

**Deanne Williams, "Papa Don't Preach: The Power of Prolixity in *Pericles*." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. 71 no. 2 (Spring, 2002): 595-622.**

In Shakespeare's *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, as Northrop Frye observes, 'father-daughter incest keeps hanging over the story as a possibility' (44). Most critics, however, are reluctant to extend the question of incest beyond the borders of Antioch, and quick to exempt the hero, Pericles, from scrutiny on this matter.(1) As C.L. Barber puts it, 'we begin with overt incest, and arrive at a sublime transformation of the motive' (64). Certainly such a reading is consistent with the play's source material. The Latin romance of Apollonius of Tyre, which Shakespeare adapted from John Gower's version in the *Confessio Amantis* (circa 1375), presents the sexual relationship between Antiochus and his daughter as an emblem of tyranny, while the platonic, paternal affection displayed by Apollonius towards his own daughter is an extension of his capacity for benevolent rule. However, to regard the hero's impeccable character as the opposite of Antiochus's moral monstrosity is to overlook the central drama of Shakespeare's *Pericles*, in which the hapless hero struggles against falling into a classic folktale scenario, according to which the daughter takes her dead mother's place as the consort of the king, her father.

The question of the authorship of *Pericles* is famously fraught. Omitted from the First Folio, although included in the Third and Fourth, the play survives in one form: that of the 'bad' first quarto of 1609. Whereas *Pericles* was extremely popular in the seventeenth century, the popular theory that the play is the product of collaboration can be traced back only as far as the eighteenth century: in the Prologue to his adaptation of the play, *Marina* (1738), George Lillo explains the necessity to exculpate Shakespeare from what he considers to be the play's 'rude wild scenes' (3). Lillo proposes that the bard's 'bright, inimitable lines' were mixed with, although easily distinguished from, those of his collaborator: 'as gold though mix'd with baser matter shines.' The struggle to determine the identity of Shakespeare's base collaborator continues, with George Wilkins emerging as the favourite, charged with composing the first two acts of the play, which critics have judged substandard. The controversy concerning the authorship of *Pericles* provides a classic example of the problem that Stephen Orgel identifies in seeking out the 'Authentic Shakespeare': 'it defines Shakespeare as the best poet, and then banishes from the canon whatever is considered insufficiently excellent' (2).(2) In other words, we look outside of Shakespeare to explain the aspects of *Pericles* that do not meet our impossibly high standards for what is 'Shakespearean.' Moreover, to use a collaborator to explain the impression that *Pericles* sounds and feels somehow un-Shakespearean overlooks the extent to which many of Shakespeare's plays which have not been banished for insufficient excellence are the product of collaboration, from Middleton's witch scenes in *Macbeth* to the hand of Fletcher in *Henry VIII*. Finally, the impression that *Pericles* contains lines and scenes that do not accord with our collective idea of Shakespeare not only discounts the wide range of tone and diction available throughout Shakespeare's work, but also overlooks the dramatic motivation for establishing an alternative voice in *Pericles*: 'to sing a song that old was sung' (Prologue, 1), an ancient text presented by the Chorus, the medieval poet John Gower.(3)

This essay takes the play that is recorded in the 1609 quarto on its own terms, as a legitimate artifact: neither a debased corruption nor an unmediated reflection of Shakespearean intentionality.(4) If we regard *Pericles* as a coherent whole (in which Shakespeare played a major, if undefined, part), it becomes more difficult to separate the incest that takes place between Antiochus and his daughter in act 1, generally considered to be composed by the collaborator, from the virtuous actions of Pericles in the subsequent acts, allegedly penned by Shakespeare himself. Indeed, from Pericles' initial discovery of the 'family romance' taking place between Antiochus and his daughter at the beginning of the play to his narrow avoidance of committing the same act with his own daughter at its end, incest lurks in the dark corners of *Pericles*, like the Duke in *Measure for Measure*. Depicting the successful avoidance of

incestuous desire rather than its absence, Pericles returns repeatedly, even obsessively, to the idea of a single king and father raising his young daughter alone.(5) After leaving the incestuous (and queenless) court of Antiochus, Pericles falls in love with Thaisa, yet another motherless princess whose possessive father, Simonides, fends off his daughter's suitors with a fervour that rivals that of Antiochus. And when Thaisa dies in childbirth, Pericles finds himself in exactly this position: raising his daughter, Marina, by himself. Rather than continuing in a situation that would allow incest to take place, Pericles leaves Marina to be raised by friends in faraway Tarsus. Freed from the incestuous relationship that would have developed if she had remained with her father, Marina develops into an articulate and self-possessed young woman.

Unlike its sources, Pericles does not insist that a good king and father remain loftily above the temptations of power symbolized by incest, enduring the failings of others with a consistent and chilly perfection. Just as Pericles avoids a desire for which Antiochus and his daughter provide a powerful precedent, so, too, does Pericles itself contend with incest as a paradigm that informs the social and sexual dynamics of patriarchy. The triumph of patriarchal will represented by Antiochus's incestuous relationship with his daughter illustrates a binary of masculine licence and female submission, and of male speech and female silence (or the pressure to keep 'mum'), that affects the experience and articulation of sexual desire, as well as the construction of gender identities. Pericles reflects upon the misogynist ideal of female silence, questioning the cultural valorization of a woman's absolute compliance with her husband's or her father's will, and exploring the kinds of 'unspeakable' crimes that are concealed by her quiet obedience. Unlike Antiochus's quiet daughter, and unlike her counterparts in the sources of Pericles, Shakespeare's Marina is neither defined nor dominated by her father. As verbal and independent as Antiochus's daughter is mute and imprisoned, the young woman who succeeds in drawing her long-lost father out of his shell is neither acquiescent daddy's girl nor patient Griselda. Seducing the old man into speech instead of sex, Marina's rhetorical powers allow her to transform a potentially devastating encounter into a miraculous family reunion.

In recent years, the subject of incest has attracted a healthy amount of interest among Shakespeare scholars. Incest often functions as a signifier in political discourse: Marc Shell's *The End of Kinship*, for example, places the theme of sibling incest in *Measure for Measure* within the play's articulation of democratic ideals, and Bruce Bohrer's *Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England* draws a series of parallels between Shakespeare's plays and the allegations of incest which swirled around the Tudor and Stuart court. Hence, a number of discussions of incest in Pericles interpret Antiochus's violation of the incest taboo as emblematic of his status as a tyrant, the wrong sort of patriarch, and see it as illustrative of the Jacobean preoccupation with definitions and manifestations of royal power.(6) Feminist investigations of incest, however, have called attention to the role that incest plays in psychoanalytic and theoretical examinations of sexual differentiation and the organization of gender roles. Described as society's 'best-kept secret,' father-daughter incest is regarded by many feminist theorists as the fullest expression of a social system which prioritizes masculine domination and feminine passivity, male speech and female silence.(7) Yet scholarship on incest in Pericles treats incest primarily as an indicator of relations between men. Janet Adelman, in *Suffocating Mothers*, insists that the incest that takes place at Antioch is 'emphatically the woman's fault' (195) and represents a challenge to Pericles in his search for a 'secure filial identity' (194); for Ruth Nevo, Pericles' flight from Antiochus expresses his Freudian fear of the father-figure; while Coppelia Kahn argues that his subsequent peregrinations constitute 'symbolic confrontations with oedipal desire and oedipal fear' ('Providential,' 230).

This essay takes the question of incest in Pericles outside the realm of male bonding, and considers, instead, its relationship to the experience of daughterhood: a topic which has provided a focus for feminist (and profeminist) Shakespeare studies, from Mary Cowden Clarke's *The Girlhood of*

Shakespeare's Heroines to Lisa Jardine's influential *Still Harping on Daughters*. The understated heroines of Shakespeare's late plays have prompted a general critical appraisal that Shakespearean 'romance' reaffirms patriarchal norms and prerogatives, and have been kept quite separate from the more overt transgressions, sartorial and otherwise, of Shakespeare's 'unruly' cross-dressed heroines.(8) Although Marina has remained, for most critics, a paragon of daughterly obedience, a vessel of patriarchal wish-fulfilment, it is my contention that she is the result of an effort to move beyond the old pattern of masculine domination and submissive feminine silence symbolized by incest.(9) In Shakespeare's earlier plays, this pattern is evaded when the heroines disguise themselves as boys, only to be embraced again, wholeheartedly, upon their engagement. A learned virgin in the tradition of medieval saints' lives, Marina is forced to fend for herself, and her discursive powers provide an alternative to cross-dressing: they give her the same freedom, livelihood, and physical safety ensured by Viola's disguise as a eunuch in *Twelfth Night*.(10) Although her comedic counterparts are expected, ultimately, to return to their 'women's weeds,' Marina's rhetorical powers never leave her: at the end of the play, Lysimachus betroths himself to a woman fully capable of arguing him under the table.

