The Tempest in the Trivium

by Dan Harder

Note: The original, longer version of this essay was sent to, and commented on, by Stephen Orgel, Keith Sagar, David Sullivan, Curtis Dozier, and numerous other Shakespeare and philology scholars and journals.

While trolling through dozens of rhetoric texts for information on the history of "the essay", I chanced upon what I am convinced is the solution to the puzzling origin of one of Shakespeare's most obscure character names. I refer, namely, to Sycorax – witch-mother of Caliban and arch, though absent, enemy of Prospero in *The Tempest*. Sycorax is a minor character, so minor, in fact, that she doesn't even make it onto stage (she's dead well before the action of the play begins). And yet, minor and unseen as she is, she is mentioned by name seven times and is a major topic of dispute between Caliban, her son, and Prospero, her rival. Over one hundred and twenty lines are devoted to Prospero's wrangling, first with Ariel then with Caliban, about the nature and effect of "this damned witch Sycorax" (1. 2. 264) [1]. She represents nothing less important than the island's other magician to whom Prospero is implicitly compared.

Portrayed as "wicked", "foul", and "damned", it would not be surprising to find that Shakespeare had added some pejorative barb to this witch's name. Shakespeare was far from loath to load the names of his characters, particularly the bad and/or comic, with reverberant reference. Typically, Shakespeare either found some well-known historical

and/or mythological precedent, used a clearly allegorical name, or coined a name from recognizable parts or sources.

Surprisingly, then, in his last play, it seems that the Bard broke the rules and coined a name of uncharacteristically recondite origin. We read in *The Shakespeare Name Dictionary* that Sycorax's description, quote, "owes much to Ovid's portrayal of Medea in *Metamorphoses, 7*. The name is not found in any source. It most likely derives from the Greek words for sow (*sys*) and raven (*corax*), both animals associated with witchcraft. The name may derive from a description of the raven in *Batman uppon Bartholome his booke De propietatibus rerum* (1582), an encyclopedia, which suggests the wording of Caliban's first speech at *1.1. 324*. Heartbreaker (*psychorrhax*) has also been suggested, as well as the Greek words for fig (*sukon*) and spider (*rax*). Another possibility is from Arabic, *shokoreth* 'deceiver'. The Coraxi were a tribe in Colchis, a center for witchcraft, where Circe, the famous witch of mythology, was born. Pliny locates the Chalybeates (who have been proposed as the source of Caliban) as living near Coraxi. Circe was exiled to an island in the Mediterranean (like Sycorax) and her name derived from a bird (hawk, *kikros*), also." [2]

A few other suggestions are also worthy of note. From Edwin Bormann we get the idea that the prefix "Sy" comes from Sirocco and, hence, we have Sycorax, an ill south-wind/raven. [3]. More recently, there is Stephen Orgel's suggestion that Sycorax can be identified as Medea, the Scythian raven, by combining the Greek "korax" with the "Sy" of the occasionally misspelled "Sythian" (Scythian). [4]. There is also the notion floating about that takes the Medea/Sycorax connection even further. Sycorax is (supposedly) derived from Ovid's Medea and because Circe is Medea's aunt, Sycorax is

essentially Circe, the swine-making sorceress of old. [5] Finally, there is Katherine King's creative suggestion that some of Shakespeare's drinking buddies, in a moment of erudite outrage, might have sworn in Classical Greek, "*Es kórakas*", "Go to Hell", and the ever-opportunistic Bard picked up the colorful, cacophonous epithet and dropped it into a play with thematic aplomb. [6]

These are impressive guesses, all, but a bit of a stretch. All suggest a level of education and/or scholarly concern for which there is scant evidence in Shakespeare's work. It is highly unlike Shakespeare to have sought and used what would have been, either to him or his audience, obscure and only marginally relevant references. Instead, I suggest a simpler, funnier, and more thematically pertinent solution and one that fits what Shakespeare was wont to do so often in his preceding plays: poke fun at pedants and pedantry. The target of his scorn this time is no less than the first "trial lawyer" and the typically acknowledged progenitor of the art of "rhetoric". This "magician" of language, this witch of rhetorical exercise, was the 5th century Greek, Corax of Syracuse. Snip a syllable from one word, snap it on another and, 'quick and home', Corax of Syracuse becomes... Sycorax, a portmanteau of significant jest.

