ROMANCE, MASQUE, AND MIRACLE PLAY:
THEOPHANIC TRADITIONS AND THE HYBRIDIZATION OF GENRES IN
PERICLES AND *CYMBELINE*

by

Andrew J. Black

A Thesis Submitted for Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English

Middle Tennessee State University
May 2018

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Kevin Donovan

Dr. Pete McCluskey

I dedicate this thesis to Nicole and Evelyn.

Time's expired eye will us discover
still sweet in the remembering,
fair as the sun's forgotten heat:
beaming, burning, beloved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

Lawrence Danson has argued that Shakespeare's late plays hybridize elements of distinct genres. This tendency toward hybridization is especially evident in Shakespeare's use of the earnest theophany. In *Pericles*, the goddess Diana appears. In *Cymbeline*, the god Jupiter. These two scenes are similar in their use of music, in their implicit pageantry, and in their being presented as idiosyncratic dream visions, available to and mediated through the experience of one character. The bodily appearance of a deity in this manner is arguably unique to these two plays. Since their first staging, these theophanies have been critically panned, either attributed to a co-author or subsumed under and thus conflated with the often recognized late-play "atmosphere of wonder." More recent scholarship has established their Shakespearean authenticity and read the theophanies as, among other things, scientifically, socio-politically, or religiously significant. These theophanies ought to be read for their literary significance as well. They are consummate moments of generic hybridity, instances that hybridize theophanic traditions already present in three specific genres, webs of association according to Alastair Fowler: the medieval miracle and saint's play, the romance, and the court masque. These genres would have been variously appealing and available in the heterogeneous spaces in which Shakespeare staged his late work. Shakespeare's hybridizing participation in these theophanic traditions subsequently influences their later iterations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER ONE

SHAKESPEARE'S THEOPHANIES AND GENERIC HYBRIDITY

In the final act of William Shakespeare's *Pericles*, the goddess Diana appears to the seemingly widowed Pericles in a vision. This is an occurrence unprecedented in Shakespeare's oeuvre: the earnest depiction of an effective and actual deity. Then, in *Cymbeline*, the god Jupiter similarly appears to the imprisoned Posthumus. Taken together, these two divine visions, or theophanies, are unique in Shakespeare's work. None of Shakespeare's other plays, even his other late plays, contain anything quite like them. Yet the two visions have often been conflated with other miraculous scenes of the late plays. This conflation can result in an unsophisticated reading of the theophanies and in an incomplete understanding of their literary significance. If we focus our attention on these two theophanies, we may increase our understanding of Shakespeare's late preoccupations and the resulting devices of his late work.

In a 2015 article, Daryl Kaytor argues that Shakespeare's late theophanies in *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* are a synthesis of Plato's philosophy and Christian notions of virtue. His is the first scholarly work that focuses exclusively on Shakespeare's theophanies since Richard Paul Knowles' essay of 1982, which was the first to do so since Kenneth Muir in 1975. These three represent the only serious critical or scholarly treatments of Shakespeare's late theophanic preoccupation. But Kaytor's fairly limited scope and the seeming outmodedness of the earlier essays hardly provide a substantive step toward significantly treating why, how, and with what possible implications

Shakespeare demonstrably turns, in two of his last plays, to the question of deity and the manner of its appearance in the world of the stage.

The historically first and most significant critic, Kenneth Muir, notes that *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* include theophanies, but "there is no actual theophany in *The Winter's Tale*" (37) and "no actual theophany in *The Tempest*" (39). There is a theophanic pattern or mode, it seems, but it does not always include the definitive appearance of a deity. Muir acknowledges the differences between the four plays, but finds ways to suggest "that the theophany in *The Winter's Tale* is the appearance of Perdita" (38) and that Prospero functions as something like a deity in *The Tempest*. He also discusses the vision of Queen Katherine in *Henry VIII* and the portents of Mars and Venus in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Muir's concluding assertion is thematic: the late plays fall along a chronologically progressive continuum that slowly peels away at the possibilities of direct divine help while asserting, nevertheless, that the universe is governed by a mysterious providence. *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, as the first two plays chronologically, present deities that physically appear but have "no real influence on what happens" (37). The gods are more distant in *The Winter's Tale*, speaking only through an oracle. And ultimately, in *The Tempest*, "the rarer action of Prospero does not require a heavenly validation" (39). When Prospero forgives his former betrayers, he proves the good of providence and antiquates any need for its appearance.

In addition to suggesting the thematic significance of the theophanies, Muir discusses the possible reasons for their unique presence in these late plays and connects these with the question of what might have caused so dramatic a shift from the darker tragedies of the last years of Elizabeth's reign, to the happier endings of the early years of

James I. Muir offers three reasons. The first concerns the possible innovations of staging that take place in the first decade of the seventeenth century, when "the use of Blackfriars made possible more spectacular scenes than the Globe had done" (41). The second concerns the play's audience, and the ways that a developing taste for the court masque may have created a "wish of the King's Players to cater for the fashionable taste" (41). The third reason involves Shakespeare's creating, in *Pericles* especially, a play built from older "romance" sources, and so encountering source material that necessitated a happy ending (42). In the end, though Shakespeare seems to reassert "that the universe is under the government of providence" (42), this providence is most clearly seen in the inexplicable and "virtuous actions of human beings" (43). The theophanies function as a plot device that allows Shakespeare to transcend the tragic mode, but are not themselves significant.

I will have reason to return to some of the themes of Muir's investigation later in this introduction, especially his explanations for Shakespeare's use of theophanies. Muir's brevity (an inevitable consequence of the scale of his work) constrains him, along with his date of publication. Writing over forty years ago, he works without the help of later scholarly investigations into the continuities between medieval and early modern drama and without the later focus on masques as a genre unto themselves. Recognizing that there are other genres at work as well and identifying their elements, my thesis will follow Muir's suggestion that the court masque is a main generic influence on Shakespeare's use of theophany. I argue that Shakespeare's use of theophanies draws immediately on and participates in the masque's developing popularity. Muir writes before more recent developments in studies of the masque, and so cannot enumerate the

similarities or the distinctions specific to these scenes. Moreover, Muir does not mention the significance of theophanic moments for classifying—and thereby understanding—these earliest late plays. Like most scholars and critics, Muir reads the earlier plays, *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, as primarily transitional: they are preparation for Shakespeare's greater accomplishments in *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. It should be remembered that *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* are the only two late plays in which theophanies literally—I will elsewhere use the word "earnestly"—occur. Further, as G. K. Hunter notes, *Pericles* is second only to *1 Henry IV* in its contemporary popularity as evidenced by the frequency of its republication (503). There must be some reason for this popularity, and the question should justify a look at the play as particularly significant.

The second scholar to focus exclusively on Shakespeare's late theophanies, Richard Paul Knowles, suggests that Shakespeare's late use of oracles and theophany intricately melds providence with theatrical artistry and the desires of the audience. Knowles close reads all four of the last plays—specifically those scenes he refers to as "theophanies," though there are compelling reasons to limit the scope of our discussion—to demonstrate his ideas about their function. In *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, each theophany works to fulfill the audience's desire for an artistic/providential control that reigns above the chaos of the early acts. In *The Winter's Tale*, an effective oracle anticipates the play's resolution and intimates the control of a divine playwright/artificer. In *The Tempest*, Prospero is the already manifested—and importantly human—artist, but Ariel's appearance as a harpy, and his words to Alonso and his men, function as a theophany and so seem also to participate in the dynamics of the earlier plays.

Knowles's interest in the theophanies as audience-willed intimations of authorial artifice causes him to define theophany too broadly. Knowles applies the label to any moment wherein something like authorial artifice is represented in the late plays. His reading conflates scenes notably distinct in order to prove his larger point about the effect such moments have on an audience's emotions. While there is reason to retain Knowles's pointed interest in Shakespeare's audiences and their effect on his use of particular devices, there is also room to push back against his unhelpful conflations.

In the most recent critical discussion of Shakespeare's theophanies, Daryl Kaytor examines the philosophical implications of Shakespeare's two theophanies: Diana in *Pericles* and Jupiter in *Cymbeline*. Kaytor argues that Diana and Jupiter are, in these plays, philosophically novel deities, neither the morally corrupt gods of pagan antiquity nor directly identifiable with the Christian God. By presenting so-called "new" gods, Shakespeare is working to reform those images of deity that Plato derides and to create a true and politically good poetry worthy of being welcomed into the *polis*.

Like Muir and Knowles, Kaytor believes that the theophanies function primarily to assert a providential governance. Shakespeare's gods are a manifestation of a justly ordered cosmos. Their appearances recover the just and virtuous soul after it has been tried by suffering. Kaytor is informed by an emerging scholarly interest in Shakespeare's familiarity with and use of the writings and ideas of Plato. Kaytor uses the ideas of Plato—especially Plato's *Republic*—to clarify and explain the narrative and themes unifying the two plays and their theophanies.

Kaytor's scope is narrower than Muir's and Knowles's, as he reads the plays for their philosophical themes rather than their relationship to Shakespeare's wider corpus.

His focus on the two earlier plays—the only two in which a god actually appears on stage—proves amenable to my argument as well. There may be some significance to Kaytor's unique assertion that Plato's writings influence Shakespeare's depiction of these particular gods—though his is not an argument easily grafted onto any branch of Shakespearean criticism. But Kaytor is most helpful for his willingness to isolate Shakespeare's two earnest theophanies as worthy of distinct consideration. For while there is a definite atmosphere of wonder in all the late plays, there is something peculiar about *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*. In these two plays, Shakespeare is willing to stage the entrance of a character that is not, and this is key, pretending to be a deity[1], but is actually a deity.

In this thesis, I will depart from what has been, it seems to me, the dominant tack taken by all three preceding treatments: a hesitation to regard theophanies as an essential component of the plays' dramatic structure or generic kind. Perhaps on account of their relative brevity, or their notable peculiarity, no scholar has read these appearances as generically significant beyond the atmosphere of wonder they might lend to the plays. Muir, for example, seems to consider the gods an unfortunate result of Shakespeare's initial inability to imagine happier endings. Knowles sees them as Shakespeare's last resort, heightening the question of resolution till the last possible moment. Kaytor sees them as philosophically meaningful. But they are generically significant.

The theophanies of *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*—the two late plays arguably most often maligned—are moments when Shakespeare's method of generic hybridization is most clear and three distinct genres are compellingly conjoined: the court masque, the "occasional" medieval miracle or saint's play, and the romance. The narrative

mechanisms and the staging of the theophanies can tell us something significant about Shakespeare's place in the wider moment of early Jacobean drama and illuminate Shakespeare's effectiveness within his milieu. The late theophanies of Shakespeare are an attempt to hybridize elements of preceding and developing forms—masque, miracle play, and romance—to give his vision a form that will most likely appeal to an audience of shifting aesthetic preoccupations and dramatic opinions. In this heterogeneous context, the success of these now seemingly unsuccessful dramas can be best explained. Theophanies are a means of hybridizing distinct and dissimilar modes.

As Gary Schmidgall has argued, Shakespeare's late plays may most helpfully be understood as participating in a larger dramatic moment in early modern England, a short instance of optimism during the first roughly ten years of James I's ascension to the throne of England. At the same time, Shakespeare's late plays do not simply jettison all interest in popular continuities between the medieval and the Renaissance moment. Though many readings of the late plays focus primarily on the preoccupations of the early Stuart monarchy, much of Shakespeare's work continues to be staged for audiences comprised of court and commoner, aristocrat and simpler artisan. G. K. Hunter makes a similar point when he argues that, in *Pericles* specifically,

> Shakespeare's concern is not only to flatter the audience's sophistication; he uses the story to focus for naïve as well as sophisticated the pattern of an individual's struggle to maintain identity in an essentially unstable world . . . In these terms, *Pericles* seems well designed to appeal to the mixed audience of the Globe and the Blackfriars. (Hunter 503)

Hunter and Schmidgall both maintain that, for these last plays, Shakespeare is composing with multiple audiences and multiple spaces in mind.

It follows, especially in light of their Jacobean milieu, that *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* cannot be read simply as late instances of earlier preoccupations, an argument made most coherently by Northrop Frye in *A Natural Perspective*. Multiple audiences necessitate multiple appeals. And though Hunter asserts that "Sophisticated nostalgia for older modes may be seen as a key to open up a new dramaturgy at once artful and emotional, distanced and immediate, romantic and comic" (504), this sophistication seems at least to encourage the mixture of multiple modes. The late plays of Shakespeare consist of an odd patchwork of seemingly irreconcilable generic elements: the masque (with all its interest in pageantry, spectacle, and mythological allegory), the medieval miracle play (secularized by the Elizabethan dramatists, in some accounts, but still present as a pervasive influence, if often vestigial), and romance (in R. S. White's estimation, a vogue of the late 16th century that arguably reaches back to Homer's *Odyssey*, wherein a virtuous hero wanders about, completing episodic tests of his virtue, aided by providence amidst the buffets of a counteracting misfortune). These definitions are expanded below (13-19). Focusing on these genres and their appeal to various kinds of audiences may help explain why theophanic mechanisms—plot devices whereby gods are made to appear onstage to affect the plot directly—seem dramatically useful to Shakespeare, if not also to other playwrights and companies of the same period.

