

“WHO STAND I’ TH’ GAPS”: NARRATIVE AUTHORITY IN THE EARLY
MODERN ENGLISH TRAVEL PLAY

BY

JENNIFER LEIGH GREENHOLT

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

English

May 2011

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Susan E. Harlan, Ph.D., Advisor

Dean J. Franco, Ph.D., Chair

Omaar Hena, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank, first, my advisor Susan Harlan for not only discussing obscure plays and reading a plethora of drafts with angry marginal comments, but also offering invaluable advice (It is no longer my contention!) in all stages of the writing process. Without your encouragement, I might never have made it past Heywood. To Omaar Hena, thank you for challenging me to think deeply about what literature is and why we study it. Your intellectual and emotional support has been a constant of my MA experience. To the English faculty at Wake, especially Dean Franco and Olga Valbuena, thank you for the gifts of your time, insightful questions, and thoughtful comments. I'm reminded of them every time I sit down to write. I am incredibly grateful to have spent the last two years with my fellow MA students. To Anna, Emily, Suen, and Wes—our conversations (about clams, shame, and heirloom tomatoes as much as Shakespeare, meta-theater, and what it all means) have carried me through many a long night in A201 and the grad lounge. To Emma and Rachel—I can think of no better company in which to write a thesis than that of the Graces. (I should also thank the cashiers at CVS and Lowes Foods who discreetly enabled our late-night candy habit.) Finally, many thanks to my parents Pam and Chandy, for your support and patience with a daughter who forgot to call but remembered to borrow the vacuum; to Kristen, for fielding panicked midnight phone calls with grace and good humor; and to Tara and Dano—voluntarily reading a chapter from an MA thesis is no small feat, and your genuine interest has meant more than you know.

This project would not have been possible without each and every one of you.

May “Orlando” rest in peace.

Mark you, *he* does not go; he sends his narrator;
he plays tricks with time because there are two journeys
in every odyssey, one on worried water,
the other crouched and motionless, without noise.
For both, the 'I' is a mast; a desk is a raft
for one, foaming with paper, and dipping the beak
of a pen in its foam, while an actual craft
carries the other to cities where people speak
a different language, or look at him differently,
while the sun rises from the other direction
with its unsettling shadows, but the right journey
is motionless; as the sea moves round an island
that appears to be moving, love moves round the heart—
with encircling salt, and the slowly travelling hand
knows it returns to the port from which it must start.
Therefore, this is what this island has meant to you,
why my bust spoke, why the sea-swift was sent to you:
to circle yourself and your island with this art.

--Derek Walcott, *Omeros*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	v
Introduction.....	vi
1. The Monologism of the Traveler's Account in Shakespeare's and Wilkins's <i>Pericles</i>	1
2. Domestic Travel and the Violence of Narration in Heywood's <i>The English Traveller</i>	43
3. Travel as Metaphor and the Illusion of Access in Brome's <i>The Antipodes</i>	81
Conclusion	124
Works Cited	130
Curriculum Vitae	144

ABSTRACT

In travel writing, the conditions of travel (temporal, spatial, and cultural distance) prevent audiences from verifying foreign content for themselves, so travel accounts demand a narrator, in the words of Gower in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, "who stand[s] i' the gaps." However, because the traveler's task is to represent what is, for his readers, unknowable, his authority cannot be challenged and is subject to abuse. In this thesis, I analyze three English travel or travel-based plays—Shakespeare's and Wilkins's *Pericles*, Heywood's *The English Traveller*, and Brome's *The Antipodes*—as a setting in which to examine the use of travel to construct authority on the early modern stage. Travel plays, unlike a written travel narrative, place distant events and people in close physical proximity to the viewer and revitalize textual competitions for authority in living flesh. I argue that by making their narrators visible even as they gradually relegate travel to metaphor, these plays call attention to and question the use of travel to construct narrative authority.

INTRODUCTION

If you consider, for example, that the ship is a piece of floating space, a placeless place, that lives by its own devices, that is self-enclosed and, at the same time, delivered over to the boundless expanse of the ocean...you see why for our civilization, from the sixteenth century up to our time, the ship has been at the same time not only the greatest instrument of economic development, of course, but the greatest reservoir of imagination.

--Foucault, "Different Spaces"

The imaginative work Foucault associates here with the ship derives from the traveler who writes about his experiences and turns the physical makeup of a ship into the kind of "placeless place" that Foucault describes. The payoff for the traveler is access to a degree of authority he might not otherwise possess, but which the conditions of travel—temporal, spatial, and cultural distance, which prevent audiences from verifying foreign content for themselves—demand. They demand a narrator,¹ in the words of Gower in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, "who stand[s] i' the gaps." But because the traveler's task is to represent what is unknowable for his readers, his authority cannot be challenged and is

¹ One of the initial challenges of this project is determining the appropriate terminology for these plays' authority figures. The clearest example from the texts themselves is in a list of characters from George Wilkins's 1608 prose narrative *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles*, which names "Iohn Gower the Presenter." This term adequately describes his role, being the most detached of the figures I address, but it does not take into account other, less formal permutations of the role, so I have chosen to use the additional term "narrator" for the purposes of this argument. I use the word to refer to an individual who is given authority to (re)tell a story or give an account. Although the verb "to narrate" (from the Latin *narrare*) did not enter common usage in English until the mid-eighteenth century, the OED lists several transitional uses of the word in the early seventeenth. In 1611, Randle Cotgrave's French-English Dictionary translates *narrateur* as "a Narrator, relater, declarer." A second usage appears in 1625 in cleric Richard Montagu's theological appeal *Appello Caesarem*. Montagu is said to be "but a Narrator of other mens opinions," with the implication that he is "suspending his own judgment" (5, B3) to do so and is therefore "guiltless of the meaning" (Brakenbury, R3 1.4). Together, these two references connect the earliest uses of 'narrator' in English to problems of authority and transmission. These are precisely the issues I see surrounding the role of narrator in *Pericles*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Antipodes*. In each case, the narrator seeks to affirm his own authority to translate a temporally, spatially, and culturally disparate experience from travel narrative to stage play by portraying himself as a transparent conduit for information. In doing so, he repeats—with increased visibility and conflict—the work of the traveler/travel writer.

subject to abuse. Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) famously extrapolates the relationship between "authority" and the "representer" who speaks on behalf of another. He writes, "And therefore he that maketh a Covenant with the Actor, or Representer, not knowing the Authority he hath, doth it at his own peril" (111). In the process of representation, Hobbes identifies a possibility of deception that he likens to the actor who portrays a character on stage. An individual who "personates," in Hobbes's sense of "to represent another person" (110), may do so without possessing the legal authority to make covenants or promises on that person's behalf. Likewise, in travel writing, the speaker claims the right of artistic representation in story or dramatic form, but he may not have been ceded this right by the subject about whom he writes. As a result, any promises he makes to his audience by virtue of that authority may be nothing more than illusion. Because travel plays with prominent narrators foreground this unique travel authority and the conflicts associated with the role, I have chosen three English travel or travel-based plays—Shakespeare's and Wilkins's *Pericles*, Heywood's *The English Traveller*, and Brome's *The Antipodes*—as a setting in which to examine the use of travel to construct authority on the early modern stage. By making their narrators visible even as they gradually relegate travel to metaphor, these plays call attention to and question the use of travel to construct narrative authority.

Much initial work on early modern English travel plays focused on the relationship between fact and fiction and the degree to which plays were informed by actual cultural encounters. Later scholars, like Ivo Kamps, Anthony Parr, and Jean-Pierre Maquerlot have convincingly argued that the line between literature and history is less clearly delineated than was previously thought, so their work has emphasized instead the

workings of discourse in travelers' representations of cultural alterity. These scholars focus on what travelers choose to recount and the language they use to recount it, but they do not generally focus on the narrative persona of the traveler and the authority by which travelers claim the right to narrate. My approach, though in many ways indebted to theirs, takes as its focus what has remained a minor point in most previous critical studies. The central question of my research is what happens when the travel narrator, who has a particular need to acquire and retain rhetorical mastery, is placed on stage. The plays in this study are especially suited for a discussion of the demystification of authority that happens when travel narratives are transformed into travel plays, because they prominently foreground the narrators who, in textual accounts, remain inseparable from the text they narrate. Each of the three plays shares a common concern about narrating overseas travel and the consequences for the traveler's authority when he returns home. These plays dramatize the contest between the final (authorized) narrator of travel and the alternate accounts suppressed in the writing, whereas in a textual travel narrative, such oppositional voices are generally occluded.

Furthermore, the three plays do not simply replicate the contents of a travel narrative, although they are certainly informed by such narratives. Ivo Kamps has argued in relation to historiography and historical drama that that "the *forms* of historiography developed in the sixteenth century became part of the *content* of pre-Civil War Stuart historical drama" (2), and I will be making a similar argument with respect to the drama of travel. While plays like *Pericles*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Antipodes* deal with the subject matter of travel, they also re-create the structure of a travel narrative: each play contains at least one figure who asserts the right to narrate by virtue of his authority

as a traveler, who is in some way foreign to the content he narrates, and whose version of the story is driven by vested interests, may not correspond precisely to the actions it represents, and could be or is contested by other narrators. Even as travel becomes a less central concern to the plays of the mid-seventeenth century, the language and structures of authority developed through the earlier travel plays still inform these later city comedies, for which travel is an auxiliary matter in terms of content, but a dominant element of structure and metaphor. The question of authority is thus worked out through both structure and language.

Michel de Certeau writes in *Culture in the Plural*, “A sign of authority in a society takes the shapes of these two figures: discourses (works and texts) or persons (who are also representatives)” (12). De Certeau places at the root of cultural power the ability to convince people to accept an anonymous source of authority. Plays like the ones I examine pose a threat to the authority a travel narrator assumes and requires, because they dramatize the instability and artificiality of that authority. The narrator is physically present as a persona and an actor at the same time as he verbally diverts and defers authority as part of a text. In the process, each play draws attention to the narrator’s mediation and the gaps, inaccuracies, and violence generated by that act. What is more, each play offers glimpses of alternative stories that might have been told.

As this description of my project implies, my approach to the primary texts I study is first and foremost a model of close reading. Because I am interested in modes of authority, I read for language that defers to a higher authority, privileges one form of authority (written, spoken, visual) over another, competes for authority, or dispenses authority and/or responsibility to the audience or to other characters in the play. In

addition, I take note of characters or alternative interpretations that are silenced by the principal narrator. For the purposes of this discussion, I will be using several basic criteria to identify a narrator. First, these characters prominently incorporate the language and forms of the travel narrative as part of their rhetorical strategy. Second, they demonstrate their desire for mastery by offering to re-narrate information already provided by another character. Third and finally, they narrate that which is impossible to represent on the stage, an act that requires that they have access to space outside the theatrical world in which they live as characters. (Examples of this last criterion are imagined or purely metaphoric events and locations or those on a scale too grand to reproduce given the constraints of the early modern stage.) Even if they interact on a primary level within the bounds of the play, these characters are thus, on a secondary level, outsiders.

Because I am interested in the meaning of theatrical texts at the moment of production and consumption, I have endeavored to ground my work in political, theological, and poetic conceptions of authority in early modern England.² Although theatrical texts are my primary focus, I also reference early travel narratives and

² While this aspect of my work is similar to that of historicist critics like David Scott Kastan and Stephen Greenblatt, I do not fully subscribe to a historicist model. Reading literary texts as artifacts in an objective historical record neglects the “slipperiness” (in a Derridean sense) of language and ignores some of the discursive properties of history. Kamps describes this problem well in *Historiography and Ideology*, where he writes, “The historical ‘facts’ or ‘contents’ of literary works are already culturally produced, that is, prior to their incorporation in the literary text” (8). Even a text that purports to deliver fact is colored, through language and inclusions and exclusions, by ideology. For this reason, my intent is not to propose a one-to-one correlation between literary versions of authority and an external social reality, but rather to recognize historical influences while providing insight into the ambiguities produced by the nature of literary language and theatrical representation. By contrast, John Archer’s *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern English Writing* proposes an alternative approach to understanding global relations, one he calls “*modeling*, the systematic imagining of the world” in which “the ancient rhetorical commonplace of the world as a *theater* is foundational” (11). He views the meaning ascribed to history as performative rather than intrinsic, and he treats representation and reality as intertwined rather than distinct. Archer’s methodology, and that of scholars like Kamps and Richmond Barbour, calls for the treatment of both literary and non-literary texts as parts of a larger cultural imagination.

traveler's guides in an effort to situate the literary texts within a framework of the rhetoric surrounding travel and the traveler's authority. This is not a model of text divorced from context; instead, it is a model that treats the relationship between text and context as dialogic.

I use the term "dialogic" deliberately, because my work on authority is informed by Bakhtinian concepts of heteroglossia and multivocality. Bakhtin argues that studies of the novel often strain to assign a basic stylistic unity to a genre he claims is marked instead by heteroglossia (*raznorečie*). He defines heteroglossia in *The Dialogic Imagination* as "social diversity of speech types" (263), or, "another's speech in another's language" (324). This "double-voiced discourse" refracts authority by layering speakers and voices over one another, using conventions such as clowning, dialect, narration, and introductory or framing genres. I have chosen these specific examples to illustrate the similarity between what Bakhtin identifies in the novel and what I will be identifying in travel plays. For example, *Pericles* refracts authority through the character Gower, who stands outside the play proper as a narrator, as well as through antiquated dumb shows, messengers, and letters. *The Antipodes* does something similar using the device of a play-within-a-play. In addition, all three of the plays in my study are characterized by generic hybridity, another force that Bakhtin says "stratif[ies] the linguistic unity of the novel" (321), or in this case, the play. The overall effect is to draw attention to the act of, and necessity of, weaving together disparate elements to form what is supposed to be a unified account with preexisting authority, but in fact represents a retrospective construct of authority.

Because Bakhtin deals with the novel, the multivocality he identifies is always

limited by the unifying tendency of the novel's language,³ which creates a tension between centripetal and centrifugal forces. He argues, "A unitary language is not something given [*dan*] but is always in essence posited [*zadan*]³—and at every moment of its linguistic life it is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia. But at the same time it makes its real presence felt as a force for overcoming this heteroglossia, imposing specific limits to it" (270). The theater produces a form of double-voiced discourse that has the potential to overwhelm, or at least undermine unitary language, because theatrical representation not only *voices* texts; it *personates* them. The addition of a performer's physical body means that the text of the play is literally "another's speech in another's language." Thus, when the "traveler" attempts to construct authority on stage rather than in a printed narrative, the viewer is confronted with a double displacement: the travel narrator who claims he has the authority to speak on behalf of foreign lands and peoples is at that moment being spoken for by an actor. The traveler's authority, like the traveler himself, is shown to be a theatrical illusion.

Given that my subject is literary authority and its dispersion, it seems fitting that two of my texts, *The English Traveller* and *The Antipodes*, have until recently received modest scholarly attention. While plays like *The English Traveller* and *The Antipodes* remain relatively obscure, a growing body of work has been dedicated to treating these and other texts as equally important to the study of early modern drama. The staging of *The Antipodes* at the Shakespeare's Globe Theatre in London in August 2000, alongside

³ In "What is an Author?" Foucault writes that "the consequences of [the disappearance of the author in modern discourse] have not been sufficiently examined, nor has its impact been accurately measured. A certain number of notions that are intended to replace the privileged position of the author actually seem to preserve that privilege and suppress the real meaning of his disappearance" (207). The unifying tendency of language is one such author function.

The Tempest and *Hamlet*, is one marker of the widening influence of a movement to bring Shakespearean texts into dialogue with formerly non-canonical texts from the early modern period. Like others in this movement, although I acknowledge Shakespeare's significance in early modern drama, considering his work in the context of that of his contemporaries provides a richer image of theatrical culture in early modern England.⁴ To do so also opens up what Bakhtin calls "the social life of discourse outside the artist's study, discourse in the open spaces of public squares, streets, cities and villages, of social groups, generations, and epochs" (259), to which list I would add "discourse in the theaters." Analyzing horizontal intertextuality destabilizes the notion of an uninterrupted linear trajectory for theatrical history during the Renaissance, and it leaves open the possibility of discovering alternative narratives that would otherwise be silenced.

The difference between print travel narratives and performed travel plays is a core concept of my argument, because of certain unique properties that differentiate theatrical space from other types of representation. Foucault's model of the heterotopia⁵ is a useful lens through which to examine why theatrical representation is better suited to challenging the authority of a traveler. In the 1967 lecture "Different Spaces," he defines two types of spaces that are "connected to all other emplacements, but in such a way that they suspend, neutralize, or reverse the set of relations that are designated, reflected, or represented [*réflechis*] by them" (178): utopias and heterotopias. Whereas utopias are fundamentally unreal, heterotopias are real places that nonetheless stand outside all places. The theater, for Foucault, is one such space. He writes, "The heterotopia has the

⁴Challenging the image of Shakespeare as British monolith takes on a new significance in light of the plays' after-history as a marker of English identity and a "civilizing" influence when they traveled overseas during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

⁵ I will explore this concept in greater detail as it applies to Thomas Heywood's plays in chapter two.

ability to juxtapose in a single real place several emplacements that are incompatible in themselves. Thus the theater brings onto the rectangle of the stage a whole succession of places that are unrelated to each other” (181). In this respect, the theater is comparable to a travel narrative, which, by relating information about faraway places for consumption at home, similarly compresses space and time.

Foucault attributes to heterotopias several additional characteristics with relevance to the questions my study poses. First, he says, heterotopias contain “temporal discontinuities” (182) including the extremely transitory nature of the festival and the accumulation of time found in a museum. Each of the plays I address confronts the problem of time, whether through questions of antiquity and memory, modishness, or the compression of time to meet theatrical demands. Second, he identifies a “system of opening and closing that isolates [heterotopias] and makes them penetrable at the same time” (183). The plays in this study deal consistently with the anxiety of closing down or delimiting authority, so they place special emphasis on prologues, epilogues, framing devices, and comedic resolution. The sum of these characteristics, according to Foucault, produces the political or ideological implications of the heterotopia: either it creates a fantastic space that demonstrates the illusory nature of real places, or it creates a real space that attempts to compensate for the failings of reality (184). Theater has the potential to be both satirical and escapist. I will return to this dual potentiality in my conclusion. In reading these plays for examples of heteroglossia and heterotopia, then, I will be working toward a better understanding of the role that theater plays in making travel a source of narrative authority. I begin by laying some of the groundwork for understanding authority as it relates to travel and as it relates to the broader social context

of early modern England.

Developing Conceptions of Authority

Although the subject of authority in early modern England is beyond the scope of this project,⁶ I want to address three general trends, beginning in the rule of James I and continuing into Charles I's reign, that are particularly relevant to my line of inquiry and that affect not only religious and political authority but also textual authority. These three developments are, first, the tension between internal and external authorities; second, an increasing dualism between the subject and the scientifically observed object; and third, the textualization of authority: that is, the rising significance of reading, writing, and interpretation as forms of mastery.

The clearest representation of the internalization of authority comes in religious discourse,⁷ but its effects quickly spread to the political. According to James, religious interiority could become a threat to monarchical authority when it was taken to the extreme by the Puritans. Defending his complaints against religious sects, James writes, "And what in other parts I speake of Puritanes, it is onely of their morall faults, in that part where I speake of policie: declaring when they contemne the law and soveraigne authoritie, what examplare punishment they deserve for the same" (A5v). Their moral fault is "making the Scriptures to be ruled by their conscience, and not their conscience by the Scripture" (A5r). Internal authority, James argues, must still be governed by

⁶ For a more thorough discussion, see, for example, Robert Weimann's *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse* (Johns Hopkins, 1996).

⁷ The Reformation is, of course, central to this movement of authority away from the Pope toward the conscience, Scripture, (and the king). James writes in "To the Reader" of *Basilikon Doron* (1603), warning of the biblical premise that "there is nothing so covered, that shal not be revealed...which should move all godlie and honest men, to bee very warie in all their secretes actions, and whatsoever middesses they use for attaining to their most wished ends" (A-A2v). The shift represented here is from the external authority of the Church to the internal authority of the conscience. For a thorough discussion of this subject, see G.R. Evans, *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates* (Cambridge, 1992) and Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (University of Chicago, 2005).

external—in this case, textual—forms of authority. I will return to the importance of text in a moment. On the level of political authority, later writers similarly advocate a form of interiority. In the essay “Of Great Place,” first published in 1612, Sir Francis Bacon describes the vices of local authorities as “delays, corruption, roughness, and facility” (44), but the greater threat to authority he identifies is excessively verbal claims to authority. “Preserve the right of thy place,” he advises, “but stir not questions of jurisdiction; and rather assume thy right in silence, and *as a matter of fact*, than voice it with claims and challenges” (44). Likewise, in “Of Counsel” (1612), Bacon suggests that consensual decision-making is damaging to authority only when a council is poorly managed. Outward show of authority is not necessary to the king’s strength, he claims, so “the majesty of kings is rather exalted than diminished when they are in the chair of council; never was there ever prince bereaved of his dependencies by his council, except where there hath been either an over-greatness in one counselor, or an over-strict combination in divers, which are things soon found and holpen” (87). Internalized authority, as these examples suggest, functions most effectively when it is not blown in every eye. This point is significant in respect to what happens to authority when it is placed on stage and a narrator’s claims must be not only voiced but also enacted in public view.

The second development in forms of authority, externalization of the object, emerges prominently in scientific and philosophical discourse, and it lays the foundation for the traveler’s way of seeing—and claiming—the world. Robert Weimann writes in *Authority and Representation*,

Authority...was indissolubly tied to a bold and precarious project of modern world mastery in which modern subjects in their alleged freedom thrive on the controlled distance to a world of objects out there. The distance was important because it allowed the modern agent of ‘trafficke and travell’ (to use John Lyly’s phrase) to be free, and even to celebrate a new inwardness and spirituality, while doing business with the hardness of profitable things. (2)

He goes on to say, “This was a world whose principal metaphors used to be the telescope (‘eye-instrument-world’) and the voyage of discovery (‘self-possessed port of departure-sea journey-country claimed as legitimate possession of the discoverer’)” (7). The clear distinction between subject and object that Weimann describes is visible in the culture of collecting that emerged in the seventeenth century—according to Marjorie Swann in *Curiosities and Texts*, collections of art, cabinets of curiosities from abroad, and private libraries were standard marks of prestige in the later Stuart and early Caroline eras (2-3)—and it is also the necessary precondition for the kind of authority a travel narrator assumes.

