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ABSTRACT

*Pericles'* apparent inferiority to Shakespeare’s mature works raises many questions for scholars. Was Shakespeare collaborating with an inferior playwright or playwrights? Did he allow so many corrupt printed versions of his works after 1604 out of indifference? Re-dating *Pericles* from the Jacobean to the Elizabethan era answers these questions and reveals previously unexamined connections between topical references in *Pericles* and events and personalities in the court of Elizabeth I: John Dee, Philip Sidney, Edward de Vere, and many others. The tournament impresas, alchemical symbolism of the story, and its lunar and astronomical imagery suggest *Pericles* was written long before 1608. Finally, Shakespeare’s focus on father-daughter relationships, and the importance of Marina, the daughter, as the heroine of the story, point to *Pericles* as written for a young girl. This thesis uses topical references, Shakespeare’s anachronisms, Shakespeare’s sources, stylometry and textual analysis, as well as Henslowe’s diary, the Stationers' Register, and other contemporary documentary evidence to determine whether there may have been versions of *Pericles* circulating before the accepted date of 1608. I also delve into the printing and publication history of *Pericles*, as well as some stylometric analysis, to show how and why this probably early play might have been appropriated by victualler George Wilkins (1576-1618) and others, and revived to feed a growing demand for Shakespeare’s works.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The author William Shakespeare (1564-1616), history’s most influential playwright, by the 1600s had reached the peak of his powers as a dramatist. *Macbeth, King Lear,* and *Othello* had already been performed at the Globe by 1609, so clearly Shakespeare by this time had the skill, talent, and experience to craft great works. The inferior quality of *Pericles,* supposedly written in 1609, compared to Shakespeare's other plays, has baffled critics since Ben Jonson (1572-1637), who wrote in 1631:

```
Some mouldy tale like *Pericles,* and stale
As the shrieve's crusts, and nasty as his fish,
Scraps out of every dish,
Thrown forth and raked into the common tub (Jonson).
```

Comparing *Pericles* to “Broome's sweepings,” or “lees” instead of “lusty wine.” Jonson casts aspersions on the taste and judgement of audiences who could prefer this, and other old pirated plays, to his own fresh new ones. *Pericles* is by no means a masterpiece, yet it appears at a time when most of Shakespeare’s plays were usually of the highest caliber. Over the centuries, various explanations have been proposed for its apparent inferiority to his mature works. These include his collaboration with an inferior playwright or playwrights, experimentation with new forms, or simply indifference to his own work. Scholars generally accept that the last three acts are indisputably Shakespeare’s, but no explanation can be found for why the dramatist would have composed this play so late in his career. A re-dating of this play might reveal previously unexamined or unknown facts about its composition, authorship, and inspirations. More generally, a more accurate understanding of the sequence
of Shakespeare's plays might give a better insight into his development as a dramatist, and into his artistic process.

William Shakespeare

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) was born in Stratford-upon-Avon to ambitious merchant John Shakespeare, an alderman and bailiff of the town until he was arrested for illegal wool dealing in 1576. William was twelve years old when the family was plunged into debt and lost their property. Although he was entitled to free schooling at King's Grammar School in Stratford, there is no record of Will ever attending, nor that King's was at that time provided with many of the sources used in the 37 plays, 158 sonnets, and 2 long narrative poems in the Shakespeare canon. His family life is well known and documented: at eighteen, Will married Anne Hathaway, nine years his senior. Their daughter Susannah was born six months later. Twins Hamnet and Judith were christened in 1585, most likely named after neighbors Hamnet and Judith Sadler, the baker and his wife. Shakespeare’s son Hamnet was buried in 1596, aged eleven years. We know nothing about the boy’s life or education. As for Will’s theatrical involvement, he may have seen his first play at age eight, when Leicester's Men came to Stratford in 1572. By age eighteen, he could have seen as many as eight touring plays, but there is no evidence that he did. Some scholars speculate that he may have seen Coventry plays before they were suppressed in 1579, but this, too, is conjecture. Since no record of Shakespeare traveling, buying or selling or bequeathing books, writing a letter, or attending any school has ever been found, the Mermaid's Tavern in Cheapside is proposed as the source of his encyclopedic knowledge of law, medicine, alchemy, courtly language, world affairs, astronomy, languages, sailing, and geography. It is certainly possible to glean some
knowledge simply by talking to people, but even equipped with genius and an eidetic memory, knowledge gained in this way would require spending many hours in the tavern, to the exclusion of other pursuits.

Shakespeare's name first appeared in print on the title page of the narrative poem *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, and began appearing on quartos of plays beginning in 1598 with *Love's Labor's Lost*. In 1597, he purchased New Place, one of the grandest homes in Stratford, for £60, ten times what a playwright typically earned from the sale of a play. From 1592, new Shakespeare plays appeared in print twice a year, but this stopped abruptly in 1604, and nothing more was printed for nearly five years, when suddenly in 1608 *King Lear* appeared in quarto. The following year, 1609, *Shakespeare's Sonnets* appeared, printed by Thomas Thorpe. Quarto editions of *Troilus and Cressida* and *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* also appeared for the first time in 1609. No other new quartos were printed until *Othello* in 1622. Shakespeare is not mentioned in the Stationers' register, Henslowe's diary, or Burbage's diary. Although there is a reference to him in Francis Meres's 1598 *Palladis Tamia*, Shakespeare is unheard of as a playwright until 1592, when there is a possible reference in Robert Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*:

> An upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, who with his tiger's heart wrapt in a player's hide fancies himself as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you, and is in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country.

This passage is often cited as proof that Shakespeare was already well-known as an actor and playwright in 1592, but there no reason to believe it refers to him. Because *Henry VI Part III* was not printed until 1595, and even then was anonymous, the line more likely refers to the actor who said it, than the writer who wrote it. It far better describes actor/manager Edward Alleyn, who actually spoke the line in *Henry VI, Part III* referenced by Greene, “O tiger’s
heart wrapt in a woman’s hide!” (I.iv.578). Alleyn had dealings with Greene, probably owed him money (Wraight 153-5), and had lately taken to writing plays in 1592 (Detobel 5), Greene two years earlier had already castigated Edward Alleyn in his Francesco’s Fortunes as “proud like Aesop’s Crow, being pranct with the feathers of others.” The “upstart crow” probably refers to Alleyn, therefore Greene’s Groatsworth cannot establish the date of Shakespeare’s arrival in London, although it may establish that Henry VI Part III was performed publicly before 1592.

Although the Shakespeare family kept careful records of sales of goods, they kept no record of the sales of Shakespeare's plays, nor are there extant manuscripts of any of the plays. Ben Jonson, writing in 1616, credits him with having been paid twice as an actor in the 1590s, and there is a 1594 document naming him as a shareholder. Much of the current knowledge of Shakespeare of Stratford comes from his 1616 will. It is a somewhat atypical will, according to Bonner Cutting (171). It makes no specific provision for his wife apart from his second-best bed, and makes no mention of any books, plays, musical instruments, shares in theatres, or manuscripts. It does bequeath rings to actors Heminge and Condell, who were instrumental in putting together the First Folio, but the mention of them is an interlineation in another hand which may not be genuine. Even before Shakespeare’s death, his plays were being appropriated. It is curious that he did not interfere in any way, considering that the record does show him as a shrewd and litigious businessman.

After 1604, Shakespeare's plays were published without authorization, in inferior or corrupt versions, with unprecedented frequency for a living writer. Inferior texts printed during Shakespeare's lifetime include 2 Henry VI, 3 Henry VI, Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, Merry Wives, Hamlet, King Lear, Pericles, and Richard III (Price 136).
Anderson cites eighteenth-century scholar W.R. Chetwood, who concluded, based on the publishing records, that Shakespeare “took his farewell of the stage, both as author and actor” in 1603 (Anderson, 396-397). Looney, Anderson, and other Oxfordian scholars note that Shakespeare seemed to fall silent in 1604. Anderson observes:

The silence was broken twice. The first break came in 1608-9 when de Vere's widow, Elizabeth Trentham de Vere, was preparing to move out of King's Place in Hackney, the house she had shared with her late husband during his final years. Four new Shake-speare works (*Pericles*, *King Lear*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and the Sonnets) were printed during this period. The second window began with the publication in 1622 of the debut edition of *Othello* and culminated the following year in the publication of the thirty-seven plays (eighteen of which had never been printed before) that constitute the 1623 'Shakespeare First Folio' (397).

Anderson further notes that the phrase “newly emended” disappeared from the title pages around 1604. Based on the *Bellott v. Mountjoy* document, Shakespeare was lodging with George Wilkins on Silver Street in Cripplegate in 1604.

How long Shakespeare lodged there is not certain, but he was definitely there in 1604 ... He was then 40 years old, a writer, actor and shareholder in the leading troupe of the day, the King's Men—a man at the peak of his profession (Nicholl 8).

Waterfield cites Charles Nicholl’s speculation in *The Lodger* that “Shakespeare would have welcomed Wilkins' collaboration, as giving him the benefit of insider information about what went on in a brothel” (Waterfield 570). It is puzzling that a man at the peak of his profession, a wealthy merchant and shareholder, would lodge himself in the red light district with characters like Mountjoy or Wilkins, or collaborate with a complete novice. Living over a brothel would facilitate researching the brothel scenes for *Pericles* and *Measure for Measure*, but one would think that life in a brothel would be the one topic that Shakespeare could easily have picked up at the Mermaid Tavern. Why not lodge with Nathan Field, or Richard Burbage, or John Fletcher? And why the long silence? Surely an author who could annually
churn out two of the greatest works in the English language would not have needed five years to pen *Pericles*.

Although published under Shakespeare's name in 1609, *Pericles* did not appear in the First Folio. Scholars have always been uncertain what role Shakespeare played in its creation. Vickers mentions that Alexander Pope brusquely rejected *Pericles* and the Apocrypha completely, but cites a 1733 note from Lewis Theobald, “‘This absurd Old Play...was not entirely of our Author's penning; but he has honor'd it with a Number of Master-Touches so peculiar to himself that a Knowing Reader may with Ease and Certainty distinguish the Traces of his Pencill' (CHS, ii.413, 500)” (291). Most commentators see the initial 1608 entry of *Pericles* in the Stationers' Register by Edward Blount as an unsuccessful attempt at a “blocking entry,” to keep other publishers from publishing it. In 1609 Henry Gosson published the first Quarto of *Pericles* with the title,

*The Late, And much admired Play, Called Pericles, Prince of Tyre. With the true Relation of the whole Historie, adventures, and fortunes of the said Prince: As also, The no lesse strange, and worthy accidents, in the Birth and Life, of his Daughter Mariana. As it hath been divers and sundry times acted by his Maiesties Servants, at the Globe on the Banck-side. By William Shakespeare. Imprinted at London (by William White) for Henry Gosson, and are to be sold at the signe of the Sunne in Pater-noster row, &c. 1609* (Gilvary 435).

As the title page states, the play by then had been performed at the Globe, possibly many times. Because of the poor quality of the text, the 1608 quarto is widely regarded as a pilfered copy. “Editors agree that the text is very poor, believing that the copy was not authoritative. Chambers has outlined many of the problems including irregular setting of verse and prose” (Gilvary 436). As Gilvary notes, “All subsequent publications seem to derive from Q2” (436). A third quarto appeared in 1611 under the title,

*The Late And Much admired Play, Called Pericles, Prince of Tyre. With the true Relation of the whole History, adventures, and fortunes of the sayd Prince: As also,*
This version differs very little from the second quarto. A fourth quarto appears in 1619, published by Thomas Pavier (d. 1625), with the title, *The Late, And much admired Play, Called Pericles, Prince of tyre. With the true Relation of the whole History, adventures, and fortunes of the saide Prince* (Gilvary 436). Unlike the previous three folios, the fourth does not comment on the play's performance history, but *Pericles* must have been a very popular play to support so many editions.

In 1619, Thomas Pavier and William Jaggard attempted to print a folio, but were issued a cease and desist order by the Lord Chamberlain, William Herbert Earl of Pembroke (1580-1630). The King's Men requested that the Lord Chamberlain “put a stop to the publication of any more Shakespeare plays” (Wells 141). The First Folio was instead published in 1623 by William and Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, with a dedication to Pembroke and his brother, Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery (1584-1650), calling them the “Incomparable Paire of Brethren.” Having sued to prevent others from compiling a similar folio, the Herbert brothers apparently paid for the cost of the First Folio, which Richard Whalen calls “one of the most expensive printing undertakings of the time” (81). Suzanne Gossett suggests three possible reasons why the popular play *Pericles* is absent from the First Folio (1623): the editors of the First Folio, Heminges and Condell, were unable to obtain either a copy of the play or the rights to it or both; the editors knew the text was badly corrupted; or, as Gossett opines, the editors knew that the play was co-authored (Gossett 41). Since several other plays are believed to be co-authored, it makes no sense to exclude *Pericles* on that basis, even if it were true.
CHAPTER 2
PLOT SUMMARY

_Pericles, Prince of Tyre_ follows sixteen years in the life of a fictionalized Prince Pericles, ruler of Tyre, as told by the ghost of 14th-century poet John Gower. Wishing to marry, Pericles travels overseas to woo the famously beautiful daughter of King Antiochus the Great. To win her, he must stake his life on solving a transparently easy riddle which reveals the princess's incestuous relationship with her father. On solving the riddle, Pericles flees Antioch with King Antiochus's henchman Thaliard in hot pursuit.

Once in Tyre Pericles appoints his trusted advisor Helicanus to rule Tyre in his place while he exiles himself for a year in hopes of averting a war with Antioch. He then sets sail and arrives in famine-stricken Tharsus, kingdom of Cleon and Dionyza. Using the grain on his ship to end the famine, Pericles accepts its people’s thanks. Cleon and Dionyza vow eternal gratitude. Hearing that Antiochus's assassins are still chasing him, Pericles boards his ship and departs. A great storm at sea hurls him up naked onto the shores of Pentapolis, where some fishermen give him clothes and food, and tell him that their wise king Simonides is holding a tournament for the hand of his daughter, Thaisa. Pericles enters the lists and wins favor with both princess Thaisa and good King Simonides. The King’s similarity to Pericles’s own deceased father makes him willing to marry Thaisa (fortunate, since Simonides marries them almost immediately). Nine months later, word comes that Antiochus and his daughter have been struck by lightning, and Tyre is ready to elect a new king. Pericles sails for Tyre, with his pregnant wife Thaisa and her nurse, Lychorida. During an even greater storm at sea, Thaisa dies in childbirth and a devastated Pericles is forced to cast
her overboard. Her coffin washes ashore in Ephesus, where the physician Cerimon resuscitates her and helps her to the position of priestess in Diana’s temple.

Meanwhile Pericles, concerned that the infant (named Marina because she was born at sea) cannot withstand the long voyage to Tyre, returns to Tharsus with her and the nurse. Cleon and Dionyza vow to raise Marina alongside their own daughter, Philoten, but the relationship sours when Marina is fourteen and suitors show more interest in her than in Philoten. Dionyza orders her servant Leonine to kill Marina, but pirates appear and abduct Marina just in the nick of time. Leonine pretends to have done the murder, and Dionyza, in a scene reminiscent of Lady Macbeth, talks Cleon into covering it up with her. When Pericles returns for Marina he is shown her grave. Mad with grief, Pericles returns to the open seas.

The pirates sell Marina to a brothel in Mytilene, where she preaches virtue and chastity to the customers. Governor Lysimachus comes disguised to the brothel and is converted just as Marina's other prospective customers are, and is so moved by her goodness that he gives her money to remain an honest virgin. Exasperated, the Bawd and Pimp order their employee Boult to rape Marina so that she will start earning them money, but instead Marina talks Boult into helping her start a school with the money Lysimachus gave her. She supports herself by teaching sewing, music, and the arts to noble girls, until one day Pericles's ship drifts into harbor.

Upon learning that the king in the ship is mad and mute, Lysimachus sends for Marina, who heals Pericles using music. The two slowly recognize each other and reconcile. Pericles then dreams of the Goddess Diana, who tells him to go to her temple. There he is reunited with his wife and daughter, betroths Marina to Lysimachus, and gives them Tyre. Meanwhile Pericles and Thaisa plan to return to Pentapolis to inherit Simonides's kingdom. Gower
explains that Cleon and Dionyza were torn apart by a mob for their treatment of Marina, and so the bad have been punished, the good rewarded.
CHAPTER 3
PLAY ANALYSIS

The main characters do very little in this story. Apart from solving a riddle, lifting a famine, and winning a tilt, Pericles is the passive victim of fate and the elements. He drifts from one scenario to the next, suffering hardships, but not actually solving any problems or overcoming any obstacles. His victories seem a bit unearned. Marina's victories, as well, seem too easy. To foil the bad guys she only has to speak. The characters have no more depth or complexity than might be found in any medieval mystery or miracle play. The language and the themes are what mark the play as Shakespeare's. Because of this, and its uneven quality, critics such as John Dryden, Edmund Malone, Victor Hugo, and many others, concluded that *Pericles* must have been Shakespeare's first play. As Phillips notes,

It is possible, however, that Dryden, in 1675, had sources of information now lost, and that he had reason for writing,—Shakespeare's own Muse her *Pericles* first bore, The Prince of Tyre was elder than the Moor—and asserting that *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, was Shakespeare's first play (118).

Phillips was convinced that the first two acts, often attributed to George Wilkins, John Fletcher or some other collaborator, were early Shakespeare, but that the last three probably were late.

Though I am convinced that the first two acts are genuine, I will only assert that they contain many passages reminiscent of genuine work (as to which there is a great weight of critical opinion against me), and suggest that the writer, whether he was Shakespeare or not, may have had some sufficient reason for beginning it with so unpleasant a situation (Phillips 118).

Scholars of Phillips’s period were reluctant to accept the first two acts of *Pericles* as Shakespeare’s, more because of Victorian disgust at the incest theme than any actual
concerns about the style of its writing. The first acts were “bad” simply because they didn’t like them.
CHAPTER 4

CHRONOLOGY

There is no definite chronology of Shakespeare’s plays. The dating of Shakespeare’s plays is sometimes aided by known dates of performances, but plays have often been composed many years, sometimes even decades, before any recorded performance. Publication dates do not always reflect composition dates, either, as in the case of Philip Sidney's Arcadia, written in 1580 during his banishment from court, but not published until 1592, seven years after his death. Performances can give us a date by which the play must have been written, but they cannot pinpoint a date of composition. A play can reasonably be considered to have been written no earlier than its oldest source, and no later than its first performance, but that often leaves a wide gap. Sources are nearly always too early. Topical references are helpful in establishing an earliest date for composition. They can help to narrow to a specific date, but there are two problems with dating plays based solely on topical references. First, actors often ad lib topical references to make a joke funnier or to make a play more relatable to its audience; and so a play transcribed from a performance, or revised for a particular production, can have topical references which could refer to events taking place long after the date of composition, or even after the author’s death. This is frequently done even nowadays by directors who, correctly guessing that a name or event that got a laugh in 1962 will not be recognized by an audience in 2015, replace it with a current one. Second, topical references to shipwrecks, earthquakes, and other natural phenomena are difficult to pin down. For instance, does the Nurse’s mention in Romeo and Juliet of an earthquake eleven years prior to the play’s action reference the Dover Straits
earthquake of 1580, or does it refer to the Ferrara earthquake in Italy in 1570? The former would date the play to 1591, the latter to 1581. The audience is in England, so a reference to the Dover earthquake would bring the story closer to home for them. But the Nurse is in Verona, and so the earthquake reference could be an instance of Shakespeare using the Ferrara earthquake to build the world of the play. The earthquake reference is still helpful, as it pinpoints two possible years of composition, but more information is needed to eliminate either date. The earthquake alluded to in *Pericles* (III.ii.1303-7), which has prompted the two gentlemen to visit Cerimon’s house so early, carries with it a similar problem. Is the earthquake topical, or is it a relic of the ancient legend?

There are other difficulties in dating Shakespeare's plays. Actual dated manuscripts, allusions in correspondence, or payment records would be the most desirable evidence for establishing a play’s date, but none of these is available for any Shakespeare play (Gilvary 8). Unlike Ben Jonson, who appealed in a letter to the Earl of Salisbury for help during his imprisonment over The Isle of Dogs (Gilvary 8-9), Shakespeare does not seem to have written any letters at all, much less letters discussing the plays, or if he did, they were all lost. Moreover, there is no record of Shakespeare ever receiving payment for a single play, although Henslowe's diary records payments to other playwrights. Other actor managers kept diaries, too, but neither Richard Burbage nor Edward Alleyn kept any record of any payments made to Shakespeare, and so those records cannot help to date the plays. There is a 1594 document naming him as payee with two other members of the Chamberlain’s Men, but for what job, or which play, it does not say.

Another method of dating a play is to examine style and language. It is frequently remarked on by writers such as Felperin, Jackson, Knight, and others, that the style of
Pericles, and colloquialisms used therein, were out of vogue by 1608. Hardin Craig notices that the language seems “earlier than the earliest Shakespeare we have” (51-6). Marjorie Garber offers that “Jonson's gripe about it being ‘mouldy’ likely meant that it was both archaic and improbable” (Garber 754). Lake complains of “nasal assonances” which appear only five times in 2,000 lines (140). This is sometimes attributed to the idea that the provincial proposed collaborator George Wilkins used outmoded language in the first two acts of the play, in contrast with the more modern, sophisticated style used by his more urbane friend William Shakespeare. Wilkins was twelve years Shakespeare’s junior and had apparently been living in London for some time, and so it is unlikely that the younger man's language would be more old-fashioned. The two seemingly distinct styles in Pericles are often currently considered to be evidence of collaboration between Shakespeare and Wilkins, but it is also possible that the play was written when the language of the first two acts was current and fashionable, and then subsequent revisions updated the language of the final three acts. Jackson asserts that the language of last three acts is consistent with that of Shakespeare's “late” plays (Jackson 49), but this is something of a circular argument, since he defines the “late” plays as those romances such as Cymbeline, The Tempest, A Winter’s Tale, and Pericles, which share definite thematic and linguistic qualities as a result of their shared genre and authorship. They are called “late romances” late because they resemble one another, and are assumed to have been composed close to the time of their earliest known performances or publications, but all of them might have been written decades before they were published or performed. This is reasonable use of external evidence, but ignores quite a bit of internal and textual evidence, especially in the case of Pericles.
The first recorded performance of *Pericles* follows a five-year gap in publication and performance of any new material from Shakespeare (Anderson 361). Some of his already established plays were performed during Christmas of 1604 at the court of King James I, which Taylor calls “the high-water mark of Shakespeare's popularity, accurately reflecting his theatrical dominance in the last decade of Elizabeth I's reign” (Wells and Taylor 18). Clearly the king was interested in Shakespeare's works, but “from 1603 to 1608, according to this record, no single play was printed and published for the first time” (Looney 415-7). Surprisingly, considering that the Chamberlain's Men became the King's Men upon the accession of James I, the troupe had no new Shakespeare to offer the royal family.