Shakespeare, catering to a public market and a patronizing court with new tastes (tastes refined, or at least informed, by the schools of Renaissance humanism), finds ways of hybridizing distinct forms. These forms, however, are not static models. Alastair

Fowler has cautioned against thinking of genres as static types (*Kinds* 39), and has more recently (2004) asserted that genres function within their particular period "as fields of association like those in actual situations of utterance" (190). Genres facilitate invention through opening up prescribed possibilities and imposing constraints. Fowler's interest is in genre writ-large. It is Lawrence Danson who applies Fowler's work to Shakespeare in particular, and notices that, "Shakespeare's plays are so many explorations and experiments in the endlessly revisionary process of genre-formation" (7). Shakespeare uses generic webs of association to form new kinds. A mediating stage in the formation of new genres (always identified and defined in retrospect) may helpfully be called hybridization. I shall return to Fowler's theorizing momentarily, but such hybridization, I argue, can be most clearly seen in moments of theophany, where the popular and miraculous expulsion of verisimilitude meets the courtly interest in spectacular staging and classical allusion. Shakespeare brings together in his late plays the popular and the courtly, from romance, medieval play, and masque, informed by but transforming the three into what can subsequently be identified and described as a new kind. These late plays appeal to tastes that are both medieval and modern. Such a reading avoids the all too common practice of treating *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* as experimental stepping stones toward *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. Rather than experimental cast-offs, these plays can be read as artful on their own terms.

Shakespeare's relationship to genre, as discussed most recently by Lawrence Danson, is definitively fluid. The mixing of forms is Shakespeare's *modus operandi*. While Danson does not directly illustrate this fluidity in the late plays, considering the theophanies as generic indicators of Danson's fluidity is a more helpful way of

understanding their significance. The rest of this introduction will provide more precise definitions by using the terms of Alastair Fowler's work: genre, kind, mode, inclusion, mixture, hybridity. It will also sketch the constituent elements of the three relevant genres which Shakespeare's theophanies hybridize: masque, as discussed by David Lindley, Schmidgall, David Bergeron, Hunter, and Constance Jordan; miracle play (or saint's play) discussed by F. D. Hoeniger, Hans-Jürgen Diller, Michael O'Connell, John Caldewey, and Schreyer; and romance as studied by R. S. White, G. K. Hunter, Valerie Wayne, and Barbara Fuchs.

First, it will be helpful for us to define our terms as clearly as possible, for the already unwieldy study of the boundaries of and intersections between genres may prove impossible without increased specificity. Alastair Fowler's influential study *Kinds of Literature* provides us with a helpful introduction, especially when combined with his later and more specific work on the functions of genre in the Renaissance and with the investigations of Lawrence Danson into the ways in which Shakespeare's plays participate in and depart from conventional generic forms of tragedy and comedy.

Shakespeare's late plays present a particular stage in the development of Shakespeare's dramatic form, and, as Gary Schmidgall has shown, they are influenced by the wider developments of Shakespeare's milieu. Questions about a play's generic form ought to be seen as questions about a play's contextual significance, its meaning. Fowler argues that this precisely is our aim "when we try to decide the genre of a work" (*Kinds* 39). In his influential study *Kinds of Literature*, Fowler attempts to extricate questions of genre from straightforward discussions of classification for its own sake. Such simple classificatory efforts overlook how all generic iterations "are positively resistant to

definition" (40). The goal of genre study should be to establish the contextualized

significance of particular forms. Rather than establishing the unchanging and "universal

characteristics" of any one particular genre, Fowler believes we should instead attempt to

understand the ways in which "generic resemblances" are produced by "tradition: a

sequence of influence and imitation and inherited codes connecting works in the genre"

(42). In a later essay, Fowler outlines the source of many of these shared traditions:

humanist education, the curricular revolution effected by the Renaissance humanist

movement over the course of the sixteenth century. "Humanistic education" makes

possible a new Renaissance awareness of genre by emphasizing "the best classical

authors" (Fowler 186). This emphasis is also no longer limited to the aristocracy on

account of the establishment of a number of "better grammar schools," that each

participate in a "specific method of education" involving "the *silva* or miscellany" (186),

anthologies that organize literary excerpts according to genre.

Lawrence Danson, in his application of Fowler's work to Shakespeare, provides a

more detailed outline of "the chequered history of genre-theory" (Danson 21), arguing

that the Renaissance privileging of classical forms stems from an inaccurate mixture of

Horace and Aristotle. Danson presents genre, which some critics have seen as classically

fixed and modernly resuscitated, as more of an early modern patchwork that, "by the end

of the seventeenth century . . . could look to some critics like natural, irrefutable facts of

aesthetic life" (25). The patchwork nature of Renaissance genre theory results in

"Shakespeare's contemporaries," and here Danson primarily means Sidney and Jonson,

"commonly [using] the terms of genre in ways that demonstrate both their interest in

generic distinctions and the difficulty they have in using them consistently" (10).

Shakespeare, in Danson's view, relishes this difficulty, making genre-mixing one of his definitive characteristics.

In his book *Shakespeare and Genre*, Danson argues that there is nothing unique about Shakespeare's technique in the late plays. According to Danson, "In these late plays, as in his earliest, Shakespeare was drawing on received ideas of literary and dramatic form, and wringing fresh surprises from old generic conventions" (56). But in his most recent essay on the subject, Danson modifies his position. While Danson sees "mixed genre" as a fundamental component of Shakespeare's work from the earliest plays, he finds more interesting those instances "in which a new, 'distinct kind' creates, as in *King Lear*, a productive indeterminancy of tone and of what, for want of a better word, we call meaning" (Danson 109). Danson has in mind that often mentioned moment of tragic farce where Edgar pretends to lead the blind Gloucester off a precipice. But it could also be suggested, given the relatively cursory attempts to claim or examine these moments, that theophanies represent similar, albeit less extreme, moments of indeterminancy, moments of significant hybridity.

Fowler differentiates hybridization from other kinds of "generic mixture." In Fowler's schematization, there are four identifiable ways in which genre is mixed, four "transformations where genres are combined" (179): inclusion, mixture, hybridity, and satire. Inclusion involves the embedding of one particular genre inside another. When this embedding recurs, it becomes typical of the genre as a whole. Fowler believes this to be an especially common practice during the Renaissance (183). The second way of combing genres, mixture, involves the clear linking of two genres together such that some new genre is formed: tragicomedy, perhaps, being the quintessential example (181-

83). The third and for our purposes most significant kind of combination is the outright

hybrid, "where two or more complete repertoires are present in such proportions that no

one of them dominates" (183). Such hybridity often results when "neighboring or

contrasting kinds . . . have some internal forms in common" (183). Fowler identifies

such hybridity in Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* and Shakespeare's sonnets,

where epigrams and sonnet forms sit together in a productive tension, and describes the

late play *The Winter's Tale* as "that hybrid play *par excellence*" (184). Fowler's fourth

kind, satire, though the most common form of mixture, is assuredly not Shakespeare's

aim in the late plays, regardless of what some have claimed as a unifying principle for

Cymbeline, and is thus not relevant to the present discussion.

   Like his discussion of satire, many of Fowler's distinctions may be more helpful

when dealing with broader questions of genre. Our particular genres, as discussed below,

sit uncomfortably together, not quite adequately captured by any one of these terms. Still,

the rarity of their mixture discounts our using the term inclusion, and the indeterminancy

of their form rules out labeling them mixtures, despite Danson's unexplained preference

for this term. Hybridity, on account of these late plays' distinct and rarely combined

features, is the most useful term.

   Fowler's catalogue of "generic indicators" will also prove useful as we attempt to

define the three genres Shakespeare hybridizes, though some of Fowler's terms will

prove too broad for our purposes. While I do not cite individual pages, the entirety of

Fowler's discussion can be easily found (*Kinds* 60-74). Among the most important of

Fowler's features are: metrical structure (especially in nondramatic kinds of poetry, but

also in drama and prose), the length of the work, the breadth of its narrative, particular

subjects or *topoi* typically addressed, a particular political or thematic stance, mood (compare tragedy to comedy; each has a distinct "emotional coloration"), occasion (a wider context which catalyzes the genre), attitude (especially toward the work's subject or addressee), setting (the elements and their placement), character (a way in which subjects or actors are depicted), an order of action (for instance, epic poetry's tendency to begin *in medias res*), and a peculiar style (this usually includes a range of styles). These components of Fowler's schematization will allow us to identify and expand upon the definitive characteristics of our three operant genres—masque, miracle play, and romance—beginning with the court masque.

To suggest that Shakespeare draws upon the Stuart masque in *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* is to commit something of an anachronism. The court masque proper does not develop fully until after the earliest performances of both plays. If Shakespeare collaboratively writes *Pericles* no later than 1608 (Gossett 2), then its earliest performances precede all but a few of the earliest court masques. E. K. Chambers suggests that *The Masque of Proteus* (1594) "is usually seen as the first example of the form that governed the masque for the rest of its life" (528), but David Lindley's select chronology includes Samuel Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* (1604), Ben Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness* (1605), *Hymenai* and *Barriers* (1606), Thomas Campion's *The Lord Hay's Masque* (1607), and John Marston's *The Entertainment at Ashby* (1607). Shakespeare was probably not familiar with all of these, though he was undoubtedly familiar with some. Rather, Shakespeare's audience—touted on the title page of the earliest *Pericles* quarto as implicitly including the royal court (Gossett 3)—encouraged his use of what was, by that time, a burgeoning vogue.

Generically, the earliest court masques can be typified using a few of Fowler's indicators. First, by their particular occasion: performance before royalty. Such performance is often indicated in the play's publication. For example, the title page to Samuel Daniel's published masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* prominently features the date and location of the play's original performance (Daniel 25). Second, by the participation of royal personages. Again, Daniel's 1604 title page proclaims "presented . . . by the Queen's most excellent Majestie and her Ladies" (25). Third, by a distinct internal structure, including philosophically and allusively dense dialogues punctuated by dances, songs, and the introduction of elaborately costumed characters in ornately realized settings.

David Lindley helpfully summarizes these features, explaining that the early masques involved "the appearance of a group of noble personages dressed in elaborate disguises to celebrate a particular occasion and to honour their monarch" (Lindley 1). Lindley's explanation implies the masque's emotional coloration (celebratory) and its attitude toward the addressee (positive, perhaps epideictic). Daniel's earliest masque also includes the ornate appearances of various female deities, including Diana. Diana is described as wearing "a green Mantle embroidered with silver half moons and a croissant [crescent] of pearl on her head" (Daniel 27). Chapter two will discuss at more length the ways in which Daniel's masque influences the depiction of Diana in *Pericles*. In light of chapter three's discussion of *Cymbeline* and Jupiter, it is also important to note that later masques involve a distinctively styled metrical structure. For example, Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* consists almost entirely of rhyming couplets in either iambic pentameter or, in the case of songs, trochaic tetrameter.

While Shakespeare looks ahead to the growing popularity of the court masque, Shakespeare also looks behind, to the popular affinities of the saints' plays. Toward the end of Michael O'Connell's exploration of continuities between medieval and early modern dramatic forms, he asserts a need for scholars to investigate further the fluid boundaries between the two periods and their supposedly distinct forms. He calls for "new theatre histories that will acknowledge both continuities and discontinuities in the complex traditions that extend from the late fourteenth century" (67). His essay is not the first to make such a suggestion, for the continuities between the medieval and modern period, at least in so far as Shakespeare's drama is concerned, have been acknowledged by Hunter and F. D. Hoeniger, among others. Hunter reads the late plays of Shakespeare as operating out of "sophisticated nostalgia for older modes" (504). And he is able to connect the masque, in its oldest and earliest form dating to around 1512, with the Parish celebratory, those occasional plays punctuating the church and agricultural calendar (528). Hoeniger, in his editorial introduction to the Arden *Pericles*, finds the play to be "curiously . . . like the vernacular religious drama in its later, more developed, and less rigid forms, especially the Saint's play" (Hoeniger lxxxviii), and he is especially interested in the similarities between *Pericles* and "the Digby play of *Mary Magdalene*" (xc). The Magdalene play shares with the late plays of Shakespeare a Mediterranean setting, an expansive time-frame, a narrative full of occasional and miraculous encounters, and, most importantly here, theophanic visitations.

Hoeniger outlines the generic similarities as well, arguing that what he calls "vernacular religious drama" is the source of "most of the broad structural features of *Pericles*." He then enumerates these features, writing that the Digby *Mary Magdalene*

and Shakespeare's *Pericles* both share five elements: a chorus presenting the story's outline, a plot comprised of "loosely related episodes," the play arranged as a "pageant" rather than around its action, a significant role given to "supernatural powers," and "the construction of the whole so as to serve an explicit didactic end" (lxxxviii). Hoeniger's broad sketch of structural features can be helpfully clarified by reference to David Bevington's more detailed discussion.

Bevington, in his magisterial compendium *Medieval Drama*, notes, first, that saints' plays are occasional, "celebrations for the various saints' days of the liturgical year" (661). Second, the plays treat a similar theme, "the miraculous power of a saint" that allows them "to admonish sinners or convert the heathen" (661). Third, the plays treat a subject drawn from "the worlds of both legend and biblical history" (661). Our discussion of *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* as generically related to these plays notes their similarity of subject (the saintly sufferer), their similarity of theme (miraculous power achieved on account of or in the midst of suffering), but especially the similarities of their treatments of heavenly visitation. "In a vision," writes Hoeniger, "Magdalene is commanded by Christ to go by ship to Marcyll in order to convert the Mohammedan king" (xc). In similar fashion, a goddess and god will appear to the suffering heroes of *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, catalyzing their travel or revealing their foreknown end. Chapter Two includes a more extended treatment of these similarities.

Romance is, perhaps, the most vaguely defined of our three genres. For Michael O'Connell, the development and staging of romances may connect the forms of early modern to the forms of medieval drama. The "more recent vogue of the romances from the 1570s" stems from the development of civic and touring theater troupes. O'Connell

distinguishes the pageants put on as part of early civic festivals from the morality plays performed by professional touring companies, schematizing their subject matter and tracing their development (62). O'Connell's distinction between the popular pageant and the touring morality play shares some similarities with Simon Palfry's bipartite schematization of the romance tradition.

