charting the clearly dated progression of Jonson’s experiments with this structure may give us an unexpected new piece of dating evidence for *The Tempest*.

As for the unities, *The Tempest* is the first play with Shakespeare’s name on it to bother with them since his very early *Comedy of Errors*. Jonson, however, aggressively called attention to his rival’s failure in his 1616 prologue to the revised *Every Man in His Humour*. He obviously relished the challenge of sparring with classical strictures. In 1610 he perfected his game: as F. H. Mares observes, “Not only has *The Alchemist* the most complete unity of action of any of Jonson’s plays, it also observes the other two of Aristotle’s imputed unities with more exactness than any other play of Jonson’s.” (xiv)

Why would the earl of Oxford interrupt his astonishing run of expansive dramatic singularity to play the game by Benjamin’s arbitrary rules?

### 5). Masques, anti-masques and spectacles

This is well-established Jonsonian territory, implicitly acknowledged by all scholars of the play. Under King James, Jonson became a master of these hybrid entertainments, and scholars routinely turn to his work to explain phrases and stage



directions associated with the masque-like spectacles in *The Tempest*, such as these phrases taken from the First Folio edition:

- “confused noyse”
- “Solemne and strange Musicke”
- “Weake Masters”
- “Hymen’s Lamps”
- “Peacocks flye amaine”
- “Prosper on the top”
- “the Great Globe”

Full-length studies by Gary Schmidgall and John G. Demary document *The Tempest’s* many echoes of Jonson’s masques. Regardless of how Shakespeare used masques in plays printed before 1604, the unique experiments in *The Tempest* show a writer acutely aware of Ben Jonson’s Jacobean contributions to the genre. Jonson also left notes on the extensive research underlying the surface simplicity of his masques, much of which overlaps with the wide-ranging knowledge informing *The Tempest*.

**“Next to truth, a confirmed error does well.”**

Ben Jonson, induction to *Bartholomew Fair*, 1614

With Shakespeare as author of *The Tempest*, the play remains an echo chamber of enigmas and anomalies, more so than any other play in the canon. Harold Bloom’s wonderful intuition holds firm: “Mysteriously, it seems an inaugural work.” (673)

Yet once you begin looking at the play as Ben Jonson’s forgery – an error he personally confirmed in the First Folio – you’ll find premonitions of *The Tempest* throughout his collected works, as well as in the one play he chose not to preserve, *The Case is Altered*. As late as 1629, in *The New Inn* or *The Magnetic Lady* of 1631, he was still playing and replaying *The Tempest* soundtrack in his mind.

If Ben Jonson had included *The Tempest* in his own Folio of 1616, rather than in Mr. William Shakespeare’s Folio of 1623, I believe that discerning scholars after Looney would have seen the play for what it is: a brilliant pastiche and critique of Edward Oxenford’s life and work. Through his choice of sources, employment of his own dramatic innovations, and by internal references within his published works, Ben Jonson anchored *The Tempest* in the Jacobean-Jonsonian literary milieu of 1609 - 1614, safely beyond the earl of Oxford’s reach.

**Marie Merkel’s** poems have appeared in *The Carolina Quarterly* and *The New Republic*. The first three chapters of her unpublished manuscript, *The First Mousetrap: Titus Andronicus and the Tudor Massacre of the Howards* (a full-length study of the play’s topical references to Edward Oxenford’s Howard relations) appear on her website, [www.thefirstmousetrap.org](http://www.thefirstmousetrap.org). She thanks Lori DiLiddo, Nicole Doyle and Anna-Marie Saintonge for their perceptive comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

## APPENDIX A: Four Words Out, Nine New Words In

May 2010 © by Marie Merkel

The list of words that I claim, “appear nowhere else in Shakespeare’s canon, but do appear in Jonson’s works” mistakenly lists “**barley**” (“barley-broth” in *Henry V*), “imposter” (spelt uniquely with an “e” in *The Tempest*; “**impostor**” in *Alls Well* and *Pericles*), and “**fens**”. Although *Lear* has “fen-sucked”, the mistake was in taking a word from the wrong column in my notes, where “fens” appears among the rare words shared with *Coriolanus*, another likely candidate for Jonson’s forging talents. I would also withdraw “**totters**”, an insignificant sole appearance.

While not as rare as “**corollary**” or “**correspondent**”, Jonson’s use of “**fens**” (in *The Masque of Queens*, 1609) remains of interest, since we find him using or quoting these two rare *Tempest* words in a note to this couplet:

From the lakes and from the **fens**,  
From the rocks and from the dens.”