When The King's Men appeared at court during the winter of 1604-05, Queen Anne requested that the company perform some Shakespeare that she hadn't already seen. They told her they could not fulfill her request. So the King's Men staged the old standby *Love's Labor's Lost* instead (Anderson 596).

This five-year dry spell coincides with the death of Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford, often proposed as the author of Shakespeare's plays. This gap “is fully borne out by Professor Dowden's table, Sir Sidney Lee's account, and every other record we have seen” (Looney 416). Looney suggests that the manner of publication of *Pericles* and the Sonnets is strong evidence that the “ever-living” author of both, was dead by that time (Looney 517).

Mark Anderson observes that “There is no such thing as a 'standard' chronology of Shakespeare.” He cites *The Riverside Shakespeare*, a textbook used in many classrooms today, which dates eleven plays to sometime after 1604: *King Lear, Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, Timon of Athens, Pericles, Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale, The Tempest, Henry VIII*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, but admits that they may have been written before this time. Some scholars have concluded that Shakespeare stopped writing in 1604. As Anderson notes, “Alfred Harbage's Pelican/Viking editions of Shakespeare (1969;
1977) assign a 'tentative' date of composition for each of the plays (which would put ten works in the post-1604 category) but then provided error bars for each suppositional date” (Anderson 596). Harbage only places *The Tempest* and *Henry VIII* completely beyond 1604. Nineteenth-century German literary historian Karl Elze dated both of these plays to the period 1603 by theorizing that *Henry VIII* was originally written in early 1603 to celebrate the seventieth birthday that Queen Elizabeth never lived to see, “while *The Tempest*, Elze concluded, ‘would fall at latest to the year 1604’” (Anderson 396). *Pericles* was the one play left out of the First Folio, and even the Second Folio, 1632. *Pericles* became “semi-acceptable as a Shakespeare play with its registration and inclusion into the Third Folio of Shakespeare, 1664” (Brazil 190), more than forty years after the death of William Shakespeare.
CHAPTER 5

THEMES

The triple repetition of father-daughter pairs has its stylistic basis in Euphuism, and its philosophical and symbolic basis in Gnosticism, the occult philosophy central to alchemy as practiced by John Dee. Thematically and stylistically, then, Pericles is a window into the world of the 1580s. For the Gnostics, according to Howard, there were three worlds, each with its own gods, and Pericles mirrors this theory beautifully (Howard 1). One is a timeless spiritual world of an incomprehensible Father/Mother. This Father/Mother has various “emanations,” essentially specific aspects of the indescribable deity. The second is intermediate, above our world but in time, the realm of the world-fashioner, or what Plato called the demiurge, identified with the Greek Zeus and the Hebrew Jehovah. There are also various secondary gods and goddesses, offspring of the demiurge, whom the Gnostics called the Archons, Greek for “rulers.” Finally there is our material world, fashioned by the demiurge but ruled by Satan and his demons. “The Gnostic is one whose spirit is of the first world, yet is trapped in the third world by the forces of the second and third world. Salvation is the return to one's spiritual home” (Howard 1). The different kingdoms in Pericles correspond to these realms, and Pericles can be seen as the embodiment of the Gnostic, literally “one who knows.” These ideas were brought to court early in Elizabeth’s reign by John Dee.

In his famous preface to Euclid of 1570, which became the Bible of the rising generations of Elizabethan scientists and mathematicians, Dee sets out, following Agrippa, the theory of the three worlds (Yates 95).

In Pericles, as in medieval and Renaissance Catholic theology, the world is first lost through a woman analogous to Eve, and then regained by a woman, Marina, who is analogous to the
Virgin Mary in her purity and miraculous faith. The unnamed princess, subject of the initial riddle, is compared to a serpent, a celestial tree, and the Hesperides, guarded by dragons and covered with golden apples. This conjures up the image of the Garden of Eden, which, like the garden of the Hesperides, contained a tree whose apples were said to confer immortality or death. Pericles is confronted, then, in this scene, with the primal oldest temptation, the ultimate forbidden fruit.

*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 (1.1.64-71).

The girl’s name is never mentioned, but the fact that most of the lines of the riddle begin with the letter “I” may be intended as a clue. Incest here is presented as the primal eldest evil, as it is in Gower’s poem. Gower uses this episode to illustrate Pride as the first of the Seven Deadly Sins. Although incest certainly illustrates what Gower refers to as *unkindelich* lust, it is pride that makes Antiochus believe that he is above the usual moral code, and that his status as king entitles him to commit incest with impunity.

The princess is again referred to as a serpent by Pericles himself, as he realizes the inescapable conclusion of the riddle posed by Antiochus, “And both like serpents are, who though they feed/On sweetest flowers, yet they poison breed” (1.2.132-3). From the moment the princess enters, “apparel’d like the Spring,” the action is really taking place in the mythic Garden of Eden. From that point on, the paradise hinted at with the mention of the Hesperides is lost through a woman until it is regained through a woman: Marina. Pericles, like Adam, now has the knowledge of good and evil, and because of this is pursued by the
story's “devil,” Antiochus. Antiochus, the historical enemy of the biblical Judah Maccabee, is here presented as the ultimate evil, the Father of Lies.

In actual history, Antiochus the Great ... tried to raise the money by forcing the priesthood to disgorge the treasures hoarded in their temples... He was supervising the stripping of such a temple when the populace, aroused by the priests, mobbed and killed him in 187 B.C. (Asimov 191).

From the Gnostic perspective, Antiochus represents the inescapable evil of the material plane.

Pericles arrives with a ship full of grain to lift the famine at Tharsus. Just as Antioch represents the fall of man, Tharsus, birthplace of Paul the Apostle, represents the beginning of the redemptive journey through good works, charity, and kindness. In Tharsus, Pericles encounters King Cleon and Queen Dionyza, who appear to represent the deadly sins of Sloth and Envy. Cleon has a daughter “hight Philoten,” whom we are told adores Marina. But Philoten never appears, and Dionyza accuses Cleon of “not your child well loving.” Cleon is not guilty of primal evil like Antiochus, but neither is he any sort of heroic figure. He is the proverbial good man who allows evil to triumph by doing nothing. He fails to lift the famine himself, fails to protect Marina when she is his ward, and becomes an accomplice with his wife by failing to denounce her attempted murder of Marina. As such, he shares Dionyza’s terrible punishment at the end of the story. Philoten, being innocent, is not punished with a violent death at the play’s end. She may lack Marina’s miraculous qualities, but the implication is that meek Philoten inherits the earth, and that although the realm of Cleon and Philoten is dominated by Dionyza, in the same way that the second plane is vulnerable to evil, there is hope for Tharsus in the end.

Pericles next travels to the realm of the honorable and sincere Simonides and Thaisa, where wisdom and charity rule, as shown by Simonides and the fishermen. Simonides’s
name may be meant to remind the audience of Simon Peter, because we are introduced to
him as the king of the three fishermen. This is still the second plane, but here ruled by
goodness and wisdom. Thaisa and Simonides are good, but they are only human beings.

Thaisa, the virtuous daughter of Simonides, is a doorway into the highest plane of existence,
but Pericles is not allowed to access that plane without further suffering.

Finally, after many trials, Pericles, like the alchemical soul, ascends to the sublime
kingdom of virtue, ruled by Diana, who reunites him with his family. In this last plane, the
realm of the sublime, the maiden Marina, mother Thaisa, and Goddess Diana are all
emanations of ineffable mother goddess, Sophia, the goddess of wisdom and ultimate
goodness. Ephesus becomes the Paradise regained. That this philosophy is so easily found in
Pericles, points to its composition during a time when the author and his audience were both
keenly interested in the subjects of alchemy and Gnostic philosophy. Marina also resembles
the Gnostic’s goddess of love and wisdom, Sophia, whose redemptive journey through the
material world includes a descent into its brothels where she is forced to live as a prostitute.

Under Elizabeth I, Gnosticism became more important, as it offered a female creatrix and
redemptrix of the world not bound by Catholicism and the Marian mysteries first described
by St. Jerome. Gnosticism offered people a philosophy that resolved the tension between
Catholicism and Protestantism, and moreover soothed anxieties over John Knox’s vision of
The Monstrous Regiment of Women ruling the world as God’s punishment. A Gnostic could
view Elizabeth I as an avatar of Sophia instead.
CHAPTER 6

CLUES IN THE SOURCES

Sources cannot provide a terminal date of composition, but they can set the earliest possible date composition could have begun. Sources can also reveal something about an author’s intentions, and the audience he hoped to captivate. Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, Elizabeth I's *The Glass of the Sinful Soul*, and Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, tr. Sir Thomas North, 1579, are *Pericles*'s primary sources, and all of them were available before 1550, and available in English before 1580. The 1570 *Geneva Bible*, Lawrence Twine's *The Patterne of Painfull Adventures*, the Falckenburgk Manuscript of the *Gesta Romanorum*, and Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* were all sources available in the 1570s. John Day's *Law Tricks* and George Wilkins's *Painful Adventures of Pericles*, not available until the 1600s, are usually proposed as sources for *Pericles*, but the reverse is more likely.

**John Gower's *Confessio Amantis***

The main source for *Pericles* is Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, first printed by William Caxton alongside the Bible and Chaucer in 1483. These stories were already old when Gower told them, “by no means original with Gower. What he does is retell stories from ancient and medieval sources, choosing the most popular ones” (Asimov 181). “Moral Gower” (1330-1408), as Chaucer called him, stands both as a symbol of morality, delivering the morals and messages of the story, and also of antiquity, telling the audience “*et bonum quo antiquius, eo melius,*” or, “the older a thing is, the better.” Shakespeare probably meant the audience to apply this adage to both old Gower and his story, which Shakespeare
carefully reproduces with striking insight into the original. By his use of Gower as a narrator, Shakespeare may have been attempting to identify himself with Gower as a historian, poet, and “guardian of the well-being of the kingdom” (Peck 18), as Gower himself had done. Gower also reminds us that this tale is for lords and ladies, “to make men glorious.” By selecting Gower as his source, the author may have been attempting to remind the sovereign, as Gower once had, of the ideal code of conduct for princes: “it should be remembered that the political is the aspect of the poem Gower himself chose to emphasize in the colophon describing his three major works” (Fisher 189).

By Shakespeare's time, Gower's works were as integral to the English literary canon as Chaucer or the Bible. Philip Sidney in *The Defense of Poesie* (published in 1595) compared Gower and Chaucer with Roman poets Livius Andronicus and Ennius, and with Italian poets Dante and Petrarch (Fisher 4). Records of bequests and private libraries indicate that Gower's *Confessio Amantis* was popular among nobles from the time it was printed, and that Gower is accurate about its wide readership among lords and ladies (I.i.8–9). According to Kate Harris, Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII, bequeathed a copy to her gentlewoman (Harris 83). Educated commoners such as priests, monks, printers, clerks, and lawyers also list copies in their wills. For example, on 10 May 1454,

Richard Fox, describing himself as 'of house of seint Albon simple servant', and elsewhere described as 'Ricardus Fox litteratus', 'ordeyned made and wrote' a will, the greater part of which is taken up with bequests of books, amongst them 'tales of gower' (Harris 77).

Gower's place in the English canon owes more to its content than to its style.

Gower's Englysh is old,
And of no value is told.
His mater is worth gold,
And worthy to be enrol'd (*Philip Sparrow*) (Bullough 369).
Shakespeare also drew on Gower's epic poem as a source for *The Comedy of Errors*, itself possibly performed at court in 1577 under the title *A Historie of Error* by the Children of Paul's” (Feuillerat 286). It is logical to infer that Shakespeare's various plays drawing on Gower or featuring him as a character were probably written during the same period, perhaps with a copy of *Confessio Amantis* open on his desk. Another play performed around that same time by the same company was *Pastorell, or Historie of a Greek Maid*, which Eva Turner Clark and others believe was an early version of *Pericles*. Bullough is confident that *Pericles* is an early work: “Shakespeare knew Gower's work early in his career, and probably drew for the dénoument of *The Comedy of Errors* on the reunion of Apollonius with his wife in the Temple of Diana at Ephesus” (Bullough 354).

It should be noted, however, that Gower's unique role in *Pericles* is much like his role in *Confessio Amantis*, in which he is also the author, narrator, and a character in the story. In no other play is Shakespeare “so literally indebted to the author himself of his chief source—we can't imagine him invoking the figure of Plutarch in the Roman plays or Raphael Holinshed in the English histories” (Charney 323). Shakespeare creates an atmosphere of intimacy with Gower, who is “is on familiar and confidential terms with the audience, whom he addresses as 'you’” (Charney 323). Charney seems unaware that “you” in this context is similar to “vous” in French. It is merely the plural and formal form of address. English lacks an informal plural. Nevertheless, Gower is both familiar and confidential as he promises the audience not that the story will be exciting, or suspenseful, but that it will be good for them. Describing the play in medicinal terms, “Lords and ladies in their lives/ Have read it for restoratives,” he explains. Instead of invoking visions of the storms, pirates, and exciting dangers awaiting, Gower sounds as if he is urging a child to drink his warm milk before
bedtime. He is a soothing adult presence addressing the audience as if they were children, as gently and reassuringly as Fred Rogers inviting us into the “Neighborhood of Make-Believe.” In the Prologue to Act 5, he calls for the active imaginations of the spectators to support the play: “In your supposing once more put your sight” (V.ii.21), and in the next speech, he acknowledges the audience's magical powers of imagination which have brought the king and all his company to Ephesus: “That he can hither come so soon/is by your fancies' thankful doom” (V.ii.19-20) (Charney 323). Gower explains the story at every step, as if the audience needs the action to be explained. He frequently reminds the audience to suspend disbelief, as if the audience has never seen a play before. In spite of Gower's simple, sing-song rhymes, there is something deeply human and personal about the medieval writer's world-weary ghost shepherding his charges through the ancient story.

Although Shakespeare employs some narration in Henry V, in Romeo and Juliet, and in A Winter's Tale, Gower is a unique figure, carefully tailored to the story at hand. Gower's reassuring, kindly demeanor stands in dramatic contrast with the figure of the Chorus in Henry V invoking his muse of fire, or Romeo and Juliet's Prologue summoning images of feud-torn Verona. His language conjures up not only an atmosphere of piety and antiquity, but of childhood, as if Gower has come from the ashes to tell an assembled group of noble children a bedtime story. Unlike Time in The Winter's Tale, who appears only in Act Four, or the Chorus who appears six times in Henry V, Gower is a narrator, setting up and explaining every bit of the action. Bullough believes that revision might explain why Gower's speeches from Act III onwards are more Shakespearean in tone than those in the first two Acts, “and have some echoes of the Chorus in Henry V” (Bullough 369). On the other hand, he notices a more strict imitation of Gower's actual style in the first two acts, which could point to the
author simply creating the mood, then gradually relaxing his style to tell the story. This would make sense if Shakespeare started to write using Gower as his model, and then gradually slipped into a less conscientious style of imitation as he continued.

Gower not only binds the play together, according to Bullough, but also gives it an “atmosphere of the antique” (Bullough 369). He uses obsolete words and forms in Acts I and II (fere, bene, perishen; Ne...escapen, yravished) and “has a sententious prosiness not unlike his original.” His moralizing is gentler than that of the original, as if written for children, “that wold ensamples telle/By olde daies as they fel(e) (conf. Bk. V)” (Fisher 4). Bullough supposes that Gower in the play indicates that Shakespeare was creating a deliberately archaic drama in form, “making use of a 'Presenter' or Chorus to bridge gaps of time and place and to hold the ragged plot together” (Bullough 369). Gower appears eight times, insuring a lasting impression on the audience. Shakespeare never uses the device of the Chorus “to the same extent, nor with the same structural importance as he does in Pericles. Gower appears more frequently than any other Chorus in Shakespeare” (DelVecchio 2). The use of Gower as a narrator suggests a composition date close to that of Henry V. The use of Gower as a source suggests that Pericles might be as early, or earlier, than The Comedy of Errors.

Queen Elizabeth I's Glass of the Sinful Soul

Glass of the Sinful Soul, published in 1544 by Elizabeth I (1533-1603), is a translation of the 1531 Miroir de l'âme pécheresse by Marguerite d'Angoulême (1492-1549), containing a riddle nearly identical to that proposed by Antiochus in I.i.108-120. The riddle in Pericles is very likely referencing the protagonist in the Miroir, who “compares herself with the Virgin
Mary—the mother and sister of God the Son, and the daughter and spouse of God the Father” (Shell 31). Repeated as a refrain and then explicated and analyzed in various terms in each verse of her poem, it was apparently a very common theological brainteaser. The incestuous relationship described was that of all mankind with God or Jesus. As Beatrice says in *Much Ado About Nothing*, “Adam's sons are my brethren, and I hold it a sin to match in my kindred” (II.i.255). This sort of tip of the hat to Elizabeth I would have been superfluous during the reign of King James I. There has also been some effort to connect *Pericles's* incest riddle instead to James I's 1598 *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies*, which alludes to the marital and paternal nature of the relationship between the monarch and his kingdom. James I's work, however, contains no riddles, nor allusions specifically to incest of any kind. Conversely, *Glass of the Sinful Soul* reiterates its central theme of the kinship riddle over and over, even in the dedicatory letter to the writer's stepmother, Catherine Parr: “of herself and of her own strength she can do nothing that good is, or prevaleth for her salvation, unless it be through the grace of God, whose mother, daughter, sister, and wife by the scriptures she proveth herself to be” (Shell 111). This strongly resembles the riddle in *Pericles*,

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 (I.i.108-22).

Elizabethans were used to this sort of riddle having a theological, not a literal solution, and so would have found it less transparent than do modern audiences unfamiliar with the form:

“Nearly identical puzzles inform such writers as John Gower, Laurence Twine, and the sixteenth century Navarre born Spanish poet Julian Medrano” (Shell 25). Of course the answer in all other cases, was the soul. But because the unnamed daughter is merely light's
reflection, not its substance, and her prideful father is not God, the answer is rooted in the body, not the soul.

Elizabeth had cause to contemplate incest as something more than a theological metaphor. In the 1580s she was accused by Catholic polemicists of being the child of “an incestuous, monstrous carnal union, 'and therefore an insatiable sexual deviant herself’” (Haynes 18). In addition, not one, but two incestuous engagements presented themselves to Elizabeth in her youth. Elizabeth's translation of *The Mirror/Glass* makes it a kinship riddle, with herself cast as 'so naughty a sister it is better for me to hide such a name'. The evidence is that the topic much absorbed her and its immediacy erupted into scandal as very soon her uncle/father was accused of 'handling' her (Haynes 21-2). Thomas Seymour planned to marry Elizabeth upon the death of his wife Catherine Parr, and was rumored to have impregnated the princess (Frazer 404). He certainly had the opportunity, visiting her in her bedchamber every morning and “tickling” the fifteen-year-old Elizabeth (Cutting 172). Her governess, Kat Ashley, and Thomas Parry, the cofferer, confessed in the Tower in 1549 that Seymour habitually visited Elizabeth's bedroom before she was dressed,

and there indulged in much indecent and suggestive romping … On one occasion the Queen coming suddenly upon them had found him holding the Lady Elizabeth in his arms; upon which she fell out with them both, and this was the cause why the Queen and Lady Elizabeth parted (Hume 8).

Although none of this had yet transpired when the eleven-year-old Elizabeth put pen to paper, it may have been in the author's mind when he selected his source material. Equally incestuous to Elizabeth's way of thinking was the proposal she received from her sister's husband Philip II of Spain, possibly the most loaded proposition in history (Hume 27-28). Elizabeth's legitimacy depended on the validity of her mother's marriage to Henry VIII, whose first wife, Catherine of Aragon, was still alive at the time of their marriage. To
Catholics, Catherine was still Henry's wife, and Anne Boleyn merely his mistress. Elizabeth could not embrace Catholicism without declaring herself illegitimate, thereby losing her right to the throne. Since Henry VIII sought the divorce in the first place on the grounds that marriage to his sister-in-law was incest, it would have been unthinkable for Elizabeth to marry her brother-in-law, even if he had allowed her to remain Protestant. Just as Pericles begins with its hero fleeing incest, Elizabeth's career began with her own flight from the specter of incestuous marriage. She would have sympathized strongly with Pericles's predicament, and, more importantly, recognized the reference to her own book. 

Pericles is as pure a piece of flattery to Elizabeth I as her own book was to Katherine Parr and Marguerite d’Angoulême.

Falckenburgk Manuscript and Gesta Romanorum

Monica Matie-Chesnoiu speculates that the author of Pericles came across the 1578 Falckenburgk version of the story printed in London at Richard Graphei. The poem, written in Latin hexameters, is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, the Earl of Leicester, Lord Burghley, and others.

Apart from the fact that, in the initial dedicatory verses to the queen, the author mentions the hero's “mille periclís,” (sic) this version combines the traditional story of Apollonius with the parts of the Jewish-Syrian struggle related in the two Books of Maccabees, identifying the incestuous king as Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The final justification of the poem is particularly interesting. Here, the author adds a brief biography of Apollonius and explains that he reconstructed the story from manuscript fragments, “from an ancient exemplar,” in both Greek and Latin (Matei-Chesnoiu 165).

Matei-Chesnoiu conjectures that Shakespeare could have seen this manuscript during a military expedition in Hungary. Anyone with a keen interest in history who was close to the Queen, Leicester, or Lord Burghley might have seen it. Its appeal would have been mainly
scholarly, its readership mostly those excited by or curious about ancient Greece or Rome, as we know Shakespeare the author certainly was.

**Lawrence Twine's *The Patterne of Painfull Adventures***

Next to Gower, the most obvious and important source for Shakespeare's *Pericles* is the 1576 book, *The Patterne of Painfull Adventures, containing the most excellent, pleasant, and variable Historie of strange Accidents that befell unto Prince Apollonius, the Lady Lucina his wife, and Tharsia his daughter. Wherein the Uncertainty of this world and fickle state of man's life are lively described. Gathered into English by Laurence Twine Gentleman,* by Lawrence Twine (fl. 1564-76). Wilkins’s novel draws even more heavily on Twine than on Shakespeare’s play: “whatever the relationship between the novel and the play it can easily be shown that the former was greatly indebted to Lawrence Twine's *Patterne of Paineful Adventures*” (Muir 226). The *Patterne of Paineful Adventures* is the only known work of the older Twine brother, Lawrence. A fellow at All Souls, Oxford in 1564, Twine ultimately became a rector in 1578 (Gillespie 492). The extremely well-educated Thomas Twine M.D and his older brother Lawrence Twine were part of the movement in Elizabethan England to translate classical works of every variety from Greek and Latin (Brazil 190). Both Twine brothers contributed to the 1573 translation of *The Breviary of Britain* (Farina 99). “*The Breviary of Britain,* 1573, was a translation of a geographical history of England, originally in Latin by one Humfrey Lluyd. Going by its sources, “[*Pericles*] can be dated any time between the publication of Laurence Twine's *Painfull Adventures* (possibly as early as 1576 but no later than 1594) and the publication of the Quarto in 1609” (Gilvary 435). Gilvary’s chronological framework is well-researched, but not the dominant one currently. However,
Stanley Wells, a proponent of the currently dominant chronology, notes that the play contains many passages lifted from *The Pattern of Painful Adventures*, by Laurence Twine (257). Although Wilkins draws heavily on Twine, Muir notes that Shakespeare uses Twine more sparingly, leaning much more heavily on Gower. In fact, in all of Shakespeare’s *Pericles* “There is only one scene which appears to be slightly closer to Twine's version than to that of Wilkins—Thaliard is relieved that owing to the disappearance of Pericles he does not have to murder him—but Wilkins may have deviated from the source-play at that point” (Muir 228).

