

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Literary studies

This series provides a high-quality selection of early printings of literary works, textual editions, anthologies and literary criticism which are of lasting scholarly interest. Ranging from Old English to Shakespeare to early twentieth-century work from around the world, these books offer a valuable resource for scholars in reception history, textual editing, and literary studies.

Pericles

John Dover Wilson's New Shakespeare, published between 1921 and 1966, became the classic Cambridge edition of Shakespeare's plays and poems until the 1980s. The series, long since out-of-print, is now reissued. Each work is available both individually and as part of a set, and each contains a lengthy and lively introduction, main text, and substantial notes and glossary printed at the back. The edition, which began with *The Tempest* and ended with *The Sonnets*, put into practice the techniques and theories that had evolved under the 'New Bibliography'. Remarkably by today's standards, although it took the best part of half a century to produce, the New Shakespeare involved only a small band of editors besides Dover Wilson himself. As the volumes took shape, many of Dover Wilson's textual methods acquired general acceptance and became an established part of later editorial practice, for example in the *Arden* and *New Cambridge Shakespeares*. The reissue of this series in the Cambridge Library Collection complements the other historic editions also now made available.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Pericles

The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare

VOLUME 26

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
EDITED BY JOHN DOVER WILSON



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge New York Melbourne Madrid Cape Town Singapore São Paulo Delhi

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108005982

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2009

This edition first published 1956
This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00598-2

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE

EDITED FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BY

JOHN DOVER WILSON

PERICLES

EDITED BY

J. C. MAXWELL

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PERICLES
PRINCE OF TYRE



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1969

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by
Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521094948

© Cambridge University Press 1956, 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1956
First paperback edition 1969
Re-issued in this digitally printed version 2009

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-07550-3 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-09494-8 paperback

CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE	PAGE vii
INTRODUCTION	ix
A. THE STORY	x
B. THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORSHIP	xii
C. WHAT SHAKESPEARE MADE OF IT	xxv
THE STAGE-HISTORY	xxx
TO THE READER	xli
<i>PERICLES, PRINCE OF TYRE</i>	i
THE COPY FOR <i>PERICLES, PRINCE OF TYRE</i> , 1609	88
NOTES	98
GLOSSARY	196

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - *Pericles*, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFATORY NOTE

Pericles, probably only Shakespeare's in part, and surviving in a single text, namely a bad quarto, obscure in origin and evidently much corrupted by unknown agencies of transmission, offers the editor a task of extreme perplexity in return for which he can expect little gratitude. I can assure Mr J. C. Maxwell that in generously undertaking it he has earned the sincere thanks of one man at least. For what follows, apart from the stage-history, he is in fact entirely responsible, my own contribution being limited to suggestions here and there, mostly to the best of my recollection, of minor importance.

J. D. W.

1955

Since my first edition, a very thorough one by F. D. Hoeniger has appeared in the *Arden Shakespeare* (1963). I have introduced a few corrections from it, but must refer readers to it for discussion of difficulties. Mr Hoeniger presents John Day as a possible author of the non-Shakespearian portions. He has also had access to unpublished marginalia by Lewis Theobald, which anticipate many emendations of later scholars. I have also been fortunate enough to be able to consult marginalia by H. H. Vaughan, author of *New Readings and New Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies* (1878–86), who annotated an interleaved copy of Steevens's

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
William Shakespeare
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

edition of 1793 with a view to publication. Through the generosity of Sir Gyles Isham, these volumes are now in the English Faculty Library, Oxford. I quote the annotations as 'Vaughan MS'.

Another smaller, but valuable, edition is that by Ernest Schanzer, *Signet Classic Shakespeare* (1965).

J. C. M.

1968

INTRODUCTION

Pericles is the one play not in the First Folio which is now regularly included in collected editions. It was published six times, with Shakespeare's name on the title-page, between 1609 and 1635, Q 4 (1619) forming part of Jaggard's projected edition of the plays.¹ In that edition some attempt was made to improve the text by conjecture. Its next appearance was in the second issue of the Third Folio (1664), along with six completely spurious attributions. It was included in the Fourth Folio and in Rowe's editions, but not in subsequent eighteenth-century collections. A duodecimo edition of 1734² and Lillo's adaptation, *Marina* (1738), make occasional contributions to the text for which later editors have failed to give them credit, but the first serious attempt to edit the play was made by Malone in his supplement (1780) to Steevens's 1778 edition. Here *Pericles* appeared in a collected edition for the first time since Rowe, and since Malone's later edition of 1790 it has regularly been included in the canon.

