

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

PERICLES: TO MAKE MEN GLORIOUS

Vivian Hayward

THESIS

IN

ENGLISH LITERATURE

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at
Sir George Williams University
Montreal, Canada

April, 1973

M.A. Thesis

Department of English

Vivian Hayward

Pericles: To Make Men Glorious

This thesis considers Shakespeare's ritual play Pericles as a structural unity aimed at presenting an allegorical vision of restoration. It attempts to describe how Shakespeare makes a mystic analogue out of basic familial love. It also considers how this vision is transmitted through the mediator Gower out to the audience.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. DEATH REMEMBERED - LIFE RESTORED	10
II. GOWER - MAKING THE AUDIENCE GLORIOUS	49
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	69

INTRODUCTION

In the past a great deal of speculation persisted over the dating of Pericles largely because it was not included in the First Folio. Today, however, bibliographers possess enough historical evidence to place this play at the transitional point between Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus and the "final plays."¹

Speculation over authorship has also been a perennial problem, and has continued to be, mainly because of the essential weakness of the poetry in the first two acts. Most scholars agree with Professor Frank Kermode that the play possesses a unity that is definitely Shakespearian from the third act to the end.² Numerous theories have been proposed in an attempt to explain the disparity in poetic achievement. One

¹F.D. Hoentger, editor, Pericles (Cambridge, 1963), p. xiv. All line references refer to this edition.

²Frank Kermode, Shakespeare: The Final Plays (London, 1963), pp. 11-13.

theory postulates that Shakespeare collaborated with some lesser poet; another suggests that he revised an old play of his own; while another concludes that he revised an old play of someone else's and that he really began writing at the third act.

Another theory - which seems to be the most widely accepted and which this thesis is most sympathetic toward - proposes the reporting of the play by at least two different individuals. The irregularities in the first two acts suggest inaccurate reporting. ~~The~~ ~~rest~~ ~~part~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~play~~, which everyone agrees is clearly Shakespearean is assumed to be reported with accuracy. The reporting, however, was not bad enough to hide the unity of the play. The intrinsic unity of structure and the overwhelming popularity of the play with Elizabethan audiences, forces this writer, along with others, to conclude that this is indeed the case.³

Because of the poetic difficulties, many

³Francis Fergusson, Shakespeare, The Pattern in His Carpet (New York, 1968), p. 281.

scholars avoid interpreting the first two acts of the play in relation to the last part. However, purely in terms of structure, the first two acts are integral to the play's unity. For example, the opening father-daughter incest scene is conceptually necessary because of its parallel with the Pericles-Marina relationship. These relationships exist on the same spectrum, with Antiochus and his daughter at the extreme of human materiality at its most base and Pericles and Marina at the other extreme of human spirituality.

Similarly, if the whole play is considered, there is an explicit progressive movement of love analogous to Pico's interpretation of Platonic love. The tripartite division of love by Pico into amore bestiale, amore umano and amore celeste corresponds to the incestuous love (bestiale) signified by the incest between Antiochus and his daughter, the married love (umano) in the middle between Pericles and Thaisa and the celestial love (celeste) suggested in the

reunion of the family at the end.

In conjunction with efforts to determine authorship and the date of the play there have been numerous attempts to explain the change in vision and form of the last plays. Arguments are for the most part reactions to or agreements with (at least lately) T.S. Eliot and G. Wilson Knight, who state rather boldly that the change is a spiritual one and attribute it to Shakespeare himself. T.S. Eliot suggests that the writer of the late plays has "seen through the dramatic action of men into a spiritual action that transcends it."⁴ G. Wilson Knight assumes that Shakespeare's spiritual growth corresponds with the new vision. He calls the development the "upward lift of Shakespeare's art" and sees the "transition through Antony and Cleopatra to the mystical dramas" as "inevitable."⁵ Perhaps in reaction to the more "subjective" approach,

⁴Kenneth Muir, Last Periods of Shakespeare, Racine, Ibsen (Detroit, 1961), p. 83.

⁵G. Wilson Knight, Shakespeare and Religion (London, 1967), p. 13.

Northrop Frye stresses that the "spirit of reconciliation" that pervades these plays is "not to be ascribed to a personal attitude" of Shakespeare's but to his "impersonal concentration on the laws of comic form."⁶ And Frank Kermode, in his attempt to explain the last plays, feels that the best "possible explanation is that which postulates a revival of theatrical interest in romance."⁷ The only real disagreement among these opinions derives from their different critical points of view. However, the writer admits to being drawn into the camp of G. Wilson Knight who calls Pericles and The Winter's Tale "resurrection parables."⁸

There is no doubt about the difference between the earlier and the later work beginning with Pericles. The most obvious change is that Pericles marks the end of tragedy. The most important element of the new vision, so dialectically distant from the tragic vision, is that, unlike tragedy, it eliminates the

⁶Northrop Frye, "The Argument of Comedy," English Institute Essays, ed. D.A. Robertson, Jr. (New York, 1965), p. 62.

⁷Kermode, p. 10.

⁸Knight, Shakespeare and Religion, p. 234

need to focus on the psychology of the individual psyche. The conflicts in the mind that conceives of ideas such as Macbeth's desire to "outrun the pauser reason" have been exchanged for the more objective and harmonic vision of the sage. Prior to this play Shakespeare had allowed different characters to possess the religious vision. However, it is the first time that he has taken the vision outside of the individual psyche and placed it in a more objective position to make it the overall vision of the play.

Pericles is based on a straightforward and conventional myth of spiritual restoration. Its vision is allegorical in the sense that Pericles' highly ritualized restoration to Marina is depicted as carrying another meaning with it; that is, a restoration to the godhead. To underline this spiritual dimension, the play takes place against a background of two worlds for which there are two gods - Neptune and Diana. Neptune rules the sublunar

7

world of time and mutability and Diana rules the transcendent and eternal realm. Pericles' restoration to his daughter corresponds to a movement from the Neptunian world into the world of Diana.

The Pericles myth is, however, complicated by the fact that it is enclosed within a frame created by the poet Gower and is thus in reality a "play within a play." Shakespeare used this device numerous times before Pericles; specifically, for example, in Hamlet, Henry V, The Taming of the Shrew, and a variation of it in all of his work. In Pericles the "play within a play" forms the overall structural basis from beginning to end. Gower, standing between Pericles and the audience, constitutes "the play." His role is to mediate between the audience and the inside play and to invite the audience to participate in the imaginative history of Pericles. He outlines this when he states directly to the audience that the praxis of this play is "to make men glorious" (1.9). Hence the intention is not only to make Pericles glorious but

to make the audience glorious as well. His mediating role is similar to that of the priest or magus who presides over the sacramental ritual and takes the mystical experience to the audience.

Hence, it is not just on the myth of redemption that the power of the play rests but on the recreation or ritualizing of the myth. In other words, Gower duplicates an experience for the audience that echoes the allegorical implications of Pericles' reunion with his daughter. Because of Gower, the Pericles myth is directly effective, not merely symbolic.

The first chapter of this thesis, entitled "Death Remembered - Life Restored," will begin with a definition of what is meant in this thesis by the "allegorical vision." This will be followed by a plot outline and a thematic analysis of image patterns that underlie Pericles' mystic experience. It will focus on his confrontation with evil, his continuous movement away from evil toward "perfection," and the final restoration. The aim of the thematic analysis

9

is to bring into focus the "meaning" of the myth so that it can be placed in relation to the overall structure of the play, the most important part of which is the presence of Gower who brings the Pericles myth and its meaning to the audience.

