Routledge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture

1. Stillness in Motion in the Seventeenth-Century Theatre
P.A. Skantze

2. The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser and Jonson
Mary Ellen Lamb

3. Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture
Lethe's Legacies
Edited by Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams

4. Luce Irigaray and Premodern Culture
Thresholds of History
Edited by Theresa Krier and Elizabeth D. Harvey

5. Writing, Geometry and Space in Seventeenth-Century England and America
Circles in the Sand
Jess Edwards

6. Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood
Authorship, Authority and the Playhouse
Grace Ioppolo

7. Reading the Early Modern Dream
The Terrors of the Night
Edited by Katharine Hodgkin, Michelle O'Callaghan, and S. J. Wiseman

8. Fictions of Old Age in Early Modern Literature and Culture
Nina Tauton

9. Performing Race and Torture on the Early Modern Stage
Ayanna Thompson

10. Women, Murder, and Equity in Early Modern England
Randall Martin

11. Staging Early Modern Romance
Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare
Edited by Mary Ellen Lamb and Valerie Wayne

Staging Early Modern Romance

Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare

Edited by Mary Ellen Lamb and Valerie Wayne

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

Womack, Peter. "Shakespeare and the Sea of Stories." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29 (1999): 169–87.
The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare. Ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1980.
Woodbridge, Linda, ed. *Money and the Age of Shakespeare.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
Wroth, Lady Mary. *The First Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: MRTS, 1995.
———. *The Second Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Completed by Suzanne Gossett and Janel Mueller. Tempe, AZ: Renaissance English Text Society, 1999.

2 The Sources of Romance, the Generation of Story, and the Patterns of Pericles Tales

Lori Humphrey Newcomb

That romance elements pervade both Shakespeare's *oeuvre* and his larger literary culture has long troubled claims for Shakespeare's exceptionalism. The late plays must be admitted to employ romance tropes, to reflect the period's enchantment with romance in all its forms, and even, in several cases, to depend heavily on a single nondramatic romance source—all features that undermine the singularity of Shakespearean genius. Even the labeling of the late plays as "Shakespearean romance" has worked precisely to set this single-author subgenre apart from its era's taste for nondramatic romance.[1] In 1877, Edward Dowden dubbed the plays of Shakespeare's final phase "romances," but he never used the term *romance* for their prose sources, which he called "stories" or "tales."[2] In the century since, Dowden's label has persisted, his nonce category for part of Shakespeare's "art-life" becoming the name of a genre, a set of "family resemblances . . . key to the generic teleology of the late plays."[3] And, crucial for this volume, over the same period, another branch of Shakespeare criticism, source study, widened the distance between the plays and their known sources in, among other genres, prose romance.[4] However, in the case of *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, keeping romance distinctly Shakespearean has proven almost impossible, for the play is so inextricably tied to its nondramatic romance intertexts that it has baffled not just source study but even authorial attribution.[5] To turn the case around, this essay draws on the Pericles tales—meaning the play and its most immediate verse and prose intertexts—to consider why source study has denied certain kinds of knowledge about the romance lineage of Shakespearean drama and to bring that knowledge more appreciatively to light.

Over the last generation, feminist scholarship has explored how romance challenges traditional literary values with its loose formal structure, its apparent freedom from political or didactic purpose, its proliferation of related tales across space and time and vernaculars, and its allegedly addictive grip on readers. Romance, memorably characterized by Patricia Parker as both "inescapable" and "dilatory," opens up impulses that patriarchal literary cultures find feminine (*Inescapable*). The dilatory romance fails to be contained to a genre, or even to Northrop Frye's "romance mode," and

becomes "romance strategies" (Fuchs 9) or "memes" (Cooper). Romance tales are not contained within the corpus of single authors, but wash into what Peter Womack identifies as the "sea of stories" of the era, its "narrative reservoir for poets and playwrights alike."[6] In England especially, romance was literature's siren, the eroticized symbol of all that the belated humanist rationales for literature had to deny. Its very adaptability, its feminine wiles, engendered suspicion. The feminization of romance, then, has been a primary obstacle to investigating the deep connections between Shakespeare's late plays and nondramatic romances, especially contemporary English romances.

The gender trouble that romance intertextuality presents for Shakespearean source study can be further specified as reproductive by considering the Pericles tales. Shakespearean source study and Shakespearean exceptionalism more broadly were challenged by the discovery that three intertexts appeared more or less simultaneously in Jacobean England: a reprint of an Elizabethan prose romance by Laurence Twyne, a stage play credited to Shakespeare, and another prose romance by George Wilkins. Source study's central tenet is that earlier, lesser sources feed into later and greater plays. "Source" metaphorically positions Shakespeare's plays as superior to their allegedly immature or feminine prose counterparts, elevating Shakespearean *virtù*. These gender binaries and generational priorities remain unquestioned subtexts in most source studies. (Indeed, the tenets of "source study" have been investigated less than other editorial assumptions about collaboration, revision, and dramatic publication.) This patriarchal critical model falters, however, when it encounters the late plays. The plays must be distinguished from their feminized romance sources as masculine *Shakespearean* romances. However, these plays can hardly be masterworks if they participate in feminized romance strategies of adaptability, as *Pericles* so clearly does with its prose intertexts. This essay therefore attempts to treat the Pericles intertexts apart from the source model; it claims romance as a *resource* shared in varied patterns across the boundaries of medium and genre.

The re-patterning of the Pericles story allowed a number of medieval and early modern writers to experiment with story making and its gender encoding, whether on an all-male stage or in a virtually all-male press. Helen Hackett has called our attention to the late plays' concern with the "generation of story," gendered through male and female characters' struggles for narrative control over their stage worlds and their audiences ("'Gracious'"). She notes that male voices in the late plays dismiss women's generation of story in favor of their own controlled plots, or "issue," which ultimately repress women's capacity to produce familial and narrative generations. Her view that male-voiced dramaturgy denies the generative power of women resonates with my own argument that the patriarchal logic of source study denies the productive power of the feminized nondramatic romance. I would emphasize, however, that the late plays do

intermittently allow female voices to generate story, and in doing so, they credit feminized romance as a body of invention both within the narration and in their meta-theatrical address to audiences. Thus the plays' romance intertextuality actively experiments with gender and lineage, even if their endings tend to foreclose such experimentation. We can recover more of the gender experimentation of the late plays if we discard the notion of the source, if we stop insisting that Shakespearean romance master its romance intertexts.

The converging gender problematics of romance and source are uniquely evident in the quick succession of Pericles texts: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (entered in the Stationers' Register in 1608 and first printed 1609); Twyne's *Patterne of Painefull Adventures* (entered 1576; extant in printings of ca. 1584 and 1607); and Wilkins's *Painfull Adventures of Pericles* (1608). Even trickier is the relationship between the play and the 1608 Wilkins book, whose title page reads in part, "The true history of the play of Pericles as it was lately presented." Despite this reportorial claim, the Wilkins book also contains material that the play appears to recast, thus serving as a potential source as well as a prose adaptation of the play. Peculiar contortions were required to explain how the Wilkins book could be *both* a source of the play and an adaptation of it, especially once Wilkins was confirmed as the probable co-author of a play only partly attributable to Shakespeare. Dowden had to execute these maneuvers while still claiming the play as one of the uniquely Shakespearean romances, or at least a "preliminary sketch" of them:

> It must be mentioned that in 1608, presumably after the production of the play, appeared a novel by George Wilkins called the Painful Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre, which once more tells the story in prose, the version in this instance being in great measure founded upon the play, of which Wilkins himself is conjectured to have been one of the authors. (*Shakspere: A Critical Study* 144, 145)

Dowden figures an ongoing scholarly discomfort with the overlapping of Pericles tales that I find symptomatic of larger anxieties about the dependence of Shakespearean romance on prose romance "sources," and larger contradictions in the familial coding of source study. Indeed, over the last century editors and critics have portrayed the Pericles tales as such a disturbed lineage, such a misbegotten textual creation, that they seem to echo the reproductive taboos that the Pericles tales, and others of Shakespeare's late plays, themselves attempt to repress. Romance intertextuality, with its endlessly complex ties among texts, exceeds the simple patrilinear logic that the source model tries to impose. A familial agenda was of course crucial to Dowden's grouping of the late plays: "the Romances have in common the incidents of reunions, reconciliations, and the recovery of lost children."[7] Dowden downplayed the idiosyncrasy of a romance set whose structurally necessary "reunions" and "reconciliations" reunited

not marriageable couples but fathers and daughters. His model, then, has mapped onto our model for romance intertextuality an awkward family narrative. In criticism's intertextual imaginary, Shakespeare fathers his sources, and the feminized prose romance sources disappear. Where are the mothers in Shakespearean intertextuality? If paternal reconciliation is an allegory of intertextuality, which texts are fathers and which are progeny? Can we locate in the Pericles tales another intertextual imaginary, a less patriarchal pattern for using romance resources?