If Marina provides the occasion for the play's ongoing examination of 'daughterhood,' the Chorus, Gower, provides the focal point for its examination of 'fatherhood.' A rather Polonius-like version of the pater familias, 'old Gower' presents a succession of commentaries upon the play's action that look back to the choric conventions of Elizabethan drama and its morality play antecedents, as well as to the moralized poetry of the Middle Ages. As Chorus, Gower participates in the medieval tradition of moralized commentary, supplementing classical narratives with an allegorical Christian gloss, that was followed by his predecessor, the medieval poet John Gower.(11) If, as Chorus, Gower's self-professedly dull and prolix commentary looks back to medieval precedents, it also dramatizes (and satirizes) the position taken by Ben Jonson in an ongoing contemporary debate concerning the respective merits of the visual and verbal aspects of the dramatic experience: it was Jonson's belief that the spectacle of the stage was inferior to its capacity for moral instruction.(12) Gower was an apparently benevolent representative of literary paternity and cultural inheritance, but his efforts to moralize the narrative are, nevertheless, consistent with the exploits of tyrants such as Antiochus: just as Antiochus supplies a verbal 'gloze' to obscure his own crimes, Gower's words conceal, behind an endless stream of moral verbiage, a profound investment in, and fascination with, the paradigms of incestuous desire.

As Gower's words invoke medieval notions of literary authority, and Marina's speech draws upon the images of female learning in medieval saints' lives, Pericles makes use of the medieval past in order to address compelling questions faced in the present. At a time when the virginal cult of the Elizabethan court had been replaced by the patriarchal nuclear family of the Jacobean court (one which had its own sexual secrets and scandals to protect), Pericles explores the shift in gender roles that took place in the transition from the Tudor to the Stuart period. Figures such as Gower and Marina also look back upon the translation of humanist pedagogy into the female sphere in the sixteenth century: a chapter in the history of women's education that also possesses a solid father-daughter component, from the resounding success Sir Thomas More enjoyed with the education of his daughter Margaret to Roger Ascham's schooling of the young princess Elizabeth at the request of her father. Yet the play's dramatization of incest does more than seek out an alternative to contemporary models of femininity in medieval Catholic hagiography. It also produces a sustained examination of the legacy of sixteenth-century humanism: the power of rhetorical argument, the claims of textual commentary, and the domination by ancient precedents. Calling attention to the limitations of humanist strategies for controlling the past, Pericles imagines an alternative 'brave new world' in which it is the old who have the most to learn from the young.

When Pericles, prince of Tyre, travels to Antioch to woo its celebrated princess, only a riddle stands between him and the object of his desire:

I am no viper, yet I feed  
On mother's flesh which did me breed. I sought a husband, in which labour I  
found that kindness in a father. He's father, son, and husband mild; I, mother, wife, and yet his child.  
How they may be, and yet in two, As you will live, resolve it you. (Pericles, 1.1.65-72)

Dissolving the distinctions between 'father, son, and husband' and 'mother, wife, and... child,' Antiochus's riddle linguistically enacts the boundless nature of Antiochus's sexuality: it mirrors the king's dissolution of the sexual boundary implied by the kinship relations of father and daughter. Although the riddle implies the daughter's agency in initiating the incest, it actually confirms only Antiochus's fantasy of daughterly complicity. Although it speaks on the daughter's behalf (she is the riddle's 'I'), the riddle is actually scripted by the father, and manifests Antiochus's verbal as well as sexual domination over her: the daughter is given no name in the play (only the title 'daughter'), and she actually speaks only once, and very briefly, to wish Pericles luck with the challenge presented by her father. Antiochus's daughter, then, is 'spoken for' in more ways than one.

The riddle reveals not only the secret of Antiochus's relationship with his daughter, but also the more threatening and universal truth about incest as a cultural paradigm. The elision of the distinctions between family roles is consistent with a popular Renaissance analogy between family and state (or kinship and kingship), according to which the king represents the father and his subjects the children, while, at the same time, the king also represents the husband, and the kingdom his wife.(13) This breakdown of family roles in the political sphere extends to familiar Christian tropes: the phrase 'mother, wife, and yet his child' recalls the conflation of feminine identities embraced by the Virgin Mary, while phrases such as 'clothed like a bride' (1.1.7) and 'apparelled like the spring' (13) invoke the visionary description of the apocalyptic woman 'clothed with the sun' in the book of Revelation (12:1). Echoing biblical accounts of the spiritual communion between Christ and the church, this apocalyptic language connects the relationship between Antiochus and his daughter to a set of biblical tropes which blur the distinctions between family roles in order to convey the experience of religious transcendence. When Pericles later compares Antiochus's daughter to 'the fruit of yon celestial tree' (22), he inserts his own 'inflamed desire' (21) into the biblical story of the fall, and credits his own experience of erotic attraction to the 'gods that made me man' (20). By adopting the role of Adam, the father/brother/suitor of Eve, his seductive daughter/sister/bride, Pericles identifies his sexual feelings for Antiochus's daughter with a foundational Christian narrative according to which human sexuality is inextricably bound up with incestuous desire. A governing metaphor for the powerful institutions of church and state, incest is presented less as a monstrous aberration than as the ultimate expression of patriarchy.

Couching the blunt disclosure of the transgression within the structure of a secret, the riddle's interplay between revelation and concealment highlights the combination of visual spectacle and enabling silence that is identified, throughout the play, with incest. Pericles opens with an account, by the Chorus, of how Antiochus's daughter's reputation for great beauty inspires hordes of suitors to make the journey to see her: 'The beauty of this sinful dame / Made many princes thither frame' (Prologue, 31-32). When Pericles arrives at Antioch, he responds to Antiochus's daughter as he would to a miraculous vision: 'See where she comes,' he sighs, 'apparelled like the spring' (1.1.13). Pericles compares the visual experience of the daughter's 'glory' (4) to the act of reading: 'Her face the book of praises where is read / Nothing but curious pleasures' (16-17). Like a book, Antiochus's daughter requires another's eyes to give her meaning. Destined, like a 'Fair glass of light' (77), for the gaze of her suitors (and of her father), she reflects back to men an ideal image of their desires. Antiochus encourages the suitors in

their eagerness to view the daughter: 'Her face like heaven enticeth thee to view / Her countless glory' (31-32). Drawing attention to the sexual currents that flow through a father's participation in the 'traffic in women,' his words confirm the essentially visual nature of his own attraction to his daughter, and imply a coexistence between the sexual impulses the daughter engenders in her suitors and the sexual relationship he enjoys with her. When Antiochus compares his daughter's beauty to the 'fair Hesperides' (28), guardians of their father's 'golden fruit' (29), he situates his own incest as merely an extension of patriarchal control: the apples guarded by the Hesperides on behalf of their father were thrown before Atalanta, a famously disobedient daughter and talented long-distance runner, who, by stopping to pick them up, lost her race with Hippomenes and forfeited her plans for an independent, unmarried life.(14)

Antiochus goes on to employ the rhetoric of sight in his challenge to Pericles: 'because thine eye / Presumes to reach, all the whole heap must die' (33-34), taking pleasure in the visual display of his daughter to her suitor, while at the same time revelling in her ultimate inaccessibility to him. After he 'sees' the unspeakable meaning of the riddle, however, Pericles lapses into the impotent silence of the suitors, whose decapitated heads are powerless to 'testify' (Prologue, 40) to a secret which may be seen or witnessed but never can be spoken aloud. Although, once Pericles sees the girl, he cannot keep his distance, the riddle brings him too close, forcing him, like Oedipus, to see too much. As he reads it, Pericles discovers that the 'speechless tongues and semblance pale' (1.1.37) of previous suitors, whose decapitated heads adorn the court, convey not so much their inability to decode the utterly transparent riddle as their reluctance to put into words the horrific truth which they have silently witnessed, but not 'expounded' in words (58). Once drawn, like Pericles, to see Antiochus's daughter, the failed suitors can now only mutely warn Pericles against her with their 'grim looks' (Prologue, 40). And Antiochus knows that Pericles knows: he recognizes that Pericles has 'found the meaning' (1.1.110) of the riddle, and he dares the prince to put the crime into words: 'Either expound now or receive your sentence' (91). Taunting Pericles in this way, Antiochus confirms his own power over a younger man who cannot bring himself to challenge the king, confront him with the incest, and break the king's pattern of sexual exploitation. Daunted, Pericles offers the meek excuse that 'Few love to hear the sins they love to act' (93), and he even provides Antiochus with a weak justification for his erotic transgression: 'All love the womb that their first being bred' (108). While Pericles' evasion of the situation at Antioch by refusing to gloss the riddle plays an enabling role in the economy of visual desire and sexual transgression at Antiochus's court, Pericles is also speaking for himself when he explains his reasons for keeping the secret: 'Who has a book of all that monarchs do, / He's more secure to keep it shut, than shown; / For vice repeated is like the wandering wind' (95-97). What remains unspoken can be ignored; and the most important information that the riddle reveals to Pericles (the 'vice' that he does not wish to 'repeat') is the universal nature of incestuous desire.