Chapter two will concentrate on the structural significance of Gower. It will centre on two intrinsically related phenomena: the effect that Gower has, as the frame, on the allegory, and the effect that he has, as a mediator, on the audience. The title of this chapter is "Gower - Making the Audience Glorious."

CHAPTER I

DEATH REMEMBERED AND LIFE RESTORED

Of the numerous versions available to Shakespeare, there is considerable evidence that he adapted parts of the play from two specific sources: Lawrence Twine's The Patterne of Painefull Adventures, written late in the sixteenth century, and Gower's Confessio Amantis, written late in the fourteenth century.¹ It appears, however, that the Confessio Amantis was used to greater advantage in terms of structure and vision since Shakespeare not only uses Book 8 of the "Amantis" as a source for the Pericles story but he also uses its poet Gower as a character in the play.

Gower is brought from out of the medieval

¹Hoelder, p. xiv.

era to stand before the audience to narrate the ancient legend of Pericles. Gower, as well as the archaic rhymes and the "fairytale manner of its telling"² contribute to giving the play a medieval quality. This quality is further made evident by the allegorical nature of the vision.

The allegorical vision of reality perceives an identification between one plane of reality and a transcendent plane. Eric Auerbach's definition of this concept of reality would perhaps prove instructive here:

In this conception, an occurrence on earth signifies not only itself but at the same time another, which it predicts or confirms, without prejudice to the power of its concrete reality here and now. The connection between occurrences is not regarded as primarily a chronological or causal development but as a oneness within the divine plan, of which all occurrences are parts and reflections.³

Religious allegory is the mode used to illustrate this "oneness." As a mode, it aims at indicating

²Francis Fergusson, Shakespeare, The Pattern in His Carpet, p. 281.

³Eric Auerbach, Mimesis, trans. Willard R. Trask (New Jersey, 1953), p. 355.

the point where the temporal plane is joined to the eternal spiritual plane by a human consciousness. It always has a double purpose through which it means to show the one to one relationship between a given human action and its mystic model. Edwin Honig explains this double purpose (in a paraphrase of St. Thomas Aquinas) by pointing out that as a symbol, "God's hand signifies power," yet in allegory the:

symbol is not thought to be merely equivalent with the abstract quality we call power. It is taken quite literally as God's hand and as a sign for power in the sense that God's creation and God's operative law are manifest together in all natural events.⁴

Pericles embodies the double purpose of allegory. For example, the focal point of the play is Pericles' reunion with his daughter in Act V. The reunion, however, points to another level since it also represents a mystic restoration to the godhead. In other words, the reunion is preserved,

⁴Edwin Honig, Dark Conceit, The Making of Allegory (Evanston, 1959), p. 113.

in anagoge, at a higher level. When Pericles experiences the reality of Marina, no differentiation can be made between her temporal being and her divine significance. It is the intention of this paper to illustrate how this anagogical dimension is made explicit in the play.

Although this definition of the allegorical vision forms the basis for the conceptual framework for this thesis, it should also be made clear that the purpose here is not to examine Pericles as an allegory in the strict literary sense of the word but only to use the term "allegorical" to designate the vision of the simultaneity of the reunion of father and daughter with its mystic model. Before beginning this analysis it might be profitable to outline briefly the plot.

Gower, first on stage, quickly tells the story of Antiochus' incest with his daughter. He then

introduces Pericles and leaves the stage to him.

At the outset Pericles is in Antioch to answer a riddle that will determine whether he dies or takes Antiochus' daughter as his bride. The riddle, however, holds the secret of the incestuous relationship of father and daughter. Before hearing the riddle Pericles believes that he will have a choice - death if he cannot answer, or life if he can. When he discovers that he will die no matter how he answers, he quickly flees in fear to his own kingdom. Antiochus, in order to keep his secret, sends the assassin Thaliard after him. Pericles must therefore abandon his own country, Tyre, leaving Helicenus in command. He arrives at Tharsus with a ship full of corn for the Tharsians who are suffering from famine. Unknown, however, to Pericles, they have resorted to cannibalism. Pericles does not have time to perceive this because he must immediately leave Tharsus to escape from Antiochus.

In the second act while Pericles is still fleeing by ship from the long arm of Antiochus, he is caught in a tempest and becomes shipwrecked. He swims to shore at Pentapolis where, with the assistance of the fishermen, he meets the "good King Simonides" and his daughter Thaisa. Pericles repeats the marriage contest of Act I, this time with a "lawful" daughter, and is immediately betrothed. Following the marriage a message comes that Antiochus and his daughter have met death by a bolt of lightning. Believing that he is now safe, Pericles and his pregnant wife Thaisa embark on ship to return to Pericles' home at Tyre.

Act III centres on the death of Thaisa, the separation of the family, and the revival of Thaisa. On the way to Tyre they encounter another storm in which Thaisa seemingly dies in childbirth, is thrown into the sea, and unknown to Pericles, is found at the water's edge at Ephesus and revived

by the magician Cerimon. Pericles continues his journey home alone leaving his newborn daughter Marina at Tharsus with Cleon and Dionyza. The family is thus separated with Thaisa and Pericles both assuming that the other is dead and with Marina in the hands of the iniquitous Cleon and Dionyza.

Act IV follows the adventures of Marina. When Marina matures, Cleon and Dionyza, jealous because their own daughter is not as gifted as Marina, attempt to have her killed and, in fact, believe that she is dead. When Pericles returns to get her some fourteen years later he is told by them that she has died of natural causes. Pericles then lapses into complete melancholy. Marina has, however, been saved from the murder by pirates who take her with them and sell her to a bordello. Marina is able to convince the panderers and prostitutes of her purity and is allowed to teach the arts that she knows rather than being forced into prostitution.

Act V opens years later on the day of the Neptunalia. Pericles is on board his ship in a state of melancholy and dejection. Marina is brought on board by the governor of Mytilene, Lysimachus, who has earlier been converted by Marina in the bordello. Marina raises her father from out of his melancholy by telling him the story of her life. In a recognition scene that is considered to be one of Shakespeare's best, Pericles is reunited with his daughter. The reunion is followed by the theophany of Diana. Diana tells him to go to Ephesus where he must, like Marina, retell the story of his loss of wife and daughter. There he discovers Thaisa who has become the High Priestess in Diana's temple. The play ends at Ephesus with the family happy and reunited.

The play takes place in a universe presided over by two gods - Neptune and Diana. Neptune rules the sublunar world of time and mutability and Diana

rules the transcendent and eternal realm. The purpose of the two gods is primarily to differentiate the two modes of Pericles' existence and to assist symbolically, in underlining the mystic or allegoric dimension of Pericles' restoration through a physical movement to Diana's temple at Ephesus.

In both Twine's and Gower's versions of Pericles the goddess Diana is referred to "only twice" and plays a very minor role. In Pericles she is alluded to at least twelve times which H.D. Hoentger, says "may be significant."⁵ Referred to as "celestial Dian" (V.I.248) and "immortal Dian" (V.III.37) she and Ephesus represent a special supernatural realm, the mystic realm of timeless eternity.

