We recognize that not everyone would choose the issues we have selected for this edition of *The Tempest*. While we believe that these issues are central to reading the play at the beginning of the new millennium, we also acknowledge that it is in the nature of controversy itself that some readers of this edition will object that certain issues have been excluded or marginalized while others have been unduly privileged. We welcome this kind of criticism — and invite those who want to make it to tell us which controversies they think should take precedence over the ones we have chosen or which contributions to our controversies they would like to see added or deleted.

We also recognize that conflict and controversy are not themselves neutral terms. "Learning by controversy" may strike some of you — and some of your teachers — as a symptom of a masculinist professional and cultural ethic, one that rewards critical John Waynes who excel in shootouts with rival critics and critical schools. Others may be put off by the aridly legalistic feel of an approach to literature that may seem to treat authors as accused parties facing trial, with their fates in the hands of critical prosecuting attorneys and defense lawyers. We want to be clear that for us the aim of literary education is not to determine who is the best critical prosecuting attorney or fastest critical gunslinger (or, for that matter, bullslinger). The reason for introducing you to critical conflicts is not to encourage you to unleash your aggressions but to help you excel in the kind of analysis and reasoned argument that will make you an effective citizen as well as a good student. If our approach runs the risk of turning classroom discussions into the academic equivalent of Western shootouts or bad prosecutorial bullying, it also has the potential to generate significant breakthroughs in teaching and learning. The first key is to distinguish between productive and unproductive critical controversies; the second is to engage with these controversies in ways that open up insights into texts rather than merely lock us into frustrating oppositions or elevate winning over understanding.

You be the judge. "Why study critical controversies?" See how you might answer our initial question after you've worked through the texts in the rest of this book.

The Tempest: A Case Study in Critical Controversy - Gerald Graff + James Phelan - Boston: Bedford 2000

Literary Study, Politics, and Shakespeare: A Debate

These two brief essays suggest how the battle lines have typically been drawn (and perhaps overdrawn) in recent debates over the new emphasis on politics and ideology in the academic study of literature and of Shakespeare in particular. ***Newsweek*** columnist George Will and Renaissance scholar Stephen Greenblatt disagree sharply over the appropriateness of interpretations that see the politics of imperialism in classics like *The Tempest*.

Will's piece was immediately occasioned by a controversy that erupted in 1991 when Lynne V. Cheney, who had been appointed by President Ronald Reagan as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, nominated Carol Iannone to be a member of the NEH advisory board. Iannone's nomination was opposed by the Executive Council of the Modern Language Association, the nation's largest organization of humanities professors. The MLA claimed to oppose the nomination because Iannone lacked scholarly credentials, but critics charged that its real objection was to Iannone's conservative political leanings. Since the NEH is one of the leading sources of funds for academic humanities research, the struggle between NEH and MLA represented a larger conflict over the kinds of academic work that merit public support and the place of politics in relation to such decisions. Similar conflicts have arisen over the funding of controversial or offensive art by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Though Will and Greenblatt claim to speak for no one but themselves, it seems significant that it is the journalist who attacks political readings and the academic scholar who defends them. Will's argument implicitly speaks for the nonacademic common reader against the academic expert, suggesting that the academics who reinterpret Shakespeare in the light of colonialism, feminism, and other current preoccupations are rendering the plays unrecognizable to the ordinary reader and playgoer. Greenblatt replies by arguing that these preoccupations with political power were not at all unfamiliar to Shakespeare and his audience, and that recognizing the presence of issues of colonialism and slavery in Shakespeare should deepen the ordinary reader's pleasure rather than undermine it.

GEORGE WILL

Literary Politics

George Will (b. 1941) is a Pulitzer Prize–winning political commentator who writes a widely syndicated newspaper column and a biweekly column for *Newsweek*, and appears regularly on the ABC television network. Before embarking on his career in journalism, Will taught political philosophy at Michigan State University and the University of Toronto. Before joining the staff of *Newsweek*, Will served as Washington editor of the conservative *National Review*. The following selection is a column that appeared in the April 22, 1991, issue of *Newsweek*.

The Modern Language Association's opposition to the nomination of Carol Iannone to the National Council on the Humanities is not quite sufficient reason for supporting her. But MLA hostility is nearly necessary for creating confidence in anyone proposed for a position of cultural importance. The president nominated Iannone at the behest of the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Lynne Cheney, to whom the council tenders advice. The MLA, composed mostly of professors of literature and languages, is shocked — shocked! — that people suspect it of political motives. Oh? The MLA is saturated with the ideology that politics permeates everything. The unvarnished truth is that the MLA's sniffy complaint amounts to this: Iannone is not "one of us." Her writings confirm that virtue.

She teaches at NYU and is vice president of the National Association of Scholars, a burgeoning organization resisting the politicization of higher education. She is a trenchant critic of the watery Marxism that has gone to earth in the MLA and elsewhere on campuses. Academic Marxists deny the autonomy of culture, explaining it as a "reflection" of other forces, thereby draining culture of its dignity. The reduction of the study of literature to sociology, and of sociology to mere ideological assertion, has a central tenet: All literature is, whether writers are conscious of it or not, political.