Like any courtier who knows more than he should, Pericles flees Antioch 'like an arrow / Shot' (163-64). Although his 'breath is gone,' nevertheless Pericles' 'sore eyes see clear' (100), and he refuses to tell anyone about what he has seen at Antioch ('Antiochus... will think me speaking, though I swear to silence,' 1.2.19). The hero's silence constitutes an important departure from the play's sources. In Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, Pericles' counterpart Apollonius is famous for his verbal gifts ('of wordes he was eloquent,' 8.394), and he confronts Antiochus directly, and at length, with his interpretation of the riddle: 'Unto the king he hath ansuerd / And hath rehersed on and on / The pointz' (420-22). It is, in fact, precisely Apollonius's fearless verbal exposition of the riddle that gets him in so much trouble with Antiochus. In another major source, Twine's *The Patterne of Painefull Adventures* (1576), Apollonius also interprets the riddle correctly, although Antiochus insists that he is mistaken. In Pericles, however, it is the hero's utter refusal to testify to the incest at Antioch that supplies the motivation for the play as a whole. Ironically naming Pericles in honour of an Athenian statesman famous for his oratory (and appreciated for his democratic and imperialist ideals by early modern

readers of Thucydides), the play foregrounds its hero's lack of the verbal skills that would have allowed him to intervene in Antiochus's incest and its economy of erotic spectacle and complicit silence.<sup>(15)</sup> Rather than allowing the hero's verbal repudiation of incest to establish a firm and fixed distinction between Pericles and Antiochus, the play implicates Pericles in Antiochus's crime not only by the visual nature of his own erotic desire but also, most importantly, by his refusal to speak out and to interrupt the king's visually inflected 'scene' of incest.

Pericles progresses with a series of encounters in which the hero is taught the moral merits of verbal testimony, as opposed to the seductive dangers of sight. In contrast with the striking spectacles (ranging from storms at sea to opulent courts, from jousting tournaments to nocturnal apparitions) for which Pericles is best known, there are a series of characters who, throughout the play, mount an earnest defence of speech. In the midst of famine at Tarsus, for example, King Cleon proposes to Queen Dioniza that they try to come to terms with their sorrows by 'relating tales of others' griefs' (1.4.2), using their 'tongues and sorrows to sound deep / Our woes into the air' (13-14). The virtuous Cleon's preference for narrative includes a healthy anti-theatrical prejudice ('Who makes the fairest show, means most deceit,' 74), but Dioniza worries that telling tales would increase their visibility to 'mischief's eyes' (8), and, attracting the attention of the gods, leave them vulnerable to even more trouble. Cleon's preference, however, is rewarded when Pericles arrives at Tarsus with ships laden with grain, and explains that he 'heard' the tale of his 'miserias as far as Tyre' (86). By contrast, Dioniza's visual inclination is associated with her duplicity: when she later confesses to having ordered the death of Marina, Cleon angrily compares her scheming to the ocular deception of a 'harpy, which to betray, dost with / Thine angel's face seize with thine eagle's talons' (4.3.46-47).

Fleeing Antiochus's henchmen, Pericles goes on to meet a group of fishermen who like to pass the time discussing political philosophy. Trading gloomy tales about the 'the infirmities of men' (2.1.46), they reveal that their particular bugbear (one which recalls the earlier scenes at Antioch) is the exploitation of the powerless by the empowered, or, as they put it, 'the great ones eat up the little ones' (27-28). The biblical story of Jonah and the whale serves as a subtext for one fisherman's comparison of 'rich misers' to 'a whale: a plays and tumbles, driving the poor fry before him, and at last devours them all at a mouthful' (28-30). The fisherman boasts that if he ever found himself in such a whale's belly, he would keep 'such a jangling of the bells that he should never have left till he cast bells, steeple, church, and parish up again' (38-40). The example of Jonah, the reluctant prophet, matches up well with Pericles' experiences to this point: avoiding God's mandate to preach to the people of Nineveh, Jonah finds himself in a storm at sea that is much like the rough seas Pericles encounters while fleeing Antioch. Jonah's consumption by the whale recalls Antiochus's use of feeding as a metaphor for incest: 'I am no viper, yet I feed / On mother's flesh.' And, as the fisherman's parable concludes, 'jangling' is the only way to escape the whale's belly: like Jonah, he implies, Pericles must learn the power of speech.

Pericles is not, however, a quick study. Not only does he maintain, throughout these adventures, his code of silence about the incest he has witnessed, he also continues to be moved and motivated by visual display. When he hears of the great beauty (and availability) of King Simonides' daughter at Pentapolis, Pericles believes that the visual impact of his father's shield is all that he will need to win her hand. Allowing the fishermen's little lesson to wash over him completely, Pericles envisions his success at Pentapolis in the showy terms that recall the court at Antioch: 'I will mount myself / Upon a courser, whose delight steps / Shall make the gazer joy to see him tread' (2.1.143-45). Hence, despite his best effort to distance himself from the truth about incest revealed by Antiochus's riddle, Pericles continues to bump up against incestuous desire and its attendant visual tropes. At Pentapolis, King Simonides describes his daughter Thaisa as 'beauty's child, whom nature gat / For men to see, and seeing wonder at' (2.2.6-7). Simonides' rhetoric of sight and wonder implies that, as a motherless 'child'

(and one whose beauty recalls her mother), Thaisa occupies a position at her father's court that is very similar to that of Antiochus's daughter. Simonides' extreme jealousy of his daughter's suitors, none of whom he believes are 'As great in blood as I myself' (2.5.78), and his negative reaction to Pericles in particular, whose behaviour at dinner leads him to conclude that he is 'but a country gentleman' (2.3.32), recapitulates Antiochus's antagonism against the suitors for the possession of his daughter. Reluctantly presiding over the engagement of Pericles and Thaisa, Simonides undermines his acceptance of Pericles ('I am glad on't with all my heart,' 2.5.72) with suggestive remarks which flaunt his sexual control over his daughter. He addresses Thaisa repeatedly as his 'mistress' (71, 79), and uses language of sexual domination ('I'll tame you, I'll bring you in subjection,' 73; 'frame your will to mine,' 79-80; 'be ruled by me,' 81) to assert his patriarchal prerogative and to imply that his power over his daughter, despite her betrothal, remains unchallenged. The competition between father and suitor for access to the daughter even extends to Simonides' voyeuristic self-projection into their wedding bed: 'It pleaseth me so well that I will see you wed, / And then with what haste you can, get you to bed' (90-91).

The extent to which Pericles's relationship with Thaisa is inflected by incestuous desire is confirmed by a significant change Shakespeare makes to his source material: whereas in Pericles, Thaisa is the name of the hero's wife, in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and Twine's *Patterne of Painfull Adventures*, it is the daughter who is named, respectively, Thaisa and Tharsia. When Pericles constructs Simonides as a father-figure, 'Yon king's to me like to my father's picture' (2.3.36), he raises the possibility that Simonides is his own absent father, which would make Thaisa, his future bride, also his sister. Simonides' nervous request that Pericles and Thaisa 'unclasp, unclasp' (101), moreover, echoes an earlier reference to Antiochus's 'untimely claspings' (1.1.129) with his daughter, just as the alimentary terms by which Thaisa expresses romantic longing for Pericles, 'wishing him my meat' (2.3.31), echo Antiochus's use of cannibalism as a metaphor for incest. The conflation of the roles of mother, wife, and daughter in Antiochus's riddle is, similarly, recapitulated in the terms by which Lychorida, the nurse, introduces Pericles to his baby daughter after Thaisa has died in childbirth, defining the daughter as the fleshly extension of the wife: 'Take in your arms this piece of your dead queen' (3.1.17).