Dividing the world more distinctly into subject and object also furthered the commonplace image of the world as theater (*theatrum mundi*) and enhanced the accompanying divide between actor and audience. This performativity was influential in conceptualizations of the traveler’s role as one who “presented the nation” before those he encountered. As an example of this kind of rhetoric, one of the texts in Richard Hakluyt’s *Divers Voyages* (1582)⁸ instructs the traveler to carry with him maps of

⁸ *Notes in writing besides more priuie by mouth that were giuen by a Gentleman, Anno. 1580, to M. Arthure Pette and to M. Charles Iackman, sent by the marchants of the Muscovie companie for the discoverie of the northeast strayte, not altogether vnfit for some other enterprises of discoverie, hereafter to be taken in hande.*

England, “to make shewe of your countrie from whence you came” (IBr). Even the monarch was not immune to this pressure. James introduces *Basilikon Doron* as a duty for one “set (as it was sayd of old) upon a publique stage, in the sight of all the people” (A2v). Likewise, in 1626, Charles I issued a “declaration of the true causes which moued His Maiestie to assemble, and after inforced him to dissolue the two last meetings in Parliament,” and in it, he states his intent to “justifie [his actions], not onely to His owne Conscience, and to His owne people, but to the whole world” (A3r). Charles repeats this language multiple times throughout the declaration, and as biographer Charles Carlton asserts, if Charles’s court was “a private place...a controllable place: he could decide whom to admit and whom to exclude, which painter to commission, and which dramatists to patronize” (123), it was nonetheless made available, in a controlled manner, through the publication of declarations and treatises like the one cited above.

The third development, the textualization of authority, follows naturally from these first two. If authority becomes increasingly internalized and at the same time the gap between the authoritative subject or actor and the affected object or audience expands commensurately, then text provides a model of authority that regulates and standardizes private authority while maintaining an appropriate distance between subject and object. The prefatory sonnet of James’s treatise lays out a chain of authority stretching from God to the king: “And as their subjects ought them to obey, / So Kings should feare and serve their God againe” (3), but the epistle to his son extends the chain to the book itself, which he calls authoritative “as a faithfull Preceptor and counsellour unto you: which, because my affaires will not permit me ever to be present with you, I ordaine to be a resident faithfull admonisher of you” (5). In the process, authority formerly associated with the

role of father becomes affiliated, through metaphor, with the creation of text. In “To the Reader,” James writes, “It onely rests to pray thee (charitable reader) to interpret favourably this birth of mine, according to the integritie of the author, and not looking for perfection in the worke it selfe” (B4v). The book carries James’s authority and becomes an intermediary for passing that authority to his son.

One of the effects of textualizing authority, however, is that at least on the surface, it permits broader-based access to the means of acquiring authority. Robert Weimann suggests that, “authority, rather than preceding its inscription, rather than being given as a prescribed premise of utterances, became a product of writing, speaking, and reading, a result rather than primarily a constituent of representation” (5). In other words, those who were without authority based on lineage, religious role, or political status were able, by the content of their enunciations, to *gain* authority. Ideas and words well-presented could accrue authority for a speaker who lacked pre-existing authority. Print technologies further exacerbated this effect. In his letter to the reader of *Basilikon Doron*, James recounts his own attempt to keep the contents of the book private, but then concludes,

Since contrarie to my intention and expectation, as I have alreadie said, this booke is now vented, and set forth to the publike view of the world, and consequently, subject to every mans censure, as the current of his affection leades him, I am now forced...both to publish and spred the true copies thereof, for defacing of the false copies that are alreadie spred. (A3v-r)

Textuality opens authority to contest and permits private information to become a matter of public concern. However, even though text may undercut authority in one sense, the prefatory material nonetheless provides James with an equal opportunity to control how

his text is narrated, as the concluding remarks in “To the Reader” indicate. He argues that his text must be admitted to be “without any monstrous deformitie”; precisely because it “was first written in secret, and is now published, not of ambition, but of a kinde of necessitie; it must be taken of al men, for the true image of my very minde” (B4v). Although James claims that printing the book was contrary to his intent, textual authority enables him to turn the narrative surrounding the book’s publication to his own credit by suggesting that it is not a polished product but an unrehearsed (with the accompanying assumption ‘genuine’) statement of truth.

It is this function of text-based authority, its ability to silence or subsume the contrapuntal voices that rise against it, which makes the theater such an important site for working out questions of authority. Weimann points out that, “In these circumstances, the stage—unlike written narrative in printed form...was in a unique position to process and, sometimes, to foreground the element of (dis)continuity between the representation of authority and the authority of its own performance work” (206). Weimann gives the example of the morality play *The Tide Tarrieth No Man*, in which “the representation of authority is, as it were, actually folded out upon itself through an allegorical figure bearing this very name” (45). Likewise, as discussions of *Pericles* in the following chapter will demonstrate, the foregrounding of the narrator in travel plays involves a similar “folding out” and thus a disruption of authority-as-given. Theater in which the subject matter is travel is even more productive in this respect because travel was fraught with questions of authority, and it often strained the tenuous compromises of authority that had to be produced in the domestic sphere.

Travel Writing as a Mirror of Europe

Although travel narratives have become an increasingly popular genre of study in British and American literature, a foundational problem is how to define what is meant by “travel,” the “traveler,” and “travel writing.” The rapid expansion of inter-state travel in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Europe makes a definition of travel at this historical moment complicated and potentially exclusionary. Because an exhaustive or conclusive definition is beyond the scope of this project, my goal is to present a working definition that opens up, rather than restricts, the conversation about travel narratives’ particular contribution to early modern English discourses on authority.⁹ The three plays I study present widely different images of travel. In *Pericles*, travel by sea is an escape and a source of political alliances, and the numerous destinations of the play are relatively closely set and clearly demarcated. In *The English Traveller*, travel is a commercial or scholarly endeavor that includes European and westward routes. *The Antipodes* turns the idea of travel into a mental activity that takes as its destination mythical representations of the antipodes. What these plays have in common is not so much their understandings of travel as physical movement, but rather their appropriation of travel and travelers’ language as particularly fruitful material in which to work out questions of authority. However, in order to understand why travel language is so suggestive in this project, it is worth considering some of the relevant history of travel and travel writing in England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

In the sixteenth century, especially under the first two Tudor monarchs, Andrew Hadfield writes that not only was two-way traffic of scholars between England and its

⁹ Because my focus is the rhetorical construction of travel, I follow the model established in Hakluyt’s widely popular *Principall Navigations* and do not deal extensively with overland travel, to quote Hakluyt, “beyng neither of remote length and spaciousness, neither of search and discoverie of strange coasts the chiefe subject of this my labour” (Epistle Dedicatorie in the first edition, 7).

neighboring European countries encouraged, but many young intellectuals were officially sent to Italy to gain information and experience to prepare them for diplomatic careers (*Literature* 17). The expectation was that travelers would return to their home nation and be more effective courtiers for the monarch. Because of the perceived cultivating effects of travel, time spent abroad was often configured as a duty to the state. Sir Thomas Palmer's 1606 *Essay of the Meanes how to Make our Travailes in forraine Countries the more profitable and honourable* includes an exhaustive classification system for travel:

Travelling is either:-- I. Irregular. II. Regular. Of Regular Travailers some be A. Non-voluntaries, sent out by the prince, and employed in matters of 1. Peace (etc.). 2. Warre (etc.). B. Voluntaries. Voluntary Regular Travailers are considered 1. As they are moved accidentally. a. Principally, that afterwards they may leade a more quiet and contented life, to the glory of God. b. Secondly, regarding ends, (I) Publicke. (a) What persons are inhibited travaile. (1) Infants, Decrepite persons, Fools, Women. (b) What times to traivaile in are not fitte: (2) When our country is engaged in warres. (c) Fitte. (1) When one may reape most profit in shortest time, for that he aimeth at. (2) When the country, into which we would travaile, holdeth not ours in jealouise, etc. (qtd. in Howard, *English* 34)

Palmer's definition repeatedly returns (especially in II.A., II.B.I.b.2, and II.B.I.c.2) to the traveler's obligation to serve the prince in peace and war and to the traveler's responsibility to consider the interests of the state when choosing when and where to travel.¹⁰ Sometimes the traveler's obligation was due to financial support from the ruling

¹⁰ As travel became a potentially more profitable enterprise and colonizing voyages expanded, it became increasingly important to manage the traveler's reputation and image. Thus, the romantic hero of the Elizabethan era was replaced with the economically prudent trader under the Jacobean. Political leaders felt the need to distinguish between legally sanctioned travelers, like merchants, and those, like pirates, who

house. In her pioneering 1914 work *English Travellers in the Renaissance*, Clare Howard cites a document which lists among Henry VIII's expenses the costs associated with sending students abroad to learn diplomacy (13). Although the later part of the sixteenth century saw a decline in official state-sponsored tours abroad, travel to Italy, Germany, and France remained central to a courtier's education.

The rise of travel writing in England demonstrates the particular relevance of travel to questions of public and private authority. In the period between the 1570s and the 1590s,¹¹ travel writing emerged as a distinct genre that included both travel narratives written by returning travelers and advice manuals for those who would follow them.¹²

asserted authority independent of the crown. The line between privateers and pirates was particularly troublesome. In an article on Heywood and Rowley's *Fortune by Land or Sea* (1607-9), Claire Jowitt discusses the increasingly strict attitude of the state under James toward acts of piracy. "As early as 1603, when the Venetian ambassador complained that the Lord High Admiral was abetting piracy, James was outspoken in his response exclaiming, 'By God I'll hang the pirates with my own hands, and my Lord Admiral as well', and he followed up these sentiments by issuing official proclamations against pirates" (218-9). In Jowitt's analysis, piracy represents a threat to "the prevalent ideological vision of England as a trading nation" (221). The nostalgic image of the traveler, which was too easily conflated with that of the pirate, had to be reshaped and redefined through the types of travel narratives deemed appropriate.

¹¹ Hadfield claims that the growth of independent sponsorship of opposition ideas contributed to the emergence of travel writing as a distinct genre in the 1590s. Placing the genesis of travel writing slightly earlier, Howard attributes its popularity to the return from Europe of well-known courtiers like Sidney, Dyer, and Talbot in the 1570s.

¹² Because "travel writing" is a vague term that could encompass a broad range of experiences and genres, I have chosen to work from a definition that amalgamates Andrew Hadfield's definition from *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing* and Barbara Korte's from *English Travel Writing*. Hadfield confines his study of English travel writing to the period leading up to 1670, when the Grand Tour was first referenced by name and travel became a prerequisite of a gentleman's education. He defines travel writing broadly as "a series of reflections on the places visited (whether these be purely personal observations or possess a wider resonance), or more scholarly and polemical works which owe much to the opening-out of horizons for the articulate citizen" (32-33). Korte proposes an alternative, slightly more fluid definition. She writes, "Accounts of travel depict a journey in its course of events and thus constitute narrative texts (usually composed in prose). They claim—and their readers believe—that the journey recorded actually took place, and that it is presented by the traveler him or herself" (1). For Korte, the depiction of a journey produces a text that is linear on a macro level, but episodic at the micro level. These episodes require a narrator who can mediate the various elements of the narrative and form them into a cohesive whole. The narrator's work does not stand alone, however; it relies on the complicity of the reader. The text contains a truth claim, which the reader must accept. However, Korte says later that "a reader's sense of reality only lies in his or her *assumption* that the text is based on travel fact, on an authentic journey, and this assumption can only be tested beyond the text itself" (10). Because of its reliance on reader credulity, this definition permits a text to move in and out of popular acceptance as a reliable travel account. Korte later records, "*Mandeville's Travels* went from being an authority to a text reputed to be a monstrous hoax—just as there

Howard describes the latter as “marvellous little books, full of incitements to travel as the duty of man, summaries of the leading characteristics of foreigners, directions for the care of sore feet—and a strange medley of matters” (22). Although Howard treats these manuals as belonging to an objective historical record and correlating unproblematically to actual experiences of travel, her extensive examination of the documents provides useful examples of the way travel was constructed in popular discourse.¹³ The role of travel in fostering authority is described in a complex and often contradictory manner in these early accounts. Howard writes, “Travel, according to our authors [Justus Lipsius, Albert Meier, Gerogus Loysius, and others], is one of the best ways to gain personal force, social effectiveness—in short, that mysterious ‘virtù’ by which the Renaissance set such great store” (29). On a practical level, travel permitted the prospective courtier or diplomat to observe the mannerisms and social behaviors of other Europeans; it gave him the opportunity to learn modern languages; it allowed him to seek out and study under great German theologians, Italian philosophers, and French courtiers.

As a genre, travel writing is built on the assumption that one’s experiences abroad should be recorded, in part to enable the traveler to master and distill his experiences into a useful form, and in part to construct a certain image of travel, whether for the purposes of colonization, political training, personal enrichment, or acquisition of practical knowledge. To this end, Howard says, “The keeping of a journal is insisted upon in almost all the ‘Directions’” (38). As examples, she cites Sir John Harington, a friend of

developed a general suspicion of (old-style) travel writing as a genre prone to lie” (29). The claims of the text did not shift; however, perceptions of its veracity did.

¹³ Howard’s book contains a helpful appendix, a chronological table of advice to travellers from 1500 to 1700. Among the significant works she names, many of them German in origin, are Hieronymus Turlerus’s 1574 *De Peregrinatione*, which was translated into English in 1575; Hilarius Pyrckmair’s 1577 *Commentariolus de arte apodemica seu vera peregrinandi ratione*; and Justus Lipsius’s 1578 *De ratione cum fructu peregrinandi*.

Prince Henry, who “promises to send to Prince Henry whatever notes he can make of various Countries” for his use and study, and Henry Wotten, who “offers Lord Zouche ‘A View of all the present Almagest princes’” (38). Francis Bacon’s 1612 essay “Of Travel” says, “It is a strange Thing, that in Sea voyages, where there is nothing to be seene, but Sky and Sea, Men should make Diaries; But in *Land-Travile*, wherein so much is to be observed, for the most part, they omit it; As if Chance, were fitter to be registred, then Observation. Let Diaries, therefore, be brought in use” (qtd. in Hadfield *Amazons* 34).¹⁴ The point of these observations, Bacon goes on to say, is to “sucke the Experience of many” (34). He repeatedly uses the phrases “with much profit” and “profitable,”¹⁵ implying that the purpose of education is not far removed from the purposes of economic gain (34). Such diaries provide the raw material for later narrative accounts of travel, which configure the traveler as an advocate or representative who presents his observations to those at home, but in doing so, also contributes to the nation’s image, whether for its sake, for his own advantage, or, as is more likely, some combination of both.

The traveler thus speaks for not only the lands and peoples he encounters, but also for his home nation—representing it abroad, but also representing the nation to itself through contrast and comparison. Thomas Coryat’s ‘Epistle Dedicatory’ to Prince Henry at the beginning of *Coryat’s Crudities* says, “I exhibite in this my Journall to your princely view, that most glorious, renowned, and Virgin Citie of Venice, the Queene of the Christian world, that Diamond set in the ring of the Adriatique gulfe, and *the most*

¹⁴ Bacon’s statement also implies that promoting the practice was not wholly successful in producing its desired end.

¹⁵ A term that was increasingly associated with financial gain in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

resplendent mirrour of Europe” (qtd. in Hadfield *Amazons* 62, emphasis added). To see the nation being envisioned in and through writing about foreign spaces indicates the vital metaphoric role travel writing played in the English imagination.

More than that, travel writing necessarily involves working out questions of authority. Richard Hakluyt writes in the Preface to the first edition of his *Principall Navigations*,

Whatsoever testimonie I have found in any authour of authoritie appertaining to my argument, either stranger or naturall, I have recorded the same word for word, with his particular name and page of booke where it is extant...for I am not ignorant of Ptolemies assertion, that Peregrinationis historia, and not those wearie volumes bearing the titles of universall Cosmographie which some men that I could name have published as their owne, being in deed most untruly and unprofitable ramassed and hurled together, is that which must bring us to the certayne and full discoverie of the world. (1:6)

The personal authority of the travelers Hakluyt includes in his collection (“authour[s] of authoritie”) is absolutely vital, he argues, to the ultimate end of a “certayne and full discoverie of the world” with all its associated advantages in terms of wealth, political power, and national renown.

The Traveler’s Relationship to Authority

The conventions and conditions associated with travel writing demand a particular type of authority on the part of the traveler. First, the travelogue is frequently written after the traveler’s return to the home nation. Even taking into account the extensive note-taking that Bacon urges in “Of Travel,” the writer’s textual account of events is both

memory and construction. The reader must rely on the traveler's accuracy of memory and accept his version of events as valid. Second, the travelogue participates in a work of translation. In order to render the Other "readable" to those at home, the traveler must use metaphoric language to assimilate cultural concepts, languages, situations, and peoples into a form that those at home can understand. The reader must rely on the traveler's skill in translation. Third, the traveler's experience is constrained by his physical limitations: simply put, he cannot be in multiple places at once, (in the absence of video or satellite technology) see the entirety of a land mass, encounter every individual member of a people group, or experience in one lifetime the entire breadth of their history—even assuming it could be delimited. Therefore, the reader must also rely on the traveler's ability to make editorial decisions with respect to inclusions, exclusions, generalizations, and use of information recorded or witnessed by other travelers or scholars. Taken together, these features of travel render the personal authority of the narrator necessary to preserve the unity and reliability of the account.

Part of that authority has a legal/political origin, as travelers at the turn of the seventeenth century were required to be licensed before they could leave the country.¹⁶ Howard argues,

The ordinary license which everyone but a known merchant was obliged to obtain from a magistrate before he could leave England, in 1595 gave permission with the condition that the traveller 'do not haunte or resorte unto the territories or dominions of any foreigne prince or potentate not being with us in league or

¹⁶ As with Bacon's allusion to the failure of travelers to follow recommendations and keep diaries, Howard goes on to say that "Doubtless Bishop Hall was right when he declared that travellers commonly neglected the cautions about the king's enemies, and that a limited license was only a verbal formality" (87).

amitie, nor yet wittingly kepe companie with any parson or parsons evell affected to our State.’ (Howard 86-7)

Like plays performed in the theater, which required approval from the Master of the Revels, travel was confined to those authorized to undertake it. To write a travel account, then, a traveler carried the authority of having received such a license. Although many travel narratives from the early modern period contain a sophisticated narrative persona that is carefully distinguished from that of the author, a symbiotic relationship between writer and narrator remains. By appropriating the writer’s name, the narrator gains the legal authorization from the traveler’s license, while at the same time the writer retains a measure of freedom from culpability in the narrator’s words.

However the traveler receives authority, his ultimate possession of authority depends paradoxically on a temporary loss of authority brought on by the conditions of travel. Beyond physical hardship, the accounts Howard cites frequently laud travel for its refining influence on wild young men, a refinement that works by stripping them of their unassailable status as members of the nobility. She writes, “The rude and arrogant young nobleman who had never before left his own country, met salutary opposition and contempt from strangers and thereby gained modesty” (29). Instead of receiving honor as a consequence of his rank or privilege, the traveler has to earn respect. The accounts she cites imply that social privilege also suffered: “At German ordinaries ‘every travyler must syt at the ordinary table both master and servant,’ so that often they were driven to sit with such ‘slaves’ that in the rush to get the best pieces from the common dish in the middle of the table, ‘a man wold abhor to se such fylthye hands in his dish’” (48). Travel was not some great equalizer of persons, but it did promote encounters that might not

otherwise have taken place. It also subjected travelers to new uncertainties about the source and validity of their authority. Thus, a traveler might gain *virtù* and be newly equipped to serve the state, but to do so came at the cost of personal comfort, privilege, and presumed authority.

Nonetheless, the traveler's authority was not entirely subsumed: the loss of personal authority could be requited in another notable way—through travel writing. Like the textualization of authority taking place more broadly in early modern England, while other types of authority might diminish for the traveler, he retained rhetorical authority. Only in narrative could the traveler present himself as he wished. Even his choice to include information about deprivation, weakness, and lost authority was in itself a form of asserting narrative authority, in which the traveler fashioned a cohesive account that represented him to a domestic audience—even if his congratulatory version did not coincide with other accounts of the same incident. In *Before Orientalism*, Richmond Barbour describes the arrival of Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador to India, in Surat in 1615:

In both England and India, the question of Roe's legitimacy was inescapable: what in fact did he represent? Was this embassy a royal initiative of national honor or a mercantile improvisation dressed in regal robes? ...Roe's intuition that his performance as the local epitome of English self-respect was a tactical fiction put unwelcome ironies to his self-presentation. (2)

Barbour claims that encounters like Roe's highlight the theatricality of the state's claims to authority and the necessity of reciprocal participation from those under its authority in order for the drama to function. Using Roe as an example, Barbour claims that a gap exists between the stated, *discursive* dominance of early modern England in other parts of

the world and “material enforcements” of the same; in short, “disparities between domestic representations and foreign negotiations” (6). Barbour compares Roe’s account of the embassy to Emperor Jahangir’s journal entry for the same event and says it “marks telling counterpoints to Sir Thomas Roe’s” (6).¹⁷ What was unquestioned in England (Roe’s authority on behalf of the crown) may have become subject to challenge abroad, but Roe still retained a measure of authority through his own control over what and how much was reported back to England. Even when reciprocal participation was refused, as Barbour suggests was the case for Roe, it could be retroactively acquired in the writing of the encounter.

As this example illustrates, the rhetorical function of the “traveler” fluctuates precariously between a representative of the state’s power and authority and an independent operator functioning in competition with the state. The traveler’s inevitable location on the fringes of state control can be better understood by tracing the exchange of authority that must take place in order for travel to add value to the traveler. Note the circular movement of authority in the following paradigm: travel is an act authorized by the state to qualified individuals for the sake of gaining further authority to be used on behalf of the state. In the case of non-official travel, one gained authority by being stripped of an older (innate or entitled) form of authority, so as to put on a new (earned) authority that one’s native country alone could not confer. This last point is especially significant, because although the new authority is presumed to be in the best interest of the state, it is also tainted by foreign influence. It suggests that the nation as such is not

¹⁷ Uncovering some of those alternate accounts, as Barbour points out, is a mammoth task. He writes as an example that “The East India Company managed a system of corporate discourse long before it ever thought to hold an empire, and it accumulated considerable acreage of text. At the British Library’s India Office today, East India Company material occupies 9 miles of shelving” (8).

equipped to train its own civil servants. Furthermore, it means that those civil servants, whose work depends on absolute fidelity to the state and monarch, have been shaped at least in part by foreigners. If European travel were a reciprocal process, with Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Italians being trained at the English court, the risks would diminish somewhat, but as long as Italy or Germany, then France, remained the most popular destination, the cultural hegemony of the English nation was subtly undermined.¹⁸

By the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, the travel narrative as a catalogue of information for state purposes was evolving into a text with entertainment and allegorical or moral value as well, and the traveler's authority often became a reliable matter of fact rather than a source of contention. The travel play represents one facet of this evolution. As Thomas Platter, a Swiss visitor to England, famously observed, "The English pass their time, learning at the play what is happening abroad...since for the most part the English do not much use to travel, but prefer to learn of foreign matters and take their pleasures at home" (qtd. in Loomba 8). Platter's depiction of the theatergoer as a student and a consumer makes him a surrogate traveler who is characterized by passivity, not action. With that passivity comes an element of risk. One of the consequences of the shift in narrative purpose from facts to entertainment or didacticism is a narrowing of distance between the home nation and the traveler's destination. Earlier accounts that were narrated as a source of wonder or information for economic or political ends could represent foreign locations as wholly "other" and opposite to the familiar. In contrast, an account narrated as a source of satire or moral training had to be similar enough to be applicable to situations at home, while still different enough to preserve a sense of

¹⁸ The fear engendered by that paradox emerges in later discourse about the dangers of consorting with Jesuits and other potentially subversive foreign influencers. See Clare MacLellen Howard's *English Travellers of the Renaissance* (B. Franklin, 1968), page 75.

national identity. Travel plays, as I will demonstrate in the chapters that follow, are a fascinating site of conflict precisely because, unlike a written travel narrative, they place distant events and people in close physical proximity to the viewer and revitalize textual competitions for authority in living flesh. Placing travel narratives on stage dramatizes the traveler's struggle to establish and maintain the type of authority necessitated by the conventions of travel writing. To give a sense of the historical trajectory of representations of travel on stage, I will move chronologically through the three plays, dealing with one primary play per chapter.