Ephesus was sacred ground to both the ancients and to the Christians. As well as being the location

⁵Hoentger, p. 4

of Diana's temple, it was also the place where Heraclitus revealed his knowledge and where St. Paul first spread the gospel. The magician Cerimon, whose name connotes his role of officiating minister of ceremony, lives there. Presented as the epitome of the god-like in man, he believes that there is "immortality" in "virtue" that can make a "man a god" (III.II.30-31). He possesses miraculous powers. "Hundreds call themselves his creatures" who by him "have been restored" (III.II.44-45). Hence, Cerimon's miraculous revival of Thaisa on Ephesus surrounded by music, images of rebirth, and prayers to Diana, underlines and foreshadows the supernatural nature of Pericles' restoration to his daughter in the fifth act when Pericles attains cosmic harmony and hears the "music of the spheres" (V.I.228).

The sea-god Neptune, on the other hand, rules over the harsh realities of the sublunar world. All

the action takes place on or by the sea and all of Pericles' trials are reflected in Neptunian storms and tempests. Hence, the spectator is inevitably led to the metaphor of Pericles as vessel making his way over the turbulent waters of life. This correspondence between the sea and earthly life is made by Pericles after listening to the fishermen:

How from the finny subject of the sea
 These fishers tell the infirmities of men;
 And from their wat'ry empire recollect
 All that may men approve or men detect! (II.I.48-51)

Like the "blind mole" casting

Copp'd hills towards heaven, to tell the earth is throng'd
 By man's oppression (I.I.102-103)

Pericles makes futile gestures out to heaven as Neptune deals him blow after blow. His "vessel shakes" on "Neptune's billow" (III.44-45). He is

A man whom both the waters and the wind
 In that vast tennis-court, hath made the ball
 For them to play upon. (II.I.59-61)

His wife gives birth on a rolling ship, dies and is dropped overboard into the stormy sea. His daughter, mother presumed dead, undergoes:

...as chiding a nativity
As fire, air, water, earth, and heaven can make.
(III.I.32-33)

Even Antiochus' effect on Pericles is referred to by him as a "tempest" that "has given" him a "thousand doubts" (I.II.97). To Marina, too, the ambiguous world dominated by "mask'd Neptune," (III.III.36) as he is appropriately called, is as a "lasting storm" (IV.I.19).⁶

But if it is a harsh world, it is also kind. Miracles come from the sea. Pericles' wife is found on the sea margin and revived. Pericles finds his father's legacy - his armour - thrown up from the depths. And, at the end, Marina, born on the

⁶G. Wilson Knight, The Shakespearian Tempest (London, 1953), p. 218. In commenting on the unrelentless nature of the storms, Professor Knight observes that "to analyze the tempest in Pericles would be to analyze the whole play."

sea and named after it, comes over the waters to save her father.

Under Neptune's direction, Pericles' profane existence is traced out like a cosmic dance and Pericles, with resignation, accepts his fate. Even at Thaisa's seeming death, he acquiesces to the gods:

The powers above us. We cannot but obey
 Could I rage and roar
 As doth the sea she lies in, yet the end
 Must be as 'tis. (III.III.9-12)

In the opening lines Pericles sets out the paradox - the never-ending conflict of forces in the human soul - that hovers over the rest of the play:

. . . death remember'd should be like a mirror,
 Who tells us life's but breath, to trust it error.
 (I.I.46-47)

Pericles' metaphorical mirror elicits two possibilities: life or death. The action of the characters seems to

reflect what they see in the mirror: on one side are those who see and possess a vision of life (Cerimon, Simonides, and Pericles) and, on the other, are those who see and hold an inverted self-destructive vision of death (Antiochus, Cleon, and Dionyza).

The formula approximates, poetically, St. Augustine's concept of free will wherein he postulates that man possesses as a "part of his created nature,"⁷ liberum arbitrium, free will that allows him to make a choice to move toward evil or toward good. Pericles' continual rejection of evil, for example:

For he's no man on whom perfections wait
That knowing sin within, will touch the gate
(I.I.80-81)

and his constant movement toward the "good" allows him to partake of the higher Augustinian form of "eminent freedom" - libertas - when he transcends the Neptunian

⁷Vernon J. Bourke, editor, The Essential Augustine (New York, 1964), p. 176.

world to enter into Diana's realm.

While the clear distinctions between good and evil appear to be based on a model similar to that of St. Augustine, it is also well to remember that the audience remains unaware of any conflict in terms of a psychological or moral choice on the part of Pericles. The audience, separated from Pericles, observes his actions, not his psyche. Indeed, the playwright is not concerned with the dramatic conflict involved in a choice, but with illustrating the constant goodness of Pericles that leads to his final revelation.

Although the primary movement of the play portrays a divine cycle to perfection, there is, however, a cycle of death set in opposition to it. The death cycle is represented through Antiochus' perversion of primogenital love in his incestuous relationship with his daughter and in the perversion of brotherly love in the cannibalism of the Tharsians.

The self-devouring image of both incest and cannibalism (those who indulge in these acts "eat" their own children) portrays the extreme example of an option for and a movement toward death. They point to absolute spiritual regression by describing a very basic metaphor for human materiality at its most self-destructive. This picture of a self-annihilating cycle of death is given form by Pericles in an image that demonstrates the inevitability of evil returning to its source:

Poison and treason are the hands of sin,
 Ay, and the targets, to put off the shame
 (I.I.140-141)

The image is carried even to the deaths of Cleon and Dionyza. It is their own city that, in angry retaliation, consummates the cycle by setting the fire that kills them.

Incest and cannibalism partake in a negative way in the time-eternity paradigm. That is to say,

in contrast to Pericles who tunes himself to God's time and thus experiences the supra-temporal dimension of eternity, those who practice incest and cannibalism pervert time. Metaphorically, both appear to possess a motion that is a reversal of natural process, like a film that continually runs backward into itself. The unnaturalness of the Tharsians is further indicated by their distortion of normal eating habits. They have no respect for the fruits of the time:

Their tables were stor'd full to glad the sight,
And not so much to feed on as delight
(I.IV.28-29)

yet they resort to cannibalism when famine strikes.

Cannibalism, incest and time converge in the image that recalls the legend of Chronos, god of time who ate his children:

I see that Time's the king of men;
He's both their parent, and he is their grave,
and gives them what he will, not what they crave.
(II.III.45-47)

These lines take us back to the incest riddle:

I am no viper, yet I feed
On mother's flesh which did me breed. (I.I.65-66)

The former quotation belongs to Pericles. At this point in the play he is contemplating the "glory" and "supremacy" of his dead father. It is the "good King Simonides" who reminds Pericles of him.

On one level the movement back to his father echoes the retrograde movement of incest and cannibalism because it is this movement that makes him realize the essentially cannibalistic nature of time and the incestuous nature of the world. The context (midst happiness and images of supremacy - diamonds, the sun, stars, lights) in which this is realized underlines how Pericles acquiesces to "Time" as "king of men" in spite of its horrendous nature.

The evil ones, on the contrary, do not understand the cosmic dimension, pull the paradigm down to their level and attempt, in blasphemy, to reenact the

divine model on a physical plane. They subvert God's time by going against it, by stopping history, and by taking their children - manifestations of themselves and of time - back into themselves.