Inviting the 'good gods' to 'throw their best eyes' onto his miserable plight (38), Pericles buries Thaisa at sea, and leaves Marina to be raised, at Tarsus, with the following valediction:

We cannot but obey the powers above us; Could I rage and roar as doth the sea she lies in, Yet the end must be as 'tis. My gentle babe Marina, Whom, for she was born at sea I have named so, Here I charge your charity withal, leaving her The infant of your care, beseeching you to give her Princely training that she may be mannered as she is born. (3.3.10-16)

Pericles' fatalism ('the end must be as 'tis') reflects an awareness - which is both unconscious and so self-evident that it can go without saying - that to raise his daughter alone would lead to incest. He names Marina for the sea that removes Thaisa from the picture: the sea that would have allowed the age-old folktale scenario to be played out. Remarking upon his own inability to 'rage and roar' like the sea, Pericles acknowledges that his absence will allow Marina the opportunity to receive a 'princely training': a training that includes, according to Renaissance fashion, the development of rhetorical skills. His use of the masculine title 'prince' instead of 'princess' envisions a future for Marina in his own image: but one which is as different from his own speechless exile as it is from the silent complicity of the princess at Antioch. Marina's only chance to be a 'prince,' and to escape the role of 'princess' scripted for her by the pattern of incestuous desire, demands Pericles' absence. Like many of Shakespeare's verbal, self-determining, cross-dressing (and occasionally quite 'princely') heroines, Marina will be raised without a father. As Pericles brings his farewell to its conclusion, he makes a vow

of chastity that is usually read as an indication of his desire that his daughter will enjoy an unquestioned succession: 'Till she be married, / Madam, by bright Diana whom we honour, / All unsistered shall this heir of mine remain' (26-28).(16) While patrilineal concerns may be suited to Marina's anticipated destiny as a 'prince,' it is also significant that Pericles makes a vow to Diana, the goddess of chastity to whom expiatory sacrifices were made, according to Roman law, when incest had been committed.(17) Pericles' valediction thus communicates the extent to which, until his daughter marries, the father remains in the perilous position of a suitor.

## II

The Chorus in Henry V delivers a rousing invocation to a fantastic 'Muse of fire,' but old Gower emerges meekly from a pile of ashes. Awkward, verbose, and hopelessly out of date, Gower underscores his temporal distance from his audience with old-fashioned rhyming couplets, which he calls the 'lame feet of my rhyme' (4.0.48), and with quaint medievalisms such as 'iwis' (2.0.2) and 'y-slacked' (3.0.1). He appeals humbly to his modern audience, 'born in these latter times' (Prologue, 11), beseeching their indulgence of an old man who promises them a tale that is even older than he is, one that was 'read for restoratives' by long-dead 'lords and ladies' (7-8). Opposing speech with spectacle, and lust with age, Gower is, like Polonius, the quintessential kingly adviser: long on words, but short on showmanship. Unlike Polonius, however, he is utterly conscious of the soporific powers of his loquacity: 'Pardon old Gower, this longs the text' (2.0.40).(18)

Referring to the play that he presents as a 'text,' Gower underscores the relationship of the play to his own lengthy narrative, while his reputation as a literary 'father' functions as part of the play's ongoing exploration of paternity.(19) 'Old Gower' contextualizes the play's engagement with the subject of patriarchy within a set of late medieval practices of reading and writing recently anatomized by Seth Lerer. Gower's self-professed didacticism recalls the culture of recreational reading for the purposes of moral instruction which, as Lerer demonstrates, gave rise to a cult of 'Chaucerian paternitas' (16) and instigated a process which he calls 'reading like a child.' Dramatizing a humanist fascination with the recovery of ancient narratives and the celebration of ancient authors, Gower states piously that 'the purpose [of his tale] is to make men glorious' (9), and he bolsters his credo with a little Latin proverb: 'Et bonum quo antiquius eo melius' (Prologue, 7-10). As any humanist would agree, the older the tale (and, presumably, the teller) the better. At the same time, however, Gower's self-annihilating obsequiousness - his eagerness to please his audience, 'to glad your ear and please your eyes' (Prologue, 4); his plea for their acceptance, 'if you, born in those latter times... accept my rhymes' (11-12); and his submission of the play to 'the judgement of [their] eye' (41) - is illustrative of the fifteenth-century pose of authorial subjection Lerer defines as 'writing like the Clerk.' For Gower's Polonius-like patter succeeds less in infantilizing his audience than in empowering them. In this respect, Gower's eagerness to please draws attention to the effects of the advent of literary laureation, which, as Lerer explains, broke with an earlier, medieval, pattern of filial obedience to a 'fatherly poet' in order to privilege, instead, the achievements of the living' reader, editor and critic.' After the early modern 'self-styled laureate' had emerged out of the high seriousness of Chaucerian memorialization, in Pericles, Gower's recherche proverbialism, and a simple-mindedness Samuel Johnson described as 'dotage encroaching upon wisdom' (8,973) make him a figure of fun whose resurrection is, for the audience, less a Hamletian nightmare than an ironic exercise in nostalgia.

If Gower the Chorus encapsulates the history of late medieval reading, he also presents a thumbnail sketch of the medieval John Gower's reception as a writer. Chaucer dedicated his Troilus and Criseyde to 'moral Gower' (5.1856) and, in the generations that followed, Gower's reputation for 'virtu' and 'moralitee' earned him a place, along with Chaucer and Lydgate, as one of the 'primier poetes of this



nacion.'(20) Caxton applied Gower's status as one of the 'first finders' of an English literary language to the rhetoric of fatherhood, referring to him, in the preface to his *Book of Good Manners*, as 'that auntyent fader of memorye.' Certainly, Gower the poet's persona lends itself to a familiar stereotype of fatherhood: in the *Confessio Amantis*, he fuses wistful archaism, 'long tyme in olde daies passed' (Prologue, 55), and fears about his own long-windedness, which 'dulleth ofte a mannes wit' (14) with assertions of a modest literary ambition, 'I wolde go the middle weie' (16) and even lack of sophistication, 'the symplesece of my wit' (76). Yet many readers took Gower's unique spin on a conventional modesty topos to be an honest appraisal of his poetic limitations: Puttenham decided that Gower was 'a bungler and not a Poet,' and called his 'graue moralities... very grossely bestowed' (76). Centuries later, C.S. Lewis, who was more inclined to praise Gower than to bury him, nevertheless admits that he finds him 'dull' (201), complains that 'he says too much' (222), and, tellingly, says his poetry makes him think of 'the language of our ancestors' (199-201).

One of the few good readers of this literary 'ancestor,' Shakespeare recognized that Gower's authorial persona as a man of eminent respectability but unremarkable talent was, in fact, a sophisticated narrative strategy that he developed to ameliorate the effects of his shocking and scandalous subject matter. With an eye to detail that tends towards the prurient, Genius, ancient priest of love and confessor to the besotted lover Amans, recounts, throughout the *Confessio Amantis*, a succession of tales of homosexuality, adultery, and sexual perversity. He manifests a particular fondness for incest, describing the love of sister and brother Canace and Machaire (3.1885-2195) and Orestes' passion for his mother Clytemnestra (4.451-505). In a history of religion in book 5, Genius makes a few subtle comparisons between the incestuous relationship of Venus and Cupid and the divinely sanctioned consanguineous love of Christ and Mary. His account of the origin of 'mankind' begins with the coupling of 'siblings,' Adam and Eve, and explains how incest was an acceptable means of procreation in the Old Testament 'Forthi that time it was no Sinne / The Soster forto take hire brother' (8.68-69). Gower crowns his collection with the 'Tale of Apollonius,' the longest of his many long tales, which commences with a frank and rather leisurely report of the incest at Antioch (8.271-495). Following a medieval tradition which sought to supplement classical narratives with a Christian interpretation, Genius supplies each of these sexy stories with an allegorical gloss or 'moral.' The result is a succession of long and detailed commentaries on virtuous selfgovernance which transform a collection of tales of transgressions into a compendium of ethical advice addressed first to Richard II, and then later revised for Henry IV. The Chaucerian epithet, 'moral Gower,' thus refers as much to the author's indebtedness to scholastic moralitas, which heaps words up upon words and commentary upon narrative, as it does to his high-toned professions of moral gravitas.

In *Pericles*, Gower's reputation for 'morality' (in the textual as well as ethical sense) responds to the hotbed of visual stimuli and transgressive sexuality found at Antiochus's court. Just as the moral commentaries in the *Confessio Amantis* beat a path of commentary away from the sexual transgressions it presents, so too does Gower in *Pericles* use rhetoric to separate the audience from the dramatic scenes they witness. Seeking to diminish the impact of visual spectacle by comparing it to 'motes and shadows' (4.4.21), Gower believes the theatrical experience is incomplete without a hermeneutic apparatus to prevent the possibility of misinterpretation: 'Your ears unto your eyes I'll reconcile' (22). Enjoining the audience, 'I do beseech you / To learn of me, who stand in th' gaps, to teach you / The stages of our story' (7-9), Gower puns on the 'stages' of a narrative and the theatrical 'stage.' Transforming the theatrical 'stage' into the 'stages' of narrative, Gower redefines the site of dramatic spectacle as a setting for his own verbal exposition. Juxtaposing the direct visual apprehension of an event against the interpretative distance that can be established through introductions, commentaries, and conclusions, Gower seeks to distinguish between the seductive immediacy of sight, and the always-mediated experience of narrative.

