Eater and Eaten, Feeder and Fed: 
Intercultural Consumption in Pericles

Stephen Cohen 
Central Connecticut State University

Throughout his career, Shakespeare used the language of food and eating to explore the peril and promise of intercultural contact. In plays from Titus Andronicus to Sir Thomas More to Coriolanus, if the incorporation of foreign peoples and customs risks adulterating the body politic much as the ingestion of foreign foods risks the damaging the humoral constitution of the physical body, the refusal to do so leads to an anorexic cultural diet that culminates in a non-nutritive endocannibalism or cultural self-destruction. While partaking of this pattern, Pericles offers a significant variation: while generally a play’s focus is on the effect of absorbing or refusing to absorb the stranger on the receiving culture, Pericles through its geographic dislocation and itinerantly episodic structure repeatedly shifts its focus from native to stranger, eater to eaten—often in the same figure—in such a way as to invite an empathetic identification between self and other that points to a mutually nutritive relationship between cultures. This paper will explore the ramifications of this phenomenon for an understanding of both Pericles’ structural anomalies and Shakespeare’s developing treatment of cultural interaction in an era of nascent globalization.

"It Nips Me into Listening:
Multifocal Characters in Pericles and the Medieval Romance, or
Why this Pericles has to meet this Marina

Tracy C. Cummings 
San Diego State University

In their discussions of Shakespeare's late romance Pericles: Prince of Tyre, scholars face what Andrew Hiscock describes as the "concertina-ing" of the play's chronological architecture. With the play shifting from scenes featuring Pericles to those featuring Marina, it will take a forensic rhetorician, Hiscock states, to explicate the intrigue of the play (25-27). This bifurcated element of Pericles has prompted a range of responses, from condemnation for ways it unmoors connections between scenes to encomiums for its depiction of the recovery of voice. I argue that it is precisely the seemingly separate journeys of Pericles and Marina that causes the play's intrigue. In his analysis of the medieval multifocal romance, Rick Altman states that literary texts featuring multiple protagonists call on audiences to create individual interpretations to account for the presence of those protagonists. With this forensic tool, it is possible to ascertain that Pericles fascinates because its characters take separate, complementary, journeys whose nature they cannot comprehend without one another. Once the characters reunite and testify to their identities, they embody the interpretive requirements of medieval multifocal narratives and represent the definition of narrative itself: to create meaning from apparently unrelated fragments.
Thasia’s revival scene in *Pericles* has long been considered a textbook case of *hysterica passio*, a medical condition that physicians of antiquity and the early moderns that relied upon their work believed was exclusively a female ailment. Women slipping into a deathlike coma and then reviving suddenly not only made for a compelling medical mythology, but a terrific theatrical spectacle and so, the trope of revivification made its way on to the stage. I argue that Pericles undergoes what Kaara Peterson calls “an image of revivification though not a real one” (149) as his daughter Marina takes the role of the doctor in reanimating the wayward king. Marina’s participation in this process is not merely to serve as a promise of future male heirs, but rather as a political figure that must exist to legitimize his rule. By reversing the gender roles of this specific ailment, I discuss how *Pericles* speaks to King James’ understanding of his sovereignty as a continuous project inherently reliant on the remembrance of Queen Elizabeth’s right to rule.

While this is a piece of a much larger project that takes into account Shakespeare’s four romance plays, this examination allows insight into a new facet of how James needed or felt he needed to position himself as a sovereign and how staged plays participated in that project.