THE SOURCES OF ROMANCE

Source study assumes a gendered, generational, and textual norm: it traces single, fixed lines of descent from a feminized source via the presumed paternity of Shakespeare's genius to the legitimate inheritance of a play. The various sources of the late plays are feminized both structurally by the source model, and generically when they are romances. Thus source study has strained to explain how Shakespeare, inseminating such degenerate romance sources, managed to yield dramatic "issue" that can be acknowledged as legitimate, viable, and powerful.[8] Among the late plays, the most robust instance of issue is *The Winter's Tale*; by comparison, the textual and intertextual descent of *Pericles* attracts charges of illegitimacy, misbegetting, and even incest. The line from source to issue is clear in *The Winter's Tale* (performed 1610; published 1623) because so much of the play adapts and supersedes a single but allegedly inferior source, Robert Greene's prose romance *Pandosto* (1585?; frequently reprinted).[9] Shakespeare's word-for-word echoing of Greene's oracle even allows the "source" to be identified as a pre-1607 reprint of Greene, preserving a distinct gap between the publication dates of prose source and dramatic apotheosis. The most vexed case is that of *Pericles*, which is generally classified as the first of the Shakespearean romances but which is now by consensus attributed to Shakespeare and Wilkins as co-authors.[10] (In this chapter, I refer to *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* as "the play" rather than "Shakespeare's play."[11]) The difficulty of tracing issue in this case is evident simply in the converging dates and titles of the apparently unauthorized and certainly ill-prepared 1609 quarto and the slightly earlier publication of the novellas by Twyne and Wilkins. (It is compounded by the absence of the play from the First Folio of 1623, which might have furnished a more authoritative text.) Critics are frankly uncertain whether Twyne wholly precedes the play, whether the play wholly precedes Wilkins, and whether Wilkins is the offspring of Twyne and the play or the play is the offspring of Twyne and Wilkins. And although it is now clear that the play was jointly authored, publishing practice muddies even that: Roger Warren puts the name of George Wilkins on the title page of his 2003 Oxford edition of the play, but Oxford omits the name of Wilkins from the cover.

Between the covers, both in Warren's single edition for Oxford (2003) and in Taylor's contribution to Oxford's *Complete Works* (first edition, 1986), the text of *Pericles* includes even more Wilkins than the 1609 quarto. Taylor and Warren each embrace what Victorian critics might have deemed bastardization. They offer distinct justifications for the insertion of stage directions and even the incorporation of lengthy passages from the Wilkins novella where the quarto text appears incoherent. That practice was anticipated by stage directors who started using passages from Wilkins to fill the plays' dramaturgical gaps and editors who drew line readings from Wilkins to emend the cruxes in the quarto. Taylor in particular extends the practice to controversial new lengths, drawing prose passages from the novella and setting them as blank verse to fill out the brothel scene, both Governor Lysimachus's seduction attempt and the lost daughter Marina's rebuttal. Warren argues his similar decisions on dramaturgical grounds that recall Dowden's ordinal contortions: the extremes of passion in the interpolated material "come from Wilkins's account of the scene, but they are absolutely characteristic of Shakespeare's juxtaposition of such extreme contrasts in his late plays" (52). Warren frankly justifies re-inserting the Wilkins version of this scene because the quarto's rendering "has been emasculated" (80).

In the gendered logic of source study, the problems of ordering, attributing, and editing the Pericles tales suggest incest, although critics stop just short of invoking that taboo. Indeed, Oxford's model of authorship seems to drive further into the incestuous tangle that source study suppresses: it replaces Shakespeare as playwright as the father of his sources with the even less comfortable model of Wilkins fathering Shakespeare-and-Wilkins. The critical imaginary here echoes the "familial overcloseness, real or imagined" that haunts so many of the late plays (Frey 114). The Pericles family of texts reveals how source studies judges the close intertextual ties (so characteristic of romance) morally unacceptable: if the source material fails to yield its claim, or if the play's text is considered "bad," the lineage becomes unthinkable. The threat can be mitigated, and the openness of romance intertextuality embraced, if we replace the one-directional "source" model with a reversible model of "pattern," in which shared resources are adapted to material forms of publication and performance without cleaving to a single scale of gendered and generational value. As I will adduce from Twyne's title, the early modern use of the word "pattern" signals a process of imitation without insisting that any one text is the original. I argue that rather than a patrilineal model of source descent, we should study patterns of resource use. "Pattern" helps us imagine not the lineage of source and issue, but the complex circulation of textual resources among authors, media, and genres. Without legitimacy and inheritance at stake, we can better appreciate how textual imitation may be gendered, especially in the romance appropriations that the Pericles tales exemplify.

The Pericles stories trouble another of the "assumed linear patterns" (Mowat, "Theater" 215) informing the source model: the circulation of *material* textuality. The source has been assumed to be a printed book at Shakespeare's elbow, the authorial text to be a manuscript generated by his blotless pen, and the printed text to be the imperfect rendering of those fairest of foul papers. In its relationship to printed books as in its relationship to prior models, Shakespearean authorship is again exceptional: print, normally imagined as fixed and authoritative, becomes imperfect, even feminine, when Shakespeare's reading of printed books is compared to the lost but transcendent product of his pen. Again, the set of Pericles tales defeats ordinal logic. As Barbara Mowat pointed out in a brief but crucial 1997 essay, *Pericles* "in its variety of physical embodiments and in the mysteries clouding [their] relationships" is an "extreme" case for any theory of textual circulation (220). That extremity informs the "dependence of early modern theater on literary culture, on the book as source of the play's dramatic fiction," that *Pericles* reveals "perhaps more obtrusively than any other play of the period" ("Theater" 220). *Pericles* is uniquely disconcerting in its dependence on prose sources because the prose texts obtrude into a Shakespearean play text that ought to supersede them.

In another perceptive article on *Pericles*, Mowat argues that the play aggressively foregrounds its dependence, not on one source, but on *multiple* sources: Gower as Chorus is a singular figure, but he tells the audience that his story is "what mine Authors saye" in the plural. Again invoking the metaphor of pattern, Mowat suggests that this play is characteristically Shakespearean in its "pattern of construction" out of multiple stories: several from a common lineage—the set of Apollonius/Pericles stories—and some that are far-flung—the Marian intertexts that Mowat compellingly identifies in the handling of Thaisa. *Pericles*, according to Mowat, is patterned with a "dramaturgical audacity" that is uniquely and confidently synthetic ("'I tell'" 17). Of course *Pericles* is not unique in this plural intertextuality. Renaissance *imitatio* was omnivorous, and romance especially so. As Mowat points out, Gower too refers to consolidating multiple authorities. I would argue that in Twyne's title, *The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures*, the word *Pattern* has a similar force of composite authority. In that case, the play's composite authority is itself derived from the tradition that conjoins the Pericles stories. But of course composite authority runs counter to the claims for surpassing genius that source study underpins: as any Victorian explorer knows, the sport of source hunting lies in finding a *singular* source.[12] Nor should we assume that this authorial consciousness of pattern is Shakespeare's alone, given the play's other form of composite authority: collaborative authorship that again is merely an extension of the collaboration critics now see elsewhere in Shakespeare's work.[13] Thus another problem with the Pericles tales is that Shakespeare's contributions can never be isolated, for instead of authorial, ordinal improvement of a single text, we have an unusually vexed case of asynchronous collaboration, of texts gone plural, of begetters begotten.

Shakespearean source study, then, is willed re-ordering: it runs counter to the usual Western yoking of original force with chronological primacy as in notions of a creator, maker, inventor, or originator, or even of the classical "authority" (from whom the modern "author" was wrested with difficulty). Instead, the singular source, obscure but authentic, confirms the power of a mightier stream precisely by the distance and the difference between the trickling spring and the final outpouring. "Source" stories by definition must precede the plays chronologically. This play makes the point unusually explicit when Gower speaks of singing "a song that old was sung" (*Pericles* 1.1.0). Instead of vaunting the elder as origin, the Shakespearean source model grants sole ownership to the successor. It thus projects onto intellectual property a version of the patrilineal inheritance practices then being consolidated in early modern England: any legitimate male heir becomes sole possessor and rightful user of inherited goods eliminating any female claims (Spring 18–19). Like patrilineal inheritance which suppresses women's literal fertility to men's capacity to "give birth to the body social," the source model gives the master poet sole capacity to embody the literary (Murray 129). The property model rests, or rather founders, on its patriarchal logic, for even as such family stories invalidate certain elders' claims to economic or cultural goods as merely maternal and rule in favor of a male heir, that younger male claimant still holds his inheritance only via the maternal figure's guarantee of his legitimacy. So, too, the feminized romance source licenses a play's cultural authority through its own submission. When the Wilkins novella fails to submit its priority to *Pericles*, this insufficiently feminized source threatens the cultural authority of the play that should be Shakespearean.