Writers, say the academics Iannone refutes, are captives of the conditioning of their class, sex, race. All literature on which canonical status is conferred represents the disguised or unexamined assumptions and interests of the dominant class, sex, race. Hence culture is oppressive and a literary canon is an instrument of domination. This ideology radically devalues authors and elevates the ideologists — the critics — as indispensable decoders of literature, all of which is, by definition, irreducibly political.

Shakespeare's "Tempest" reflects the imperialist rape of the Third World. Emily Dickinson's poetic references to peas and flower buds are encoded messages of feminist rage, exulting clitoral masturbation to protest the prison of patriarchal sex roles. Jane Austen's supposed serenity masks boiling fury about male domination, expressed in the nastiness of minor characters who are "really" not minor. In "Wuthering Heights," Emily Brontë, a subtle subversive, has Catherine bitten by a *male* bulldog. Melville's white whale? Probably a penis. Grab a harpoon!

The supplanting of esthetic by political responses to literature makes literature primarily interesting as a mere index of who had power and whom the powerful victimized. For example, feminist literary criticism is presented as a political act, liberating women writers from the oppression of "patriarchal literary standards." Thus does criticism dovetail with the political agenda of victimology. The agenda is the proliferation of groups nursing grievances and demanding entitlements. The multiplication of grievances is (if radicals will pardon the expression) the core curriculum of universities that are transformed into political instruments. That curriculum aims at delegitimizing Western civilization by discrediting the books and ideas that gave birth to it.

Iannone tartly criticizes the "eruption of group politics in literature," noting that many scholarly activities, from the shaping of curriculums to the bestowing of academic awards, have become instruments of racial, ethnic and sexual reparations for Western civilization's sins. The left's agenda does liberate, in this perverse way: it emancipates literature

from the burden of esthetic standards. All such standards are defined as merely sublimated assertions of power by society's dominant group. So all critics and authors from particular victim groups should be held only to the political standards of their group. Administration of these, and of the resulting racial and sexual spoils system in the academy, "requires" group politics: Under the spreading chestnut tree, I tenure you and you tenure me.

As esthetic judgments are politicized, political judgments are estheticized: the striking of poses and the enjoyment of catharsis are central in the theater of victimization in academic life. All this, although infantile, is not trivial. By "deconstructing," or politically decoding, or otherwise attacking the meaning of literary works, critics strip literature of its authority. Criticism displaces literature and critics displace authors as bestowers of meaning.

It might seem odd, even quixotic, that today's tenured radicals have congregated in literature departments, where the practical consequences of theory are obscure. Obscure, but not negligible. As James Atlas writes, the transmission of the culture that unites, even defines America — transmission through knowledge of literature and history — is faltering. The result is collective amnesia and deculturation. That prefigures social disintegration, which is the political goal of the victim revolution that is sweeping campuses.

HIGH-INTENSITY WAR

The fight over Iannone's nomination is particularly important precisely because you have not hitherto heard of it or her. The fight is paradigmatic of the many small skirmishes that rarely rise to public attention but cumulatively condition the nation's cultural, and then political, life. In this low-visibility, high-intensity war, Lynne Cheney is secretary of domestic defense. The foreign adversaries her husband, Dick, must keep at bay are less dangerous, in the long run, than the domestic forces with which she must deal. Those forces are fighting against the conservation of the common culture that is the nation's social cement. She, even more than a Supreme Court justice, deals with constitutional things. The real Constitution, which truly constitutes America, is the national mind as shaped by the intellectual legacy that gave rise to the Constitution and all the habits, mores, customs and ideas that sustain it.

There has been a historic reversal: Many of the most enlightened defenders of our cultural patrimony are now out in the "practical" world, including government, and many philistines are in the academies shaping tomorrow's elites, and hence tomorrow's governance. That is why Lynne Cheney and Carol Iannone matter more than do most of the things that get the public's attention.

STEPHEN GREENBLATT

The Best Way to Kill Our Literary Inheritance Is to Turn It into a Decorous Celebration of the New World Order

---

Stephen Greenblatt (b. 1943), after many years at the University of California at Berkeley, is now professor of English and American literature at Harvard University. One of the most influential contemporary critics of Renaissance literature and culture, Greenblatt has been, since the 1970s, instrumental in the rise of the critical movement known as New Historicism. Greenblatt's many influential books include *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980), *Shakespearean Negotiations* (1988), *Learning to Curse* (1990), and *Marvelous Possessions* (1991). He is also the general editor of *The Norton Shakespeare* (1997). This essay originally appeared in response to Will's article, on June 12, 1991, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

The columnist George F. Will recently declared that Lynne V. Cheney, the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, is "secretary of domestic defense."

"The foreign adversaries her husband, Dick, must keep at bay," Mr. Will wrote, "are less dangerous, in the long run, than the domestic forces with which she must deal." Who are these homegrown enemies, more dangerous even than Saddam Hussein with his arsenal of chemical weapons? The answer: professors of literature. You know, the kind of people who belong to that noted terrorist organization, the Modern Language Association.

Mr. Will, who made these allegations in *Newsweek* (April 22), doesn't name names — I suppose the brandishing of a list of the insidious fifth column's members is yet to come — but he does mention, as typical of the disease afflicting Western civilization, the professor who suggests that Shakespeare's *Tempest* is somehow about imperialism.