“Accept my rhymes”:
*Gower’s personification in Pericles* An intertextual study
of Gower and Shakespeare and Wilkins

Mike Ingham
Lingnan University, Hong Kong

The Gower personification as archaic-sounding poet-narrator in *Pericles* seems particularly pertinent in both memorialising and reinventing Gower for an audience "born in these latter times, when wit's more ripe” (Act I prologue), and, in the process, refashioning the traditional stage Everyman role and function for the Early Modern individualistic age. Schreyer (‘Moldy *Pericles*’), invoking Raymond Barthes’ ideas on intertextuality, has argued that “the intertextual bed of language” (2017: 210) is a fertile locus of poetic regeneration for what Ben Jonson, in *Ode to Himself*, had dismissed as “a mouldy tale”. In their pastiche/ parody of the linguistic register and versification of the medieval poet, however, Shakespeare and Wilkins appear to be teetering on the brink of the kind of burlesque parody that MND’s Peter Quince had exemplified at an earlier stage of Shakespeare’s career. A useful analogy might go something like this: if a contemporary dramatist were to introduce the figure of Shakespeare into a play or stage musical as prologue or narrator figure, could we accept the device seriously, or would it represent a gauche, or cynical, theatrical name-dropping ploy? How feasible would it be to do so, and avoid an unintentionally Pythonesque mock-Early Modern tone in the process? Can we really “accept”
the validity and authenticity of Gower’s lines, as Shakespeare and Wilkins’ stage incarnation of the poet invites us to do? My paper compares and contrasts the poetic diction, versification, syntactic structure and overall style exhibited by Gower’s Gower in the Apollonius of Tyre story in Book VIII of the *Confessio Amantis* (a work in which Gower at one point personifies himself as the otherwise generic Amans figure) with the Gower avatar of Shakespeare and Wilkins in an intertextual stylistic analysis. It addresses a literary-linguistic aspect of the Gower presence in *Pericles* that has been little discussed, despite the many existing erudite commentaries on his role in the play.

““No Sovereignty:”
Imaginary Topographies in *Pericles* and *The Tempest*”

David Alan Katz
College of the Holy Cross

Literary historians have turned to Shakespeare’s late tragicomic-romances to theorize the relationship between Europeans and colonized “others.” These readings, however, have generally, although not exclusively, seen their interpretations as separate or ancillary from the responses which would have been available to Shakespeare’s original audiences. This essay takes the political concerns identified by recent critics into early performance history. Focusing on *Pericles*, *Prince of Tyre* and *The Tempest*, I situate scenes containing descriptions of fictional locations within a participatory conception of theatrical experience. As this paper demonstrates, both *Pericles* and *The Tempest* celebrate the stage’s ability to induce judgements about foreign locations, a form of playgoing which underscores faculties—including the ability to evaluate social relations and political systems—that Shakespeare’s romances model as useful in a rapidly globalizing world. This paper, then, reframes recent interpretations as responses to an invitation issued from within Shakespeare’s own interpretive horizon, as modern counterpoints to an early modern attempt to address fraught performance conditions.

“The purchase is to make men glorious”:
*Pericles* on the Stuart Court Stage

Gabriel Lonsberry
Purdue University

When, during the 1608–09 entertainment season, the King’s Men staged twelve plays for James and his court, it is likely that one of Shakespeare’s newest compositions, *Pericles*, was among them. If so, the play would have shared the stage with Ben Jonson’s *The Masque of Queens*, a propagandistic spectacle that explicitly condemns the values of the militant Protestant faction then coalescing around James’s ideologically adversarial son, Henry. The present paper examines this polarizing rivalry as it stood in 1608 and uses *Pericles* to demonstrate its destabilizing effect on the King’s once-tightly controlled court stage. For some in the audience, *Pericles* would have seemed sympathetic to Jonson’s claims, and in less contentious conditions, the play might have unambiguously contributed to the usual pageantry of royal power. For those aligned with the Prince, however, the play could just as easily have been understood as an endorsement of his oppositional aims and an objection to the King’s mythmaking hegemony. By reading *Pericles*
alongside *The Masque of Queens*, then, I recreate the fraught circumstances of its inaugural court performance and show that the play’s meaning would have been as unstable as the fractured court for which it was performed.