Palfry argues that by the time Shakespeare began his late plays "there had developed two broad traditions of 'romance'" (36). For Palfry, these two versions are embedded in the social hierarchy of the Elizabethan period. Sidney's *Arcadia* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* typify the first, with their allusive and allegorical "esoteric *imitatio*s of classical, medieval, and continental epic-pastoral" (36). Theirs are the romances of the royal court. The "ballads, penny-chap books, and open-air plays" at popular festivals typify the second, lower version (36). Shakespeare inhabits both camps, invoking Sidney's *Arcadia* while paying "a type of homage to popular Elizabethan plays such as *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune, Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes, Mucedorus, The Thracian Wonder*, and *Locrine*" (37). Palfry's bipartite divisions are expanded upon by Helen Moore, who argues that there are six "major groupings into which sixteenth-century romances fall." Moore lists "Arthurian romance, Tudor translated romance, and Spanish chivalric romance," and goes on to discuss "Greek romance . . . epic romance and pastoral romance" (238). All six influence the Renaissance romance, and her article highlights several generic features.

First, Moore identifies romance's common subject: "it addresses matters of human society and identity . . . against a backdrop of religion, moral philosophy, and history" (238). Second, the romance has a particular narrative structure, intermingling

several narratives together, each "being taken up or abandoned at unpredictable moments by the writer" (239). Third, there exists an impetus toward encyclopaedism: "they dip into or invoke categories of knowledge or experience" from diverse fields (240). This encyclopaedic impulse is similar to the romance's use of disparate elements as a narrative mechanism for creating a particular effect. The "juxtaposition of apparently incompatible material" helps create "romance wonder" through "the yoking of the strange and the familiar" (240). These wondrous effects are often, also, created by the inclusion of "technological marvels" and foreign or exotic settings (241).

Moore's sketch of the romance's generic elements points obviously to the fact that Shakespeare's late plays draw heavily upon the romance tradition, but the dissimilarity between her work and the discussions of O'Connell and Palfry also illuminates the reasons why these late plays are persistently referred to as "romances," though that term's inadequacies have by now been thoroughly rehearsed. Their generic ambiguity complements the ambiguity often governing discussions of the romance as a unified genre. The genre of romance seems itself to be a loose combination of distinct elements and influences.

R. S. White insists that though the late plays of Shakespeare are often inaccurately referred to as romances, *Pericles* is Shakespeare's only "pure romance." "To see *Pericles*," he writes, "as anything less than a near-perfect dramatic romance," and one that hearkens back to the older Greek forms, "is to judge its accomplishment by the wrong standards." The play is "a straightforward revival of a mode [romance] extremely popular in the 1580s" (116). White is interested, primarily, in Shakespeare's ways of ending his late plays, arguing that his dramatic consolations transcend earlier,

Elizabethan attempts at staging epic-romances. But White's emphasis on romance as the plays' sole genre distorts, I think, his reading of the theophanies. When discussing Diana's appearance in *Pericles*, for example, he writes that Shakespeare highlights how "gods and goddesses do not exist except for human uses" (125). Such statements relegate the theophanic moment to having a purely thematic significance, and overlook, too, the ways that the scenes' mechanisms allow Shakespeare to retain a semblance of the verisimilitude so important to contemporary theorists like Sir Philip Sidney.

Elucidating the generic significance of the late theophanies is a way to solve, I think, a recurring problem in Shakespearean scholarship: critical divergence and generic compartmentalization. There is, in other words, a tendency to describe Shakespeare's work as most significantly informed by masque, or most noticeably by romance, or definitively by the hagiographic spectacle of saints' plays. There is little effort put toward bringing these disparate approaches together to illuminate a topic of manageable size. The two theophanies provide a small and concrete enough scale in which to attempt to draw together larger critical movements that tend away from each other. Furthermore, such reuniting may, as mentioned above, help us better understand Shakespeare's late plays as a particular, historic, generic kind.

Subsequent chapters will close read and situate the theophanies of *Pericles* (a play about which there is very little agreement generically) and *Cymbeline* (a similar kind of pastiche) in their generic contexts, comparing their use of the theophany to demonstrate how such appearances are generically telling elements in each play. A conclusion will make nine interrelated propositions that arise naturally from our discussion of the theophanies. These propositions will attempt to widen discussions of the late plays and

will argue that giving theophanies a more prominent place in their interpretation helpfully

informs some notion of each play's uniqueness and often underemphasized

distinctiveness.

CHAPTER TWO

"THIS GRACE DISSOLVED IN PLACE": RESIDUAL, DOMINANT, AND

EMERGENT GENRES IN *PERICLES* AND ITS VISION OF DIANA

When Diana appears on Shakespeare's stage, something significant is occurring. Shakespeare's play is participating in a shifting dramatic tradition of staging theophanies and pushing that tradition in a particular direction. Commercial, material, and generic considerations influence the coauthored content of *Pericles*. But the marked popularity of *Pericles*—second in its popularity only to *1 Henry IV* according to G. K. Hunter—ought to be understood as due in part to Diana's unusual appearance, which occurs in a scene attributable to Shakespeare's hand (Gossett 68). Diana's appearance participates in the play's larger movement of memorializing an archaic exemplar—Gower's telling of the romance narrative Appolonius of Tyre—while at the same time puncturing the play's staged palimpsest with an occurrence wholly unexpected but commercially and artistically expedient. On only one subsequent occasion does Shakespeare again employ such a dramatic strategy—*Cymbeline*'s significantly different use of the vision of Jupiter. More will be said about *Cymbeline* in the next chapter, but taken together these two visions demonstrate a wider dramaturgical transition: the movement from theophanic visions as historical artifacts reminiscent of a residual genre, to theophanies as a contemporary genre in their own right, the emergent and then dominant court masque genre. Roughly sketched, this movement involves what I have called the hybridization of multiple genres—the saint's or miracle play, the romance, and what would come to be called the court masque.

The literary significance of Shakespeare's first theophany, the vision of Diana, is rarely emphasized. In her introduction to the third Arden edition of *Pericles*, Suzanne Gossett surveys the play's various critical interpretations, and, in a subsection on ideological readings of the play, includes some discussion of the appearance of Diana and its potential significances (112-21). The appearance of Diana fits, first, in the influential readings of G. Wilson Knight and Northrop Frye, metaphorical readings that ground the play's ultimate significance in a meaning that is both external to the play and ultimately spiritual. Their readings influence F. D. Hoeniger, the editor of *Pericles* in the 2nd Arden series, and Maurice Hunt, who sees the missionary journeys of Paul as intertextually significant for an interpretation of *Pericles*. All four scholars argue, in one way or another, for a Christian or at least a transcendent meaning to *Pericles*. For Hoeniger, Shakespeare transforms the Appolonius narrative to reflect Christian notions of salvific suffering. For Hunt, the narrative re-presents symbolic elements of the New Testament's *Acts of the Apostles* and the epistles of Paul. For all four of these critics, Diana appears as a kind of stand-in for the Christian god, a divine endorsement of a predominantly masculine dialectic progressing from suffering to salvation. Reading the pagan gods allegorically, as Isabel Rivers has shown, is one of the "five chief uses of myth" in Renaissance poetry (26). But, for Gossett, the appearance of Diana justifies a more explicitly feminist reading.

Gossett examines both Diana's reigning presence and Diana's appearance, relying on the insights of F. Elizabeth Hart and Caroline Bicks. Gossett believes their separate but similar focus "on Diana alters the male-centered Christian reading of *Pericles*" represented by the work of Hoeniger, Knight, Frye, and Hunt (118). Gossett explores the

symbolic possibilities of Thaisa's post-partum purification (120), and demonstrates how Bicks and Hart helpfully identify some pro-maternal ambiguity where others have seen only Shakespeare's concluding reinforcement of the patriarchal order of his day (121). Gossett ultimately sees in Shakespeare's syncretistic polysemy the source of *Pericles*'s success as a play: its wonderful interpretive possibilities remain unfixed.

Caroline Bicks thoroughly examines the relationship between the Jewish/Catholic rituals of post-birth maternal purification (and the religious debates surrounding its relative merits or relative paganism) and Shakespeare's presentation of Diana in *Pericles*—Diana being a goddess of complex associations. Bicks establishes both the tri-partite associations of Diana (moon, fertility, and virginity goddess—an amalgamation of older pagan and Catholic influences) and the status of Ephesus as a contemporary symbol of both pagan decadence and Christian idealism. Exactly which part of Diana's associations to emphasize seems largely to have depended on the rhetorical intentions of the speaker and the moment. Bicks attempts to reconstruct the religious milieu surrounding Diana and Ephesus, one wherein sermons mention Ephesus and Diana, and to emphasize the ways in which the town and goddess signal national, ecclesiastical liminality. The pagans who cried "Great is Diana of Ephesus" at Paul are also, later, the Christians whom John of Patmos addresses as having "lost their first love." In the sermons Bicks points to,[2] Diana and Ephesus function as a kind of stand-in for Britain, its people, its national possibilities. These allusive potentialities allow Bicks to interpret *Pericles* as presenting scenes reminiscent of the controversial Catholic practice of churching women after childbirth.

Bicks primarily contends that "Diana's Ephesian temple and its connections to pagan mysteries and procreative women figured a heated religious debate of Shakespeare's time that centered on the maternal body and concerned the place of Catholic ritual in Protestant practice" (207). Such explorations are especially meaningful on account of the fact that Shakespeare's addition of Diana—and this is most significant for our discussion—is a deviation from his primary source material. Neither Gower, who attributes the theophanic appearance to God (see below, pp. 35-37), nor Twine, whose novel includes an angel's appearance, include Diana as a ruling and an appearing deity (Bicks 221). For Bicks, this addition "demands a reading that resists seeing the play's ending at Ephesus as a compliant maneuvering of the female body back into the structures of a Christian-inflected order" (221).

F. Elizabeth Hart takes up Bicks's reading and combine it fruitfully with Jeanne Addison Roberts's notion of the, above all, feminine "wild" that in Shakespeare dualistically works to define and sustain male "Culture."[3] Hart suggests that, in both *The Comedy of Errours* and *Pericles*, Diana and Ephesus are potent symbols of a feminine benevolence that blesses and thereby condones and supports the patriarchal order. Interestingly, Hart emphasizes spectacle, the image of Diana's appearance. It is "an icon of great dramaturgical power that Shakespeare knew would be recognizable to his audiences" (350). But recognizable as what? I here explore, beyond Hart's brief acknowledgement, the potentially causal connection between emblematic spectacle and court masques—something alluded to by Hart (especially in her mention of the often relied upon sources, "the Italian mythographical 'manuals'" used by masque writers and dramatists of Shakespeare's day [351]).

Hart also discusses at some length the work of Margaret Doody, who in her scholarship on the Greek romances and their influence on Renaissance culture notes the often climactic and providential involvement of feminine deity, as well as the likely influence of the 1566 "novel" *The Golden Ass of Lucius Apuleius* on many of Shakespeare's poems and plays.[4] Hart includes a reading of Apuleius' theophanic dream vision, wherein a Diana-esque deity appears and speaks to Luceius (352-53).

Hart's discussion of Shakespeare's two plays and their sources culminates in a political reading of *Pericles*, drawing especially on the work of Constance Jordan. Jordan contends that *Pericles* metaphorically dramatizes tensions within the recently established Stuart monarchy—tensions between tyranny and abdication. The incest that sits uncomfortably at the play's opening represents a tyrannous relationship between the mother/wife commonwealth and the father/King. Pericles's abandonment of Marina represents an abdication of kingly responsibility. In Jordan's reading, Diana's appearance divinely legitimizes a constitutional and parliamentary monarchy. In addition to seconding Jordan's contention, Hart argues that Diana's prominence and allusive potency highlight the role of "wild" maternity: "the divine law that reshapes monarchical law is specifically *Diana's* law, the law of the Mother, which answers to, blesses, and ultimately confers legitimacy upon the father/Father in his roles as monarch" (Hart 365). Diana is not simply divinity, as Jordan suggests, but a necessarily *feminine* divinity, the opposing binary that defines the masculine norm. So, interestingly, the play becomes subversive of absolutist monarchy[5] and, conversely, contains one of the rare early modern depictions of actualized feminine autonomy.

In her discussion of *Pericles,* Hart is one of the few scholars who does not overlook the potential significance of Diana's appearance, but rather attempts to read the appearance as both classically sourced and politically meaningful. Yet, as Gossett's presentation suggests, such readings are overtly ideological. Gossett, Bicks, and Hart preoccupy themselves with explicating the wider cultural patriarchy and the ways in which Shakespeare's play either works toward its furtherance or, however subtly, subverts it. Is this an anachronism? Is there a way to note the significance of Diana's appearance without borrowing from a critical/theoretical schema that equates explication of milieu with interpretation of a dramatic form? In her discussion of sermons mentioning Diana and Ephesus, Bicks suggests *Pericles'*s ecclesial resonances, and Hart tangentially suggests the potential political resonances of *Pericles* within the early Jacobean court. But, to put the question another way, what might be the literary significance of the vision of Diana?

My emphasis on the generic hybridization evident in Shakespeare's theophanies attempts to complement Gossett, Bicks, and Hart's understandings of Diana's significance by extending this significance beyond a predominant interest in the play's historical milieu and political ramifications. Diana's appearance is not only interesting on account of its wider cultural resonances. Diana's appearance is also significant on account of its literary and generic resonances. But my emphasis on generic resonances should not mask the diachronic movements involved. The significance of the theophany changes across time, and thus its constituent elements and relative elaborateness changes as well. In other words, and to make the obvious qualification, the term *hybridization* should not imply a conception of genres as static, spatial artifacts. Instead, the term *genre*

here indicates a dominant or recessive field of association (Fowler 190). The generic

shifts that here interest us are popular transitions in dominant associations.