This a curious example — since it is very difficult to argue that *The Tempest* is *not* about imperialism. (It is, of course, about many other things, as well, including the magical power of the theater.) The play — set on a mysterious island over whose inhabitants a European prince has assumed absolute control — is full of conspicuous allusions to contemporary debates over the project of colonization: The Virginia Company's official report on the state of its New World colony and the account by William Strachey, secretary of the settlement at Jamestown, of a violent storm and shipwreck off the coast of Bermuda, are examples.

Colonialism was not simply a given of the period. The great Spanish Dominican, Bartolomé de Las Casas, argued that his countrymen should leave the New World, since they were bringing only exploitation and violence. Spanish jurists like Francisco de Vitoria presented cases against the enslavement of the Indians and against the claim to imperial possession of the Americas. The most searing attack on colonialism in the sixteenth century was written by the French essayist Montaigne, who in "Of Cannibals" wrote admiringly of the Indians and in "Of Coaches" lamented the whole European enterprise: "So many cities razed, so many nations exterminated, so many millions of people put to the sword, and the richest and most beautiful part of the world turned upside down, for the traffic in pearls and pepper!" We know that Shakespeare read Montaigne; one of the characters in *The Tempest* quotes from "Of Cannibals."

Shakespeare's imagination was clearly gripped by the conflict between the prince and the "savage" Caliban (is it too obvious to note the anagrammatic play on "cannibal"?). Caliban, enslaved by Prospero, bitterly challenges the European's right to sovereignty. The island was his birthright, he claims, and was unjustly taken from him. Caliban's claim is not upheld in *The Tempest*, but neither is it simply dismissed, and at the enigmatic close of the play all of the Europeans — every one of them — leave the island.

These are among the issues that literary scholars investigate and encourage their students to consider, and I would think that the columnists who currently profess an ardent interest in our cultural heritage would approve.

But for some of them such an investigation is an instance of what is intolerable — a wicked plot by renegade professors bent on sabotaging Western civilization by delegitimizing its founding texts and ideas. Such critics want a tame and orderly canon. The painful, messy struggles over

rights and values, the political and sexual and ethical dilemmas that great art has taken upon itself to articulate and to grapple with, have no place in their curriculum. For them, what is at stake is the staunch reaffirmation of a shared and stable culture that is, as Mr. Will puts it, "the nation's social cement." Also at stake is the transmission of that culture to passive students.

But art, the art that matters, is not cement. It is mobile, complex, elusive, disturbing. A love of literature may help to forge community, but it is a community founded on imaginative freedom, the play of language, and scholarly honesty, and not on flag waving, boosterism, and conformity.

The best way to kill our literary inheritance is to turn it into a decorous liturgical celebration of the new world order. Poets cannot soar when their feet are stuck in social cement.

The student of Shakespeare who asks about racism, misogyny, or anti-Semitism is not on the slippery slope toward what George Will calls "collective amnesia and deculturation." He or she is on the way to understanding something about *Othello*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *The Merchant of Venice*. It is, I believe, all but impossible to understand these plays without grappling with the dark energies upon which Shakespeare's art so powerfully draws.

And it is similarly difficult to come to terms with what *The Tempest* has to teach us about forgiveness, wisdom, and social atonement if we do not also come to terms with its relations to colonialism.

If we allow ourselves to think about the extent to which our magnificent cultural tradition — like that of every civilization we know of — is intertwined with cruelty, injustice, and pain, do we not, in fact, run the risk of "deculturation"? Not if our culture includes a regard for truth. Does this truth mean that we should despise or abandon great art?

Of course not.

Like most teachers, I am deeply committed to passing on the precious heritage of our language, and I take seriously the risk of collective amnesia. Yet there seems to me a far greater risk if professors of literature, frightened by intemperate attacks upon them in the press, refuse to ask the most difficult questions about the past — the risk that we might turn our artistic inheritance into a simple, reassuring, soporific lie.

Sources and Contexts

Unlike most of Shakespeare's plays, *The Tempest* was not based on any earlier story or work. The play does, however, reflect the influence of several contemporary documents that suggested situations, ideas, and language that Shakespeare borrowed and adapted to his purposes. We hope that reading these materials on the sources of *The Tempest* alongside the play itself will help you see how history — and historical conflict — can enter into the form and content of a major literary work.

The most famous of these sources is an essay "Of the Cannibals," by the French writer Michel de Montaigne, which in 1603 appeared in an English translation by John Florio, a translation that Shakespeare is believed to have read. Montaigne's argument that the natural state in which cannibals live is superior in virtue and innocence to the condition of civilization is echoed in Gonzalo's speech on the innocence of nature in *The Tempest*, 2.1. Montaigne's meditation on cannibals may have also suggested the name "Caliban" to Shakespeare.