Although there is almost no external evidence that Shakespeare actually went to school, it is widely assumed that he got at least most, if not all, of a grammar school education. In seventeenth-century England, "The aim of the grammar-school curriculum was to enable the student to read, write, and speak Latin… The method prescribed unremitting exercise in grammar, rhetoric, and logic." [7] In other words, Shakespeare in all likelihood studied the famous and inescapable Trivium, the three subjects most basic

to the "liberal arts" (l. 74) – in which, it is worth noting, Prospero claims to have excelled "without a parallel".

"That Shakespeare's works are massively influenced by rhetoric and that even his most powerful poetic creations were achieved on the basis of rhetoric is, after the intensive research in Renaissance rhetoric of the last decades, no longer a controversial statement," says Wolfgang Müller. "The vision of the Renaissance as a rhetorical culture – 'eine rhetorische Kulturepoche'(1) is increasingly taking shape, and in this context Shakespeare is accorded an outstanding position, as is confirmed by an authority on classical rhetoric and its tradition like George Kennedy, who says that Shakespeare's works are 'in a very concrete way perhaps the greatest achievements of classical rhetoric.'" [8] In his exhaustive two volume study, *William Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke,* T. W. Baldwin even suggests that the reason Shakespeare was so good at rhetoric was that he had likely *taught* rhetoric, "for a time before he began writing his plays." [9]

Without some tangible evidence, we might not wish to put the roll-book in his hands just yet. Still, it is clear that Shakespeare received a considerable education in rhetoric. "Aristotle, the *Ad Herennium*, Cicero, and Quintilian were studied directly in the schools during the Renaissance and were the chief ultimate sources of the works on rhetoric and logic, whether in Latin or the vernaculars." [10] Significantly, all three authors just cited mention Corax, the Sicilian, as the sole founder, or, with his student Tisias, co-founder of the first 'systematic' rhetoric. [11] Furthermore, the *Prolegomena*, school-ready introductions to the study of rhetoric, [12] mention Corax, his role in founding rhetoric, and his very Syracusan history. Far less believable than the notion that

Shakespeare actually taught rhetoric is the idea that somehow, having studied it as much as he had, he could have missed the name of its founder, Corax of Syracuse.

Whether or not Shakespeare actually liked the rhetoric he had learned is, and will forever remain, beyond our ability to know. There is ample evidence from Shakespeare's work, however, that he was no fan of ostentatious learning and excessive formalism. In fact, he parodied both as often as he could. [13] And a surprising number of the targets of this parody are either teachers *of* or learnéd *in* the subjects of the Trivium (Lucentio, AKA "Pedascule" — little pedant, Sir Hugh Evans, Touchstone, Polonius, Holofernes, etc.). Upon frequent occasion, Shakespeare enjoyed deriding the disingenuous formalist and the narrow-minded pedant. Is there any reason to believe, however, that Corax of Syracuse was the target for Shakespeare's last swipe at rhetorical pedantry?

In his article entitled *Who Was Corax?*, Thomas Cole suggests that any schoolboy could have told you that Corax "was a Sicilian from Syracuse, the inventor of rhetoric (defined by him as the art of persuasion)." [14] Not only would Shakespeare quite likely have known this, but his all-important audience, or most of it, would have known this. The name Corax of Syracuse, or anything significantly like it, reverberated with all sorts of recollections… and not all of them pleasant.

In fact, no lesser critics than Plato and Aristotle besmirched the reputation of Corax. As D. A. G. Hinks, in detail, points out, "Whatever allowance is made for their polemical attitude and for their eagerness to point out a failing to which they consider themselves superior, we must conclude that that failing was real, and that the system of Tisias and Corax was indeed adapted only to the oratory of the courts. No one who is familiar with the later tendencies of ancient rhetorical theory will find this surprising."

[15] Hinks goes on to discuss, quite precisely, what that "system" was based on. "The principle part of that system is the celebrated doctrine of *εἰκός* or argument from probabilities." Reasoning from persuasive-sounding probabilities and not from actual evidence or indisputable deduction was seen by both Plato and Aristotle as a weak and unacceptable way to prove anything. Although there is no incontestable evidence from historical sources that Corax ever employed or created such a system, both Aristotle and Plato *thought* that he had and gave his "system" some rough reviews. Their reviews, appearing as they do in two popular and enduring sources, the *Rhetoric* and the *Phaedrus*, have undoubtedly contributed to some of the negative press Corax has received for millennia.