It may be helpful here to appropriate the work of prominent twentieth-century

critic Raymond Williams, who, in an essay entitled "Base and Superstructure in Marxist

Cultural Theory," schematizes the relationship between residual, dominant, and emergent

culture. Williams is interested in the ways that dominant cultures (i.e. cultures rooted in

Western Capitalism) persist by allowing for the incorporation of subversive elements

from the past (residual) and subversive elements that are arising at the present time

(emergent). Residual elements, for example, are no longer articulable in the terms of the

dominant culture but are nevertheless practicable. Emergent elements are not yet formed,

but are "continually being created" (Williams 1431). Williams's schematization

elucidates our tri-partite and temporally bounded genres. In an explicable way, the

moment of theophany intimates shifting dominant, residual, and emergent *generic*

associations. These shifts are demonstrated in the dramatic expediency of a particular

kind of moment, a kind that, in its initial instance, predominantly evokes one dominant

web of associations. Yet, in its second instance, the theophany evokes other associations

that have become a more dominant component of the audience's expectations. In

Pericles, Shakespeare's text includes a theophany that, though materially influenced by

the popular staging of an early masque (an emergent genre), evinces closer associations

to prose romance (the dominant contemporary genre, as Barbara Fuchs has argued[6]) and

medieval dramaturgy (the residual genre). *Cymbeline*'s vision of Jupiter, in my argument,

demonstrates an additional shift in the dominant genre. The masque moves from

emergence to dominance.

In order to understand the ways dramatic moments can evoke shifting webs of association, we must avoid reducing our reflections on genre to the immaterial reactions of mind upon minds. Genres do not exist purely in the mind of an author and an audience. Rather, genres are also embedded in and interact through material artifacts. I have in mind here the work of Kurt Schreyer, who demonstrates how the material practices of medieval mystery plays continue to exert an influence on the context of early Modern drama. Bottom's head, for example, evokes the no doubt considerably crafted costume used for the talking ass in the Chester mystery cycle play *Moses and the Law: Balack and Balaam* (Schreyer 74-80). Emphasizing the guild's pre-industrial craft, Schreyer explains how

> . . . dramas in pre-industrial England frequently demanded the cooperation and coordination of various forms of skilled labor using materials and technologies that were often scarce and costly in order to achieve even the most fundamental theatrical costumes, properties, staging, and effects. (Schreyer 78)

Schreyer calls attention to the crafts involved in the production of medieval drama, and he suggests that these crafts provide a point of continuity between medieval and Renaissance drama. In doing so, Schreyer objects to the common critical and scholarly practice of privileging the literariness of Renaissance drama while denigrating the crudity of medieval drama on account of its materiality. A significant component of the continuity between the two not-so-distinct periods is their shared material practices. This not-so-distinctness is further supported by John C. Coldewey's observation that it is the non-cycle play, not the cycle play, that predominates as "an astonishingly popular source

of entertainment, instruction, and profit" (2). The medieval saint's play, then, can be understood as exercising a particular influence on later Renaissance theater. The material components of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama have medieval resonances. In terms of stage properties, Schreyer explains, "in the public playhouses . . . it was the possession, rather than the manufacture, of properties that prompted the theater companies to feature them in plays" (89), so that "once acquired, these remarkable pieces must have demanded a dramatic occasion" (92). The acquisition of the ass's head stage property can, speculatively, be seen as exerting some control over the content of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

In Schreyer's analysis, however, the agency of the ass's head stage property—replete with residual significance—is also accompanied by the play text's intentional subversion of the ass's antiquity. "The company's possession of them [medieval objects, e.g. Bottom's head] as *theatrical materials* is highlighted in the text of the play." And, Schreyer argues further, "Shakespeare's drama advertises the ownership of particular stage properties yet mocks, denies, or otherwise ignores their mystery play past" (71). In Schreyer's schematization, the medieval past was often emphasized as past, and this treatment coincided with a wider effort to preserve so-called "popish" artifacts and experiences by willfully attributing to them an aura of antiquity, counting them as material spectacles of a by-gone era, decidedly non-threatening and worthy of preservation.

Without necessarily supporting Schreyer's conclusions wholesale, the material emphases of his analysis encourage at least two helpful insights: that the material space and the objects of early modern drama have themselves significant generic resonances,

and that the availability and expense of products, like costumes, may contribute to the inclusion of or noticeably increased emphasis on particular characters and plots. Such an emphasis can be identified in *Pericles*, the original source of which, Gower's telling of Appolonius of Tyre, does not include the vision of Diana, the sustained emphasis on her presence, or the repeated invocation of her aid. It seems to me that the material presence of a costly accoutrement could explain both the initial appeal of the Appolonius narrative and the emphasis on Diana that creates an exigency for her appearance, the novel invoking of her presence that culminates by calling her into being. Schreyer writes that "if Balaam's ass inspired Bottom's translation, then we need to rethink the importance of sixteenth-century dramatic objects once sequestered from the preeminent Renaissance subject—William Shakespeare—by being labeled 'medieval' and therefore irrelevant" (102). It follows that contemporary material properties may also exercise a similar influence on the content of particular plays.

While still partially motivated by a medieval precedent and a contemporary generic vogue, Shakespeare may also be motivated by a material reality—the Diana costume prepared for Samuel Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* (1604) and appropriated for Shakespeare's purposes. In Daniel's masque, Diana is one among a number of goddesses who appear in a procession. In Daniel's masque, Diana's costume is, "a green mantle embroidered with silver half moons and a croissant [crescent] of pearl on her head" (Daniel 27). In Diana's costume, we can see the tri-partite associations of the Diana figure in the early Renaissance: the moon (Lucina), chastity (the pearl) and fecundity (the green of her mantle). In Shakespeare's staging of *Pericles,* Diana also

appears. And in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, as Bicks has shown, Diana evinces the same three associations.

Daniel's Diana's costume itself was probably not materially present in stagings of *Pericles* by the King's Men. John Pitcher, in researching the available texts of Daniel's *Vision* masque, identifies its likeliest destination as "the Children of the Queen's Revels, granted a royal patent on February 4, 1604" (Pitcher 35). Even so, the material reality of the costume in Daniel's original masque—transmitted through various media—influences the depiction of Diana at the Globe. Stephen Orgel, in his influential treatise distinguishing Early modern court theater from public theater, notes how costumes used in public theater were often "real court clothes, and their splendor, in a society where sumptuary laws regulated even styles of dress, would have given a merchant or tradesman the richest sense he was ever likely to have of how the aristocratic life looked in action" (9). Orgel highlights an important, later dynamic of Globe performance: that such performances give the predominantly middle-class audience of the Globe a window into the glories of the court. This dynamic partly motivates Diana's inclusion. Diana's appearance, indicative of aristocratic costume and monarchical divinity, associates the scene with the emergent masque genre, as opposed to the dominant genre—in this case romance—or the residual genre, saint's play. It is here, then, that hybridization, as Fowler defines it, occurs. Shakespeare's quintessential romance narrative is punctuated by this generically distinct moment, a moment unique to Shakespeare's telling.

In John Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, a frame warns against the dangers of immoderate love (incest) and introduces the exemplary narrative on which Shakespeare bases *Pericles*, the story of Appolonius of Tyre. In its broad strokes, Shakespeare's and

Gower's stories are relatively identical. But, in their theological emphases, these tales are distinct. While Diana is mentioned a few times, Gower's narrative excludes her from any divine or providential control. Shakespeare's *Pericles* first mentions the goddess Diana in Pericles's request for her to spare the life of his laboring and perishing wife Thaisa. Pericles exclaims

> . . . Lucina, O,
>
> Divinest patroness and midwife gentle
>
> To those that cry by night, convey thy deity
>
> Aboard our dancing boat; make swift the pangs
>
> of my queen's travails! (3.1.10-14)[7]

Lucina, Lori Humphrey Newcomb explains, is "affiliated with Diana and believed to assist women in childbirth" (39). Pericles's invocation of Lucina's aide does not occur in Gower's telling, though a storm and childbirth both threaten and ultimately claim Thaisa's life. In Gower's telling, the narrator elides Appolonius's pleading:

> Hire [Thaisa's] woful lord fro hire aros,
>
> And that was longe er eny morwe,
>
> So that in anquisse and in sorwe
>
> Sche was delivered al be nyhte
>
> And ded in every mannes syhte. (ll. 1052-56)

And though there is mention of Appolonius's theological ruminations, their audience is given no particular form.

> For evere among upon the lich
>
> He [Appolonius] fell swounende, as he that soghte

> His oghne deth, which he besoghte
>
> Unto the goddess alle above
>
> With many a pitous word of love . . . (ll. 1076-80)

Whatever the impetus for Shakespeare's more specific invocation, his primary source does not here supply it.

When Cerimon the physician, in Shakespeare's telling, rouses Thaisa from her death-dream, her first words invoke, again, the presence of Diana. She exclaims,

> O dear Diana, where am I? Where's my lord?
>
> What world is this? (3.2.102-03)

But, again, in Gower's telling, there is no mention of the goddess when the doctor Cerymon revives her, although the lines are otherwise nearly verbatim.

> . . . and pitously
>
> Sche spake and seide, "Ha, where am I?
>
> Where is my lord, what world is this?" (ll. 1205-07)

Here especially we see the deliberate addition of the person of Diana to an otherwise wholly identical scene. Such additions, in my reading, evince an intentional effort on the part of the playwright to insert the goddess for reasons that include the theophany's material, generic, and commercial significance in this early Jacobean period of Globe performance. For Shakespeare, these invocations make possible a deliberate staging of Diana's appearance to Pericles in an idiosyncratic vision—idiosyncratic here refers to the tendency in many dramatic or narrative theophanies to relegate divine visions to dreams only directly experienced by one character through whose telling the vision is then framed and made effectual. Diana's staged appearance is desirable on account of the

popularity of miracle plays and romances among the newly urbanized, formerly agrarian citizenry, and, further, on account of the popularity of Samuel Daniel's *Vision* masque, a masque that includes Diana among its procession of deities. The repeated references to or invocations of Diana in Shakespeare's *Pericles* create an exigency for her actual appearance, an appearance that is itself unique to the play's telling.

The vision of Diana is unique to Shakespeare's *Pericles*, and so is itself something more than a minor instance of literary variation. Shakespeare here departs from the Gower narrative in many respects, partially on account of distinct thematic emphases. In Gower's telling, the danger of incest—only residually present in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, largely to the bafflement of critics—serves as the story's moral frame. Gower begins by recounting the history behind the incestuous king Antiochus's court. After the death of Antiochus's wife, and in a loneliness corrupted by power and wealth, he turns to

> His doghter, which was piereles
>
> Of beaute . . . (ll. 286-87)

Appolonius's initial encounter with Antiochus represents the first trial/tempest that pushes Appolonius subsequently toward his never named wife (in Gower's tale, she is referred to only by various titles: daughter, wife, lady, etc.). For Gower, as only residually for Shakespeare, the trials of Appolonius are haunted by the specter of Antiochus's incest. Thus, the moment of Appolonius's reunion with his daughter Thaise—Shakespeare renames her Marina—is emotionally heterogeneous; the joy of reunion is mingled with a moral risk. The presence of Athenagoras—Shakespeare renames him Lysimachus—further suggests the climactic parallel between Antiochus and

Appolonius. Here, as at the beginning, a young "lord of al[l] the land" (l. 1750) requests a marriage from the widowed father of an only child. So, by thematic and structural necessity, Gower's narrative slows to include a description of the courtship: the lover's pain (ll. 1762-67), Athenagoras's courtship strategy (ll.1768-72), and finally the marriage (ll. 1772-75). Gower punctuates this happy resolution's superiority to the Antiochus perversion, writing "thus be thei alle of on[e] accord" (ll. 1776). By accentuating the successful marriage of Athenagoras and Thaise, Gower resolves the anxiety of incest. So, the vision that follows is free from the thematic burden that Shakespeare's retains. No god need counteract Appolonius's incestuous potential. Rather, his moral accomplishment, achieved by a stringent asceticism explicitly distinct from Antiochus's wealth and comfort, must be rewarded.

So, Gower's telling of the vision is a dream, but one that occurs at night, "whan that this king was faste aslepe" (l. 1790). The dream also occurs at the explicit prerogative of

> . . . he that wot what schal betide,
>
> The hihe god, which wolde him kepe. (ll. 1788-89)

The language of the dream, perhaps to avoid at once anachronism and an attribution of affective power to a pagan god, shrouds the divine identity in masculine pronouns that lack a nominal antecedent apart from the "hihe god" of several lines previous: "he hath him bede" (l. 1791), "he bad him drawe" (l. 1793), and "eke he bad in alle wise" (l.1796). The ambiguous pronouns signify at most a disembodied voice that bids but never speaks and, further, cannot be immediately trusted. Appolonius waits to see if the winds confirm, by their direction, the directives of his unusual dream (ll.1801-13). Such ambiguity

amounts to what I term masked or disingenuous theophany. These techniques arise, no

doubt, from a medieval apprehension over the deities of pagan antiquity. This is not to be

overstated. Isabel Rivers explains that "over the centuries Christianity treated the myths

in four ways," only one of which is "the orthodox view the gods were demons" (24). She

explains the more common literary use of the pagan myths is as "moral allegories of

human conduct and foreshadowings of Christian truth" (24). Gower allegorizes or

typologizes the pagan gods, and yet, as has been shown, Appolonius's dream vision

elides their effective presence, masking it. By using the term *mask*, I intend to evoke a

medieval dramatic practice.