The perverse re-ordering of source study worsens with the late plays, most of them dependent not just on sources but indeed on nondramatic romance sources. Nigel Smith comments, apparently with tongue in cheek, that

> studies of romance seem obsessively concerned by their readerships, as if the texts themselves were insufficiently interesting. In no other genre is the matter of identification between characters and readers so prominent in the intention of the author and in the assumptions of the readership. (234)

Smith continues this unique "concern with reader response . . . is why prose romance should not be confused with dramatic romance in the period, for while the two forms are related, their production and reception are not" (234). Yet drama critics concur that a signal quality of the late plays is their interest in audience identification: spectacle, tears, wonder, and acceptance of dramatic illusion that both underline and distance spectator from play. The meta-theatricality playfully contracted in the epilogue of *Midsummer Night's Dream*—"do not reprehend/If you pardon, we will mend"—becomes imperative to the action in *The Winter's Tale*—"It is required/You

do awake your faith."[14] Smith's remark suppresses its primary referent, gender: pretending obliviousness to questions of female readership, it continues the work of deflecting Shakespeare's late plays from being "confused" with the feminized prose romance. The late plays' prose sources are triply feminized: the feminized romance genre that transfers feminized affect into a feminized dramatic subgenre.

Although prose romance and romance intertextuality do bring gender trouble to Shakespeare's late plays, some feminist critics have argued that the plays are strengthened by this formative engagement with the disputed gendering of stories. I use the term *gendering* rather than *feminizing* deliberately. As I argued elsewhere, the traditional feminizing of romance may have some basis in cultural practices, but its ideological drive is nastier. Of course women characters were essential to peopling romance, women writers to producing it, and women readers to consuming it. However, early modern male writers repeatedly denied men's share in romance reading and in romance concerns. It is increasingly apparent that gender *interchange* is essential to romance, and not just because its love plots are generally heterosexual. Romance involves male and female protagonists in its classical and medieval exempla, and it was known to be consumed by both men and women in these early oral and manuscript contexts as well as once it reached print. As for early modern England, while powerful recent work by Hackett (*Women*), Lorna Hutson, Derek Alwes, and Goran Stanivukovic has emphasized male writers' double-coding romance's gendered address, foregrounding heterosexual dynamics to conduct homosocial business, that dynamic does not rule out women's substantial imprint on romance as agents, audiences, and, of course authors. Though surprisingly few English women were sole authors of romance, many featured in disseminating male-authored romances as translators, titular dedicatees, addressees, and continuation writers, suggesting that women did hold a certain authority in the genre (see Newcomb, "Prose"; Lamb, *Gender*). To return to Smith's remark: the romances of early modern England did their cultural work by insisting on their appeal to a readership of mixed gender.

Romance then, negotiates form and audience *between* genders more than any other mode, and this quality may have been invaluable to the peculiar self-reflexivity of the late plays in the Shakespeare canon. The prose romance strategy for constructing a dual-gendered audience informed Shakespearean dramatic romance strategies for shaping liminal audience experiences. "Wonder" was the play's name for affect that arrived unexpectedly. Such affective experience, and such alterations of affect, were hallmarks of prose romance, made strange in plays where experiences and their shapes had been heretofore more regular. And crucially, when the late plays foreground their formal irregularities, they tend at the same time to foreground their debts to romance tales. Mowat (*Dramaturgy*) showed how wonderful irregularity and romance intertextuality converge in the dramaturgy of *Pericles*, and of course Hermione's revival at the end of *The Winter's Tale* depends on that convergence. I argued, too, that these formal

and intertextual irregularities seem to disrupt gender coding in the performative and even the printed texts of the late plays (Newcomb, "'If'"). In the case of *Pericles*, intertextual ties to Gower, Twyne, and Wilkins provoke crises of gender and adaptive cruxes: moments when patriarchal control sways in the narration of events, when textual control resists the "assumed linear patterns" of intertextual succession. These moments of textual disturbance, often centering in stage directions, riddles, and inscriptions set off typographically as bastions of textual certainty, instead reveal more complicated interpersonal and intertextual ties. These cruces do not simply figure romance narrative as feminine, but question the gendered norms that pass narrative "patterns" across genres and media.

THE GENERATION OF STORY

I have suggested that in traditional Shakespeare source studies, the narrative source occupies a feminized position in relation to both the author and the stage play. Somehow, the feminized raw material of prose romance is inseminated by male genius to yield a masculinized dramatic romance that has marginal claims on legitimacy. Such gendered struggle becomes central to the late plays' structure. A narrative origin identified with the feminine, maternal, and oral is asked repeatedly to cede to a masculine, patriarchal, and textual authority. It is then echoed in the source studies tradition. Only the endings gloss over what is clearer in performance: that substantial accommodation is left to the feminine, in the forms of mothers, daughters, and/or goddesses, as story tellers and performers. As many essays in this volume agree, the late plays give the feminine-maternal source a qualified new life as the performative, even when that dynamic is denied by the closing words of the plays' own heroes.

Thus the impetus to create a masculine line of narrative authority for the late plays is not only a critical myth, but also integral to the plays' structure. Their gender trouble—in which powerful males find the patriarchal isolation of the tragedies threatened by strong female resistance that demands accommodation and next-generation compromise—re-enact the intertextual tension between prose romance "source" and dramatic "issue" that defeats linear succession. Although Shakespeare's plays never refer to a narrative "source," their impulse to identify "issue" is explicit in the late plays, especially in *The Winter's Tale*. Hackett notes that romances may be obsessively concerned with the "female generation of story" because narration is an activity appropriated by men from women, and by drama from romance, tied to "maternity itself as the source of marvelous narratives" ("'Gracious'" 37, 35). She concludes that

> the idea of Shakespeare's tragicomic romances as maternal in genre is fruitful in so far as maternity is inherently tragicomic, but the tradition

> which connects maternity with the actual *generation* of romance narrative is present in most of these plays only in repressed form. (37–38)

So, for instance, while the figure of Paulina connects maternity to narrative, the play's final lines "demand" the story that has been withheld from Leontes, submitting that story to his control and its actors to his masculine pronouns:

> Good Paulina,
> Lead us from hence, where we may leisurely
> Each one demand and answer to his part
> Performed in this wide gap of time since first
> We were dissevered. (5.3.151–55)

Thus struggle between the two genders for narrative control is most explicit in what Hackett spots as the only late play with "a clear and direct source in a single Elizabethan prose romance" ("'Gracious'" 30). I would argue that it is not just romance or story generating but more specifically *adaptation* of narrative to drama that stimulates the late plays' gender anxieties. Indeed, I hope that this gendered struggle over narrative looks more evenly balanced once we credit the late plays' deep attentiveness to romance intertextuality. These Jacobean stage plays identify the generation of story with women and negotiate with female-generated story up to their final moments. In the case of *Pericles* and *Winter's Tale* at least, they do so more explicitly, perhaps more willingly, than their prose sources, although these themes are also significant in the prose versions.

For instance, the statue scene of *The Winter's Tale* only partially represses its use of romance resources by figuring Greene's *Pandosto* as a dead letter given life. The play's *coup de théâtre*, reviving the moribund queen, unleashes, but does not fully justify, the later critical commonplace that Greene's narrative was moribund (Newcomb, *Reading* 131). Such a reading assumes that the play was produced solely from the playwright's imagination without meaningful input from Greene—a view that runs counter to the play's insistence that legitimate issue must respect both male and female lines. The word "issue" appears eight times in *The Winter's Tale* and is systematically redefined. In early modern genealogy, "issue" refers to the perpetuation of the line through male heirs, and Leontes's willingness to expose the "bastard" may be eased by its being a girl. But a broader definition of "issue" emerges as husband and wife struggle through the loss and recovery of Perdita. Hermione's final, authoritative narration reports that "Knowing by Paulina that the Oracle/ Gave hope thou wast in being," she "preserv'd" herself "to see the issue" (5.3.126–28). Hermione's phrase not only validates Perdita as a legitimate heir, but also links her recovery to senses of "issue" as the future, or hope, or narrative outcome. Of course, Leontes still wants a male heir, and for all his joy in recovering Perdita, his ambiguous introduction of Florizel as "son unto the king" implies that

son-in-law, not daughter, is the issue that demands recovery (5.3.150; se Frey 114; Newcomb, "'If'"). Although Leontes's attempted transfer of issu from Perdita to Florizel distances the memory of gestation so visible i Hermione's pregnancy at the start of the play (see Hackett, "'Gracious'" this victory of seminal line over mere container is largely outweighed by th women's remarkable rescripting of issue.