Muir goes on to describe Wilkins's obvious reliance on Twine in the opening chapter. The statue the Tharsians build in Pericles's honor is barely mentioned in the play. The descriptions of the storm, the wedding, and Marina's song are not given in the Quarto of the play, and part of Marina's speech in the recognition scene is found only in Twine.

From this it would seem to be certain that Wilkins followed a play where he could and that he fell back on Twine where the play was deficient. This conclusion is supported by the title-page of the novel, where we are told 'it was lately presented by the worthy and ancient Poet John Gower', and by the concluding sentence of the argument, which refers to a performance by Shakespeare's company (Muir 226).

Edmund Chambers surmised sensibly that “The reprinting of Twine's story in 1607 possibly dates the revival” (527). This assumes that the play *Pericles* already existed before 1607, but given some of the evidence, it is a plausible assumption. Chambers believed that *Pericles* itself was a revival of an earlier play.

*The Breviary of Britain* features a dedication to the Earl of Oxford, and, as it was well printed by Richard Jones in 1573, it can be argued that Oxford paid for the publication. Lawrence Twine contributed some verses to *The Breviary of Britain*” (Brazil 190). Although Lawrence Twine's novel, released three years later, was dedicated to John Donning, “The Twine brothers unquestionably fell under de Vere's patronage around 1573” (Brazil 190).
Plutarch

It is not known why Shakespeare changed the name of Apollonius to Pericles, but he might have been inspired by “his favourite (sic) source Plutarch, who had written a life of the great Athenian statesman Pericles. The names Cleon and Lysimachus also appear in Plutarch” (Waterfield 570). Plutarch's works were first translated into English by Sir Thomas North in 1579. Although Shakespeare's Pericles appears at first glance to have nothing to do with the Golden Age statesman, Dr. J.M.S. Tompkins thinks that Shakespeare may have deliberately taken the name from North's Plutarch, and Bullough concurs, because “Plutarch tells that when he lost his only legitimate son, Pericles lay at home in misery and dejection for a time, till he was won back to public life by Alcibiades” (Bullough 356). There is an obvious similarity here between the historical hero and his namesake, plunged into misery and dejection over the loss of his daughter. Bullough notes that Shakespeare seems to have pulled other names from Plutarch: “Cleon was a rash fellow with a loud voice and brazen face ('Life of Nicias'); and Lysimachus was a general of Alexander's and of Thrace, to whom the poet Philippides, being asked what he would like as a gift, answered, 'Anything but your secrets' ('Life of Demetrius'). A cruel man, he was unlike our Lysimachus, but note that the Philippides anecdote appears at 1.3.4-6” (356). Kevin Gilvary suggests that Shakespeare's exceptional insight into the tradition of classical romances such as Pericles comes from his familiarity with the classics. The works seem to reveal a man well-versed in Heliodorus, Longus, Achilles Tatius, Plutarch, and Ovid (438).
Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*

If Shakespeare did not take the name Pericles from Plutarch, he may have gotten it from Philip Sidney (1554-1586), whose *Arcadia*, first published in 1590, features a central character called Pyrocles. “In changing the name of the title character from Apollonius to Pericles, orthodox scholars agree that Shakespeare drew upon the tale of Pyrocles from Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*” (Farina 99). Given the spellings, Shakespeare more likely took the names Pericles, Cleon, and Lysimachus from Plutarch. But he definitely looked to Sidney as an inspiration. Like Pyrocles, Pericles recovers a suit of armor from the water. Podewell writes,

> the recovery of the suit of armor, an incident in neither the *Confessio* nor Twine...the parallels to *Pericles* suggest that Shakespeare had Sidney in mind when he was writing the Pentapolis episodes, a fact that would further explain his Fisherman's 'Greek' country (Podewell 89).

Alex Young agrees that “Pericles' fortuitous finding of a suit of armor, his subsequent appearance as a “stranger knight” in his rusty armor and improvised bases at the tournament, and his lack of a proper impresa shield “must have been drawn from Sidney's *Arcadia*” (Young 454). Yates sees in all of Shakespeare's so-called “last plays” a pervasive influence of Philip Sidney, a return to the past, to Tudor theology, and to ideals more current to the late 1570s or early 1580s, when *Arcadia* was known to have been written (Strong 147).

> There is a return to the Elizabethan chivalric idea, perhaps first visible in *Pericles* in which a knight seems to return from the sea of death to take part in an Elizabethan Accession Day Tilt. There is the pervasive influence of Sidney's *Arcadia* in all the Last Plays, indicating a return...to the world of Shakespeare's youth and its ideals” (Yates 79).

While this is a perfectly plausible explanation, it ignores the possibility that *Pericles* could have been written during the time when those ideals were still current. Philip Sidney represented The Areopagus, a literary club opposing the Euphuists. Its object was to silence “bald rhymers, and also of the very best too.” It had “prescribed certain laws and rules of
quantities of English verse” (Ogburn 183). Sidney was an ardent supporter of the Aristotelian unities of time, place, and action, and took a dim view of plays like Gorboduc,

where you shall have Asia of the one side, and Afric of the other, and so many other under-kingdoms, that the player, when he cometh in, must ever begin with telling where he is, or else the tale will not be conceived. Now ye shall have three ladies walk to gather flowers, and then we must believe the stage to be a garden. By and by we hear news of shipwreck in the same place, and then we are to blame if we accept it not for a rock...While in the meantime two armies fly in, represented with four swords and bucklers, and then what hard heart will not receive it for a pitched field? (Sidney, 1891).

Shakespeare is clearly in the other major literary camp of the period, that of the Euphuists, headed by the Earl of Oxford and his secretary, John Lyly. Sidney, referring to Gorboduc, could have been describing any Shakespeare play, but most of all Pericles, when he wrote,

For ordinary it is that two young princes fall in love; after many traverses she is got with child, delivered of a fair boy, he is lost, groweth a man, falleth in love, and is ready to get another child,—and all this in two hours’ space (Sidney).

Pericles spans sixteen years and is set all over the Mediterranean.

The Aeropagi were romanticists who aimed to make knighthood and chivalry attractive to their own times (Ogburn 183). Courtly love and the chivalric ideal, Sidney's chief themes, are showcased in Pericles. The tournament in Pericles is certainly a tribute to Sidney and his camp, long extinct in the time of James I. Most likely Pericles is a relic of Elizabethan times which owed its tremendous popularity during James' reign to an Elizabethan revival inspired by James I’s son, Henry IX.

**John Lyly, Euphues His England**

John Lyly's 1580 *Euphues His England* may have been the source for Pericles's correctly spelled name. Lyly alludes twice to the classical Greek leader as a role model, noting, “I have read that Pericles, being at sundry times called of the people to plead, would
always answer that he was not ready; even after the same manner Demosthenes, being sent for to declaim amidst the multitude, stayed and said, 'I am not yet provided’” (Lyly 25).

Lyly's tone is admiring. Pericles here is a subject for emulation. “In this manner did Pericles deal in civil affairs” (Lyly 210). The image of the downward torch as carried by the fourth tournament knight (II.ii.787), available in emblem books of the period, is also found in Lyly. The allusions to Lyly and to Sidney in Pericles, suggest that the rivalry between the Euphuists and the Areopagi was still of interest during its composition.

**John Day's Law Tricks**

A less well-known source often proposed for Pericles is John Day's Law Tricks, published in 1608, but considered by E.K. Chambers to have been staged around 1604, “before either of Shakespeare's romances” (Chambers 3.285-6). The assumption that it was performed later has led orthodox scholars to “invariably say that Shakespeare was the borrower, without considering the obvious alternative” (Moore 40). Both the discussion of how fishes live in the sea and the reunion scene, are featured in Law Tricks. Proposing Day as a source ignores the possibility that the influence could have gone the other way, and that Day might have been the borrower, not the source. Day borrowed from Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, Jonson, and others… Law Tricks is full of scraps and plot devices taken from at least a half dozen of Shakespeare’s plays (Hamlet, Merry Wives, Much Ado, Julius Caesar, Measure, Henry IV, and Richard II) and also from Jonson’s The Case is Altered (Moore 40).

Law Tricks resembles a spoof, deliberately parodying a collection of popular plays. Both Chambers and Gosset remark on the resemblance to parody in Day's recognition scene.
The final scene of *Law Tricks*, which Sykes long ago suggested was by Wilkins, strikingly anticipates *Pericles*. Here a lost daughter, Emilia, presumably carried away by Turks who, like the pirates in *Pericles*, emerged suddenly from the sea, reveals herself to her father. His hesitancy in recognizing her is *cast as comedy* (Gossett 162).  

(Emphasis mine)

Duke: Out of my sight, thou art no child of myne.

Emilia: Y'are the more beholding to some of your neighbours, tub man looke on me well, here's your nowne nose, and thick kissing lip up and downe, and my mother were living, she would never busse you more, till you confest I were your daughter (1946-51) (Gosset 162).

*Law Tricks* seems to be making fun of the improbable nature of the plot of *Pericles*. If a parody of *Pericles* was being staged in 1604, then *Pericles* has to have been written before that. As Moore concludes “The overwhelming presumption must be that *Law Tricks* borrows from *Pericles*, and therefore the latter existed by 1604” (40).

**George Wilkins's *The Painful Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre***

George Wilkins (1576-1618) turned to writing at around the age of forty. Over a whirlwind two-year literary career, he churned out two pamphlets, two plays, a novel, and one apparent collaborative effort with his alleged friend William Shakespeare: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, before vanishing permanently from the literary scene. Despite the brevity of his involvement, Wilkins has a great deal of external evidence connecting him with Shakespeare and with The King's Men. One of his pamphlets, *Jests To Make You Merry* (1607), was a collaboration with Thomas Dekker, (1572-1632), the prolific playwright whose handwriting is among the five found in *The Play of Thomas More*. One of his two plays, *Travails of Three Brothers* (1607), is a collaboration with John Day and William Rowley. Wilkins is credited with one solo effort, *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (1607), which was performed by the King's Men (Waterfield 569). In addition, all of his known plays share some style and vocabulary with Shakespeare's *Pericles*.
Wilkins is connected with Shakespeare’s *Pericles* mainly through his own best known work, the novel ‘true history of the play of Pericles’, *The Painful Adventures of Pericles* (1608). Some critics have argued that Wilkins's 1608 novel was a source for *Pericles*; others that the novel was based on the play. Dugdale Sykes thought that Wilkins based the play *Pericles* on his own novel and that Shakespeare revised the last three acts, but Philip Edwards argued that the 1609 Quarto of *Pericles* and Wilkins's novel were both based on reports of an earlier play by Shakespeare (Muir 225). This widespread belief in a collaboration between Wilkins and Shakespeare is one of the most important factors leading to the dating of *Pericles* as a late play.

Wilkins as a collaborator appealed to nineteenth-century bardolators like Fleay, appalled by a story he found “filthy” beyond belief. “Their” Shakespeare couldn't have written the brothel scenes, nor could his natural genius have ever produced such clumsy verse. Fleay conjectured that the later Gower speeches and the brothel scenes “must have been interpolated after Shakespeare had written his portion, for the Bard never would have allowed the story of Marina to become intermingled with such squalor” (Skeele 20). Wilkins conveniently shoulders the blame for everything in *Pericles* offensive to Victorian sensibilities, as well as the seemingly inexperienced writing. Wilkins's tavern on Turnmill Street (also called Turnbull or Cow Cross Street) in the notorious red light district of Clerkenwell was probably a brothel. Wilkins is referred to in documents as a “victualler,” a term used to describe a brothel-keeper. His “voluminous record of brutal violence against prostitutes,” also suggests he was a pimp (Nicholl 8). His wife, Katherine, was nicknamed "Mistress Sweetmeat," perhaps because she made or served the overpriced pastries common to brothels. Nicholl quotes pamphleteer Robert Greene’s warning that "For a pippin pie that
cost in the market fourpence…you will pay 'at one of the trugglinghouses 18 pence’” (Nicholl 8). Brothels, theatres, cock-pits, and bear pits were all part of the same entertainment industry, and often maintained by the same person. Philip Henslowe (1550-1616), manager of the Rose and the Fortune, whose diary gives us so much of what we know of Elizabethan theatre, also seems to have run a brothel at Bankside (Carson 1).

Wilkins's known work imitates Shakespeare's, copying Shylock for a major character in Travails, and borrowing from Twelfth Night and King Lear for Miseries (Gossett 58). Gossett argues that Shakespeare, not Wilkins, is the debtor, and “would be so again later in the sheep-shearing scene of The Winter's Tale, where the clown echoes Pericles' fishermen and the Shepherd echoes Simonides” (Gossett 58). It is just as likely, however, that Wilkins is echoing Shakespeare, as he seems to have done with his novelization of Pericles.

George Wilkins and William Shakespeare knew each other. Both were called as witnesses in the 1612 Mountjoy lawsuit, in which Stephen Belott sued his father-in-law Christopher Mountjoy for not paying a promised dowry. Shakespeare had lodged with the Mountjoys, and the young couple had moved from the Mountjoys' house to stay with Wilkins. Katherine Duncan-Jones writes that Shakespeare might have lodged with Wilkins, or at least taken his meals at Wilkins’s house (Duncan-Jones, 205-8). Because Wilkins was younger and his novel was published at the same time as the play, he is generally assumed to have revised a short or unfinished version by Shakespeare. This would allow for “a lapse of time between the composition of the original play and its subsequent revision” (Gilvary 438).

Recent scholarship dates the play based on Wilkins's novel and the subsequent publication of the quarto, and tries to link that date to events in Shakespeare's life, such as the burial of his younger brother Edmund (1580- 1607) in Southwark Cathedral, which could have given
Shakespeare a reason to view Gower's tomb there. Gossett points out that “as the church was close to the Globe the tomb would have been a familiar sight to both authors” (Gossett 60). Moreover, Gower already figured as a source and a character in Shakespeare’s works long before the 1607 burial of Edmund Shakespeare.

The current trend in scholarship is to consider Wilkins a collaborator or co-author with Shakespeare. “Many critics assert that the first two acts were penned by Wilkins, and the last by Shakespeare” (Jones 203). Stanley Wells observes, “It is natural to ask why, in the closing stages of his career, after a period of a dozen or more years during which he produced a string of solo-authored masterpieces, Shakespeare turned to write plays jointly with Wilkins, Middleton and, finally, Fletcher” (Wells 223). Rejecting the idea that Shakespeare needed help because of an illness, or that he was mentoring other writers, Wells lights on the idea that Shakespeare's writing had become too esoteric in his old age, and that the so-called late plays “are works for connoisseurs, especially, as I have tried to show, in their verbal style, and Fletcher may have been brought in to alleviate their rigours” (Wells 223). This contradicts the popular theory that Shakespeare wrote for the masses and was nothing if not a crowd pleaser.

The book of Pericles was entered on the Stationers' Register to Edward Blount on 20 May 1608, but was actually published by Henry Gosson, “to whom there is no record of an official transfer of printing rights, and the manuscript that Gosson had acquired can hardly have belonged to the King’s company” (Gossett 49). Three or four compositors appear to have set up the type; in fact, printing was divided between the shops of Edward White and Thomas Creede. “This appears to have been a ‘reported text’, of the kind transmitted in the so-called ‘bad quartos’ of Hamlet (1603), Henry V (1600), Romeo and Juliet (1597), and The
Gary Taylor even theorizes that the printer's copy for the quarto of *Pericles* was supplied from memory by “the boy actor who played Lychorida and Marina … and probably also a hired man, doubling a number of small parts.” Taylor also conjectures that “the Gower-actor was the master of the Marina-boy” and that the boy might have somehow obtained a copy of his master’s part (Wells and Taylor 557).

Because Wilkins had published both of his known works without the company's consent, the King's Men might not have allowed him a copy of *Pericles*. This could explain why he plagiarizes whole passages from Twine. “In considerable sections Wilkins is dependent on another narrative, Lawrence Twine's *The Pattern of Painful Adventures*, which had been entered in the Stationers' Register in 1576 (no copy is known of any edition of this date), published c. 1594 and republished in 1607” (Gossett 49). Another possible explanation, of course, is that Wilkins was a pirate, not a collaborator, considering that “The descriptions in Wilkins's novel indicate a change of place from outside the palace, where the heads of the unsuccessful suitors are ‘placed upon his Castle wall’ (compare to I Chor.39-40 and I.i.38-40), to a location inside the privacy of Antiochus's ‘lodging.’ This might have been a 'performance memory' of Wilkins’ based on the original staging at the Globe” (Podewell 86).

James O. Wood cites E. K. Chambers' observation that “a large part of the play 'does not read like Shakespeare at any stage of development'” as a subjective stance. The current orthodox dating of the plays begins with *Henry VI, Part I*, and *The Comedy of Errors*. But Wood ventures that “such plays must have been preceded, I should think, by a good deal of practice. It is well known that Dryden said *Pericles* was Shakespeare's first play; Edmond Malone once thought that he wrote it about 1590-91, and I am not aware of any firm evidence that the original *Pericles* was written at a later date or by any other particular
playwright” (Wood 86). Sina Spiker boils the cumulative argument in favor of Wilkins down to its essential components;

Wilkins wrote a conventional five act play based on the ancient legend of Apollonius of Tyre. The play was retouched by a superior poet who found the character of Marina the only attractive feature and devoted his energies only to those parts in which she figured. The first two acts remain practically untouched and are in all likelihood by Wilkins; a substratum of his work is found throughout. This argument finds corroboration in parallels and also in discrepancies which have been pointed out to exist between the play and Wilkins' novel on the same theme, published in 1608 (Spiker 552).

Spiker goes on to point out that Wilkins's parallels with the play “are such scraps of speeches and such short passages as an attentive person might easily retain and record from having attended but a few times the performance of the play at the theatre” (Spiker 558). Spiker further notes that bringing new-born Marina onto the deck of the ship during such a severe storm is very unlikely, and could have been handled differently in a novel, but that Wilkins follows the play precisely (Spiker 559). Wilkins says himself on the title page of the novel, that it is his recollection of a stage performance of the play “Being The true History of the Play of Pericles as it was lately presented by the worthy and an-cient (sic) Poet John Gower.” He does not mention Shakespeare. Despite some intriguing stylometric evidence from Jackson, and some from Vickers, it is uncertain that Wilkins ever had anything at all to do with the composition of the play Pericles, although his association with Shakespeare of Stratford does suggest that the two may have been involved in its 1609 revival at the Globe. Perhaps most tellingly,

The names of the characters are as in Shakepeare's play, except that Wilkins does not name Boult, the 'leno' [meaning pimp]. There are references to 'cues' and 'actors' 'parts' when characters enter or speak, and the narrative is often interrupted by dialogue...How far he invented material it is impossible to be sure, but his borrowings from Twine and from the play are usually so close that we may well doubt whether he troubled to insert anything of his own except some stylistic flourishes and a little sentiment (Bullough 358).
Wilkins's own novel, which Waterfield observes is the main evidence for his involvement as a collaborator, also provides substantial reason to doubt his collaboration in *Pericles* (569). Bullough proposes that Wilkins's novel is a catchpenny work, inspired by the success of the play and the reprint of Twine's novel (357-8), noting that Wilkins, unlike the author of the play, does not draw on Gower. Had Wilkins ever read Gower, “as the original author of *Pericles* certainly had, he might have been expected to refresh his memory now and then in writing the novel. But no link between Gower and Wilkins except through *Pericles* has been detected” (Maxwell xxi). Wilkins’s lack of familiarity with Gower, in fact, suggests that he could not have written the very portions most frequently attributed to him: Gower’s “awkward” rhymed speeches. Spiker points out that one third of Wilkins's book consists of passages from Twine, and that these passages are arranged according to the structure of the play, but says that “the extent of these borrowings is not the significant thing. Rather it is the fact that they are systemic in their distribution, ie, they are determined by the structure of the play” (Spiker 560). Clearly the play existed, because Wilkins mentions that it had already been performed, but *Pericles* in the form that has come down to us must have been was unavailable to Wilkins when he was working on his book. If he were truly a collaborator, he would have been able to draw on his own notes or memory of the composition instead of relying so heavily on Twine.

*Pericles*, despite its popularity, was not included among Shakespeare's other plays until the 1664 Third Folio. “Eric Sams...ascribes the difference in style to Shakespeare's revision of his own earlier play. Hoeniger dismisses this as 'pure speculation' without elaboration. Wells & Taylor (1987: 130) call it an 'intrinsic improbability' again without explanation” (Gilvary 437). Spiker notes that Wilkins not only seems unfamiliar with the play, but also
ignores errors in the novel’s text that the real author of the play would have corrected (560).

To impute to Wilkins the original authorship of the play on the strength of the likenesses between it and the novel is to ignore their fragmentary character and also the absence of clarity in Wilkins' version on a number of the cruxes in the corrupt text; and furthermore, it is to ignore the great quantity and the systematic distribution of the slavish borrowings from Twine (Spiker 570).

Spiker reasons, based on the textual evidence, that

Such conclusions do not controvert the theory that our received text of the Shakespearean Pericles represents the work of two or even three hands. But they do indicate that in all probability Wilkins was not one of its authors (Spiker 570).

Hoeniger, who in his 1963 edition accepted the co-authorship of Pericles later expressed doubt that “late in his career Shakespeare collaborated with such a hackwriter as George Wilkins” (Hoeniger 478). It does seem unlikely that Shakespeare would have collaborated with Wilkins, or anyone else, at that point in his career. Pericles is far more likely an example of the rampant piracy of Shakespeare's works after 1604 than any sort of collaboration. The company put Shakespeare's name on plays as late as 1642, proving that either new works continued to be discovered more than twenty years after his death, or that by then the company was willing to go to any lengths to cash in on the famous name.
CHAPTER 7
PERSONALITIES IN PERICLES

Allusions to historical events and people can help date a play to the lifetimes of those people or shortly afterwards. *Pericles* arguably contains allusions to Elizabeth I, Philip II, Catherine de Medici, Henri IV, Stephen Báthory, Edward de Vere, Philip Sidney, William Cecil, Anne Cecil, Elizabeth Vere, Pedro Valdés, John Dee, and Richard Tarleton. These allusions may help to establish that *Pericles* was written between 1577 and 1589, and not in 1607 as has been argued.