**Silent before the Sphinx:**  
*Pericles after Psychoanalysis*  

James J. Marino  
Cleveland State University

Shakespeare, who never speaks Oedipus’s name, comes closest to the Matter of Thebes in the late romances. *Pericles* opens with the feat for which Oedipus was best known in early modern England: solving a riddle, and reveals secret incest, the revelation for which Oedipus is currently best known. Pericles refuses Oedipus’s course by leaving that secret unspoken, and yet he suffers Oedipus’s fate, surrendering his royal authority and losing his standing as husband and father.

But *Pericles*’s opening scene also restages another Greek legend, Pelops’s wooing of Hippodamia from her murderous father Oenomaus, who tries to keep his daughter unmarried by issuing suitors a life-or-death challenge and displaying the unsuccessful wooers’ heads. Oenomaus, like Antiochus, is motivated by sexual desire for his child, but also, like Oedipus’s father Laius, by a prophecy that a male successor will kill him. Pericles, unlike Pelops or Oedipus, flees rather than fights the murderous patriarch, thereby losing his own patriarchal authority as husband, father, and prince. Only when resisting Simonides’ mock-aggression wins him a bride. Pericles is not Oedipal enough; he cannot inhabit his adult authority while he leaves secrets hidden.

**“Marina’s Kairotic Body”**

Randall Martin  
University of New Brunswick

Like Adriana and Helen before her and Paulina after, Marina appropriates St Paul’s persuasive rhetoric, embodied boldness of speech, and emancipating ethos of messianic temporality – the “time of now” or *kairos* – theorized by Giorgio Agamben. She thereby saves herself from rape and venereal disease in the Mytilene brothel, converts Lysmachus, and fearlessly rejoins public truth-speaking to women’s bodies, qualities which Paul had infamously severed by silencing and disciplining women in 1 Corinthians 14, and King James and his clergy sought to reinforce.

Marina’s gendered appropriations of Paul transform the brothel’s commodification of women into an economically self-sustaining artisan community which revisions Pauline restrictions. Its unshamed bodily expression of intellectual, spiritual, and practical skills resembles both the Corinthian women suppressed by Paul and the local followers of Diana (or Artemis) who successfully resisted him in Ephesus (Acts 19). The edifying freedom of Marina’s new community also recalls eastern-Mediterranean house-churches led by women such as Priscilla, praised by Paul but erased by emergent church patriarchy. Marina and her disciples ultimately apply their gifts to heal Pericles and enable a fully inclusive family reunion that emblems
the poly-ethnic and culturally syncretic rituals of first-century Jewish Christianity at Ephesus and elsewhere.

**The Fortunes of Pericles**

*Stephen Orgel*

*Stanford University*

Pericles was one of a number of plays credited to Shakespeare in or shortly after his lifetime, but that were not included in the first folio. Though this was presumptive evidence that the plays were not by Shakespeare, seven of them, including Pericles, were added to the second issue of the third folio in 1664. They then appeared in the fourth folio, 1685. Over the next century, the seven plays bounced back and forth, in and out of the Shakespeare canon. Nicholas Rowe in 1709 included them in his edition. Pope banished them in 1725, but his publisher included them in the second edition of Pope’s Shakespeare three years later. Malone in 1790 settled the matter for subsequent editors by rejecting all but Pericles. There was something in Malone’s idea of Shakespeare that did not suit with The Yorkshire Tragedy, The Puritan Widow, Locrine, The London Prodigal and Sir John Oldcastle. But Pericles was another matter: there was now something in Pericles that the idea of Shakespeare could not do without. What that something was, however, changed a number of times over the next century; moreover, for Malone Pericles was—self-evidently—an early play, one of Shakespeare’s earliest.

‘Watery sorcery: how can we think about Gower and Twine?’