Herewith we see the formal beginnings of that rift between those who cared more for the pragmatic uses of speech – winning court cases, presenting persuasive arguments on a range of topics – and those for whom speech was to be strictly trained to the rigorous tasks of seeking and communicating truth. It is the conflict between the lawyer for whom oratory is a means to courtroom victory — a victory not necessarily based on a clear and convincing presentation of "the truth and nothing but the truth" – and the philosopher who is, presumably, interested in nothing but the truth. For Plato, Aristotle, the Sophists, et al of the fifth and forth centuries in Greece, the division between the legal and the philosophical was not nearly as wide as it is in our own far less truth-troubled era. In fact, the division was not between the legal and the philosophical but between the legal (diconic) and the political (deliberative), [16] in other words, between that which affected court decisions and that which affected the well-being of the *polis* — the "island" of people truly "citizen" to the state. As such, courtroom antics were far less important,

ethically, than what one said and did in the political arena. Seen in this light, Corax was the earliest known proponent of a relatively amoral oratory.

Further coloring the reputation of poor Corax was the story of his dispute with his putative student, Tisias. This story comes, most clearly, from the *Prolegomena* and tells of his having sued Tisias for failing to pay him his teaching fee. Tisias took his case to court saying that if he won his case, he wouldn't have to pay the fee, and if he lost the case, he shouldn't have to pay the fee, either, since such loss would show that he'd not been taught well by 'the master'. Corax, it is said, turned the argument around and claimed that if he won, he'd certainly need to be paid, and if he lost to his student, he should still be paid since such a loss would clearly show that his student had learned a great deal from him. The story ends with judge, jury, or assembled audience (depending on the source) dismissing both master and student with the words, "From a bad crow, a bad egg."

Shakespeare may not have known this less-than-honorific story though he almost surely would have been acquainted with Plato and Aristotle's demeaning reviews of Corax's system of rhetoric. Add to this the scorn that would naturally accrue to the inventor of one of the Trivium's subjects, a subject that would have been studied in maddening trope-and-figure drills, and we can see how, in the mind of one particular Renaissance schoolboy who had a talent for, though no clear love of, the details of rhetoric, the name Corax might have resonated with foul associations.

Thus far, it should be clear that the irrepressible punster would have far more likely known and remembered the name "Corax of Syracuse", a name rich with associations of rhetoric, language, and schoolboy drills, than he either knew or

remembered ANY ancient Greek he might have, though probably hadn't, studied. [17] And if Ovid is supposedly the source, look at the word Ovid uses. It is *cornicis* NOT *korax* or *corax*. [18] *Cornicis* is, instead, the genitive form of *cornix* — meaning "crow" — which connects rather poorly either to her name, Sy-corax, or to the raven's feather Sycorax used to brush "wicked dew" (1. 2. 321-2). If Shakespeare had consulted or remembered Ovid's original, he'd have known this. And if he'd used Arthur Golding's popular 1567 translation, he'd have read "Crowe". [19] In Latin, *corax* was a rarely used transliteration of the Greek word *κόραξ* meaning "raven" (and occasionally "crow") and was not the term used by Ovid. Further, *cornicis* was not intended to suggest something evil in this particular passage. Quite the opposite. The term is used in *Metamorphoses 7* to suggest longevity, the longevity Medea wants to conjure for her father-in-law. [20]

The likelihood that Shakespeare knew the name Corax of Syracuse is only part of my argument – albeit, an important part. The other part is how aptly a play of words on the name "Corax of Syracuse" functions in *The Tempest*, most particularly in Act 1, scene 2. This entire scene is either exposition or verbal jockeying for position. When it becomes the latter, when, that is, Ariel asks for his liberty and Caliban asks for his land, it becomes a forum for Prospero's oratorical wizardry. And this is precisely the moment Sycorax comes on stage. Liberty, land, and Corax of Syracuse come together in the fifth century B.C.E. With a bit of wordplay, I submit that in the seventeenth century C. E., they come together once again.