The inferiority of much of the play in its present form led some earlier readers, from Dryden onwards,³ to the conclusion that it was one of Shakespeare's earliest works, but it is clear from the style that the indubitably Shakespearian portions are to be linked with the 'Last Plays', and it is now generally agreed

¹ See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 133 ff.; W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, pp. 11-17.

² Based on Rowe, and not (as the Cambridge editors, p. ix, assert) F 4. H. L. Ford, *Shakespeare 1700-1740*, 1935, p. 119, records a second 1734 ed., issued with a new title-page and dramatis personae in 1735.

³ See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, ii. 251.

that it cannot have been more than a few years old when it was first published. Beyond this, almost everything is in dispute, and the different aspects of the problems must now be discussed.

A. THE STORY

The story of Apollonius of Tyre,¹ the ultimate source of the play, can be traced to about the fifth century A.D. The earliest version survives only in Latin, but it is very much in the manner of the later Greek novel, though folk-tale motifs are more than usually prominent. All the extensive discussions of the story and its many versions are over fifty years old. The only one in English, A. H. Smyth's *Shakespeare's Pericles and Apollonius of Tyre* (Philadelphia, 1898), though praised by Chambers,² is a rather slovenly piece of work, and even for the specific purposes of the student of Shakespeare, more is to be learned from the two German monographs, S. Singer's *Apollonius von Tyrus* (Halle, 1895) and E. Klebs's *Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus* (Berlin, 1899). Klebs's study in particular is exhaustive (532 pp.), and has a good discussion of the relation of *Pericles* to its immediate sources, though it exaggerates the importance of Twine, as against Gower, for Acts 4 and 5. Some of the contentions in the earlier parts of the book, notably the author's rejection of the usual belief in a lost Greek original, have not been generally accepted.³ To those who are interested in the continued vitality of the story may be recommended an article by

¹ Shakespeare may have drawn on it as early as *The Comedy of Errors*: see E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 311.

² *Op. cit.* i. 527.

³ See, e.g., F. Garin, *Mnemosyne*, n.s. XLII (1914), 198-212.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - *Pericles*, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xi

R. M. Dawkins, 'Modern Greek Oral Versions of Apollonios of Tyre'.¹

For the study of *Pericles*, only two versions of the story are directly relevant: that of John Gower in Book VIII of the *Confessio Amantis*, and Laurence Twine's *Patterne of Paynfull Aduentures*, registered in 1576, and surviving in an undated edition and in a reprint of 1607. The use of these two sources is discussed in notes at the head of the commentary on each scene, and here it is enough to say that the dramatist who originally planned the play clearly had both before him throughout, though he generally keeps closer to Gower, to whom he owes most of his proper names. Comparison with the sources is one of the things which make it difficult to believe that the play as we have it represents, however imperfectly, an entirely Shakespearian original. The plotter follows a complicated episodic narrative in a fashion unparalleled in Shakespeare, and makes very little attempt to adapt it to the requirements of drama, though the introduction of Gower reflects a certain sense of the difficulties involved. It might be said that it is only by means of a deliberately naïve transcription that this fantastic and often irrational narrative could be put on the stage at all,² but the contrast with Shakespeare's normal methods is none the less striking.³ Not long after he had worked on *Pericles*, he was again to compose an episodic tragic-comedy rich in folk-tale material. But his treatment of his sources in *Cymbeline* is very different from what we find in *Pericles*.⁴ Material is brought together from a

¹ *Modern Language Review*, xxxvii (1942), 169–84.

² Cf. p. xxviii below.

³ Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch made this point forcibly in *Shakespeare's Workmanship* (1931 ed.), pp. 198–9.

⁴ For the most recent treatment, see J. M. Nosworthy's Introduction to the Arden edition, 1955.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - *Pericles*, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

variety of places, and is thoroughly rehandled. Again, in *The Winter's Tale*, which like *Pericles* has a single narrative source,¹ there is also a much freer and more imaginative handling of plot-material. If it was Shakespeare who first dramatized the story, all we can say is that he used a method he never used before or after.²

B. THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORSHIP

The name of George Wilkins enters into the story of *Pericles* in two ways: it is certain that he is the author of a novel published in 1608, *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*, which claims on its title-page to be 'The true History of the Play of *Pericles*, as it was lately presented by the worthy and ancient poet *John Gower*³, to which the Argument adds that the play was acted by the King's Players; and it has been conjectured that Wilkins was himself part-author of it. It is now agreed by all that the novel is in fact, as it claims, based on a play, though with considerable supplementation from Twine's *Patterne of Paynfull Aduentures*. The contrary view that the novel was the source of the play, championed by H. Dugdale Sykes,³ is certainly mistaken.⁴ What is still the subject of controversy is whether

¹ Gower and Twine are close enough to each other to justify putting it this way. They are used concurrently in *Pericles*, but never fused into a more complex whole.