As the theory of the Shakespearean source was spun out in later criti cism, it recapitulated Aristotelian reproductive logic. Shakespeare's geniu operates as a seed to the raw material of narrative contained in pros sources and generates a legitimate and masterful play. Although the mode for Shakespearean source study appears to be Biblical textual criticism its rapid emergence in nineteenth-century critical discourse was imperia in vehicle, patriarchal in tenor. The most literal definition of *source* in th *Oxford English Dictionary* is of a fountain or spring (sense 3). Source doe not extend to the foundational sense 4, "The chief or prime cause *of* some thing of a non-material or abstract character; the quarter whence somethin of this kind originates," until 1640 (a reference to the "spring" of tears i Greene's prose romance *Menaphon* suggests the route of its development When that abstraction does appear, it is quickly accompanied by a patri archal shift, as sense 4c, "the origin, or original stock, *of* a person, famil etc." appears by 1690. By the nineteenth century, the great exploratory er for source study, seeking a literary source is an act of denial (pun intended the original is not the founding line; the origins are primitive raw mate rial, mere output ready for patriarchal and colonial extraction. The pros romance source is a passive vessel of plot into which genius inserts itself t render the legitimate issue of a Shakespearean play. Thus *The Winter's Tal* is redeemed of its heavy reliance on its source, for it revivifies the materia "mother" (Hermione) as a purified guarantor of issue: issue is preserved while it suppresses the femininity of narrative (split from Hermione ont the servant Paulina). As Wells's still indicative essay from 1967 concludes the "total effect" of the last plays allows "none of the irresponsibilit with which romance literature is often charged"; the romances handle th "extremes of imaginative experience" while confirming "the total contro that Shakespeare maintained over his inherited material" (78–79).

More recent, theatrically oriented criticism has shown, however, that thi control is not so absolute. On stage, *Winter's Tale* and *Pericles* fascinat because they reveal gendered contestation over story telling, often stage as a battle between feminized performativity and masculinized print-lik fixity (Newcomb, "'If'"). The romances convey the insistent textuality o sources full of oracles, riddles, inscriptions, and monuments (indeed, suc texts often stand in the printed plays without a clear performative function see Gallagher). Yet they rewrite the tale telling of women equally insistently converting it to performative spectacle. While men attempt to control verba narrative, women (or female divinities) perform it in scene-stealing ways and impress men into dramatic schema. Diana instructs Pericles in 5.1 t

give "repetition" of his narrative: "Or perform my bidding, or thou liv'st in woe."[15] Performance in her name is necessary for the patriarch to recover wife and daughter. That performative imperative is repeated in Wilkins, but with the agency of the goddess de-emphasized, as I will discuss (also see Bicks 206).

Admittedly the pattern in *The Winter's Tale* ends with the patriarch getting (and demanding) the last word, and as Hackett and I have pointed out, with narrative "issue" restored in the patriarchal interest ("'Gracious'"). Still, as that pattern of issue so clearly drives Shakespeare through the late plays, it is notable that the familial story carried across generations is almost always a tale of father and daughter, balancing male- and female-centered interests on a generic knife's edge. The temporal gap between older generation and younger, often creating a temporal gap in the stage action, mirrors the plays' claimed temporal gap between an older prose romance antecedent and an in-the-moment stage adaptation, but in adaptation's shared world of asynchronous collaboration, the prose narrative and the drama can share a year of publication. The patriarch and his issue, the familiar romance and its innovative performance, are mutually dependent on one another to form a meaningful pattern of meaning and experience, a story of generations that self-consciously generates story as a product of conversation between genders. This pattern need not be seen as an incestuous circle. I would rather see the cross-authorial set of tales as generating a spiral of ever-nuanced meanings.

INTERTEXTUAL INCEST

If *The Winter's Tale* sets "source" and "issue" in the orthodox relationship of material parent and rightful heir, the "pattern" in *Pericles* is one of uncertain interbreeding–fittingly enough, of course, in a story that begins in, and never quite escapes the threat of, incest. When *Pericles* rejects the daughter of Antiochus for having incestuous relations, he also seems to foreclose issue itself: he rejects her "whence an issue I might propagate" (1.2.72). This is a play, then, that must remain anxious about not just whether issue survives, but indeed whether it is lawful.

In retelling the classical romance tale of Apollonius and Tyre, his wife, and his daughter (Archibald), *Pericles* draws on both John Gower's fourteenth-century verse *Confessio Amantis* (Gower appears as an old-fashioned Chorus in this play who invokes the tale's broad and ancient familiarity) and Twyne's prose romance narrative (probably derived via a French version from the *Gesta Romanorum*, in a lineage parallel to Gower's). The lines of descent for Twyne are troubled enough: its 1576 entrance in the Stationers' Register seems to produce no immediate edition, the first extant copy can be dated only approximately to 1594, and the 1607 edition shamelessly slots in Twyne's younger brother Thomas as author. Hoeniger worries

about lineage: the 1607 reprint of Twyne "may have been the immedia cause for the play, or the play may have been the immediate cause for i (Hoeniger xvi, n. 2; Jackson 39). Even worse problems of descent are pos when Wilkins publishes something that we would call a novelization of t play—but in 1608, that is, a year *before* the quarto. Wilkins claims (on t title page) to offer "the true History of the Play of Pericles" as acted, and l narration breaks the story into scenes much like those of the quarto (Hc niger xli; Jackson 25–26). At the same time, Wilkins's tale seems to rely memorial, not textual, access to the play, filled in with narration deriv from Twyne, especially in the latter half. Alarmed, Hoeniger concludes th "Rather than 'the true History of the Play of Pericles', Wilkins's novella a hybrid creation, the product of heterogeneous cross-breeding" (xlii). It "obviously not a source of *Pericles*" but based on the stage play or a (muc debated) *ur-Pericles* (Hoeniger xli; see Mowat, "Theater"). And yet (a this is the *Pericles* "problem" that editing has created) Wilkins's novell lacking as it may be, has been treated as *more* than a source. Knowled of the novellas creates discontent with the 1609 play text, and so postw stage directors and recent editors have increasingly drawn on Wilkins, a have mentioned, to fill out the brothel scene—and one critical stage dire tion that I will discuss below.

Hoeniger's phrase "heterogeneous cross-breeding" denies that the re problem is a lack of heterogeneity: the play and the novella are interbr endogamously, since the play is the offspring of Wilkins and Shakespea and the novella the offspring of Wilkins via Twyne and Wilkins and Shak speare. They are never quite explicit about the sense that Wilkins is bo father and son to the play, or rather that the play and Wilkins are in a sibli rather than generational relationship. They simply identify the various texts the quarto and of Wilkins's novella as illegitimate issue, and less than healt births: Wilkins's memory is "weak" (Hoeniger xli), while Edwards repeated accuses the quarto of "feebleness" (196), since it is "not legitimate" (193) b "deficient and corrupt" (194). On occasion a sense of sexual scandal appli to these descriptions of inbreeding: Edwards is editing "a poor text which l can never hope to bring back to its pristine condition" (198). Disgust wi the *Pericles* quarto imputes various kinds of abomination. G. Wilson Knig shudders at "scenes which no one can accept as Shakespeare's without disqu etude," "queer scenes" whose "form" differs from Shakespeare's usual "viri growth" (78, 111). Even the broad-minded Roger Warren notes the "more ge eral feebleness" of the quarto text (74).[16] The tinge of incest that contaminat critical estimates of Pericles intertextuality has its counterpart in the corru play text, where cruxes repeatedly trip on questions of family relationship: tl promise of Pericles to leave Marina "unsister'd," usually emended "unsci sored" (3.3.30; see Jackson 220); in the final scene of the play, Pericles' que "What means the mum?," usually emended "nun" (5.3.15).[17] These are sign instances of what Valerie Wayne calls "the sexual politics of textual tran mission": moments of gender instability that lead compositors and scribes

textual instability, and then often communicate that instability intertextually. The sexual/textual cruxes in the Pericles stories seem to originate in its dark heart, in the Latin incest riddle. Some but not all Latin prose manuscripts of the original Pericles tale render one of its riddling assertions, "quaero fratrem meum" (I [Antiochus] seek my brother), with "patrem" (I seek my father); Gower repeats this corruption in his Middle English verse translation and his Latin marginal note.[18] Gower transfers such a muddled series of assertions in the riddle that P. Goolden "wonders whether Gower did any more than reproduce the words themselves; whether he penetrated to the darker meaning underneath" (248). Goolden explains that the author of *Pericles*, "more honest with himself" than Gower, struggles to reconcile the riddle's various assertions and so alters other clauses to be consistent with this one (249). The riddle's "subject," the "I" at the center of its perverse knot, shifts from Antiochus in the "true original Latin form" to his daughter in the play (Goolden 247, n. 3). Somewhere between the "true original" and the play, the focus of concupiscence shifts from father to daughter, but this shift is obscurely produced by multiple agents of textual misdirection.