The other major source reflected in the play is a set of written accounts that reached England in 1610 of a shipwreck near the Bermuda islands in the summer of 1609. These so-called Bermuda pamphlets describe a storm encountered by a fleet of nine English ships, one of which was given up for lost but whose survivors sailed almost a year later into the port of Jamestown, Virginia. We include here two excerpts from these accounts, one by William Strachey, the other by

Sylvester Jourdain. Interestingly for readers of *The Tempest*, these accounts present sharply contrasting images of nature. On the one hand, there is the "dreadful storm and hideous" described by Strachey (p. 121 in this volume) and "the dangerous and dreaded" Bermuda islands the sailors expect —"the Devil's islands . . . feared and avoided by all sea travellers alive above any other place in the world" (p. 122). On the other hand, there is the paradise the sailors do find, described succinctly by Jourdain as a "country so abundantly fruitful of all fit necessaries for the sustenation and preservation of man's life" (p. 124). These clashing views of nature — is it the opposite of civilization or the harmonious complement to it? — become a central theme of *The Tempest*.

The question of whether nature is good or evil is at the heart of the problem of Caliban, insofar as he resembles the "natives" who were being encountered by European travelers and adventurers. Were such native "Others" human and worthy of respect, or were they "natural" in the worst sense, subhuman savages who could be conquered, enslaved, or slaughtered with impunity? The sharply clashing views of Shakespeare's contemporaries over this question of the natural man are dramatized by Richard Hakluyt's "Reasons for Colonization" (1585) and Bartolomé de Las Casas's "Letter to Philip, Great Prince of Spain" (1550).

Hakluyt's "Reasons for Colonization" reveals that supposedly enlightened Englishmen had few scruples about conquering and dominating the Indians of the New World. In his enumeration of the various justifications for colonizing the New World, Hakluyt takes for granted a kind of entitlement on the part of English:

> The ends of this voyage are these:
> 1. To plant Christian religion.
> 2. To traffic [i.e., trade].
> 3. To conquer.
> } Or, to do all three.

From Hakluyt's perspective, the desires of the natives themselves were obviously not worth mentioning.

In view of documents like Hakluyt's, it is tempting to assume that the emergence of humane attitudes toward distant peoples had to wait till the advent of modern democratic times. Nor is it surprising that readers often find hopelessly improbable and anachronistic the suggestion that Shakespeare conveys some partial sympathy for Caliban. It is noteworthy, however, that even Hakluyt defines limits beyond which the colonizers must not go:

> But if, seeking revenge on every injury of the savages, we seek blood and raise war, our vines, our olives, our fig trees, our sugar-canes,

> our oranges and lemons, corn, cattle, etc., will be destroyed and trade of merchandize in all things overthrown. (p. 132)

Such passages indicate that the colonizers did at times have misgivings about the consequences of militaristic colonization, even if those misgivings were predominantly about economic consequences.

These misgivings rise to the level of articulate moral protest in Las Casas's powerful letter of 1550 to the king of Spain, which demonstrates that some Europeans of this period did regard the conquest of the New World as a serious violation of Christian principles. Protesting that "the Indians are being brought to the point of extermination," Las Casas invokes the principle that "seizing what belongs to others and increasing one's property by shedding human blood" (p. 138) is indefensible for any nation that claims to be Christian.

Finally, the chapter we have included on the historical context of *The Tempest* by current historian Ronald Takaki from his *A Different Mirror* (1993) provides further evidence of the tensions felt by Shakespeare's contemporaries in their attitudes toward New World Indians. For the most part, these attitudes assumed the unquestioned superiority of European culture, which at the time the play was written, according to Takaki, had begun to use such native peoples to delineate "the border, the hierarchical division between civilization and wildness" (p. 149). The supposed laziness and "savagery" of the Indians justified the English in dispossessing them (p. 158), just as similar beliefs about the Irish, Takaki notes, justified English rule over Ireland. *The Tempest*, according to Takaki, can be approached "as a defining moment in the making of an English-American identity based on race" (p. 142). The only issue in dispute seems to have been whether the Indians were unregenerate devils or capable of being "civilized." Yet despite this dominant attitude, Takaki points out that counterviews did exist: for example, Pope Paul III had proclaimed that Indians "should not be deprived of their liberty and property" despite being outside the Christian faith (pp. 150–51). "Clearly," Takaki argues, "Caliban was no mere victim: capable of acculturation, he could express his anger" (p. 151).

MICHEL DE MONTAIGNE

From Of the Cannibals

Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592) was a French courtier and author of *Essais*, the extensive collection of philosophical writings that was instrumental in establishing the essay as a literary form. Educated at the Collège de Guyenne at Bordeaux and then as a lawyer, probably at Toulouse, Montaigne spent the early years of his adult life in the public realm. Though he would always remain engaged in public life (serving as the mayor of Bordeaux from 1581–1585, for example), in 1571, he sold his seat in Parliament and began work on the *Essais*, a project that would occupy him for the rest of his life. The first two volumes of *Essais* were published in 1580; "Of the Cannibals," which appears here, was one of those in the first volume. This excerpt, translated by John Florio, is reprinted from the Signet Classic paperback edition of *The Tempest*, edited by Robert Langbaum (New York: Penguin, 1998).