² Of other works which may have influenced the play, only two are of sufficient importance to be mentioned here: Sidney's *Arcadia* and Plautus's *Rudens*. Affinities between the latter and *Pericles* were first noted by Malone (1821 *Variorum*, xxi. 197) and have recently been discussed in detail by Dr Percy Simpson, *Studies in Elizabethan Drama* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 17-22. Dr Simpson is inclined to credit Shakespeare with a first-hand knowledge of Plautus (p. 1).

³ *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (1919).

⁴ See K. Muir, *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 68.

INTRODUCTION

xiii

the novel is based on the play of which the 1609 quarto gives us a garbled version,¹ or on an earlier form of it (an *Ur-Pericles*); and whether, in either event, Wilkins had anything to do with the play.

The simpler view, and to that extent the more attractive, is that Wilkins's connection with the subject begins and ends with his novel, and that this was based on the same version of the play as the 1609 quarto reports. I think this is probably the right view.² Wilkins does not seem to have been overburdened with modesty or conscience (witness his rifling of Twine's novel), and if he could have laid any claim to authorship of the play, it seems likely that he would have done so. Nor is there any external evidence of an *Ur-Pericles* on the stage. Wilkins's mention of the recent production does not, indeed, preclude the existence of an earlier one, since he would naturally have linked his novel with the recent popular success. But the complete coincidence of characters' names in the play and novel favours the view that he used the play after it had passed through Shakespeare's hands. It is difficult to believe that the name 'Marina' at least, with its resemblance to 'Perdita' and 'Miranda', was not of Shakespeare's invention. Professor Muir, one of the champions of an *Ur-Pericles* by Wilkins as the main dramatic source of the novel, admits this, but believes that the latter was contaminated by the final Shakespearean version.³

What are the positive grounds for the more complicated theory that the novel is based on an *Ur-Pericles*, whether by Wilkins or another? Professor

¹ Cf. Note on the Copy, p. 88.

² So P. Edwards, *Shakespeare Survey*, v (1952), 39; S. Spiker, *Studies in Philology*, xxx (1933), 551-70 (still the best study of the problem).

³ *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 75-7.

Muir, the latest scholar to argue at length for it, takes his stand mainly on two scenes, 4. 6 and 5. 1. In the former, play and novel give radically different versions of Lysimachus's motives in coming to the brothel. Wilkins depicts him as being converted from his lascivious intentions, which he urges with promises and threats, by Marina's eloquence; in *Pericles*, he claims (somewhat abruptly and obscurely) not to have 'brought... a corrupted mind' (l. 108), and to have come 'with no ill intent' (l. 111). Assuming that each version represents a different original, Professor Muir argues that 'it would have been natural for Shakespeare, working on the *Ur-Pericles*, to tone down the brutality,¹ so as to make Lysimachus a less intolerable husband for the pure Marina'.² One may doubt this, remembering that Shakespeare did not consider Angelo an 'intolerable' husband for the (admittedly less pure) Mariana.³ Professor Muir also points out a number of verse fossils in Wilkins's version, and writes, 'if Wilkins in his verse fossils were merely reproducing lines which had been accidentally omitted by the quarto, it is curious that the reporter was so much less accurate in reproducing a popular brothel scene than he was in reproducing the scene of the reunion of Pericles and Marina'.⁴ Neither of these arguments seems to me to have much force. The quarto version of Lysimachus's disclaimer of 'ill intent' is dramatically inept. As Edwards notes, the

¹ I.e. of his threats 'that he was the Gouvernour, whose authoritie could wincke at those blemishes, . . . or his displeasure punish at his owne pleasure' (*Painfull Adventures*, ed. Muir, pp. 88–9). ² *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 73.

³ Cf. Edwards, *Shakespeare Survey*, v (1952), 44.