Much "disquietude" over intertextuality in *Pericles* is displaced onto the quarto's lapses, skirting the more complex problems of the *excessive*, nonlinear links among the tales in the set. Edwards ends his introduction with a famous disclaimer: "There is no solution to the problems of Pericles" (41). Jackson echoes him: "the puzzles posed by the *Pericles* quarto will never be solved to everybody's satisfaction" (225). These textual scholars begin to sound a little like suitors in Antioch, blind to a solution that is both unthinkable and obvious. The relationship among Twyne, Wilkins, and Shakespeare is not a normal happy intertextual family: for if Twyne is the romance mother, Shakespeare's *Pericles* is "father, son and husband mild"; Wilkins is "mother, wife, and yet his child." (Gower, as the Chorus and as the poet who, according to the Wilkins title page, "presented" the play, more or less stands in for Shakespeare.) Wilkins definitely wrote the novella, which appears to be a child of the play; and perhaps also cowrote the play; the play relies too heavily on Twyne's novella; the Wilkins novella sometimes "adopts" material from its sibling the play; and scholars and directors "adopt" material to the play from its sibling the Wilkins novella, even though, as all scholars agree, Wilkins wrote the novella surreptitiously, without legitimate access to the play. In sum, the family tree of these painful adventures is one in which the source is not fully prior nor the play's inheritance a fully distinct next generation. Jackson, after arguing that "collaboration is the key feature of this play" stretching back to its Greek intertexts, tries to press the play into some final lineage: "George Wilkins was the last of a long line of Shakespeare's helpers. But it was Shakespeare who gave the tale its definitive form" (188). Jackson invokes the Aristotelian model with a sentence division that elides the difficulty: Wilkins may have been the last helper, but he is also integral to the tale's "definitive form" in drama, emended or not.

The critical desire to fit the Pericles tales into the model of "source" and "issue" leaves critics subconsciously imagining the case as textual incest, but I would suggest that this scandal is one that criticism itself willed into existence. There is nothing inherently blameworthy in the complex links among the play and the two novellas, and indeed no *moral* force to any intertextual relationship (issues of intellectual property are another matter). In a period when imitation and adaptation were normative, to adapt play to novella, novella to play was an art "lawful as eating" (*Winter's Tale*, 5.3.111). If there is a problem with *Pericles*, directors and editors exacerbate it by using Wilkins as textual supplement on the grounds that Shakespearean dramatic quality demands those passages. When critics try to push away the threat of incestuous contact between Shakespeare and Wilkins, they may simply will its recurrence.

In the case of *Pericles*, the sexual politics of romance intertextuality are rendered more forbidden in degree, and more violent in nature, by modern emendation. There is, first, Taylor's theory that the "bad" quarto text was a memorial reconstruction by the boy actor playing Lychorida and Marina, a claim that creates very odd familial subtexts. The relative authority of the Gower choruses is explained by the boy apprentice having stolen those pages from the actor playing Gower.[19] Edwards long ago stipulated that doubling in the romances is used carefully to head off the threat of incest (139; see Gossett's Arden 3 edition, 389), but here the doubling of the Marina actor as daughter and nurse, plus the boy actor's real-life role as an apprentice, enables, at the level of textual transmission, an illegitimate "issuing" of the play text. Much as Pericles greets Marina: "Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget" (5.1.195), so could *Pericles* greet the text stolen by a Marina boy actor. Of course, as Marina has already noted, "If I should tell my history, 'twould seem/ Like lies, disdain'd in the reporting" (118–19). Indeed this quarto has been "disdained" in its allegedly memorial "reporting."[20] Yet the quarto spelling "hystorie" suggests that the blame for this crime accrues not to the boy actor, but to a woman, an alternate, hysterical Marina.

Critics also exacerbate the sexual violence of the intertexts when they turn to Twyne or Wilkins to emend the brothel scene, as I have discussed. Jackson credits Wilkins's novella for a "handling of the encounter" that "many producers have considered desirable" (231). As Wilkins reports how Lysimachus begins to be "more rough" with Marina, Jackson notes that his threats shift into "first person pronoun," an immediacy conceivably derived from play dialogue (231). Roger Prior has shown that narrative identification with characters violent against women is characteristic of Wilkins's individual writings (as individual as they ever were). Furthermore, in his later career as bawd, Wilkins showed a particular fetish for *kicking* women (one court record charges him with kicking a pregnant woman; Prior 144–46). Warren suggests that this abusiveness might make him "relish" the violence in the Pericles tale (7), that it thus was probably Wilkins who first selected and plotted the tale, and that he thus may have

"provided Shakespeare with a stimulus for all his late work" (7–8).[21] The appalling, although surely unintended, implication is that Wilkins's abuse of women was a special "stimulus" to Shakespearean invention. To bring material from Wilkins's novella into the play cannot merely be a pragmatic solution to an intertextual puzzle if it celebrates gendered violence in either the artists' or the editors' choices.

Sadly but obviously, Wilkins cannot be held solely responsible for these texts' violence against women. Charles Nicholl, a biographer of Shakespeare, writes in great disapproval of Wilkins's brutal record and literary taste, without acknowledging that the pattern recurs in Shakespeare's single-authored late plays; a similarly violent gesture occurs in *Cymbeline*. The hero kicks his daughter in Twyne (and in early Latin texts, but not Gower or Wilkins): he "stroke the maiden on the face with his foote, so that shee fell to the ground, and the bloud gushed plentifully out of her cheekes." In the case of the play, the transmission of violence is probably disrupted only by an accident of textuality. There is no stage direction to accompany Pericles's "hum, ha!" although he later admits to Marina that he "did push thee back" (5.1.74, 117). Does the play show a push, or a kick as Twyne suggested, or a blow with the hand as Wilkins reports? Recent editors have felt that the context demands an explicit stage direction, albeit in brackets, for dramaturgical reasons: to point up the climactic moment, to bring out the sexual subtext that links this plot to the Antioch episode, to suit the alleged extremity of Shakespearean romance. Warren notes "Editorial directions like '*pushing her back*' are surely not strong enough" (213). But perhaps the impulse to represent, or to re-insert, a violent act for Pericles here is not entirely regressive. Doing so brings to light, whether the adaptors and editors intend it or not, that Marina is perceived by the patriarch as a threat in the moments before he recognizes her. In *Pericles*, it must be Marina's request that her lord "lend ear" that moves him to humming violence within a single verse line; a little later, what draws his admission of violence is clearly her complaint that her "history" will be "disdain'd" (5.1.74, 108–9). Marina's verbal power, her capacity to generate story, is of course compounded by her youth, her capacity to generate issue. In short, the violent push against the daughter negotiates both sexual and narrative problems of degree that carry intertextual as well as dramaturgical weight.

But if Periclean intertextuality implies gender struggle, must that struggle be seen as sexually forbidden? We now accept collaborative authorship as a normal and productive condition of playwriting, reproductive tensions as essential to romance plots (Bicks, Gallagher, Hackett), and romance as a powerful hybrid of tragedy and comedy (Mowat, "'What's'"). If we can summon similar insight about the complexly gendered subtext of early modern romance intertextuality, we can better appreciate the extremely complex instance of the Pericles tales. Richard Hillman, in a study of romance intertextuality, defends his sole focus on Gower in a footnote: "Commentators agree that the contribution of Lawrence Twyne's *The Patterne of Painefull Adventures* [to the play] was relatively small . . . and I have not found the work interesting from an intertextual perspective" (190, n. 2). Since commentators do *not* agree, Twyne's place in the Pericles set is certainly as interesting as any other aspect of this set's uniquely tangled intertextuality. Isn't it time to stop pushing it away?