. . . I find (as far as I have been informed) there is nothing in that nation [the American Indians], that is either barbarous or savage, unless men call that barbarism which is not common to them. As indeed, we have no other aim of truth and reason than the example and idea of the opinions and customs of the country we live in. There is ever perfect religion, perfect policy, perfect and complete use of all things. They are even savage, as we call those fruits wild which nature of herself and of her ordinary progress hath produced; whereas indeed, they are those which ourselves have altered by our artificial devices, and diverted from their common order, we should rather term savage. In those are the true and most profitable virtues and natural properties most lively and vigorous, which in these we have bastardized, applying them to the pleasure of our corrupted taste. And if notwithstanding, in divers fruits of those countries that were never tilled, we shall find that, in respect of ours, they are most excellent and as delicate unto our taste, there is no reason art should gain the point of honor of our great and puissant mother Nature. We have so much by our inventions surcharged the beauties and riches of her works that we have altogether overchoked her; yet wherever her purity shineth, she makes our vain and frivolous enterprises wonderfully ashamed. . . .

All our endeavor or wit cannot so much as reach to represent the nest of the last birdlet, its contexture, beauty, profit and use, no nor the web of a seely spider. "All things," saith Plato, "are produced either by nature, by fortune, or by art. The greatest and fairest by one or other of the two first, the least and imperfect by the last." Those nations seem therefore so barbarous unto me, because they have received very little fashion from human wit and are yet near their original naturality. The laws of nature do yet command them, which are but little bastardized by ours, and that with such purity, as I am sometimes grieved the knowledge of it came no sooner to light, at what time there were men that better than we could have judged of it. I am sorry Lycurgus and Plato had it not; for me seemeth that what in those nations we see by experience, doth not only exceed all the pictures wherewith licentious Poesy hath proudly embellished the golden age, and all her quaint inventions to fain a happy condition of man, but also the conception and desire of Philosophy. They could not imagine a genuity so pure and simple as we see it by experience; nor ever believe our society might be maintained with so little art and humane combination. It is a nation, would I answer Plato, that hath no kind of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no intelligence of numbers, no name of magistrate, nor of politic superiority; no use of service, of riches, or of poverty; no contracts, no successions, no partitions, no occupation but idle; no respect of kindred but common, no apparel but natural, no manuring of lands, no use of wine, corn, or metal. The very words that import lying, falsehood, treason, dissimulations, covetousness, envy, detraction, and pardon, were never heard of amongst them. How dissonant would he find his imaginary commonwealth from this perfection? . . .

Furthermore, they live in a country of so exceeding pleasant and temperate situation that, as my testimonies have told me, it is very rare to see a sick body amongst them; and they have further assured me they never saw any man there either shaking with the palsy, toothless, with eyes dropping, or crooked and stooping through age.

I am not sorry we note the barbarous horror of such an action, but grieved that, prying so narrowly into their faults, we are so blinded in ours. I think there is more barbarism in eating men alive than to feed upon them being dead; to mangle by tortures and torments a body full of lively sense, to roast him in pieces, to make dogs and swine to gnaw and tear him in mammocks (as we have not only read but seen very lately, yea and in our own memory, not amongst ancient enemies but our neighbors and fellow citizens; and which is worse, under pretense of piety and religion) than to roast and eat him after he is dead.

WILLIAM STRACHEY

From True Repertory of the Wrack

William Strachey (1572–1621), a Cambridge-educated historian, sailed to Virginia in 1609 with the appointed governor of the colony of Virginia, Sir Thomas Gates. On the journey, their ship encountered a storm and wrecked in the Bermudas, where Strachey and the other passengers remained for almost a year before building two new ships and continuing their trip to Virginia. "True Repertory of the Wrack," a letter written by Strachey to an unidentified woman, is one of several accounts of the shipwreck Shakespeare is believed to have read before composing *The Tempest.* Strachey is also known for his writing about Virginia, published as *Historie of Travaille into Virginia Britannia,* written after the group finally reached their destination. This excerpt from "True Repertory" comes from the Signet Classic paperback edition of *The Tempest,* edited by Robert Langbaum (New York: Penguin, 1998).

A dreadful storm and hideous began to blow from out the northeast, which swelling and roaring as it were by fits, some hours with more violence than others, at length did beat all light from heaven; which like an hell of darkness turned black upon us, so much the more fuller of horror, as in such cases horror and fear use to overrun the troubled and overmastered senses of all, which (taken up with amazement) the ears lay so sensible to the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds, and distraction of our company, as who was most armed and best prepared was not a little shaken.

For four and twenty hours the storm in a restless tumult had blown so exceedingly, as we could not apprehend in our imaginations any possibility of greater violence, yet did we still find it, not only more terrible, but more constant, fury added to fury, and one storm urging a second more outrageous than the former; whether it so wrought upon our fears or indeed met with new forces. Sometimes strikes [shrieks?] in our ship amongst women and passengers not used to such hurly and discomforts made us look one upon the other with troubled hearts and panting bosoms; our clamors drowned in the winds, and the winds in thunder. Prayers might well be in the heart and lips, but drowned in the outcries of the officers. Nothing heard that could give comfort,

nothing seen that might encourage hope. . . . It could not be said to rain, the waters like whole rivers did flood in the air. . . . Here the glut of water (as if throttling the wind erewhile) was no sooner a little emptied and qualified, but instantly the winds (as having gotten their mouths now free and at liberty) spake more loud and grew tumultuous and malignant. . . . There was not a moment in which the sudden splitting or instant oversetting of the ship was not expected.