Diana of Ephesus/Mary Magdalene/Queen Elizabeth I

“Celestial Dian, goddess Argentine, I will obey thee...”
(V.i.252-53).

Diana of Ephesus looms large in the story of *Pericles*, replacing the original story's Mary Magdalene. The author may have been inspired by the original source material, “as Diana's temple is mentioned in several versions of the Apollonius story, the role of the goddess may well have been suggested to Shakespeare by the denouement” (Muir 228), but the name of the Goddess probably has something to do with his selection of her, as well.

Replacing a Catholic saint with a pagan goddess was a politic choice for an artist writing under Elizabeth I or James I. It would have been impossible to depict a Catholic saint onstage during Elizabeth’s reign. All religious plays were outlawed when the Protestant Queen took the throne. It was illegal even to mention the name of God or Jesus onstage, which is why characters in Elizabethan plays swear instead by Jupiter or Jove, or refer to “the gods” instead of God. Shakespeare seems to have gone out of his way to connect *Pericles* to
Elizabeth I by selecting the pagan moon goddess to replace Mary Magdalene, thereby making the medieval fable suitable for the Elizabethan stage. The choice of Diana as her replacement makes it likely that the author was currying favor with a queen, not a king.

Elizabeth I cultivated a magical image of herself as the moon. The moon is associated with chastity, purity, childbirth, and women in general, but to Elizabeth’s subjects, “the moon as an allegorical representation can mean only the Queen” (Ogburn 334). According to Roy Strong, the cult of Elizabeth as the moon was begun by Sir Walter Raleigh in the 1580s (Strong 48). In 1588 Raleigh had himself painted wearing Elizabeth's black and white livery, white for the moon's bright side, black for its dark side. In the top left corner is a crescent moon, representing Elizabeth as the moon goddess. Elizabeth's naval dominance further associated her with the moon as lady of the seas, as the moon controls the tides and was believed to control the sea. For good measure Raleigh added “everywhere another symbol of the Queen, virgin pearls” (Strong 74). Pearls, Elizabeth’s personal symbol, also represented the moon, and the ocean. Elizabeth had other symbols and nicknames: “Eliza the sun, the moon, the pelican, the phoenix, the rainbow” (Strong 54). But as Strong notes, the moon became Elizabeth’s favorite courtly symbol, and in the nineties the courtier poets referred to the Queen by every nickname of the moon goddess: Diana, Artemis, Cynthia, Phoebe, Lucina, Semele, or Selene, and she answered to them all (Strong 48).

Diana also appears in the New Testament. The most famous association of Artemis of Ephesus is with the silversmiths in Acts: 19-24 crying out, “great is Diana of the Ephesians.” Elizabeth I was also associated with silver in the Elizabethan mind. In 1560-1, she had taken steps to counteract the debasement of English coins, especially silver ones. Henry VIII had put so much copper into the coinage that he was at one time referred to as “copper-nose,” and
subsequent Tudors continued the debasement. Elizabeth, upon taking the throne, had silver sixpences minted with her face, and improved the purity of English coins in general. In one act she associated herself with silver and purity, and her face shining in the round sixpence effortlessly associated her with the moon. Claire Asquith notes,

To represent Elizabeth, Shakespeare used the classic image of the inconstancy, the moon. The beauty of this marker was that it had been sanctioned by the Queen herself, who was associated with Diana, the moon goddess, more often than with any other classical figure. Officially, the moon represented her virginal purity (295).

Marina's virginity is demonstrated by the fact that she still wears Diana's “silver livery” (V.iii.54). Viewed in this light, the use of Diana as a kind of *deus ex machina* becomes a bit of flattery aimed at Elizabeth I. If so, the play has to have been written when the author would have had a reasonable expectation of her seeing it. It could not have been written any later than 1603, the year she died, and was most likely written considerably earlier.

After Elizabeth's death, and even shortly before it, the moon's reputation became a bit tarnished. Claire Asquith observes that in the 1601 *The Return from Parnassus*, a character calls “the moon in comparison of thy bright hue a mere slut,” and that the line in Sonnet 107, “The mortal moon hath her eclipse endured” is Shakespeare's only generally accepted epitaph to Elizabeth (Asquith 295). It is logical that darker references to the moon would become more obvious for a time under the new monarch, but in *Pericles* there is nothing dark or ironic about Diana's livery or her role in the salvation of Pericles's family. Furthermore, the emphasis on chastity and purity as the redemption of all of the characters is more in keeping with the reign of the Virgin Queen, than with that of the comfortably married father, King James I. When England was ruled by an unmarried woman, it made sense to glorify virgins and rhapsodize about moon goddesses, especially since Elizabeth I had to vie with the
Madonna in the public imagination. Under James I, justifying, defending, and celebrating virginity was less vital.

Moreover, the romance of family lost and regained is an adventure Elizabeth I would relate to, having been a “lost princess” herself. Elizabeth's father, like Leontes in *A Winter's Tale*, had executed her mother and declared their daughter a bastard. Although Henry VIII revised his will to say that Mary and then Elizabeth Tudor should succeed their brother Edward VI, Edward was uncomfortable letting either sister take the throne, and instead declared Jane Grey his heir. Mary suspected Elizabeth of collaborating with Protestant rebels during the Wyatt rebellion, and imprisoned her in the Tower of London for a year. Like Marina in *Pericles*, Elizabeth was a young girl deprived of her royal house, nearly murdered by a jealous queen, effectively separated from her father, and as if by magic restored to her family and legitimacy, and then crowned queen. Like Marina's, her journey ended in being awarded her father's kingdom.

In a monarchy, the most successful plays tend to be those which flatter the reigning monarch, not his predecessor. *Pericles*, if written under James, is almost insulting in its apparent nostalgia for Elizabeth. James disliked Elizabeth intensely for having his mother executed, as he showed by demoting Elizabeth’s place of burial from under the altar of the King Henry the Seventh chapel in Westminster Abbey to a joint grave with her sister Mary, in order to claim the prestigious location for himself (Walker 252-5).

Another connection with Elizabeth I is the reference to the music of the spheres. Edmund Spenser, too, in his *Faerie Queen*, directly connects Elizabeth I to this heavenly music:
I sing, adoring,
Humbly imploring
That my rude voice may please her sacred ears
Whose skill deserves the music of the spheres (V.i.232).

Elizabeth's skill at the virginals, (a kind of early harpsichord) and her devotion to and patronage of music is well known. When Pericles hears the celestial music inaudible to others, he has a vision of Diana of Ephesus, who at long last rewards him for his patient suffering by reuniting him with his family. Appropriately enough, however, she does not tell him what awaits him at her temple, but simply gives the instruction that he should go there. Only through blind faith in his goddess does Pericles finally regain his crown and his family. Skepticism would cost him all. This is both religious and political flattery of Elizabeth, “rewriting Greek romance and Euripides with an eye on the Gospels, Shakespeare, to bring the play to an end, makes Diana the *deus ex machina* who appears to the sleeping Pericles in a vision in which she tells him to go to Ephesus, make sacrifices at her altar, and reveal to the priestesses there all his and his daughter's ‘crosses’” (Boitani 54). It is significant that the door to Diana is opened by Pericles's daughter, the virginal Marina, who resembles Elizabeth in so many respects. Marina is like an avatar of Diana herself, chaste, beautiful, and full of music, inspiration, and healing powers.

Diana is not the only name in the story meant to catch Elizabeth's attention. E.T. Clarke suggests that the reason for the otherwise enigmatic name change of Pericles's wife from Tharsia to Thaisa is that the author is playing on Elizabeth's name, using the first three letters of the name of Thalia, muse of poetry and comedy, and the last three letters of Elissa, one of the many poetic nicknames for Elizabeth. Ogburn agrees that

An Elizabethan would recognize the latter as combining the first three letters of Thalia, the Muse of lyric poetry and comedy, and the last three of Elissa, by which name the Queen was often referred to, especially in poetry (Ogburn 575).
Word games, riddles, and codes were a constant feature of Elizabethan life, especially at court. Finally, as observed earlier, *Pericles* most likely owes its incest riddle to Elizabeth I's translation of Marguerite d'Angoulême's *Miroir de l’âme pêcheresse, or The Mirror of the Sinful Soul*.

**Philip II as Neptune**

*Their vessel shakes on Neptune's billow*  
*(III.0.1171-2)*

There are two deities vying for control of the oceanic world of *Pericles*: Diana and Neptune. If Diana is the hero's salvation, Neptune is his nemesis. Philip II of Spain (1527-1598) was one of Elizabeth's first suitors, and her lifelong adversary. He represented the greatest threats to Elizabeth's rule: Catholicism and a vast naval force. Spain was the most powerful country in the world, and Philip II was not only king of Spain, but according to the 1584 Treaty of Joinville, also over any lands that might be discovered in the ocean. His personal motto, *Non sufficit orbis*, “The world is not enough,” attested both to his imperial ambitions and to his dedication to his Roman Catholic faith. Although unlike Elizabeth he never encouraged anyone to address him as a pagan deity, he nevertheless was honored as Neptune, God of the Sea, in a famous 1557 sculpture by Giovanni Montorsoli, and also in another by Bartolomeo Ammanti commissioned in 1565.

It can be shown that Montorsoli's fountain in Messina depicting Neptune between Scylla and Charybdis with the imperial gesture of the pacificatio ruling the waves alludes to Charles V and Philip II as peacemakers … there can be no doubt that Ammanti's Neptune in the Piazza della Signoria in Florence is a mythologically disguised statue of the Medici Duke (Ellenius 186).
Neptune and Diana vie both for control of the ocean, and also control of the hero’s fate, just as Phillip II and Elizabeth I did. This struggle was moot in the reign of James I, laid to rest by the 1604 Treaty of London.

The Transylvanian

“The poor Transylvanian is dead that lay with the little baggage!”
(4.ii.22-23).

In Mytilene, Marina is sold to a brothel by pirates. The Bawd and Pander discuss the dire condition of their brothel, lamenting that they have only three girls left, who are nearly rotten with disease. Pander mentions a Transylvanian client, dead presumably of a disease he caught from one of the prostitutes, but “We never hear anything further about the poor deceased Transylvanian, who is the only Transylvanian mentioned in Shakespeare. This is also the last we hear about the little baggage” (Charney 328). The casually vulgar conversation is meant to inform the audience that there is both moral and physical danger to Marina in her new home. As Asimov observes, “Transylvanian” is an anachronism. In ancient Greece it would simply have meant “across the woods.” But Shakespeare had something more specific, and topical, in mind. In 1583, Count Alberto Laski (1527-1605) came to England representing the Transylvanian sovereign, Stephen Báthory (1533-1586). Laski spent time with John Dee at Winchester in Southwark, a place famous for its high-class prostitutes, or “Winchester Geese” as they were called (Haynes 62). Dee wrote in his journal, “Behold, when Lasky (sic) cometh, he shall not hastily return unto Poland: till I whisper in his ears, He is dead that sought thy life” (Dee 243). Laski eagerly participated in seances with John Dee and Edward Kelly, asking them many questions, particularly “how long Stephen Báthory, the king of Poland, could be expected to live, whether or not Laski was to be his
successor” (Woolley 189). By 1586, Stephen Báthory was dead of a rare kidney disease, but Laski did not claim his throne. Báthory's condition may have been assumed to be a venereal disease, making him the “poor Transylvanian” referred to in Pericles. The line cannot refer to Báthory's successor, who lived until 1618.

**William Cecil as Simonides**

“*Yon king’s to me like to my father’s picture*”

(*II.iii.860*).

The three fishermen greet Pericles on the shore with the news that their wise and good king is holding a tournament for the hand of his daughter, and that “today is her birthday.” William Cecil, the Queen's chief advisor and Lord Treasurer, Baron Burleigh (1521-1598) had a fair daughter who wed a champion on her fifteenth birthday, as does Thaisa in Pericles. Although William Cecil was no king in the hereditary sense, he was the power behind Elizabeth's throne, and looked after her interests while serving his own. The fishermen speak anachronistically of whales eating whole parishes, bells, steeples, and all. There were no bells or steeples in ancient Greece, but in England many loyal Protestants owed their wealth to “swallowed up” parishes and churches, and Cecil, the exemplar of these, had devoured his fair share (G.W. Phillips 121). In Hamlet, Polonius, another character widely recognized as based on Cecil, is addressed by Hamlet as “a fishmonger.” According to Charlton Ogburn, this is a reference to Cecil's Parliament bill making both Wednesday and Friday fish-days to encourage the fisheries (Ogburn 369). This unpopular law supplied England with large fleets of sea-worthy ships, and plenty of experienced men to sail them when the need arose. Like Simonides, Cecil was the fishermen's king.
John Dee as Cerimon

“Tis known I ever/ Have studied physic”
(III.ii.1323).

That Cerimon, the goodly physician dwelling in Ephesus, is transparently modeled on the Queen's philosopher-in-chief, the alchemist, astronomer and physician John Dee, is a very old and nearly universal observation. Dee enjoyed tremendous favor under Elizabeth I.

Dee consulted astrological charts to determine the best day for Elizabeth's coronation, and was called on to offer his views on the political significance of the comet of 1577. (Elizabeth herself asked that horoscopes be cast for her suitors, and used astrology to assess potential heirs) (Falk 251).

Some key words in Cerimon's speeches include cunning, physick, and treasure, all three of which are found abundantly in John Dee's writings.

Infani funt omnes, & fatui: For, Physick is in very deed, the true, and perfect science of the natural combination, and proportion of known parts, answering in graduation real, to one principal and defined; is therefore above the capacity of such as are worldlings, and do hunt after money more than the truth of Gods Spirit (Dee 251).

Cerimon's speech is practically a perfect paraphrase of the above quotation:

I held it ever,
Virtue and cunning were endowments greater
Than nobleness and riches: careless heirs
May the two latter darken and expend;
But immortality attends the former,
Making a man a god. 'Tis known I ever
Have studied physic, through which secret art,
By turning o'er authorities, I have,
Together with my practice, made familiar
To me and to my aid the blest infusions
That dwell in vegetives, in metals, stones;
And I can speak of the disturbances
That Nature works, and of her cures; which doth give me
A more content in course of true delight
Than to be thirsty after tottering honour
Or tie my treasure up in silken bags,
To please the fool and death (III.ii.1317-34).
It is unlikely that such a loving portrait of John Dee would have been drawn during the reign of James I, considering that “Dee had fallen into deep disfavour after his return from his mysterious continental mission in 1589 and he was completely cast off by James I after his accession” (Yates 95). James I did not believe Dee's protestations that he had nothing to do with evil spirits or black magic. Dee's deep disgrace under James points to the play being Elizabethan, rather than Jacobean. “[Dee] appealed to James, after his accession, to defend him from charges of black magic, but in vain” (Yates 18-9). Yates interprets figures such as Prospero and Cerimon as vindications of Dee and other scientists and mathematicians like him, as having been created for the benefit of the young prince Henry IX (1594-1612). She notes that “the contemporary scientists and mathematicians who were working in the Dee tradition were to be found, not in the circle of the King, but in that of his son, Prince Henry” (Yates 96). Given the references to the Armada, the earthquake, and Philip Sidney also found in Pericles, it is more likely that Cerimon was modeled on Dee at a time when he needed no vindication. Cerimon is presented as a wise, virtuous, and saintly figure, without the slightest hint of darkness or evil, or even any whiff of the con man about him. His very first action onstage is to tell a prospective client there is nothing to be done to help his master, unlike a con artist, who would have sold a false remedy.

However, according to some, Dee is also the model for Owen Glendower in Henry IV, Part I, but although the portrait is transparent and easily discerned, it is also much less flattering than the version of Dee depicted in Pericles. Glendower is a fiery Welshman, like John Dee, who was extremely proud, like Glendower, of his Welsh ancestry (Bevan 78). This considerably less sympathetic Welsh magician was created between 1595 and 1598, as references to Ireland in Henry IV, Part I attest. Glendower, like Dee, is full of portents and
astrological insights, but unlike the virtuous Cerimon, he brazenly offers to teach Hotspur to summon the devil. Glendower is arrogant, boastful, and misguided, and his powers come to nothing. Very likely Glendower was created when public opinion turned against Dee in the 1590s, suggesting that Pericles was created before Henry IV, Part I.

Years later, Shakespeare's powerful, conflicted Prospero would reconcile these two opposite views of the great magician, displaying both the rebellious ire of Glendower and the benevolent wisdom of Cerimon. The simpler, more positive characterization of Cerimon is consistent with a dating of Pericles as written during the 1570s or 1580s, when Dee enjoyed great popularity and was seen as a savior of the nation. Henry IV, Part I was written during the Irish conflict, when Dee had already fallen from grace, and faced serious charges. Finally, when a public figure is out of favor, allusions to them tend to be satirical, as are those to Dee in Henry IV, Part I. There is no trace of satire in the figure of Cerimon. On the contrary, the author depicts him as “the man 'through whom the gods have shown their power' (V.iii.59), and Pericles praises him by affirming that 'The gods can have no mortal officer/More like a god than you'(V.iii.61-62)” (Charney 325). Yates notes Cerimon's Christ-like virtues. Cerimon's house is peaceful, his servants devoted, and his charity famous. Like John Dee, “The doctor has, he tells us, ever 'studied physic,' and learned the secret properties of metals, stones, plants, holding that knowledge and virtue may 'make a man a god'” (Yates 88). John Dee in his own journals uses very similar words to Cerimon’s in praise of physic and the use of the natural world, “Out of it springeth Physick. The knowledge of all elemental Creatures, amongst you” (Dee 179). Yates points out the influence of the new ideal of the physician spreading in Europe
through the influence of Paracelsus, in whom new medical skills are combined with a reputation for new magic. Cerimon uses 'musical therapy' in his healing, and his power of bringing to life again seems a miracle to the beholders (88).

Swiss alchemist and physician Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim eleven (1493-1541), also called Paracelsus, held that illness was the result of external agents attacking the body, rather than of an imbalance of humors. Paracelsan medicine focused on the use of chemical preparations to defend against disease. Dee was known as a practitioner of Paracelsan medicine, using tinctures, herbs, and potions that contained powdered stones, precisely like the ones Cerimon describes in his first speech.

Studies of Dee's alchemical notes show signs that Paracelsus's ideas influenced his laboratory work. For example, the scholar Urszula Szulakowska has speculated that a series of experiments undertaken in 1581 involving vitriol, saltpeter, and marcasite may have been inspired by Paracelsus's own recipes for medicines that treated bone fractures and gangrene (Wooley 88). Despite his popularity at court, in 1577 Dee published a “'Necessary Advertisement' against the 'divers untrue and infamous reports' that accused him of being a 'Conjurer, or caller of divels: but a great doer therein, yea, the great conjurer: and so, (as some would say) the arche conjurer, of this whole kingdom'” (Wooley 147). In the 1570s Dee was concerned with mere rumors and innuendo, not royal disfavor or legal difficulties.

Cerimon miraculously revives Thaisa from the dead. Although John Dee never made any claims to perform similar miracles, he did believe it was possible, exhorting the reader to “Therefore believe: for the Spirit of truth worketh wonders, raiseth the dead, and hath power to forgive sins” (Dee 48). In his journals Dee also relates a story of a man restored to life by a bishop, to confess to murdering his wife (Dee C2). Dee is not known to have attempted to raise the dead. Dee was interested in speaking with angels, not with departed mortals. His
longtime colleague, Edward Kelly, however, was rumored to have done so with the help of his friend Paul Waring, and there are artist's renderings of Waring's account (Sibly 1106).

**Pedro Valdés as The Great Pirate Valdes**

“These roguing thieves serve the great pirate Valdes;
And they have seized Marina” (IV.i.1658).

Shakespeare used anachronisms to insert topicality. Gossett agrees that the familiar name Valdes is intended as topical (Gossett 132). Don Pedro de Valdés was a well-known admiral in the fleet of the Spanish Armada. When his ship was disabled, he was taken by Sir Francis Drake, on the twenty-second of July, 1588, and set to Dartmouth. Malone also commented on the audience appeal of making one of the Spaniard's ancestors a pirate (Malone 105). Just as Shakespeare deliberately replaced the original's Greek games with the sort of sports popular among royals of his day, he selected a well-known name for his ancient Greek pirate captain, a name suggesting a much earlier date of composition than 1607. Pedro Valdéz might have been a household name in the wake of his capture by Sir Francis Drake in 1588, and perhaps even before that, as he sank British ships in the Bay of Biscay in the 1570s, but by 1608, Valdéz had long ago served his sentence in England and gone home. The frisson of fear his name might have elicited in the early 1580s was long gone. Valdéz was no concern to James I, but he was to Elizabeth I.
Catherine de Medici as Dionyza

Cleon: Dionyza, such a piece of slaughter
The sun and moon ne’er look’d upon!
Dionyza: I think
You’ll turn a child again”
(IV.iii.1818-21).

Like Lady Macbeth, Dionyza is a seemingly gracious and beautiful queen motivated by the sin of envy, who dominates her husband and causes the downfall of her house. She is a wicked foster mother who, like the Wicked Queen in Snow White, orders her servant to murder her charge, Marina. Dorothy Ogburn suggests that Dionyza is modeled on Catherine de Medici (1519-1589), Elizabeth I's potential mother-in-law, “and would have been so recognized by the audience at court” (D. Ogburn 130). Elizabeth I's engagement to Alençon, Catherine's younger son, ended in 1584, but the world continued to vilify Catherine de Medici as a poisoner, sorceress, and Machiavel until the end of her life and afterwards.

Shakespeare was not the only Elizabethan playwright to make a great villainess of Catherine de Medici. Christopher Marlowe did so as well, and without even disguising her. The Massacre at Paris offers unquestionably the wickedest of Marlowe's female characters. Catherine de Medici orders the poisoning not only of her fellow queen Jeanne d'Albret but of her own son Charles when he displeases her. Marlowe's audience would have had no trouble believing this “because it was precisely what the real Catherine de Medici was supposed to have done” (Hopkins 126). After the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre, Catherine was perceived as “the quintessential Florentine, whose spectre had begun to haunt Protestant Europe” (Knecht 164). Marlowe's play was performed in 1594, a year after Marlowe's death. Like Pericles, it was probably written much closer to Catherine de Medici's death in 1589.
Dick Tarleton

“Like mots and shadows see them move awhile,
Your ears unto your eyes I’ll reconcile”
(IV.iv.1895-1896).