In contrast to the celestial harmony that surrounds Pericles at the end, the harsh dissonance of those not in harmony with time is underlined by the image of musical discord. This, for example, is how Pericles rejects Antiochus' daughter:

You are a fair viol, and your sense the strings,
 Who finger'd to make man his lawful music,
 Would draw heaven down and all the gods to hearken;
 But being play'd upon before your time,
 Hell only danceth at so harsh a chime.
 (I.I.82-86)

Besides indicating the "hell" that she represents these lines also indicate how ultimately powerless Antiochus' daughter really is. For example, Pericles' allusion to her as a "fair viol" that has been "played upon" before her "time" suggests that

she has not come fully into being and thus cannot participate in time. On one hand, it is as though her father has pulled time out of joint in the sense that he will not allow his child to separate from him to move forward in time. On the other hand, the fact that she has not been differentiated from her father, is thus without autonomy, and that she remains nameless, suggests, poetically, non-existence.

This is further indicated through the vision of perfection that Antiochus traces out as he introduces her.

Music!

Bring in our daughter, clothed like a bride,
 For the embracements even of Jove himself;
 At whose conception, till Lucina reign'd,
 Nature this dowry gave: to glad her presence,
 The senate-house of planets all did sit
 To knit in her their best perfections.

(I.I.6-12)

Perfection only exists prior to her birth; that is, "till Lucina," goddess of childbirth, reigns. Once she enters into the temporal realm, the ideal, for her,

no longer exists. However, given the daughter's "nothingness," the description of perfection appears to stand alone, perfect. The ideal is distinct from the daughter. When she is placed against it, there is discord, but when Thaisa is placed against it, the heavens sing. Indeed, this picture is in reality a replication of the virtues that Pericles will find in his real bride. The point is that the playwright indicates corruption by superimposing it against the ideal but the ideal is what remains constant.

Evil functions in the play in two ways.

It serves as a contrast to the good and as such is used to represent Pericles' symbolic fall into base materialism. It is also used, paradoxically, to underline the vision of perfection that the play means to mirror. This is achieved through the transforming actions of Pericles whereby he always rejects evil and continually refuses to be caught in "death's net," and through the transformation of the imagery.

The same imagery - paradise, trees, music, jewels - all of which pertain to the "good" are used in both good and evil contexts. Evil is presented as being a corruption of them and the action of the play continually restores them to their original significance.

Pericles' confrontation with evil and death in Antioch represents the plunge into darkness that always precedes the revelatory experience. Antiochus' every word breathes death. He speaks of the "speechless tongues" and "semblance nake" (I.I.37) of the severed heads and tells Pericles that "death-like dragons here affright thee hard" (I.I.39) as he warns Pericles that the "dead cheeks" tell him to "desist/For going on death's net whom none resist" (I.I.40-41). Surrounded with these images, but prior to hearing the riddle, Pericles thinks that death is "no hazard" in "this enterprise" (I.I.5) and he thanks Antiochus for teaching his "frail mortality to know itself" (I.I.43). His innocence before he hears the riddle, foreshadows the realization that Pericles finally comes to, an echo of St. Paul's and Antony's, "Death, where is

thy sting?"

The opening scene does in fact turn out to be knowledge for Pericles. Antiochus holds a mirror of death up to him and Pericles transforms it. The scene, modeled after Genesis, suggests that Pericles is eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. His desire for the incestuous daughter is referred to by him as a wish:

To taste the fruit of yon celestial tree
Or die in the adventure

(I.I.20-23)

and the inference is that he has come close enough to eating to know. A few lines later Antiochus refers to his daughter as a "fair Hesperides/With golden fruit but dangerous to be touch'd" (I.I.28-29) which makes explicit the loss of innocence and forbidden fruit. However, like the second tree in Eden, the conquest of the apples in the garden of Hesperides also

signifies the quest for immortality... In other words, what is really sensual desire for the incestuous embodies, poetically, the suggestion of the "celestial tree" and establishes the ideal that is opposite to the reality in which he finds himself and for which he is in fact questing.

It is Antiochus who introduces his daughter as tree to Pericles and who suggests that Pericles is himself a tree:

Though by the tenour of our strict edict,
Your exposition misinterpreting,
We might proceed to cancel of your days,
Yet here, succeeding from so fair a tree
As your fair self, doth tune us otherwise.

(I.I.112-116)

When Pericles later arrives at the court of Simonides he carries the image with him and presents himself as a "wither'd branch, that's only green at top" (II.II.112-113). Once a "fair tree," he has now become a withered branch, symbol of the sick soul. That this is a symbolic "fall" is further made explicit by the

dismemberment of the branch from the tree. His motto "In hac spe vivo" (in this hope I live) also echoes Antiochus. Hence, while Pericles receives this image within a context of evil and death and experiences a fall because of it, he converts it into a context of life and maintains hope in the greenness.⁸

The recurring paradox of death transformed to life is reinforced by the casket imagery. The image is first introduced in Act I when Pericles refers to Antiochus' daughter as a "glorious casket stored with ill" (I.I.78) and recurs in Act III, Scene I when Thaisa dies in childbirth; Pericles places Thaisa in a casket with his jewels and Marina in a satin coffer. The box-like coffin for both Thaisa and Marina and the simultaneous death and

⁸The image and motto are particularly significant since they are not found in the other versions of Pericles and, as H.D. Foeniger observes, are perhaps the "invention of the playwright" p. 56.

birth - Thaisa "died the minute" (V.I.159) Marina was born - reinforces the paradoxical life-death theme and underlines the theme of death being transformed into life. Thaisa (the jewel) appears to be hidden behind a mask of death (the coffin) but emerges in a miraculous revival.

The bordello also represents both corruption and conversion. Marina's entry into the bordello indicates that, like her counterpart in Antiochus' daughter, she must also do battle with illicit sex. Marina, however, wins her battle largely because the corruption of the bordello people is not as final as that of Antiochus. Because they recognize Marina's goodness and allow her to teach the higher arts, they fare quite well on the hierarchy of being.

The bordello and fishermen scenes do not conform to the more severe allegorical portions of the play built around the good-evil binary. They

do, however, appear to stand in relation to one another in a similar kind of binary as the larger good-evil pattern but in a lesser model that recalls Plotinus' descending model of good and evil:

There must then be the Good - good unmixed - and the Mixed Good and Bad, and the Rather Bad than Good, this last ending with the Utterly Bad.⁹

Applied to this formula, the bordello would be the "Rather Bad than Good" which is a more ambiguous and thus more realistic position on the hierarchy.

The realistic quality of these scenes when compared to the rest of the play suggests an amalgam of human possibility. Hence the bordello, through the conversion of "simple people" underlines the transformation theme. The suggestion is that Boult and Lysimachus, in confronting goodness in the form of Marina, use the liberum arbitrium available to give over their sins. Lysimachus gives gold

⁹Plotinus, The Enneads, trans. Stephen Mackenna (London, 1956), p. 77.

to Marina to signify his renunciation of sin and Marina passes the same gold to Boult as she tells him to "empty old receptacles . . . of filth" (IV.VI.173-174). Boult recognizes Marina's gifts and is responsible for the freedom given to her by the bordello. Neither Boult nor Lysimachus, however, achieve the eminent freedom of libertas that Pericles does. When Pericles hears the "music of the spheres," for instance, Lysimachus warns everyone to humour Pericles. There is, however, the suggestion that he, like the young Pericles, is moving in the right direction when he foregoes the bordello and takes Marina as his bride, just as Pericles earlier rejects Antiochus' daughter.