PATTERNS

I propose that we take Twyne's own title, the "Patterne of Painefull Adventures," as a model of romance intertextuality capable of replacing the source/issue binary. In this reading, "Patterne" most likely refers to the rhetorical practice of *imitatio*. Alternatively, Twyne's "pattern" might assert the existence of design despite "pain" and through what appear to be random chances, since the Greek-romance concept of Fortune is the book's governing trope. This is "pattern" in the modern sense of logic visible only empirically and fleetingly. To modern minds, pattern is abstract, perhaps meaningless and hollow, if its design remains unrevealed to man by a higher power. So Edwards says of *Pericles*: "there is no pattern, either of providence or of redemption" (30); or, "We have the suggestion of divine love but we never understand its pattern" (31). For Hoeniger, who titles a section of his introduction to the play "Characterization; The Pattern of Pericles' Adventures," the only character development of any depth "must be sought in the 'pattern'—to employ Twine and Wilkins' term—of Pericles' experience. . . . The basic rhythm of Pericles' adventures may be described as one of love, loss, and restoration" (lxxix). If pattern is synonymous with rhythm, Hoeniger's usage is modern but not nihilist:

> What matters is the pattern of sudden changes in Pericles' fortune . . . Twine had portrayed the pattern of these basic experiences merely for the sake of illustrating the whimsical and melodramatic power of the goddess Fortune. But the playwright used the same material for a deeper purpose. (lxxxii)

And Marina is merely part of the pattern. She is "part of Pericles' own personality, a symbol of the fruition of his marriage with Thaisa. She clearly represents. . . . that hope man can find in the younger generation, more especially in his children, of renewal" (lxxxvi). For Hoeniger, the play's clearest pattern is renewal through issue.

However, Twyne never connects the word "pattern" to "Pericles' fortune." Since the word appears only in the title and the running title, never in the main text, it seems less an in-text trope for causation and more an intertextual signal of *imitatio*.[22] Emphasizing the romance intertextuality of this oft-told tale, Twyne promises to retrace a familiar narrative for his

readers. What is striking about "pattern" in early modern usage is a functional ambiguity. *Pattern* means a repeated and repeatable ideal, "a model, example, or copy," says the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Several Shakespearean examples are glossed, respectively meaning "an original" (sense 1.a), a "model to be imitated . . . a person who or thing which is worthy of copying" (sense 2a), and even "a precedent" to be "appealed or referred to" (sense 7). So "pattern" could mean, to early modern readers and spectators, any original work or act of worth, or the imitation of its example, or the provision of such examples to the future. The early modern usage of pattern is nonordinal; it does not distinguish source from issue. Pattern recognizes that value inheres neither in the first nor last of a series, but in the impulse to repeat, and the pleasure of recognizing such repetition. A pattern can be "taken out," as Bianca does with the embroidery on Desdemona's handkerchief, yet it is not a *mere* pattern (a paper template) except to Bianca; to others the linen's unique embellishment itself carries and gathers meaning at every appearance. Similarly, when Marina's needle copies "Nature's own shape" so that "her art sisters the natural rose" (5.0.7), who is to say which is the original, and which the copy? When Marina "dances as goddess-like to her admired lays" (5.1.4), are we admiring the authorship of goddess or of princess? Or rather, why should their indistinguishability, their refusal to stand as creator and created, or parent and child, be incest, when it could be a rich, meaningful, and variable pattern? So Twyne's title does not specify whether this story copies a pattern from previous versions of the Apollonius tale, or offers itself as a pattern to other writers, or offers Apollonius as a pattern of endurance for readers to imitate. Pattern confounds the assignment of primacy; it melds content and readership. It thus perfectly captures the way that romance intertextuality defeats issue.

Although I have attributed an awareness of intertextuality to all three of these texts, the word "pattern" does not occur in the body of any of them. However, another orthographic variant of pattern echoes in Wilkins's novella and the play, and carries on the struggle for gender control that is characteristic of romance intertextuality. According to the *OED*, "pattern," in the sense of idealized imitation or ideal for imitation, was not, before 1700, distinguished from "patron," in the sense of an idealized mentor and a mentor in the pursuit of ideals, a similarly reversible notion. (Early modern etymology was as omnivorous as its intertextuality.) Calls to patrons are important in both Shakespeare and Wilkins, in ways that generate the stories and generate their control. Wilkins has the citizens of Tharsus praise Pericles as their "patron and releever" (C2ᵛ). Later, in his extended brothel scene, he has Marina summon Diana to aid her defense against Lysimachus at yet another moment of physical contact: "catching her rashly by the hand, as he would have inforced her to his will; she first calling on *Diana* patronesse of Chastitie to defend her, fell likewise downe at his feete, and besought him but to heare her" (H4ᵛ). In this context, Diana is clearly both protector and role model in Marina's defense of her chastity. The obtrusive

feminine ending, *-ess*, underlines the act of regendering here; if we today derive "patron" from "pater" rather than "pattern," this patroness is a strongly marked matriarch.

The virgin's calling on Diana as patroness in this scene is a detail unprompted by Twyne, and it neither echoes nor is echoed in the Shakespearean play, whichever comes first. It does of course echo the larger pattern of reference to Diana in both Wilkins's novella and the play—the Temple of Diana is the site of the denouement of both, for it is there that the lost mother serves as nun. Thus Wilkins's Marina's call to Diana is linked by dramatic irony to her lost mother Thaisa, and to Pericles, who learns Diana's power through the remaining events of the story. That process is narrated hastily by Wilkins but in some detail in the play, where another "patroness" is summoned by the patriarch himself. As Thaisa struggles in childbed, Pericles calls first to the sea-god, and then, for his first time, to a goddess: Lucina, affiliated with Diana and believed to assist women in childbirth (Hart). Pericles calls on "Divinest patroness, and midwife gentle/To those that cry at night" (3.1.11–12).[23] His call is apparently unanswered, as is his promised to "bright Diana" to remain "unscissored" (Q has "unsister'd") until Marina marries (3.3.29, 30). The answer comes in the play's last act, when Diana instructs Pericles to tell his story before her altar, where her priestess will be revealed as the lost Thaisa. Pericles learns, then, to call on divine women to generate story and to recover living women. Instead of Fortune, an arbitrary woman producing random adventures, the patroness of the last two Pericles tales is Diana, deliberately producing meaning from the cooperation of genders and generation.

Thus both texts invoke a female "patroness," in different contexts, and by differently gendered voices, to maintain a troubled family lineage, to unite fathers with daughters *and* mothers, to find a pattern of control in disordered events. In both cases, the intervention of goddess figures is necessary for both familial and narrative control. Wilkins merely allows Marina to participate unwittingly in this pattern of female protection (and if editors are right that part of the scene is lost in Q, she may have done so in stage performance as well). The Pericles of the play grasps the point forcefully, repeatedly, and performatively: Diana tells Pericles to recite the narrative of his identity and Marina at her Temple and to the people of Mytilene:

> Reveal how thou at sea didst lose thy wife.
> To mourn thy crosses, with thy daughter's, call
> And give them repetition to the life.
> Or perform my bidding, or thou liv'st in woe. (5.1.231–34).

Replies Pericles: "Celestial Dian, goddess argentine/ I will obey thee" (237–38) and, in scene 3, he makes his obedience explicit, beginning his narration: "Hail Dian! To perform thy just command, I here confess myself / The king

of Tyre" (5.3.1–3). Although Diana's "just command" is for Pericles to repeat "to the life," to re-enact in a lively manner his own griefs and his daughters', as he does, her verb "call" (5.1.243) must recall the earlier moment when Pericles calls out first to the "god" who "called" the winds "from the deep" (3.1.4) and then to the goddess of those "that cry by night" (3.1.12). Only now has he realized that his call to a goddess has been effectual, a point the stage action renders inarguable. Thus, the Diana/Lucina figure patterns this play much as other goddess figures mediate in several other late romances (Hart). She wields control so deep that she can tell the hero to "perform [her] bidding" in a moment far more dazzling and meta-theatrical than Gower's lumbering epilogue. In this play Gower literally gets the last word, but Diana performatively enacts the ultimate authority. Gower narrates the story, but Diana has clearly generated it, and Pericles here testifies that it is so. Of course like Leontes in *The Winter's Tale*, Pericles speaks last in the framed tale, gathering the female capacity to generate story: he has a "longing . . . / To hear the rest" (5.3.83–84). The patriarch is in control, but his "longing" still links the maternal state to the generation of story.

This call to a female patroness to control the narrative pattern is, then, slightly stronger in the quarto than in the novella, although we cannot trace the direction or agency of differences between quarto and novella. Wilkins gives Diana the most minimal of roles in the novella. The narrator merely mentions that Pericles was activated to "discourse the whole progresse of his life" after "being awake" from the "sweet sleepe" in which Diana visited. Neither Pericles nor the narrator ever again mentions the goddess; the king chooses to take these actions and his subjects support him. Similarly, the recognition scenes of the two texts show that the Pericles of the novella has not learned to respect feminine agency as fully as the Pericles of Q—or rather, he disrespects it violently. Wilkins, as we have seen, makes Pericles brutal in his initial rebuff of Marina; and at the end of the novella, he pushes away the nun who is his wife.