My use of the term *mask* draws on Schreyer's discussion of the materiality of

medieval stage craft. Schreyer analyzes the differences between the Early and Late

Chester Banns, documents originally used both to advertise and to announce the staging

of Chester's mystery cycle plays. The Early Banns predate the English Reformation,

while the Late Banns were "unquestionably written after Henry's break with Rome. . .

possibly as late as 1572" (Schreyer 48-49). In Schreyer's reading, the Late Banns provide

evidence of medieval play craft by cataloguing, among other things, the various material

properties associated with each guild's play. Importantly, "the Late Banns conclude with

a serious note of warning about the issue of idolatry," prescribing how God's appearances

ought to be staged:

> Ffor then shoulde all those persones that as godes doe playe
>
> In Clowdes come downe with voice and not be seene
>
> Ffor noe man can proportion that godhead I saye
>
> To the shape of man face, nose, and eyne

But sethence the face guilte doth disfigure the man that deme

A Clowdye covering of the man. A Voyce onlye to heare

And not god in shape or person to appeare. (qtd. in Schreyer 58)

Schreyer explains how "gilded masks," worn by an actor, are here understood as signifying a staging of God's voice only and not a staging of God's person. The voice, the Bann argues, should be deemed acceptably non-idolatrous. So, in our present attempt at schematization, I borrow the metaphor of the mask from medieval stage practice. To some extent, masked theophanies can be seen as typical of the medieval saint's play (see below). Distinctively, Gower's romance seems similarly interested in eliding the affective power of pagan deity by utilizing the theophanic masks of the disembodied voice (though even vocalization must be at most inferred) and the idiosyncratic dream. In drama, the mask avoids the charge of idolatry. In prose, the mask-like ambiguity arises from an orthodox ambivalence toward the pagan gods, especially those not functioning allegorically.

Masked theophanies are typical of sixteenth-century romances as well. I suggest that the idiosyncratic dream vision typifies the prose romance genre more so than the masque or the miracle play. Though Gower's orthodox ambivalence regarding pagan deity precludes any "vision" proper, Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia* presents its own vision, buried in "The Fourth Eclogue," and recounted in the song of the shepherd Philisides. His vision is a dreamed argument between the goddesses Diana and Venus. As a narrative, the dream is a clever variation on the story of Paris's fateful choosing who of the three goddesses is most beautiful. When asked a similar question, Philisides picks a

third option, Mira, the nymph servant of Diana who predictably cannot return his affection.

The vision of Philisides contains one theophanic indicator, music, and utilizes the theophanic mask typical of romance: an idiosyncratic dream. Philisides's song opens with a long description of the evening landscape, including a mention of

A silence sweet each where with one consent embraced

(A music sweet to one in careful musing placed) . . . (335, ll. 19-20)

In these lines, music accentuates the individuality of the "musing" shepherd. Only Philisides can hear it. Music, further, recalls the Neoplatonic belief that souls can, in dreaming, rise into the realm of spheres. This is especially evident in the scene's quick transition into a discussion of sleep and the soul in dreaming.

The description of the landscape gives way to a reverie on the symbolic meanings of sleep, which Philisides presents as an intimation of death (ll. 21-22), a return to innocence and simplicity (ll. 27-32), and a portal for the immortal mind's ascension (336, ll. 9-13). So when Philisides himself drifts off, he dreams his vision. His recounting includes an odd parenthetical apology:

. . . (O gods, O pardon me,

That forced with grief reveals what grieved eyes did see) (337, ll. 1-2)

This parenthetical aside interrupts a description of the moon's splitting and the goddesses descending in a chariot. As a seemingly requisite apology, it highlights the vision's typical idiosyncrasy. What Philisides has seen is meant for him alone.

Sidney's *Old Arcadia*, like Gower's Appolonius narrative, is similarly haunted by a king's foolishness. The radical instability of King Basilius's reign has, as its catalyst,

Basilius's impious counteraction of a cryptic Delphic prophecy. Basilius's error institutes the larger romance's wandering (L. *errare*) movements, including (as in Gower) sexual deviation—the adulterous urges of the king and queen for Philoclea—and sexual indeterminacy—the prince Pyrocles disguised as the huntress Philoclea, with whom both the king and queen attempt separate adulterous affairs. Philisides's vision and his resulting misery reflect the foolish and ineffectual pining that King Basilius has brought upon himself and his family. In other words, the effectual power of the pagan gods is counteracted by the premises of its catalyst. In Gower's Appolonius, pagan deities act, at best, as potentially dangerous conduits for "the hihe god." In Sidney's *Old Arcadia*, pagan deities always stultify. In Appolonius's skepticism, he waits for the wind's confirmation. In Basilius's foolishness, and Philisides's by extension, he works to counteract the oracle's predictions. Sidney uses theophanic masks, music and the idiosyncratic dream, but not out of an orthodox ambivalence. Rather, by the time of Sidney's writing, such masks are a necessary component of the romance genre. These generic masks highlight the tenuous status of the revelation, not yet confirmed by communal wisdom or natural occurrence.

Not all narratives, however, include the tenuous appearance of a pagan god. The medieval miracle or saint's play often includes a moment of earnest theophany, the appearance of the Christian God. In the two non-cycle Digby plays which alone unanimously qualify as English saints' plays, the Digby *Conversion of St. Paul* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, the action "dwells simultaneously in a world of human narrative and of spiritual abstraction" (Bevington 688). The two plays are replete with moments of residual significance for Shakespeare's *Pericles*, as acknowledged by David Bevington.

Bevington explains that the two plays valuably "show the growth of a significant

dramatic genre. In time, that genre will make its contribution to dramatic romance of the

English Renaissance" (663). F. D. Hoeniger has, separately, argued that the Digby *Mary*

Magdalene exercises a marked influence on the narrative content of *Pericles*. For

Hoeniger, as for Bevington, Renaissance romance is partly secularized saint's play. The

influence of continental romance, especially of Italian precedents, is bolstered and

"prepared natively by the established tradition of the miracle play" (Hoeniger lxxxix).

Hoeniger and Bevington are interested in numerous similarities between the genres of

Renaissance romance and saint's play, but we can focus especially on the Digby *Mary*

Magdalene, and how it is punctuated throughout by the appearances of Christ, angels,

and demonic figures. Furthermore, many scholars have noted how both *Pericles* and the

Digby *Mary Magdalene* contain a sea voyage wherein a woman dies in childbirth and

both she and her infant are abandoned. In *Pericles*, the seemingly deceased woman is cast

to sea. In *Mary Magdalene*, the deceased woman and her child are placed on an island.

The Digby *Mary Magdalene* is anomalous to a certain extent. John C. Coldewey

describes it as "the most extravagant play in the whole of early English drama" (186). Its

extravagance is partially based on the numerousness of its actions and the variety of its

locations: "At least nineteen distinct locations are mentioned in the stage directions or

text" of the play (187). But its anomaly is also based on the oddity of its replete

supernaturalism. To take one example, Jesus appears to Mary in the garden early in the

play. This appearance, though not strictly a theophany, does occur idiosyncratically:

Mary alone sees Jesus (ll. 1061-95). Mary's response to Christ's appearance is

reminiscent of Pericles's rapturous response to the appearance of his wife Thaisa. Mary extolls,

> Itt is innumerabyll to expresse,
>
> Or for ony tong for to tell,
>
> Of my joye how mych itt is,
>
> So myche my peynnys itt doth excelle! (ll. 1100-03).

Pericles's famous lines after being reunited with Thaisa at the temple of Diana express a similar sentiment: "This, this! No more, you gods! Your present kindness / Makes my past miseries sport" (5.3.40-41). Mary's initial encounter with the resurrected Christ is followed by numerous appearances of angels and demons. Throughout the play, Christ shows himself from the spread heavens, in moments where directions read "Her[e] shall hevyn opyn, and Jhesus shall shew [hymself]" (229). Importantly, Jesus does not at any point descend. Though his appearances are visible, his position is stationary, and he, as a kind of ideal king at court, sends his angel messengers down to comfort or direct. The angel's appearance functions as a kind of theophanic mask. Rather than staging the descent of Jesus in bodily form—a potentially idolatrous event—the angelic hierarchy allows for the appearance of deific direction without the bodily representation of God. In one scene, the angel directs Mary to travel to the kingdom of Marcyll, saying

> Abasse the[e] noutt, Mary, in this place!
>
> Ower Lorrdys precept thou must fullfyll.
>
> To passe the see in short space,
>
> Onto the lond of Marcyll (ll. 1376-79).

These two scenes together, merely two among a number of similar moments, are enough to indicate the strange and pervasive and atmospheric supernaturalism of the Digby play. Shakespeare creates a similar atmosphere by repeatedly invoking Diana's presence throughout the *Pericles* play. These invocations, as has been shown, are unique to Shakespeare's telling. These invocations, further, create the need for Diana's appearance.

Shakespeare replaces the theophanic masks of medieval drama, the disembodied voice and the angelic hierarchy, with the idiosyncratic dream vision more characteristic of Renaissance romance. The costume of Diana, further, signifies the emergent masque genre known to the audience through the mediations of various media—printed texts and word-of-mouth. Unlike in Gower, Shakespeare includes the vision of Diana immediately after the reunion of Pericles with Marina, preempting any courtship narrative between her and Lysimachus. What Gower uses to dispel the anxiety of incest, Shakespeare ignores. An awareness of the romance genre—the dominant genre of the day—enables us to see the theological assertion underpinning the narrative location of this vision: Shakespeare's hero is not rewarded for forbearance, as Appolonius and numerous other heroes of medieval and Renaissance romance, but divinely rescued from the possibility of incest. Pericles's idiosyncratic vision of Diana, preceded as it is by the heavenly music that has come to be generically indicative of Shakespeare's late plays and would have been characteristic of the kinds of court theater that the Globe makes available to its heterogeneous audiences, hybridizes three prevailing genres of the early Jacobean theater. In so doing, Shakespeare pushes a residual tradition of dramatic theophany toward its emergent dramatic form, the masque's resplendent dream vision of deific processions. Shakespeare embeds these forms—the atmosphere of a saint's play and the costume of a

masque—into a typical romance narrative, thereby making a soteriological assertion reminiscent of the saint's play's emphasis on divinely aided conversion.

In the next chapter, I demonstrate how *Cymbeline*'s distinct dream vision is a continuation of this trajectory, albeit one that evinces a shift in generic association from dominant romance to increasingly dominant masque, all the while retaining the residual genre of the medieval non-cycle play as a key component. Shakespeare's success depends upon his always present emphasis on generic expansion. In the theophanies of the late plays, the elements of this expansion are most transparent and demonstrably hybridized from three shifting webs of association.

CHAPTER THREE

"OF HIM THAT BEARS THE THUNDER": *CYMBELINE*'S VISION OF JUPITER

AND THE SHIFTING THEOPHANIC TRADITION

When the editors of Shakespeare's First Folio placed *Cymbeline* at its conclusion, as the final play in a section entitled "Tragedies," they ensured that questions about the play's genre would be at the center of its criticism. If Shakespeare exhibits a tendency to hybridize and expand upon the possibilities of classical generic modes, as Lawrence Danson suggests, *Cymbeline* is something of his *tour de force*, containing within its dramatic action elements of the comic, the tragic, the historical, the satirical, and the pastoral. The play also shares many of the characteristics often understood to be unique to Shakespeare's later plays: an estranged daughter, a sea journey, presumed deaths that prove untrue, hidden identities revealed, a wise and dramatically significant doctor, an interpreted oracular pronouncement, a resolution filled with recognitions and filial reunions. Most important for the present discussion, *Cymbeline* contains the most pronounced and the most clearly directed theophany in Shakespeare's *oeuvre*, Posthumus's vision of Jupiter. The scene functions as the play's dramatic linchpin, turning the dramatic movement from its descent into darkness toward the play's impending happy resolution.

In the wider argument of this thesis, I have noted how the vision of Jupiter is one of only two explicit theophanic interventions, or earnest theophanies, in Shakespeare. In *Pericles*, Shakespeare alters a narrative common to various sources, and resonant of various literary and popular genres, in order to create a similar linchpin intervention, the

vision of the goddess Diana. The vision of Diana, in both her staged materiality and her wider cultural significance, hybridizes elements of various genres into one theophanic mode that simultaneously resembles each distinct kind. Diana's appearance participates in a theophanic tradition that is present in miracle and saints' plays, in prose and dramatic romance, and in the masque genre coming into distinct form in the early Jacobean period. Appropriating Raymond Williams's schematization of the elements within a cultural apparatus, we identified each of these genres as either residual, dominant, or emergent. As R. S. White has suggested, *Pericles* is Shakespeare's quintessential romance (116). But, in its theophany, the play evinces a generic simultaneity: the Diana of Samuel Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* (1604), an early Jacobean masque, presents herself idiosyncratically to the saintly Pericles, her appearance accompanied by music and occurring, as all the action of Daniel's masque occurs, within a dream. Such elements, as the previous chapter has shown, are variations within what I have called the theophanic tradition, a tradition distinctively present in our three residual, dominant, and emergent genres.

Cymbeline's distinctive theophany results, partially, from its later composition and performance. There is a certain amount of responsible tenuousness appropriate to any chronology of Shakespeare's later plays, but the production of *Pericles* can be firmly placed "between April and June 1608" (Gossett 55). *Cymbeline* comes after, most likely written "between March and November of 1610" and publicly performed in both the Globe and Blackfriars, "followed by a court performance during the Christmas season of 1610-11" (Wayne 30). The lapsed time and the plethora of relevant dramatic spaces are both significant factors in our present discussion of the elaborately enhanced theophany

Cymbeline contains. Compared to the relatively sparse, though uniquely Shakespearean, vision of Diana, *Cymbeline*'s vision of Jupiter presents a heightened mode of intricate spectacle. Taken together, the two distinct theophanies demonstrate a wider shift in the genres available to Shakespeare. The vestiges of occasional miracle play, though still present, move farther off. The romance mode persists. The masque elements have expanded significantly.