Howbeit this was not all. It pleased God to bring a greater affliction yet upon us; for in the beginning of the storm we had received likewise a mighty leak. And the ship . . . was grown five foot suddenly deep with water above her ballast, and we almost drowned within whilst we sat looking when to perish from above. This, imparting no less terror than danger, ran through the whole ship with much fright and amazement, startled and turned the blood, and took down the braves of the most hardy mariner of them all, insomuch as he that before happily felt not the sorrow of others, now began to sorrow for himself when he saw such a pond of water so suddenly broken in, and which he knew could not (without present avoiding) but instantly sink him. . . .

Once, so huge a sea brake upon the poop and quarter upon us, as it covered our ship from stern to stem, like a garment or a vast cloud, it filled her brim full for a while within, from the hatches up to the spar deck. . . . with much clamor encouraged and called upon others; who gave her now up, rent in pieces and absolutely lost.

. . . Sir George Sommers, when no man dreamed of such happiness, had discovered and cried land. . . . We were enforced to run her ashore as near the land as we could, which brought us within three-quarters of a mile of shore. . . .

We found it to be the dangerous and dreaded island, or rather islands of the Bermuda; whereof let me give your Ladyship a brief description before I proceed to my narration. And that the rather, because they be so terrible to all that ever touched on them, and such tempests, thunders, and other fearful objects are seen and heard about them, that they be called commonly the Devil's Islands, and are feared and avoided of all sea travelers alive above any other place in the world. Yet it pleased our merciful God to make even this hideous and hated place both the place of our safety and means of our deliverance.

And hereby also, I hope to deliver the world from a foul and general error: it being counted of most that they can be no habitation for men, but rather given over to devils and wicked spirits. Whereas indeed we find them now by experience to be as habitable and commodious as

most countries of the same climate and situation; insomuch as if the entrance into them were as easy as the place itself is contenting, it had long ere this been inhabited as well as other islands. Thus shall we make it appear that Truth is the daughter of Time, and that men ought not to deny everything which is not subject to their own sense.

SYLVESTER JOURDAIN

From A Discovery of the Barmudas

Sylvester Jourdain (?–1650?), like William Strachey, was a passenger on the *Sea Venture,* the ship that wrecked in the Bermudas in 1609 before reaching its destination of Virginia; he also wrote an account of the wreck, one that presents a slightly more jovial image of the survivors' encounter with the Bermudas. Little is known of Jourdain's life; he was a resident of Lyme Regis in Dorsetshire and had a wealthy brother, who worked as a merchant and was a member of Parliament. Jourdain himself may have been a merchant; a shipper by the same name is listed in the Port Book of Poole in 1603. This excerpt from *A Discovery of the Barmudas* is reprinted from the Signet Classic paperback edition of *The Tempest,* edited by Robert Langbaum (New York: Penguin, 1998).

. . . All our men, being utterly spent, tired, and disabled for longer labor, were even resolved, without any hope of their lives, to shut up the hatches and to have committed themselves to the mercy of the sea (which is said to be merciless) or rather to the mercy of their mighty God and redeemer. . . . So that some of them, having some good and comfortable waters in the ship, fetched them and drunk the one to the other, taking their last leave one of the other, until their more joyful and happy meeting in a more blessed world; when it pleased God out of His most gracious and merciful providence, so to direct and guide our ship (being left to the mercy of the sea) for her most advantage; that Sir George Somers . . . most wishedly happily descried land; whereupon he most comfortably encouraged the company to follow their pumping, and by no means to cease bailing out of the water. . . . Through which weak means it pleased God to work so strongly as the water was stayed

for that little time (which, as we all much feared, was the last period of our breathing) and the ship kept from present sinking, when it pleased God to send her within half an English mile of that land that Sir George Somers had not long before descried — which were the islands of the Barmudas. And there neither did our ship sink, but more fortunately in so great a misfortune fell in between two rocks, where she was fast lodged and locked for further budging.

But our delivery was not more strange in falling so opportunely and happily upon the land, as our feeding and preservation was beyond our hopes and all men's expectations most admirable. For the islands of the Barmudas, as every man knoweth that hath heard or read of them, were never inhabited by any Christian or heathen people, but ever esteemed and reputed a most prodigious and enchanted place affording nothing but gusts, storms, and foul weather; which made every navigator and mariner to avoid them, as Scylla and Charybdis, or as they would shun the Devil himself; and no man was ever heard to make for the place, but as against their wills, they have by storms and dangerousness of the rocks, lying seven leagues into the sea, suffered shipwrack. Yet did we find there the air so temperate and the country so abundantly fruitful of all fit necessaries for the sustenation and preservation of man's life, that most in a manner of all our provisions of bread, beer, and victual being quite spoiled in lying long drowned in salt water, notwithstanding we were there for the space of nine months (few days over or under) not only well refreshed, comforted, and with good satiety contented but, out of the abundance thereof, provided us some reasonable quantity and proportion of provision to carry us for Virginia and to maintain ourselves and that company we found there, to the great relief of them, as it fell out in their so great extremities . . . until it pleased God . . . that their store was better supplied. And greater and better provisions we might have had, if we had had better means for the storing and transportation thereof. Wherefore my opinion sincerely of this island is, that whereas it hath been and is full accounted the most dangerous, unfortunate, and most forlorn place of the world, it is in truth the richest, healthfulest, and pleasing land (the quantity and bigness thereof considered) and merely natural, as ever man set foot upon.