Chapter one will deal with *Pericles* and the growing concern in Shakespeare's late plays with mediation and intertextuality. My focus will be the character Gower, a figure borrowed across space and time from John Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and re-employed as a moral guide for the play. In the seven scenes in which Gower appears, he calls attention to his acts of mediation as he claims authority on behalf of his authors (1.20) and physically changes the story he tells by compressing time and referencing elements he has withheld. I will argue that Gower is a necessary figure because he has access to space and time outside the limitations of the theater, but while he repeatedly defers authority to others, the effect of his verbal deflections is to render him even more visible.

Chapter two will move to Heywood's *The English Traveller* and the play's critique of narrative authority. *The English Traveller* acts as a bridge between the straightforward travel account in *Pericles* and the wholly metatheatrical representation of travel in *The Antipodes*. Heywood uses a bifurcated structure to treat the divided reality of a traveler who returns to face domestic disorder. The authority figures who mediate this divided space do so using the language and form of a travel narrative, but their

authority is constantly subject to revision and contest. My focus will be the competition for authority between the “authentic” travelers Young Geraldine and Old Lionel and Roger and Reignald, whose authority is purely rhetorical. I will argue that the centrality of narrative authority throughout the play emphasizes all the more the absence of an authoritative narrator at the play’s uneasy resolution.

Chapter three will address Brome’s *The Antipodes* and the turn to metaphor and solely cognitive representations of travel. By applying the language of childbearing, fertility, inheritance, and lineage to the processes of traveling and creating text, Brome’s play demonstrates what happens to travel when it becomes solely cognitive and highlights the associated anxieties about authority that cognitive travel engenders. My focus will be the characters Doctor Hughball and Lord Letoy, who simulate an elaborate experience of travel through a play-within-a-play. Although the play purports to advocate an extemporaneous model of acting that disperses authority outward from its center, the language and structure of the play preserve Letoy’s authority as a narrator. Collectively, by making their narrators visible even as they gradually relegate travel to metaphor, these plays call attention to and question the use of travel to construct narrative authority.

CHAPTER ONE
THE MONOLOGISM OF THE TRAVELER'S ACCOUNT IN SHAKESPEARE'S
AND WILKINS'S *PERICLES*

*He rather prayes, you will be pleas'd to see
One such, to day, as other playes should be.
Where neither Chorus wafts you ore the seas;
Nor creaking throne comes downe, the boyes to please;*

--Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour*

I begin my discussion of the dramatization of narrative authority through travel with *Pericles*, a play whose authority, fittingly, has also been subject to contest. Although, as I will argue in this chapter, the positioning of the character Gower is central to the play's internal response to questions of authority, the text itself challenges a consistent or unified model of authority. *Pericles* first appeared in quarto form in 1609 and was probably performed in 1607 or 1608, and it has consistently been a problematic play with respect to text, performance, and authorship. Roger Warren, the editor of the 2003 Oxford edition,¹⁹ introduces it in this way:

But if *Pericles* is a stageworthy play, it is also a tantalizing one, because of two major problems which must be briefly mentioned at the outset. First, that much-reprinted Quarto text is grossly corrupt: many passages are garbled and nonsensical, others are actually missing, one of them crucially. It is almost certainly a 'reported text', put together by an actor or actors who had appeared in it. Moreover, since *Pericles* was not included in the First Folio of Shakespeare's

¹⁹ I will be using this edition throughout. The Oxford uses consecutive numbering of scenes and does not divide the play into acts.

works in 1623, we have no adequate text by which to remedy the Quarto's deficiencies. (3)

Warren goes on to cite a second problem, the problem of authorship. After much scholarly debate, most scholars now presume that Shakespeare co-wrote *Pericles* with George Wilkins, the author of a 1608 prose narrative *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*, which probably post-dates the play.²⁰ As a result of these two problems, even using Wilkins's narrative, reconstructing a performable edition of the play in its entirety is a daunting challenge. Because of these concerns, although it was a popular play in its contemporary scene, since then *Pericles* has received mixed critical attention and has continued to trouble critics even in light of the resurgent interest in Shakespeare's last plays in the past twenty years.

Even beyond textual concerns, the play challenges compartmentalization in terms of genre, style, and subject matter. It is anachronistic to the point of excess: famously called by Ben Jonson a "mouldy tale" (*Ode to Himself* 21-2), *Pericles* exploits the outmoded conventions of the dumb show, the chorus or presenter, and the episodic structure and then-archaic chivalry of the romance, rendering it a fit subject of Jonson's satire in the prologue of *Every Man in His Humour*, as quoted in the epigraph of this chapter.²¹ As I will discuss in greater depth in the section dealing specifically with Gower,

²⁰ For a thorough discussion of the textual evidence for co-authorship, see Macdonald P. Jackson, *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford, 2003).

²¹ Unlike plays in which a "Chorus wafts you ore the seas" and "creaking throne comes downe, the boyes to please," *Every Man* (1598), a play in which, according to Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare may have acted, is a comedy following the model of Plautus; it is structured by the neoclassical unities of time and place, mobilized by domestic deception, and set in London. The play's prologue mocks at length romantic conventions like those Shakespeare and Wilkins would later employ in *Pericles*, including "th'ill customs of the age" that "make a child, now swaddled, to proceed / Man, and then shoot up, in one beard and weed, / Past threescore years" (P.4, 7-9). *Pericles*'s disregard for the unity of time, in that Marina grows from an infant to near womanhood in one "fast-growing scene" (15.6) narrated by Gower, is only outdone by its disregard for unities of place, as Gower "wafts you ore the seas" to no less than six geographically distant

the humor attached to the Rude Mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* shows Shakespeare himself ridiculing the techniques he and Wilkins would later employ. This observation not only emphasizes the anachronistic quality of *Pericles*; it also demands consideration of why archaic conventions would be newly salient to a theatergoing audience in the first decade of the seventeenth century, as the reputed popularity of *Pericles* implies that they were. I argue that Shakespeare's and Wilkins's use of generic hybridity necessitates Gower's mediation while simultaneously demonstrating that his mode of authority is archaic and overdetermined.

Romance and the City: Asserting narrative control through generic hybridity

Any discussion of genre with respect to *Pericles*, as well as *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, and *Cymbeline*, inevitably runs up against the question of "lateness." Because these plays are among the last written or co-written by Shakespeare (in addition to *Henry VIII*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and the lost *Cardenio*), critics have tended to attribute greater biographical influence to these plays than to earlier ones. According to Gordon McMullan in *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing*, this tendency has its origins in "Romanticism's urge to root stylistic development in the life of the individual genius rather than in period and context" (16). Recently, works like Edward Said's *On Late Style*, which explores the final projects of composers and writers to trace what he identifies as features of aesthetic composition in the last stage of an artist's life, have re-affirmed the concept of lateness.²² For McMullan, this approach is decidedly problematic

locations (Antioch, Tyre, Tarsus, Pentapolis, Ephesus, and Mytilene). Written nearly ten years before *Pericles*, the prologue of *Every Man* emphasizes just how conspicuously outmoded *Pericles*'s conventions would have been by 1607 or 1608.

²² In the introduction to Said's book, Michael Wood specifically distinguishes the "ironic expressiveness" of Adorno's, Beethoven's, or Strauss's last works from the "unearthly serenity" of Shakespeare's or Sophocles' (xiii).

because not only does it fail to account for the co-authors of several of Shakespeare's last plays (Wilkins and Fletcher were not in the last stages of their careers), but it also undervalues the importance of popular theatrical trends and commercial viability to a company's choice of plays.

In *Pericles*, these trends display themselves in part through the sheer multiplicity of represented genres. Recognizing generic hybridity in *Pericles* lays the groundwork for any attempt to classify the character Gower, because each type of play lends itself to certain concerns about and conventions of representing authority. *Pericles*'s generic hybridity contributes to the necessity of a narrator who can bridge not only gaps in time and space within the context of the play, but also gaps in expectations that result from the play's blended composition. In this section, I will focus particularly on three influential genres—romance, city comedy, and tragicomedy—but my goal is not to compress the play into any one genre, but rather to explore the similarities between the genres and the ways they work together in the play. Recounting the long history of attempts to classify Shakespeare's late plays in *Shakespeare's Late Style*, Russ McDonald settles finally on “these creakily old-fashioned, deeply resonant, Shakespearean *tragicomic romances*” (Mowat, “What's in a Name?” qtd. in McDonald 25). *Pericles* in particular, McDonald says, is characterized by “sprawling, episodic, casually organized dramatic structures” (40). As the multifaceted nature of his definition illustrates, this play challenges simple definition. Other critics echo these sentiments,²³ contemplating the value of reading *Pericles* alternately as a modified romance, tragicomedy, or city comedy. As I aim to

²³ See for example, Hoeniger and Giddens.

show, each of these genres shares the characteristic of requiring outside intervention to ensure the concluding stability of the play's social systems.²⁴

The romance is one of the most common categories to which critics have assigned *Pericles*. Reading the romantic qualities of a play like *Pericles* solely in terms of Shakespeare's response to his waning career, as the category of "late plays" would tend to do, fails to address important questions about the salience of older theatrical modes at this particular moment in history. One explanation is that the intersection of conventions from the popular prose travel narrative and conventions from the romance permit a play like *Pericles* to utilize older forms while participating in contemporary discussions. The particular way in which *Pericles* makes use of this older form suggests that the anachronistic quality of the romance is self-consciously brought forward to serve a contemporary purpose.²⁵ Besides contributing source material to the play via John Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, the romance form also loans *Pericles* a thematic concern for chivalry that shows up most clearly in the presentation of shields and the tournament at Pentapolis and that points back to the conventions of the medieval romance, which, according to Roberta Krueger, represents, "a dynamic network of fictions, written first in verse and then in prose, that recounted the exploits of knights, ladies, and noble families seeking honor, love, and adventure" (2). The tournament at Pentapolis, with its presentation of shields and recitation of Latin mottoes, demonstrates a deep concern for chivalric order. During the tournament scene, Simonides and Thaisa use the word

²⁴ The most prominently theatrical intervention comes from Diana's *deus ex machina* appearance in the final scenes of the play, but Gower's intervention is much more sustained and central to the progression of the plot.

²⁵ *Pericles*'s appropriation of medieval romance also relates to Gower himself. According to Krueger, the early romance fictions in the francophone courts of England were written in octosyllabic couplets and are marked by, among other things, "narratorial interventions" (2). Gower also speaks in octosyllabic couplets, and his narratorial interventions give structure and a didactic quality to the plot.

“honour” three times in the first sixteen lines, and Simonides later instructs the knights, “honour we love, / For who hates honour hates the gods above” (7.20-1). Within the scene, however, is a hint of self-mockery that acknowledges the outmoded quality of the events depicted: Pericles’s armor is specifically named as “rusty” (5.158) and has been fished out of the sea in the preceding scene. Like Gower, and like the romance form, it is a device pulled from the past to serve present needs, without losing awareness of its archaic nature.

The later romance tradition also represents a tension between chivalric ideals and social realities. Krueger writes that after the thirteenth century, “chivalric fiction presented itself less as a panel for the advertisement of social ideals than as a forum for the construction and contestation of social identities and values” (5), particularly as print culture, the politics of the Reformation, travel, and commerce imbued the romances of the Renaissance with a new irony stemming from the gaps between an ideal, imagined past and a pragmatic present. By the early modern period, according to McDonald, romance is:

...that famously episodic form that skips over great gaps of time, neglects logical connections in favor of less predictable sorts of juxtaposition and sequence and regularly withholds satisfactory accounts of human motive or supernatural influence. The theatrical spectator is required to fill in gaps, to ignore or forgive unclear sequences and logical faults in the structure of romance fiction. (80)

The intersection of romance and travel narrative makes the form as well as the content of a travel narrative available and to some degree familiar to a theatre audience.²⁶ That

²⁶ Notice the parallels between the romance genre and the travel narrative. Based on Korte’s definition as described in my introduction, both forms are progressively episodic, respond to problems of disparate space

explanation can also be inverted, however, suggesting not so much that the travel narrative revitalizes interest in the romance, but that the romance ages the travel narrative and demonstrates that the models of authority necessary to it are also outmoded. The episodic structure of a play like *Pericles*—characteristic of both the travel narrative and the romance—necessitates the presence of a narrator (in this case Gower), whose authority, like that of a travel narrator, must be specifically constructed through claims to spoken, written, and eyewitness corroboration. Whereas in a prose text the acquisition of authority by suppressing or occluding alternative accounts is an invisible process, Gower's physical presence on stage becomes a visible demonstration of the distance and isolation necessary to preserve a travel narrator's authority.

Gower's distance and isolation appear in stark contrast to the play's appropriation of a relatively new, popular style with probable influence on *Pericles*. City comedy emerged as a distinctive genre in the 1590s and rose to prominence in the Jacobean theatre under playwrights like Jonson, Middleton, and Marston. These plays come from the tradition of the Morality play as well as the comedies of Plautus and Terence, but they are characterized by realism of a sort that Brian Gibbons says "shape[s] character and incident in order to bring alive the underlying social and moral issues through the specific and local experience" (4). In other words, the realism they employ does not simply represent local peculiarities, but selects and molds them to give them greater significance and satirical weight. Other characteristics of the city comedy are "their critical and satiric design, their urban settings, their exclusion of material appropriate to romance, fairy-tale,

and time, and in their reliance on one dominant perspective, control or withhold alternative accounts from the reader or viewer. Charles Moseley later explicitly connects *Pericles* (and *The Tempest*) to the tragicomedy's sub-genre, the travel play. He writes, "Such plays engage with Europe's increasing interest in, and response to, the previously unknown, and can test easy European certainties" (51).

sentimental legend, or patriotic chronicle” (Gibbons 11). *Every Man in His Humour*, discussed above, is a representative example of a city comedy.²⁷ The pragmatism and realism on which the city comedy is prefaced stand in clear opposition to Gower’s moralistic tendencies and the fantastic nature of his appearance out of the metaphoric ashes, demonstrating the tension that emerges between old and new forms as Gower struggles to re-shape their content to his mode of narration.

On the level of content, the scenes in *Pericles* bearing the largest trace of the city comedy are the brothel scenes in Mytilene, by virtue of their emphasis on economic language and their satirical representation of social issues. Bolt acts as a venture capitalist when he buys Marina from the pirates, telling Pander on his return, “Master, I have gone through for this piece you see. If you like her, so; if not, I have lost my earnest” (16.41-2), referencing the money put down as a deposit on a purchase. Likewise, the Bawd and the Pander are shrewd marketers and negotiators in the market of human flesh. And while Marina uses adept rhetoric to persuade Lysimachus and the other gentlemen not to take her virginity, Lysimachus nonetheless treats the exchange as an economic one, saying before he leaves, “I came here meaning but to pay the price, / A piece of gold for thy virginity; / Here’s twenty to relieve thine honesty” (19.154-6). In addition to its economic framework, the scene bears notable elements of social satire. When Marina similarly inflicts guilt on Bolt for his attempts to ravish her, he replies, “What would you have me do? Go to the wars, would you, where a man may serve seven years for the loss of a leg, and have not money enough to buy him a wooden one?” (19.218-21). The importance of capital in this society is evident in the fact that Bolt’s threat to Marina’s chastity is

²⁷ For a more in-depth discussion of city comedy, see Jean Howard’s *Theatre of a City*.

alleviated for good only when she passes him some of Lysimachus's gold (19.227) and promises to trade one profitable profession (prostitution) for another (teaching). Notably, these scenes fall largely outside of Gower's narration. His description in scene fifteen of the danger to Marina from Cleon and Dionyza does not include mention of the brothel; in scene eighteen, between the two brothel scenes, he likewise refers only obliquely to her "woe and heavy welladay / In her unholy service" (18.43-4). Only after she leaves the brothel does he reference the actual location in the brief statement, "Marina thus the brothel scapes, and chances / Into an honest house" (20.1-2). Gower's ancient mode of narration struggles to account for this newer, popular form of drama.

However, the city comedy seeks the same absolute authority that Gower claims. Gower asks the audience to adopt from city comedy the distance necessary for moral and critical response to the play's content. If the brothel scenes demonstrate the most direct influence of the city comedy on the level of plot, on the level of form, the use of a (modified) prologue and epilogue in *Pericles* also follows the style of a city comedy. Gibbons identifies prologues and epilogues as one convention of the city comedy that demonstrates "Jonson's ambition to realize also *in the theatre* the formal characteristics of satiric poetry and to give satire's moral and social principles and assumptions dramatic expression" (6). For the purposes of my argument, several elements in this claim are particularly significant. First, Gibbons identifies an impulse to cross not only between dramatic genres, but between the genres of poetry and drama, the media of print and stage. Satiric drama, according to Gibbons, establishes "a relationship between the play and its spectators which corresponds to that prevailing between satiric poetry and its readers" (6), a relationship characterized by distance and intellectual engagement. Second,

by linking a dramatic trend to a desire to express “moral and social principles,” Gibbons highlights the didacticism of city comedy, a characteristic central to Gower in *Pericles*.

If the romance serves to place in tension the ideal and the reality of social life, and the city comedy contrasts proximity and distance, the tragicomedy places in tension the expected conventions of drama and highlights the instability of absolute authority. Gower’s last lines in the play flout the tragicomic tendencies of the ending and make his final assertion of authority one that figuratively upsets the balance of the play, like the balance necessary to the uneasy genre of the tragicomedy. In *Defence of Poesie*, Sir Philip Sidney makes snide reference to the “mungrell Tragy-comedie” (qtd. in Maguire 1) that was then growing in popularity. Likewise, when the actors approach Elsinore in *Hamlet*, Polonius famously presents them to Hamlet as, “The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral, scene individable, or poem unlimited” (2.2.396-402). Countering this type of mockery, in the first decade of the seventeenth century Giovanni Battista Guarini began to develop a poetics of tragicomedy, and his vision was carried further by Fletcher and then Jonson. The print edition of Fletcher’s 1608 play *The Faithful Shepherdess* defines tragicomedy in this way:

A tragi-comedie is not so called in respect of mirth and killing, but in respect it wants deaths, which is enough to make it no tragedy, yet brings some neere it, which is inough to make it no comedie: which must be a representation of familiar people, which such kinde of trouble as no life to be questiond, so that a God is as lawfull in this as in a tragedie, and meane people as in a comedie. (“To the Reader,” qtd. in Shawcross 32)

In this definition, the tragicomedy is a genre that places authority in question through its blending of the traditionally “high” and “low,” setting them on the same stage and granting them, at least on one level, the same importance. Tragicomedy further destabilizes dramatic authority because it hovers between the space of tragedy and that of comedy, between life and possible death. According to John Shawcross, authority in a tragicomedy is never stable because the genre wavers between the closure of tragedy and the open-endedness of comedy, with emphasis on a present, ephemeral happiness that always carries the possibility of being supplanted by a repetition of the former evils, but which must nonetheless avert death (24). In *Pericles*, Thaisa’s resuscitation at Ephesus (scene 12), the timely rescue of Marina by pirates (scene 15), and the final reunion between Pericles, Marina, and Thaisa with the intervention of Diana (scenes 21-2) all conform to this model; however, the play distinctly refuses wholly to circumvent death. Pericles and Thaisa’s joy is enhanced by inheritance because Thaisa’s father is reported dead (22.100). Antiochus’s and his daughter’s deaths, as reported in a single line (10.25), would be overshadowed by the reunions but for Gower’s reminder in his epilogue that they have received “the due and just reward” (22.108), and in the final recounting of the play, Gower informs the audience that Cleon and his wife “in his palace burn / The gods for murder seemed so content / To punish that, although not done, but meant” (22.120-2). Gower attributes responsibility for these deaths to the gods, yet it is he who brings the warning forward and moves the play away from tragicomedy in an assertion of control over how the play will be received and what its emphasis will be.

The Traveler from Antiquity: Situating Gower in theatrical convention

As this analysis of genre suggests, Gower's authority is at the core of *Pericles's* peculiarities both of subject and form. Reflecting this fact, what critical attention *Pericles* has received has dealt prominently with Gower, a figure who does not directly participate in the action of the play, but rather appears on stage eight times (including as an epilogue) to forewarn what will be seen, to moralize what has been seen, and to account for leaps of time and location. Moseley claims that Gower is necessary because of the play's reliance on the romance narrative for form. He writes, "What might cohere in a narrative poem could easily fall into incoherence in a play, which must to some degree show not tell. Shakespeare's solution is the device of Gower, who intervenes eight times to frame, summarise, and move the action forward through time and space" (52). Moseley's depiction contributes to the image of Gower as having the authority to manipulate not only time and space but narrative as well. He clearly claims an important role; the grounds of his claim are more complicated, as Gower's classification is one of the most popular subjects of debate in relation to the play. In order to lay the groundwork for my own interpretation of Gower's role, I turn first to some of the ways Gower has been understood previously, examining the candidates of Chorus, morality figure, and authorial presenter.

Gower's position outside the play proper and his possession of extradiegetical information would seem to align him with then-popular incarnations of the chorus.²⁸ Ruth Nevo writes, "Like the chorus in *Henry V* or Time in *The Winter's Tale*, but unlike other mediating or parabastic figures [Gower] *only* addresses the audience, never the *dramatis personae*" (68). Among possible models for a chorus are Greek choruses, similar to the

²⁸ Although many critics refer to Gower as some form of chorus, most also acknowledge the problems posed by such a classification.

one in *Henry V*, or allegorical choruses like those found in medieval mystery and miracle plays, comparable to Time in *The Winter's Tale*. I will examine both of these possibilities briefly before going on to look at what makes Gower different in the way he constructs his own authority.