Lysimachus is important to poetic structure as well. Once he is converted he is instrumental in reuniting Marina with her father. And because he begins a new relationship with the third part

(Marina) of the original Thaisa-Pericles union, the continuity of the sundering and restoration theme extends beyond Pericles into the future. His conversion also contains a paradox similar to that manifested in the parallels in the father-daughter relationships. The Pericles-Marina and Antiochus-daughter couplings are paradoxically similar, yet infinitely different, representing the extremes of the matter-spirit spectrum. Similarly, the giving of gold to a prostitute in the bordello is purely a materialistic gesture. The same gesture, in the same place, with Marina as the recipient is a spiritual one.

The final transformation and transcendence of the life-death paradox that is the backbone of the play occurs in the fifth act when Pericles is reconciled with his daughter. The reunion depicts a breakthrough from the world of time

into Diana's eternal realm which represents a return to the prelapsarian world of perfection in which the communication lines between man and God are direct.

The reunion is presented as a ritualized religious awakening. Pericles even reenacts the universal human reluctance to awaken just prior to the restoration. Like the prisoner in Plato's cave who has to be dragged into the light, he refuses for a moment to recognize the "truth," a name given to Marina at this time. He pushes her away and later confesses it when he asks her:

Didst thou not say when I did push thee back,
Which was when I perceiv'd thee, that thou cam'st
From good descending?

(V.I.126-128)

Pericles calls her by capitalized ultimate abstractions that are also the various "names of God." She is "Perfect," "Modest as Justice," and like a "palace for the crown'd Truth to dwell in" (V.I.121-122). At the same time

as he gives her these names he participates in them (they are simultaneously abstractions and his daughter). The reconciliation is hence both a reunion based on parental love and an allegorical reconciliation with the godhead.

Mystics have perennially advised that the way to the mystic consciousness involves a detached point of view vis-à-vis material experience. In theological language, for example, conversion (metanoia) is defined as:

a continuous renewal, from moment to moment, of man's relation to earthly sensory experience, which must be continuously negated and transcended with a view to the miraculous manifestation of the divine kingdom.¹⁰

In his essay on detachment, Meister Eckhart casts his ideas in pretty much the same mold:

¹⁰Ernesto Buonaiuti, "Christ and St. Paul" The Mystic Vision, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton, 1968), p. 124.

All thoughtful persons should take note of this: although the joy that we might have in the physical presence of Christ is an obstacle to us in the reception of the Holy Spirit, how much more detrimental in our search for God is the inordinate joy which we have in transient comfort. Therefore, detachment is the very best thing. It purifies the soul, cleanses the conscience, inflames the heart, arouses the spirit, quickens desire and makes God known.¹¹

This kind of detachment is a central concept behind the play. The magician Cerimon, for instance, possesses it. He

. . . can speak of the disturbances that Nature works, and of her cures. . . (III.II.37-38)

but he remains remote, refusing to tie his

. . . treasure up in silken bags,
To please the fool or death. (III.II.41-42)

Cerimon uses the material world but is not attached to it. In this sense he stands antithetically against the physical attachment of Cleon, Dionyza and Antiochus.

Marina seems virtually to embody the idea of non-attachment. She is described as possessing a

¹¹Meister Eckhart, Selected Writings, editors J.M. Clark and J.V. Skinner (London, 1958), p. 170.

"fairy motion" (V.I.154) and indeed barely seems to touch the ground. The fact that she is not "of any shores" (V.I.102) further suggests her other-worldly quality. Even when she appears to be caught in an inescapable material trap, surrounded by cannibalism, venereal disease and prostitution, she manages to extricate herself as if by miracle.

Pericles' detachment is more ambiguous. He has the appearance of detachment prior to his restoration. He refuses to speak to any one and to hear "through his deafn'd ports" (V.I.135). The sackcloth that he wears and the fact that he hides behind a curtain symbolically implies detachment. However, his melancholic state indicates that his is rather the ambivalent space of alienation and spiritual loss. But with the help of Marina he is led to understand "endurance" (V.I.136) and detachment when he perceives Marina as:

. . . Patience gazing on kings' graves, and smiling
Extremity out of act.

(V.I.138-139)

The passivity inherent in this non-attached stance recalls as well Christ's passivity on the cross and its paradoxically active quality - the passivity that redeems mankind. When Pericles is purged of his melancholy, emptied and receptive, he experiences grace. (Earlier, incidentally, Pericles says that it is "on Marina's grace/You may depend hereafter" (III.III.40-41).)

While detachment ideally allows the double consciousness of time and eternity to become manifest and leads to Eckhart's perception that the

. . . now wherein God made the world is as near this time as the now I am speaking in this moment, and the last day is as near this now as was yesterday.¹²

detachment does not mean the negation of the material realm. While the thrust of the play is the movement

¹² F.C. Hapgood, Mysticism, A Study and an Anthology (Middlesex, 1971), p. 279.

to Ephesus and the spirituality thus symbolized, the human condition is in no way negated, making the vision more Christian than say Manicheistic. The flesh and its resurrection is of primary importance. For example, when Pericles first meets Thaisa their attraction for one another is extremely sensual. Thaisa wishes Pericles her "meat" (VI.III.32) and even Simonides makes insinuating sexual puns:

And I have heard, you knights of Tyre
Are excellent in making ladies trip,
And that their measures are as excellent

(VI.III.101-103)

and remarks:

It pleaseth me so well, that I will see you wed;
And then, with what haste you can, get you to bed.

(II.V.91-92)

(The music and dancing at the banquet, traditional symbols for the spiritual, also portray the mood and exhilaration of physical love.

That there is no real incompatibility between matter and spirit is basic to the vision. Plotinus, for example, speaks about the paradox inherent to the idea of the consubstantiality of time and eternity. Like all mystics, he defines the mystic consciousness as an "ascent" from time into eternity. He points out, however, that "any imagined entrant into Eternity will prove to be not alien but already integral."¹³ Similarly, St. Thomas Aquinas, using Christian terminology, says that "Grace does not take the place of nature but perfects it." The point is that although the "act of cognition"¹⁴ on which the vision is based is timeless, it is experienced, necessarily, in time.

This vision, basic to the play, is made

¹³Plotinus, p. 224.

¹⁴Henri Charles Puech, "The Conception of Redemption in Manichaeism," trans. Ralph Manheim, The Mystic Vision (Princeton, 1968), p. 254.

explicit through its two ruling deities. For instance, while Diana (eternity) and Neptune (time) may appear to exist as two separate entities, they are really aspects of the same thing. As moon goddess, Diana also rules the sea over which Neptune is lord. (This is further underlined by the lesser goddess of childbirth, Lucina, who is, as well, another manifestation of Diana.) When Pericles enters Diana's realm he is surrounded with birth images and a "great sea of joys" rushes upon him to "overbear the shores" of his "mortality" (V.I.192-193). No differentiation can be made between the Neptunian seas and the joy, an idea that is further illustrated by the fact that Pericles' restoration occurs on the same day as the Neptunalia, a fertility rite celebrating life and regeneration.

The reconciliation encompasses both the physical and spiritual dimensions. Just as Thaisa's return to Pericles' embrace is intensely physical:

O come, be buried
A second time within these arms (V.III.42-43)

so is Marina's return to her mother:

My heart
Leaps to be gone into my mother's bosom.