Gower's belief in the primacy of the verbal 'moral' is illustrated in a succession of dumb shows. Coyly, he introduces the first dumb show by raising the question of the tension between visual and verbal modes of apprehension: 'But tidings to the contrary / Are brought your eyes, what need speak I?' (2.0.15-16). The dumb show, however, goes on to depict Pericles receiving a letter, and Gower explaining its contents to the audience. Unlike the dumb show in *Hamlet*, the significance of which is not lost upon the audience, this one demands an explication which Gower promises to deliver: 'What's dumb in show I'll plain with speech' (3.0.13-14). Manifesting an intense anxiety about visual experience, Gower insists that the theatre requires a verbal apparatus in order for its visual pleasures to be contained, controlled, and properly interpreted. In the final dumb show, in which Pericles discovers Marina's grave and makes great gestures of lamentation, Gower intervenes to inform the audience that the monument does not contain her body, and then goes on to provide them with a moral proverb which warns them against trusting their eyes: 'See how belief may suffer by foul show' (4.4.23).

Encouraging his audience to be suspicious of what they see, preparing them for what they are to be shown, and instructing them how to interpret it, Gower ventriloquizes the position taken by Ben Jonson in an ongoing early modern debate concerning the respective merits of the visual and verbal experience of the theatre. In the forward to *Hymenaei*, his Twelfth Night masque for 1605-6, Jonson voiced his strong support of the supremacy of spoken words over the accompanying dramatic spectacle: (21) 'It is a noble and just advantage things subjected to understanding have of those which are objected to sense, that the one sort are but momentarie, and meerely taking; the other impressing, and lasting: Else the glorie of all these solemnities had perish'd like a blaze, and gone out, in the beholders eyes' (1-6). Jonson believed that the visual pleasures of stagecraft gave only a momentary pleasure to the senses, while 'things subjected to understanding,' which he goes on to define, bookishly, as 'those grounded upon antiquitie, and solide learnings' (15-16), leave a lasting impression in the mind. Throughout *Hymenaei*, Reason, like Gower, attempts to take the attention of the audience's 'sensual eyes' (718) away from the erotic spectacle of the masque, urging them to focus instead upon her lengthy explications of 'chaste, and holy love' (502).

Jonson also happened to be one of Gower's biggest fans. He quoted him at length in his *English Grammar* (1640), and considered him to be the consummate English stylist. Just as Gower's self-presentation constitutes an effort to obviate the licentiousness and depravity of his tales, so, too, did Jonson cultivate a respectable literary persona in order to suppress and distance himself from an uncomfortable personal history. Like Gower, Jonson saw his primary role as a poet to be in the service of king and country, and developed a scholarly persona that was at odds with any pretensions to courtly gallantry. In his prologue to *Volpone* (1605), Jonson apologized for the Gowerian prolixity of his own 'loose writing,' and praised the didactic function of a 'good Poet' in words that suggest the possibility that 'moral Gower' had a great deal to do with Jonson's own authorial self-presentation: 'to inform young men to all good disciplines, inflame grown men to all great virtues, keep old men in their best and supreme state,... the interpreter and arbiter of nature, a teacher of things divine' (22-25). Jonson's eager cultivation of legal connections, the success of which he celebrated by dedicating *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599) to the Inns of Court, and his sense of the theatre as a law court, in which the audience, as jury, are asked to judge the play, may also owe something to a Gowerian precedent: John Gower's name appears in the capacity of council or judge in fourteenth-century legal yearbooks, and in his French treatise, *Mirour de l'omme*, Gower claims to sport a lawyer's striped sleeves, 'la raye mance' (246; line 21774). As Chorus in *Pericles*, Gower references this legal background by comparing his presentation of the play to a legal argument: 'I give my cause, who best can justify' (Prologue, 42).

What Jonson takes from the medieval Gower is an image of literary paternity that manipulates the age-

old dynamics of filial piety and paternal privilege. Jonson demands respect from readers not on the basis of his genius, but simply because he is a 'father.' As the Chorus in *Pericles*, Gower takes his audience back to the position of late medieval readers: passive and childlike witnesses to moral redaction, an audience that goes to 'hear' a play rather than to 'see' it; an audience that prefers a high-toned old Christian poet to an incestuous tyrant; an audience that attended the morality plays whose archaic dramatic structure Jonson was seeking to resurrect. By presenting Gower, Jonson's adopted literary 'father,' as a comic senex, Shakespeare both engages with and critiques Jonsonian dramatic theory. For Gower, for all his mild-mannered avuncularity, does not successfully counter Antiochus's exploitative incest: his moral discourse does not offer a viable model of incest-free paternity. Instead, he simply translates the sexual subjection of daughters by fathers into the interpretative subjection of the audience, forcing them to submit to an authoritative moral gloss.

From his devastating portrayal of the bluestockings in *Epicoene* to his scathing attack on its appeal to popular taste in 'Ode to Himself' (1623), it is clear just how much Jonson hated *Pericles*.<sup>(22)</sup> Jonson's antipathy has been attributed to his loathing for the dilations of its romance narrative (he dismissed *Pericles* as a 'mouldy tale'), and to his own professional jealousy (The New Inn had just proved a spectacular failure). Yet, as I have suggested, a much more personal animus may also motivate his comments. The play's engagement, and ultimate dismissal, of both Jonson's Gowerian strategies of self-presentation and his dramatic theories would have made its tremendous popularity as a spectacle especially hard for Jonson to swallow. A contemporary reference to *Pericles* underscores the connection between its success (the title page of the First Quarto boasts that *Pericles* was 'much admired' and 'diuers and sundry times acted') and its attributes as an enticing visual spectacle: 'Amazde I stood, to see a Crowd / Of Civill Throats stretcht out so lowd; / (As at a New Play)... So that I truly thought all These / Came to see Shore or Pericles.'<sup>(23)</sup> What we must take from these lines, however, is not simply the rhetoric of sight and even amazement attached to the 'show,' but also the extent to which the audience (those 'civill throats') responds verbally to what it sees. The audience's 'lowd' response to the spectacle it enjoys reflects the reinstatement, at the end of *Pericles*, of visual experience alongside, rather than in tension with, verbal testimony. The audience's raucous appreciation counters the humble decorum Jonson expects from his audience, just as the articulate and self-possessed Marina replaces the silent and benighted daughter of Antiochus.

I opened this section by comparing Gower to Polonius, a figure described by Alan Fisher as 'Shakespeare's Last Humanist.' While I would claim that distinction for Gower in *Pericles*, Polonius's endless commonplaces, and his pompous conception of the importance of his role as advisor to the king 'to expostulate / What majesty should be, what duty is, / Why day is day, night night and time is time' (2.2.88), respond with a flurry of aphorism, precept and cliché to the currents of regicide, fratricide, bloody revenge, adultery, and incestuous desire that flow freely through *Hamlet*. Betraying a deep investment in precisely those acts of illicit sex and bloody violence that appear so antithetical to his avuncular image, Polonius confirms the fascinating mutual dependence that exists between a pose of pious morality and a rather prurient delight in transgression: his interruption of Laertes' extended farewell to Ophelia is often dramatized as an intrusion into an incestuous *tete-a-tete*; *Hamlet*'s description of Polonius as a 'fishmonger' (2.1.174) underscores his pandaric employment (and enjoyment) of Ophelia's sexuality as both decoy and bargaining chip; and ultimately, Polonius bears fatal witness, ensconced behind the arras, to *Hamlet*'s jealous passion for Gertrude.

This symbiotic (or parasitical) relationship between moral commentary and sexual transgression may be located in some early responses to Gower's *Confessio Amantis*. Chaucer may have called Gower 'moral' at the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, but in his *Canterbury Tales*, the Man of Law, whose profession recalls Gower's legal affiliations and whose 'wordes' (like Gower's) 'weren so wise' (1.313),

is intensely critical of Gower's fixation upon tales of 'unkynde abominations' (2.88). In the 1520s, Alexander Barclay agreed to translate Gower's *Confessio Amantis* for his patron Sir Giles Allington: a choice that was likely based on Gower's reputation as a 'moral' poet. Yet when Barclay actually read the text, he was horrified to discover that it was, as he wrote, 'replete with wantonnesse,' and immediately started looking for another text (sig. A2v). It is as impossible for Gower to separate moral discourse from transgressive sexuality as it is for Jonson to detach the experience of theatre from the pleasure of dramatic spectacle, and as it is for Pericles, despite his best intentions, to separate himself from the pervasive presence of incestuous desire. The resolution, as Pericles concludes, is achieved by no longer dwelling on the father. Instead, it is found in the daughter, in whom (in the traditional spirit of Shakespearean romance) these contradictions are resolved.