The play of The famous (sic) Victories of Henry the Fifth was entered on the Stationers' books in 1594. The parts of the Judge Prince Henry strikes, and also Derrick, the clown, were both played by Dick Tarleton, who died in 1588. The fact that Tarleton played in it entry proves that a play was sometimes entered in the books years after it had been performed. Collier assigns the date “Not long after 1580, and it was perhaps played by the Queen's players who were selected from the companies of several noblemen in 1583, and of whom Tarleton was one” (Collier 455).

If this history is an early version of Henry V, it was very likely composed close to the same time as Pericles, as the author seems to be experimenting with many of the same techniques, ideas, and characters in both plays. Both have a figure out in front of the play, Gower in Pericles and the Chorus in Henry V. Both are useful primers on the necessary attributes of an ideal ruler, and both are initiation stories dealing with ordeals through which a young prince must pass before claiming his kingdom. Both are found by stylometrics experts to have fewer feminine endings and other stylistic markers common to Shakespeare's “later” works. It is by no means certain, but it is a strong possibility.
Homage to Philip Sidney

“He seems to be a stranger; but his present is
A wither’d branch, that’s only green at top;
The motto, ‘In hac spe vivo’” (II.ii.799-801).

Philip Sidney’s is the only tournament impresa Henry Green could find, that significantly resembled the “wither’d branch” carried by Pericles. The tournament scene, along with the various references to Sidney’s Arcadia, indicate some conciliatory feelings towards Philip Sidney on the part of the author. Although Shakespeare usually lampoons Philip Sidney mercilessly, he treats him with uncharacteristic admiration in Pericles.

According to Mark Anderson, by mid-January of 1581, de Vere's chief enemies were known to everyone. Philip Sidney had quarreled very publicly with de Vere, but in 1581 “previous tiffs and scuffles no doubt appeared in a new and less partisan light. With a bastard child on the way and two unscrupulous adversaries charting new frontiers in defamation, the Sidney tennis-court quarrel must have now seemed a trifle” (Anderson 169-170). De Vere began to mend severed ties with Sidney, and the proof of this is his performance at the 1581 Accession Tilt, at which De Vere appeared as “The Knight of the Tree of the Sunne.” The premise of the event was that Callophisus fought for beauty, and Sidney, “The White Knight,” fought for virtue, not realizing that they both fought for the same sovereign, Elizabeth I, who epitomized both attributes. To what must have been the astonishment of all present, de Vere picked up Sidney's fallen standard, and delivered a speech in his praise (Anderson 169-170), signifying that whatever animosity had divided de Vere and Sidney in 1579 was now behind them. Philip Sidney's Arcadia is one of the accepted sources for Pericles, and scholars accept his emblem as the model for the one used by Pericles in the tournament scene.
Anne Cecil as Thaisa

_He hath a fair daughter, and tomorrow is her birthday_
_(II.i.111)_.

Thaisa bears a striking resemblance to Anne Cecil, (1556-1588), which might be intentional. One clue that Anne Cecil is the model for Thaisa “is provided in the First Fisherman's words to Pericles (II.1.111): ‘he hath a fair daughter, and tomorrow is her birthday.’ For Anne Cecil was married near the time of her birthday” (D. Ogburn 131). Thaisa's father Simonides, like Polonius, bears some resemblance to Anne Cecil's father, Elizabeth's Great Lord Treasurer, William Cecil, Lord Burleigh (1520-1598), who was also Shakespeare's model for Polonius. In _Pericles_, however, the portrayal is affectionate and idealized, unlike the skewering Burleigh receives as Polonius in _Hamlet_. Prince Pericles falls as much in love with the judicious Simonides as with his daughter, Thaisa. In addition to being a brilliant king, Simonides is manipulative and sly, like Polonius. Not only does Simonides trick the young lovers into declaring their love, but he tricks his daughter’s other suitors into departing by announcing that Thaisa has decided to remain a virgin dedicated to Diana for yet another year, but then immediately betroths her to Pericles. Like Anne Cecil, Thaisa is wedded on her fifteenth birthday to the winner of a tournament whose “study was in arts and arms.” Like Anne, she leaves her husband widowed. Like Ophelia, Thaisa is lost in the water, but unlike Ophelia she re-emerges and lives again.

Most of Shakespeare's married heroines are accused of infidelity, but not Thaisa. Just as Anne Cecil was accused by her husband, Ophelia, Hero, Adriana, Helena, Desdemona, and Hermione, all of whom resemble Anne, are all falsely accused by men who all strongly resemble Anne Cecil's husband. In the comedies the women are reconciled, and in the tragedies they die, but all are vindicated. But like Anne, Thaisa undergoes a long period of
separation from her longed-for husband immediately following the birth of their daughter, and ultimately is reconciled with him. Thaisa's sparkling purity and the simplicity of her husband's grief, lacking in self-blame or reproach, is unusual for Shakespeare, suggesting that this play was specifically intended for an audience who would appreciate a pristine version of the story, uncomplicated by any hint of blame or suspicion on either side. It may have been written to flatter Anne into a reconciliation with her husband, or it may have been written after her death with the aim of flattering her surviving family. Possibly it was originally written with the first purpose in mind in 1577, then revised years later under a new title, for the second.

**Elizabeth Vere as Marina**

*I am a maid, my lord, that ne'er before invited eyes,*  
*But have been gazed on like a comet: she speaks,*  
*My lord, that, may be, hath endured a grief*  
*Might equal yours, if both were justly weigh'd*  
*(V.i.2277-81).*

Elizabeth I was celebrated as “‘the bright moon...in majesty’, her court shining about her like 'a thousand stars’” (Strong 53). Elizabeth Vere (1575-1627), the queen's namesake, was among the brightest of those stars. Granddaughter of William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, she was one of Elizabeth's favorite ladies. The poet Henry Lok addressed Elizabeth Vere in a sonnet, “And such fair stars as you (who influence have/Of her bright beams) to give some light I crave,” referencing her role as a lady in waiting to Elizabeth I, whose ladies were flattered as stars surrounding the moon, able to influence the queen's bright beams with their own lesser lights. Like Marina, Elizabeth here is compared with a star, a clear light which guides the poet. This also may reference both the comet discovered during her infancy, and her family
coat of arms, which features a white mullet (star).

Marina has been “gazed on like a comet.” In 1577 there was a great comet visible in the sky. While Elizabeth I consulted John Dee about its significance and astronomers the world over made predictions about this omen, Elizabeth Vere met her father for the first time, although he was not told who she was at the time. No record survives of the result of this meeting, but the following year, a week after New Year's Day, an anonymous play titled *Pastorell, a historie of a Greek Maid* was performed at court by the Children of St. Paul's, under the direction of John Lyly, Oxford's personal secretary. Eva Turner Clark, Dorothy Ogburn, and Charlton Ogburn believe this play to have been an early version of *Pericles* inspired by de Vere's ocean voyage and subsequent meeting with his estranged daughter. Perhaps the lifelong interest in theatre shared by Elizabeth Vere and her sisters began in childhood, with *Pericles*. All three acted in masques and were prominent patronesses of the arts. Although Elizabeth Vere's parents are not known to have reunited formally until 1582 (Read 138). Tycho Brahe's comet overhead when Elizabeth Vere's father was brought to meet her could have had something to do with the reconciliation. Elizabethans took astrology very seriously.

In Marina’s first entrance, she is gathering flowers to strew on the grave of her nurse, Lychorida, and incidentally in her speech giving us a hint about the possible occasion for the performance. Summer began on May first, Whitsunday, also known as Pentecost, Beltane, or *Walpurgisnacht*. In Marina's world, by the second week of April spring is almost over.
In Marina's speech,

No, I will rob Tellus of her weed,
To strew thy green with flowers: the yellows, blues,
The purple violets, and marigolds,
Shall as a carpet hang upon thy grave
While summer-days do last (V.i.61-65).

Marina does not actually say that it is currently summer, merely that she will continue placing flowers on Lychorida's grave until summer's end, which would be August first, or Lammas. Podewell believes a performance date of July twenty-second or twenty-third is indicated by the text. “Marina mentions 'summer-days' in her first speech, but to fit with the fixed date of V.i. (July 23, see below), this scene must take place during the second week of April” (Podewell 92). In the second week of April, summer would have been a mere two weeks away by Elizabethan reckoning. The date of July 23 is significant because it is the feast day of St. Mary Magdalene by the old church calendar, but since that is a Catholic celebration, if the play were performed in July, it would have been in honor of some other occasion. Elizabeth Vere's birthday was celebrated in July. Podewell notes how unusual it is for the time arc of the play to be split. The time required for Pericles to accomplish all his adventures, is fifteen and a half years (Podewell 85). “When the action picks up again, Marina is fourteen years old (v.iii.8)” (Podewell 92). In 1589, Elizabeth Vere was fourteen years old, her age exactly matching that of Marina in the play. She had strewed her mother's grave the previous year.
Edward de Vere as Pericles

Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford (1550-1604), has often been proposed as the author of Shakespeare's works. Author or not, he has a great deal in common with Pericles, so much so that the play, if not by him, could have been written to curry his favor. *Pericles* contains biographical elements of de Vere's life from start to finish.

The first two acts of *Pericles* can easily be seen as a sentimentalized portrait of the young Edward de Vere ... Like the title character de Vere was known for his wanderlust and traveled far and wide (though not to the eastern Hellenic world where the play is set). Like Pericles's daughter Marina (IV.i)—and like Hamlet—de Vere had at least one encounter with pirates during his travels (Farina 100).

Shakespeare is drawing his own portrait in Pericles, a young man still solving life's mysteries, still adrift and looking for his place in the world. “Because Pericles, like a Flying Dutchman, seems to be eternally at sea, he seems to belong to nonbelonging, seems to originate in a flawed origin” (Fawkner 38). The reference to Pericles as a tennis ball could also be intended to remind the audience of the Great Tennis Court Quarrel between de Vere and Philip Sidney. The two were both romantic and literary rivals who quarreled publicly over tennis court privileges in 1579. De Vere allegedly called Sidney “puppy,” whereupon Sidney answered, “Puppies are gotten by dogs, children by men.” The argument escalated to a challenge from Sidney which was apparently ignored by de Vere. Elizabeth I finally intervened to persuade Sidney to apologize (Whalen 73-4). The waters and the wind certainly played with de Vere. Not only did he lose ships in the Frobisher expedition, but, like Marina in *Pericles*, “Lord Oxford, on his return from the Continent in 1576 was attacked by pirates” (Clark 198).
De Vere resembles Pericles in a host of other ways. For instance, Elizabeth I preferred Edward de Vere as a dancing partner during his days at court, and was even rumored to have considered marriage to him (Hume 28-29).

Pericles, while revealing his identity in act II, states that his education has been 'in arts and arms' (II.iv.82)—note the order—and gains attention for his skills in the performing arts, as well as jousting. Thaisa's father King Simonides declares Pericles a 'music master' (II.v.36) and 'the best' (II.iv.108) for dancing (Farina 100).

Edward de Vere, accomplished musician and patron to William Byrd, was Castiglione’s model courtier, cast in the same mold as Pericles, “highly accomplished in both soldiering and the humanities” (Farina 100).

De Vere not only helped to sponsor a Latin translation of Castiglione's book in 1572, but took its lessons seriously as well, for he was noted both as a musician and dancer at court. In 1599, composer John Farmer's *First Set of English Madrigals* was dedicated to de Vere with unsparing praise for his musical talent (Farina 100).

De Vere, like Pericles, was also tournament champion, earning the highest award of honor at the tilt, the tourney, and the barriers in 1571 (Phillips 121). He continued to win high honors in the other tournaments in which he is known to have competed, in 1581, and 1584, but most interestingly, “the first of these victories, in 1571, was immediately followed by de Vere's wedding to Anne Cecil, just as Pericles marries Thaisa shortly after winning the tournament prize in the play” (Farina 100).

Like Pericles, Edward de Vere knew how to make an impression. One of his most famous and well-documented accomplishments was his appearance as the Knight of the Tree of the Sun in the 1581 Accession Day tilt. He had gilded an entire birch tree, and festooned a silk tent in his tawny heraldic color with golden ornaments. All of this was calculated to regain the favor of Elizabeth I, and it worked, for “it soon became apparent that this tree from which he took his name was a metaphor for the Queen herself...whereat Cupid is ever
drawing, but dare not shoot” (Somerset 366-7). The verses read by his page at the event have a distinctly Shakespearean style. Each knight at every tournament tried for a similar effect, but apparently de Vere was better at achieving it than anyone else.

Like Pericles, de Vere was separated from his wife and his newborn daughter for a significant length of time—more than five years. And like Pericles, he was brought into a room with his daughter without realizing who she was (594-95). The Countess of Suffolk, whose son Peregrine Bertie soon married de Vere's sister Mary, wrote to Lord Burleigh 15 December 1577:

On Thursday I went to see my Lady Mary Vere. After other talks she asked me what I would say to it if my Lord her brother would take his wife again. “Truly, quoth I, ‘nothing could comfort me more, for now I wish to your brother as much good as to my own son.” “Indeed,” quoth she, “he would very fain see the child, and is loth to send for her.” “Then,” quoth I, “an you will keep my counsel we will have sport with him. I will see if I can get the child hither to me, when you shall come hither; and whilst my Lord your brother is with you I will bring in the child as though it were some other child of my friend's, and we shall see how nature will work in him to like it, and tell him it is his own after (Clark 73).

The girl was only two years old at the time, but de Vere might well have gone through Pericles's process of piecing together who she was from nonsensical-seeming clues (Clark 73). E.T. Clark believes that the meeting sparked a reconciliation, based on an “uncalendared” document stating that Lord and Lady Oxford in 1577 brought 28 servants, most likely a troupe of actors, to Theobalds (Clark 73). It is generally believed, however, that they did not truly reconcile until 1582.

Not only does he resemble Pericles in his personality, adventures, and family life, but like Pericles, de Vere had a friendship with a wizardly character, John Dee, who “in 1592 … reported that he kept in his possession (and to his credit) 'The honorable Erle (sic) of Oxford his favorable letters Anno 1570’”(Nelson 58). Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn consider Cerimon to be “a composite presentment of Oxford and Dr. Dee, a famous astronomer—or
astrologer—of the time ... and the Earl of Oxford, who had studied with Dr. Dee, after making his acquaintance in 1573”(Ogburn129).

But the most striking resemblance between de Vere and Pericles is suggested by Pericles's muteness. Of Elizabeth Vere's birth in 1575, Edward de Vere declared in a letter to Burleigh that he would "not blaze or publish until it please me" (Fowler 286). “[Pericles] is not known to her [or to himself] as her father but is simply “A man who for this three months hath not spoken/To anyone” (Fawkner 38). This is analogous to Oxford's refusal to speak of his daughter's birth. He apparently continued his muteness by refusing to speak to his wife for five years. Fawkner asks, “Is not Shakespeare in love with Pericles? And is not this love based on the recognition of the muteness of Pericles rather than on any appreciation of him as a pliable character ready to speak proper lines?” (Fawkner 28). Like Pericles, Oxford was a keeper of secrets, imagined, rightly or not, to be a man who knew too much. He was accused of, among other things, owning a secret Book of Babies that would reveal royal bastards, their fathers, identities, and dates of birth (D. Ogburn 962). Whether or not Oxford actually had such a secret “book of all that monarchs do” (I.i.143), some courtiers believed that he did, which was enough to put him in mortal danger for a time. Of course, there is another sense in which de Vere was silent. He kept silent about his work as a playwright. Francis Meres praised him in Palladas Tamia as “the best for comedy” in 1598, and so he is known to have written at least one comedy by then, and probably quite a few of them. According to George Puttenham, he kept it secret. Puttenham in the 1589 Art of English Poesie says,

And in her Majesties [i.e., Queen Elizabeth's] time that now is are sprong up an other crew of Courtly makers Noble men and Gentlemen of her Majesties owne servauntes, who have written excellently well as it would appeare if their doings could be found out and made publicke with
the rest, of which number is first that noble
Gentleman Edward Earle of Oxford.

Whether or not he wrote under the name Shakespeare, de Vere was a silent playwright. The secret was apparently not well-kept among the literati, in spite of de Vere's own silence. Knowing who wrote his plays at the time was probably a little like knowing that Cary Grant's real name was Archibald Leach, or that the Reverend Charles Dodgson wrote Alice in Wonderland as Lewis Carroll. Most moviegoers or readers probably neither knew nor cared, but those who did know, while understanding that it was not to be openly discussed in print, still took great pleasure in the knowledge.

Marina’s miraculous nature points to her being somehow more than human, something her father suspects when he asks if she is flesh and blood, and where she comes from.

Marina's answer to Pericles's inquiry as to whether she is “of these shores” is poignant: “No, nor of any shores” (5.1.103). Being without a shore, being out of sight of the visible limit of any ground, is not being in the void. On the contrary, it is being in the place where the absence of the ground is what always itself moves visibly into view "Where do you live?" asks Pericles: “where I am but a stranger; from the deck / You may discern the place” (5.1.113-15).

(Fawkner 18)

When reconciled to her father, Marina restores his voice. As such, Marina seems to stand both for his literal daughter, and also for his symbolic one: his works, no sooner created than lost, which, once restored, would allow his voice to be heard. Marina “begetst him that did thee beget.” She names and rescues her father, not the other way around. Pericles compares himself to a woman in labor, as he discovers Marina. This is exactly the relationship any anonymous author has with his works.

The recognition scene between Marina and her father, described by TS Eliot as the greatest recognition scene ever written and a perfect example of the “ultra-dramatic,” “a dramatic action of beings who are more than human, “takes place in an atmosphere that recalls the fourth gospel (Boitani 48).
This recognition is foreshadowed in the riddle posed at the beginning of the play. Both scenes involve a gradual recognition of the truth, like the solving of a puzzle. Silenced by Marina's loss, Pericles is “Like a similar Shakespearean prince caught in a situation fraught with incest and murder, he lapses into paralyzing grief, 'dull-eyde melancholie” (Wood 83). The slow, delicious process by which the pair recognize one another, the play's anagnorisis, is very much like the pleasure one gets from solving a riddle or recognizing a hidden image in a camouflage painting. Anagnorisis is defined in Merriam-Webster as “the point in the plot especially of a tragedy at which the protagonist recognizes his or her or some other character's true identity or discovers the true nature of his or her own situation.”

Anagnorosis, the critical discovery, is what makes mystery and detective stories satisfying, and horror stories horrifying. It is what makes the moment of recognition between Marina and Pericles so powerful. *Pericles*, more than any of Shakespeare's other works, depends upon this principle, rather than character development or dramatic action, for its dramatic impact and resolution. Just as Marina's identity tantalizes Pericles in their reunion, Shakespeare regularly plants hints and jokes about his real name, his real life, and his true identity, as if inviting the reader to solve a riddle: who am I?
CHAPTER 8

NATURAL TOPICAL REFERENCES

The general consensus that there are not many topical references in *Pericles* is true if one looks for topical references relating to 1606-09. According to Robert Brazil, however, “the topical allusions in the play that Shakespeare introduced relate more to the 1570's than to 1607” (190). Bullough observes that “Shakespeare was not a topical dramatist in the sense of … making references to current personalities and fashions the mainstay of his comedy,” but allows for “distanced topicality, as if the dramatist, without explicitly saying so, expected the audience to draw parallels. Thus *Henry VI, Part I*, with its war in France and sieges, would be topical between 1589 and 1592 when English gentlemen and troops were assisting Henry of Navarre” (Bullough 125). There are many references in *Pericles*, such as the impresa slogans, Thaliard's pistol, the pirate Valdes, and the reverent treatment of Philip Sidney, which suggest that it, too, was topical between 1589 and 1592.

The Assassination of William the Silent

*My lord,*

*If I can get him within my pistol's length,*

*I'll make him sure enough: so, farewell to your highness (I.i.227).*

Shakespeare used anachronisms such as Thaliard's pistol or the tilt at Pentapolis to draw parallels between those incidents, and his own times. When Shakespeare is at his most anachronistic, he is also at his most topical. Thaliard's pistol is one of Shakespeare's most glaring anachronisms, and most mysterious. Why put a pistol in ancient Greece? There is no topicality to be found for pistols in the court of James I. But assassination with a pistol was quite topical in Elizabeth's court in 1584 and for some years afterward, because William the
Silent (1533-1584) was assassinated with a handgun in that year, the first statesman ever to be so dispatched according to Lisa Jardine. Only a year earlier, John Somerville of Warwickshire had threatened to assassinate Elizabeth with a pistol (Somerset 406). The shocking assassination of William the Silent moved Elizabeth to send troops to aid the Netherlands under the command of the Edward de Vere (Ward 254-5). Oxford was recalled and replaced by Philip Sidney, who in 1586 died heroically of wounds sustained in the conflict when he gave away his leg armor to one of his men.

**Dutch Revolt**

“Arise, I pray you, rise:
We do not look for reverence, but to love,
And harbourage for ourself, our ships, and men” (*I.iv.519-20*).

In 1585, the queen signed the Treaty of Nonesuch on August 20, formally committing her country to aid their Dutch compatriots on the battlefield. She had already sent money and supplies in 1572, but no troops before this treaty. Her generosity in committing financial aid, supplies, and troops to the Netherlands had direct consequences, making England “no longer an observer in the Spanish conflict. Elizabeth had effectively entered into an open state of war with Spain” (Anderson 207). Just as Pericles declines to rule Tharsus, Elizabeth I declined the invitation from the grateful brother of William of Orange to accept rulership of the Netherlands. The Earl of Leicester, however, accepted, much to the Queen’s chagrin.
Bridewell

“How now! How a dozen of virginities?” (IV.vi.1965).

Throughout the late 1570s, “in the winter of 1578 the Bridewell bench boldly took it upon themselves 'to police morality in the city.' And to do this they targeted brothels, highly visible premises” (Haynes 65). “Bridewell baggages,” as they were called, sometimes serviced one favorite caller exclusively on an on-call basis, as in the case of Sir William Brooke, and also of a steward of the French ambassador (Haynes 65). The steward could be the Frenchman alluded to at the brothel in Mytilene, in Pericles. Lysimachus's dialogue may also have been inspired to some extent by an incident in Bridewell in January of 1579. A wealthy public servant named Palavacino, hoping to secure a virgin, was told “that there was no available virgin in the entire city” (Haynes 68).

Shipwrecks

It is impossible in Pericles to separate the metaphorical significance of a shipwreck in a life conceived of as a nautical voyage, from topical shipwrecks of the time. The author may have had the Frobisher expedition in mind, or any of a number of wrecks described by Richard Hakluyt. It is interesting to note that in one of his final letters in 1603, de Vere likened Elizabeth's death to a shipwreck.

In this common shipwreck, mine is above all the rest who, least regarded though often comforted of all her followers, she hath left to try my fortune among the alterations of time and chance, either without sail whereby to take the advantage of any prosperous gale or with anchor to ride till the storm be overpassed (Fowler 740).
Porpoise Incident

Nay, master, said I not as much when I saw the porpus
How he bounced and tumbled?
A plague on 'em, they ne'er come but I look to be washed (II.i.603-7).