(V.III.44-45)

Look, who kneels here, flesh of thy flesh' . . .

(V.III.46)

The brief incest scene in the first act is brought forward to create a stark contrast to its opposite in Pericles and Marina and, paradoxically, to reinforce the ineffable nature of the reunion. The birth imagery makes it clear that this is mystic rebirth, an experience that Henri-Charles Puech defines as a "recollection of one's own luminous and divine substance."¹⁵ It is Marina, his flesh, who is this substance:

I will believe you by the syllable
Of what you shall deliver.

(V.I.167-168)

Thou hast been godlike perfect, the heir of kingdoms,
And another life to Pericles thy father.

(V.I.206-207)

O, come hither
Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget . . .

(V.I.194-195)

¹⁵Puech, p. 254.

Since the begetting of him that did her beget is physically impossible, a supra, non-physical "incest" analogous to the Trinity is evoked. Meister Eckhart, for example, says, "he who stands continually in a present Now, in him God the Father begets his Son without ceasing."¹⁶

This, then, is the allegorical vision that Gower presents to us. The play moves steadily toward the final glory. Evil is rejected, death is transformed, and the material world, transfigured, is preserved in anagoge at a higher level, revealing the eternal paradox on which the mystic vision is based.

¹⁶W.R. Inge, Mysticism in Religion (London, 1969), p. 76.

CHAPTER II

GOWER: MAKING THE AUDIENCE GLORIOUS

In the previous chapter this analysis has centred on the action that takes place inside the frame. The main concern of this chapter is to consider the effect that Gower has as a frame and as a mediator on the play and on the audience.

Gower is primarily a vehicle for bringing the allegorical vision from out of medieval times to present it to the seventeenth century audience. In this role he offers Pericles to the audience as a sacrament through which the audience is made glorious. He is also, however, the vehicle for adding the conceptual and aesthetic dimension to the play that takes it out of the realm of religious allegory and places it in the realm of art.

Through this conceptual dimension - the play as art - Shakespeare recreates the allegorical

vision and induces audience participation analogous to the ritualistic nature of a mystery play. On one hand, Gower, as mediator, is instrumental in creating a "reality" for the audience. On the other hand, Gower, as frame, is the means by which the play is designated as "illusion." The main concern here is to consider the play as a "reality" in which the audience participates. Before this can be done, however, consideration must be given to the play as an "illusion."

It would have been impossible, of course, for Shakespeare to write a mystery play in the seventeenth century. The difference in the relationship of the medieval audience to the play and the Elizabethan audience to the play perhaps best clarifies why this is so.

According to Professor Anne Richter, the medieval audience assumed a direct relationship with the actors and "tended to regard its drama as a reaccomplishment

rather than an imitation of action."¹ Medieval drama had not yet been removed from its religious and ritualistic beginnings. Hence, the mystery plays were no doubt effective in terms of "immediacy" and audience participation because the audience brought a "primitive" openness to them and partook of drama as a real experience, much as the believer participates in the mass. This means that they did not make distinctions between the play's illusion or reality.

The Elizabethan audience, regarding its drama as an imitation of action, reacted quite differently. They were accustomed to the dramatic techniques of the masque, disguise, plays within plays and they delighted in the reality-illusion paradox of drama. Theatre for them represented both life and art. The stage was a metaphorical "globe" with the cosmos painted on the ceiling and the action was a depiction of "life."

¹ Anne Richter, Shakespeare and The Idea of The Play (Middlesex, 1967), p. 18.

~~They also know, of course, that drama was clearly something other than real life.~~

As a frame, Gower provides the necessary conceptual dimension that enables Shakespeare to create a "convincing" illusion. Like other Elizabethan playwrights (Kyd, for example, in The Spanish Tragedy), Shakespeare used the device of a "play within a play" to suggest the ambiguity of reality and illusion within a play and to signify the illusory/real nature of drama itself. This device in Pericles, of which Gower constitutes the outside part of the play, forms the overall structural basis that provides an extended metaphor of illusion that encompasses the whole play.

Gower, anchored to the Pericles myth and functioning as a window through which the audience sees, sets the reality-illusion paradox within the play into motion. Illusion is placed within illusion to the point where distinctions are almost impossible. The deaths of Pericles' loved ones, for example, are all the time an illusion. What appears to be

hallucination when he hears the music of the spheres and sees a vision of Diana turns out to be real because Pericles is directed to Ephesus by his "dream" where he finds Thaisa. When he is awakened by Marina and recognizes his true situation, he says:

This is the rarest dream that e'er dull'd sleep
Did mock sad fools withal. . .

(V.I.161-162)

Pericles wonders if Marina is "real, or a fairy" (V.I.157) and when she suggests that he thinks her an "imposter" he asks her:

But are you flesh and blood?
Have you a working pulse, and are no fairy
Motion?

(V.I.153-155)

At the same time that these words question her reality, there is a suggestion of a movement fairy-like, beyond her physicality. And, for Pericles, the metaphysical, illusory "fairy motion" turns out to be real too.

Inside the frame, then, the illusions are transformed into reality. The same phenomenon occurs.

from the point of view of the audience. Due to the fact that Gower is balanced between the audience and the play and creates a force that pulls two ways - toward Pericles and toward the audience, the perennial problem of dealing with illusion and reality in the play shifts in Pericles to dealing with it in relation to the audience.

Gower's relationship with the audience is direct. Using the second person, he speaks directly to us:

If you, born in these latter times,
When wit's more rife, accept my rimes,
And that to hear an old man sing
May to your wishes pleasure bring,
I life would wish, and that I might
Waste it for you like taper-light. (I.11-16)

He implores us to "be attent," (III.11) to "be quiet then" (II.5) and to use our imaginations:

In your imagination hold
This stage the ship, upon whose deck
The sea-tost Pericles appears to speak. (III.58-60)

. . . time that is so briefly spent
With your fine fancies quaintly eche;
What's dumb in show I'll plain with speech. (III.12-14)

Imagine Pericles arriv'd at Tyre,
 Welcom'd and settled to his own desire.
 (IV.1-2)

And, in a rather mysterious manner, he asks us to
 consider his place in the story:

I do beseech you
 To learn of me, who stand i' th' gaps to teach you
 The stages of our history.
 (IV.IV.7-9)

After pointing to Pericles as a fantasy off
 in the distance spatially and temporally, Gower
 comes forward to suggest that he and the audience
 exist in a time that is real. Two phenomena occur
 because of this. On one hand, the audience is
 compelled to recognize the illusory nature of its
 own experience with Gower because he too comes
 from a dream world. On the other hand, if the
 audience communes with Gower (and it does), it too
 partakes of the illusion. The audience is thus moved to
 the realization that all the world is a stage and its
 reality is as questionable as that represented by Gower.
 With this shift in focus, the paradox is transformed

and illusion is totally subsumed by the reality of the fantasy.³

Illusion and reality, art and nature, are intrinsic to one another in this play. Like Marina's "art" that "sisters" nature (V.7), the playwright, through overt artifice, creates an atmosphere in which the audience believes in the power that illusion can exercise over reality. The rest of this chapter, then, will focus on the effect that Gower has on the audience in terms of the reality of the illusion; that is, once we have suspended disbelief.