### III

What images return O my daughter (T.S. Eliot, 'Marina')

A childhood spent in the company of books gives Marina the ability to talk herself out of trouble and provides her with the capacity to restore her sad old father to the realm of the living. A celestial maiden instructor in the tradition of Boethius's *Lady Philosophy*, Marina is, like Cleon and the fishermen, a creature of verbal testimony. In her first appearance as a young woman, Marina is living in the past, mourning, like Mariana by the moated grange, the loss of a beloved relative by shipwreck. She repeats her tragic tale to anyone who will listen: 'When I was born the wind was north... When I was born; / Never was waves nor wind more violent' (4.1.51-58). Like her mother, Thaisa, who confessed her love to Pericles through 'A letter that she loves the knight of Tyre' (2.5.42), Marina is an epistolary virtuoso, who 'with rich and constant pen / Vail[s] to her mistress Dian' (4.0.28-9) - 'vail' here denotes Marina's homage to the goddess, but it also suggests the demure 'veil' of her chastity. Her accomplishments at needlepoint - Gower explains how she weaves the 'sledded silk' with her 'Fingers long' (21-22) and how 'with her neele' she 'composes / Nature's own shape' (5.0.5-6) - constitute the textile counterpart to her textual investment in language and narrative. Unlike her mother, however, Marina does not cloak her feelings in silence. Her singing, as Gower observes, could make 'the night-bird mute' (4.0.26), while her 'education' (9) gives her a means of supporting herself (outclassing her male counterparts) after she is freed from the brothel at Mytilene: 'Deep clerks she dumbs' (5.0.5). And when she is thought to be dead, she is duly memorialized with a large tomb and a lengthy epitaph 'in glittering golden characters' which Gower reads to the audience (4.4.34-43).

If Antiochus's daughter is presented as the splendid visual artifact of a book 'where is read / Nothing but curious pleasures,' Marina's rhetorical gifts place her squarely within the textual tradition of Gower and Jonson. With her 'quirks, her reasons, her master-reasons' (4.6.7-8), Marina persuades a succession of potential clients to 'do any thing... that is virtuous' (4.5.8), echoing the terms Berthelette used to describe Gower's *Confessio Amantis*: 'manifold eloquent reasons, sharpe and quicke argumentes, and examples of great auctoritee, perswadynge vnto vertue' (ii.r). The most recent printed version of the *Confessio* that was available to Shakespeare, Berthelette's 1554 edition, was printed during the resurgence of interest in medieval texts during the reign of Mary I. Like Marina, Mary I was a highly educated woman who was sent away by her father and raised under the shadow of incest (that of her father and his 'brother's wife,' Catherine of Aragon, as well as that alleged of her stepmother, Anne Boleyn, and her brother George). A text through which John Gower attempted to forge the conscience, not only of the king, but also of an entire nation, the 1554 *Confessio* was a relic of a long-past Catholic England (another edition was not printed until 1810) that was, itself, the product of an initiative to recuperate the textual artifacts of the even-longer-past Catholic England of the Middle Ages.

Although Gower's prolixity, as I have shown, belies its investment in Antiochus's incestuous paternity, Marina's rhetorical abilities give her the authority to forestall the possibility of father-daughter incest. Contrary to her textual affiliations, Marina's sexual attractiveness is described in terms that recall the steamy visual culture of Antioch. Dioniza is jealous of Marina's 'excellent complexion, which did steal / The eyes of young and old' (4.1.39-40) and of the attention she receives from those who 'cast their gazes on Marina's face' (4.3.33); Marina, modestly, complains that she 'ne'er before / Invited eyes, but have been gazed on like a comet' (5.1.80-1). As verbally gifted as Antiochus's daughter is mute, she manages to erect a barrier of language to preserve her chastity when Dioniza's death-warrant forces her to flee Tarsus. When she is held captive in the Mytilene brothel, Boulton the bawd attracts clients by drawing 'her picture with [his] voice' (4.2.76), and he boasts that a Spanish client 'went to bed to her very description' (81). In the same way that Pericles was drawn to Antiochus's daughter by hearing her charms reported, so too is the governor, Lysimachus, drawn to see the brothel's latest acquisition. Lysimachus's silence, and his disinclination to 'name' the sexual 'trade' he so eagerly seeks from her (4.5.66), recall the economy, at Antiochus's court, of visual desire, transgressive sexuality, and silence. Unlike Antiochus's wordless daughter, however, Marina produces a tale of 'most ungentle fortune' (89), a sermon of 'holy words' that removes all traces of illicit desire. 'I did not think / Thou couldst have spoke so well,' Lysimachus marvels, 'Had I brought hither a corrupted mind, / Thy speech had altered it' (94-97). Marina's speech has this effect on all her clients: the Bawd describes Marina's verbal precocity, punningly, as 'virginal fencing' (56). One gentleman who forsakes the pleasures of the brothel, on her recommendation, for the more refined pleasures of vestal vespers, remarks, 'Did you ever hear the like?' (4.5.1).

When Pericles arrives at Mytilene, 'in sorrow all devoured,' (4.4.25), his long hair and lugubrious silence (Lysimachus is startled to learn that he 'for this three months hath not spoken,' 5.1.22) align his misery with the silent victimhood of Antiochus's daughter. Remembering Marina's 'attractions' (41), the governor summons this 'fair one' (61) to 'win some words of him' (38), situating this intended meeting within the incestuous paradigm of male prolixity and female silence. Marina, however, has another plan. She does not deploy her charms to prompt the visitor to engage in amorous sweet-talk; rather, she requests him to 'lend ear' (78), embarking upon a story that produces, in Pericles, not a desire for sex, but a hunger for more and more words. Pericles thus responds to Marina not simply by dwelling upon her 'square brows: her stature... wand-like straight' and 'eyes / As jewel-like and cased as richly' (104-6), but by recognizing her as a speaking subject 'who starves the ears she feeds / And makes them hungry the more she gives them speech' (107-8).

Whereas Antiochus's riddle breaks down the linguistic distinctions between mother, wife, and child to signal the breakdown of family relationships implied by incest, the story of Marina's genealogy (her 'parentage - good parentage,' 92, as Pericles echoes) uses speech and narrative in order to re-establish both a familial relationship and the sexual distance it requires. Yet the reunion which results does not so much reassign the old binary of speech and silence as dispense with it altogether. Although her unfettered tongue provides her with the instrument of masculine domination, Marina does not produce an endless Gowerian monologue; neither does her traumatized father remain mute and inglorious. Despite an emphasis upon questions of genealogy and lineage that have the potential to develop into a very long text indeed ('My derivation was from ancestors / Who stood equivalent with mighty kings,' 85-86), Marina does not allow her own tale to unravel untrammelled; rather, she responds to Pericles' exhortations (such as 'Report thy parentage,' 126, 'Tell thy story,' 131, and 'Recount, I do beseech thee,' 138), and pauses to allow him to consider her words. When Pericles becomes overwhelmed by her revelations ('O I am mocked,' 140), she threatens to cut off her story altogether - 'Patience good sir, or here I'll cease' (142) - and proceeds with caution so that what she is saying will sink in, so that Pericles can 'believe [her] by the syllable' (164). Beginning with a little voice whispering in Marina's ear, 'go not

till he speak' (91), and ending with Pericles' insistence, 'I'll hear you more / To th'bottom of your story' (161-62), their reunion moves beyond the binaries that are produced by an incestuous paradigm of relations between genders and presents instead a pattern for father-daughter relations according to which dialogue replaces desire, enabling full disclosure and self-revelation.

The transcendence of the binary of speech and silence through dialogue is accompanied in the scenes that follow by the reinstatement of visual spectacle. After having referred throughout Pericles to the action that he presents as a 'text,' and after having expected the audience to 'sit and hark' to the 'lame feet of his rhyme' (4.0.48), Gower introduces the masque-like scene in which the goddess Diana appears to Pericles in a dream and supplies him with the crucial information that will lead to Thaisa, by renouncing his role as commentator altogether: 'more a little, and then dumb' (5.2.2). In place of moral commentary, Gower now promises the audience 'pageantry' and 'shows' (6); awestruck, old Gower breathes, 'see, / Our king' (17-18). Pericles' reunion with Thaisa is sprinkled liberally with references to sight: Cerimon, the Ephesian lord and amateur magus who restores Thaisa to life, tells Pericles and his entourage to 'Look to the lady' (5.3.19) when they locate Thaisa at the temple; surrounded by priests and virgins, she exclaims, 'O let me look' (26) when Pericles is brought to her: 'May we see them?' (23), Pericles asks about his wife's recovered jewels. If speech is the dominant mode in Pericles' reunion with Marina, sight predominates in his reunion with Thaisa, signalling the reawakening of the hero's sexual desire licensed by the presence of his wife.