Englishmen were apprehensive in the year 1587, worried that the coming year might bring plagues, famines, wars, and “wonders” of various kinds, “afflicting mankind with woeful destiny” as predicted by astronomers.

The best known of these prophecies was that penned by the fifteenth-century mathematician and seer Regiomontanous, whose reading of the heavens had led him to conclude that in 1588 there would be ‘either an universal consummation and final dissolution of the world, or at least a general subversion and alteration of principalities, kingdoms, monarchies and empires (Somerset 451).

As a result of these prophecies, “much was made of the fact that ... thirty great fish, commonly called porpoises, came up the river to the watergate of the Queen's Court” (Somerset 451). The fisherman's joke about porpoises heralding storms and shipwrecks could be a reference to this incident. Porpoises and dolphins of course have the reputation for saving drowning sailors, and so the sailor’s resentment of them is meant to be ironic. Heralded by this bizarre appearance of thirty very out of place porpoises, 1588 did turn out to be a pivotal year of wonders, for in that year England's navy defeated the Spanish Armada.

Comets and Stars

Yet cease your ire, you angry stars of heaven! (II.i.580).

Marina points out to her father that “I am a maid, My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes, But have been gazed on like a comet” (V.i.2279). A dazzling comet stretched one-eighth of the way across the sky (Falk, 22) the day Elizabeth Vere, then aged 2, first met her father in 1577. Thirty years later, the reprinting of Lawrence Twine's Patterne of Painfull Adventures coincided with Halley's comet in 1607, as did a reprinting of Philip Sidney's Arcadia, and
also the birth of Elizabeth Vere's first child, James Stanley. If the first printing, and the original version of Pericles were inspired in part by the 1577 comet, it would have been a brilliant publicity move to revive those works in celebration of another comet, particularly if the writer hoped to catch the patronage of Elizabeth Vere or her husband. In this “remarkably eventful period in terms of celestial drama” as Falk calls it, “Two more comets appeared in 1582 and 1607; and a solar eclipse darkened the skies over Europe in the autumn of 1605. There were ample reasons for taking an interest in cosmic happenings” (Falk 22).

Shakespeare was far from indifferent to these happenings. Mark Anderson notes the reference in Hamlet to the 1572 supernova in the constellation Cassiopeia, “Yond same star that's westward from the pole [making] his course to illume that part of heaven” (395). Anderson also notes a metaphor in Troilus and Cressida: “As true...as iron to adamant, as earth to the center,” which reveals that Shakespeare knew of William Gilbert's theory of geomagnetism (published in 1600) (395). Shakespeare knew astronomy well, writing in Sonnet 114, “Not from the stars do I my judgment pluck, And yet methinks I have Astronomy."

Apart from All's Well that Ends Well, no Shakespeare play better reflects its author's fascination with astronomy than Pericles. Pericles contains eight references to stars or celestial bodies, compared with three in most Shakespeare plays. Shakespeare, during the writing of this play, seems to have had the stars on his mind, even including two astronomers as characters: Gower was a noted astronomer, and Cerimon is based on John Dee, also an astronomer. In addition, there are 27 references to heaven. All's Well That Ends Well also contains fourteen uses of the word virgin, the only play to contain more references to virginity than Pericles itself, with ten. That points to All's Well That Ends Well and Pericles both being written at a time when Shakespeare was unusually preoccupied with stars,
virginity, and heaven itself. Both plays deal with a family markedly like de Vere's, reunited after the hero's sea voyage. Scholars have often postulated an “ur-Pericles,” and E.T. Clark suggests that the 1578 Historie of a Greek Maid listed in the Revels Accounts of 1577 might have been that play, inspired by the events of 1577.

Curiously, although Shakespeare manages to work the stars into his plays, he seems to have missed every important astronomical development after 1604. He was forty, “and at the height of his career, when Kepler's star illuminated the skies of Europe. Even if he somehow failed to see Tycho's star, he could not have missed Kepler's” (Falk 22). And yet Shakespeare makes no reference to Kepler's 1604 star. Falk, who pictures Shakespeare packing his bags and retiring in 1610, nevertheless is puzzled that “Shakespeare must have seen the new star of 1604, must have heard of Galileo's discoveries in 1610...yet his poetic imagination shows no response either to new stars or to other spectacular changes in the cosmic universe” (Falk 242). Altschuler points out that in addition, Shakespeare refers over forty times to the sun in his plays, but never to sunspots. This is odd for someone who has displayed throughout his life a passionate interest in astronomy.

Shakespeare’s works show us that the instrument he was using to examine the Heavens was the human eye—indeed a most keen and learned eye—but not a telescope: Shakespeare knew about [supernova] SN1572A, and Gilbert’s discussion of geomagnetism in 1600, but apparently not about [supernova] SN1604A, sunspots, the phases of Venus, the imperfections on the surface of the Moon, or the moons of Jupiter. There are many possible explanations why Shakespeare did not write about any of these topics, however, the most parsimonious is that the Bard was not alive to know of these new developments in astronomy (Altschuler).

Someone interested enough in astronomy to comment on Gilbert's discussion of geomagnetism in 1600 would not have ignored Galileo's book in 1606, yet Shakespeare shows no knowledge of the work. The logical inference is that all of his plays were written by 1604, including Pericles.
Famines and grain-hoarding

“So sharp are hunger’s teeth, that man and wife
Draw lots who first shall die to lengthen life” (I.iv.460).

The late Elizabethan period saw unprecedented food prices as a result of bad weather and poor harvests, but the famine reference in *Pericles* dates from the oldest versions of the original text. If the author chose the story partly for the famine, the reference is more likely to the Dutch famine in the 1560s and 1570s, than to any famine in England, since the story shows Pericles bringing aid to a foreign country, not to his homeland.

Earthquakes

*Our lodgings, standing bleak upon the sea,*  
*Shook as the earth did quake;*  
*The very principals did seem to rend,*  
*And all-to topple: pure surprise and fear*  
*Made me to quit the house*  
*(III.ii.1303-1307).*

Some writers connect the earthquake which coincides with the storm at sea, birth of Marina, and death of Thaisa with the Dover Straits earthquake of 1580. Claire Asquith notes that the earthquake in *Pericles* resembles the one in Romeo and Juliet, noting that “Like Juliet's, Marina's birth evokes the earthquake of 1580, the year of Campion's and Person's seminal English mission” (Asquith 47-8). This earthquake had “rattled the tankards around London during the late afternoon of April 6, when the day's plays were in progress” (Anderson 250-51). Anderson points out that minor injuries were sustained at The Theatre and The Curtain, and that two people were killed by falling stones in Westminster Abbey, inspiring anti-theatre polemics from pamphleteers like Philip Stubbs.
CHAPTER 9

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TOURNAMENT AND IMPRESAS

William Camden (1551-1623), author of the Britannia and one of the sixteenth century’s foremost heralds and antiquarians, defines an impresa’s aim as follows:

An Impress (as the Italians call it) is a device in Picture with his Motto or Word, borne by Noble and Learned personages, to notify some particular conceit of other own, as Emblems...do propound some general instruction to all...There is required in an Impress...a correspondency of the picture, which is as the body; and the Motto, which as the soul giveth it life. That is the body must be of fair representation, and the word in some different language, witty, short and answerable thereunto; neither too obscure, nor too plain, and most commended when it is an Hemistich, or parcel of a verse (Strong 77).

Shakespeare deliberately replaces the Greek games in Gower and Twine with an anachronistic typical Elizabethan tournament (II.ii). As Eva Turner Clark observes in her 1931 Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays, “This scene is but another description of one of the tournaments of Elizabeth's time, the tilters are not foreigners, but are dressed in costumes to represent the strangers of distant nations” (65). Like the games in Gower and Twine, the tournament exists to illustrate Pericles's nobility and worthiness as he wins each event and is crowned above the other challengers. Clark notes that the Earl of Oxford was given the prize of victory by the Queen at the only three tournaments of which there is record of his having taken part; the first of these was on the first, second, and third of May, 1571, just after he came of age; the next on January 22nd, 1581, to celebrate Philip Howard, Earl of Surrey's succession to the Earldom of Arundel; and the third occasion was in 1584” (Clark 62).

Art mirrors life here, as Pericles is crowned the victor by the princess Thaisa, whom he will shortly marry. Edward de Vere married Anne Cecil within six months of his 1571 victory.

Tilts were usually held each November, in honor of Elizabeth's accession to the throne, but the May 1571 tournament, “was the second of what seem to have been five great...
tournaments held during Elizabeth's reign in addition to the Annual Accession Day tournaments, each on some special occasion” (Ogburn 478-80). Charleton Ogburn suggests that the May tournament of 1571 could have been held to celebrate de Vere's coming of age.

The tilt in Pericles is in honor of Thaisa's birthday. The Queen's birthday was sometimes celebrated in this manner, but more often the tilts were held on November seventeenth, Accession Day, also known as Queen's Day:

“No only is [Accession Day] an overt manifestation of the adoption of Protestant historiography, but, within a wider context, it promotes Elizabeth as a Queen within an eschatological framework in which she assumes the dimensions of a ruler of the Last Days, whose virtues alone hold back the reign of Antichrist” (Strong 115).

Accession Day rivalled Christmas in its pageantry and celebrations. The customary tilts became so elaborate that books containing the speeches, devices, and their meanings were sometimes given out to the Queen and other honored guests.

Philip Gawdy, a Norfolk gentleman, sent his father such a book, which was given him on Queen's Day 1587, and the Revels Accounts two years later record payment “for the fair writing of all the devices on the 17 day of November...in two copies of the Queen” (Strong 145).

No known copies of these books or the devices therein described survive, which Strong believes indicates the exclusivity of their circulation.

There are a total of six impresas in Pericles, one for each act of the play, plus the one Pericles himself carries. There are probably multiple layers to their significance, as there would have been at an actual tournament. “The devices, like the speeches, remain an enigma unless we happen to know the name of the bearer and the reason for the device. Sir Philip Sidney, heir to the Earl of Leicester, when the latter had a son, bore on his shield at the next tournament Speravi 'dashed through, to shew his hope therein was dashed”’ (Strong 144-5). Unlike a family court of arms, an impresa represents an individual at a tournament. It might
be used repeatedly, or a contestant might choose to have a new one made each time he entered the lists. Most impresas symbolize the knight's relationship to the Queen, depicting her as an astrological influence on the knight—the moon, sun, or stars. For example, “one knight, who had been born under the star Spica Virginis, the brightest in the constellation Virgo, depicted this on his shield to show 'that he lived by the gracious favor of a virgin Prince'” (Strong 144). Most of the six devices in the Triumph scene of Pericles have their origins in Emblem books already in existence before Shakespeare's era, such as Alciato’s 1531 Emblemata. Some may have been invented by the author or drawn from actual tournaments he witnessed (Green 160-161).

The first of six mottoes is:

First, the Spartan knight,
And the device he bears upon his shield
Is a black Ethiope reaching at the sun;
The word, Lux tua vita mihi (II.i.19-21).

Both Henry Green (160) and Alan R. Young note the resemblance between these words and the Blount family motto “Lux tua vita mea,” (your light is life to me). The author might have intended flattery to Blount, one of the publishers of Pericles, but the Blount picture, although it includes the sun, has an armed foot, not an Ethiope. Shakespeare might not have been thinking of Blount at all, but rather, the Spartan knight in Plautus's Asinaria, III.iii.24, whose motto is Certe tu vita mihi, "Of a truth thou art life to me" (Green 162). Young ultimately concludes that the resemblance to the Blount motto and emblem is too imperfect.

The possible connection with the Blount family thus seems tenuous at best, although as the editor of the Arden edition of Pericles has pointed out, Edward Blount, a member of the family, was the bookseller who registered a copy of Pericles in the Stationer's Register in 1608 (Young 455).
The image on the shield of the Spartan knight draws on classical mythology and the myth of Phaeton, one of de Vere's suspected pen names. He is said to have addressed a sonnet to John Florio under that name, in 1591. The ill-fated Phaeton, while driving his father Apollo's sun chariot, scorched Ethiopia and its inhabitants, including his own mother, before losing control of the chariot and falling to his death. Phaeton was a popular subject for courtly poetry, and so a courtly audience would recognize the reference. The story illustrates that the sun, like royal favor, can burn as well as nurture. The Spartan knight, like Phaeton, is willing to be harmed or destroyed in pursuit of favor, in much the same way Pericles is willing to be executed in the attempt to win the hand of Antiochus' daughter. The first impresa comments on the recklessness and passion of youth, such as Pericles himself displays at the beginning of the story. Considered this way, the first impresa could represent de Vere himself, eager for royal favor and honors to a self-destructive degree. De Vere was even rumored at one time to be the Elizabeth's lover and a suitor to the queen (Hume 29).

The second knight, of Macedonia, has a motto described by Thaisa as being in Spanish (II.ii.27). "Piu dulzura que por fuerza"—“more by gentleness than by force," calls to mind the Aesop fable in which the sun and wind bet on who can most quickly make a man remove his cloak. The wind tries to force it off of him, but of course the sun with his kindly warmth is the winner. Shakespeare alludes to this same fable in King John (IV.iii.76). He might have found the fable in Corrozet's Hecatomgraphie, Paris, 1540, or in Freitag's Mythologia Ethica, published in 1579. The device on the shield, however, depicts an armed knight conquered by a lady. The second impresa parallels Pericles's adventures in the second act of Pericles, in which he does not conquer the famine-stricken city of Tharsus, but instead offers kindness by relieving the famine.
A prince of Macedon, my royal father,
And the device he bears upon his shield
Is an armed knight that's conquered by a lady;
the motto thus in Spanish, Piu dulzura que por fuerza (II.ii.20-24).

Isaac Asimov notes that Macedon was a kingdom on the northwest shore of the Aegean Sea, “Greek in language and culture, but backward in the time of Athens' Golden Age, and playing little part in Greek history at the time” (Asimov 190). Macedon has great historical significance, however. In 350 B.C. it rose to prominence when “a remarkable man, Phillip II, began his period of rule over it” (Asimov 190). As Asimov notices, a Macedonian is consistent with the Greek world of Pericles, “but what is he doing with a motto 'in Spanish,' a language which did not yet exist and would not for nearly a thousand years?” (Asimov 191). There is no reason to give any of the knights a Spanish motto, except to make the audience think of Spain. Just in case Philip II of Macedon went over the audience's head, the imperfect Spanish motto would drive the point home. The fact that the motto is not in perfect Spanish is probably intended as humorous. The Spanish king had been Elizabeth I's second official marriage proposal, and since her refusal England had been perpetually in a cold war with him. The second knight may have had a comic accent reminiscent of Don de Armado in Love's Labor's Lost. Philip's actual motto, “The world is not enough,” expressing his zeal for forceful conquest, could not be more different from Piu dulzura que por fuerza, appropriate English advice to the Spanish monarch. The image on the impresa, a knight surrendering to a lady, may be a reference to Elizabeth's aid to the Netherlands, which caused its people to offer her rulership, where Philip II's efforts to conquer by force had failed. It could also represent Elizabeth's victory over Philip II's naval forces in 1588. The references in Pericles to Valdélz, Sidney, the earthquake, and Catherine de Medici support the theory that the Armada victory is referenced in Pericles.
Antioch's knight, the third challenger, bears a wreath of chivalry, with the words "Me pompae provexit apex," or, "The desire for reknown has carried me forward." This knight freely admits that he is fighting not for love, but for fame. This in spirit resembles the motto of Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who proposed to Elizabeth I in 1568. His motto was plus ultra, “ever beyond,” which, like Philip II's motto expresses the ambition for world domination. Green states that on the 146th leaf of Paradin's Devises Heroiques, 1562 Antwerp edition, the wreath and motto appear exactly as described in Shakespeare's play, but have never been linked to any specific party until Edward VII claimed them in the nineteenth century. Pericles in the third act is certainly carried forward by the desire for reknown. Upon hearing that his people are electing a new king in his absence, Pericles rushes home to save his crown, only to lose his queen in childbirth at sea and part with his newborn daughter, Marina. The message here is that those who follow the third knight's way, may gain the world but lose their souls. Green says Shakespeare's likeliest source is Geoffrey Whitney's Choice of Emblemes, but allows that for the third knight's Impresa it is also very likely that Shakespeare consulted Symeoni (Green 185).

The fourth knight must be from Pentapolis, for Thaisa and Simonides do not comment on his nationality, and his motto is in Latin. The image on his shield is:

A burning torch that's turned upside down;
The word, Quod me alit, me extinguit.
Which shows, that beauty hath this power and will,
Which can as well inflame as it can kill (II.ii.32-35).

This impresa may be a reference to Christopher Marlowe whose motto, "what nourishes me destroys me," proved prophetic. Unlike the first three knights, Marlowe could never remotely have been considered a contender for the hand of the queen, but may have been doing important work in her majesty's service at the time Pericles was written. The likeliest source
for this motto and image is Symeoni's *Tetratstichi Morali*, published in 1561 and 1574, but it also appears in a passage John Lyly's *Euphues, His England*, "No, no, for as the Torch bourned downewarde, is extinguished with the self-same waxe which was the cause of his lyght: so Nature tourned to unkindenesse, is quenched by those meanes it shoulde be kindeled, leaving no braunch of love, where it founde no roote of humanitie" (Lyly 1). The fourth impresa corresponds to the action of its respective act, in which Marina's foster mother Dionyza jealously hires an assassin to dispatch Marina for outshining Dionyza's own daughter. Pirates kidnap Marina in the nick of time, but sell her to a whorehouse, a profession that promises to make her rich but would destroy her body and soul. Dionyza, the pirates, and the bawd all nurture Marina, and yet try to destroy her.

The fifth impresa is described as a hand "environed with clouds," holding out gold.

The fifth, a hand environed with clouds,  
Holding out gold that's by the touchstone tried;  
The motto thus, *Sic spectanda fides* (II.ii.36-38).

The motto may be translated as "So is fidelity to be proved." According to Green, Kings Francis I and Francis II of France both favored this emblem and motto, as did Henry IV, Henry of Navarre, the model for the King of Navarre in *Love's Labor's Lost*. Proof of fidelity is the theme of the fifth act of *Pericles*. Marina proves her faithfulness to her ideas and her mettle as a teacher. Pericles proves his devotion to his wife and daughter, having lost the power of speech and withdrawn from the world. Marina and Pericles prove that they are father and daughter. Pericles's worth is proved to the Goddess Diana. Thaisa proves to be alive and faithful. Cerimon proves himself a good and honest friend by returning all the objects found in Thaisa's coffin. Lysimachus is proved a decent man and governor worthy of
Marina's hand. The deaths of Cleon, Dionyza, Antiochus and his unnamed daughter, prove the inescapable nature of heaven's justice. Fidelity can only be proven by temptation.

Pericles himself is the final knight, with “a wither'd branch that's only green at the top, the motto, in hac spe vivo,” or, “I live in hope.” Benedick in Much Ado about Nothing makes reference to this image when he says of Beatrice, "O, she misused me past endurance of a block! An oak but with one green leaf on it would have answered her" (II.i.214). According to Green there is nothing like it in any of the books. Green resigns himself to uncertainty regarding the source of the sixth motto and device (Green, 185). Young, however, is confident that the device belongs to Philip Sidney.

Unlike Sidney's Pyrocles, however, Pericles does have an impresa to hand personally to the mistress of the tournament (Thaisa). For this detail Shakespeare may have turned from Sidney's Arcadia to an impresa that Sidney had invented for one of his own appearances at a Whitehall tournament (Young 454).

Sidney appeared at the 1581 tournament of Whitehall as “The desert knight,” wearing the mossy bark of a dead tree and carrying an impresa showing a half-dead tree with the motto, Hoc ordine fata. “Such be ye corse of Heavens.” Young suggests that Sidney's “desert knight” poem uses “desert” to mean “desert” both in the sense of deserving, and also barren, empty, like the world outside Elizabeth's kingdom, for, like Oxford, he had been abroad. “His impresa of the tree which is half alive and half dead suggests that his fortunes lie in the balance. All depends upon what his motto refers to as 'ye corse of Heavens,' that is to say, Elizabeth herself” (Young 454). Young wonders how Shakespeare of Stratford could have known of Sidney's impresa, “since its most likely date of composition is November 1577, following Sidney's recent service with his father in Ireland and an important European mission for Elizabeth” (Young 454). The use of Sidney's impresa for Pericles can only be interpreted as a flattering gesture on the part of the author, since it appears in the play as
Pericles's own impresa. This is puzzling, since Sidney appears to be the model for both Slender in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and Andrew Aguecheek in *Twelfth Night*, two of the most foolish comic figures in all Shakespeare's works. He is also thought to be the model for Boyet, Berowne's rival in *Love's Labor's Lost*. One would not expect a heroic depiction of the same man, by Shakespeare. If Shakespeare hoped in this way to gain Sidney's patronage, or for that matter, de Vere's, 1608 was far too late, for Sidney died in 1586, de Vere in 1604. William Shakespeare had no particular reason to mock Philip Sidney, but Edward de Vere had several. In addition to leading the opposing literary camp, the Areopagi, Sidney had been a rival for the hand of Oxford's wife Anne Cecil, and the two had famously quarreled over the use of a tennis court in 1569. Apparently by the time of the 1581 tournament, all was forgiven between the two. *Pericles*, with its long, flowery title, its symmetrical plot, and its triple repetition of the same images and themes, shows Euphuistic influence, yet appears at the same time to be a tribute or homage to the Romantics of Sidney's camp, with its images of ladies won in jousts by knights in rusty armor, and its allusions to Sidney's *Arcadia*. The contrast between this homage, and the usual satirical treatment of Philip Sidney argues special circumstances, such as the death of Sidney in 1586 possibly inspiring a more reverent tone for several years afterwards. The final impresa expresses Pericles's hope of Thaisa's favor, and also the author's hope of favor and salvation. Gower finishes the play by saying, "On your patience evermore attending, new joy wait on you! Here our play has ending!" The whole play is about hope--hope of reconciliation between father and daughter, between mankind and God, between the exile and home.
Revels Accounts

The Revels Accounts list plays performed at court but do not indicate when they were written. The winter season at court 1604-5 included performances of at least six plays by Shakespeare: *The Moor of Venice, Merry Wives of Windsor, Mesur for Mesur, the plaie of Errors, Loues labours Lost* and *Henry the fift*. It is unlikely that all six plays could have been written in the same two years, especially if in 1604 Shakespeare was also collaborating with Wilkins on *Pericles*, and beginning the seminal works *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, both now currently proclaimed in textbooks to be written in 1605.

Like Clark, Ogburn notices the 1577 entry, “A pastorell or historie of a Greeke maide shewn at Richmond on the sondaie next after Newe yeares daie enacted by the Earl of Leicester his servauntes furnished with some thinges in this officee”--the Revels Office having provided “Three yards of gray cloth to make my Lord of Leicester's man a fishermans coat” (Ogburn D 129). The fisherman's coat is an intriguing detail which may mean that the pastoral alluded to here, was indeed an early version of *Pericles*.