The exploitation of the audience-play relationship may be the penultimate conclusion

³In his usual capricious way, Jorge Luis Borges, Other Inquisitions (New York, 1966), p. 48 describes this experience:

Why does it make us uneasy to know that the map is within the map and the thousand and one nights are within the book *A Thousand and One Nights*? Why does it disquiet us to know that Don Quixote is a reader of the *Quixote*, and Hamlet is a spectator of Hamlet? I believe I have found the answer: these inversions suggest that if the characters in a story can be the readers or spectators, then we, their readers or spectators, can be fictitious.

to Shakespeare's contemplation of the metaphor of stage as life and life as stage for in Pericles the metaphor becomes more than metaphor as stage spills over into the audience. Because of this, it can be concluded that the most important concept behind the play is the effect that it has on the audience. The play is more than a vicarious experience because Gower, as mediator, recreates the myth for the audience and, in the process, creates models in the spectator's mind that replicate experientially elements from the vision of Pericles. Audience participation is unavoidable since the concept of effect is incorporated into the form of the play.

The praxis⁴ does not originate simply from

⁴Francis Fergusson, The Idea of a Theatre (New Jersey, 1968), pp. 229-230. Professor Fergusson discusses how the Moscow Art Theatre school based its acting theories on Aristotle's idea of the "imitation of an action." In training its actors, the Theatre taught that the "action of a character or a play must be indicated by an infinitive phrase." Fergusson gives the example of the infinitive "to find the culprit" for Oedipus Rex. It is in this derivative sense that the Aristotelian concept of praxis is used here.

the action of Pericles on whom the parable centres, but from the interplay between the frame created by Gower and the content of Pericles' personal redemption. Gower states the intention of the play in the infinitive "to make men glorious" (I.I.9) directly to the audience. (In theological language "glory" is that essence along with "justice" that the "beatified angels and men" possess.⁵) Hence, the glory extends out from Pericles, through Gower, to the audience.

In terms of form, Gower is both a disrupting and a unifying agent. His presence and his comments make the action on stage recede into the distance. And, because the audience is made conscious of form, it is arbitrarily made to experience aesthetic distance. At the same time as this distance is created, Gower steps in to mediate between the

⁵St. Thomas Aquinas, Selected Writings, trans. Robert P. Goodwin (New York, 1965), p. 139.

audience and the play and thus closes the gap. The very form of the play creates distance and closeness - a simultaneous sundering and restoration - that is the theme of the play.

Gower imposes onto the audience a detached stance that is structurally not unlike that recommended by mystics. This is achieved through the manipulation of point of view. Gower actually instructs the audience to see the actors from a distance "like motes and shadows" (IV.IV.21). Because it sees through eyes directed by Gower, the audience incorporates his stance which is a unique one. He has no earthly problems. He is not concerned with uncertainty or with an unknown destiny because his story is history already known. Furthermore, the audience knows that what Pericles laments is an illusion. While Pericles is involved in the duality of the Neptunian world, the audience's identification

with his problems is minimal. This further increases the spectator's objectivity and places it, along with Gower, in a kind of omnipotent position that allows the spectator to see the phenomena of the fallen world as puppet-like and (perhaps) to apply inadvertently this objectivity to its own fallen position.

The detachment places the audience in a contemplative state of mind through which it perceives the "greater matter" that Pericles himself will reach. This contemplative distance, however, coincides with the fact that Gower invites the audience in to participate in the recreating of the myth. In essence this amounts to an experience of double perception because the detachment and the participation are synchronized which serves to place within the psyche of the spectator a model that is a replication of, or at least a dim analogue of, the simultaneous

detachment and participation experienced by Pericles when he hears the music of the spheres.

The audience is meant to participate in the restoration too. Gower, who is himself restored in Act I.1-2:

To sing a song that old was sung,
From ashes ancient Gower is come,

returns with a tale that has been read over and over again "for restoratives" (I.1.8). It is a tale that existed far back in time about a man who existed still farther back, and the tale, and Gower, and Pericles, like the phoenix (symbol of rebirth) alluded to, are restored into the present. Pericles' story has been repeated ad infinitum for the same central purpose: restoration.⁷ In other words,

⁷Shakespeare was no doubt aware that the myth of Pericles has no determinable source. R.M. Dawkins, "Modern Greek Oral Versions of Apollonius of Tyre" The Modern Language Review, Vol. XXXVII (Cambridge, 1942) points out that variations of the myth are still being told today in less sophisticated cultures.

Gower tells us that we are, while watching the play, participating in an equally intimate and universal restoration. And, indeed, within the play itself as Helicanus says:

We'll mingle our bloods together in the earth,
From whence we had our being and our birth.

(I.II.111-113)

and within the close relationship of Gower to the audience, there is a sense of universal brotherhood. This sense of a return to the source of being for regeneration pervades the play and is the essence of the concept of restoration.

The play is not merely a symbolic representation of restoration but a reenactment of the myth wherein Gower presents the parable like a ritualized sacrament to the audience. Gower says that the repeating of the tale is itself a ritualized event. It "hath been sung at festivals, on ember eves and holy ales" (I.I.45). From this point of view, Gower

Gower tells us that we are, while watching the play, participating in an equally intimate and universal restoration. And, indeed, with the play itself as Helicarus says:

We'll mingle our bloods together in the earth,
From whence we had our being and our birth.

(I.II.111-113)

and within the close relationship of Gower to the audience, there is a sense of universal brotherhood. This sense of a return to the source of being for regeneration pervades the play and is the essence of the concept of restoration.

The play is not merely a symbolic representation of Pericles' ritualized restoration but a reenactment of the myth wherein Gower presents the parable like a ritualized sacrament to the audience. Gower says that the repeating of the tale is itself a ritualized event. It "hath been sung at festivals, on ember eves and holy ales" (I.I.15). From this point of view, Gower

appears to take on the robes of the priest or the magus. (In fact it is as though Gower joins forces with the magician Cerimon to become Prospero in The Tempest.)

Ritual, by its very nature, corresponds conceptually to the ideas implicit in the time-eternity paradigm. In ritual, focus is on the present action and, in this sense, it cannot be separated from temporal process. It is, however, a repetition that is an imitation of a divine, eternal model. In essence, ritual relates to processes through which contact is made with the divine. Ideally, the aim of ritual is to empty the psyche of ego consciousness to prepare the soul for grace. As such, it is a mediating action of which the aim is to recapture the cosmic significance of a given action.

Ritual, as a mediating action, corresponds to and serves the same purpose as the mediating figures

in the play. For example, Cerimon and Marina, both of whom possess "sacred physic," mediate between matter and spirit. Cerimon raises Thaisa from the dead and Marina lifts her father out of the melancholy world of alienation into a world of joy. Similarly, Gower mediates between the audience and Pericles, the focal point of the ritual.

To allow the audience to participate in the ritual, time is evoked in a special way. Shakespeare reached back in time to bring Gower, a poet long dead, into the present to tell the tale. On one hand, this establishes planes of historical reality reaching back in time from the Elizabethan, to the medieval, to the Greek world, the continuity of which serves to underline the universal nature of the experience. On the other hand, by coalescing his past with the present, Gower creates a disjunction of time. He disrupts history to present an action for a particular

period of time: the duration of the play.

The stress on the reality of a given time - now - appropriate to Pericles' experience of ultimate immediacy and his discovery of the illusory nature of death, is underlined by the time images that open and close the play. Gower begins with:

I life would wish, and that I might
Waste it for you like taper-light (V.I.15-16)

and ends with, "Now our sands are almost run (V.II.I).