The visual experience of theatre that is foregrounded in the final scenes of the play is freed from Gower's anxious verbosity. The power shifts from Gower, whose authorial commentary kept him, throughout the play, at arm's length from the play's action, and whose nervous attestations to the priority of speech over sight attempted to keep the audience at arm's length from its status as spectacle, to the magus Cerimon, the 'Reverend appearer' (5.3.16), whose abilities in the 'secret art' of 'physic' (3.2.29-30) endow him with Prospero-like powers which overshadow Gower's textually motivated humanism. Heralded by an apocalyptic thunderstorm ('Our lodgings standing bleak upon the sea / Shook as the earth did quake,' 3.2.13-14), Cerimon replaces old Gower's universe of moral commentary with a brave new scientific world. His medicinal infusions, drawn from 'vegetives,... metals, stones,' remedy the 'Disturbances' of 'nature' (33-34). His reanimation of Thaisa is presented as a profoundly physical act: 'how fresh she looks' (78), Cerimon comments on Thaisa's body; while he directs his gentleman followers to 'behold her eyelids' (95), and warns them of her fragility: 'her relapse / Is mortal' (105-6). Cerimon's restoration of Thaisa is thus not only the restoration of wife and mother to the family unit, but also the restoration of the natural order: whereas the statue scene in *The Winter's Tale* conveys a sense of other-worldly magic, in *Pericles* Thaisa's return to life is an organic phenomenon. As she begins to breathe, Cerimon pronounces, 'Nature awakes' (90), and her family witnesses her 'blow into life's flower again' (92). With an obvious analogy to the theatre, Thaisa's resuscitation also requires lights and costumes ('fire and clothes,' 85), and is accompanied by the music of the court masque: Cerimon orders 'the viol' 'once more' (87). Couched in the rhetoric of nature, the return of Thaisa also heralds the return of theatrical spectacle: the reunion of family members cruelly forced apart is paralleled by the reunion of the dramatic elements of speech and spectacle which had, themselves, been artificially separated.

Just as Marina's verbal powers enable, rather than repress, her father's return to speech, so too does the attention to visual spectacle at the conclusion of the play work alongside, rather than in resistance to, verbal communication. Cerimon's revelation of Thaisa is complete only when Pericles has heard her voice (5.3.31); after the couple embrace, Pericles immediately asks her, 'How you were found? How possibly preserved?' (5.3.53); and although, as Cerimon acknowledges, 'the gods have shown their power' (56, italics my own), the experience is not complete until everyone has had a chance to relate

the story of his or her calamities, 'No needful thing omitted' (64). Pericles thus concludes not only with a visionary miracle, but also with the promise of yet another long tale. This reconciliation of opposites moreover allows for the recapitulation of the rhetorical tropes of riddle and paradox that were associated with father-daughter incest at Antioch. Expressing his love and gratitude to Marina, Pericles uses a phrase that, in its paradoxical conflation of familial roles, recalls the dissolution of linguistic boundaries in Antiochus's riddle: 'Thou that begetst him that did thee beget' (5.1.190). Just as Thaisa's reappearance allows Pericles to trust his eyes again, by filling up, with her physical presence, the potentially sexual space that lies between father and daughter, the discovery of Thaisa also allows Pericles to employ a rhetorical trope associated with incest to convey his gratitude to his daughter. Like the reincorporation of vision, the reincorporation of this incestuous trope suggests not that incestuous desire has been sternly banished but that its powerful impulses have instead been channelled into more positive directions. This is what Diana means, when, at the end of the play, she calls upon Pericles to 'give... repetition to the life' (238). The conclusion of the play repeats the spectacular and rhetorical forms of incestuous desire, without the trauma of genuine incest. Spectacle reappears as the agent of reunion, and paradox is reinstated to convey the complex power of familial bonds.

Pericles thus transforms father-daughter incest, the subject of tragedy, into a reaffirmation of 'family values,' the matter of comedy. Fathers are no longer the tyrannical agent of terror, and daughters are no longer the passive objects of patriarchal will. Convents and brothels are abandoned for nuptial celebrations, and even Gower, the quintessential 'grumpy old man,' is neither exiled nor ridiculed, but rather given the honour of closing the play. Yet its comic ending does not, as in the case of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, require the silence of its female characters. Indeed, the play's contemporary popularity may have been due to the fact that, on the contrary, it presents an alternative to silent feminine acquiescence that usually accompanies a comedy's conclusion. For Marina is neither mad, maniacal, nor miserable, and the ending of the play gives the audience every reason to expect that she will go on to enjoy the respect and love of her husband and family. As the news of Simonides' death (5.3.74), along with Gower's recollection of the fate of Antiochus, confirms the passing of incestuous paternity and the rigid gender binaries it imposes, Pericles concludes not with a stark repudiation of fatherhood, but with an optimistic glimpse into the regenerative possibilities of male vulnerability and female empowerment while at the same time confirming the inextricable mutuality of the dramatic elements of speech and spectacle, past and present.

#### WORKS CITED

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origins in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. New York: Routledge 1982

Archibald, Elizabeth. ' "Deep clerks she dumbs": The Learned Heroine in Apollonius of Tyre and Pericles.' *Comparative Drama* 22 (1989), 289-303

Ashby, George. *Active Policy of a Prince*. Ed M. Bateson. EETS ES 76. London: Oxford University Press 1899

Barber, C.L. ' "Thou That Beget'st Him That Did Thee Beget": Transformation in Pericles and The Winter's Tale.' *Shakespeare Survey* 22 (1969), 59-67

Barclay, Alexander. *Here begynneth a rygth frutefull treatyse intituled the myrroure of good maners*. London 1523

- Bell, Vikki. *Interrogating Incest: Feminism, Foucault and the Law*. London: Routledge 1993
- Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Culture, Kinship and Kingship*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1992
- Boose, Lynda E. 'The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare.' *PMLA* 97 (1982), 325-47
- Boose, Lynda E., and Betty S. Flowers, eds. *Daughters and Fathers*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press 1989
- Caxton, William. *Here begynneth the table of a book intytuled the book of good maners*. Ed F.J. Furnivall. London: Oxford University Press 1868
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1987
- Cowden Clarke, Mary. *The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines, A Series of Fifteen Tales*. London: Dent 1893
- Dean, John. *Restless Wanderers. Shakespeare and the Pattern of Romance*. Salzburg: Institut fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik Universitat Salzburg 1979
- Dickey, Stephen. 'Language and Role in Pericles.' *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986), 550-66
- Eggers, Walter F., Jr. 'Shakespeare's Gower and the Role of Authorial Presenter.' *Philological Quarterly* 54 (1975), 434-43
- Erickson, Peter. *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1985
- Fisher, Alan. 'Shakespeare's Last Humanist.' *Renaissance and Reformation* 14 (1990), 37-47
- Fisher, John H. *John Gower. Moral Philosopher and Friend of Chaucer*. New York: New York University Press 1964
- Frazer, J.G. *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion*. New York: Macmillan 1922
- Freud, Sigmund. 'The Horror of Incest.' *Totem and Taboo*. Ed and trans James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton and Co 1950, 2-23
- Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture. A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 1976
- Gilbert, Sandra. 'Life's Empty Pack.' *Daughters and Fathers*. Ed Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press 1989, 256-77
- Gilroy-Scott, N.W. 'John Gower's Reputation: Literary Allusions from the Early Fifteenth Century to the Time of "Pericles."' *Yearbook of English Studies* 1 (1971), 30-47
- Goldberg, Jonathan. 'Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images.' *Rewriting the*



Renaissance. Ed Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1986, 3-32

Gordon, D.J. 'Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones.' *The Renaissance Imagination*. Ed Stephen Orgel. Berkeley: University of California Press 1975, 77-101

Gower, John. *The English Works of John Gower*. Ed G.C. Macaulay. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1900-1

- *The French Works of John Gower*. Ed G.C. Macaulay. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1899

- *Gower's Confessio Amantis*. London: Berthelette 1554

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1992

Helms, Lorraine. 'The Saint in the Brothel: Or, Eloquence Rewarded.' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41 (1990), 319-32

Herman, Judith Lewis, and Lisa Hirschman. *Father-Daughter Incest*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1981

Hillman, Richard. 'Shakespeare's Gower and Gower's Shakespeare: The Larger Debt of Pericles.' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36 (1985), 427-37

Hoccleve, Thomas. *Regement of Princes, and Fourteen Poems*. Ed F.J. Furnivall. EETS ES 72. London: Oxford University Press 1887

Hoeniger, F.D. 'Gower and Shakespeare in Pericles.' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982), 461-79

James I of Scotland. *The Kingis Quair*. Ed A. Lawson. London: A. and C. Black 1910

Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters. Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. New York: Columbia University Press 1983

Jonson, Ben. *Ben Jonson*. Ed C.H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1925-52

Jordan, Constance. *Shakespeare's Monarchies. Ruler and Subject in the Romances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1997

Kahn, Coppelia. *Man's Estate. Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1991

- 'The Providential Tempest and the Shakespearean Family.' *Representing Shakespeare*. Ed Murray Schwarz and Coppelia Kahn. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1980, 229-332

Knowles, Richard Paul. ' "Wishes Fall Out As They're Will'd": Artist, Audience and Pericles's Gower.'