⁴ *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 73; in his Introduction to *Painfull Adventures*, p. vii, Professor Muir expresses the view that 'the verse preserved by Wilkins is more primitive than the verse of Act 5' of the play.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xv

bawds greet Lysimachus as an old friend, and the 'scene of dissimulation' which the quarto gives us would be 'a silly trick on Lysimachus's part, which hangs loose on the action of the play'.¹ And as he goes on to point out, even if we were to accept the quarto version to this extent, we should still have to admit considerable loss in the scene: there has been nothing to justify such words as 'I did not think thou couldst have spoke so well, | Ne'er dreamed thou couldst' (ll. 104-5). Yet such eloquence is what Wilkins gives us some trace of. This being so, little importance can be attached to the fact that verse in Q and verse fossils in Wilkins do not coincide. It is never safe to assume that what a reporter omits was not in the play, just because it seems to us that, if it had been there, it *ought* to have been reported; nor is Wilkins's version so exhaustive as to make it particularly surprising that he omitted the verse that *is* present in Q. As a main argument for an *Ur-Pericles* as Wilkins's source, Professor Muir's seems quite inadequate. The situation in 5. 1 is similar. Here it is claimed that Shakespeare in revision removed the episode in which Pericles 'strucke' Marina 'on the face',² so that she swooned. This blow is not an addition to the story: it is mentioned in Gower (ll. 1693-4), though the face is not specified. The only difference between the two versions is one of degrees of violence. Though Q has no relevant stage-directions, ll. 101, 129 imply that he has thrust her roughly from him. In Twine, as Professor Muir points out, Apollonius is even more brutal, in that he 'stroke the maiden on the face with his foote, so that she fell to the ground, and the bloud gushed plentifully out of her cheeks'³ The

¹ *Shakespeare Survey*, v (1952), 43.

² Wilkins, *Painfull Adventures*, ed. Muir, p. 105.

³ Twine's *Patterne in Shakespeare's Library*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Part I, iv. 311.

phrase 'struck on the face' is common to Twine and Wilkins, who is again following Twine almost literally a few lines further on. In view of this, it seems unnecessarily complicated to hold with Professor Muir that 'Wilkins, and doubtless the *Ur-Pericles*, are midway between the crudity of Twine and the comparative refinement of Shakespeare.'¹ It is more likely that the original dramatizer (whether Shakespeare or another) followed Gower, and that Wilkins, conflating the play with Twine, introduces a little more violence, and a swoon, from the latter. Even the blow on the face may have been present in the original text of the play. At ll. 96–7 Marina says, 'But there is something glows upon my cheek, | And whispers in mine ear "Go not till he speak."' As it stands this scarcely makes sense, and 'glows upon my cheek' may be a misplaced fragment of a reference to the blow.

Nowhere else in Wilkins's novel is there anything that positively suggests as its source an *Ur-Pericles* rather than the play as it was when Q reported it. But this does not mean that we need go to the extreme of denying that there ever was a pre-Shakespearian version of all or part of the play. *Pericles* as we have it falls into two sharply contrasting parts, of which the first, Acts 1–2, shows few if any signs of Shakespeare's hand, whereas the second, Acts 3–5, certainly goes back to a Shakespearian original. It is at least a possible theory that Shakespeare took up an existing play, left the first two acts untouched or almost untouched, and completely rewrote the second half.

The simplest way of disposing of any such theory would be to hold that the whole of Q is based on a Shakespearian original, and that the sharp contrast between the two parts is due entirely to the different methods and capabilities of two different reporters. In

¹ *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 74.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - *Pericles*, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xvii

his important article in *Shakespeare Survey*, v (1952), Mr Philip Edwards argues strongly for two reporters as the immediate cause of the apparent disparity, though he does not commit himself to a positive assertion of sole Shakespearian authorship of the original. He presents his arguments ably, but I do not find them convincing. It would probably be unfair to lay too much stress on the fact that no such sharp contrast of reporting methods (as distinct from mere unevenness in quality) can be found in any other Bad Quarto, since *Pericles* is on any showing a play with problems of its own which may require solutions not applicable elsewhere. But it is hard to believe that any method of reporting would turn verse which originally resembled that of Acts 3–5 into what we find in Acts 1–2.

Some light is thrown by Wilkins's novel on the level of the reporting. The degree of resemblance between it and Q is *prima facie* evidence about the reliability of the latter. It is true that where they diverge widely it would be rash to pin the blame confidently on one rather than the other, especially as Wilkins's version is so heavily conflated with Twine, but where they closely resemble each other, it is a reasonable inference that they also resemble the original. The one other possibility that has to be borne in mind here is contamination of Q by the printed text of the novel, and I argue in the Note on the Copy¹ that the 'bibliographical links' that have been suggested are not strong enough to bear the weight of any such argument. Now in 2. 2 the two texts are fairly close together, and Edwards himself notes that 'in a slow-moving piece of pageantry... where there was time for the words spoken on the stage to be imprinted on the memory, the two versions run together almost word for word',² but he does not say whether he regards this wording as

¹ Pp. 92–3 below.