The Greek chorus has been defined by Cynthia Gardiner as a group of persons, presumably representing the poet's views and acting as an "ideal spectator" (1-2) while nonetheless participating to varying degrees as a character in a play (5). Alternately, in *The Poetics*, Aristotle called for the chorus to be a single actor as part of the larger company (qtd. in Wiles 142). David Wiles writes that because of the scale of theatres in Athens, "The presence of the chorus underpinned the convention, essential if the text was to reach its audience, that every speech was a mode of public address" (Wiles 109). He contrasts the hundred-meter distance actors' voices had to travel to reach the farthest spectator to the twenty-five-meter distance in Shakespeare's Globe. Intimacy was not sufficiently available in the Greek theaters to permit the kind of dialogue that takes place, for example, between Pericles and Marina in the final scenes of *Pericles*. The Greek chorus, a collective body, expresses emotion unreadable on the level of the singular individual (110) and then clears space for the entrance of the hero, whose larger-than-life characteristics must fill the vacuum left by the choral retreat. According to Wiles, a common assumption is that "the chorus stood as intermediary between the audience and the actors" (142). This reading of the chorus renders them "involved in the action, giving advice and being sworn to silence" (142). The chorus traditionally draws from a body of knowledge, be it myth or history, to "embody the collective wisdom of the community" (142) and also to pass judgment on the contents of the play.

Among Shakespeare's plays, *Henry V* presents the clearest example of a Greek chorus, although it is represented by a single speaker rather than a group. Comparing Gower to this chorus is one way to illuminate Gower's divergence from the expected choric mode. The Chorus in *Henry V* acts as the prologue and epilogue and introduces the contents of each act as he accounts for, through apology, the limitations of theatrical representation. (Unlike a Greek chorus, his apology is that the space is too small to present spectacle; the Greek chorus functionally apologizes that the space is too large to present intimate emotion). *Henry V*'s Chorus asks the audience to pardon "the flat unraised spirits that hath dared / On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth / So great an object" (Prologue 9-11). The effect is to magnify his subject matter by deprecating the theatre company's ability to portray it. The Chorus also demands audience participation; he relies on their "imaginary forces" to "suppose within the girdle of these walls / Are now confined two mighty monarchies" (P.18-20). Gower's admonitions that the audience "Imagine Pericles arrived at Tyre" (15.1) and "on this coast / Suppose him now at anchor" (21.15-6) are of a kind. In the *Henry V* model, the audience is in turn responsible to "Pierce out our imperfections with your thoughts" (P.23), thus "Turning th'accomplishment of many years / Into an hourglass" (P.30-1) that he, the Chorus, will supply. It is a collaborative effort, and the Chorus provides the vessel for the raw imaginative material the audience contributes. Compare this statement to Gower's that "Now our sands are almost run" (22.1). In *Pericles*, the conventional role of the chorus has reached its outermost limit and is as outdated as Gower himself. Contributing to this distinction is the layering of messenger, letter, and dumb show alongside Gower to aid—

or muddle—his narrative efforts and call attention to his growing insufficiency, a point to which I will return later.

In *Henry V*, at the beginning of act three, Chorus urges the audience to “play with your fancies (3.0.7), “grapple your minds” (18), and “eke out our performance with your mind” (35). These and other images suggest a work comparable to that of the armies themselves as they are transported out of England. The fourth chorus follows a similar pattern of patriotic description that ends with a plea to disregard the “four or five most vile and ragged foils” that represent the battle of Agincourt (4.0.50). The Chorus spends most of his time describing the illusion rather than disabusing the audience of it. In act two, the Chorus appears to convey the audience to France for the next stage of the war. His mode of speech is recitative, and only at the end of this interlude does the Chorus remind his listeners that they must “digest / Th’abuse of distance, force a play” as the playhouse is transported from Southampton to France (2.1.31, 36). The Chorus is thus uniquely seductive, constructing a world before inviting the audience to suspend their disbelief and participate in its work. The Chorus’s instructions, notably, are to “[mind] true things by what their mockeries be” (53). This is a major point of departure from Gower’s method, because Gower frequently demonstrates not that theatrical mockeries stand in for true things, but that seemingly true things are as theatrical as representative mockeries. In scene eighteen, Gower demonstrates through a dumb show of Cleon and Dionyza’s mock grief that “belief may suffer by foul show” when “This borrowed passion stands in for true-owed woe” (18.23-24). An enacted funeral does not necessarily represent a larger heartfelt grief, it is a substitute for it. In Gower’s vision, staged

representations are not un-problematically synecdochical for larger events; they are explicitly susceptible to deceit.

In keeping with the Chorus's foregrounding of illusion rather than device, unlike Gower's prominent use of textual metaphors, the chorus in act five marks the first association of the Chorus with reading or source material, as he begs, "Vouchsafe to those that have not read the story / That I may prompt them; and of such as have, / I humbly pray them to admit th'excuse" (5.0.1-3) of theatrical limitations. This is the first gesture to a specifically textual narrative from which the Chorus draws. The *Henry V* epilogue carries further the image of writing, saying, "Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen, / Our bending author pursued the story" (E.1-2) and referring also to the previously performed plays *Henry VI*, parts 1-3. Rather than giving conclusion like Gower's explicit "Here our play has ending" (22.124), this epilogue situates the play within the context of a larger theatrical—not textual—history that permits the story to live on after the play itself ends. By contrast, from scene one, in which he says of his story, "lords and ladies in their lives / Have read it for restoratives" (1.7-8), to his explicit identification with text in 5.40, Gower repeatedly appeals to textual authority, but he does so in such a way as to render his story self-contained and extant.

If the Greek chorus is marked by an effort to respond to the limitations of theatrical representation and to help the audience tap into a broader collective wisdom, the allegorical "chorus" figure in medieval morality or miracle plays performs a disparate but related function by serving as the physical representation of an abstract principle.²⁹ Because Gower identifies and analyzes morals rather than acting out their struggle

²⁹ See David Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe*.

against vice, he does not fit easily into the model of the morality play. Because he represents a historical figure, his claim of authority is more straightforward than that of an allegorical chorus. According to Christine Dymkowski, despite similarities between the type of information Gower provides and that of medieval presenters and expositors, “Unlike the abstract Contemplacio of the N. town plays or the functionally named Expositor of the Chester cycle, for example, Gower comes to the audience complete with a personal identity” (245). Later incarnations of morality plays may lack “clear allegorical signposts,” according to Alan Dessen, but they nonetheless retain characters that are essentially “a social type that acts out that [abstract] concept” (*Shakespeare* 137).³⁰ A representative example is Time in Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*. Time appears only once during the play, at the beginning of act four. He has a specific function, to fill the gap of sixteen years that pass as Perdita grows to maturity. He says, “Impute it not a crime / To me or my swift passage that I slide / O’er sixteen years and leave the growth untried” (4.1.4-6). His language is similar to Gower’s, who both speaks of his own position “I’th’ gaps” (18.8) and begs the audience to agree that “we commit no crime / To use one language in each several clime” (18.5-6).

Other than linguistic similarity, Time stands opposite to Gower in several distinctive ways. First, Time’s role is functional rather than didactic. Second, Time’s authority is abstract rather than involved. Even though Gower stands at a distance from the events of the play, the fact that he represents a physical, lived human (John Gower) places him in a relationship of human authority over the characters in the play and the audience, whereas the abstract Time is wholly other to them. When a physical actor

³⁰ Among allegorical figures in Renaissance drama, Walter Eggers lists *The Tale of Three English Brothers’s* Fame and *Two Lamentable Tragedies’s* Truth (437).

represents both Gower and Time, the figure playing Time has a weaker claim to the authority on behalf of which he speaks, since an abstract concept requires greater suspension of disbelief on the part of the audience. Time's (the physical actor's) submission to the audience, asking that they "impute it not a crime" and "allow" the argument to proceed (4.1.4, 29), thus makes a mockery of his (the abstract concept's) self-proclaimed power to "o'erthrow law and in one self-born hour / To plant and o'erwhelm custom" (8-9). Gower's identity as a historical author in this way simplifies his relationship with the audience and the other characters.

Other language used to describe Gower comes from the *dramatis personae* of Wilkins's narrative, which refers to "John Gower, Presenter." McDonald classes Gower as "the most thoroughly developed presenter" among the romances, "although the other texts depend on similar mediators between stage and audience" (232).³¹ For Gower to be named as a presenter in Wilkins's list of characters, and perhaps in the play as well, is to align him with a theatrical convention that is recognizable, but also subject to ridicule. Shakespeare's earlier play *A Midsummer Night's Dream* mocks the convention of both prologue and presenter in the form of the Rude Mechanicals, implying that the devices they employ are marks of an amateurish theatrical production. To ensure that their comedy of Pyramus and Thisbe does not offend, Bottom demands a prologue to "say we will do not harm with our swords, and that Pyramus is not killed indeed; and for the more better assurance, tell them that I, Pyramus, am not Pyramus but Bottom the weaver" (3.1.16-20). Likewise, in this scene, responding to limitations of theatrical space, Quince calls for "one [to] come in with a bush of thorns and a lantern and say he comes to

³¹ McDonald also lists Time in *The Winter's Tale*, Jupiter in *Cymbeline*, and Prospero's epilogue in *The Tempest*.)

disfigure, or to present, the person of Moonshine” (3.1.55-7). Bottom then calls for “Some man or other [to] present Wall” (3.1.63). The presenter, as an allegorical figure who compensates for theatrical limitations, is made a source of mockery during the performance of the Rude Mechanicals’ play in act five, as Theseus interjects jests such as, “Would you desire lime and hair to speak better?” to which Demetrius replies, “It is the wittiest partition that ever I heard discourse, my lord” (5.1.164-7).

In a similar movement toward excess, in response to Quince’s request that it “be written in eight and six” (3.1.22), referring to the number of syllables in each line of a typical ballad stanza, Bottom adds, “let it be written in eight and eight” (3.1. 23-4). Given Bottom’s position as the “butt” of the company’s jokes and the one with the greatest proclivity for unintentional humor, his addition of two extra syllables in the second line suggests that such a decision makes the play even more pompous and/or archaic. “Eight and eight”, or roughly tetrameter lines, is, as mentioned earlier, not only a meter typical of the medieval romance, but also the meter Gower uses for most of his speeches in *Pericles*. If *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* contributes to the impression of this metrical system as one out-of-date or out-of-fashion, then Gower’s use of it adds to his anachronistic persona.

Within the class of presenter, Gower fills a particular role that Walter Eggers has termed an “authorial presenter,” a presenter who bears the name and character of a specific author. In 1975, Eggers proposed a list of other plays that use an authorial presenter. The list ranges from the 1580s to the 1620s and includes at least seven other plays with a fully-developed figure of this type.³² These narrators are characterized by

³² *The Seven Deadly Sins, The Downfall of Robert, The Devil’s Charter, The Golden Age, The Valiant Welshman, Hengist, and Herod and Antipater.*

special authority (they stand alone and at a distance), continuous control, responsibility for structural transitions, didactic exposition, and antiquity (435-6). Eggers writes that even among this set, Gower stands out. Not only was *Pericles* likely the most popular Elizabethan play with a presenter, but Gower also has the most appearances and the most thorough development as a character who is eventually dwarfed by the story he tells (Eggers 438). Mullaney concludes that Gower anticipates the dominance of the author in print, looking ahead to a self-consciously authorial writer like Jonson: “Reincarnated on stage, [Gower] occupies the place of both author and authority and seeks to legitimize the play in the way a father or a monarch legitimizes a genealogy, by authorizing it in a rather full sense of the term” (102). This analysis would suggest, as Helen Cooper does, that the appearance of a source’s author both detracts from and enhances the playwright’s authority (107). On one hand, it eliminates the possibility of originality, albeit a quality valued differently during the Renaissance than it is today. On the other hand, it corroborates the playwright’s story and permits him to borrow his source’s innate authority.

Gower, as F. David Hoeniger points out in “Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*,” has implicit authority because of his identity as a historical figure: “[John] Gower was a learned poet, as the audience knew, and the Latin [in the first few lines of the play] befits his authority” (464). Charles Moseley argues that John Gower’s literary reputation during the Renaissance was comparable to that of Chaucer (52). Dymkowski similarly calls Gower one of two fathers of English literature and claims early moderns knew his reputation as a moralist and patriotic figure if not his actual work (238). Furthermore, the name “Gower” had authority in the early modern period by virtue of its antiquity. The

oft-cited woodcut from Wilkins's prose *Adventures of Pericles*, which is often assumed to reflect costuming from the play, shows Gower as a figure dressed anachronistically; his poetics (rhyming tetrameter) and vocabulary also reinforce his antiquity. Gower himself, in the Latin quotation Hoeniger references, makes this claim: "*Et bonum quo antiquius eo melius*" (1.10). What critics rarely go on to say is that in consequence of having authority by right of antiquity, Gower's authority is a product of his alienation from not only his historical entity, but his historical context as well as the present moment. The Gower who speaks is precisely not the Gower under whose authority he commands attention. He could not be.³³ As a stand-in for poet John Gower, the billed "Gower" is at a distance first, from his historical self. He is, quite simply, a traveler across both space and time—from England to the Mediterranean; from the fourteenth century to the seventeenth. The importance of travel to Gower's mode of narrative is the subject of the next section.

Auctor, Auteur, Author: Interpreting Gower's language of authority

In light of the linguistic distance written into the play, Gower is a necessary figure: as McDonald succinctly puts it, "Gaps demand bridges" (104). Gower calls himself one who "stands i' th' gaps" to teach his audience how to understand what is a structurally and morally wandering play. To do so, he has need of the traveler's peculiar authority, because his narrative shares the circumstances that necessitate it. The definitions previously cited in the introduction from Hadfield and Korte offer three related features.

³³ Notably, a 2003 production directed by Neil Bartlett and starring Bette Bourne as Gower chose to characterize Gower as something between a stage manager, a janitor, and a school teacher. "In constructing Gower in this way," Dymkowski writes, "Bartlett relinquished the character's identity as a noted literary author" (262). It should come as no surprise that losing his literary identity means Gower also loses some of his authority. Appropriately, Dymkowski points out that Bourne's Gower was also lauded by audiences as being more relatable—and perhaps less commanding—than earlier incarnations of the role.

First, the traveler's textual account relies on retrospective construction, rendering the account of events both memory and construction. The reader must rely on the traveler's accuracy of memory and accept his version of events as valid. Second, the account relies on translation, requiring that the traveler use metaphoric language to assimilate cultural concepts, languages, situations, and peoples into a form that those at home can understand. The reader must rely on the traveler's skill in translation. Third, the account responds to physical limitations, forcing the traveler to make editorial decisions with respect to inclusions, exclusions, generalizations, and use of information recorded or witnessed by other travelers or scholars. Taken together, these features of travel render the personal authority of the narrator necessary to preserve the unity and reliability of the account. Gower's account relies on the same personal authority, a fact to which he draws attention by distancing himself from the material he narrates.

In his opening lines, Gower calls his tale as an act of memory and reconstruction. This is "a song that old was sung" (1.1) as part of public ceremony and also "read...for restoratives" (8). For him to repeat this account is, as the first feature suggests, both memory and construction, because while he refers to "our story" (20.2) as though it were a complete extant narrative, the story he tells is also a new adaptation from at least Gower's *Confessio Amantis* (ca. 1390) and Twine's *Patterne of Painfull Aduentures* (1576). The work of adaptation is carried out through various forms of translation, and in each case Gower acts as a translator, but then he turns to critique or negate his own efforts. The most direct application is in scene eighteen, when Gower calls attention to the fact that he is both translating and not translating the foreign elements of the play. He states, "By you being pardoned, we commit no crime / To use one language in each

several clime / Where our scenes seem to live” (18.5-7). On a basic level, he asks the audience to imagine the spoken words as translations of what would have been said in the languages appropriate to the foreign locations Pericles visits. However, what he is actually indicating is the absence of translation. *Pericles* merely pretends that English characters are translations of foreigners. The real translation takes place on a textual level, bringing a Latin text (*Confessio Amantis*) and European theatrical conventions and tropes into the form of the play.

A similar model of revealing and then negating translation appears with respect to a second form, translation across different media. At several points, Gower introduces a dumb show and offers to translate its visual representations into verbal ones. In scene ten, he says, “What’s dumb in show, I’ll plain with speech” (10.14), with the implication being that the eyes may mislead in the absence of a credible translator. This sentiment is in keeping with Pericles’s discovery in scene one that the Daughter’s “glorious casket” has been “stored with ill” (1.120); he relies on the verbal instruction of Antiochus’s riddle to unmask the Daughter’s misleading beauty. In his subsequent soliloquy, Pericles muses, “How courtesy would seem to cover sin / When what is done is like an hypocrite, / The which is good in nothing but in sight” (1.164-6). The same conquest of word over image is present in Marina’s escape from the brothel via rhetorical persuasion (scene 19), as well as in Pericles’s restoration through Marina’s words in scene twenty-one. But even in this last moment that represents the triumph of speech over silence, Marina negates in speech the work her speech is doing; she refuses to tell the story that she is even then in the midst of telling: “If I should tell my history, it would seem like lies / Disdained in the reporting” (21.107-109). At the same moment, Pericles opts to believe her tale because

“Falseness cannot come from thee, for thou look’st / Modest as justice, and thou seem’st
a palace / For the crowned truth to dwell in. I will believe thee” (21.110-112). Gower’s
narration participates in this contradictory work of translation, because one scene after he
promises to “plain with speech” the dumb show, he avers,

...what ensues in this fell storm

Shall for itself itself perform;

I will relate; action may

Conveniently the rest convey. (11.53-56)

His statement implies that translation is no longer necessary, and that actions now speak
on their own behalf—even as the dramatic flow of the scene demands that he speak first
on behalf of what is to come. Even when he says that the visual speaks for itself, he is
nonetheless speaking for it.

A third form of translation is that involved in the creation of literary language:
metaphor, simile, and personification, among other figures. Gower practices this form of
translation frequently, as in scene eleven, when he uses a string of metaphors to describe
a storm. Because the storm is not performed for the spectators’ eyes, using simple
declarative language to transform a visual image into oral description would already be
an act of translation. Instead, Gower layers poetic forms on top of the images he conjures:

The grizzled north

Disgorges such a tempest forth

That as a duck for life that dives,

So up and down the poor ship drives. (11.47-50)

Within these four lines, the north is likened to an old man with gray hair who vomits out a storm that causes a ship, likened to a diving duck, to rise and fall on the waves. The proliferation of images can be read in contradictory ways: it creates a rapid sequence of images—gray hair, north, vomit, storm, duck, ship, waves—that could be said to render the scene more vivid and thus immediate and more abstract and thus distant.

The contradictory effects of translation also apply to a set of lines from scene fifteen, when Gower describes the imminent murder attempt on Marina's life, saying Dionyza has, "The pregnant instrument of wrath / Pressed for this blow. The unborn event / I do commend to your content" (15.43-46). Leonine, the would-be murderer, is given inverted gender through Gower's description of him as "pregnant" with "the unborn event." He is furthermore an "instrument of wrath," a tool "pressed" into service by another; as the note in the Oxford edition suggests, he is both a willing and unwilling participant. The complexities of the language become one in a series of layers when Gower adds, "Dionyza does appear, / With Leonine, a murderer" (51-2). This language is both declarative and didactic. Leonine is assigned a name that leaves no ambiguity about his role in the play, contrary to the strongly ambiguous way in which he has just been described and the ambiguity that will characterize his subsequent interaction with Marina. The scene contains an additional layer because that which has been described in poetic and declarative language is also presented in visual image and auditory speech as Leonine appears on stage and recounts his reservations about the deed.

As a whole, Gower's authority is positioned so as to leave no doubt as to its artificiality, and, at times, its inaccuracy. Even though, as Cooper argues, "Gower's presence means that the play does not need to rely on reports or messengers for such

things, but gives performative utterance to these gaps between the scenes” (108), reports and messengers exist nonetheless. Gower’s ability to fill the gaps is supplemented by not only the dumb shows, but also traditional messengers (see 21.1-ff.), letters (see 5.15-ff. and 9.13-ff.), oral reports (see 3.25-ff. and 4.56-ff.), and divine visions (see 21.226-ff.).

Furthermore, although Gower is not *Pericles*’s only narrator—Pericles, Helicanus, and Marina are also prominent storytellers—the others’ narration consistently bears the mark of his overarching narrative control. Consider Pericles’s soliloquies in scenes one (“How courtesy would seem to cover sin”) and two (“Why should this change of thoughts”). Pericles is, after all, the representative traveler in the play. He is familiar with sea trade, sending away his lords with a request to “let your cares o’erlook / What shipping and what lading’s in our haven” (2.53-4). Helicanus, the good counselor, bids Pericles “go travel for a while, / Till that his rage and anger be forgot” (2.111-2). For Pericles, travel is a voluntary escape that outmaneuvers Antiochus and thus preserves his authority as a true prince. However, he relies on others’ narratives to drive the action and thus renders himself passive. In his instructions to Helicanus, he says, “to Tarsus / Intend my travel, where I’ll hear from thee, / And by whose letters I’ll dispose myself” (2.120-2). It is Helicanus’s letters that will dispose Pericles’s actions, not vice versa. Furthermore, Pericles’s narrations as a traveler are always moderated either by Gower’s framing interpretation or by another character. His commission, which, according to Helicanus, “does speak sufficiently he’s gone to travel” is, significantly, sealed (3.13). In the scene at Simonides’ court after the tournament, when Pericles should tell his tale, it is mediated by Thaisa. Pericles begins his tale in the fashion of a traveler:

A gentleman of Tyre, my name Pericles,

My education been in arts and arms,
Who looking for adventures in the world,
Was by the rough seas reft of ships and men,
And after shipwreck driven upon this shore. (7.77-81)

Thaisa relays his message as, “He thanks your grace, names himself Pericles, / A gentleman of Tyre, whom sour misfortune, / Bereft of ships and men, cast on this shore” (7.82-4). Her interpretation, while preserving the substance of his tale, also abbreviates it as an editor might. Finally, Pericles narrates that which has been either seen by the audience or foretold by Gower, so he does not claim the traveler’s authority to narrate the inaccessible.

Although elsewhere Helicanus is a strong narrative presence,³⁴ in the final scenes of the play, his narration demonstrates anxiety about the process of selection and editing. The tension of the final scene is brought on by Pericles’s silence—his refusal to promulgate narrative—yet it features a filtering process that sorts narrative that is useful to repeat from narrative that is not. Pericles’s malady, according to Helicanus, is that he “for this three months hath not spoken” (21.18); however, when it comes to the grounds of his disorder, Helicanus says, “’Twould be too tedious to tell it over” (22) and must summarize it instead. Observation stands in for narration even though Helicanus marks it as inferior, saying, “See him, sir, you may, / But bootless is your sight. He will not speak / To any” (25-7). The anxiety associated with editing appears repeatedly in this scene, as when Helicanus says, “nothing we’ll omit / That bears recovery’s name” (42), echoing back to Gower’s opening claim that “lords and ladies in their lives / Have read [this

³⁴ See for example scene three, in which Helicanus narrates to the lords of Tyre the reason for Pericles’s absence.

narrative] for restoratives” (1.7-8). Helicanus’s attempt to take narrative control of the scene is overshadowed by his reluctance to alter what remains Gower’s story.