In addition to its purpose of enclosing the play within a given time, the hourglass, which can simply be picked up, turned over and begun again, suggests two other interpenetrating ideas. It underlines the dimension of the play that is outside of time and is thus eternally the same, and it places focus on the repetition in time since the time of the play, like the time of the hourglass, can be experienced anew. This corresponds to the concept implicit in the nature of repetition in that the temporal is continuously and infinitely being acted out against its eternal paradigm.

The disruption of historical process in favour of repetition and ritual occurs in the non-successive nature of the play. In Act IV, Scene IV, Gower stands before Marina's monument at Tharsus and introduces the action. The action that is about to take place has, however, already happened. The dumb show that follows "whereat Pericles makes lamentation, puts on sackcloth and in a mighty passion departs" is a repetition of what Gower has already told us and what has happened before he told it. Gower, revealing the action to the audience, gives it "previous knowledge" beyond the level of dramatic irony. This is then repeated in action, and again in dumbshow, in a kind of compressed history. The point is that the disjunction of the linear, historical continuum by Gower serves to place emphasis on the eternal cyclical world of ritual. Emphasis is placed on the repeating of the story in time so that the myth is "lived" rather than on the life of Pericles, which is past.

The idea of the repeating of the story occurs numerous times in the play. When Marina is brought to her father, she retells the story of her life. Immediately prior to her entrance, Helicahus is just about to retell the story of Pericles when he is interrupted by Marina. In Act V, Scene III, Pericles repeats his whole history at Ephesus in thirteen lines. Significantly, it is Diana who tells Pericles to go to Ephesus and "give repetition to his life" (V.I.244). These thirteen lines are themselves a compression of a lifetime that has already been compressed by Gower and, finally of course, by Shakespeare.

From the audience's point of view, Pericles' restoration is predestined because it is known before it occurs. Because of this, suspense is eliminated and there is no anticipation of the future. Gower eliminates the past too by making it doubly past, "I tell you what mine authors say" (I.20). There is no past or future because time, poetically, has become

"consubstantial" with eternity, which is appropriate to the ahistorical nature of religious allegory.

The audience, through Gower, is made conscious of the archetypal nature of repetition at the same time that a similar process is being experienced. The play is ritual abstracted into art and the time that Gower creates for the audience consumes itself in the presentation of an eternal and magical restoration to innocence.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aquinas, St. Thomas. Selected Writings. Translated by Robert P. Goodwin. New York: 1965.
- Auerbach, Eric. Mimesis. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: 1953.
- Barry, Jackson G. Dramatic Structure. Berkeley: 1970.
- Berry, Francis. "Word and Picture in the Final Plays," Later Shakespeare. Edited by J.R. Brown and Bernard Harris. London: 1966.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. Other Inquisitions. Translated by Ruth L.C. Simms. New York: 1966.
- Bourke, Vernon J., editor. The Essential Augustine. New York: 1964.
- Brown, Norman O. Life Against Death. Middletown: 1970.
- Buonaiuti, Ernesto. "Christ and St. Paul," The Mystic Vision. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Edited by Joseph Campbell. Princeton: 1968.
- Burke, Kenneth. The Philosophy of Literary Form. New York: 1957.
- Cassirer, Ernest. The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy. Translated by Mario Domandi. New York: 1963.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. Time and Eternity. Ascona: 1957.
- Curry, Walter Clyde. Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns. Baton Rouge: 1937.
- Dodkins, R.M. "Modern Greek Oral Versions of Apollonius of Tyre," The Modern Language Review. XXXVII (1942), pp. 169-84.

- de Menasce, Jean. "The Experience of the Spirit in Christian Mysticism," The Mystic Vision. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Edited by Joseph Campbell. Princeton: 1968.
- Eckhart, Meister. Selected Writings. Edited by J.M. Clark and J.V. Skinner. London: 1958.
- Eliade, Mircea. The Sacred and the Profane. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: 1959.
- Felberin, Howard. "Shakespeare's Miracle Play," Shakespeare Quarterly, XVIII, No. 4 (Autumn, 1967), pp. 363-74.
- Fergusson, Francis. Shakespeare, The Pattern in His Carpet. New York: 1968.
- _____. The Idea of a Theatre. Princeton: 1968.
- Frye, Northrop. "Recognition in The Winter's Tale," Shakespeare, The Winter's Tale, A Casebook. Edited by Kenneth Muir. London: 1968.
- _____. "The Argument of Comedy," English Institute Essays. Edited by D.A. Robertson, Jr. New York: 1965.
- Happold, F.C. Mysticism, A Study and an Anthology. Middlesex: 1971.
- Honig, Edwin. Dark Conceit: The Making of Allegory. Evanston: 1959.
- Inge, W.R. Mysticism in Religion. London: 1969.
- Kermode, Frank. Shakespeare: The Final Plays. London: 1963.
- Kierkegaard, S.A. ; Repetition, An Essay in Experimental Psychology. Princeton: 1941.

Knight, G. Wilson. The Shakespearian Tempest.
London: 1953.

_____. The Crown of Iife. London: 1965.

_____. Shakespeare and Religion. London: 1967.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. The Philosophy of Marsilio
Ficino. Translated by Virginia Conant.
Gloucester: 1964.

Langer, Susanne K., editor. Reflections of Art.
New York: 1961.

Muir, Kenneth. Last Periods of Shakespeare, Racine,
Ibsen. Detroit: 1961.

Oslon, Charles. "Quantity in Verse and Shakespeare's
Late Plays," Selected Writings. New York:
1966.

~~Parker, M.D.H. The Slave of Iife; A Study of Shakespeare
and the Idea of Justice. London: 1955.~~

Plotinus. The Enneads. Translated by Stephen Mackenna
London: 1956.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "The Concept of Redemption in
Manichaeism," The Mystic Vision. Translated
by Ralph Manheim. Edited by Joseph Campbell.
Princeton: 1968.

Quispel, Gilles. "Time and History in Patristic
Christianity," Man and Time. Translated by
Ralph Manheim. Edited by Joseph Campbell.

Rabkin, Norman. Shakespeare and The Common Understanding.
London: 1954.

_____. Approaches to Shakespeare. New York: 1964.

Righter, Anne. Shakespeare and The Idea of the Play.
Middlesex: 1967.

Seltzer, Daniel. "The Staging of the Last Plays,"
Later Shakespeare. Edited by J.R. Brown and
Bernard Harris. London: 1966.

Shakespeare, William. Pericles. Edited by H.D. Hoeniger.
London: 1963.

Van der Leeuw, G. "Primordial Time and Final Time,"
Man and Time. Translated by Ralph Manheim.
Edited by Joseph Campbell. New York: 1957.

Vyvyan, John. Shakespeare and Platonic Beauty. London:
1961.

Walker, D.P. Spiritual and Demonic Magic From Ficino
to Campanella. London: 1958.

West, Robert H. Shakespeare and the Outer Mystery.
Lexington: 1968.

White, Howard B. Corp'd Hills Towards Heaven. Shakespeare
and the Classical Polity. The Hague: 1970.

Wind, Edgar. Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance.
London: 1958.

Yates, Frances. The Art of Memory. London: 1966.

_____. Theatre of the World. Chicago: 1969.