² P. 40.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xviii

PERICLES

conceivably Shakespearian. Shakespeare's authorship might be defended on the analogy of the Vision in *Cymbeline*, where also verse is subordinate to spectacle, but even so I find it hard to accept it. In general, Wilkins affords no positive evidence that Q is further from its original in Acts 1–2 than in Acts 3–5. It is worth noting that of the two scenes which, according to Edwards himself, are particularly mangled in Q, one (1. 2) is in the first half and the other (4. 6) in the second half of the play. Edwards, it is true, credits the reporter of Acts 1–2 with 'attempting to cobble together into a metrical pattern the imperfectly remembered verse of another writer... perhaps he wholly rewrites much, preserving only the sense of the original';¹ but one cannot avoid being suspicious when this reporter is endowed with just the qualities he would have had to have, on Edwards's theory, to account for what the Quarto offers.

A further disadvantage of the hypothesis that there once existed a wholly Shakespearian *Pericles* is that it makes the exclusion of the play from the First Folio difficult to understand. The obvious explanation is that the play was not regarded as substantially Shakespeare's,² and it is undesirable to fall back on wholly conjectural copyright difficulties as an *ad hoc* solution.³

If, then, it is accepted as probable that Shakespeare

¹ P. 36.

² See, e.g., W. W. Greg, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, pp. 19–21, which deals with possible parallels: *Henry VIII* and *1 Henry VI* among the plays included in F, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* among those omitted.

³ J. G. McManaway, *Shakespeare Survey*, VI (1953), 165, suggests this as a possibility. W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, p. 98, impressed by Edwards's arguments, is rather more favourably disposed than he was before towards the hypothesis that a good text was not available to the Folio editors.

INTRODUCTION

xix

was not the sole author of the play reported in Q, further questions arise, and the claims of Wilkins must again be discussed. If, as I have argued, Wilkins's novel is dependent on the Shakespearian version of the play, and not on an *Ur-Pericles*, one piece of evidence for supposing him to have had a share in the play is destroyed. The use of a version other than that which was a current stage success would have been such an odd proceeding as to call for a special explanation, and Wilkins's authorship of the *Ur-Pericles* would have been a plausible one. But if the novel is based on the same original as Q, Wilkins has, at best, no special claim to be considered as originator or part-author of the play. There are, however, specific arguments for his hand in the play which have seemed strong to a number of scholars. They were set out at great length by Dugdale Sykes (*Sidelights on Shakespeare*), and are summarized by Professor Muir,¹ who attaches considerable weight to them. (1) Wilkins frequently omitted the relative pronoun in the nominative case, and this is a characteristic of *Pericles*, Acts 1–2. (2) There are parallels between *Pericles* and Wilkins's acknowledged work, notably the reference to the myth that vipers devour their mother (*Pericles*, I. I. 64–5; *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*,² pp. 522, 565); the image in *Pericles* I. 2. 30–1,

the tops of trees

Which fence the roots they grow by and defend them,
 which resembles *Miseries*, p. 480:

Men must be like the branch and bark to trees,
 Which doth defend them from tempestuous rage:

¹ *English Studies*, xxx (1949), 77–8. I summarize Professor Muir's summary a little more, omitting the arguments he regards as unconvincing.

² In Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, ix.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - *Pericles*, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

and the descriptions of famine in *Pericles* 1. 4 and in *The Three Miseries of Barbary*, D 2^r. (3) Wilkins would not have called the novel his 'infant' if the story had been lifted bodily from the play; but he might have done so if the novel was based, not on the Shakespeare *Pericles*, but on his own *Ur-Pericles*.¹

The last of these arguments I reject out of hand; I have already said why I think the novel was not based on an *Ur-Pericles*, and Wilkins's shameless pilfering from Twine makes it most unlikely that he would measure words carefully in making claims for himself; indeed, as I have suggested, one would have expected him to state, and even exaggerate, any claims he had to a share in the play. The other two arguments are also flimsy. For the syntactical trick noted in (1), it is enough to refer to H. D. Gray's count of fifteen instances in Acts 1-2 of Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*.² The parallels cited under (2) are not striking either. There can have been few writers of the time who were not familiar with the mythical habits of the viper; the two tree images are quite different in their bearing; and the resemblances between the famine descriptions are of the most commonplace kind.³

The case for Wilkins, then, is by no means strong. It is further weakened by W. T. Hastings, who points to Wilkins's reliance on Twine in his novel for the framework of the story, notes that 'details of play,

¹ Sykes was anticipated by Delius in this argument.

² *PMLA*, XL (1925), 529.