> When *Thaysa* standing by, and no longer being able to temper her affections, being assured he was her Lord, shee ranne hastily unto him, imbraced him in her armes, and would have kissed him. Which when *Pericles* sawe, hee was mooved with disdaine, and thrust her from him, accusing her for lightnes.

Pericles's reversion to abuse of his own wife is unique to Wilkins; no editor suggests bringing it to the play. This final act of violence, like the novella's "relish" for the blow to Marina and its comparatively cursory treatment of female divinity, demonstrates a suspicion of women's capacity to read or generate narrative pattern that is virulent, but not unique, to Wilkins's novella. In Q, on the other hand, the cumulative efforts of our authors (and I would argue, their collaborators in printing and playhouses) create a pattern that just might allow Pericles to reconcile himself to feminine agency.

In the final scene of Q, a telling crux, one that may be adaptive but certainly is gendered, could even allow a subtextual communication from Thaisa to Pericles. As the nun faints, but before Cerimon identifies her as "your wife," Q's Pericles asks "What means the mum? She dies, help, gentlemen!" (5.3.18, 15). Editors now correct the line to "what means the nun?," but Pericles's call for help for a dying "mum" could suggest a deep recall of Thaisa's troubled shipboard childbed, and perhaps his embodied identification with it, since "mum" was known by the sixteenth century as a diminutive form of mother. "Mum" would then mean Pericles recognized his wife *as a mother* in a fainting woman. Indeed, this performative stimulus—woman fainting—summons up an intertextual pattern that disputes gender hierarchy: when Pericles calls for aid for Thaisa in the throes of generating issue, the "patroness" he invokes is "Lucina" (3.1.21, 20), the name Twyne gave Thaisa. If Pericles here seems to recognize his wife across a sea of intertexts, "mum" represents a collaborative recognition, an admission to a pattern of meaning beyond the control of either spouse or indeed of any single author. That pattern cannot be controlled by the wife or the patriarch or even the goddess Lucina; it inheres precisely in their interchange.

For early modern audiences, "what means the mum?" was more likely to suggest meanings of "mum" surrounding speech and its silencing. The word was used elsewhere by Shakespeare as a command to keep mum. Then, when Thaisa greets Pericles: "You are, you are—O royal Pericles!" (5.3.15) and faints, her recognition of her husband could be visible or audible, in her "refusal to speak, silence" or her "inarticulate sound made with closed lips, usually as an indication of inability or unwillingness to speak" (*OED*). Thaisa may try to keep a secret or to reveal it. The important thing is that Pericles could, after five acts of secrets and lies, ask the woman, a *mother*, to explain what she "means"—without kicking her. Of course, in the remainder of the scene, he seeks his explanations from Lord Cerimon, but in this moment he acknowledges that Thaisa, or the intertextual set of Thaisas, can reveal surprising, secret narratives, family histories, issues that complicate issue. Perhaps we too can now hear the patterns of romance intertextuality that this late play almost mums. The set of Pericles tales did not ask early modern audiences to impose textual lineages, to claim textual patrimonies, to isolate singular sources or master authors. It called on early modern audiences to listen carefully for patterns of repetition and difference, to "stand i'th'gaps" and teach themselves "the stages of our story" (4.4.8–9). It invited audiences to draw on romances' resources to travel an expanding sea of narrative meaning.

NOTES

1. Fuchs (96). For a characteristic example, see Sanders (5–6).

2. In his much-reprinted *Shakspere*, written for a series of primers (London: Macmillan, 1877; American editions are dated 1879). The late plays are grouped in his landmark *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*, which debuted in 1875, but the term *romance* is introduced only in the "Preface to the Third Edition" of 1879, where pages ix to xi reprint verbatim pages 56–58 from the primer, including the new table of plays incorporating the label.
3. McMullan (59). On "family resemblance" as a looser definition of genre, see Mowat ("'What's'" 130).
4. On Dowden's articulation of the late-play category and the persistence of his terms despite their flaws, see Mowat ("'What's'" 131) and McMullan (54).
5. Dowden vacillated about including *Pericles* among his "romances" on authorial grounds. He calls it a "preliminary sketch" for the romances in his little primer (144) but merely footnotes it as a "Shakespearian fragment" in all editions of *Shakspere: A Critical Study* (358) and again in 1895 *Introduction to Shakspeare*.
6. See Womack (172, 170). Womack draws the phrase from Salman Rushdie's 1991 book for children, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*.
7. In his "Preface to the Third Edition" (1879), included in all later reprints of *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*, x.
8. Alison Thorne notes in her recent collection *Shakespeare's Romances: New Casebooks* that modern criticism has struggled merely to claim that these plays are "worthy of serious analysis" (9), that their particularity, coherence, and artistry rise above the presumed triviality, artlessness, and fairy-tale looseness of romance.
9. However, Mowat's article ("'I tell'") uncovers further hybridity in the source material for *Winter's Tale*.
10. All recent authorship studies have found that Wilkins is clearly the co-author of the *play*: see Jackson; Vickers (327); as do recent editions by Gossett (Arden 3), Mowat and Werstine (New Folger), Taylor and Jackson (Oxford Complete), and Warren (Oxford). A few scholars would still argue for a third hand in the authorship, although only Wilkins is granted a double role as both source and co-author.
11. I refer to Wilkins's and Twyne's books as "novellas" since the word "novel" (used in most source studies) carries heavier generic baggage. Neither of these is a period term.
12. In 1863, the Royal Geographical Society responded to John Hanning Speke's telegram claiming that "the Nile is settled": "we could not positively say that the source of the Nile had been discovered without fuller details." *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 7 (3): 109.
13. For a study of *Pericles* in the larger context of Shakespearean authorship studies, see Vickers. My own sympathy with asynchronous collaboration is no doubt informed by the debt I owe to the pathbreaking scholarship of Barbara Mowat, Mary Ellen Lamb, and Valerie Wayne, which goes far beyond my works cited list. They have been integral collaborators in this essay's revisions and enormously patient and inspiring.
14. William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, eds. Snyder and Curren-Aquino, 5.3.94–95. My subsequent quotations from *WT* cite this edition.
15. *Pericles* (5.1.233–34). This and all remaining quotations from the play cite Suzanne Gossett's 2004 Arden 3 edition of the play. This edition does not carry an authorial attribution in its paratextual material, although Gossett certainly accepts joint authorship.
16. Gossett's Arden 3 edition of *Pericles* models a nonjudgemental treatment of co-authorship: "the combined experiences of both authors yield[ed], in collaboration, something different from what either wrote alone" (163). She does describe the state of the text as "damaged" by many "hands" and wonders whether its condition would have "disturbed" or "dismayed" its original readers (161, 10, 11).
17. On the crux in Gower, see the notes in Macaulay's edition of the *Confessio*, and Goolden. For a psychoanalytic reading of the riddle in the play, see Nevo.
18. In the *Confessio*, Gower does not mention that he relies on the "prose versions" for the text of the riddle; the source he "avowedly uses," the verse chronicle of Godfrey of Viterbo, omits the riddle altogether (Goolden 247). Gower, too, is playing a more complicated intertextual game than he can admit.
19. See Taylor, "Transmission." As Gossett's edition points out, that would be a serious violation of the terms of apprenticeship (25). It is delicious, but even more suspect, to imagine that the master who played Gower would have been Shakespeare himself (old men were apparently his performative line).
20. For example: "If Marina had been the source of the report, it is highly improbable that the text of one of her own scenes should have such major lacunae" (DelVecchio and Hammond 205.)
21. Similarly, Jackson concludes that Wilkins as a "rough dealer in miseries, travels, travails, and painful adventures deserves our gratitude for starting off Shakespeare's chimerical masterpiece and ushering in the late romances"; a chimera is, of course, a monstrous offspring (189).
22. The intertextuality that carries Twyne's trope into Wilkins's novella extends even into the material practices of authorship and printing. While Wilkins's title page reads "Painfull Adventures," with no mention of "pattern," his running title is "a patterne of the painefull adventures," echoing Twyne's title page and running title *The patterne of painefull adventures* (except for the variant articles). Running titles were added at the printing house, so this repetition suggests that Wilkins or his publisher gave the printer (Nathaniel Butter) a text including not just manuscript pages copied out from Twyne, but marked-up printed pages of Twyne.
23. This is the play's only reference to Lucina; as it happens, "Lucina" is the wife's name in Twyne. Wilkins gives Pericles's cry in the storm only indirectly, but no divinity of any gender is invoked: Pericles was "one while praying to heauen for [Thaisa's] safe deliverance, an other while suffering for the sorow wherwith he knew his Queene was imburthened, he chid the contrary storme (as if it had been sensible of hearing)" [E4v].

WORKS CITED

Alwes, Derek B. *Sons and Authors in Elizabethan England*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004.