Much of the important business at the end of *The Tempest's* long second scene deals with establishing who has the better claim to the island, AND who can present that claim most persuasively. It is because of Prospero's superior skill at rhetorical

manipulation that he wins the argument. Clearly, his claim is based on his superior "nature" — he is the civilized one and brings to the island superior qualities. And although it is not the possible cacophony of Sycorax's speeches ("terrible/ to enter human hearing" l. 265) that bothers but the vile nature of her sorceries that is most offensive, it is, nonetheless, clear that some of the threads Shakespeare braids into his web of motifs explore the use and abuse of rhetoric and the magical/poetical art of language. The "nature" of the evil may be the most important aspect, [21] but its fundamental, inextricable relationship to the art of expression cannot be ignored. Since both Sycorax and Prospero have used the darker aspects of magic, [22] it is not enough simply to suggest that these rivals are ethical opposites. They are, perhaps, more similar than we might wish to acknowledge. Note the important and obvious similarities between these two characters: both are banished, both are saved from worse fates because they are with "child", both are magicians. And Prospero exhibits his own "darker" side. His proud and angry excesses are not only numerous but truly painful to other worthy creatures on the isle, Ariel, Gonzalo, Ferdinand, and Miranda being but a few of them. Yes, he is teaching them lessons. And more importantly, we are watching these lessons play out on stage. The 'true' magic of the play, however, is in the way the humans come around to being more human. Prospero's supernatural magic, more than anything, compresses these transformations and reveals their worthwhile effects. He is the agent of nature creating struggles by which various characters discover themselves, viz., Ferdinand and Miranda and their discovered love for one another. This magic resides, mostly, in the ability to aid the action of nature to do what is 'natural', just, and good; punish those deserving of punishment and enlighten those worthy — and capable — of enlightenment: "Oh brave

new world…" cries Miranda at her vision of others, though that world of others is only new to her.

Still, even if we see Prospero's supernatural magic as an essentially benevolent sort of goad to nature itself, he, very naturally, gets a bit carried away with his own powers. In Act 4, it is Ariel who must bring Prospero back to a more human concern for all of those in his magical thrall.

> Ariel: "Your charms so strongly works 'em,
> That if you now beheld them, your affections
> Would become tender."
> Prospero: "Dost thou think so, spirit?"
> Ariel: "Mine would, sir, were I human." (4. 2. 17-20)

Let us not forget, too, that it was this art and his obsession with the study of the "liberal arts" that contributed to his woe in the first place. Proud of his unparalleled abilities, his duties to his "state" or *polis* "grew strange" while he, instead, becomes "transported/ And rapt in secret studies." For him, his "library/ Was dukedom large enough" (1. 2. 109) and, in the absence of his attentions to matters of state, his brother takes advantage of the vacuum of power, usurps his dukedom, and banishes the man from human company. It is only when Prospero renounces his books and ART that all can be freed and returned to their natural state.

And yet, before his "charms are all o'erthrown" (5. 1. 319), we witness a very entertaining display of Prospero's powers. His art *is* great, is impressive, is persuasive, gets results, and the results he wants (applause and hence freedom from his island stage, a "proper" son-in-law, his dukedom restored, revenge on his enemies, etc.). He is a master

at the magic of rhetoric. And so his rival, with whom he shares some darker qualities/interests/talents, shares at least a 'nominal' connection to his ART. As that art is founded and expressed through oratorical skill, it is necessary that that rival be less adept at that art. Clearly, both the "hag-seed" son and the mother are no match for Prospero's verbal skills. They were designed very craftily not to be — "You taught me language and my profit on't/ Is I know how to curse!" The "foul witch Sycorax" has a foul-mouthed kid. Truly, the old 'crow' who founded rhetoric's rules in an effort to win property cases with potentially dubious arguments is a suitable parallel, indeed.

Shakespeare's protagonist/parallel had achieved the pinnacle of rhetorical skill, and such skill was, as his audiences witnessed, truly magical. Prospero, and by extension, Shakespeare, had bested the best, the very founder of one of the three "liberal arts" of the Trivium, the reputed inventor of rhetoric. In *The Tempest*, Corax of Syracuse is unseated by the "upstart crowe" on the Jacobean stage.

But, this is not Shakespeare's final point. Prospero must release his magical minions and, conversely, be released from his own magic, before returning to his much-missed Milan. Rhetorical achievement is not the ultimate goal. It's a handy skill, gets one close to godliness on "the great globe itself" (5. 1. 153), but, in a sense, keeps one too "rapt" to be able to be in the world fully. To perform the magic of parenthood requires some very good talking — and then some. To regain the right to rule a state requires some fine oratory — and then some. To get those who are subordinates to do your bidding quickly and without complaint requires some powerful rhetoric — and then some. That "then some" is no single thing but is a combination of strength, natural goodness, and artful care. As Mercutio says to Romeo upon recognizing the return of his

friend to friendly balance, “Now art thou sociable, now art thou Romeo, now art thou who thou art, by art as well as by nature.” (2. 4. 83-85) [23] When Prospero frees Ariel, breaks his staff (magic raven’s feather/pen??), and buries his book, he frees himself to return to his former state where he can reign, not by supernatural magic but by a sort of magical humanity. No longer “transported/ And rapt” in rhetorical artistry, he is free to rejoin others in the art of living.