³ One example of what Sykes considers a parallel will suffice: 'the parents "mourning and pining up and down" of *The Three Miseries of Barbary* are represented by "here a lord and there a lady weeping" in the play' (p. 167). Well might E. H. C. Oliphant take Sykes as an example in his article 'How Not to Play the Game of Parallels' (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXVIII, 1929).

INTRODUCTION

xxi

dialogue and action come in fragmentarily and unconsecutively', and regards it as 'inconceivable that Wilkins should have gone to the trouble of this elaborate adjustment of Twine to the play if the play had been his own composition.'¹ I do not think this conclusion is inescapable. It is obviously easier to vamp up a novel from an earlier novel than from a play, and even if Wilkins had written a play on the subject he would very likely not have had a manuscript to hand. None the less, there is much to support Hastings's argument. At the beginning of Act 4, for instance, the play as we have it follows Gower in having Marina brought up from the start in the knowledge that she is only the foster-daughter of Cleon and Dionyza, whereas in Twine she is brought up as their daughter, and only learns the true facts from the dying Lychorida. Wilkins here reverts to Twine's version, and gives the death-bed scene almost verbatim from him. It is difficult to see, if he were the original author of the play, why he should at this point of the novel have shifted from Gower to Twine for a fairly important detail of the plot. He behaves much more like a man who has met the play for the first time on the stage, and is mechanically conflating what he can remember of it with the Twine novel which is open in front of him. Again, if he had 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.² But no link between Gower and Wilkins except through *Pericles* has been detected.³ Hastings is rather less

¹ *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, XI (1936), 72.

² Mr Edwards makes this point in *Review of English Studies*, n.s. VI (1955), 86.

³ See note on 3. 4. 7-8. Hoeniger, Arden ed. (1963) thinks 3. 2. 92 provides an example, but here too Wilkins may echo a line lost in the Quarto. [1968.]

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

happy in his claims that Wilkins has misunderstood the text of the play in some places. Some of his examples are trivial and others quite mistaken, while in others again it is probably Q and not Wilkins that is guilty of misunderstanding.

We can now, I suggest, take our leave of Wilkins, and review the conclusions so far arrived at. The play reported by Q is not of single authorship; Shakespeare's hand is present, and predominant, in Acts 3–5, but scarcely if at all detectable in Acts 1–2. How can this have happened? One theoretically possible, but most improbable, solution is Fleay's:¹ that Shakespeare 'wrote the story of Marina, in the last three acts, minus the prose scenes and Gower',² and left the play unfinished; another hand then completed it. The Apollonius story is a unity, and, as far as plot is concerned, is treated in the same fashion throughout, with the same use of sources. The other alternative theories are revision and collaboration. I doubt whether conclusive arguments can be adduced for deciding between them. The state of the text makes revision particularly difficult to detect, and even with a good text the results of competent revision and those of collaboration are not always easy to distinguish. Acts 1–2, even if they were never of high quality, must have been a good bit more coherent in detail than they have become in Q, and may have been written in tolerably workmanlike verse and prose, by an author with whom Shakespeare would think it worth while to collaborate. But it is probably easier to think of the King's Men coming into possession of a complete play which caught Shakespeare's imagination to the extent of inducing him to rewrite the last three acts while leaving the first two

¹ *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, 1 (1874), 195–209.

² *Ibid.* p. 197.

INTRODUCTION

xxiii

more or less as they stood. The way in which Gower and Twine are conjointly used throughout favours the hypothesis that the original version which Shakespeare had before him was a complete play by a single author. This also tells against the hypothesis (improbable in itself) of a fragment completed by Shakespeare.¹

There is even a little evidence to suggest that the King's Men might have been favourably disposed towards a play of this kind round about 1607. It would not be fair to dwell too strongly on the popularity in the next few years of Shakespeare's other romances and of Beaumont and Fletcher's tragicomedies,² which may have created the taste by which they were enjoyed, but the revival, with some additions, of *Mucedorus* (first published in 1598) is of some significance.³ J. M. Nosworthy⁴ has recently called attention to this, noting that dramatic romance was a genre in which no really distinguished models were available: 'a tradition that rests on things no better than *Mucedorus* or Peele's *Old Wives Tale* scarcely merits the name of tradition'.⁵ In

¹ See also W. T. Hastings, *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, xiv (1939), 67-85, for a sensible argument in favour of Shakespeare's revision of a complete play. I am not convinced by Hastings's attempts to specify passages revised by Shakespeare in Acts 1-2.