Francis Meres

As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latins, so Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage; for Comedy, witness his *Gentlemen of Verona*, his *Errors*, his *Love's Labors Lost*, his *Love Labors Won*, his *Midsummer's Night Dream*, and his *Merchant of Venice*; for Tragedy, his *Richard the 2*, *Richard the 3*, *Henry the 4*, *King John*, *Titus Andronicus*, and his *Romeo and Juliet*” (Meres).

This list indicates thirteen plays that were in existence by 1598, but gives no further
indication of the date of composition. Moreover, this may be only a partial list of the Shakespeare plays which were known by 1598. Even if this is the whole list, working at the rate of a play a year, Shakespeare has to have begun his career by 1585, when he was only twenty-one.

**Stationers' Register**

Kevin Gilvary points out that “The Stationer's Register mentions fourteen Shakespeare plays up to the death of Elizabeth in 1603, with four more from 1607-8, including *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labor's Lost* (which had already been published in the late 1590s), *Antony and Cleopatra* (which was not published until 1623) and *Pericles* which was published in 1609 but omitted from F1” (Gilvary 1). From this list it can be seen that entries were sometimes made long after publication, as in the case of *Love's Labor's Lost*, or long before, as in the case of *Antony and Cleopatra*. Dating based on this external source alone is therefore unreliable. Gilvary notes that scholars often assume that the earliest mentioned performance is the first staging, and that the first performance has to have occurred soon after composition. Neither of these assumptions is valid (Gilvary 2). In the nineteenth century there were many attempts at a chronological sequence of the plays. Malone relied on external evidence from the Stationers' Register to date *The Winter's Tale* to 1594, based on the entry for *A Winter Night's Pastime*. “He dates *Hamlet* to 1596 on the basis of Harvey's marginalia in a copy of *Spegh't Chaucer*. (As this edition is now dated to 1598, Harvey's written comments should be placed between 1598 and 1601)” (Gilvary 3).
Henslowe's Diary

Henslowe's Diary was actually a business record, kept from 1592 to 1603, in which Henslowe at first merely recorded the companies performing at his theatre (probably the Rose), the plays performed, and his takings. According to Vickers, “after 1597, when the Admiral's Men were reorganized, Henslowe began to record the money he advanced to the company for purchasing plays, properties, costumes, play licenses, and payments to the actors” (Vickers 20). Vickers cites G. E. Bentley, “for 1597 The Annals of English Drama lists 23 plays, six with single authors, one collaboration, and 16 of unknown authorship” (Vickers 20). Pericles could be one of the sixteen anonymous plays, but that is pure speculation. There are no records of payments for the script of any Shakespearean play. Henslowe includes records of payments to other playwrights, but none to Shakespeare. This could be because Shakespeare worked for The Chamberlain's Men, not the Admiral's Men, but we know that several of his plays were in fact produced at The Rose, and so it is surprising that Henslowe does not mention them. Pericles does not appear by name either.

Ben Jonson

Brian Vickers notes that “Jonson also mocked the Chorus who 'wafts you over the seas' as in Heywood's The Four Prentices of London (c.1954), or Shakespeare's Henry V (1599). Pericles very deliberately violates the unities, not only of time and place, but also of action, and as such has a great deal in common with these two plays” (Vickers 436). Being a University Wit, Jonson was well aware of the unities and other classical rules of drama. Diana Price observes that Jonson associated Pericles with scraps, possibly a reference to a collaboration, or to its chequered publishing history. Entered in the Stationers' Register in 1608 by Edward Blount, but published by Henry Gosson in 1609 in a corrupt edition;
*Pericles* has all the earmarks of a pilfered play. “Jonson was not so much putting down the author(s) of *Pericles*, as he was putting down the scavengers who produced the corrupt text” (Price 216). Unfortunately, all of Jonson's known writings mentioning *Pericles* were published long after 1608, and so although they point to a long and complicated history, they do not help with establishing an earlier date of composition.

**Greene's Vision**

*Greene's Vision*, written in 1592, may actually reference *Pericles*, rather than the other way around. In it, Greene describes Gower wearing:

A surcoat of a tawny dye  
Hung in plaits over his thigh,  
A breech close unto his dock,

This detailed description of Gower's clothing bears no resemblance to that of either the well-known woodcut of Gower, or the effigy over Gower's famous tomb in Winchester Palace in Southwark, nor any other known depiction of Gower. It does, however, bear a striking resemblance to the livery of the Earls of Oxford. The livery described in the household of the Earl of Oxford during the time of Elizabeth I was tawny, just as it had been in Robert de Vere's time.

Hundreds rode in formation, with eighty men displaying gold chains and the tawny livery of the earls of Oxford. Following the train were two hundred more yeomen bearing an embroidered emblem of the blue boar, the Earl of Oxford’s heraldic badge, on their left shoulder (Anderson 11).

John Gower (1330-1408) was contemporary to three kings and three Earls of Oxford, among them Robert de Vere, ninth Earl of Oxford. Robert de Vere's livery was blue and tawny, as can be seen in the 1397 painting by Froissart, which depicts Robert's men fleeing Radcot Bridge in a boat. The men are wearing tawny surcoats over blue suits of armor. “Barrell
points out that 'tawnie' is a direct reference to Oxford—in fact, it's one of the two heraldic tinctures of the House of Vere (Reading tawny and Oxford blue)” (Altrocchi 49).

Robert Greene (1558-1592), writing in 1592, seems to be implying that John Gower served the Earls of Oxford, but there is nothing in the historical records to suggest that Gower, a native of Yorkshire, ever wore Oxford's livery or served under him in any way. John Gower served King Henry IV, whose colors were blue and murray (a vivid wine red such as the one Gower's statue wears on his tomb). In his Mirour de l'Ommne, Gower alludes to wearing “striped sleeves” (probably marking him as a scholar), but makes no reference to any livery, surcoats, or colors.

Gower appears not only as the Chorus in Pericles, but also as an ideal soldier in Henry IV and as a messenger in Henry V, but there is no hint of a connection between him and the de Veres in either story. He might have been a servant to Oxford, in the sense of having served Oxford as a source and as a character in Pericles. Greene might be making the statement that Oxford is the author or patron of the works. Another literary reference connects Oxford with Gower, as early as 1589.

Although John Gower and Edward de Vere were together praised as great writers in The Arte of English Poesie (1589), there have been no other connections made between de Vere and the works of Gower, who appears as the Chorus in Pericles. This is a rather unique situation in the canon, since almost every other major source either was dedicated to de Vere or his family, was written by one of his relatives or servants, was accessible through the private libraries of his guardian or tutor, or was personally owned by him (Farina 99).

Something linked Oxford and Gower together in the minds of both Greene and Puttenham, possibly an early version of Pericles. If Greene was identifying Gower with Oxford by garbing him in a tawny surcoat, then Pericles was written and performed by 1592. For Puttenham to link de Vere with Gower, Pericles would have had to exist before 1589.
It is frequently remarked on by writers that the style in *Pericles*, and the colloquialisms used, were dated by 1608. This is sometimes explained as a result of provincial George Wilkins' language contrasting with the more modern style of his more sophisticated friend William Shakespeare. Older language could indicate that the play was written in older language and revised much later in newer language by the same author. Most of the antiquated colloquialisms occur in the speeches of Gower, a fourteenth-century poet, and so could have been intentional. Jackson, Vickers, and others argue that Gower's iambic tetrameter appears nowhere else in Shakespeare, and therefore those speeches must have been written by someone else. The speeches are not precisely in the style of Gower, either. To use a vocabulary and style identical with Gower's would have made the speeches unintelligible to ordinary Elizabethans. But Shakespeare's imitation of Gower's iambic tetrameter, laced with a few medievalisms, lends Gower's speeches a medieval flavor.

As the language of Gower's first speech makes clear, the audience will have to surrender their sophisticated notions of dramatic speech, and in this way be guided and open to a recollection of their older, imaginative responses (DelVecchio 30).

The oft-criticized stiffness and archaism of the first two acts may actually be, as Felperin argued, intended to lure the audience into the world of this “secular miracle play.”

Shakespeare used similarly archaic language and style in the “play within-a-play” sequences in *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, proving that he could exploit a more primitive verse style for effect. “The imitation of Gower's jingly rhymes, antiquated diction, and unabashed didacticism is itself skillful, as is Shakespeare's unfolding of the chief motives of
the play—resurrection and restoration—within the first eight lines” (Skeele 116). Gower's opening speech reveals that he and the author are aware of the story's antiquity, and of the centuries dividing him from his audience. DelVecchio notes that Pericles makes more extended use of archaic language than any other Shakespeare play. The effect is of an illustrated book of Gower come to life, of a quaint poem gradually giving way to a living story.

Some scholars have noticed seeds of Shakespeare's other plays in Pericles. Brandes wrote, “It is deeply interesting to trace in this sombre yet fantastically romantic play of Pericles the germs of all his succeeding works” (Brandes 72-73). Brandes saw in Marina and her mother preliminary studies for Perdita and Hermione in The Winter's Tale, and perceived in Dionyza a forerunner of the wicked stepmother in Cymbeline (Brandes 72-73). It could also be added that the shipboard storm surrounding Marina's birth and Thaisa's death prefigures the storms in both King Lear and The Tempest, and that Pericles's flight from Antiochus and his descent into madness both contain the seeds of Hamlet, with Helicanus as a prototype of Horatio. Caroline Spurgeon pointed out that Pericles's line, “One sin, I know, another doth provoke. Murder's as near to lust as flame to smoke” is later explored in more depth in Hamlet and in King John. The same theme is also expressed throughout Macbeth (Spurgeon 291). Farina noticed that the lines:

Now sleep yslaked hath the rout;  
No din but snores the house about.  
The cat, with eyne of burning coal,  
Now couches fore the mouse's hole;  
And crickets sing at the oven's mouth,  
E'er the blither for their drouth (III.o.1119-1126)

appear to prefigure Puck's speech:
Now the wasted brands do glow,
Whilst the screech-owl, screeching loud....”
(V.i.2224-25).

As has been observed by Farina, it is as if the image were introduced by the poet early in his career, and later perfected in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. What stylometry cannot measure, is the intensity and appropriateness of the imagery, such as “the perfect analogy used by Pericles between lawful love and lawless passion respectively and the right handling and disordered playing on a viol...” (Spurgeon 70).

The effect of these impeccable Shakespearean images scattered throughout the workmanlike verse, uttered by stock characters, is as Lillo described,

As gold though mix'd with baser matter shines,
So do his bright inimitable lines
Throughout those rude wild scenes distinguish'd stand,
And show he touch'd them with no sparing hand (Lillo).

There is no scene empty of those “bright inimitable lines.” It is impossible to know, without more information, however, whether those bright lines indicate the poet's potential, which grew as he continued over the years to write, or whether they are emendations to earlier, less inspired work. What is certain, however, is that separating the gold from the dross in *Pericles* is not an easy task. More than any other Shakespeare play, *Pericles* is based on the alchemical vision of suffering and regeneration. Its central character embodies the rex marinus, who represents the stages of the metaphysical transmutation of the soul. The use of alchemical imagery

...enables Shakespeare to present a non-Christian miracle play with all the attendant aura of magic and wonder, and which at the same time communicates a profound re-statement of the travails and triumphs which accompany the inner transformation of man, without attaching it to the dogma of any particular religious position (Abraham 524).
Given the play's alchemical nature, underscored by its imagery, characters, and the figure of Cerimon, it would be understandable if the author decided to further underscore the alchemical aspect by leaving his first scenes leaden, when he revised the rest to gold, or if he planned the contrast from the beginning. The richness of the alchemical imagery and symbolism in Pericles suggests it was written in the 1580s, during the peak of alchemy's popularity in England. The language comparing Thaisa to gold, and both women to treasure, is alchemical:

Her eyelids, cases to those heavenly jewels
Which Pericles hath lost, begin to part
Their fringes of bright gold. The diamonds
Of a most praised water doth appear,
To make the world twice rich (III.ii.1402-7).

Although the imagery of the play fairly sparkles with alchemical and oceanic beauty, its chaotic, episodic structure has been remarked on by scholars throughout the centuries. “Much of the action seems pictorial, lending itself to tableaux vivants” (Ogburn 125). Early critics saw no reason why Shakespeare, so sure-handed with his A Midsummer Night's Dream in 1595, so masterful in his Hamlet in 1599, should suddenly be so inconsistent with Pericles in 1606. The best-known of these, John Dryden, asserted in his Prologue to Davenant's Circe (1677) that Pericles was Shakespeare's first play:

Shakespeare's own Muse her Pericles first bore,
The Prince of Tyre was elder than the Moore:
Tis miracle to see a first good Play.
All Hawthorns do not bloom on Christmas-Day.

Nicholas Rowe excluded Pericles from his 1709 edition of Shakespeare, convinced that Shakespeare could never have produced something as uneven as Pericles at any age. He and Alexander Pope established a tradition of ignoring Pericles altogether (Skeele 3). The critic and editor Edmond Malone felt that all the unevenness of Pericles, and its wildly improbable
story were signs that it was an early play, possibly his first” (Skeele 3). Like stock characters from morality plays, _Pericles's_ characters have very little depth or dimensionality. “Pericles is just real enough to suffer trauma, and Marina is strong enough to resist being debauched, but both scarcely exist as will, cognition, desire. They are not even passive beings” (Bloom 604). Skeele notes that

_Pericles_ not only divides its cast right down the middle into sheep and goats, the good and the wicked, after the fashion of the earlier religious drama, but like that drama sets up elaborate moral patterns of contrast and similarity between them (Skeele 118).

Felperin makes the apt comparison between Dionyza and the medieval figure of Hypocrisy. Skeele takes this idea further, supposing that _Pericles_ represents a peak of development for the author, who is finally revealing the stock figures that always lurked behind Shakespeare's flesh-and-blood characters (Skeele 118). The precise opposite is more likely—that these are the skeletons that Shakespeare in his later work layered and modeled into more complex, living characters. It is much more likely that Shakespeare would begin with these simple, stock figures, and gradually come to a more complex understanding of people, than that he would boil his habitual complicated portrayals of the human psyche down into pure good or evil in his last plays. The natural trajectory is for Lady Hypocrisy to evolve into Queen Dionyza, who evolves into Lady Macbeth, not the other way around. A writer's characters grow less simplistic and more lifelike, with time. Pericles' confrontation with Antiochus prefigures Hamlet's with Claudius. The characters appear and and disappear before we can really know them.

Most of them are very slight sketches indeed, but still such as a young author, who trusted more to incident than to the exhibition of character to enlist the attention of his audiences, and who was apprehensive of amplifying his subject, would be likely to write (Tyrell 56-57).
Everything about the plotting, characters, and themes of the play suggests that it is the work of a young writer finding his style, not the work of a mature author with an established style. Working playwright Frank Higgins, who has taught beginning playwrights for fifteen years, lists a number of playwriting mistakes which tend to characterize an inexperienced playwright. In addition to a lack of dimensionality in the characters, especially antagonists, and a “sensitive” protagonist struggling against an indifferent world, Higgins listed inept handling of exposition and structure as common mistakes that show that a playwright is inexperienced. “Too much information early on that is convenient to the playwright,” he explained, “is a beginner’s mistake.” The first few scenes of Pericles are almost entirely exposition. Other common mistakes of the beginning playwright are all found in Pericles, such as the too-perfect “sensitive” protagonist faced with one-dimensional antagonists. “Superman is interesting because of kryptonite. Somebody may be powerful but has some kind of weakness.” Pericles has no kryptonite, nor does he ever actually square off against the bad guys. He never rescues Marina or Thaisa. He is a passive figure, as is Marina. Higgins also mentions a flippancy in the writing of younger playwrights which he attributes to television, but a similar flippancy can be seen in Pericles, particularly in the brothel scenes. Moreover, the older characters are stereotypes, products not of experience, but of imagination. The writer himself probably was comparatively young when he wrote Pericles. The fantasy elements, the simplicity of the morality, its didacticism, and its stock characters, further suggests that unlike most of Shakespeare's plays, this one might have been written with children in mind. Despite the inspiration and skill it displays, Pericles reveals that either the writer or his audience was thinking in stark black and white terms. “Nothing mars the
simple antinomies of the play, where all is black or white, the bad very bad, the good very
good” (Bullough 372).

Stylistometric comparisons used to date the plays

Stylometry is an attempt at an objective analysis of the verbal habits of an author, which has been used in recent years to identify anonymous authors, or discover unnamed collaborators. For example, in 2013 forensic linguist Patrick Juola in 2013 used a stylistometric computer program to unmask J. K. Rowling, who had written The Cuckoo's Calling under the pen name Robert Galbraith (Sozek). Stylometry can also be used to determine whether the language of a document is consistent with its date, and has exposed forgeries in the past. Stylistometrics depends on having a reliable sample of works for comparison.

Moreover, stylistometric findings which focus on spelling or usage are more likely to reflect the habits of the printer than those of the author in the Elizabethan period. For example, exclamation points were not commonly used before the 1590s, and so a stylistometric analysis comparing their use would not be useful for establishing authorship, although it might be very useful for establishing period (Moore 9). That one hundred and thirty-one exclamation points appear in Pericles would seem to set its composition after 1590 until one remembers that the printer in 1609 would have added them if faced with a document which lacked them. Their presence signifies a 1609 printing date, but tells us nothing about the date of composition.

Any stylistometric analysis of Shakespeare involves the use of corrupt data, because there are no extant manuscripts, except possibly that of Sir Thomas More, which is in the handwriting of five different dramatists plus one scribe. It is not really possible to establish
what Ward Elliott calls “a clean baseline” for that reason. Finally, researchers often “stack the
deck” for or against a candidate in this type of analysis, without realizing it. Juola, for
example, knew exactly what his findings would be before he began.

Sir Brian Vickers criticizes the findings of Morton, whose stylometric tests determined
*Pericles* to be the work of a single author.

> After all, the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* in the British library is in the
> handwriting of five different dramatists, together with a playhouse scribe, and three of
> those writers—Chettle, Munday, Shakespeare—can be seen in the act of composition,
> scratching out what they have just written as a fresh thought came to them. How
> could this play possibly be the work of one author?” (Vickers 100).

It does not seem to occur to Vickers that one man might have been dictating to the others, but
that would be the most parsimonious explanation. On the other hand, Morton's methods
classed *A Double Falsehood*, a probable eighteenth-century forgery, as Shakespeare's, and so
Vickers may be correct in his assertion that the methods used by Morton, Mertz, and
Merriam were a misapplication of computer-driven stylometry (Vickers 113). F.G. Fleay, F.J.
Furnivall, Edmund Dowden, and others used metrical testing to assemble the chronology
favored by most scholars today, according to Vickers. “When this list managed, with
reasonable certainty, to place *Pericles, The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline*, and *The Tempest* right
next to each other, the resemblance between them fairly leapt out at critics” (Skeele 16).
Despite the resemblance between the four “late” romances in genre, themes, and plot, the
style of *Pericles* does not match. “The gnomic, end-stopped, fitfully rhymed verse of the first
acts of *Pericles*, it has been remarked, seems earlier than the earliest Shakespeare we know”
(Skeele 129). Skeele's observation is fully consistent with E.T. Clark's timeline, which places
its composition as early as 1577. Conversely, Jackson, Vickers, Ward, and other orthodox
scholars attribute this instead to an inferior collaborator.
The currently accepted chronology is based on a combination of external evidence and stylometry. The Riverside dating conforms to a neat arc which shows feminine endings, (iambic pentameter lines which end on an extra, unstressed syllable), growing steadily throughout Shakespeare's career, from 5-8% at its lowest, to 25% at its highest. The traditional chronology established by Chambers is similar. Vickers sees feminine endings as proof of Shakespeare's hand in Pericles, but proof of Fletcher's in Henry VIII (Altrocchi 207), and also ignores them in favor of the date on the title page. Using the Riverside’s methods, and Vickers’s, Pericles, at 8%, should be placed near the beginning of the curve, but since it was printed in 1606, it is placed near its end.

George Wilkins's play, Miseries of Enforced Marriage, also has a low concentration of feminine endings, which could indicate collaboration. “For Miseries they are: 11.5 feminine endings, 1.1 alexandrines, 7.5 short lines; for Pericles, 1-2, they are 8.8 feminine endings, 0.6 alexandrines, 8.7 short lines” (Jackson 86). Jackson draws the reasonable conclusion that Acts 1-2 of Pericles, and the whole of Miseries are “broadly similar” in their moderate use of feminine endings, few alexandrines, and more rhyme, end-stopped verse, and short lines than is typical of Shakespeare. The resemblance implies common authorship, but as Ward Elliott himself points out, it is possible to fit Cinderella's slipper without actually being Cinderella (Elliott 331).

Statistical vocabulary comparisons between de Vere's letters and Pericles, and in fact all of Shakespeare's works, unlike stylometric comparisons, have supported the Oxfordian theory of authorship, which in turn supports an earlier date for Pericles. William Plumer Fowler, in his 1986 Shakespeare Revealed in Oxford's Letters, reveals astonishing parallels between phrases used in Edward de Vere's correspondence and the plays of William
Shakespeare. Particularly interesting is the word “eftsoons,” which appears once in
Shakespeare's works. Pericles in a shipboard speech in Act V, orders Helicanus:

My purpose was for Tharsus, there to strike
The inhospitable Cleon; but I am
For other service first: toward Ephesus
Turn our blown sails; eftsoons I'll tell thee why
(V.i.2477-80).

“Eftsoons” also appears in Oxford's May 21, 1578, Northwest Passage Letter:

After my very hearty commendations: Understanding of the wise proceeding and
orderly dealing for the continuing of the voyage for the discovery of Cathay by the
Northwest, which this bearer, my friend Master Frobisher, hath already very
honourably attempted and is now eftsoons to be employed for the better achieving
thereof....(emphasis mine).