Marina also stands as a possible narrator, but like Pericles, she is subject to Gower’s narrative encapsulation. The final scenes of the play are obsessed with repetition and re-telling. Marina’s reiterations serve to disabuse Pericles of his mistaken understanding and to give him access to the correct narrative of his family’s history. Pericles’s physically violent response to Marina’s greeting prompts her to say in rebuke, “She speaks / My lord, that maybe hath endured a grief / Might equal yours, if both were justly weighed” (21.76-8). Her subsequent speech represents, for the audience, a recap of what they have already seen, but for Pericles, it contains the missing pieces of the story to “justly weigh” against his own. In a reversal of Lysimachus’s promise that Marina might draw Pericles from his silence, it is Pericles who must urge Marina to continue her story³⁵ until he knows the full, true account; then in his dream he is commanded by Diana to do the same at Ephesus for Thaisa: “Reveal how thou at sea didst lose thy wife. / To mourn thy crosses, with thy daughter’s, call / And give them repetition to the life” (21.230-3). Just as Marina’s narration brings forth a father and daughter supposed lost, Pericles’s repetition of it restores “to the life” a dead wife, husband, and daughter. The corrective force of their combined narration is a reminder that within the play, mis-recognitions and invalid narrative can be corrected and brought into harmony by corroborating testimony, a fact which emphasizes again that Gower’s narrative, set as it is outside the play proper, is exempt from this reparative force.

³⁵ See, for example, 21.87, 109, 119, 124, 131, 142, and 153.

What sets Gower apart is that he stands outside the text, so his words cannot be verified or disproved within the context of the play.³⁶ The content of Gower's speeches in this respect share more in common with those of Othello, another of Shakespeare's traveling storytellers. However, while Othello's speeches both separate him from and fix him in the play, Gower looks backward to an earlier text for verification and to call attention to his alienation from this text even as he asserts authority over it. As Nevo argues in a Freudian reading of the play, "Gower's punctuation of the sequence of direct dramatic enactment by alternating narration and dumbshow foregrounds the question of selection and deletion in narration itself; for that matter the question of the authentic as against the authenticated—the retold" (69). The authority Gower asserts relies not only on the visual, like Othello with his demand for an "ocular proof" (3.3.376), nor solely on the aural, like Desdemona with her "greedy ears" (1.3.151). Instead, he—and the story he tells—creates a complicated combination of these forms of authority.

Early in the play, Gower's narration evinces the tension in assigning authority to a particular mode of communication. In his later speeches, Gower calls equally on the authority of the eye, the ear, the text, and the body. He refers the audience back to that which they have seen (i.e. witnessed), what they have heard, and what they have read, but he is particularly attuned to sight and the difference between performance and discourse. He closes his first speech with a claim about the supremacy of visual authority: "What now ensues, to the judgment of your eye / I give my cause, who best can justify" (1.41-2).

³⁶ Jeffrey Masten reaches the opposite conclusion in *Textual Intercourse* when he argues, "The play frequently does not separate [Gower] from the representation he ostensibly creates and presents" (77). Masten cites Gower's acknowledgment of the other characters on stage and his placement, with Pericles, on the stage/ship he asks the audience to imagine. However, while Gower can narrate the other characters, they cannot do the same for him, and they never acknowledge his presence. Any part Gower has in the play proper is thus one-sided and does not diminish his authority.

The scene that follows, however, is an illustration of the eye's deceptiveness and the reliability of the written word. Pericles's first impression of Antiochus's daughter is of her bridal costume. He calls "her face the book of praises, where is read / Nothing but curious pleasures" (1.58-9). By reading the daughter's face, Pericles believes he has probed the truth of her being, when instead he has fallen prey to a deceptive performance. In this way, Pericles demonstrates a form of selective vision that renders his trust in ocular authority, mistaken for textual authority, decidedly problematic. He accepts the daughter, quite literally, at face value, even as he is faced with the heads of those who died before him in a similar endeavor, whose warning he does not accept. He finds the truth in the riddle Antiochus demands he interpret. Although he fails to interpret the daughter's face, Pericles correctly interprets the textual riddle and receives life from it. Notably, his moment of recognition is expressed in terms that reject visual authority. He demands of the power "that gives heaven countless eyes to view men's acts, / Why cloud they not their sights perpetually / If this be true which makes me pale to read it?" (1.115-8). Pericles makes a distinction between the visual act of reading and the visual act of seeing, and he implies that textuality is more reliable than sight. Given that Gower's authority is distinctly textual, while the play proper lays claim to eyewitness authority, this feature of the text reinforces Gower's supremacy even as he has verbally passed authority to the spectators' eyes. The discrepancy between Gower's invocation and Pericles's discovery is one example of the disjuncture that exists between the modes of authority proposed and those shown to be dependable; it is a disjuncture that leaves no model of authority wholly free from doubt.

A similar contradiction marks the relationship between Gower's verbal deferral of authority and the authority he implicitly claims by his decisions to speak or not to speak. In scene five, Gower introduces the first dumb show by saying, "tidings to the contrary / Are brought your eyes. What need speak I?" (5.15-6). "Need" is a key word, because Gower then proceeds to narrate the contents of the dumb show, implying that whether or not his extrapolation is needed, he will still bring it forward. He is able to affirm his own authority by speaking even as he undermines his authority by breaking his implicit promise not to narrate further. The opposite occurs in scene eleven, when Gower implies that action and show are preferable to discourse. He says, "what ensues in this fell storm / Shall for itself itself perform; / I nill relate" (11.54-5). In this instance, he fulfills his promise because the action of the play does begin, and he does not return to narrate until scene fifteen. Thus he limits his own authority by handing storytelling responsibilities over to the performers even as he bolsters his authority by situating himself as a truth-teller.

As the play progresses, Gower's efforts to defer authority are reflected in his increased use of the pronoun "we."³⁷ In his first two appearances, Gower clearer demarcates himself as "I" and the audience as "you." His first use of "we" is in scene ten, and it is notably in a line that calls attention to one of Gower's most authoritative functions, that of the editor: "Omit we all their dole and woe" (10.42). It is this same scene in which Gower transfers authority to the power of performance, saying, "what ensues in this fell storm / Shall for itself itself perform; / I nill relate" (10.53-55). From that point on, Gower's "I" increasingly is subordinated to the collective "we." Scene

³⁷ This turn could be related to the change in authors, as most critics assume Wilkins was responsible for most of scenes one through nine, while Shakespeare wrote most of eleven through twenty-two. This assumption, however, still involves a degree of speculation.

fifteen opens with “His woefull queen we leave at Ephesus” (3); “I” appears only in the last few lines of the scene, already quoted. In scene eighteen, Gower begins, “Thus time we waste” (18.1). “I” is relegated to statements of appeal as in, “I do beseech you” (7). Scene twenty privileges “our story” (20.2), and the “I” makes no appearance at all. Finally, in scene twenty-two, “you” predominates; the speech closes with reference to “our play” (124), and the “I” is again absent.

Gower’s speech is marked by additional distancing or self-effacing techniques. He defers in scene five to the authority of the dumb show: the men of Tarsus build Pericles a statue “to make him glorious / But tidings to the contrary / Are brought your eyes. What need speak I?” (5.14-6). Having given primary accountability for what follows to the dumb show, Gower is then free to extrapolate and interpret it. (A similar order of events takes place in scene ten.) In scene fifteen, Gower references our “fast-growing scene” (6). Segall interprets this metaphor as placing Gower in a father-child relationship with the text, but the language also implies what Eggers hints at: the text is growing separately from Gower, to the extent that he can disavow full responsibility for its contents.³⁸ At this point, Gower also transfers a limited amount of authority to the audience. His rhyme, he says, “never could I so convey / Unless your thoughts went on my way” (15.49-50). It is true that his ability to move Time at a speed faster than natural time is dependent on audience consent, but his repeated emphasis on his own powerlessness becomes in itself a form of power, as his narration precipitates the appearance of the performers who act out (sur)reality as he has described it.

³⁸ Bear in mind that this fast growth is a product of Gower’s own metaphors; unlike Eggers, I argue that the text is not growing beyond Gower’s control, but rather he is attempting actively to disengage from it.

Gower is able to make these concessions because his separation from the dramatic action proper ensures that his account cannot be challenged directly. Notably, Hoeniger calls the outmoded dumb shows in the play “bridges between the play’s archaic presenter and an audience familiar with a subtler and more complex drama” (471). The only mediation Gower permits between himself and the players is a dumb show, composed of figures that cannot speak and can contradict his report only visually, a mode of witness the play at large discredits. In consequence, even Gower’s offer to transfer authority produces at best an uneasy resolution, echoing nothing so much as Antiochus’s promise to give his daughter to the man who can interpret his riddle. The transfer of authority is precisely the reason Gower’s position as a travel narrator is so appropriate and also so problematic.

In a discussion of incest in Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, María Bullón-Fernández argues that incest represents a moment of friction in traditional discourses of authority as centered in familial relations. In her analysis, incest represents a deliberate refusal of the politics of exchange that permit a society to function. She says that just as a father abuses power when he does not permit his daughter to circulate on the social market, and just as a king abuses power when he does not permit authority to circulate on a representative or consensual market of ideas, “an artist, the author of a work, abuses his power when he tries to impose a one-sided interpretation on his work, trying to prevent it from producing meanings beyond his control” (2). Like Shakespeare’s “Gower,” “Genius” in *Confessio Amantis*, “has a relationship of authority with his own text; he tries to exert control over his stories in an attempt to reduce their meaning to his own purposes” (34). His abuse of power renders him, as much as his character Antiochus, an incestuous father or author.

Bullón-Fernández contends that the incest narrative is particularly suitable for discussions of authority because the incest taboo is created through discourse about sexuality and heteronormative impulses. Likewise, authority is a construct of discourse.

Reliance on discourse in turn creates a space for contradiction. The narrator in *Confessio Amantis*, Genius, is both a promoter of reproduction and a moral and religious priest, so his attempts to regulate sexuality are inherently conflicted. Furthermore, Bullón-Fernández describes the *Confessio* as “a narrative which refuses to identify an authoritative voice” (38). At various points, the poet John Gower is found “in Genius, in Amans, in the Latin glosses, in the spaces opened up by the contradictions in Genius’s teachings, and in none of them” (214). He is everywhere and nowhere; his authority is both concentrated and dispersed at once. If, as she goes on to argue, Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* contains an implicit challenge to this kind of abuse of authority, it seems curious to find Gower—as a character—being used in Shakespeare’s play to perpetrate that same abuse.

Like its source, *Pericles* is driven by the threat of incest. According to Leonard Tennenhouse, who gives a political reading of *Pericles* based on the relationship between familial and governmental structures, “[Incest] serves the rather simple function of dispatching Pericles on the various journeys which comprise the plot of this romance” (48); however, incest remains a threat through the unnatural similarity Pericles notices between Marina and Thaisa in scene twenty-one, beginning with, “My dearest wife was like this maid, and such a one / My daughter might have been” (21.97-8). What is more, Pericles’s words of recognition, “Thou that begett’st him that did thee beget” (21.184-5) eerily echo Antiochus’s riddle, “He’s father, son, and husband mild / I mother, wife, and

yet his child” (1.111-2). Gower preserves a parallel between Pericles’s relationship to Marina and Thaisa and Antiochus’s relationship with his daughter by opening his epilogue with the following lines:

In Antiochus and his daughter you have heard
Of monstrous lust the due and just reward;
In Pericles, his queen, and daughter seen,
Although assailed with fortune fierce and keen,
Virtue preserved from fell destruction’s blast (22.107-11)

Tennenhouse calls the source of unrest in *Pericles* “the desire of Antiochus to seek sole and permanent use of his daughter’s body in violation of the principle of genealogy” (48), and it could be said that the unrest is not wholly eliminated when Pericles assumes his throne.³⁹ The proximity between the two sets of names has the potential to establish a parallel relationship, not just an oppositional one, between the two families.

If the content of the play proper serves the moral purpose of restoring a good, non-incestuous king to the throne, the structure of the play is much more ambiguous. The incestuous tendencies Bullón-Fernández identifies in the author/artwork relationship of *Confessio Amantis* also apply to Gower’s relationship to *Pericles*. Gower both opens and closes the play: even after Pericles calls the company to exit and “hear the rest untold” (22.106), inviting a continuation and opening up of narrative to alternative accounts, Gower returns as epilogue to provide closure, and part of that closure involves an

³⁹ Tennenhouse turns for explanation to the contest during James’s rule between the self-contained authority of the family and the king’s authority as sole father of the state. It is worth noting that the king under whom *Confessio Amantis* was written, Richard II, was characterized by the same absolutist tendencies that would later be associated with James, the king when *Pericles* was performed (Bullón-Fernández 22). Both Gower and Shakespeare/Wilkins were writing in a context of contested authority, and both chose to use a dominating narrator figure to tell the same story about incest and political reprehensibility.

invocation once more of Antiochus's lust. Precisely because Gower is a narrator, one who assumes the roles of prologue, epilogue, and chorus, preserving the impression, as Hoeniger concludes, "that [Gower] controls the presentation of the whole play, which merely presents his own narrative in the adaptation suitable for a revival in a theatre" ("Gower" 464), his positioning as a traveler through space and time and one with explicitly textual authority permits him a degree of control that would not otherwise be possible. He has gained the particular authority that comes from his antiquity and literary reputation, and he supposedly has access to information and events the other characters have not witnessed (Antiochus's sin, Dionyza's plot to murder) and the audience has not seen (Pericles's shipwreck, Marina's growth to maturity). In other words, the traveler-narrator's authority is particularly susceptible to an incestuous relationship with the text he produces.

Gower's Authority to Close: Negotiating the liminality of the epilogue

Despite the seeming invulnerability of Gower's narration, it is important to remember that *Pericles* was written for the theater, a point that makes Gower's authority more necessary and also more fragile. The play's conclusion demonstrates this paradox. The final scene of recognition, restoration, and redemption through the mediation of divine intervention is typical of the plays associated with Shakespeare's late style. Even the final movement off stage is familiar—think of Cymbeline leading the Roman and British ensign "through Lud's Town march / And in the temple of great Jupiter / Our peace we'll ratify, seal it with feasts" (5.5.485-7). Leontes ends *The Winter's Tale* with the promise that all explanations will be revealed, saying, "Lead us from hence, where we may leisurely / Each one demand and answer to his part / Performed in this wide gap of

time” (5.3.153-7). *The Tempest* delivers a similar message through Prospero’s demand that his guests stay, “For this one night; which, part of it, I’ll waste / With such discourse as, I not doubt, shall make it / Go quick away: the story of my life” (5.1.306-8).⁴⁰ Promised proliferation of stories is characteristic of these plays, as of *Pericles*, who closes his part with, “Lord Cerimon, we do our longing stay / To hear the rest untold. Sir, lead’s the way” (22.105-6). However, *Pericles* does not end with this line, but goes on to Gower’s epilogue, which provides the closure of “Here our play has ending” (22.124).

Gower’s epilogue is not unique, but the prologue and epilogue of a play are particularly liminal spaces characteristic of a heterotopia. Weimann argues in *Author’s Pen and Actor’s Voice*, “At this moment, the (in)dividable quality of the scaffold stage, housing real space and symbolic space in a very particular symbiosis, is about to vanish” (218), requiring delicacy to transition from the symbolic to the real. Part of that transition involves a transfer of authority from the players (and behind them, the playwright) to the audience, as the spectators take away the authority to re-tell and recount their experience.⁴¹ For this reason, the narrator’s authority, no matter how impervious on stage, must end when the play ends. As Weimann writes, “Both prologues and epilogues implicated a peculiar type of contractual relationship between playhouse and spectators. These relations...could be negotiated as an article, respectively, of both aperture and closure for the (re)presentation itself” (217). The conclusion of *Pericles* follows a similar model, because *Pericles*’s final lines invite a re-opening of discourse, while Gower’s

⁴⁰ *The Tempest* then diverges slightly in the use of an epilogue, but it is an epilogue spoken by Prospero, who has retained his authority to the end so that he may cast it down by virtue of audience applause. Beaumont, Fletcher, and Shakespeare’s *The Two Noble Kinsmen* similarly has a prologue and epilogue, but the figure does not intervene in the rest of the play.

⁴¹ In fact, the economic fate of the playhouse depended on its own loss of authority, because a play’s publicity and popularity would be a product of the re-tellings that took place after the play concluded.

epilogue closes it down. These two competing models of closure mimic the vulnerability and tenuousness associated with the transfer of authority outward.

Critics have been divided in their response to the play's conclusion. Kreg Segall argues that "Gower shifts from his choric and paternal role just as Pericles runs from incest in his travels" (248). Segall characterizes Gower as having distaste for his authoritative position and a desire to retreat from it as a form of incest like that Bullón-Fernández describes. In Segall's analysis, Gower's gradual fading and bequeathing of narrative authority to Pericles in the final act and to the audience represents the proper reinstitution of inheritance in contrast to Antiochus's incestuous hoarding of authority (258). Assuming, for the moment, that Segall is correct, what is left in Gower's absence is not a proper chain of succession. Gower does not hand over authority finally until the play's conclusion, and if he permits Pericles and Marina a greater narrative role in the last act, it is nonetheless subject to Gower's moralizing interpretation in the epilogue. Pericles and Marina undertake the expository aspect of Gower's role, but never the didactic function. Pericles's speeches in scene twenty-two are prominently forward-looking rather than retrospective: he promises to "in that kingdom [Pentapolis] spend our following days" while "Our son and daughter shall in Tyrus reign" (103-4). He consistently appeals to others (Helicanus, Marina, Diana, and Thaisa) to narrate the tales of the past, exuding a lack of confidence in his own memory and thus leaving space for Gower to continue to frame Pericles's narration with his own.

Dymkowski claims that "the monologic 'song' Gower introduces in the first line of the performance has, by the final line, firmly become a dialogic 'play'" (247). On a strictly rhetorical level, her assertion is correct. However, by giving the epilogue, no

matter how dialogic Gower's *rhetoric* becomes, his actual control of the play's narrative comes full circle; it does not erode. Robert Weimann also closes his treatment of authority in Shakespearean drama with a claim that "in Shakespeare 'authority' is not given but an issue in motion whose constituting elements are not simply office and enforceable power but wit, insight, and integrity" (46). Gower is an exception to this rule because while his rhetoric seems to permit authority to be an "issue in motion," his position is premised on authority-as-given: no one, with the possible exception of the audience, is permitted to question his right to speak.

It is possible that Gower's unquestioned—indeed, unquestionable authority represents an implicit critique of James's autocratic tendencies. Tennenhouse concludes that the romance play allows the playwright to "[stage] scenes which transform the monarch's body into an artificial and self-enclosed figure remote from the theatre of action" (59); in other words, through metatheatricality romance permits the playwright to present the political in a less offensive manner. The description of "an artificial and self-enclosed figure remote from the theatre of action" fits Gower perfectly. Nonetheless, his rhetorical domination is not entirely straightforward. To become a moral and theatrical guide for the audience, Gower must take his place as what McDonald calls a "metadramatic intrusion" (232); he is able to stabilize and make sense of the play by virtue of his position outside of it. Thus, he "imagines an alternative world but mocks it at the same time and then whisks it away" (107). The price of resolution is disenchantment. McDonald writes, "We recognize that such idealized resolutions do not occur in our own world, and yet we are allowed those consolations in the theatrical world" (180). This is

the illusory side of the heterotopia: like the romance form he represents, Gower is outmoded. He cannot be authoritative without being artificial and powerless.

Following a similar logic, several critics, notably Dymkowski and Ryan, have interpreted Gower as less a figure out of the past than a figure presaging hope for the future. Ryan incorporates the theories of Herbert Marcuse and Ernst Bloch to conclude that *Pericles*, “by dislocating the dramatic narrative and contorting conventional poetic discourse...articulates its own alienation from its own age and its commerce with futurity” (18). He claims that engagement with metatheatrical conventions like Gower makes possible “an open, unpredictable dialogue between then and now about what might be” (19). Similarly, Dymkowski points to modern productions of *Pericles* in which Gower is “the guide who can take us believing into a world that, despite evils and injustices all too similar to our own, is ultimately too good to be true.” She posits that a figure like Gower is particularly suited to a contemporary audience: “Now that we no longer collectively inhabit that hope, the play’s own insistence on its status as theatre and on the concomitant need for imaginative engagement, which Gower voices, provides the audience with one of its only opportunities to experience it” (264). For this reason, Ryan, Nevo, Sokolova, and Dymkowski all use the term “Brechtian” to describe the play.

I hesitate to go as far as these critics, because I see an additional cost in treating Gower’s intrusions as a symbol of futurity or promise. The price of resolution is submission to Gower’s version of the story. Because he is set apart from the action of the play, the suspension of disbelief his character inspires demonstrates that theatrical resolution based on a singular narrative account relies on avoiding encounter and interaction with other narrators. Gower’s authority, which is foreign to the content he

narrates not only in space but also in time, is the unifying factor that bridges gaps in plot and character, but while he speaks on behalf of McDonald's "voice of the situation," he does not represent himself as a personification of that voice. In his first speech, Gower identifies his tale as a broader extant narrative for which he is not solely responsible. He premises his description of Antiochus's incest with the statement "I tell you what mine authors say" (1.20). The footnote in the Oxford edition points out that John Gower employs a similar technique in *Confessio Amantis* (279-81) and that this device was typical of medieval writing; however, by repeatedly deferring his own authority, the physically present Gower calls attention to the fact that accepting his narrative authority, or that of other traveler narrators, means accepting the—anonymous—vested interests on whose behalf he speaks.

With that being said, in closing this chapter, I want to offer one final example that illustrates why staging this narrative as a travel *play* opens up the question of authority in a way that prose narratives do not. In 1608, George Wilkins published *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre, Being The true History of the Play of Pericles*, a narrative presumably based on the play. The narrative names "John Gower" as its presenter, but after the opening synopsis of chapter one, which begins, "Wherin *Gower* describes..." (9), his presence is lost. By chapter eleven, when Wilkins relates the gap of time that Gower bridges in the play (scene 15), the narrative says, "Having thus preseued *Marina*, our Story giues vs now leaue to returne again to Prince *Pericles*" (97). In the absence of a physical figure like Gower, authority passes to the text—"our Story," rather than "mine authors" (1.20). When a travel play is converted back into a travel narrative, the space in which authority is subject to contest slowly vanishes back into the monologic

authority of the text. A play, however, by making the source of authority physically present, offers greater possibility of challenge. The plays that follow *Pericles* chronologically and hover at the boundaries of the travel play genre take this movement toward polyvocality to the next level when they place the narrator on the same plane as the rest of the *dramatis personae*. The next play to which I will turn, Thomas Heywood's *The English Traveller* (1626) develops this theme further. Although the divisions of the plot, as in *Pericles*, render the narrator's role necessary, the narrator is no longer permitted to stand outside the events of the play proper, and thus his authority can be challenged, as a closer study of Heywood's play will demonstrate.