² There is probably no longer any need to discuss in detail A. H. Thorndike's claim, in *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, 1901, for *Philaster* as Shakespeare's main stimulus in the Last Plays. See, most recently, J. M. Nosworthy's Introduction to the Arden *Cymbeline*, 1955, pp. xxxvii-xl, and H. S. Wilson, 'Philaster and Cymbeline', *English Institute Essays* 1951.

³ L. Kirschbaum, *Modern Language Review*, L (1955), 5, doubts the claim on the 1610 title-page that it was played by the King's Men.

⁴ *Op. cit.* in n. 2, pp. xxv, xxx-xxxI, xxxviii.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. xxx.

view of Mr Nosworthy's suggestion that *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (1582?; published 1589), which seems to have had a slight influence on *Cymbeline*, may have been read by Shakespeare in order to see if it too was suitable for revival,¹ one may ask whether the pre-Shakespearian form of *Pericles* was likewise an Elizabethan play from the early days of dramatic romance or an attempt to resuscitate the genre. On the whole, the latter seems the more likely. Even as it has come down to us, the early part of *Pericles* is a good way from the consummate ineptitude of *Mucedorus*² or *Love and Fortune*. Moreover, until an earlier date can be discovered for the precise form of the saying quoted in 1. 3. 4–6, Steevens's reference to Barnabe Riche's work of 1604 seems the most probable source; and in general it is undesirable to add unnecessarily to the number of completely unrecorded pre-1600 plays.

I have avoided the term *Ur-Pericles* in this part of the discussion, as it is convenient to confine its use to the theory of an earlier version that actually reached the stage. Apart from this, the play I conceive to have existed is of the same kind as has been attributed to Wilkins by some scholars. If Wilkins is to be rejected, the search for another name is likely to be fruitless, as the state of the text does not lend itself to stylistic arguments. The only known dramatist for whom much of a case has been made out is Thomas Heywood, whose claims were supported by H. D. Gray,³ with some plausibility. Rambling romantic narrative, closely following its sources, is characteristic of Heywood, and

¹ Introduction to the Arden *Cymbeline*, p. xxv.

² Some allowance must, no doubt, be made for the deplorable transmission of this text. See L. Kirschbaum, *Modern Language Review*, I (1955), 1–5.

³ *PMLA*, XL (1925), 507–29; an earlier supporter of this view was D. L. Thomas, *Englische Studien*, xxxix (1908).

INTRODUCTION

xxv

the use of Gower as presenter recalls that of Homer in the *Golden, Silver and Brazen Ages*. The case for Heywood is summarily dismissed by the leading authority on that author, Dr A. Melville Clark.¹ Even his unargued verdict carries considerable weight, but I am not sure that he has made sufficient allowance for the fact that Q must in any case represent the author's work very imperfectly. Another eminent scholar, Professor T. M. Parrott, is favourably disposed towards the hypothesis of Heywood's authorship.² There can be no doubt that Heywood was familiar with *Pericles*, which he imitates several times in *The Captives* (1624), but the most striking echo is of a passage which is likely to be entirely Shakespeare's.³ As Heywood was at the time regularly writing for the Queen's Men, with whom he was a sharer, it is not easy to imagine why he should have submitted a play to the King's Men, and then acquiesced in its rewriting by Shakespeare. It seems best to leave the non-Shakespearian hand anonymous. Possibly it is the same that was responsible for the additions to *Mucedorus* which first appeared in the 1610 Quarto. Act 4, Sc. i is in a style not unlike that of *Pericles*, Acts 1-2, and l. 24, 'But care of him, and pittie of your age', recalls *Pericles* I. 2. 29, though of course such an echo is no good evidence of common authorship.

C. WHAT SHAKESPEARE MADE OF IT

If we are to suppose that Shakespeare saw potentialities in a rather crude dramatization of a popular story,

¹ *Thomas Heywood* (1931), p. 333.

² *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, XXIII (1948), 105-13. Professor Muir, Introduction to *Painfull Adventuress*, p. xi, suggests that Wilkins and Heywood may have collaborated.

³ 4. 6. 121-2; cf. *Captives* (Malone Society Reprint), 41-3.

its influence on the work of his last years as a dramatist becomes singularly interesting. For it is remarkable how many of the themes which are commonly said to link the 'Romances' are present, not only in *Pericles* as we have it, but in the story on which it is based. Thus we have the literal resurrection of Thaisa, taken up again in the contrived coming to life of Hermione (Shakespeare's addition to his source), and in Imogen's supposed death; the daughter lost and exposed to danger, found again, and instrumental in reuniting her parents and restoring them to happiness; the storm as source of immediate woe and ultimate blessing, as in *The Tempest*;¹ the wicked foster-mother, corresponding to the wicked step-mother in *Cymbeline*; the fairy-tale nature of the royal personages in whom the plays centre.² And over and above all this there is a quality about these plays which tempts critics to use the dangerous word 'symbolic'. The literal story is felt to stand for something 'behind' it more than in other plays. *Pericles* itself stops short of the full development of some of those themes: there is, for instance, reunion, but not expiation or forgiveness.