“Eftsoons,” meaning “soon after” or “another time,” may have already been archaic when
Oxford used it. A rare word, it appears the work of Mary Sidney, Philip Sidney, and Richard
Hakluyt, all during the 1570s and 1580s. In Two Noble Kinsmen, the word also appears,
when Arcite, thinking of the favors shown him by Queen Emilia, says, “In thy rumination,
that I poor man might eftsoones come between and chop on some cold thought” (III.i.12).
Mark Twain uses it as a medievalism in Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court. In
Pericles, however, it appears not in Gower's speeches, where an archaic word is to be
expected, but rather, in Pericles's own speech. This further supports a 1580s date of
composition. Pericles, moreover, is quite clearly a pastoral. It celebrates nature, specifically
the ocean, and dwells on gemstones, flowers, doves, crows, stars, and other imagery from
nature to tell its story. The ancient Greek setting is consistent with the courtly pastorals such
as Phillyda and Corin and Felix and Philiomena, popular in 1584 (MacLean 35). In addition
to archaic words, a masque-like episodic plot, and a style consistent with a young writer still
finding his way, Pericles, like Love's Labor's Lost, shows the influence of Lyly's euphuist
movement, as demonstrated in the sources section of this thesis. Robert Brazil notes that the long, flowery title, *The late and much admired play, called Pericles, Prince of Tyre, with the relation of the whole history, adventures, and fortunes of the said Prince, as also the no less strange, and worthy accidents, in the Birth and Life, of his daughter Mariana* is much more in keeping with the Euphuistic style of the 1570s, than it is with Shakespeare's later works, which sport neat, one-word titles like *Hamlet, Macbeth, or Othello*. Queen Elizabeth herself has been styled by J. R. Green "the most affected and destestable of euphuists." No such description ever applied to James I. Thomas Dekker in his 1609 satirical advice pamphlet, *The Gull's Hornbook*, denounces "Euphuized gentlewomen" (67). He also states on the first page that he got all of his information from “the musty pages of an old almanac,” indicating that the gentlewomen he describes as sharpening their tongues on him are the Jacobean equivalent of the twentieth-century “blue hairs,” elderly women expecting standards of entertainment and etiquette current twenty or more years earlier. Drayton, Sidney, and others castigated and stigmatized Euphuism's artificiality, and Shakespeare caricatured it in *Love's Labor's Lost*. In an elegy printed in 1627, Drayton credited Sidney with restoring lost dignity to English prose.

Both Euphuism and the “plain style” favored by the Sidney-led Areopagus faction flourished in the 1580s, their common goal the legitimizing of the English language. *Pericles* represents the aesthetic of that earlier age. “In 1606 the prologue to Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Woman Hater* had announced that 'Inductions are out of date', but this did not apply to choruses” (Gossett, 75). A 1606 production of *Barnabe Barnes* featured a prologue, but this appears to have been a novelty, rather than a general trend. Jackson cites D.A Travers's acknowledgement that *Pericles* is a stratified composition which shows layers of
development and revisions. D. A. Travers doubted “whether the theory of divided authorship … accounts fully for what reads in reality more like a failure in creative consistency” (29). James O. Wood also agrees that Pericles is the product, not of two authors, but of widely separated layers of revision. Wood cites Hoeniger:

F.D. Hoeniger, the careful editor of the New Arden Edition, grants that there may have been a version of Pericles by Shakespeare extant in the 1590's. I not only concur; I submit that we probably have the first two acts of it, virtually unchanged, in the 1609 quarto, as well as some pieces of the last three acts scattered among the superb revisions he made about the time of King Lear (86).

Brandes also opines that Pericles was entirely written by Shakespeare. He notes the strong resemblance to similar scenes in Measure for Measure, and acknowledges that

It is impossible to ascertain the precise circumstances under which the play was produced. Some critics have maintained that it originally began with what is now the third act, and that Shakespeare, having lain it aside, gave Wilkins and Rowley permission to complete it for the stage (Brandes 67).

Nevertheless Brandes holds to the theory of a single author. Vickers allows for the possibility that Shakespeare could have made a start on Pericles in the 1580s or soon after, based on the fact that Pericles shares a source with A Comedy of Errors, which appears in the Revels Accounts in 1594. A Comedy of Errors may be a revision of A Historie of Error, which appears in the Revels Accounts in 1577. Vickers is nonetheless convinced by the newest research that George Wilkins is beyond a doubt Shakespeare's collaborator, and that the only date of composition that can be supported by current research is that on the title page. Schoenbaum, too, prefers to base his dating of the plays on external evidence and a single author (Vickers 153). Yates regards Pericles as Shakespeare's “First Last Play,” but cautions that

Amongst the uncertainties is its date of composition, though we know that it cannot be later than 1608 when the first printed edition was entered in the Stationers' Register. Pericles differs from other Last Plays in its textual history, since it was
several times printed from 1609 onwards, whilst all the other Last Plays were first
printed in the First Folio of 1623” (Yates 88).

Langworthy's findings support the idea of an early play which has gone through several
revisions. Although Vickers and Jackson both uncovered strong resemblances to Wilkins's
Miseries of Enforced Marriage in their stylometric analyses of Pericles, it should be noted
that the results also support the conclusion that the last three acts of the play were revised to
reflect a more modern style, while the first two acts, written a decade or two earlier, were left
in their original condition, or at least revised more sparingly. Jackson's most compelling
evidence is in his comparison of rhymed pairs in Pericles with those in Miseries:
“breath/death, ill/will, life/wife, away/stay, die/testify/eye/justify” (Jackson 96).

Breath/death, life/wife, way/stay, die/defy/cry/bye/deny all appear in Gower, however, and so
these rhymes could simply come from the source material. There seems to be a slightly
skewed perspective in evaluating what separates Wilkins from Shakespeare, moreover.

Jackson drew together all the linguistic habits long known to characterize Wilkins—
the constant use of antithesis, often to add emphasis to a sententious couplet, which is
given even more emphasis by alliteration; the idiosyncratic use of ‘which’ to open a
speech; the frequent use of ‘this’ or ‘thus’ to point towards some moral or maxim; the
elision of the relative pronoun; the unpredictable insertion of rhyme into blank verse
speeches—and showed how they all come together in long sequences of Pericles and
Miseries (Vickers 331).

All of these eccentricities appear to some degree in every Shakespeare play.

Kevin Gilvary in his Dating Shakespeare's Plays asserts that there is no way to assign
certain dates to Shakespeare's plays (473). Gilvary finds no correspondence between prose as
a proportion of a play, use of rhyme compared with use of blank verse, lines with feminine
endings, lines with light and weak endings, or changes in linguistic preference for doth or
does, and a play's position in the chronology. He notes multiple inconsistencies in the use of
stylometry to arrange chronology, especially in the case of Pericles. Of Pericles, he states,
The play can be dated any time between the publication of Laurence Twine's *Painfull Adventures* (possibly as early as 1576 but no later than 1594) and the publication of the Quarto in 1609" (Gilvary 435). As Gilvary observes, there is a wide range of possible dates of composition.

**Prince Henry and the Elizabethan Revival (1594-1612)**

The 1608 publication of George Wilkins's novel coincides with the fourteenth birthday of Prince Henry of Wales, oldest son of James I. Henry was an athletic boy with "no pretensions to scholarship," a good audience for a story of pirates and shipwrecks, knights and chivalry. Claire Asquith believes Shakespeare wrote *Pericles* hoping to win the Prince to the Catholic cause (Asquith 246). Henry's little sister, Princess Elizabeth, was twelve, and the future Charles I of England was only eight. Like the three de Vere daughters in 1589, the royal children were the perfect ages for the tone, episodic plot, and wild fantastical story of *Pericles*. Yates observes that James I claimed Elizabeth's symbolism when he claimed her throne and points out an Elizabethan revival associated with the prince (Yates 18). The emphasis was on religious purity, rather than virginity, and Arthur and his knights, rather than the moon, were the iconography, but the tilts on Accession Day were a particular favorite with the young prince (Yates 78-9). That the fictional princess, Marina, turns fourteen in the play suggests that the play was revived for the Prince's fourteenth birthday. If the original were written for a boy, however, one would expect more pirates, more jousting, and more emphasis on manly honor and less emphasis on female chastity. One would also expect a great deal more flattery directed at James I, if the play were actually a product of the Jacobean period.
The impresa scene, with its Latin phrases, and Gower's Latin quotes, argues against the play having been written with James I's twelve-year-old daughter, Princess Elizabeth in mind. Although she was a very educated girl, James I disapproved of teaching girls Latin, feeling that it made them too cunning (Fraser 71). Although *Pericles*, like all of Shakespeare's plays, was wildly popular at the court of James, there is very little to link it to the private lives or public obsessions of his court. Even the tournament scene, reminiscent of tilts Prince Henry loved so, is, as this thesis has shown, a relic from Elizabeth's time, loaded with topical references to her court, not to that of James. It would have been a simple matter to insert a few Jacobean topicalities, but no one seems to have thought to do so. Anderson compares Shakespeare's plays to a palimpsest, “popular dramas refashioned from works that were originally written for an elite audience in the 1570s and '80s” (Anderson 123-4). *Pericles* was extraordinarily popular throughout the Jacobean period. “It was chosen, on at least two occasions in the early seventeenth century, for the entertainment of visiting dignitaries, and, even more impressively, it had the distinction of being among the first staged Shakespeare plays of the Restoration” (Anderson 123-4). Yet there is no mention of it for another hundred years (Skeele 2).
Pericles, as Anderson observes, is like a palimpsest, showing many layers of revision, many sources and much topicality relating it to the Elizabethan period. With its simple characters, black-and-white morality, poetic justice, and didacticism, it shows signs of having been written for children, or by a youthful author. The fantastical elements of the tale, its episodic plot, and the solicitude of its narrator also support this interpretation. If the 1577 performance of Pastorell, historie of a Greeke maide, by the Children of Paul's, is actually an early version of Pericles, then it was written for children to perform, possibly with an adult guest star from Leicester's Men as Gower. It may also have been written with the courtly children in mind, in particular Elizabeth Vere, whose life it seems to mirror in many ways. The comet imagery and biographical similarity to the de Vere family suggest that it was inspired by those events, perhaps even intended as a gift to Elizabeth Vere, who also may have received the gift of a Shakespeare play, A Midsummer Night's Dream, for her 1595 wedding to William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby. It would be appropriate for a play written for courtly children between 1577 and 1589, to be revived for another generation of courtly children in 1608. Like Harry Potter, The Wizard of Oz, and Alice In Wonderland, it is a fantastical tale geared towards the forgiving imaginations of children, but ultimately loved most by adults.

There is no direct external evidence to support an earlier date, but there is a great deal of internal evidence. With its exploration of alchemical themes, and its many references to prominent figures of the 1570s and 1580s, such as John Dee, Philip Sidney, Pedro Valdés,
and Elizabeth I herself, *Pericles* clearly holds a mirror up to Elizabethan times. Although it was performed many times in playhouses and at court under James I, it contains no Jacobean topical references. Even the lines of the clowns, designed for the comic actor to alter by inserting his own topical jokes, contain no Jacobean references. The style of the play is that of a young or inexperienced writer, the themes of interest to a young man. Without more information it is impossible to set a fixed date of composition, but based on the internal evidence of the play, *Pericles* was composed no earlier than 1577, no later than 1592, and most likely took the form familiar to modern audiences, with its many allusions to the Armada victory, in 1589.
APPENDIX

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

First or second century C.E. original Greek novel of Apollonius of Tyre postulated.

Ninth century C.E. Numerous Latin translations of the Apollonius story circulate.

Eleventh Century, an English manuscript of Apollonius extant, preserved in Corpus Christi College in Cambridge.

1186 Godfrey de Viterbo’s Pantheon is published, containing the Gesta Romanorum.

1483 Gower’s Confessio Amantis is printed by William Caxton.

1510 Prose translation from French by Robert Copland, printed by Wynkyn de Worde.

1532 Gower’s Confessio Amantis reprinted by Thomas Berthelet.

1544 11-year-old Elizabeth I translates Marguerite d’Angouleme’s Miroir de l’ame pecheresse under the title The Glass of the Sinful Soul as a gift to her stepmother, Catherine Parr.

1550 Edward de Vere is born.

1554 Gower’s Confessio Amantis second reprinting by Thomas Berthelet.

1558 Elizabeth I is crowned queen on a date selected by astrologer John Dee.

1559 Act of Uniformity effectively outlaws religious theatre.

1560 Elizabeth I has new silver sixpences printed with her face, in purer silver than used in previous decades.

1562 Edward de Vere becomes 17th Earl of Oxford upon the death of the 16th Earl, his father.

1564 William Shakespeare born.

1566 Dutch rebellion led by William the Silent of Orange.

1571 Edward de Vere purchases a copy of the 1571 Geneva Bible.

1571 Edward de Vere wins most of the events at the May tournaments.

1571 Edward de Vere marries Anne Cecil, who had been engaged to Philip Sidney.

1572 Marriage of Henry of Navarre and Marguerite de Valois.

1572 Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, in which 5,000 to 30,000 Huguenots are slaughtered. Catherine de Medici is generally blamed.

1572 Leicester’s Men play in Stratford.
1573 Lawrence and Thomas Twine dedicate *Breviary of Britain* to Edward de Vere.

1575 Edward de Vere, now licensed to travel abroad, goes to Italy in February.

1575 Elizabeth Vere is allegedly born in July.

1575 Elizabeth Vere is christened in September, and de Vere first learns of her birth. The late christening and delay in the news make him skeptical of his paternity, as he has not been with his wife since October of the previous year.

1576 On his way home from Italy, Edward de Vere is abducted by pirates.

1576 Lawrence Twine, gentleman, licensed “The Patterne of Painfull Adventures, Containing the most excellent, pleasant, and variable Historie of the strange accidents that befell vnto Prince Apollonius, the Lady Lucina his wife and Tharsia his daughter. Wherein the uncertaintie of this world, and the fickle state of mans life are lively described. Gathered into English by Lawrance Twine Gentleman. Imprinted at London by William How. 1576.” No known extant copies of How’s edition exist.

1576 John Shakespeare, charged with illegal wool dealing, loses his position. William is twelve.

1576 James Burbage opens The Theatre.

1576 Richard Farrant, Master of Windsor Chapel leases part of Blackfriars to stage plays for the Queen, and to rehearse the boy choristers.

1577 Tycho Brahe’s comet sighted in November, and remains visible until January of 1578.

1577 In December, the Duchess of Suffolk writes a letter conspiring to bring Edward de Vere and his daughter Elizabeth together without telling him.

1577 *The Historie of a Greek Maid* appears in the *Revels Accounts*.

1578 Falkenburgk Manuscript of the *Gesta Romanorum* printed at Richard Graphei.

1578 On John Dee's recommendation, Queen Elizabeth I and several courtiers invest in Martin Frobisher's third expedition, which returns with iron pyrite, not gold. Edward de Vere loses the most of anyone, having ventured £3,000.

1579 Edward de Vere and Philip Sidney quarrel publicly over tennis court privileges.

1579 Thomas North’s *Plutarch’s Lives* printed in English.

1579 Stephen Gosson’s *School of Abuse* dedicated to Philip Sidney.

1579 Philip Sidney’s *Defense of Poesie* most likely written this year.

1580 Edward de Vere denounces his companions Charles Arundell, Henry Howard, and Francis Southwell for Catholic heresy and treason, confesses and throws himself on Elizabeth’s mercy.
1580 Edward de Vere takes on the patronage of Oxford’s Men.

1580 The Dover Straits earthquake shakes London.

1580 Philip Sidney is banished from court, writes Arcadia to entertain his sister while he is her guest.

1581 Edward de Vere and Philip Sidney cooperate as teammates at Accession Day tournament. De Vere appears as “Knight of the Tree of the Sunne.”

1581 Anne Vavasor gives birth to de Vere’s illegitimate son, Edward Vere. The illicit lovers are confined separately in the Tower.

1582 Edward de Vere reconciles with his wife, Anne Cecil.

1583 John Somerville, a Catholic from Warwickshire, threatens to kill Elizabeth I with a pistol.

1583 Edward de Vere subleases Blackfriars and gives control of it to John Lyly.

1583 Children of the Chapel and Children of Paul’s combine to form Oxford’s Boys.

1583 Oxford’s Men and Leicester’s Men combine to form the Queen’s Men

1583 John Dee and Edward Kelly accompany Alberto Laski to Poland.

1584 William the Silent, leader of the Dutch rebellion is assassinated with a pistol by Catholic radical Balthasar Gérard.

1585 Elizabeth I signs the treaty of Nonesuch, committing troops, weapons, supplies, and money to lift the Siege of Antwerp.

1585 Elizabeth sends Edward de Vere to the Lowlands as Commander of the Horse.

1585 Elizabeth I is offered the rulership of the Netherlands under the title of Governor General of the Provinces, but declines.

1585 Elizabeth I sends Philip Sidney to replace Oxford as General of the Horse, he also assumes the position of Governor of Flushing. Leicester accepts the Governorship Elizabeth declined, and is ordered to return home.

1585 One of de Vere's ships, on the way back to England, is taken by the Spanish.

1586 Philip Sidney dies in the Battle of Zutphen.

1587 The Rose, chief venue for the Admiral’s Men, opens at Bankside.

1587 Execution of Mary Queen of Scots is taken as an act of war by Philip of Spain.

1588 Richard Tarleton, Elizabeth I’s favorite comedian, dies.

1588 June 5 Anne Cecil, Edward de Vere's wife and Elizabeth Vere’s mother, dies.

1588 July, Elizabeth I’s navy defeats the Spanish Armada.
1588 Walter Raleigh commissions a painting of himself under a crescent moon in black and white livery, commemorating the association of Elizabeth I with the moon.

1588 The Earl of Leicester, Elizabeth’s favorite, dies.

1589 George Puttenham’s *Arte of English Poesie* is printed.

1589 John Dee returns from Poland to find his home vandalized.

1590 Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia* published.

1592 *Greene’s Vision* published with Gower as one of its main characters.

1592 Greene’s *Groatsworth of Wit* published.

1593 Theatres are closed because of plague.

1593 First appearance of the name Shakespeare in print, on *Venus and Adonis*.

1594 Second printing of Twine’s book.

1594 The Queen’s Men become The Lord Chamberlain’s Men, under the supervision of Henry Carey, First Baron Hunsdon. Lord Strange’s company dissolves and is absorbed into the Chamberlain’s Men, with exclusive rights to the Globe Theatre. Will Kempe, Richard Burbage, and Will Shakespeare first join the Lord Chamberlain’s Men.

1595 Elizabeth Vere marries William Stanley. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* is probably written for this occasion.

1595 Elizabeth I appoints John Dee Warden of Christ's College in Manchester.

1596 The Theatre closes.

1596 Theatres cannot operate inside London’s City limits; many companies go on tour.

1596 Richard Burbage purchases Blackfriars, but cannot open it.

1597 The Curtain becomes the primary venue of the Chamberlain’s Men.

1598 First Quarto edition of *Love’s Labor’s Lost* appears with Shakespeare’s name on it.

1598 James VI of Scotland writes *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies*.

1598 William Shakespeare listed as a “principle comedian” in Every Man in His Humor.*

1598 Francis Meres’s *Palladis Tamia* published.

1599 The Chamberlain’s Men build the Globe Theatre out of salvaged timber from The Theatre.

1603 Elizabeth I dies, leaving no successor.

1603 King James I takes the throne.
1603 The Lord Chamberlain’s Men become The King’s Men
1603 William Shakespeare listed as a “principal tragedian” in Ben Jonson’s Sejanus.
1604 Edward de Vere dies of plague June 24, at his house in Hackney.
1604 August, King James I signs the Treaty of London, ending the war with Spain.
1604 Kepler's supernova appears on October ninth.
1604 Christmas, King James I has seven Shakespeare plays performed. De Vere's daughter, Susan, marries Philip Herbert, First Earl of Montgomery, later Fourth Earl of Pembroke, at court during these celebrations.
1604 First Parliament of James I passes a stricter witchcraft law appearing to target John Dee.
1606 The Venetian Ambassador, Zorzi Gustinian, writes of a production of *Pericles* while visiting London between 1606-1608, for which he paid twenty crowns.
1607 On January thirty-first, Elizabeth Vere has her first son, James Stanley, Seventh Earl of Derby.
1607 Halley’s Comet is observed from September 21 to October 26.
1607 Twine’s book is reprinted.
1608 February nineteenth is the fourteenth birthday of James I’s eldest son, Henry IX.
1608 John Day’s *Law Tricks* published.
1608 Richard Burbage regains the lease on Blackfriars.
1608 *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* staged at the Globe by the King’s Men.
1608 Edward Blount obtained a license for publishing both *Pericles* and *Anthony and Cleopatra* on May 20.
1608 George Wilkins’s novel, “*The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre. Being The true History of the Play of Pericles, as it was lately presented by the worthy and an-cient Poet John Gower*” is printed.
1608 or 1609 John Dee dies in poverty and disgrace at his house in Mortlake.
1609 Two Quarto editions of *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* by William Shakespeare are published by Henry Gosson.
1609 ‘Pimlyco or Runne Red-cap: Tis a mad world at Hogsdon’ contains the lines:

Amazde I stood, to see a Crowd
Of Civill Throats stretchd out so lowd;
(As at a New-play) all the Roomes
Did swarme with Gentiles mix’d with Groomes,
So that I truly thought all These Came to see Shore or Pericles (Sig. C1, line 6).

1610 Ben Jonson’s satirical play The Alchemist is performed.

1611 Another Quarto edition of Pericles, Prince of Tyre is published.

1612 Bellott v. Mountjoy lawsuit over dowry names William Shakespeare and George Wilkins as witnesses and refers to them both as having lodged at Mountjoy’s in 1604.

1613 The Globe theatre burns to the ground during a performance of Henry VIII.

1614 Robert Tailor’s comedy, The Hogge hath lost his Pearle, has the line “If it prove so happy as to please, Weele say ’tis fortunate like Pericles.”

1614 A second Globe Theatre is built on the foundations of the first one.

1616 April 25, burial of William Shakespeare in Stratford.

1619 Court performance in honor of the French ambassador, the Marquis de Trenouille.

1619 Thomas Pavier and William Jaggard together attempt to publish a folio of ten of Shakespeare's plays, and are ordered to desist.

1621 The Second Globe burns to the ground.

1623 The First Folio, dedicated to William and Philip Herbert, is published without Pericles.

1623 Ben Jonson's personal library is destroyed by fire.

1630 Another Quarto edition of Pericles is published.

1630 Ben Jonson, in “Ode to Himself” refers to “some mouldy tale like Pericles.”

1631 Pericles is revived at the Globe “Upon the cessation of the plague.”

1632 Second Folio published without Pericles.

1642 Puritans close all of the theatres in England.

1644 Second Globe Theatre demolished by Puritans.

1646 Samuel Sheppard in The Times Displayed said “great Shakespeare...outran the powers of Aristophanes.”
1648 Puritans order theatres pulled down, all players whipped, and a fine of five shillings imposed on anyone caught attending a play.

1649 Charles I is beheaded.

1653 Oliver Cromwell becomes Lord Protector of England.

1658 Cromwell dies and Puritans begin to lose power.

1660 Charles II crowned king and the monarchy is restored.

1660 *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* is the first play produced for King Charles II by the Duke’s Company, led by William Davenant.

1664 Third Folio includes *Pericles*, along with six spurious plays.

1684 Dryden in Prologue to Charles Davenant’s *Circe* writes his famous quote:

> “Shakespeare’s own Muse her *Pericles* first bore,
> The Prince of *Tyre* was elder than the *Moore*."

1685 Fourth Folio is published with *Pericles*. 
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