English Studies in Canada 9 (1983), 14-24

Leggatt, Alexander. 'The Shadow of Antioch: Sexuality in Pericles, Prince of Tyre.' *Parallel Lives - Spanish and English National Drama 1580-1680*. Ed Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne. London: Associated University Presses 1991, 167-79

Lerer, Seth. *Chaucer and His Readers: Imagining the Author in Late-Medieval England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993

Lewis, C.S. *The Allegory of Love*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1936

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Trans James Harle Bell, John Richard von Sturmer, and Rodney Needham. Boston: Beacon Press 1969

Lillo, George. *Marina*. In *The Plays of George Lillo*. Ed Trudy Drucker. New York: Garland 1979

Minnis, A.J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar Press 1984

Nevo, Ruth. 'The Perils of Pericles.' *The Undiscover'd Country: New Essays on Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare*. Ed B.J. Sokol. London: Free Association Books 1993, 150-78

Neeley, Carol Thomas. *Broken Nuptials in Shakespeare's Plays*. (Urbana-Champagne: University of Illinois Press 1993

Orgel, Stephen. 'What Is an Editor?' *Shakespeare Studies* 24 (1996), 19-25

- 'The Authentic Shakespeare.' *Representations* 21 (1988), 1-25

-Introduction to *Shakespeare, The Tempest*. Ed Stephen Orgel. *The Oxford Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1987

- 'Prospero's Wife' in *Rewriting the Renaissance*. Ed Margaret W.Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1986

- *The Illusion of Power. Political Theatre in the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1975

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans A.D. Melville. *Oxford World's Classics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1986

Parker, Patricia. *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1996

Parkes, M. B. 'The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the Book.' *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*. Ed J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1976, 115-41

Pitcher, John. 'The Poet and Taboo: The Riddle of Shakespeare's Pericles.' *Essays and Studies* 35

(1982), 14-29

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*. Ed Baxter Hathaway. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press 1970

Rank, Otto. *The Incest Theme in Literature and Legend: Fundamentals of a Psychology of Literary Creation*. Trans Gregory C. Richter. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1992

Rebhorn, Wayne A. *The Emperor of Men's Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1995

Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 1989

Rush, Florence. *The Best Kept Secret. Sexual Abuse of Children*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall 1980

Shakespeare, William. *Pericles*. Ed Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond. New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998

- Hamlet. Ed G.R. Hibbard. *The Oxford Shakespeare*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1994

- Pericles, Prince of Tyre. Ed F.D. Hoeniger. *Arden Shakespeare*. London: Methuen 1963

Shell, Marc. *The End of Kinship. 'Measure for Measure,' Incest, and the Ideal of Universal Siblinghood*. Stanford: Stanford University Press 1988

Sherbo, Arthur, ed. *Johnson on Shakespeare*. Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson. New Haven: Yale University Press 1968, Vols 7-8.

Sundelson, David. *Shakespeare's Restorations of the Father*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press 1983

Taylor, Mark. *Shakespeare's Darker Purpose: A Question of Incest*. New York: AMS Press 1982

Thompson, Ann. "'Miranda, Where's Your Sister?': Reading Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare and Gender: A History*. Ed Deborah Barker and Ivo Kamps. London: Verso 1995, 168-77

Traub, Valerie. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. London: Routledge 1992

Twine, Laurence. *The Patterne of Painefull Adventures. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol 6. Ed Geoffrey Bullough. London: Routledge and Paul 1966, 423-82

Willis, Deborah. 'The Monarch and the Sacred. Shakespeare and the Ceremony for the Healing of the King's Evil.' *True Rites and Maimed Rites: Ritual and Anti-Ritual in Shakespeare and His Age*. Ed Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry. Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1992

Womack, Peter. 'Shakespeare and the Sea of Stories.' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29

(1999), 169-87

(1) John Dean contrasts Antiochus's 'destructive passion' against the 'chaste, creative love' of Pericles (14-24); John Pitcher sees the danger of incest solely in terms of the possibility of Pericles finding himself in the brothel where Marina is being held captive (14-29); Mark Taylor argues that Antiochus provides a 'foil' for Pericles's more appropriate expressions of familial love (72); Lynda E. Boose argues that witnessing incest at Antioch allows Pericles to 'reject the implicit seductiveness' of his encounter with Marina (339); Alexander Leggatt sees the incest rectified by the 'images of healthy courtship and sexual love, and of normal family relations' that proceed (167).

(2) For a recent review of the controversy concerning the authorship of Pericles, see the introduction to the New Cambridge edition of the play edited by Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond, 8-15, 79-81.

(3) See Pericles, Prince of Tyre, ed DelVecchio and Hammond. All references to the play will be to this edition.

(4) I take this term from Orgel's 'What Is an Editor?' 21.

(5) According to Rank, the Apollonius legend concerns both the father's desire to replace an aged wife with her 'youthful image,' and the daughter's fantasy of replacing the mother and winning her father's unlimited affections (300-38). For Freud, the incest taboo prevents Oedipalized competition for women between men of the same family; for Claude Levi-Strauss, the father is responsible for preserving his daughter's virginity in order to use it as an object of exchange to forge political and economic alliances.

(6) See Willis, who sees Marina as the healer of Pericles's melancholy, 'set in motion by his discovery of an incestuous relationship,' and thus containing the play's 'anxieties about kings' (162), and Jordan, who regards the play's treatment of incest as an extended reflection upon Jacobean legal discussions of property rights.

(7) See Rush; Boose and Flowers; Herman and Hirschmann; and Bell.

(8) The exception to this rule is Adelman's discussion of 'generative maternal power' in *Suffocating Mothers*. Most scholars maintain that the late plays putatively undermine patriarchal authority yet ultimately reaffirm it: Orgel ('Prospero's Wife'), Kahn (*Man's Estate*), Erickson, Sundelson, and Traub. Orgel's introduction to *The Tempest*, however, argues that Miranda is a 'complex' figure, and not the 'traditional guileless innocent' (17), a point pursued by Thompson.

(9) Jardine compares Marina to Chaucer's patient Griselda (182-84); Helms identifies her with the 'relentlessly patriarchal contexts' of Senecan rhetoric (321); while Archibald considers the play's treatment of female learning 'old-fashioned' (301).

(10) As Womack explains, Marina's fortunes have a great deal in common with the saint's life, *The Play of Mary Magdalen*, which was contained in a manuscript anthology that was the object of a great deal of interest for seventeenth-century antiquarians.

(11) On medieval exegetical traditions see Minnis and Parkes.

(12) On Jonson's dramatic theory, see Gordon, Orgel (*Illusion*), and Riggs.

(13) For further discussion see Goldberg.

(14) On the story of Atalanta, see Ovid, 10.560-739.

(15) There is a French analogue, *Du noble roy apolonie*, in which the hero assumes the name 'Perillie' at Pentapolis. In his edition of the play, Hoeniger (iii) sees the connection as a coincidental, but points out that the name in both cases highlights the hero's association with 'peril' (or Latin 'periculum').

(16) This line is usually emended as 'Unscissor'd shall this hair of mine remain' - see Hoeniger (95) - an emendation adopted since the time of Steevens and understood as an anticipation of Pericles's subsequent vow to 'never to wash his face nor cut his hairs' (4.4.27-28).

(17) Diana's connection to incest is discussed in Frazer, 141.

(18) Hoeniger (in his edition of *Pericles*,) reads this line as an apology for the incestuous material, i.e. 'this belongs to the text.' Following Steevens, DeVecchio and Hammond gloss it as 'lengthens or prolongs,' which is similar to my reading, although I read 'longs' as an adjective, not a verb, consistent with Gower's emphasis upon the textuality of his narrative. It is also significant that Gower is referring to the action of the play as 'the text.'

(19) Critical discussion of Gower as Chorus tends to focus upon evaluating his success or failure. Hoeniger finds Gower 'quaint in [his] oldfashionedness and simplicity, stodgy yet charming' 467; while Hillman praises his 'theatrical savoir-faire' (427); Eggers finds him 'inept' (138); and Knowles believes that he fails in achieving the audience's full 'imaginative co-operation' (16).

(20) See, respectively, Hoccleve, 72; James I of Scotland, 100; Ashby, 13. For further discussion of Gower's literary reputation, see Gilroy-Scott.

(21) See Jonson, vol 7, 238-53.

(22) Jonson's 'Ode to Himself' reads: 'No doubt some mouldy tale, / Like Pericles, and stage, / As the Shrieves crusts, and nasty as his fish- / scraps, out of every dish, / Thrown forth, and rak't into the common tub' (see Jonson, vol 7, 492-94). The Catholic references refer not only to the play's medieval sources but also to Jonson's own, vexed, relationship with Catholicism.

(23) From the anonymous *Pimlyco, or Runne Red-Cap* (1609), quoted in Gurr, 231.