CHAPTER TWO

DOMESTIC TRAVEL AND THE VIOLENCE OF NARRATION IN HEYWOOD'S

THE ENGLISH TRAVELLER

...my soul aches
To know, when two authorities are up,
Neither supreme, how soon confusion
May enter 'twixt the gap of both, and take
The one by th'other.

--Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*

As we move from *Pericles* to Heywood's *The English Traveller*, the role of narrator becomes a much more contested role. Whereas Gower is a non-participant in the action of *Pericles* and in that respect a clear intermediary between the audience and the play proper, all of the potential narrators in Thomas Heywood's play are part of the dramatic action, creating a situation like that in act three of *Coriolanus*. In their attempt to restrain Coriolanus from confronting a mob they have incited, a group of patricians assert an authority they do not properly possess. In doing so, they provoke Coriolanus's heated response, as quoted above. Coriolanus claims that when two authorities vie for mastery, the result is confusion that leads to the internal dissolution of the state. In the case of *Coriolanus*, proper authority is also a question of context: Coriolanus is indisputably a superb military leader, but his leadership in civil society is far more controversial. The question the senators confront, which initiates the conflict in the scene, is what to do with a returned hero who does not belong in domestic government. The crisis expressed in *Coriolanus* plays out through the language and forms of travel in *The English Traveller*. Heywood's play, written between 1625 and 1627 and first published in

1633, operates on a recognizable double plot structure. The “high” or tragic plot concerns the return of a traveler, Young Geraldine, who finds his love interest married to an older man, Wincott. Although Geraldine and the nameless Wife pledge their fidelity until the death of her husband, she quickly defaults to Geraldine’s friend Dalavill, and the discovery of their deceit drives Young Geraldine back toward a life of travel. The “low” or comic subplot is taken from Plautus and concerns the neighboring Lionel family, from which the patriarch, a merchant, is absent at sea. Young Lionel, with the aid of his steward Reignald, has squandered the family fortune, leading to an elaborate cover-up scheme when Old Lionel returns. The two plots collide in the final act of the play, when the public revelation of the Wife’s infidelity leads to her (problematically cathartic) death and a re-affirmation of male solidarity.

What makes *The English Traveller* particularly intriguing is that Young Geraldine, Dalavill, Reignald, and Roger all possess some attributes of a narrator, as I have defined the term. Although *The English Traveller* does not represent travel directly, only alluding to it through the prior absence of Young Geraldine and Old Lionel, the characters vying for the role of narrator use travel metaphors and language in their efforts to demonstrate mastery over domestic theatrical space, and it is in these moments that their competition for narrative authority becomes most apparent. *The English Traveller* thus foregrounds the confrontation in a way that *Pericles* does not, and in doing so, it marks a deliberate departure from the convention of a narrator who stands apart from the dramatic action. Like Shakespeare and Wilkins, Heywood had previously made use of an authorial presenter in parts of his early tetralogy *The Golden Age*, *The Silver Age*, *The Brazen Age*, and the two parts of *The Iron Age* (printed in 1611, 1613, 1613, and 1632

respectively). Acting as a choral figure, “Old Homer” presents the first three plays as an emissary for the gods who “Haue giuen old *Homer* leaue to view the world / And make his owne presentment” (*Golden Age* 1.1.4-5). At the same time he represents his own personal authority as author, who “by my pen gaue heauen to *Iupiter*” (6), even offering, like Gower, “To sing an old song” (24) for “You that are in the worlds decrepit Age” (22) and incorporating dumb shows (3.1-ff.) into his narration. Homer differs from Gower in that his narrative interludes are less self-conscious about textual authority and deal in myth rather than corporeal travel; however, this play and the others in the tetralogy confirm that the device of an authorial presenter was a technique with which Heywood was familiar and which he had freely utilized earlier in his career.

Fifteen years later, in a play that is saturated in travel, Heywood presents his material in such a way as to emphasize the competition for narrative authority rather than to assert it. On one hand, the convention of presenter, already “mouldy” by the time of *Pericles*, may have been too far out of vogue by the 1620s and 1630s; that *The Iron Age*, which was printed in 1632, a year before *The English Traveller*, discards the role of Homer in favor of direct representation would seem to support this interpretation. On the other hand, using the language of travel in the form of a domestic play poses a unique challenge to the authority used in travel narratives, which still informed the structure of cultural authority in English society. By examining the play’s genre and structure and its use of travel language, I will trace the way the play’s potential narrators construct their authority, the challenges posed to their authority, and the ways in which they reassert authority in the face of contest. Unlike a travel narrative, which, as text, shows only the victor’s narrative and perhaps traces of those suppressed along the way, *The English*

Traveller makes the alternative narrators physically present alongside the dominant ones. In consequence, the play's final scenes re-enact in physical form the violence that is required to produce a single narrative account.

Pilots of London: Using the traveler's authority to navigate dramatic structure

A basic structural challenge posed by Heywood's play is its division into two, largely unrelated plots: Young Geraldine's intrigue with Dalavill, Wincott, and the Wife; and Reignald and Young Lionel's revels in the absence of Old Lionel. Until recently, scholars have attributed the play's structure to poor craftsmanship rather than theatrical technique. Richard Rowland's recent study of Heywood's dramatic works, *The Theater of Thomas Heywood*, refutes such characterizations. Although, "Scholarship has been reluctant to concede that Heywood might have possessed the same kind of intelligence, or that he too might have been capable of offering daringly new approaches to dramatic structure or generic modulation" (14-15), Rowland compares Heywood's work to the "abrupt tonal shifts in plays by dramatists such as John Marston," which have been received "as examples of experimental boldness and philosophical complexity" (14). My explanation of the structure of Heywood's play is similarly cautionary. Although the two plots seem only minimally connected by a theme of returning travelers, the play's dyadic nature provides a key to understanding its complex treatment of narrative authority. On a very practical level, a divided structure necessitates the presence of a narrator who can construct or reveal the connection between the two plots for the benefit of the audience as well as for the sake of dramatic continuity. As Gower asserts in *Pericles*, there must be someone to "stand i' the gaps."

Richard Levin describes the convention of multiple plots in late Renaissance drama as containing “every gradation from mere contiguity...to extremely complex schemes of interrelationship” (5). He argues that multiple plots are a sophisticated device permitting the playwright to layer affective responses on top of each other, thus “satisfying both of the opposing demands” of tragedy and comedy (224). Levin lists *The English Traveller* among plays whose connections of geographic proximity or personal relationship (neighbors and relatives) culminate in “fifth-act weddings and feasts and funerals” which “[unite] the separate sets of characters into a kind of community” (6). This structure is bound together by the presence of clown figures or other mobile characters—here, Roger and Reignald—who, Levin says, are not only an archaic throwback to the vice lieutenants of the Morality plays, but whose associations with the child, the idiot, and the proletarian also lend them a unique form of wisdom (144). Although they may be associated with one or the other plot, these characters move between the plots to create continuity, and they generate a closer relationship with the audience than the rest of the *dramatis personae* can.

While Heywood’s use of multiple plots creates a climate in which a narrator is necessary, the presence of generic instability in the play places at odds potential narrators from multiple genres, social classes, and genders. Like *Pericles*, *The English Traveller* is notoriously difficult to classify. Rowland goes as far as to call *The English Traveller* “a play concerned with the instability of generic conventions” (139), and the Prologue classifies what is to come in terms of its mongrel nature: “Some mirth, some matter, and perhaps some wit” (16). Rowland argues that the play consistently resists a strict assignation to the category of either tragedy or comedy. In defiance of Aristotle’s unities,

the play mingles high and low characters, and while the matchmaking schemes and the threat of cuckoldry at the center of the relationship between Wincott and the Wife seem to point to comedy, it is difficult to shake the sense of tragedy from the Wife's death at the end of the play. Martin Wiggin writes in his introduction to a collection of domestic plays that includes *The English Traveller*, "The plays are engaged in a delicate balancing act: tragedy's emotional intensity is relocated away from the genre's usual courtly setting" (viii). The tenuous balance of expectations contributes to a moral uncertainty present in the play, what Rowland calls a "generic and moral wilderness," through which "there are no characters that spectators can trust to guide them" (217).

Rowland concludes that the unlikely moral guides of the play turn out to be the servants, Roger and Reignald, whose mobility is partly a function of their status in society. D.R. Hainsworth claims in *Stewards, Lords and People* that, "A familial relationship existed between masters and servants in noble and gentry households throughout the seventeenth century" (253). The steward of a country house in particular functioned as a "'mediator' between governors and governed, between capital and province, between the 'great society' and the 'popular culture of the local community...stewards were the conduit through which flowed from the centre a variety of intelligence'" about national and local events (3-4). As a result, much like the figure of the chorus or authorial presenter in earlier plays, these characters are well-positioned to claim narrative authority. The elaborate tension over narrative authority in Heywood's play derives from a contradiction between their *structural* right to authority and their *social* roles as servants, which position in the patriarchal structure should prevent them from acting independently of their masters' wishes (Hainsworth 254). I will return to this

point later in my analysis of the play's final scenes, but for now, it is important to recognize that the structure of the play is partly responsible for producing this general uncertainty about the sources and forms of authority.

Another contribution is the balancing act between city comedy and travel play in *The English Traveller*, which allows the play to subtly mock both genres and at the same time highlight the complex relationship between travel and home as markers of personal and national identity. The domestic play or city comedy participates in its own balancing act between the city and household and the broader contexts that encroach upon them. Despite its title, *The English Traveller* takes place in London and thus participates in what was by then the well-established tradition of city comedy.⁴² In contrast to Heywood's earlier play *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*, which specifically revolves around the workings of the Royal Exchange, *The English Traveller* is relatively ambiguous about its location.⁴³ The language of the play, however, participates fully in the discourse of English capitalism: it is saturated with discussions of credit (see 2.1.232), usury (3.2), markets (3.3.1-14), and properties (4.1.99-124). The symbolic value of household goods that Natasha Korda discusses in depth in *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies* also appears in the play's preoccupation with cataloguing (e.g. 1.2.13-ff. and 4.6.199-ff.) As discussed with respect to *Pericles*, it is perhaps not so surprising that a

⁴² In her seminal work on city comedy, *Theater of the City*, Howard argues for a shift in terminology to "London comedy," with the rationale that "city comedy" has too often been used only for those plays (predominated by Jonson and Middleton) that conspicuously adopt a satirical approach to the workings of city life. I use the term "city comedy" broadly, but for reasons already mentioned, this play can be more precisely understood as a domestic tragedy than a comedy. An early study of Heywood's work, *The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood* by Mowbray Velte, includes *The English Traveller* among "Dramas of Contemporary Life" (100), classifying it with those domestic tragedies that "contain simple direct accounts of tragic occurrences in the homes of ordinary citizens" (101).

⁴³ One exception is in 3.3, when the Gentleman asks Dalavill where they will dine, and Dalavill replies, "At th'ordinary, / I see, sir, you are but a stranger here. / This Barnet is a place of great resort" (2-4) on market days.

play based on a traveler should be influenced by this genre. Although Jean Howard classifies city comedies as such because of their preoccupation with the specific geographic and cultural spaces of the city of London, she notes that they are also self-conscious about the relationship between the self and the other, whether on the basis of class, nationality, gender, race, occupation, or religion. In one example, she points out that London was becoming increasingly interconnected economically, with the Royal Exchange facilitating international commerce as well as gendered and classed forms of exchange. Within this context, domestic anxieties are frequently figured in terms of travel. Howard quotes Henry Peacham's 1642 essay, "The Art of Living in London," which describes London as a "vast sea, full of gusts, fearful-dangerous shelves and rocks, ready at every storm to sink and cast the weak and unexperienced bark" (qtd. in Howard 11), where "an inexperienced newcomer needs a skillful pilot, 'another Columbus or Drake,' as guide" (11). The metaphor of travel implies that to negotiate London in this climate is as dangerous as it once was to negotiate the open seas. A play that draws on the language and forms of a travel narrative is thus uniquely appropriate to the contents of a city comedy or domestic tragedy.

In the same way, the contents of a city comedy are uniquely appropriate to the language and forms of a travel play. Though the title would suggest otherwise, *The English Traveller* is not, strictly speaking, a travel play like Fletcher's *The Island Princess*, Day, Rowley and Wilkins's *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, *Pericles*, or even Heywood and Rowley's earlier play *Fortune by Land and Sea*, which also has a bifurcated structure but locates one half at sea and the other in London.⁴⁴ *The English*

⁴⁴ Interestingly, Jowitt claims that *Fortune* borrows domestic language to describe the world of the sea. She says, "The pirates describe the government of their ship in similar terms to that of England. When Purser

Traveller is set wholly in London and the travels of the main characters are never depicted on stage. Likewise, foreign locations are named but never shown. The discontinuity between the title and the subject matter demands some explanation. Rowland calls Dalavill and Young Geraldine “casually familiar with fashionable travel writers” but says this conversation merely “establishes a rank and a social style for his characters” (139). Beyond identifying some of the travel narratives which probably informed the image of the returning traveler, scholars have largely glossed over the complex ways Heywood adopts and modifies the conventions of the travel narrative—and the travel play—in *The English Traveller*. Their reasoning is, in a sense, well-grounded: to ignore the play’s use of domestic comedy would be to elide an important aspect of its form; however, because the play makes prominent, extensive use of the travel narrative’s tropes and conventions, this aspect is equally worthy of attention.

A recent article by Daniel Gibbons, “Thomas Heywood in the House of the Wise-woman,” begins to address Heywood’s use of alternative spaces to propose new models of authority. Gibbons argues that in *The Wise-woman of Hogdon* (1604), Heywood “examines untraditional models of urban space and authority that justify themselves not through revolutionary cant but through their ability, at least onstage, to produce some measure of justice and social stability when the established systems of authority fall short” (391). Gibbons’ argument focuses on Heywood’s representation of a brothel, which, because of its location outside the conventional restraints and corruptions of the city system, is an alternative site of justice and civic order. Gibbons uses Foucault’s concept of the heterotopia, which “juxtapose[s] in a single real place several emplacements that

and Clinton [notorious pirates] reminisce about their seaborne exploits they do so in language that mirrors descriptions of ceremonies and state activities in London” (222). As I will argue, *The English Traveller* does the exact opposite: it appropriates the language of travel to describe domestic spaces.

are incompatible in themselves” (qtd. in Gibbons 396), to explain the theater’s ability to critique the structure and functions of London society. *The English Traveller* uses a combination of travel language and domestic space to accomplish a similar work in relation to the rhetorical stability and authority promised by narratives that attempt to define the nation by defining those outside its bounds.

Contrary to the expectations created by the play’s source material, genre, and central characters, *The English Traveller’s* clearest evocation of travel rhetoric and of the modes of speech common to travel narratives is in a scene that mocks the theatrical imagination demanded by earlier travel plays like *The Three English Brothers* or *The Tempest*. Although the scene reads like the traditionally authoritative speech of a chorus filling in the gaps created by limitations of stagecraft, the other characters recognize that the narrative refers to a group of drunkards who mistake a house for a ship (2.1.147). Because the scene borrows its tone from other travel plays and narratives, it subtly mocks the traveler as a figure of authority. Heywood’s play thus departs from other travel plays in its refusal to grant the traveler the same *gravitas* the figure had enjoyed in the earlier plays. On one hand, because *The English Traveller* was written and produced after the heyday of the travel play, popular discourse about travel had been so thoroughly saturated by the image of the heroic traveler as to render it comic. On the other hand, the play’s comedic structure implies that the traveler’s narrative authority, while a source of humor, is a means to resolve domestic upheaval.

To critique travel through a domestic metaphor is to exacerbate a danger already inherent in the travel narrative as a genre. Consuming travel from the safety of home was not without its own inherent risk. To explain, Peter Holland quotes Richard Marienstras:

“The voyage brings together places formerly far apart, the far becomes the near, indeed becomes so dangerously near that it invariably proves necessary to recreate familiar distances to separate the far-off world from the world of Christian civilisation.” Holland adds, “If the problem is there in travel literature it is even more acute in drama” (Maquerlot 165-6). His reasoning is that drama physically represents what would otherwise be kept at a safe distance. Not only does it require that a (domestic) actor undertake to embody the foreigner, it blurs the boundaries between the real, theatrical space located directly in front of the audience and the imagined, foreign world they are asked to collaborate in creating and for which they are made culpable. Heywood takes this compression one step further when he mingles travel metaphors with the plots of a domestic tragedy. The result, I will argue, is a scenario in which those who construct narrative authority on stage, in their effort to maneuver between the domestic and the foreign, inevitably reveal the contradictions and violence on which such authority is based.

A Ship in the House: Re-visioning domestic spaces in travel language

The English Traveller's multiple narrators demonstrate the characteristics of travel accounts laid out in the introduction (constructed retrospectively, translated using metaphor, and edited in response to physical limitations) as they seek to preserve the unity and reliability of the account, or, alternately, to contest it. The aspect of translation and metaphor is one of the primary grounds of contested authority in this play. In *The Forest of Symbols*, cultural anthropologist Victor Turner defines liminality as a period of margin in *rites de passage* (93) when “the state of the ritual subject (the ‘passenger’) is ambiguous; he passes through a realm that has few or none of the attributes of the past or

coming state” (94). Important liminal moments include birth, puberty, marriage, and death. I want to extend the concept of liminality to the transitional state implied by oceanic travel. For theatrical representations, the ocean and the ship represent uniquely liminal spaces. When characters in *The English Traveller* compare the house to a ship, they transfer those liminal characteristics to the domestic realm. With respect to the language of authority in the play, the relationship between travel and home as markers of personal and national identity—and authority—takes on greater significance. Two key motifs foreground the tension present in the play’s construction of authority: the house, the scene of city comedy and domestic disturbance as well as insular nationalism, and the ship, the scene of travel plays and foreign unrest as well as international capitalism. As the play’s potential narrators vie for authority, the relationship between these two images is a core site of contention, so I will be tracing it throughout this chapter.

Domestic and traveling metaphors offer competing ways to understand the world, and their antagonism is loosely divided along generational lines. The metaphor of the house evaluates the young man by his stability and how well he maintains an established inheritance. In the Lionel plotline, characters critique Young Lionel’s extravagance as a poor reflection on his training and family name. In an extended soliloquy, Young Lionel castigates his own laziness and debauchery, and his chosen metaphor is that of a house:

To what may young men best compare themselves?

Better to what, than to a house new built

.....

Left unrepaired, the stormy showers beat in,

Rot the main posts and rafters, spoil the rooms,

Deface the ceilings, and in little space
Bring it to utter ruin; yet the fault
Not in the architector that first reared it
But him that should repair it. (1.2.93-4, 105-10)

This metaphor of the maturing gentleman as a house is a common one in religious discourse of the period. John Grismand's *Fiue sermons preached vpon sundry especiall occasions* (1626) is representative of many similar homilies describing the believer as the temple of God and instructing him to keep himself accordingly. He writes, "Let vs bee glad when hee is in vs, and giue him no disturbance. Let not the foulenes of any roome make him dislike his habitation. Cleanse all the sluttish corners of sinne, and perfume the whole house with *Myrrhe & Cassia*" (I3r). This metaphor promotes stability and insularity by imagining man as the product and habitation of a divine master craftsman, but its scene of ritual purification depends on foreign imports like myrrh and cassia, a point to which I will return with respect to Reignald's description of the Lionel house.

Lionel's metaphor stands in contrast to the ship metaphor applied to young men by those of the older generation. The metaphor of the ship weighs the young man in terms of his ability to be mobile and navigate shifting social and economic spaces. Wincott contrasts Old Lionel's prudence with his son's improvidence, saying, "Whiles all that merchandise through gulfs, cross-tides, / Pirates, and storms he brings so far, th'other / Here shipwrecks in the harbour" (2.1.97-9). The implication is that Old Lionel's ability to navigate the open sea with its associated dangers greatly outstrips his son's ability to navigate the relatively calm "waters" of London society. In a parallel moment, responding to Dalavill's suggestion that Young Geraldine has committed adultery with

the Wife, Old Geraldine compares his son to “a well-built vessel ‘tween two currents, / Virtue and vice. Take this, you steer to harbour, / Take that, to eminent shipwreck” (3.1.150-2). The emphasis of the ship metaphor in other seventeenth century texts is likewise on the necessity for proper piloting and guidance. The metaphor is applied to the relationship between men and women, as in the 1613 treatise *The excellency of good women* by soldier Barnabe Rych, which takes “the wife to be the ship, and the husband to bee the marchant, and the husbands word to be the *Routher* to the shipp, by the which she must be turned, guided and directed” (8A). It also appears in reference to a man driven by his passions, as in the anonymous play *Wily Beguiled* (1606), in which the scholar Sophos describes his mind as “a mastlesse ship, / Thats huld and tost vpon the surging seas” (F2r) by unrequited love. The metaphor promotes exploration and adventure, but cautions against the danger of doing so in an unregulated manner.

Reignald repeatedly manipulates the tension between these two classes of metaphor as they relate to the physical house he stewards. Appropriately, because he moves in liminal space, he is also a liminal character. Reignald adopts the speech habits of the nobility, speaking predominantly in verse rather than the prose of the other servants and the clown, but as a servant he also possesses special knowledge that allows him to manipulate the system of the house to his own advantage. As he reminds Young Lionel, “am I not your steward?” (1.2.68), and with that position comes authority over the house. Hainsworth writes that in the seventeenth century “the word steward had in fact already three different meanings, denoting different, although sometimes overlapping functions: household steward, steward-of-courts and estate steward” (10). Reignald falls in the first category. Although historically the household steward’s importance shrank as

fewer servants were employed, the title still carried the association of responsibility and honor. As Hainsworth concludes, “It was probably as rare for a lord to sack his steward as it was for him to disinherit his eldest son” (253). That Reignald is associated with Lionel’s equally transgressive son doubles their offense against the patriarch. In “Ophelia’s ‘False Steward’ Contextualized,” Mark Thornton Burnett traces the biblical and dramatic tradition of stewardship, concluding that the deceitful or wasteful steward was a prominent character type in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (51).⁴⁵ This duality is also present in Reignald’s character because positionally he supports dominant systems and individuals even as he critiques them from within.