       Cymbeline contains a unique level of generic indeterminacy. This indeterminacy evinces a temporally progressive and spatially determined generic fluctuation: the play is written for the Globe, for Blackfriars, and for the court. The dynamics within and between these spaces, described respectively by Stephen Orgel and Andrew Gurr, encourage a heightened hybridization punctuated by a theophany governed increasingly by the masque as a dominant generic web of associations. In our last chapter, we explored the generic potentiality of stage properties, demonstrating how material reality can play as significant a role as literary discourse in critical and historical interpretations of the late plays. In this chapter, a similar argument is made, only now regarding the generic potentialities of not just stage properties, but the stage itself. Shakespeare's artistic vision identifies a form capable of appealing, in various ways, to heterogeneous audiences in various dramatic spaces. The vision of Jupiter, in its hybridization of different kinds that each contain their own theophanic tradition, is a moment of punctuated generic unity. This chapter will explore the dramatic utility and generic signifance of the vision of Jupiter, its various generic resonances, and its function in particular dramatic space. The vision of Jupiter is not, as has been suggested, an uncharacteristic moment in Shakespeare's corpus. Rather, the vision of Jupiter signifies

the ways in which Shakespeare's imagination seeks to unify generic disparities and extend the boundaries of what can be staged and to what end.

If we assert the centrality of *Cymbeline*'s vision of Jupiter, and put this assertion into the crucible of a broad historical perspective, we find ourselves initially in uncomfortable isolation. Almost concomitant with the play's earliest performance, the vision itself has been maligned or overlooked. Simon Forman, whose account of attending *Cymbeline* provides the *terminus ad quem* for our dating of the play's earliest performance, neglects to mention the vision at all (Wayne 30-32).[8] When the play is revised after the Interregnum in 1683, it is rewritten to exclude the vision entirely (Maisano 404). J. M. Nosworthy, introducing the text in 1969, explains how "very few critics are willing to admit the whole of the ensuing episode [the ghostly apparitions and the vision of Jupiter] . . . as Shakespearean, and many reject it *in toto*" (156). Peter Usher, writing in 2003, lists a number of critics who have deplored the vision: Frederick Boas, George Bernard Shaw, Robert Heilman, and Roger Warren among them (Usher 8). This catalogue suggests the varying degrees of discomfort critics feel with *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* more generally—a discomfort that caused Ben Jonson to criticize the moldiness of *Pericles*. But criticism of *Cymbeline* often discusses its theophany as an unfortunate component of its equally unfortunate generic eclecticism. Unless we see the generic eclecticism of Shakespeare's play as definitively connected to and unified by the theophanic moment, unless we understand the way this moment functions to unify the unique hybridization of shifting generic prevalence, we run the risk of joining the historical chorus of skeptical critics.

G. Wilson Knight is the first to push definitively against this historical devaluation with his spirited early twentieth-century defense of Jupiter's appearance as a necessary component of Shakespeare's vision. Knight reads *Cymbeline* alongside the other later plays, drawing out the unity of their patterns of imagery. He first discusses "Cymbeline, his queen, and Cloten" (130), using their various appearances to trace the play's theme of Britain's national history. Knight then presents Posthumus as something of an ideal British man, contrasted with the Italian courtier Iachimo, who represents corrupted continental sophistication. Knight also examines the unique qualities of the heroine Innogen: her particular qualities of speech and the language other characters use to describe her. Knight moves from Innogen to a discussion of the natural and rustic upbringing of Guiderius and Arviragus, raised by the banished lord Bellarius to have a kind of ingrained reverence. Finally, Knight briefly treats the play's tightly woven conclusion. The blessing of Jupiter and the soothsayer's interpretation of the oracle which Jupiter gives to the sleeping Posthumus "both symbolize a certain transference of virtue from Rome to Britain" (166). Knight's investigation, which I summarize here in some detail, draws out and intimates several themes that later critics will pick up on and expand: *Cymbeline* seems deeply concerned with establishing an historic English identity rooted in England's legitimate connection to the *pax romana*. Patricia Parker, to name one subsequent critic who returns to Knight's themes, explores the similarities between Posthumus and Aeneas (191), the legendary founder who connects mythological Troy to ancient Rome in Virgil's epic poem. But Knight's key point, and one this chapter seeks to defend, involves the centrality of the vision of Jupiter.

Knight argues against an impressive catalogue of critical skepticism, and asserts the authenticity of the Jupiter scene, "examining it as an example of a normal Shakespearean technique whereby a single important unit concentrates the massed meanings of its play" (Knight 168). In Knight's interpretation, the theophanic moment represents a typical move of the later plays. They all include powerfully concentrated thematic moments: *Pericles*'s vision of Diana, Apollo's abiding presence in *The Winter's Tale*, Prospero's masque in *The Tempest*, Queene Katherine's unstaged though intimated vision in *Henry VIII* (189-90). His defense of Jupiter's authenticity, however, makes an even stronger claim: that the moment of theophany concentrates and unifies the play's disparate elements. As far as I have found, no other critic makes so strong a claim for the centrality of this theophany.

In the most recent Arden edition of *Cymbeline*, Valerie Wayne dedicates a few pages to a discussion of the vision, cataloguing its possible references to Galileo's *Siderius Nuncius* (a text published in 1610 and quickly available in English translation) and discussing the possible sources for Jupiter's appearance on an eagle (45-49). Though she dedicates a substantial portion of her introduction to discussing the play's various generic resonances (3-30), the vision of Jupiter is not presented as having central generic significance. Wayne's discussion of the play's various genres attempts reconciling their disparate combination by suggesting the play is ultimately "recapitulatory" (28).[9] Shakespeare's invocation and use of various styles and modes explains *Cymbeline*'s "role in the Folio as a valedictory play" (29), one whose intricate and detailed finale, especially, helps "provide a peroration for the entire First Folio," exhibiting, "how expansively the author reflects on, reimagines, and parodies his previous work while

making something distinctively new" (30). Taking the arrangement of the First Folio into account, Wayne goes a long way toward explaining the potential logic of the play's placement: it is, generically and typically, a kind of Shakespearean apotheosis. Yet this explanation does not address the more specific question of what might unify, or at the very least justify, the generic eclecticism of Shakespeare's play in performance. Wayne's introduction to the play, a rigorously researched and convincing exploration, cannot ultimately resolve the questions raised by *Cymbeline*'s generic complexity.

Without an adequate theoretical schema for identifying and assessing the mechanisms, moments, and resonances of Shakespeare's generic hybridity, critical examinations often result in either a narrowing of approach or a deliberate anachronicity. It is important to notice how these two tendencies acknowledge *Cymbeline*'s generic complexity, but cannot ultimately account for it. Further, neither tendency can explicate effectively the full signifance of the vision of Jupiter. The vision is instead subsumed into the wider point as an illustration of it. What we need, however, is a means of reading the vision of Jupiter not simply as a dramatic linchpin, but as the key to *Cymbeline*'s generic unity.

Alongside Valerie Wayne, whose introduction discusses each genre in isolation without establishing any connection between them, Arthur Kirsch and Peter Usher illustrate the former tendency toward disciplinary or topical narrowing. Kirsch, arguing in support of one of this chapter's contentions, suggests how the Blackfriars theater provides a significant context for understanding a preoccupation of Shakespeare's later plays: coterie dramaturgy at the private theaters. Kirsch demonstrates how Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, and Marston all employ a dramatic mode typified by a deliberate self-

consciousness. These playwrights create this sense of self-consciousness by placing passionate rhetoric in inappropriate contexts. *Cymbeline*, in Kirsch's reading, contains many such moments, notably Innogen's moving lament over what she thinks is the dead body of her husband though the audience knows it is really the dead body of the vicious Cloten. Such tonal discontinuity is not typical of Shakespeare. "No other heroine," writes Kirsch, "suffers this kind of exploitation" (294). But, for Kirsch, Shakespeare uses this prevalent mode to complement his unique interest in redemptive time and the *felix culpa*, misfortunes whereby result in a superior resolution (298-99). In such a reading, the vision of Jupiter is an instance where the play is punctuated by an obviously self-conscious artifice, valuable largely for the obvious analogy between providential governance and authorial control (302-03). The theophanic moment reveals the author's controlling presence, making the author "deliberately conspicuous" (303). However, Kirsch's reading limits the theophanic moment to one particular generic mode, court theater, and so does not adequately capture the moment's resplendent complexity, its hybridity of various modes.

Peter Usher's more recent article is especially important for our discussion because it purports to uncover a wider significance for the vision of Jupiter. Usher builds off of previous arguments that *Hamlet* dramatizes the conflict between Ptolemaic and Copernican conceptions of the universe. If *Hamlet* contains references to Shakespeare's emerging scientific milieu, then it may be possible "that Shakespeare referred to Galileo's discovery [of Jupiter's four moons] in *Cymbeline,* which first appeared about six months after the publication of [Galileo's work] *Siderius Nuncius*" (7). Usher highlights the role of the four ghosts, suggesting that their circular dance represents the

orbit of Galileo's four moons around Jupiter. Usher's reading lends the theophany a layer of astronomical allegory, pointing to the New Science of Shakespeare's day (8). Usher then attempts to unravel the implicit presence of a name-game involving Posthumus and Thomas Digges, an important English astronomer of the day (10). If Usher is right, then his work serves as a correction to numerous scholarly assessments indicating the New Science had no discernible effect on Shakespeare's dramatic imagination. But Usher's reading is, undoubtedly, illustrative of a scholarly tendency toward disciplinary narrowing.

Moreover, Usher's reading of the ghosts' movements builds upon Peggy Muñoz Simonds's work, but misreads it. Usher quotes Simonds directly when discussing the "planetary motion" of the four ghosts. But Simonds, first, is careful to note that the ghosts circle Posthumus, not Jupiter. Second, she explains how such a scene has its primary source not in the New Astronomy, but in classical drama: "The use of ancestral ghosts to conjure up a god or an action was, of course, a standard convention in the tragedies of Seneca, whose work Shakespeare undoubtedly studied as a schoolboy" (Simonds 291). Rather than a cryptic reference to an astronomical discovery, I contend that the ghostly apparitions are a compacted invocation, an explicit summoning of deity that makes its appearance a dramatic necessity. Chapter Two demonstrates a similar dynamic throughout Shakespeare's *Pericles*. The generically more expansive *Cymbeline* requires a more compact, a less general invocation. The ghostly invocation has, it will later be argued, interesting affinities with another medieval miracle play, the Digby *Killing of the Children*. The ghosts utilize the structure of an element within the genre of medieval

miracle play in order to invoke the theophanic vision that expands upon this earlier genre with one that is, still, emergent.

Usher's argument has, in spite of its oversights, proved to be quite influential. Valerie Wayne discusses it, albeit concluding that "the spectacle probably appeared more mythological than cosmological, but Galileo's discovery may be suggested in a more generalized way, especially since its news reached England relatively quickly" (45). Wayne addresses Usher's article directly, though largely on account of John Pitcher's reiteration of it in his Penguin edition of *Cymbeline* (lxxii-lxxvi). But it is Scott Maisano who builds most expansively upon Usher's suggestion and, in other ways, illustrates our second scholarly tendency, an embrace of explicit anachronism.

In Maisano's reading, Shakespeare's vision of Jupiter reflects the influence of the New Science on Shakespeare's imagination. But this reflection is combined, suggests Maisano, with another significant book, "the much anticipated Authorized Version or King James Bible . . . published in 1611" (407). Maisano's argument moves in several directions. First, Maisano recognizes the astronomical features of the vision of Jupiter to be significant (405-06). Second, Maisano argues that the bizarre anachronism of *Cymbeline*'s plot—characters travel back and forth between a dissolute seventeenth-century Italy and an ancient, pre-Christian Britain—is a consequent extension of Shakespeare's interest in the possible implications of the New Science. The wormhole effect of staging an explicit anachronism juxtaposes the locale of the New Science— Renaissance Italy—with the time of an at least equally significant breakthrough—the birth of Christ (411). All the action in Britain takes place, albeit implicitly, in first century Britain, concurrently with the time of Christ's birth. To Maisano, it seems appropriate

that a play implicitly concerned with Christ's birth—a birth announced to others by way of both angelic apparition and astronomical anomaly—would include an astronomically informed divine appearance. Maisano's embrace of outright anachronism, however, results in his use of the descriptive term "scientific romance" (411), by which he means "a work of theatrical science fiction" (412). Maisano goes on to identify more scientific elements within the play and, further, more similarities between "The news of Galileo's discoveries and the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (417). Maisano's complicated argument seeks, ultimately, to establish Shakespeare's intentionally implicit parallel between the pagan world's ending at the birth of Christ and the Christian world's ending in light of the contradictions between the New Science and the Authorized Version. Maisano concludes that

> The representation of a vital pre-Christian life in these final scenes [especially the vision of Jupiter] suggests, to my mind, that Shakespeare did not intend for his audience to rejoice at the sight of Rome's hastening demise, but rather to discover, in this portrait of a vast and enduring culture on the peak and precipice of its glory, an analogue for their own situation. (433)

In Maisano's reading, Shakespeare's scientific romance juxtaposes two moments of axial transition, the emergence of modern Protestant science and the ancient birth of Christianity. Looking forward to a genre properly emergent in the twentieth century, he suggests it as the genre that can unify *Cymbeline*'s disparate elements.

It is my contention that the disparate elements of *Cymbeline* can be adequately unified, but not by the narrowing of disciplinary focus and not by the use of an

anachronism. What is needed, instead, is an adequate account of generic fluctuation, an assessment that sees *Cymbeline* as participating in and appealing to the heterogeneous tastes of heterogeneous audiences in various dramatic locales. These tastes are both modern and medieval, both Elizabethan and Jacobean, both rural and urban, both simple and sophisticated, both high and low, both national and cosmopolitan. The relevant generic kinds—often subsumed under the broader terms tragedy and comedy—are miracle play, romance, and court masque. The hybridity that Shakespeare and his company stage is prismatically appealing. Turned in the light of a new audience and location it yields distinct generic interest. The remainder of this chapter will seek to recreate the various contexts for *Cymbeline*'s generic prism, hoping thereby to illuminate its various generic angles and correct the scholarly tendency toward either unnecessary narrowness or unnecessary expansion.