RICHARD HAKLUYT

Reasons for Colonization

Richard Hakluyt (1552?–1616), born to a family with connections among merchants, geographers, and explorers, was the first professor of modern geography at Oxford. He wrote at length about the topic of English colonization and was an especially strong advocate for colonizing North America, in the hopes of establishing northern passages to the Orient. His interest in such a venture is documented in various writings, including early works such as *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America* (1582) and *The Discourse on the Western Planting* (a report on the Virginia colonial project written in 1584 but not published until 1877). His colonial interests can also be seen in his major work, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffics, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1598–1600). This piece, "Reasons for Colonization" (1585), is reprinted from *The Elizabethans' America: A Collection of Early Reports by Englishmen on the New World*, edited by Louis B. Wright (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).

1. The glory of God by planting of religion among those infidels.
2. The increase of the force of the Christians.
3. The possibility of the enlarging of the dominions of the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, and consequently of her honour, revenues, and of her power by this enterprise.
4. An ample vent in time to come of the woollen cloths of England, especially those of the coarsest sorts, to the maintenance of our poor, that else starve or become burdensome to the realm; and vent also of sundry our commodities upon the tract of that firm land, and possibly in other regions from the northern side of that main.
5. A great possibility of further discoveries of other regions from the north part of the same land by sea, and of unspeakable honour and benefit that may rise upon the same by the trades to ensue in Japan, China, and Cathay, etc.
6. By return thence, this realm shall receive woad, oil, wines, hops, salt, and most or all the commodities that we receive from the best parts of Europe, and we shall receive the same better cheap than now we receive them, as we may use the matter.

7. Receiving the same thence, the navy, the human strength of this realm, our merchants and their goods, shall not be subject to arrest of ancient enemies and doubtful friends as of late years they have been.

8. If our nation do not make any conquest there but only use traffic and change of commodities, yet, by means the country is not very mighty but divided into petty kingdoms, they shall not dare to offer us any great annoy but such as we may easily revenge with sufficient chastisement to the unarmed people there.

9. Whatsoever commodities we receive by the Steelyard Merchants, or by our own merchants from Eastland, be it flax, hemp, pitch, tar, masts, clapboard, wainscot, or such-like; the like good[s] may we receive from the north and north-east part of that country near unto Cape Breton, in return for our coarse woollen cloths, flannels, and rugs fit for those colder regions.

10. The passage to and fro is through the main ocean sea, so as we are not in danger of any enemy's coast.

11. In the voyage we are not to cross the burnt zone, nor to pass through frozen seas encumbered with ice and fogs, but in temperate climate at all times of the year; and it requireth not, as the East Indies voyage doth, the taking in of water in divers places, by reason that it is to be sailed in five or six weeks; and by the shortness the merchant may yearly make two returns (a factory once being erected there), a matter in trade of great moment.

12. In this trade by the way, in our pass to and fro, we have in tempests and other haps all the ports of Ireland to our aid and no near coast of any enemy.

13. By this ordinary trade we may annoy the enemies to Ireland and succour the Queen's Majesty's friends there, and in time we may from Virginia yield them whatsoever commodity they now receive from the Spaniard; and so the Spaniards shall want the ordinary victual that heretofore they received yearly from thence, and so they shall not continue trade, nor fall so aptly in practice against this government as now by their trade thither they may.

14. We shall, as it is thought, enjoy in this voyage either some small islands to settle on or some one place or other on the firm land to fortify for the safety of our ships, our men, and our goods, the like whereof we have not in any foreign place of our traffic, in which respect we may be in degree of more safety and more quiet.

15. The great plenty of buff hides and of many other sundry kinds of hides there now presently to be had, the trade of whale and seal fishing and of divers other fishings in the great rivers, great bays, and seas there, shall presently defray the charge in good part or in all of the first enterprise, and so we shall be in better case than our men were in Russia, where many years were spent and great sums of money consumed before gain was found.

16. The great broad rivers of that main that we are to enter into, so many leagues navigable or portable into the mainland, lying so long a tract with so excellent and so fertile a soil on both sides, do seem to promise all things that the life of man doth require and whatsoever men may wish that are to plant upon the same or to traffic in the same.

17. And whatsoever notable commodity the soil within or without doth yield in so long a tract, that is to be carried out from thence to England, the same rivers so great and deep do yield no small benefit for the sure, safe, easy, and cheap carriage of the same to shipboard, be it of great bulk or of great weight.

18. And in like sort whatsoever commodity of England the inland people there shall need, the same rivers do work the like effect in benefit for the incarriage of the same aptly, easily, and cheaply.