The metaphors of travel and empire that Reignald uses reflect his conflicted position. In act one, scene two, Reignald narrates the circumstances through which he and Young Lionel enjoy their current position of extravagance. Referencing Old Lionel’s absence, he says,

...wee are Lords amongst our selues,
And here we Liue and Reigne, Two yeeres already
Are past of our great Empire, and wee now
Write, Anno Tertio. (1.2.3-6)

Measurements of time now depend on the founding of Reignald’s new “empire” in the house of Old Lionel. Despite the unknown longevity of Old Lionel’s residence there, despite his ongoing economic investment in not only the house itself but in the servants in his employ, Reignald issues a new dating system. His parody of empire is based on the discourse of origination that appears in the “new world” language used by Europeans

⁴⁵ One of the best-known representations of a steward is Malvolio in Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*. Malvolio becomes the subject of mockery in part because he takes his role too seriously: he is, as Olivia says, “sick of self-love” and thus cannot “take those things for bird-bolts that you deem cannon bullets” (1.5.87, 89-90).

encountering the Americas. Sir George Peckham's 1583 "True Report of the Late Discoveries, and Possession Taken in the Right of the Crown of England of the Newfound Lands" is one example. Peckham's assumption, like the one Reignald parodies, is that his arrival in the new-found-land signals the beginning of a new era, and that the land had never been "found" before (Hadfield, *Amazons* 256). Like Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations*, Peckham's narrative was over forty years old when Heywood wrote *The English Traveller*; the age of this kind of conquest language contributes to the satirical effect by making the modes of travel targeted by Reignald's satire seem outmoded or antiquated.

Reignald expands his affiliation with an outmoded model of travel when he compares himself to classical figures of conquest:

Great *Alexander*, and *Agathocles*,
Caesar, and others, haue bin Fam'd, they say,
And magnified for high Facinerous deeds;
Why claime not I, an equall place with them?
Or rather a presedent: These commanded
Their Subjects, and their seruants; I my Master,
And euery way his equalls, where I please,
Lead by the nose along. (4.1.58-65)

As this speech suggests, Reignald's power is in his subversive influence as one at once inside and outside the system. From that position of discursive mobility, he inverts hierarchies by taking the words of Alexander, the name of Agathocles, into the mouth of a serving man in order to lead his master "by the nose along." His power comes from his

ability to use metaphor to translate foreign sources of authority to the domestic sphere, much as a travel narrator claims authority on account of his ability to translate foreign experience into domestic paradigms.

In each incident, as the move toward antiquity in the previous example indicates, Reignald's usurpation of authority contains an element of critique. When he presents the kitchen through the metaphor of a foreign policy, he speaks of Robin, his fellow servant from the country, as one might a spy. He tells Young Lionel,

One of their Hindes oth' country, that came prying
To see what dainty fare our kitchin yeelds,
What Guests we harbor, and what rule we keepe,
And threats to tell the old man when he comes;
I thinke I sent him packing. (1.2.64-68)

Reignald aligns the domestic sphere with the international and casts Robin as an invader who comes to survey what resources the nation has ("what dainty fare our kitchin yeelds"), who its allies are ("what guests we harbor"), and what laws and order are maintained there ("what rule we keepe"). His comparison invites Young Lionel to respond, "Let such keepe, the Countrey where their charge is...And visit vs when we command them thence, / Not search into our counsels" (1.2.73, 75-6). Lionel's critique implicates not only the spy, but also the traveler like Young Geraldine who goes abroad to gain knowledge.

Reignald's affiliation with the traveler figure is repeatedly re-encoded in domestic form through catalogues or registers, like that of a merchant, extending from the menu for

a meal to the things of the house. As he surveys the house with Robin, Reignald adopts language that emphasizes the exoticism and foreignness of the rooms:

Is that breath
Agreeing with our Pallace, where each Roome,
Smells with Muske, Ciuit, and rich Amber-greece,
Alloes, Cassia, Aromaticke-gummes,
Perfumes and Pouders, one whose very garments
Scent of the fowlds and stables, oh fie, fie,
What a base nastie rogue tis. (1.2.115-21)

In this way, Reignald draws upon contemporary anxieties about the movement of foreign goods into domestic spaces. Natasha Korda argues that the influx of luxury and necessary goods into England from the late sixteenth century onward caused some concern about the economic effects of outsourcing and foreign imports. She quotes Sir Thomas Smith's 1581 *Discourse of the Common Weal of This Realm of England*, which says, "Were it not better for us that our owne people should be sett aworke with suche things then straungers?" (qtd. in Korda 22). The scents and spices Reignald mentions are particularly indicative of the house's affiliation with travel; goods, probably obtained by Old Lionel through his trading capacity, become physical markers not only of a personal collection, but of the amalgamation of international affiliations the house now bears.⁴⁶ The foreign

⁴⁶ For example, musk is mentioned in 1589 in Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* as a commodity of exotic trade (see "Musk, n."). Amber is affiliated with the southern shores of the Baltic (see "Amber, n.1."). Aloe is the product of a tree found in East India (see "Aloe, n."). Eden's *Treatise on New India* (1553) references cassia, a cheaper alternative to cinnamon, among other spices obtained there (see "Cassia, n.1"). Several of these items are mentioned on the list Charles I published in March 1627 detailing the goods permissible to be exported and imported under the colors of the East India Company. Among permissible imports are, "12. Muske. 13. Alloes Soccatrina. 14. Ambergreece" ("A Declaration of Orders").

items in these rooms likely come from the “real” travel of Old Lionel,⁴⁷ but they provide another example in which the foreign has been transported to and now pervades, like strong odors, the rooms of the English house, where they mix with domestic odors like those of the “fowlds and stables.”

The mixing of domestic and foreign metaphors culminates in a conflict over the nature of the Lionel house itself. When Old Lionel returns, Reignald instructs the rioters to take shelter in the house. Young Lionel protests, “But whither? But into the self-same house / That harbours him, my father’s, where we all / Attend from him surprisal” (2.2.64-6). Lionel’s use of “harbours” compresses the word’s dual meaning as the more generic safe place or home and, the newer use, a resting place for a ship (“Harbour, n.1”). In response, Reignald promises to “make / That prison of your fears your sanctuary” (66-7). He continues, “I’ll make this supposed jail to you as safe / From th’injured old man’s just incensed spleen / As were you now together i’ th’ Low Countries” (73-75). In this exchange, Reignald undertakes a double displacement of the simple home/away dichotomy on which Young Lionel’s claim rests.⁴⁸ If city comedy rests on specific locations and attention to place, the prison is an exemplary emblem because its foundational purpose is to contain and immobilize its occupants. Reignald rejects Lionel’s attempt to associate the house with the prison, a quintessentially domestic and immobile space, and instead he associates it with the ship, a foreign and mobile space that can transport its occupants out of harm’s way and into exotic locations like the Low Countries or Virginia. When he promises to use the rioters’ imagination and his wiles to

⁴⁷Reignald’s description is also reminiscent of the *wunderkammern* (curiosity cabinets), collections of exotic objects popular in early modern Europe. (See Archer and Swann.)

⁴⁸Jean Howard writes that prisons were symbolically rich in city comedy because they represented the darker side of market economics: debt (70).

transport the revelers across space from the domestic to the foreign, he mimics the theatrical collaboration between the audience and a figure like Gower in *Pericles* when Gower asks that the audience “think this [stage] his barque” (21.22). By conflating the theatrical spaces of house and ship, Reignald calls attention to the liminality of both, and by figuratively sending Young Lionel and the others “overseas” to safety, Reignald places himself in a position of authority over the imaginative machinery of the theater. Likewise, his invention of the ghost of a “Trans-Marine by birth, who came well stored / With Gold and Jewels, to this fatall house” (2.1.548-9) to prevent Old Lionel from entering the disorderly house, mocks the long-running theatrical convention of the vengeful ghost in Senecan revenge tragedies and demonstrates his command of theatrical convention.

In this scene, Reignald’s position as a narrator who stands on the same plane as the other characters is significant because his fanciful narration of the Trans-Marine is subject to contradiction and correction. The goal of the ghost trick is to prevent Old Lionel from entering the house by convincing him that the door is cursed, and in the early parts of the play Reignald’s ruse succeeds. In act four, scene six, Roger arrives at the house to deliver invitations to Young Geraldine’s farewell party, and as the house’s former owner and Old Lionel watch, he knocks at the gate. Despite their anxious questioning and observation, Roger is unharmed, demonstrating the fallacy of the narrative Reignald has told. Roger’s narration (4.6.47-70) describing the revels of the household further contradicts Reignald’s account. Robin arrives moments later to corroborate Roger’s version of the story. The denouement of the comedic plot rests on this scene of meeting: Reignald’s narrative authority to that point has relied on his ability

to prevent contradictory witnesses from encountering each other. When they do meet and exchange narratives, they are able to counteract the misrecognitions and false information Reignald has disseminated.

Reignald's response to this discovery shows theatrical space to be a means of mediating the conflict over narrative authority. Confronted with the alternative stories he has attempted to suppress, Reignald claims the overlap between domestic and travel spaces as a refuge when he climbs up the frame of the Lionel house to escape imprisonment. He explains, "Because, sir, 'tis your own house. It hath been my harbour long, and now it must be my sanctuary" (4.6.214-5). Reignald's use of "harbour" suggests a subtle pun on its double meaning, given the company's drunken misrecognition of the house as a ship in act two, scene one, which led Young Lionel to speak of the area outside the house as "this safe harbour" in the next scene (2.2.5). The house has ceased to be a foreign space, and now stands in for a place of safety associated with the medieval right to take sanctuary⁴⁹ in a church, another quintessentially domestic space. Reignald's manipulation of language intertwines domestic metaphors with metaphors of travel and turns the physical house into not only a ship, a prison, and a church, but also a theater, over which he asserts his authority. In an oft-cited line at the end of the same scene, Reignald claims he will remain "Like a statue in the forefront of your house / For ever, like the picture of Dame Fortune / Before the Fortune playhouse" (4.6.293-6). He conflates images of the domestic and the foreign into an overarching image of the theater, and by making the theater his last resort, he draws attention to the

⁴⁹ His choice of the word "sanctuary" is timely given that a note in the OED entry defining sanctuary as a place of refuge indicates that in 1625, within a year of the probable first performance of *The English Traveller*, the right of sanctuary was abolished for criminal cases, although it was retained in civil cases (see "Sanctuary, n.1").

way theatrical space bridges gaps between the home and abroad, the ship and the house. This metatheatrical moment gives Reignald a form of authority as one who stands, however briefly, outside the world of the play. The theater, particularly when operating within the conventions of comedy, has become a sanctuary and harbor in which it is safe for a servant to usurp authority and still find restoration and clemency in the end.

Whereas Reignald's authority is predominantly built on the power of metaphor to translate between domestic and foreign spaces, another potential narrator, Wincott's servant Roger, possesses authority by not only his skill in metaphorical translation but also his physical mobility within the play and his subsequent access to information unavailable to the other characters. Based on theatrical convention, Roger is already situated as a potential authority figure. As a servant, he carries the authority of his master. As a rustic figure, his preoccupation with drinking, eating, and other minutiae of daily life is reminiscent of the clown in *The Winter's Tale* before he is robbed by Autolycus (4.3), but he is also acknowledged to be a source of information about the Wincott household. In this respect, he draws on the theatrical convention of the clown or fool as expressed in Robert Armin's earlier Shakespearean fools⁵⁰, who traditionally possessed unique wisdom. Michael Bristol writes in *Carnival and Theater* that a clown in early modern drama "who mingles with the *dramatis personae* of a dramatic text is not simply a character in a play. He traverses the boundary between a represented world and the here-and-now world he shares with the audience" (140). In support of his statement, Bristol cites Will Kemp's famous performance of the "Morris Dance" between London and Norwich over the course of nine days. As a performer, Kemp's interactions with the

⁵⁰ See Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*.

audience “did not have sharp, well-defined boundaries between actors and an audience” (142) in part because there was continuity between his performances as part of a theatrical company and his personal performances; in other words, his individual persona was not wholly subsumed by the characters he represented on stage. The result of this “extra-literary status,” which Bristol likens to a chorus, is that the clown’s additional knowledge gives him power over the other characters (141). As a participant in this tradition of clowning, Roger shares some of Gower’s narrative authority as one who stands outside the play proper. When Roger enters in act one, scene one, Young Geraldine immediately recognizes him as a reliable source, asking “how doth all at home?” (1.1.39). Roger’s answer, “the age of my master corresponds not with the youth of my mistress, and you know cold January and lusty May seldom meet in conjunction” (1.1.40-42), demonstrates his insight into what will become the main plot’s central problem: the misdirected sexuality of the Wife. Throughout the play, Roger’s use of domestic framing language conceals his shrewd knowledge about the outside world.

As a narrator, Roger provides vital information about the settings of the play, taking on the role performed by figures like the chorus in *Henry V* and Gower in *Pericles*. His assertion of authority is based in theatrical convention, but it also draws from the conventions of the travel narrative. In act four, scene two, as Young Geraldine approaches the Wincott house, Roger aids the audience in their imaginative work by describing the change of scene and his own role in the new one.

This is the garden gate, and here am I set to stand sentinel and to attend the coming of young Master Geraldine. Master Dalavill’s gone to his chamber, my mistress to hers. ‘Tis now about midnight, a banquet prepared, bottles of wine in

readiness, all the whole household at their rest; and no creature by this honestly stirring. (4.2.1-5)

Because this scene, like others, follows closely behind a scene from the subplot also involving a house, Roger facilitates the audience's smooth transition between the plots, a role made necessary by the divided structure of Heywood's play. The viewer must simultaneously keep the two sets of characters and plots separate and find connections between them.⁵¹ Although to some extent every dramatic or literary work demands the audience's contribution to the imaginative work, Heywood's choice to alternate between two largely distinct plots places additional demands on the audience, who must navigate between the two. In the absence of a chorus, bridging characters like Roger help to give consistency to the play's vision. Likewise, a travel writer operates across a temporal gap between his own experiences and his retrospective writing of them, requiring an act of memory similar to that employed by the theatergoer in keeping track of events in the plots. The writer must distill a range of seemingly unrelated incidents into a narrative that can be understood as a whole. Finally, he must make the world he describes exotic enough to excite curiosity and to preserve English identity through opposition to the foreign Other, but he must also render the content of his narrative familiar enough for English readers to assimilate it into their understanding of the world. In *The English Traveller*, the viewer's interpretation and reconstruction mirrors the traveler's attempt to make of fragments a cohesive, consumable whole. Roger uses domestic metaphors to highlight the violence of this practice.

⁵¹ This task may have been exacerbated by what Andrew Gurr identifies as a feature of indoor playhouses, "the practice of breaking off the performance between each act, which spread from the private to the public repertories after about 1607. In the hall playhouses pauses were necessary, if only to keep the candles that lit the stage trimmed" (177).

When it comes to the relationship between the domestic and the foreign, Roger is inclined to disambiguate the two and focus strictly on the domestic. At the beginning of the play, Roger has one of the few soliloquies addressed to the audience, and he uses it to present an image of hospitality as a governing principle (1.1.201-10). According to Kari McBride in *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England*, the city was commonly associated with the decline of hospitality, particularly through the rise of merchant class like that Old Lionel represents. McBride says popular laments “located its demise in aristocratic waste and vanity, an understanding that replaces the older view that hospitality itself was a particular kind of legitimate waste” (94). The simultaneous fulfillment and violation of the principle of hospitality forms the basis of critique in Roger’s most extended narrative of the play. In act two, scene one, he reports back to Wincott the revelry taking place at the Lionels’ house:

As I came along by the door, I was called up amongst them, he-gallants and she-gallants. I no sooner looked out, but saw them out with their knives, slashing of shoulders, mangling of legs and lancing of loins, till there was scarce a whole limb left amongst them. (2.1.40-4)

He describes the upheaval taking place by focusing on a domestic image: the butchering of fowl, but he does so in such a way that Wincott mistakes his description for that of “a fearful massacre” (2.1.45). The hospitality Roger champions at the beginning of the play has turned into a massacre. The domestic, gustatory metaphor reflects outward, through Wincott’s misreading, onto the violence of domestic upheaval and, more subtly, the violence of narration. Roger makes the link between observation, consumption, and violence explicit a few lines later as Young Geraldine prepares to narrate his own

encounter with the characters of the subplot. Roger identifies the approaching Dalavill and Young Geraldine as “some, that it seemes / Were at the rifling of the dead Carcasses; / For by their mirth, they haue had part of the Spoile” (2.1.109-11), thus aligning them with the violence he has described. In Roger’s metaphor, those who exploit the violence are as culpable as those who commit it.

In addition to providing information about place and time, Roger also consistently acts as a messenger, and as such, despite his association with Wincott’s household, he becomes the only character to move easily and repeatedly between the two plots and control the flow of information. Roger’s mobility—his lack of physical limitations and thus his access to a wide range of information—is a key dimension of his claim to authority. As I have already discussed, it is in the role of messenger in act four that Roger disrupts Reignald’s unilateral narrative authority. Even though Roger speaks directly to the audience more frequently than any other character, he still operates on the same plane as the rest of the characters, and as such, his authority is also subject to contest. In the “massacre of meat” scene described above, although Roger has already presented the central information of the account, Wincott assigns primacy to Young Geraldine’s subsequent retelling and silences Roger, adding, “’Tis he that I would hear” (2.1.131). Roger’s account of the situation is not allowed to stand on its own. As this analysis suggests, Roger’s mobility and access to information renders him a viable narrator, but within the bounds of the play his narration is frequently suppressed by the play’s more conventional authority figure, the returned traveler Young Geraldine.

The opening dialogue between Dalavill and Geraldine establishes Geraldine’s credentials and personal authority to narrate; however, it also introduces a central irony of

the plot: Geraldine's knowledge of travel leaves him blind to the natures of the people he has left at home. According to Dalavill, Geraldine is superior by virtue of his "knowledge by travel, / Which still makes up a complete gentleman" (1.1.20-1). Young Geraldine himself claims travel has made him judicious, calling truth "a word, / That should it every language relish well, / Nor have I that exceeded" (1.1.118-9), and represents himself as a disinterested observer who "neuer cast on any in those parts / A curious eye of censure, since my Trauell / Was onely aymed at Language" (153-5). Rather than passing on knowledge upon his return, Young Geraldine consumes for the purpose of self-improvement and not for the education of those at home. In doing so, he adheres to Bacon's advice in "On Travel" to those returning—"And in his Discourse, let him be rather advised in his Answers, than forwards to tell Stories" (Hadfield 35). Prudentilla calls him something of an anomaly because he demonstrates, as she says, "a most vnheard of modestie, / And seldom found in any Traueller, / Especially of our Countrey" (1.1.159-61). Young Geraldine's modesty may be a laudable characteristic, but it does not render him a self-sufficient narrator. Instead, to pass on knowledge, he requires prompting from the Wife and Prudentilla. Whereas Young Lionel and Reignald are bad stewards of physical goods, Young Lionel is a bad steward of knowledge. In act one, the Wife reminds him that Wincott, "Hath tooke much pleasure in your strange discourse" (1.1.121-2). She proceeds to repeat back to him the skeleton of the stories he once told, in effect speaking for him. Wincott goes as far as to say, "you shall finde him (make no doubt) / Most pregnant in his answere" (1.1.146-7), implying not only a feminized fullness, but withholding: rather than giving birth to useful information, he retains the fruit of his travel experience within his own body, an act which is non-productive from an

economic, as well as a reproductive perspective. This discourse demonstrates the fissure that Geraldine's travel has opened between his understanding of the world and that of the London to which he returns.

When, however, Geraldine is called upon to narrate the fantastic revels that take place off-stage at the Lionel house, his demonstrated ability—by virtue of his travels—to remember and retrospectively construct a narrative causes him to be assigned superior authority as a narrator. Geraldine's version of the story is framed much like a travel narrative: while in motion (walking), he observes an unusual occurrence. He records it, including significant details of character, place, and situation. He returns to his own social setting, and there he recounts the story for the entertainment and, less explicitly, for the moral instruction of his audience. Notably, Geraldine uses travel as a metaphor for domestic disturbance, and what is more, he presents it as merely comic and fantastical, thus erasing the violence Roger identifies in the scene. Like a privileged traveler who, on his return, produces a narrative about his experiences, Young Geraldine begins,

Warm'd with the heat of Wine; Discourse was offer'd,
Of Ships, and Stormes at Sea when suddenly,
Out of his giddy wildnesse, one conceiues
The Roome wherein they quafft, to be a Pinnace,
Moouing and Floating; and the confused Noise,
To be the murmuring Windes, Gusts, Marriners;
That their vnstedfast Footing, did proceed
From rocking of the Vessell: (2.1.145-52)

In this scene, the audience hears the play's clearest representation of travel by sea. However, in this case, the travel discourse Geraldine produces is entirely fictitious. The characters are, by his witness, in a house; instead of climbing the rigging and unloading the ship's cargo, they are climbing on bedposts and tossing tables into the street below. For the theatrical audience, the effect is a double displacement of imagination: they must imagine over the world their eyes see (the theatre) another world (the house) in which men imagine yet another world (the ship).⁵² Shortly thereafter, when Young Lionel and his compatriots appear on stage still convinced that they have been brought "To this safe Harbour" by "Marine gods"⁵³ "sure heere to be shipwrackt" (1.2.323-36), the audience members must repeat their multilayered work of imagination and participate in Young Geraldine's fiction until Reignald arrives to break into the illusion and announce the return of Old Lionel. Imagining the stage as a ship is not unique to Heywood's play;⁵⁴ however, like Brome's *The Antipodes* (also performed by Queen Henrietta's Men), the subject of the next chapter, *The English Traveller* mocks the convention used in plays like *The Tempest*, *Pericles*, and *The Three English Brothers*. If the audience participates in the imaginative work Geraldine invites, they are, in fact, participating in the "giddy wildnesse" of an alcohol-induced illusion (2.1.147).

⁵² Referring back to Young Geraldine's earlier cautions against excess, it is noteworthy that Young Lionel and his friends' "travel" emerges from a moment of excess consumption (of alcohol).

⁵³ The constable with a trident probably alludes to Neptune in Jonson's masque "Neptune's Triumph," which satirized Charles' recent—failed—quest to Spain in hopes of marrying the Infanta (Rowland 219).

⁵⁴ In the essay "Hamlet in Africa 1607," Gary Taylor suggests that such imaginative work was made easier by the connections between theatrical space and shipboard space. He writes, "A wooden stage is indistinguishable from a wooden deck, a trap door resembles a ship's hatch, a tiring house facade is remarkable similar to a fore-castle, a theatre's 'cellerage' is structurally parallel to below-decks" (Kamps and Singh 234). Taylor's argument is that a 1607 performance of *Hamlet* aboard the ship *The Red Dragon* off the coast of Africa would have been relatively easy to stage. The same parallel might apply to *The English Traveller*, although the Cockpit, where it was performed, was probably enlarged from an actual cock-fighting pit and thus differed substantially from the Globe.