Valerie Wayne suggests that Shakespeare lifts the calumny plot, wherein Posthumus and Iachimo wager over the dependable fidelity of Posthumus's wife Innogen, from the medieval romance tradition. Wayne relies on the work of both Helen Cooper and Barabara Fuchs to build what she considers to be the first sustained argument for considering such a plot to be typical of a wide range of both English and Continental romance (6-18). She offers further evidence for *Cymbeline*'s general affinity with popular stage romance (17-19). What Wayne expresses is, I think, a scholarly consensus. Shakespeare's later plays undeniably owe a debt to "the old romances, narrative and dramatic" (Wayne 19). Such romances enjoyed a widespread and "uninterrupted popularity across Europe . . . well into the seventeenth century" (Fuchs 78).

In chapter Two, I discuss the notable influence of this romance mode and its function as the dominant genre. The romance genre governs the overall narrative into which other generic elements are hybridized. And the theophanic tradition within the romance genre, illustrated in both Gower's *Appolonius of Tyre* and Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia*, is shown to involve an idiosyncratic dream vision. The implicit Neoplatonism of these visions is helpfully explicated by Peggy Simonds, who explains that

> According to popular Neoplatonic belief, the soul could actually leave the body at times to commune with the airy spirit world in a state of ecstasy, but then it had to return to the body once more in order to "understand" its own spiritual nature through the five senses. (293)

The ecstatic journey of the soul seems especially operative in Sidney's *Arcadia*, in the recounted dream vision of the shepherd Philisides (for a more thorough description, see chapter Two). Importantly, the Neoplatonic elements of the dream vision reestablish the governing significance of Ptolemaic cosmology. The music that precedes the dream vision in both *Cymbeline* and *Pericles* connects the harmony of the spheres (*musica mundana*) to the virtuous life of Pericles and Posthumus respectively. The music indicates the soul's ascension into the "airy spirit world."[10] An understanding of the theophanic tradition within romance suggests, counter to the claims of Peter Usher and Scott Maisano, the important connection between romance and Ptolemaic cosmology. The musical and providential legitimization of Posthumus's virtue, embedded within an idiosyncratic dream vision, participates clearly in the romance mode. So far, the theophanies of *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* have been discussed together. But, unlike in the

vision of Diana, the vision of Jupiter includes the appearance of four spirits—the dead family of Posthumus—who intercede on Posthumus's behalf and summon the intervention of Jupiter.

The previous chapter notes several similarities between the plot and dream vision in *Pericles* and elements of the saint's play the Digby *Mary Magdalene*. A similar connection presents itself in *Cymbeline*, especially if we consider, as Scott Maisano has, the operant and implicit historical context—the birth of Christ. The context of Christ's birth is made more significant by the play's third theatrical place, the Christmas season performances at the king's court (Wayne 30). A play that seeks to present the ancient, Roman legitimacy of a uniquely British monarch—themes resonant in the context of James's court, as is often mentioned (Parolin 193; Marcus 120; Wayne 39)—also depicts an historical scene believed to be concurrent with Christ's birth. Roger Warren explains: "The most significant event that took place during Cymbeline's reign [according to Holinshed's *Chronicle*] was the birth of Christ, and this may be the reason why Shakespeare chose this king's reign in which to set a play ending with international peace" (Warren 38). I think the chronological adjacency of these mythical events justifies a consideration of whether there may be resonances between *Cymbeline* and earlier, even medieval dramatic treatments of the narratives that surround the birth of Christ. And we find one in the Digby *Killing of the Children*.

The vision of Jupiter, a spectacular moment of divine intervention, is preceded by the intercession of four filial ghosts, the "airy spirits" of Posthumus's dead family. This scene has often been rejected or at least maligned on account of its supposedly stilted verse and stylistic crudity. A similar narrative invocation occurs toward the conclusion of

the Digby *Killing of the Children*. The strange plot of this play juxtaposes two biblical

events: King Herod's politically motivated execution of all male children born in

Bethlehem and the Christ child's temple purification. The non-cycle play has "a widely

ranging performance history under a variety of circumstances" (Coldewey 254),

including the possible extension of its performances "into Chelmsford, Essex, during the

third quarter of the sixteenth century, as seems to have been the case with the other Digby

plays" (253). The obviously dark material includes, like *Cymbeline*, a filial lament, and,

more importantly, one that invokes the rectifying intervention of God, whose implicit

response causes king Herod's subsequent insanity.

Immediately following the slaughter of the young boys, four mothers variously

lament. Coldewey preserves, in his anthology, their original appellations, *mulier*. This

term, whose oddity provokes a discussion by Wayne (84-86), recurs in *Cymbeline*, as part

of the soothsayer's concluding interpretation of Posthumus's received oracle. The

soothsayer offers this bit of punnery

> The piece of tender air, thy virtuous daughter,
>
> Which we call *mollis aer*, and *mollis aer*
>
> We term it *mulier*, which *mulier* I divine
>
> In this most constant wife, who even now,
>
> Answering the letter of the oracle,
>
> Unknown to you [Posthumus], unsought, were clipped about
>
> With this most tender air. (5.5.445-51)[11]

Wayne sees the soothsayer's offered etymology as a moment wherein Shakespeare

appropriates a linguistic phrase usually used to emphasize feminine weakness and

fragility and uses it instead to assert a woman's fidelity (84-86). While not contradicting this claim, Scott Maisano has demonstrated the ways in which the soothsayer's interpretation may misrepresent or misinterpret the actual content of the oracle (421). In agreement with Maisano, I contend that there remains room to associate the "tender air" of the oracle with the "airy spirits" who appear in Posthumus's dream vision. They, it seems, "unknown to" him, "unsought," have clipped him about, as it were. The polyphonic association of *mulier*, simultaneously a faithful Innogen and the *mollis aer* of filial spirits, allows us to consider seriously the similar movements contained in these two otherwise disparate plays.

In the Digby play, the first mother laments

Alas, allasse, good gossyppes! This is a sorofulle peyn,

To se oure dere children that be so yong

With these caytyves thus sodeynly to be slayn!

A vengeaunce I aske on them all for this grett wrong! (ll. 315-18)

The second mother names specifically her murdered son, focusing the audience's attention on the pathos of the moment by individualizing the pain (ll. 319-21). The third mother localizes the intercession, specifying the appropriate target of divine justice: King Herod.

Gossippis, a shamefulle deth I aske upon Herowde our kyng,

That thus rigorously oure children hath slayn! (ll. 322-23)

The fourth mother asks also that God would bring Herod "to an ille ending!" (ll. 324). Though God does not subsequently appear on stage, the intercession of the four *mulieres* results in Herod's madness. "Oute! I am madde! My wyttes be ner gone!" Herod shouts

in the scene immediately following (l. 365), a scene that concludes with King Herod's

death (ll. 385-88).

In *Cymbeline*, four ghosts appear to lament Posthumus's fate and intercede on his

behalf. They speak in fourteeners, a verse form that "harks back to Chapman's 1598

translation of the *Iliad*" (Wayne 336), but also sounds, at times, similar to the verse

speeches of the four *mulieres* of the Digby play. Each ghost, in turn, recounts the ways

that Jupiter has allowed injustice and asks for the reversal of Posthumus's fortunes. Their

intercessory invocation does, like those of the Digby mothers, result in a dramatic

consequence, but Shakespeare's scene mediates the response through an earnest

theophany.

The genre we have called residual, the medieval miracle play (which includes

here the broader category of occasional drama), is fainter and more tenuous in *Cymbeline*

than in *Pericles*. The romance mode into which the earnest theophany is embedded

remains operative: the idiosyncratic dream vision depicts the Neoplatonic ascension of

the virtuous soul into the musical realm of the spheres. But note, further, the way that the

theophany itself, the subsequent component of the dream vision, has increased in length

and extravagance. This signifies the growing influence of the court masque genre.

S. Schoenbaum summarizes the transition in Shakespeare's contexts, exploring

"The fabled flexibility of Elizabethan dramaturgy" and "the significance of the

Blackfriars move" (214). Andrew Gurr, in a recent volume, asserts that there are, indeed,

generic possibilities created by the move of Shakespeare's company, adding

performances at the indoor and more exclusive Blackfriars onto their continuing outdoor

performances at the Globe. In Gurr's reading, there is a telling affinity between the

romance genre and the affordances of an indoor theater: an increased use of artificial light and a space conducive to the use of resonant music (210). As I have already mentioned, *Cymbeline*'s early performance history lends an additional layer onto this heterogenous audience, namely the court itself (Wayne 30). This tri-partite context, not a firm transition from outdoor to indoor but a continual contextual fluctuation (Schoenbaum 214), creates a unique exigency for generic multiplicity. And the court, it seems, provides the most appropriate context in which to see the final generic kind especially evident in *Cymbeline*'s extended and uniquely earnest theophany. Writing with older theophanic traditions in mind, Shakespeare is influenced by and in turn influences the court masque.

Many concurrently produced court entertainments include the appearances of mythological deities. Far from a uniquely Shakespearean theatrical event, a pageant of deities revealed proves to be a typical element of the masque genre. Arthur Kirsch and Valerie Wayne both note the similarities between Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* and Beaumont and Fletcher's tragicomedy *Philaster* (Kirsch 286; Wayne 48-49). Wayne suggests that their similarities arise from an almost interdependent composition. Shakespeare could have either read their work-in-progress or been privy to an early staging (48-49). Alongside the courtly tragicomedy *Philaster*, the vision of Jupiter is shared with Thomas Heywood's play *The Golden Age*. Wayne explains their similarity by claiming that Heywood's is a "1611 imitation of Jupiter on an eagle" (49). She describes how "the finale of *The Golden Age* includes the god Jupiter being presented with an eagle, crown, scepter and thunderbolt, after which Jupiter ascends to Olympus on his eagle in a striking scene" (47). The inclusion of Jupiter in subsequent plays and courtly entertainments indicates the way that Shakespeare not only stages an extravagant

theophany, but also, by this staging, pushes the dramatic theophanic tradition in a particular direction. Just as Shakespeare in *Pericles* picks up on Daniel's depiction of Diana, so now Shakespeare's staging influences and controls the theophanies included in later court masques.

A later masque of Ben Jonson's, *The Golden Age Restored* (1616), begins with an earnest theophany in the Shakespearean mode, and one that, though Jupiter never appears, reiterates his continued centrality. An opening stage direction reads "Loud music. Pallas in her chariot descending. To softer music" (Lindley 102). The following monologue, recited by Pallas to the "softer music," is a laudatory hymn to Jove, which begins

> Look, look! Rejoice and wonder!
>
> That you offending mortals are
>
> (For all your crimes) so much the care
>
> Of him that bears the thunder! (ll. 2-5)

Jove is, throughout the hymn, presented as the bringer of justice, the restorer of harmony. Such praise seems immediately reminiscent of Shakespeare's own depiction of Jupiter, whose thunderous descent on an eagle is accompanied by music. His opening lines read

> No more you petty spirits of region low,
>
> Offend our hearing. Hush. How dare you ghosts
>
> Accuse the thunderer, whose bolt, you know,
>
> Sky-planted, batters all rebelling coasts. (5.4.63-66)

There is an obvious similarity between these two moments. An initial, interjectory imperative is followed by an exhortation to recognize one's own position in relation to

the elevated speaker, whether Pallas or Jupiter. Compared to Jonson, further, and placed in the wider context of the masque, Shakespeare's verse retains a bit of its elevation and grandeur. His choppier, more punctuated lines include an element of thunder: the strength of the adjective "sky-planted" and of the verb "batters" also work toward this general sense of a thunderous rhythm. Here, similar to Jonson's masque, Jupiter is presented as the maintainer of order and the deliverer of justice. Leah Marcus has argued that, in the logic of the courtly masque, *Cymbeline*'s Jupiter "is clearly to be identified with King James" (120). In Jonson's later masque, this explicitly political connection is made clearer. Pallas exhorts the spectators to "show the world your fire" (l. 209) as Jupiter's "bounty gives you cause" (l. 207). In the context of the court, the audience of royalty and nobility would, no doubt, take this to be an immediate reference to the king, whose grandeur, largesse, and generosity the masque has served to demonstrate. Stephen Orgel reminds us, further, that the context of the court is not limited to court performance. The Globe too, largely on account of Shakespeare's direct connection to the king as patron of "The King's Men," offered some of this prestige to the common viewer, giving many their closest look at the costly grandeur of the court (9).

What, then, is the literary significance of Shakespeare's second earnest theophany? *Cymbeline*'s vision of Jupiter, preceded by and including the intercessory dance of filial spirits, hybridizes three distinct genres in an attempt to appeal to a heterogeneous audience. These three genres, each identifiable in the scene's various elements, function effectively in the fluctuation of theatrical space, the various spaces in which *Cymbeline* would have been staged. Shakespeare takes up the distinct theophanic traditions available to him and moves them in a particular direction. His first and simpler

theophany, the vision of Diana in *Pericles*, demonstrates the residual elements from the older miracle play, participates firmly in the romance mode, and builds upon an association with the court and an early masque of Samuel Daniel, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* (1604). His second and more extravagant theophany, the vision of Jupiter in *Cymbeline*, contains a fainter trace of the residual miracle play, sustains the Neoplatonic elements of the romance mode, and more emphatically participates in the increasingly significant court masque. Shakespeare's theophany, rather than merely representing constituent elements of his wider moment, participates in and alters the developing webs of association such that subsequent court masques evince the influence of his language, his imagery, and his thematic preoccupations.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

I should like to make nine interrelated propositions, each based in the research contained within the previous chapters. All of them arise naturally from what I have been arguing throughout this thesis. The first seven propositions summarize and pull together the various strands of the previous chapters. The eighth suggests a direction for further research, how subsequent scholarship and criticism might build on what I have here put forward. The final proposition suggests one quite specific direction for my own continued research on Shakespearean theophanies and the late plays.