In some ways, the fact that Pericles has no very sharply defined character fits him for being the central figure of a play in which very general aspects of human life are obliquely presented through a fantastic narrative. Pericles' journeyings, more extensive than those of any other Shakespearian hero, can evoke the sense of

¹ See G. Wilson Knight's valuable study, *The Shakespearian Tempest*.

² When Shakespeare brings one of these kings into contact with real historical events in *Cymbeline*, the result is not too happy, as Lytton Strachey half a century ago eloquently argued in 'Shakespeare's Final Period' (reprinted in *Literary Essays*, 1948, p. 10), and as J. M. Nosworthy also recognizes (Introduction to Arden ed., p. 1).

INTRODUCTION

xxvii

life as a journey, and there is a certain coherence of feeling in his attitude towards it. Three recent critics, D. A. Stauffer,¹ J. M. S. Tompkins² and J. F. Danby³ have noted the emphasis on the theme of patience in adversity, and the last has well described how in the certainly Shakespearian portion of the play what has been mere moral precept, 'the cliché of resignation' (p. 92), becomes response to 'a completely given moral occasion' (p. 97).

The use of Gower as Chorus, whether it was (as seems more likely) in the original play or was Shakespeare's invention, colours the whole action. Here too we see something on which Shakespeare was to play more subtle variations in subsequent plays. In *The Winter's Tale*, Time not only appears once as Chorus, but is felt as a presence and a power throughout the culminating scenes. He has, as it were, collaborated with Julio Romano in the supposed statue (5. 3. 30-2). In *The Tempest*, the role of presenter is fused in that of protagonist. But already in the dénouement of *Pericles* the measured ceremonial revelation is a beautiful example of the way in which narrative can be translated into drama, while leaving us still with a sense of the organizing power of the narrator behind what we see on the stage. There is a similar double vision in *The Winter's Tale*, when we have drama retold in narrative, with explicit comment on its fairy-tale quality—'so like an old tale that the verity of it is in strong suspicion... Like an old tale still' (5. 2. 28-9, 59).

If Pericles is in some ways more Everyman than are any of the other characters in the Last Plays, his kingly character is also more stressed than that of Leontes or Prospero in the more complex fabric of *The Winter's*

¹ *Shakespeare's World of Images* (1949), p. 271.

² *Review of English Studies*, n.s. III (1952), 322-4.

³ *Poets on Fortune's Hill* (1952), pp. 85-103.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00598-2 - Pericles, Volume 26
 William Shakespeare
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xxviii

PERICLES

Tale and *The Tempest*, and it is in keeping with this that the full fairy-tale associations of the word 'queen' should also be exploited through evocative repetition, as Mark Van Doren has pointed out.¹ D. G. James has noted the 'recovery of a lost royalty' as one of the recurrent 'myths' of the Last Plays, and he adds that 'it is in *Pericles* that we have the most perfect representation of the myth of lost and recovered royalty; in none of the three later plays is it set out with the same simplicity and single-mindedness'.² This single-mindedness largely comes from letting the story speak for itself. Having taken over the Apollonius story, and probably the device of its presentation by Gower, Shakespeare has had the tact to realize that the deeper effects that can be achieved through it must of necessity be of a broad and simple kind.³ As a result, there are certain moods in which the finest scenes of *Pericles* may appeal to us more than anything else in the Last Plays. *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* are greatly superior to it as works of art, and at least as far as virtuosity is concerned *Cymbeline* leaves it far behind. But *Pericles* is freer than any of them from certain types of tortuousness and over-elaboration that occasionally interfere with our enjoyment of them. The absence of detailed characterization, too, is by no means an unmixed disadvantage in a play of this kind.⁴

On the side of low comedy, the brothel scenes have qualities that have not always been recognized. It is

¹ *Shakespeare* (1939), pp. 298–9. He draws attention especially to 3. 1. 7, 18, 20, 47; 3. 2. 98.

² *Scepticism and Poetry* (1937), pp. 215, 219.

³ Some minor subtleties have, no doubt, been destroyed by the reporter.

⁴ Mr J. M. Nosworthy has recently criticized Shakespeare for attempting too much characterization in *Cymbeline* (Arden ed., 1955, pp. li ff.).