*“To which we may add this **corollary** out of Agrip. de occult. Philosop. L. 1.c.48. Saturno **correspondent** loca quoevis foetida, tenebrosa, subterranean, religiosa & funesta...”*

A translation of this passage from Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa shows Jonson researching Caliban-like territory:

*‘To Saturn correspond any places that are fetid, dark, underground, superstitious or dismal, such as cemeteries, tombs, dwellings deserted by men and ruinous with age, dark and horrible places, lonely caves, caverns, wells. Furthermore, fish-ponds, **fens**, swamps and the like.’ (Ben Jonson’s Selected Masques, by Stephen Orgel, p. 350)*

To compensate for the four words deleted from my list, I’d like to offer nine additional words from *The Tempest* that appear nowhere else in Shakespeare’s canon (using Open Source and Matty Farrow’s search engines) but do appear in Jonson’s works:

1). “**bawling**”: SEBASTIAN: “A pox o’ your throat, you bawling, blasphemous, incharitable dog!” [I,1]

Shakespeare has no “bawl” or “bawls” either. In Jonson’s response to Alexander Gill’s satire on his *Magnetick Lady* we find: “Keep in thy **bawling** wit, thou **bawling** fool” In *Bartholomew Fair*, we find: “what can any man find out in this **bawling** fellow, to grow here for?”

2). “**closeness**”: PROSPERO: “I, thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated/ To **closeness**, and the bettering of my mind...” [I, 2]

In Jonson’s *Sejanus*:

*Sejanus*:    tell the words  
You brought me the other day, of Silius,  
Add somewhat to them. Make her understand  
The danger of Sabinus, and the times,  
Out of his **closeness**. Give Arruntius’ words  
Of malice against Caesar...

3). “**wiselier**”: SEBASTIAN: “You have taken it **wiselier** than I meant you should.”  
[II, 1.]

Although we find 16 instances of “wiser”, Shakespeare has no use for “**wiselier**”. In Jonson’s *The English Grammar*, chapter XII, we find: “Many words have no comparison; as *reverend, puissant; victorious, renowned*. Others have both degrees, but lack the *positive*, as *former, foremost*. Some are formed of *adverbs*; as *wisely, wiselier, wiseliest; justly, justlier, justliest*.”

4). “**cubit**”: ANTONIO: “A space whose every cubit/ Seems to cry out, “How shall that Claribel/ measure us back to Naples?” [II, 1]

Not an exact match, but Jonson has “cubits” in *Neptune’s Triumph*: “And thus it grows: The goodly bole being got/ To certain **cubits** height, from every side/ The boughs decline”

5). “**unnecessarily**”: ANTONIO: “There be that can rule Naples/ As well as he that sleeps; lords that can prate/ as amply and **unnecessarily**/ As this Gonzalo...” [II, 1]

Shakespeare used “unnecessary” in *Lear* and *Henry V*. In Jonson’s address prefixed to *The Satyr*, he writes, “the author hath suffered to come out, and encounter censure; and not here **unnecessarily** adjoined, being performed to the same queen and prince, who were no little part of these more laboured and triumphal shews.”

6). “**feater**”: ANTONIO: “True: And look how well my garments sit upon me;/ Much **feater** than before...” [II, 1]

In Jonson’s poem, ‘In Praise of Two’:

Faustina hath the fairer face,  
And Phyllida the **feater** grace;  
Both have mine eye enriched:  
This sings full sweetly with her voice;  
Her fingers make as sweet a noise:

Both have mine ear bewitched.  
Ah me! Sith Fates have so provided,  
My heart, alas, must be divided.

7). "**undergone**": FERDINAND: "There be some sports are painful, and their labour/ delight in them sets off; some kinds of baseness/ Are nobly **undergone**..." [III, 1]

In Jonson, *The Barriers*:

Vanish, adulterate Truth! and never dare  
With proud maids' praise to press where nuptials are.  
And champions, since you see the Truth I held,  
To sacred Hymen, reconciled, yield:  
Nor (so to yield) think it the least despight:  
"It is a conquest to submit to right."  
This royal judge of our contention  
Will prop, I know, what I have **undergone**...

8). "**wetting**": TRINCULO: "That's more to me than my **wetting**; yet this is your harmless fairy, monster." [IV, 1]

In Jonson's *Miscellaneous Pieces*, an untitled "Interlude" apparently for the christening of the earl of Newcastle's son: "'Twas yours, Mrs. Wetter – and you shrunk in the **wetting** for't, if you be remembered; for she turned you away, I am sure. – Wet moons, you know, were ever good weed-springers." In *Bartholomew Fair*: "Do my Northern Cloth zhrink i'the **wetting**? ha?"