Notes:

Acknowledgements: To Ann Herold, my editor at the LA Times, who, in 2002, heard my idea, was intrigued, and told me to prove it, even if the Times couldn't publish it. To Stephen Orgel for his open-minded interest, "I prefer my idea," said he, "but I think you're onto something very interesting. See where it takes you." And so, I have. To Curtis Dozier, graduate student at UC Berkeley who, like a tireless Virgil, guided me through the ever-deeper obscurities of the *Prolegomena* and back to the light. To eminent classicist George Kennedy for entertaining the "distinct possibility" that classical Corax could have morphed into Jacobean Sycorax and for suggesting places to go to find more "evidence". To my wife and kids for putting up with an often absent and usually absent-minded husband/dad. To David Sullivan of the UC Berkeley Art History/Classics Library for his timely and lively translations and for his help in getting me access to some essential texts. To Franck Bessone for his help in straightening out some of my circuitous translations. To Professor Keith Sagar and his helpful advice and wonderfully thought-provoking essays. To the helpful librarians at UC Berkeley, San Francisco State University, UCLA, and the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library.

Copyright:

[1] The Tempest, *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972)

[2] J. Madison Davis and A. Daniel Frankforter, *The Shakespeare Name Dictionary* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1995): 472

[3] Edwin Bormann, *The Shakespeare-Secret*, translated by Harry Brett, (London: Thwohlleben, 1895). Bormann, funnily enough, says that because so many aspects of Bacon's *History of the Winds* can be found in *The Tempest*, this further proves that Shakespeare was Francis Bacon. Wacky, yes, but I do rather like his suggestion about the origin of Sycorax's name; it's one of the most compellingly appropriate.

[4] Stephen Orgel, *The Oxford Shakespeare, The Tempest* (Oxford: Oxford Press, 1998): 19

[5] Implicitly, Frank Kermode, novelist and scholar Marina Warner, sci-fi writer Dan Simmons, Davis and Frankforter: 472

[6] Katherine Callen King, "Go To Hell, Sycorax", *English Language Notes* 27:4 (1990):1-3 esp. 3. King suggests that "*Es kórakas*", "Go to Hell", "represents the exact opposite of Prospero, whose name in Latin means 'make happy or successful.' There arises a splendid symmetry between the names of the 'good' and 'bad' families on the Island: Go-to-Hell is the logical progenitor of the unregenerate malformed 'Cannibal' just as Makehappy is the logical progenitor of the lovesome 'Wonderwoman'." A wonderfully inventive suggestion, but for the sake of his enduring success, thank God the Bard was rarely so logical.

[7] Sister Miriam Joseph, c.s.c., *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947): 8

[8] Wolfgang G. Müller, "Syllogism and Enthymeme in Shakespeare", in *Rhetoric Movet: Studies in Historical and Modern Rhetoric in Honour of Heinrich F. Plett (Symbola Et Emblemata, Vol. 9* (Philadelphia: Brill Academic Publishing, 1999): 171. Further, Nancy Struever says in her essay, "Shakespeare and Rhetoric", *Rhetorica* 6 (1988): 140, "… there is a strong tendency in modern scholarly accounts of Shakespeare to suggest Shakespeare's appropriation of a very learned, and very 'literary' body of rhetorical doctrine."

[9] T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944): Vol. 2, 672

[10] Joseph: 20.

[11] Quintilian, the hugely influential first century rhetorician claims that, *"... the earliest writers of [rhetoric] text-books are the Sicilians, Corax and Tisias…." Institutio Oratoria* 3. 1. 8., translated by H. E. Butler, (Cambridge, Mass.: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1920). Cicero similarly credits Corax and Tisias as the founders of rhetoric, his source being, presumably, the *Synagoge Technae,* a lost work of Aristotle's, "Thus Aristotle says that in Sicily, after the expulsion of tyrants, when after a long interval restitution of private property was sought by legal means, Corax and Tisias the Sicilians, with the acuteness and controversial habit of their people, first put together some theoretical precepts;" *Brutus 46,* translated by G. L. Hendrickson, (Cambridge, Mass.: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1952). Aristotle, in a work definitely NOT lost, speaks at length about the "dubious" contribution Corax made to the development of rhetoric in his own "compendium" on the subject, *On Rhetoric*, "As in eristics the deception lies in not adding the conditions, application, or manner in which

our statement is valid, so in rhetoric it lies in the probability's being not absolute but conditional. On this topic Corax's system is constructed." as quoted by D. A. G. Hinks, "Tisias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric", *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1940): 61-69, esp. 64.