*Adam Smyth*

*Balliol College, Oxford*

How do we imagine texts such as John Gower’s *De Confessione Amantis* (1554), Book 8, and Lawrence Twine’s *The Patterne of Paineful Adventures*, shaped, or underpinned, or enabled, the writing of *Pericles*? In Greenblatt’s famous words, source studies in Shakespeare can resemble ‘the elephant’s graveyard of literary history’: which doesn’t sound good. But can a study of sources be more than a tidy but arid listing of prior texts? I’d like to use this seminar paper as a space in which to revisit some of the axioms that lie beneath discussions of sources, and to think about other ways we might productively configure related terms such as influence, omission, appropriation and repression. More basically still, I’d like to think how we imagine a source is distinct from simply anything that Shakespeare or Wilkins read. The word ‘source’ itself comes from the French *sourdre*, to rise or spring: it was often figured as a fountain-head or origin of a river, and it might be productive to think of source as water for *Pericles*, a play that presents the ocean as both enabling and threatening.
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**Shakespeare’s *Pericles* and Baroque Romance**

*Hudson Vincent*

*Harvard University*
A century ago, German academics started calling Shakespeare baroque. Dozens of texts were published on the topic during the first half of the twentieth century, yet few critics today still associate Shakespeare with the baroque. Indeed, the word baroque is seldom used by English literary critics at all. While it remains a foundational concept for scholars of other European literatures, this stylistic category has been largely elided from the literary history of England over the last few decades. This seminar paper assesses the relevance of the baroque to a single Shakespeare play—Pericles—to determine the merits of such a critical practice. The first section on “Baroque Form” situates the disorienting complexities of the play’s plot within broader art historical research on the baroque. In the second section “Baroque Subjectivity,” I draw on Walter Benjamin’s theory of the baroque drama to reveal the importance of melancholy and miracle in Pericles. I conclude by demonstrating how Pericles may be read as a baroque romance.

**Musicking the Spheres in Pericles**

Jennifer Linhart Wood
Folger Shakespeare Library

When Pericles states that he can hear the music of the spheres, was audible music sounding in the theater? This essay will survey early modern dramatic representations of the music of the spheres to argue that music was playing as representative of divine harmony so that the theater audience could hear “the music of the spheres” along with Pericles. Christopher Small’s term “musicking”—a verb encompassing the gamut of collective musical experience, including such activities as composing, singing, and listening—is employed here to indicate the scope of music involved at both the theatrical and metatheatrical levels. Musicking gestures toward both the multivalent music of the spheres (itself a phenomenon incorporating the planetary motions, perfect mathematical proportions, and musical pitch relationships), and the theatrical artifice of music representative of divine harmonies. Examining corollary moments in other early modern dramatic works, reconsidering staging conventions, and reexamining Renaissance notions of the music of the spheres—including Plato’s “Vision of Er” and Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis—allows us to consider the multiple resonances of “musicking” at play in staging the music of the spheres, and supports my contention that the music of the spheres was performed as audible sound in Shakespeare’s Pericles.

**Taking our "imagination [from] region to region":**

Travel and Estrangement in Pericles

Emily Yates
Michigan State University

This paper uses Pericles and its interest in staging travel and cross-cultural encounters to look afresh at Shakespeare’s romances and show how they uniquely reflect the social and political conditions of early modern England. Travel in the play is a condition and consequence of estrangement, and the play is a travel narrative both in terms of its episodic structure as well as its explorations of different understandings of travel. The Tempest is traditionally used to discuss travel in Shakespeare, but further exploring this idea in Pericles proves useful because the play more concretely gestures to early modern globalization and a world outside of Europe.
This in turn, asks us as audiences and scholars to think about the roles of nations and refugees. The play’s first publication in 1609 and frequent performances (“sundry times [it was] acted by / his Maiesties Servants, at the Globe”) mark it as a text invested in earlier and concurrent travel accounts and as a text that garnered interest from the public. This paper, thus, reads *Pericles* with travel narratives like Ralegh’s travels and accounts of his voyages to America and William Strachey’s “A True Reportory of the Wracke” along with early modern scholarship on travel and the notion of the “encounter” from scholars including Stephen Greenblatt, Kim Hall, and Johnathan Sell to show how the encounter is another aspect of the estrangement of the romances. *Pericles*, therefore, presents the familiar and unfamiliar, using travel and estrangement to engage audiences in a unique way.