9). "**diversity**": BOATSWAIN: "Of roaring, shrieking, howling, jingling chains,/and more **diversity** of sounds, all horrible..." [V.1]

Found in Jonson's final play *The Magnetic Lady: or Humours Reconciled* (licensed 1632; publ. 1641). The passage from the Induction, in which Jonson uses this word underscores the pervasive influence of his art on the overall design of *The Tempest*:

**Boy.** My Conceit is not ripe yet: I'll tell you that anon. The *Author* beginning his Studies of this kind, with every Man in his Humour; and after every Man out of his Humour; and since, continuing in all his *Plays*, especially those of the *Comick* Thred, whereof the *New-Inn* was the last, some recent Humours still, or Manners of Men, that went along with the Times; **finding himself now near the close, or shutting up of his Circle**, hath phant'sied to himself, in *Idaea*, this *Magnetick Mistris*. A Lady, a brave bountiful House-

keeper, and a vertuous Widow: who having a young Neice, **ripe for a Man and marriageable**, he makes that **his Center attractive**, to draw thither a **diversity** of Guests, all Persons of different Humours to make up his *Perimeter*. And this he hath call'd *Humours reconcil'd*.

Jonson in his dotage is here aggressively staking out his claim to this territory. Yet every part of this induction to *The Magnetic Lady* reads like a recipe for the plot of *The Tempest*. From the “phant’sied” gathering of “humours” by the magnetic pull of Prospero’s charms, to the marriageable Miranda at the play’s attractive center, the play curiously apes Jonson’s signature *modus operandi*. In *The Tempest*’s final act, we find the great Necromancer “shutting up” his circle in a most Jonsonian manner, surrounded by “all Persons of different Humours” at his *Perimeter*. Throughout the play, the author of *The Tempest* moves his **diversity** of guests about like puppets or pawns in Prospero’s egocentric game of *Humours reconcil’d*.

### **Bibliography:**

- Barish, Jonas A.** *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy*. New York: Norton, 1960.
- Barton, Anne.** *Ben Jonson, Dramatist*. London: Cambridge University Press, London, 1984.
- Bednarz, James P.** *Shakespeare & the Poet’s War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Boughner, Daniel C.** “Jonsonian Structure in *The Tempest*”. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Winter 1970), pp. 3-10 [Jstor, Web, 04/01/09].
- Burnett, Mark Thornton.** *Constructing ‘Monsters’ in Shakespearean Drama and Early Modern Culture*. New York, Palgrave, 2002.
- Demary, John G.** *Shakespeare and the Spectacles of Strangeness: The Tempest and the Transformation of Renaissance Theatrical Forms*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.
- Drummond, William.** *Discoveries, 1641/Ben Jonson. Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, 1619*. London: John Lane the Bodley Head Ltd., 1923.
- Greenwood, George.** *Ben Jonson and Shakespeare*. Hartford: Edwin Valentine Mitchell, 1921.
- Jonson, Ben.** *The Alchemist*. Ed. F.H. Mares. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Jonson, Ben.** *Bartholomew Fair*, from *Ben Jonson: Selected Works*. New York: Random House, 1938.
- Jonson, Ben.** *The Case is Altered*. Ed. William Edward Selin. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.
- Jonson, Ben.** *Timber: or Discoveries made upon Men and Matter*. London: The Bodley Head, 1923.

- Looney, J.T.** *Shakespeare Identified*. London: C. Palmer, 1920.
- Lucking, David.** *The Shakespearean Name: Essays on Romeo and Juliet, The Tempest, and other plays*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- McAvoy, William C.**, Review. of “Ralph Crane and Some Shakespeare First Folio Comedies” by T.H. Howard-Hill. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Winter, 1975). Jstor, *Web*, February 2, 2009.
- Miles, Rosalind.** *Ben Jonson: His Life and Work*. London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Murphy, Patrick M. ed.** *The Tempest: Critical Essays*. New York and London: Routledge, 2001.
- Riggs, David.** *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Schmidgall, Gary. *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Shakespeare, William.** *The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and T. Alden. London: Arden Shakespeare/Thomson Learning, 1999.
- Shapiro, James S.** *Rival Playwrights*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Sokol, B.J.** *A Brave New World of Knowledge: Shakespeare's "The Tempest" and Early Modern Epistemology*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003.
- Tudeau-Clayton, Margaret.** *Jonson, Shakespeare and Early Modern Virgil*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.