[12] The *Prolegomena* are the work of thirty-four authors, who, between the latter part of the 3rd century and the 13th century wrote "introductions" — *prolegomena* — to the study of rhetoric in which they relate, among other things, its history. Stanley Wilcox suggests that these introductions "were used by generations of school teachers" as standard openings to the study of rhetoric and all were pretty much the same in their treatment of the essential details. It is not clear to what extent any of these Greek "introductions" would have been known and "used" in Western Europe. The *Prolegomena* were known mostly to Byzantine scholars and teachers though through the Renaissance – for many reasons, there was an increasing interest in all things Greek in the lands of the Latin tradition. For an interesting discussion of the similarities, differences, and possible origins of these "stories", see Stanley Wilcox, "Corax and the *Prolegomena*", *American Journal of Philology* 64:1 (1943). One essential aspect of the "accepted" story was that Corax invented rhetoric in "response to the challenges of democratic politics after the popular revolution which deposed the last of the Syracusan tyrants, Hieron's brother Thrasybulus." See Thomas Cole's article, "Who was Corax?", *Illinois Classical Studies* 16 (1992): 65-84, esp. 65. Clearly, Corax wasn't just "of Syracuse"; rhetoric was "of Syracuse" and its uniquely debate-fertile context, circa 463 B. C. E.

[13] Shakespeare's "response to academic, scholarly moralism is parody." Struever: 137

[14] Cole: 65. Cole's thesis , interestingly enough, is that Corax and his student, Tisias, were one and the same and that "Corax" is merely a nickname for Tisias meaning "crow" -- as in an unpleasant sounding bird (!).

[15] Hinks: 63-65. Aristotle illustrates the problem by citing the case of a small man accused of attacking a larger man. It is probable that a small man would not be foolish enough to attack a larger man. However, as Aristotle, citing Agathon, says, "Well might one say just this is probable/ that much not probable should come to pass." Since this contention is as conditionally true as the contention about the small man, it follows that a larger man accused of attacking a smaller man could not have done it since it is probable that the improbable will occur — that is, that the big guy was attacked by the small guy. Clearly, nothing absolute can be deduced from this way of arguing, and it is this way, or "system", that Aristotle ascribes to Corax, and then trashes.

[16] Cicero's account at *Brutus 46,* "whether or not it corresponds to anything in Syracusan history, certainly accords better than the Byzantine [*Prolegomena*] account with the testimony of Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who complain consistently that writers on public speaking concentrate on dicanic [legal] oratory to the total or nearly total exclusion of political oratory." Cole: 68

[17] One of Baldwin's principle contentions in *William Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* is that Shakespeare really didn't know Greek in any significant way.

[18] Ovid, *Metamorphosen Liber Septimus*: line 274

[19] Arthur Golding, *The Fifteen Books of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Book 7: line 358. Originally published 1567.

[20] Ovid: line 273-74

[21] Frank Kermode *The Tempest* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U. Press, 1958): xxiv-xxv, "Caliban represents (at present we must over-simplify) nature without benefit of nurture… he is born to slavery, not to freedom" [but… wasn't he free until Prospero got there?!?] "of a vile and not a noble union; and his parents represent an evil natural magic which is the antithesis of Prospero's benevolent Art."

[22] "Our information about Prospero's magical activities prior to the beginning of the play comes largely from the speech in which he renounces his Art (5.1. 33-57). This famous speech, beginning 'Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves', derives directly from a passage in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* spoken by the black witch Medea. … Kermode claims that 'only those elements which are consistent with 'white' magic are taken over for Prospero'. (149) This is not so: 'graves at my command/Have wak'd their sleepers, op'd, and let 'em forth/By my so potent Art.' What had been his benevolent purpose in raising the dead? There is not a hint of benevolence in the entire speech." Keith Sagar, essay "The Tempest", www.keithsagar.co.uk. A version of this essay appears as "The Crime Against Caliban" in Sagar's book *Literature and the Crime Against Nature*, (London: The Chaucer Press, 2005).

[23] "Romeo and Juliet", *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (Baltimore Penguin Books, 1972)