Archibald, Elizabeth. *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations, Including the Text of the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri with an English Translation*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1991.

Bicks, Caroline. "Backsliding at Ephesus: Shakespeare's Diana and the Churching of Women. *Pericles: Critical Essays*. Ed. David Skeele. New York: Garland, 2000. 205–27.

Cooper, Helen. *The English Romance in Time*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

Dowden, Edward. *Shakspere. Literature Primers*. London: Macmillan, 1877.

———. *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*, including "Preface to the Third Edition." London: Macmillan, 1879.

———. *Introduction to Shakespeare*. New York: Appleton, 1895.

Frey, Charles. "Tragic Structure in *The Winter's Tale*: The Affective Dimension." *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. Ed. Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs. Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press, 1978. 113–24.

Fuchs, Barbara. *Romance. The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Gallagher, Lowell. "'This seal'd-up Oracle': Ambivalent Nostalgia in *The Winter's Tale*." *Exemplaria* 7.2 (1995): 465–98.

Goolden, P. "Antiochus's Riddle in Gower and Shakespeare." *Review of English Studies* n.s. 6 (1955): 245–51.

Gossett, Suzanne. "'You not your child well loving': Text and Family Structure in *Pericles*." *Companion to Shakespeare's Works*, Vol. 4. *The Poems, Problem Comedies, Late Plays*. Ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. 4 vols. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. 398–64.

Gower, John. *Confessio Amantis*. London: Bertellette, 1554.

———. *Complete Works of John Gower, Vol. 3*. Ed. G. C. Macaulay. London: Oxford UP, 1901.

Hackett, Helen. "'Gracious Be the Issue': Maternity and Narrative in Shakespeare's Late Plays." *Shakespeare's Late Plays*. Ed. Jennifer Richards and James Knowles. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999. 25–39.

———. *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Hart, F. Elizabeth. "'Great is Diana' of Shakespeare's Ephesus." *Studies in English Literature* 43:2 (2003): 347–74.

Hillman, Richard. *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama*. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.

Hutson, Lorna. *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-century England*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Jackson, MacD. P. *Defining Shakespeare—Pericles as Test Case*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Knight, G. Wilson. "The Writing of Pericles." *Pericles: Critical Essays*. Ed. David Skeele. New York: Garland, 2000. 78—113.

Lamb, Mary Ellen. *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1990.

———. *The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson*. London: Routledge, 2006.

McMullan, Gordon. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Mowat, Barbara A. *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1979.

———. "'A local habitation and a name': Shakespeare's Text as Construct." *Style* 23:3 (1989): 335–51.

———. "The Theater and Literary Culture." *A New History of Early English Drama*. Eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. 213–30.

———. "'I tell you what mine Authors saye': *Pericles*, Shakespeare, and Imitatio." *Archiv* 240 (2003): 42–59.

———. "'What's in a Name?' Tragicomedy, Comedy, or Late Comedy." *Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. 4: The Poems, Problem Comedies, and Late Plays*. Eds. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. 129–49.

Murray, Mary. "Primogeniture, Patrilineage, and the Displacement of Women." *Women, Property, and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England*. Eds. Nancy E. Wright, Margaret W. Ferguson, and A. R. Buck. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2004. 121–36.

Nevo, Ruth. "The Perils of *Pericles*." *The Undiscover'd Country*. Ed. B. J. Sokol. London: Free Assoc. P, 1989. 150–78.

Newcomb, Lori Humphrey. "'If That Which Is Lost Be Not Found': Monumental Bodies, Spectacular Bodies in *The Winter's Tale*." *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*. Ed. Goran Stanivukovic. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001. 239–59.

———. "Gendering Prose Romance in Renaissance England." *A Companion to Romance*. Ed. Corinne Saunders. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. 121–39.

———. "Prose Fiction." *Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. Ed. Laura Lungers Knoppers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

———. *Reading Popular Romance in Early Modern England*. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.

Nicholl, Charles. *The Lodger Shakespeare: His Life on Silver Street*. New York: Viking, 2007.

Nicholson, Peter. *An Annotated Index to the Commentary on Gower's Confessio Amantis*. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989.

Parker, Patricia. *Inescapable Romance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.

———. *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, and Property*. London: Methuen, 1987.

Prior, Roger. "The Life of George Wilkins." *Shakespeare Survey* 25 (1972): 137–51.

Pettet, E. C. *Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition*. London: Staples P, 1949.

Sanders, Norman. "An Overview of Critical Approaches to the Romances." *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. Eds. Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1978. 1–10.

Shakespeare, William. *Pericles*. Ed. Gary Taylor. *The Complete Works*. 2nd ed. Gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005. 1059–88.

———. *Pericles*. Ed. F. D. Hoeniger. London: Routledge, 1962.

———. *Pericles*. Ed. Suzanne Gossett. Arden Shakespeare, third series. London: Thomson Learning, 2004.

———. *Pericles*. New Folger Library Shakespeare. Eds. Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Washington Square P, 2005.

———. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. New Cambridge. Eds. Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

———. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. New Penguin. Ed. Philip Edwards. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

———. *The Winter's Tale*. New Cambridge. Eds. Susan Snyder and Deborah T. Curren-Aquino. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins. *A Reconstructed Text of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. Oxford Shakespeare. Ed. Roger Warren, on the basis of a text prepared by Gary Taylor and MacD. P. Jackson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Shakespeare, William [and George Wilkins]. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. London: White and Creede for Henry Gosson, 1609.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

Spring, Eileen. *Law, Lineage, and Family: Aristocratic Inheritance in England, 1300 to 1800*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1993.

Stanivukovic, Goran V. "Knights in Armes": The Homoerotics of the English Renaissance Prose Romances." *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities 1570–1640*. Eds. Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2003. 171–92.

Taylor, Gary. "The Transmission of *Pericles*." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 80:2 (1986): 193–217.

Taylor, Gary, and MacD. P. Jackson. "*Pericles*." *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. New York: Norton, 1997. 556–92.

Thorne, Alison, ed. *Shakespeare's Romances: New Casebooks*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Twyne, Laurence. *Patterne of Painefull Adventures*. London: Valentine Simmes for Widow Newman, 1594.

———. *The Patterne of paineful Adventures*. London: Valentine Sims, 1607.

Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare, Co-Author*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Wayne, Valerie. "The Sexual Politics of Textual Transmission." *Textual Formations and Reformations*. Ed. Laurie E. Maguire and Thomas L. Berger. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998. 179–210.

Wells, Stanley. "Shakespeare and Romance." *Later Shakespeare*. Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 8. New York: St. Martin's P, 1967. 48–79.

Wilkins, George. *Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. London: T. P[urfoot] for Nat. Butter, 1608.

Womack, Peter. "Shakespeare and the Sea of Stories." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29:1 (1999): 169–87.

3 "Asia of the One Side, and Afric of the Other"

Sidney's Unities and the Staging of Romance

Cyrus Mulready

At a crucial moment in his *Defense of Poesy*, Philip Sidney summons a magical horse. He does so in response to the question: "How then shall we set forth a story which containeth both many places and many times?" Sidney offers: "Again, many things may be told which cannot be showed, if they know the difference betwixt reporting and representing. As, for example, I may speak (though I am here) of Peru, and in speech digress from that to the description of Calicut; but in action I cannot represent it without Pacolet's horse" (244). Editors of Sidney's treatise have long noted that "Pacolet's horse" alludes to a figure from the French romance *Valentin et Orson*.[1] In the story (qtd. here from Henry Watson's sixteenth-century translation), a dwarfish enchanter named Pacolet fashions a magical wooden horse that allows him to travel throughout the world:

> Euery tyme that he mounted upon the horse for to goo somwhere, he torned the pynne [turned the pin] towarde the place that he wolde go to, and anone he founde him in the place without harme or daunger, for the hors was of suche facyon that he wente throughe the ayre more faster than ony byrde coude flee. . . . (*Hystory* N4[r])

In the scene depicted in the following woodcut (Figure 1), two characters are flying over a castle on the back of Pacolet's magic horse to the wonder of the onlookers below.

Sidney's invocation of this flying wooden horse comes on the heels of his complaint that the English stage is "faulty both in place and time" (243): it disregards the unities associated with Aristotle. But his response also indicates the extent to which the world had changed since the time Sophocles wrote his tragedies, Terence his comedies, and Aristotle his *Poetics*. In a strange juxtaposition, Sidney brings the expanding world of global exploration, discovery, and commerce into conversation with neoclassical dramatic theory. The figure that he derisively suggests can bridge this gap, that can "represent" such fanciful globetrotting "in action," is Pacolet's horse. It is surprising, and clearly ironic, that Sidney, a theorist who rigorously