I.

The vision of Diana and the vision of Jupiter are moments unique to two of Shakespeare's late plays, *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* respectively. They should not be reductively conflated with the ultimately dissimilar moments in other late plays: whether Ariel's harpy, Apollo's oracle, or Katherine's dream.

II.

Because the gods appear onstage bodily, the two theophanies ought to be considered as earnest. They should not be regarded only as sophisticated authorial self-representation (Kirsch) or as symbolic representations of the monarchy (Orgel; Marcus; Jordan). The theophanies are also more than simply representations of something else with extra-literary import, whether Galileo's moons (Usher) or the potentialities of English identity and church practice (Bicks).

III.

Insomuch as Shakespeare's work arises from a meaningful web of theophanic precedents, contained within distinct genres of Shakespeare's day, these precedents ought to be understood as influencing the possibilities available to Shakespeare within his historical moment and his theatrical locale.

IV.

Because occasional medieval plays, romances, and court masques each contain their own theophanic tradition, Shakespeare's two earnest theophanies ought to be seen as composed of diverse generic elements and thereby as moments of generic hybridity.

V.

Generic hybridity is uniquely appealing to Shakespeare later in his career, especially during the early reign of James I, on account of Shakespeare's gradually and consistently shifting places and audiences. The later plays of Shakespeare are composed with these various locations in mind: the Globe theater, the Blackfriars theater, and the royal court. The plays are thus quite versatile and varied.

VI.

Though Shakespeare's two earnest theophanies are similar, they are not identical. Their differences arise from shifts in the generic preoccupations of Shakespeare's milieu, a progression that moves away from miracle play, through romance, and toward court masque as each genre becomes more or less available and expedient.

VII.

Shakespeare's earnest and spectacular theophanies are influenced by precedent and, in turn, participate in and move proceeding genres in particular and demonstrable ways.

When Shakespeare's theophanies are seen as participants in furtherance of a group of theophanic traditions, they each regain a bit of their complexity and grandeur.

VIII.

If generic hybridity typifies the two earnest theophanies in the late plays, then there are undoubtedly additional ways in which hybridity governs other constituent elements of the late plays. Further work could be done to identify and elucidate the ways distinct components of these plays participate in the dynamics of different theatrical places or appeal to a variously heterogeneous audience.

IX.

Subsequent work should take into account not simply the shift toward theophany I have discussed here, but also the overt shift away from it. In the context of the late plays, we have dealt with the obvious question of why and to what end Shakespeare begins to include earnest theophanies to effect dramatic resolutions. The question remains, however, as to why Shakespeare subsequently turns away from them. Nothing comparable to the two theophanies occurs in *The Winter's Tale*; the masque in *The Tempest* is always already artificial, beginning and ending as a spectacular illusion; and Katherine's vision, in *Henry VIII*, is intimated but unstaged. Katherine's vision especially seems to be a moment where Shakespeare deliberately rejects his previous device, at least in its earnest and hybridized form. Investigating this turn away from the earnest theophany would further our understanding of the shifting contexts of Shakespeare's late work and of the genres available to and expedient for him.

NOTES

1. It may here be objected that Shakespeare's *As You Like It* includes a comparable moment when, seemingly, the god Hymen appears and blesses the weddings at the play's conclusion. But I am in agreement with David Giffin, who argues that this moment ought to instead be read as the speech of a disguised Corin. Giffin argues that *As You Like It* has an otherwise naturalistic plot, in contrast to the ways in which the presence of Diana and Jupiter punctuate their respective plays by being mentioned throughout.

2. F. Elizabeth Hart calculates there are, "at least four Protestant sermons of the period" that refer to Diana or to Ephesus (350), and identifies each as appearing in both the work of Caroline Bicks which I here discuss, and in Laurie Maguire. Hart does not claim this number is exhaustive and, if there has been an exhaustive study done, she does not mention it.

3. Hart borrows this term from Roberts's work, and summarizes Roberts's contentions (348-9).

4. Hart discusses Margaret Doody's work *The True Story of the Novel* (1996) at some length, but mentions alongside it Carol Gesner's *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A Study of Origins* (1970), Barbara Mowat's *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (1976), and J. J. Tobin's *Shakespeare's Favorite Novel* (1984). To this list, I'd like to add Stuart Gillespie's article "Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: 'Like an old tale still," edited by Charles Martindale and A. D. Taylor. Gillespie discusses the four known Greek Romances of Shakespeare's day, and attempts to distinguish their actual generic qualities from a scholarly tendency to read and define

the Greek Romance predominantly through the lens of the late Shakespearean Romances. Gillespie asks several valuable questions about the relationship between the plays and their various translated forms and provides a wealth of annotated references for further research.

5. Karen Britland, in her exploration of the late plays' historical contexts in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Late Plays* (2009), suggests some contemporary political resonances of six of Shakespeare's late plays—resonances within the wider social and political contexts of the early reign of James I. She suggests that James's reign centered around three issues: absolutism, union, and diplomatic marriages. Significantly all three are present in *Pericles* at various points, and her suggestion of absolutism seems to complement Jordan's political reading.

6. In the popular culture of the Elizabethan period, prose romance is demonstrably the dominant literary genre or mode—both dramatically in plays like *Mucedorus* and in print in Sidney's *Arcadia* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. Barbara Fuchs's discussion of romance in the Renaissance is especially insightful (97).

7. All citations from Shakespeare's *Pericles* text are taken from Suzanne Gossett's Arden 3 edition.

8. Wayne asserts that, rather than evidence of the vision's absence, this oversight may indicate Forman's lack of interest in spectacle (31). S. Schonebaum notices Forman's neglect, but describes his *Bocke of Plaies* as containing "unique eyewitness accounts of these productions [*Macbeth*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Cymbeline*]" (214).

9. This suggestion was originally made by Roger Warren, although he uses the term "retrospective" (18).

10. Isabel Rivers explains the significance of musical harmony in Ptolemaic cosmology (74).

11. All citations from Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* text are quoted from Valerie Wayne's Arden 3 edition.

WORKS CITED

Bergeron, David M. *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family*. U of Kansas P,

    1985.

Bevington, David, editor. *Medieval Drama*. Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Bicks, Caroline. "Backsliding at Ephesus: Shakespeare's Diana and the Churching of

    Women." *Pericles: Critical Essays*. Edited by David Skeele, Garland P, 2000, pp.

    205-27.

Britland, Karen. "Politics, Religion, Geography, and Travel: Historical Contexts of the

    Last Plays." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Last Plays*, edited by

    Catherine Alexander, Cambridge UP, 2009, pp. 71-90.

Coldewey, John C. *Early English Drama: An Anthology*. Garland P, 1993.

Daniel, Samuel. "The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses," edited by Joan Rees. *A Book of

    Masques*, edited by T. J. Spencer, Cambridge UP, 1967, pp. 17-42.

Danson, Lawrence. "The Shakespeare Remix: Romance, Tragicomedy, and

    Shakespeare's 'distinct kind.'" *Shakespeare and Genre: From Early Modern

    Inheritances to Postmodern Legacies*. Edited by Anthony R. Guneratne, Palgrave

    Macmillan, 2012, pp. 101-18.

---. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Genres*. Oxford UP, 2000.

Diller, Hans-Jürgen. *The Middle English Mystery Play: A Study in Dramatic Speech and

    Form*. Cambridge UP, 1992.

Doody, Margaret. *The True Story of the Novel*. Rutgers UP, 1996.

Fowler, Alastair. "The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After." *New Literary*

History, vol. 34, no. 2, Spring 2003, pp. 185-200. *Project Muse*,

doi:10.1353/nlh.2003.0017. Accessed 14 Nov. 2017.

---. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Harvard

UP, 1982.

Fuchs, Barbara. *Romance*. Routledge P, 2004.

Gesner, Carol. *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A Study of Origins*. U of Kentucky

P, 1970.

Gillespie, Stuart. "Shakespeare and Greek Romance: 'Like an old tale still.'"

Shakespeare and the Classics, edited by Charles Martindale and A. D. Taylor,

Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 225-36.

Gossett, Suzanne, editor. *Pericles*. Written by William Shakespeare, Bloomsbury P,

2004.

Gower, John. *Confessio Amantis*. Edited by Russell A. Peck, Holt Reinhart and Winston

P, 1968.

Grantley, Darryll. "Saints and Miracles." *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval*

English Theatre. Edited by Richard Beadle and Alan J. Fletcher, Cambridge UP,

2008, pp. 263-86.

Gurr, Andrew. "The New Fashion for Indoor Plays." *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*.

Edited by Andrew Gurr and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 203-

16.

Hart, F. Elizabeth. "'Great is Diana' of Shakespeare's Ephesus." *Studies in English*

Literature, vol. 43, no. 1, 2003, pp. 347-74.

Hoeniger, F. D., editor. *Pericles*. By William Shakespeare. Harvard UP, 1963.

Hunter, G. K. *English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare*. Oxford UP, 1997.

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

Kaytor, Daryl. "Shakespeare's Gods." *Literature and Theology*, vol. 29, no. 1, Mar. 2015,
    pp. 3-17.

Knowles, Richard Paul. "'The More Delay'd, Delighted': Theophanies in the Last Plays."
    Shakespeare Studies, vol. 15, no. 1, 1982, pp. 269-80.

Kirsch, Arthur C. "*Cymbeline* and Coterie Dramaturgy." *ELH*, vol. 34, no. 3, 1967, pp.
    285-306. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2872115. Accessed 26 Oct. 2017.

Knight, G. Wilson. *The Crown of Life*. Oxford UP, 1947.

Lindley, David, editor. *The Court Masque*. Manchester UP, 1984.

Maguire, Laurie. "The Girls from Ephesus." *The Comedy of Errors: Critical Essays*,
    edited by Robert S. Miola, Garland P, 1997.

Maisano, Scott. "Shakespeare's Last Act: The Starry Messenger and the Galilean Book in
    Cymbeline." *Configurations*, vol. 12, no. 3, Fall 2004, pp. 401-34. *Project Muse*,
    doi:10.1353/con.2007.0003. Accessed 5 Feb. 2018.

Marcus, Leah. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents*. U of California
    P, 1988.

Moore, Helen. "Romance." *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and
    Culture*. Edited by Michael Hattaway, vol. 2, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, pp. 238-48.

Mowat, Barbara. *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*. U of Georgia P, 1976.

Muir, Kenneth. "Theophanies in the Last Plays." *Shakespeare's Late Plays: Essays in*

Honor of Charles Crow. Edited by Richard C. Tobias and Paul G. Zolbrod, Ohio

    UP, 1975, pp. 32-43.

Newcomb, Laura Humphrey. "The Sources of Romance, the Generation of Story, and the

    Patterns of Pericles Tales." *Staging Early Modern Romance*. Edited by Mary

    Ellen Lamb and Valerie Wayne, Routledge P, 2009, pp. 21-46.

Nosworthy, J. M., editor. *Cymbeline*. Written by William Shakespeare, Bloomsbury P,

    1969.

O'Connell, Michael. *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early-Modern*

    England. Oxford UP, 2000.

---. "Continuities between 'Medieval' and 'Early Modern' Drama." *A New Companion to*

    English Renaissance Literature and Culture. Edited by Michael Hattaway, vol. 2,

    Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, pp. 61-69.

Orgel, Stephen. *The Illusion of Power*. U of California P, 1975.

Parker, Patricia. "Romantic Empire: Anachronistic *Cymbeline*." *Unfolded Tales*. Edited

    by George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey, Cornell UP, 1989, pp. 189-207.

Parolin, Peter A. "Anachronistic Italy: Cultural Alliances and National Identity in

    Cymbeline." *Shakespeare Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2002, pp. 188-215.

Pitcher, John, editor. *Cymbeline*. Written by William Shakespeare, Penguin P, 2005.

---. "Samuel Daniel's Masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*: Texts and

    Payments." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2013,

    pp. 17-42. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24322738. Accessed on 8 Jan. 2018.

Rivers, Isabel. *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry*. George

    Allen and Unwen P, 1979.

Schmidgall, Gary. *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic*. U of California P, 1981.

Schoenbaum, S. *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life*. Oxford UP, 1975.

Schreyer, Kurt. *Shakespeare's Medieval Craft: Remnants of the Mysteries on the London Stage*. Cornell UP, 2014.

Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*. Edited by Jean Robertson, Clarendon P, 1973.

Simonds, Peggy Muñoz. *Myth, Emblem, and Music in Shakespeare's Cymbeline*. Associated UP, 1992.

Tobin, J. J. M. *Shakespeare's Favorite Novel: A Study of "The Golden Asse" as Prime Source*. U of America P, 1984.

Twine, Laurence. *The Pattern of Painful Adventures (Quarto)*. *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. Edited by Tom Bishop and Andrew Forsberg, University of Victoria, 3 Oct. 2016, internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Twine_Q1/complete. Accessed 28 Mar. 2018.

Usher, Peter. "Jupiter and *Cymbeline*." *The Shakespeare Newsletter,* vol. 53, no. 1, Spring 2003, pp. 7-12.

Warren, Roger, editor. *Cymbeline*. Written by William Shakespeare, Oxford UP, 1998.

Wayne, Valerie, editor. *Cymbeline*. Written by William Shakespeare, Bloomsbury P, 2017.

White, R. S. *Let Wonder Seem Familiar: Endings in Shakespeare's Romance Vision*. Humanities Press, 1985.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." *The Norton*

    Anthology of Theory and Criticism. Edited by Vincent B. Leitch. Norton and

    Company P, 2010, pp. 1423-37.