19. If we find the country populous and desirous to expel us and injuriously to offend us, that seek but just and lawful traffic, then, by reason that we are lords of navigation and they not so, we are the better able to defend ourselves by reason of those great rivers and to annoy them in many places.

20. Where there be many petty kings or lords planted on the rivers' sides, and [who] by all likelihood maintain the frontiers of their several territories by wars, we may by the aid of this river join with this king here, or with that king there, at our pleasure, and may so with a few men be revenged of any wrong offered by any of them; or may, if we will proceed with extremity, conquer, fortify, and plant in soils most sweet, most pleasant, most strong, and most fertile, and in the end bring them all in subjection and to civility.

21. The known abundance of fresh fish in the rivers, and the known plenty of fish on the sea-coast there, may assure us of sufficient victual in spite of the people, if we will use salt and industry.

22. The known plenty and variety of flesh of divers kinds of beasts at land there may seem to say to us that we may cheaply victual our navies to England for our returns, which benefit everywhere is not found of merchants.

23. The practice of the people of the East Indies, when the Portugals came thither first, was to cut from the Portugals their lading of spice; and hereby they thought to overthrow their purposed trade. If these people shall practise the like, by not suffering us to have any

commodity of theirs without conquest (which requireth some time), yet may we maintain our first voyage thither till our purpose come to effect by the sea-fishing on the coasts there and by dragging for pearls, which are said to be on those parts; and by return of those commodities the charges in part shall be defrayed: which is a matter of consideration in enterprises of charge.

24. If this realm shall abound too too much with youth, in the mines there of gold (as that of Chisca and Saguenay), of silver, copper, iron, etc., may be an employment to the benefit of this realm; in tilling of the rich soil there for grain and in planting of vines there for wine or dressing of those vines which grow there naturally in great abundance; olives for oil; orange trees, lemons, figs and almonds for fruit; woad, saffron, and madder for dyers; hops for brewers; hemp, flax; and in many such other things, by employment of the soil, our people void of sufficient trades may be honestly employed, that else may become hurtful at home.

25. The navigating of the seas in the voyage, and of the great rivers there, will breed many mariners for service and maintain much navigation.

26. The number of raw hides there of divers kinds of beasts, if we shall possess some island there or settle on the firm, may presently employ many of our idle people in divers several dressings of the same, and so we may return them to the people that cannot dress them so well, or into this realm, where the same are good merchandise, or to Flanders, etc., which present gain at the first raiseth great encouragement presently to the enterprise.

27. Since great waste woods be there of oak, cedar, pine, walnuts, and sundry other sorts, many of our waste people may be employed in making of ships, hoys, busses, and boats, and in making of rosin, pitch, and tar, the trees natural for the same being certainly known to be near Cape Breton and the Bay of Menan, and in many other places thereabout.

28. If mines of white or grey marble, jet, or other rich stone be found there, our idle people may be employed in the mines of the same and in preparing the same to shape, and, so shaped, they may be carried into this realm as good ballast for our ships and after serve for noble buildings.

29. Sugar-canes may be planted as well as they are now in the South of Spain, and besides the employment of our idle people, we may receive the commodity cheaper and not enrich infidels or our doubtful friends, of whom now we receive that commodity.

30. The daily great increase of wools in Spain, and the like in the West Indies, and the great employment of the same into cloth in both places, may move us to endeavour, for vent of our cloth, new discoveries of peopled regions where hope of sale may arise; otherwise in short time many inconveniences may possibly ensue.

31. This land that we purpose to direct our course to, lying in part in the 40th degree of latitude, being in like heat as Lisbon in Portugal doth, and in the more southerly part, as the most southerly coast of Spain doth, may by our diligence yield unto us, besides wines and oils and sugars, oranges, lemons, figs, raisins, almonds, pomegranates, rice, raw silks such as come from Granada, and divers commodities for dyers, as anil and cochineal, and sundry other colours and materials. Moreover, we shall not only receive many precious commodities besides from thence, but also shall in time find ample vent of the labour of our poor people at home, by sale of hats, bonnets, knives, fish-hooks, copper kettles, beads, looking-glasses, bugles, and a thousand kinds of other wrought wares that in short time may be brought in use among the people of that country, to the great relief of the multitude of our poor people and to the wonderful enriching of this realm. And in time, such league and intercourse may arise between our stapling seats there, and other ports of our Northern America, and of the islands of the same, that incredible things, and by few as yet dreamed of, may speedily follow, tending to the impeachment of our mighty enemies and to the common good of this noble government.

The ends of this voyage are these:
1. To plant Christian religion.
2. To traffic.
3. To conquer.

} Or, to do all three.

To plant Christian religion without conquest will be hard. Traffic easily followeth conquest; conquest is not easy. Traffic without conquest seemeth possible and not uneasy. What is to be done is the question.

If the people be content to live naked and to content themselves with few things of mere necessity, then traffic is not. So then in vain seemeth our voyage, unless this nature may be altered, as by conquest and other good means it may be, but not on a sudden. The like whereof appeared in the East Indies, upon the Portugals seating there.

If the people in the inland be clothed, and desire to live in the abundance of all such things as Europe doth, and have at home all the same in plenty, yet we cannot have traffic with them, by means they want not anything that we can yield them.