Here, travel is shown to be a useful metaphor for moral instruction in a domestic space; however, the play also suggests that excessive travel endangers the mental faculties and acuity of the traveler.⁵⁵ Despite Geraldine's claims that travel has added to his wisdom by allowing him to "[suck] / A breath of every language" (1.1.25-6), later in the play, his inability to read Dalavill's treachery shows a disparity between the stated benefits of travel and the actual capabilities it produces. The same blindness applies to Geraldine's misrecognition of the Wife. When Old Geraldine accuses him of adultery, Young Geraldine admits that the discourse of infidelity is something travel has not prepared him to encounter. He says, "Of all the Languages I yet haue learn'd, / This is to me most forraine" (3.1.194-5). Attempting to speak this foreign language, he defends both his and the Wife's honor and mistakenly holds her up "For Chastites examples" (3.1.270). Geraldine's narration is challenged not so much by other characters in the play, but by the situational irony of the play. When he discovers Dalavill and the Wife's treachery in act four, his travel knowledge fails to provide him with precedent by which to explain what has happened. He runs through a sequence of possible comparisons with notably exotic origins, "a Serpent and a Crockadell; / A Synon and a Circe: Oh, to what / May I compare you?" (4.1.330-2), but finds none satisfactory. He responds to failure by renouncing his role as a narrator and preparing to submerge himself in non-narrated travel. In resignation, he says,

You haue made mee

To hate my very Countrey, because heere bred:

Neere two such monsters; First I'le leaue this House,

⁵⁵ This fear is played out further in Brome's *The Antipodes*, the subject of chapter three.

And then my Fathers; Next I'le take my leaue,
Both of this Clime and Nation, Trauell till
Age snow vpon this Head: My passions now,
Are vnexpressable, I'le end them thus; (4.1.346-52)

In reaction against his inability to navigate the world to which he has returned, Young Geraldine plans to systematically absent himself from a series of worlds that he fails to understand: Wincott's house, his father's house, and his "Clime and Nation."

In the same way that Reignald's and Roger's grasps of narrative authority eventually fall under the weight of collaboration, as in Reignald's case, and superior personal authority, in Roger's case, Young Geraldine's narrative authority also breaks down, but his loss of authority stems from contradictions portrayed as inherent to travel. Peter Holland calls *The English Traveller* "a sustained and vicious mockery of the assumption that the observation of that which lies out there, in some cultural other world across the channel, helps one cope with life at home" (175). Similarly, Martin Wiggins asserts that the underlying moral of the tale is that "while there is experience and profit to be gained from travel, it is always much safer to remain at home" (xxvii). If the emphasis in Reignald's claim to authority is the overlap of travel and domestic rhetoric, and Roger's emphasizes a disambiguation of the two, Geraldine's rests—and falls—on his ability to place the two forms of knowledge in a hierarchical relationship. The implication is that foreign knowledge must be subordinate to domestic knowledge, and while foreign knowledge provides appropriate content to serve a domestic purpose, it also carries the danger of blinding the traveler to practical insight.

Retreat into the House: Reasserting domestic authority by abnegating travel

If, as I have argued, each of the play's potential narrators uses the language of travel to construct his own authority in a domestic space, and if each narrator loses authority when he attempts to establish unilateral control over that which he narrates, it would seem that the play offers up a kind of plurality with respect to authority. Each of the three main narrators serves a distinct purpose, and all three remain present at the end of the play. This reading would not be incongruous with existing criticism on the plays, as a quasi-democratic view of authority has been associated with Heywood before. Daniel Gibbons reads another Heywood play, *The Wise-woman of Hogsdon*, as support for the idea that multivocality is necessary to a complete understanding of city life. He writes, "Heywood makes it manifestly evident that the kind of knowledge one needs to understand civic life properly...is dispersed among the various members of the community who all have some stake in the story" (407-8). Some critics have read *The English Traveller* in such a way as to privilege the subversive actions of Roger and Reignald and give them credit for ushering in a similar kind of multivocality. Writing in this vein, Rowland calls *The English Traveller* a response to the cynicism about theatre expressed in Massinger's *The Roman Actor*, which appeared in 1626. He characterizes Roger as a mediator between Young Geraldine and Old Wincott and concludes that it is the servants who "teach humanitie" and hospitality to their masters. According to Rowland, this is the function of comedy within tragedy.

Rowland focuses on the inversion of virtues, but in doing so, he grants unambiguous triumph of character to Roger and Reignald. In his introduction to a collection containing *The English Traveller*, Wiggins similarly diffuses the threat of social disorder in the play by emphasizing the purely rhetorical quality of the servants'

challenges to the established order. He points out that the speeches of Roger as well as his host are marked by elaborate metaphors: “Every such speech is a playful exercise of the imagination which grows, like a genie out of a bottle, along the lines of its own internal logic” (xxviii). He goes on to say, “Both servants bring their transforming wit to bear upon reality, but where Roger juggles only with words and concepts, Reignald tries to do so with actual events and circumstances” (xxix). The implication is that he tries—and fails. To Wiggins, there is no final threat to the social order and thus no punishment. Yet, as the final act of the play demonstrates, the servants must be silenced and their rhetorical mastery diffused.

Despite the latent sympathy the play expresses for these characters, it is important not to occlude the play’s ending in order to produce an internally cohesive narrative about the unlikely teachers of humanity or the plurality of authority. The play’s uneasy resolution can be better understood as the necessary but usually unspoken violence required to produce authoritative narration. Within the last three hundred lines of the play, the characters of the two plots collide in a farewell banquet for Young Geraldine hosted by the Wincotts. Young Geraldine confronts the Wife with her infidelity, and she dies in guilt; Reignald speaks a scant four lines but otherwise remains a repentant spectator; Dalavill flees, and Roger pursues him but instead of enacting vengeance returns and narrates in minute detail Dalavill’s mounted escape; finally, Young Geraldine renounces further travel in favor of declaring a male-only bond of love with Ricot, the Owner, Old Lionel, Young Lionel, Old Wincott, and his father. Because Reignald is largely silent and Roger’s discourse reverts to peripheral, insignificant commentary, the play’s resolution

seems to undo its earlier critical work and suppress deviant voices in order to reinforce the dominance of the conventional traveler and narrator.

The language with which Old Geraldine drives his son to the banquet against his will is the first indicator of the violence involved in such an effort. Old Geraldine accuses Young Geraldine, who has refused to explain his decision to leave, of trying “to steale out of your Countrey, / Like some Malefactor that had forfeited / His life and freedome” (5.1.18-20). He aligns Young Geraldine with a criminal condemned to death, and Young Geraldine’s response confirms the simile: he says the doors of Wincott’s house “to mee / Appeare as horrid as the gates of Hell” (5.1.42-3). The play’s historical context adds ominous overtones to this language, because *The English Traveller* was performed only a few years after the devastating plague outbreak of 1625. When Young Geraldine later describes the Wife as full of poison (5.1.124), speaks of her “polluted chamber” (5.1.139), and searches her face for a “faint fever” (148) of shame, he insinuates that her infidelity is a disease. Because he has associated the Wife’s sins with infection, Young Geraldine’s instinct to flee becomes not only a defensive act, but an unmanly and ignoble one. Ernest Gilman writes in *Plague Writing in Early Modern England* that the fact that “most Londoners had no means of travel and nowhere to go made it difficult to argue that the titled and the wealthy should be able to ride out to their country houses with a clear conscience” (173). He goes on to say, “Whatever the subtleties of the debate, the strong consensus in 1603, as in all plague years, is that flight is always sinful on the part of magistrates, ministers, and the fathers of families, who thereby betray their obligations to those under their care” (175). Old Geraldine employs filial obligation to produce a similar

guilt in his son. Given the introduction of the scene in such terms, Wincott's jovial assertion a few lines later that "all ends so well" (49) lacks credence.

Old Lionel similarly attempts through understatement to expunge the danger of the play's earlier upheaval, calling Reignald's usurpation "some sport" (53), but when Reignald further abases himself as a potential threat, saying, "Not so much worth Sir" (55), the effect is to discredit both underestimations. In a final collapse of the company's efforts to restore order without violence, when the Wife tries to break Young Geraldine's silence, she releases the latent anger he has been restraining in "oppressed sufferance" (115).⁵⁶ His ensuing verbal attack links her with the Syrens (132), Eve—"mankinds seducer" (136), Satan—"Thou Adultresse, / That hast more poison in thee then the Serpent" (139-40), and Medusa (168) as well as with the plague. In this, his one moment of free, even excessive release of speech, he associates her with mythological and religious evil and concludes his discursive violence by calling for her to "Die, and die soone" (193). She does.

The Wife's sudden illness and subsequent death eliminate her disruptive presence and allow the remaining men to reinforce their bond, which Wincott calls "a Marriage of our Loue, / Which none saue onely Death shall separate" (294-5). Young Geraldine is also restored, as he says the reclaimed masculine society "calles me from all Trauell, and from henceforth, / With my Country I am Friends" (296-7). And yet despite the symbolic celebration of male unity that signals a restoration of proper hierarchy, the play fails to achieve full resolution, because Dalavill never receives the proper penalty for his

⁵⁶ Notably, the breaking point for Young Geraldine comes when she warns him not to "miscarry" in his desire to travel, thus not only returning to the feminized discourse that had undermined his authority in an earlier scene, but also linking through a metaphor of pregnancy the knowledge he acquired by travel (and withheld) and the knowledge he has gained of her infidelity (which he is trying to escape).

misdeeds; instead, he flees abroad. Rowland calls this scene problematic in terms of gender, because “Heywood not only compounds the discomfort audiences experience at witnessing the destruction of his female characters by ensuring that their seducers, putative and actual, emerge unscathed, but he frequently and flagrantly contradicts his sources in order to do so” (17). The plague association I have identified with respect to Geraldine’s desire to escape via travel also complicates this development. Geraldine and the other men remain in the house, which he has characterized as a site of disease, and although Dalavill’s flight represents abandoned responsibility, it permits him to avoid contamination, while the men are left in the house as though they are in quarantine.

Significantly, the character most closely associated with this rupture in the play’s efforts to create closure is, once again, Roger. Shortly before the end of the play, Wincott recognizes that in order to stifle the violence codified in the Wife’s final letter and complete the conventions of comedy (reward of virtue, punishment of vice), Dalavill must be punished, so he sends Roger to do the task. Roger goes willingly enough, but he returns without upholding the conventional discourse of punishment. Instead, his language reverts to the mundane, rambling accounting of events with which he first spoke. He describes Dalavill’s flight in detail: “Hee went presently to the Stable, put the Sadle vpon his Horse, put his Foote into the Stirrup, clapt his Spurres into his sides, and away hee’s Gallopt, as if hee were to ride a Race for a Wager” (5.1.287-9). He does not enact revenge against Dalavill. His only function is to recount, to narrate, and then to lapse into silence with Reignald, leaving Wincott to try awkwardly to account for Dalavill’s unconventional fate, saying, “All our ill lucks goe with him, farewell hee” (290). Wincott then attempts to construct, through narration, a proper comedic ending with a wedding,

however unconventional and metaphorical it may be, but his efforts cannot erase the uneasiness of the play's rapid-fire conclusion. In this respect, Roger's position as a clown permits him to "evade and willfully to misinterpret prior authority" (Bristol 155). If reinforcing dominance is the underlying drive of the final act, Heywood's alternative narrators draw attention to the violence that accompanies the English travelers' and patriarchs' efforts to take back, by whatever means necessary, the authority they have lost as a result of the instability inherent in narrating travel. In addition, the alternative narrators demonstrate the artificial and contrived nature of any resolution achieved by means of that discursive violence.

Because *The English Traveller* is drama rather than print narrative, what might otherwise be occluded becomes uniquely visible on stage and produces a resolution that offers mirth even as it makes this response deeply problematic. As Bristol concludes, "[Clowns'] presence within the theater, and their intrusion or capture by a dramatic narrative, are an active discouragement to projects of unity and of closure" (155). They do so by disrupting the continuity of theatrical illusion. By conflating the metaphors of house and ship throughout the play, *The English Traveller* demonstrates the liminality of both as constructs of theatrical illusion. The "Lionel house" and the "Wincott house" are no more real houses than Young Lionel and the other rioters' "ship" is a real ship, but both are equally strange and violent environs. In her study of city comedy, Wendy Wall interprets the scene in which Roger describes the "massacre of meat" as an example of the strangeness of domestic tasks in the early modern imagination. She says, "What if these scenes of domestic passion and panic simply foregrounded what everyone already, at some level, knew: that ordinary experience could be bizarre and disquieting? Might

drama then implicitly unsettle ideologies resting on an ordered domesticity merely by revealing the disorienting nature of everyday practice?" (2). As a drama not only about the relationship between city life and the life of a traveler, but on a more basic level, about the relationship between the imagery of home and ship, *The English Traveller* is able to produce a similar effect, because it places before the audience the contested authority that lies at the root of both travel and domestic order.

The impulse to mask the relationship between travel and discourses of authority carries over into the plays that follow *The English Traveller* both chronologically and in their appropriation of travel narratives as source material and structural precedent. The final play I will consider, Richard Brome's *The Antipodes* (1638), emphasizes the theatricality of travel as a means of satire. If *The English Traveller* demonstrates a two-way relationship in which travel is alternately the vehicle and the tenor of metaphor, the medium and the message as it were, *The Antipodes* relegates travel firmly to the position of vehicle and medium: it is a metaphoric tool used to restore domestic stability. Through analysis of Brome's play, I will argue that in this kind of setting, in which the play recedes into itself and travel becomes solely cognitive, any representation of extemporaneity or concession of authority will be simultaneously affirmed and foreclosed.

CHAPTER THREE

TRAVEL AS METAPHOR AND THE ILLUSION OF ACCESS IN BROME'S *THE ANTIPODES*

*I ran it through, even from my boyish days
To th' very moment that he bade me tell it,
Wherein I spoke of most disastrous chances,
Of moving accidents by flood and field,
Of hairbreadth scapes i'th' imminent deadly breach,
Of being taken by the insolent foe
And sold to slavery, of my redemption thence,
And portance in my travels' history,
Wherein of antres vast and deserts idle,
Rough quarries, rocks, and hills whose heads touch heaven,
It was my hint to speak—such was my process*

--Shakespeare, *Othello*

The Greek word “antipodes” (*ἀντίποδες*), which means “having the feet opposite,” implies both radical difference or distance and radical similarity or proximity, as in the associated image of two men who are oriented in opposite directions but who are connected at the feet. For this reason, the concept of an antipodes has been used historically to explore questions of alterity. In *The Idea of the Antipodes*, Matthew Boyd Goldie claims that antipodes are consistently disruptive: the discovery of a physical antipodes disrupts medieval cartographies that rely on a three-continent model based on biblical imagery (43); in Arthurian legend, antipodeans are not wholly monstrous but “provide a mirror for reflection back to Europe” (58); and in later texts, like Caxton’s *Mirroure of the World* and the *Book of John Mandeville*, antipodeans are not easily contained, always presenting a risk of contamination as “one may travel to the antipodes...and antipodeans easily come to the North” (69). By the seventeenth century,

according to Goldie, the trope of a world upside down was a familiar one and had been thoroughly internalized in popular imagination; however, the trope retained much of its disruptive character.

In the above scene quoted from *Othello*, the lure of travelers' tales, especially those drawing on fanciful works like *Mandeville* and Pliny's *Natural History*, enables Othello to woo Desdemona's "greedy ear" with stories of "the Cannibals that each other eat, / The Anthropophagi, and men whose heads / Do grow beneath their shoulders" (1.3.145-7). In Othello's version of the story, such tales are dangerous for their seductive power, and they work to disturb the harmony of Brabantio's household, absorbing fault away from both the teller and the listener. As the Duke replies, "I think this tale would win my daughter too" (173). In *Othello*, however, this acknowledgement of the power of exotic narratives is followed closely by Brabantio's admonition that "Words are words. I never yet did hear / That the bruised heart was pierced through the ear" (1.3.221-2).⁵⁷ More than thirty years later in 1638, the probable date of performance for *The Antipodes*, the effects of travel have undergone a dramatic shift. The premise of *The Antipodes* is precisely that the words of Mandeville have pierced Peregrine's ear and bruised his heart; travel is recognized as a form of disease, while the theatrical appropriation of travel has become a still-problematic cure.

In Brome's play, Peregrine suffers from an obsession with travel to the extent that he has yet to consummate his marriage of three years. Doctor Hughball offers to cure his malady through an elaborate simulation of travel that will also cure Peregrine's elderly father, Joyless, of his excessive jealousy over his younger wife. The simulation takes

⁵⁷ Brabantio is later disproven; *Othello* goes on to track the physicality of desire associated with travel narratives, while *The Antipodes* converts physical desire to cognitive so that even desire recedes back on itself to the autoeroticism of reading.

place at the home of Lord Letoy and his company of actors, who stage a satirical play-within-a-play about Anti-London and its antipodal inversion of English social mores. The seduction and lure of travelers' tales may be the stated cause of Peregrine's melancholy, but for the audience, travel is both disease and cure because it facilitates a satirical critique of London society while both disturbing and restoring domestic stability. The play emphasizes the danger of narrating travel because it blurs the lines between truth and illusion, home and abroad, and sanity and madness. Although, as I have argued, the clearest representation of travel in *The English Traveller* is clearly deceptive, Young Geraldine and Old Lionel's experiences of travel are never overtly called into question. And while Gower quickly establishes that *Pericles* is a "song that old was sung", the characters within the play do not challenge the fact that Pericles moves from Tyre to Pentapolis to Ephesus and back. In *The Antipodes*, unlike *Pericles* or *The English Traveller*, travel is never mistaken for anything but a dramatic tool: only Peregrine believes that he has actually reached the antipodes, and because the audience members are privy to the early conversations between Hughball and Letoy as they plan, they are not encouraged to take Peregrine's part.

My focus in this chapter will be what happens to authority in a play that circles inward and does not draw a clear line between theater and reality, home and abroad. Building on the two previous chapters, I will examine the language and structures of authority in the play, analyzing the characters who receive or claim authority to intervene in the play-within-a-play, especially Doctor Hughball, Lord Letoy, and Peregrine. Throughout the play, the authority of these three figures is closely interwoven and frequently deferred: although Doctor Hughball is granted authority to narrate, he is in

turn responsible to his employer, Letoy. Letoy also treats narration as a collaborative effort, inviting Joyless, Diana, and his company of actors to participate, and both men scheme to involve Peregrine in their constructed world, which relies on the authority of Mandeville and other extant writers. Despite seeming to advocate an extemporaneous form of playing that overturns or undermines authority, the play perpetually defers authority. As a result, it fails to identify a final source of authority, the figure who would have to surrender control to make room for a viable model of multivocality.

Considering the questions of authority that the play poses is appropriate given the play's previous critical reception. Although in the last twenty years critics have paid more attention to the professional playwrights of the late Caroline era, including Brome, Massinger, Ford, and Shirley, such playwrights have often been characterized as imitators of the genius of Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Jonson. In 2004, surveying the field of critical work on Brome's plays, Matthew Steggle writes, "Brome is 'placed' with reference to Jonson, and often...by means of a geographical metaphor: Brome travelling a few parasangs behind his master" (2). Even Steggle, who defends Brome, calling it a "disservice" to classify him based on his relationship to Jonson, places Brome in a subordinate position when he refers to *The Antipodes* as Brome's "most Shakespearean play" (115) and says his plays are "among the most interesting and appealing texts to emerge from the later phase of the Shakespearean theatre" (1). Always to speak of Brome in relation to Jonson and Shakespeare gives the playwright credit only for derivative skill.

Critics who represent Brome and his contemporaries as technicians who mindlessly recycle older tropes often cite the highly structured meta-theatrics of plays like *The Antipodes*. Consider, for example, Ian Donaldson's oft-cited work *The World*

Upside-Down: Comedy from Jonson to Fielding, which describes Brome in this way:

To read *The Antipodes* after reading *Epicoene* or *Bartholomew Fair* is to feel the very great distance between an original unsettling writer of dramatic genius for whom the sharp contrasts provided by such folk humour were simply an occasional means of anchoring more turbulent and complex feelings, and his neat and competent imitator, for whom they could become an end in themselves. (86)

Elsewhere, Donaldson grants that Brome had some skill, but at “what might be called light-weight structural engineering, fairly obviously derived from the richer skills of his master in comedy, Jonson” (81).⁵⁸ It is true that *The Antipodes* demonstrates a familiarity with theatrical convention and utilizes not only the play-within-a-play but also an inset masque. It is also true that *The Antipodes*, with its concern for physical space and its frequent references to real London locations (Bridewell and Newgate prisons to name a few) and contemporary events, participates readily in the genre of city comedy. However, although Donaldson calls Brome’s theatrical devices “simple” (85), he nonetheless identifies as a characteristic of the play its engagement with “circles of madness and eccentricity” and “circles of illusion” (88-9) that expand throughout the play. As with *Pericles*’s use of the dumb show and the chorus/authorial presenter, or *The English Traveller*’s use of multiple plots, the elaborate structure of Brome’s play invites serious consideration about what is at stake in reviving this set of conventions for this play.

Travelers’ Dreams: Re-configuring travel as metaphor

⁵⁸ Not every critic has dismissed Brome’s craft so summarily. In the last ten years, critics like Julie Sanders, Miles Taylor, and Charlotte Spivack have called for a reassessment of Brome’s “comforting and conservative” leanings (to use Donaldson’s phrase) by confronting the play’s ambiguous as well as conventional rendering of theatrical tropes.

While *The Antipodes* can be classified as a city comedy, it also invokes the language and conventions of the travel play, which, as I have argued, lend themselves to the construction of narrative authority. What makes this play unique is that while it employs the tropes of travel, it shifts the context of travel from the physical territory of ships, explorers, and colonies to the realm of the mind. Peregrine's obsession is described alternately as disease, melancholy, and madness, but at its root is what Joyless calls "his travelling thoughts" (1.1.124). Although Joyless has kept him from physical travel, Peregrine cannot be prevented "from travelling / So far beyond himself that now, too late, / I wish he had gone abroad to meet his fate" (1.1.148-50). Accordingly, Doctor Hughball, as Blaze tells Joyless, works, "Not so much by bodily physic (no, / He sends few recipes to th'apothecaries) / As medicine of the mind" (1.1.22-4). Cognitive travel of the type Peregrine represents is a specifically textual form of travel. Books, not ships, "convey his fancy around the world" (1.1.137).⁵⁹ Peregrine's mental journeys are facilitated by his reading of Mandeville, a fact to which he makes frequent reference.

The choice of Mandeville as the source of a traveler's madness is intriguing, because by the time Brome was writing *The Antipodes*, Mandeville had been largely discredited as a source of information about the physical world. Doctor Hughball's "O, Mandeville" (1.1.196) on hearing of Peregrine's delusions and before hearing that Mandeville is the source, demonstrates his familiarity with the tales and may evince a similar sentiment. Julie Sanders writes this in "The Politics of Escapism":

Mandeville's *Travels* held a paradoxical status as both fantasy and fact in the seventeenth century; increasing navigation of the world revealed many of the

⁵⁹ In this respect, Peregrine would be an ideal member of a theatrical audience: compare this language to that of the Chorus in *Henry V*, which asks that the audience "play with your fancies" (3.0.7) to bring the scene to life.

text's claimed truths to be fantastic fabrications, an artistically ambitious gathering, under the persona of Mandeville, of the writings of numerous other authors such as William of Boldensele, Oderic of Pordenone, Giovanni de Pian Carpini and Albert of Aix. (141)

If Mandeville stands in for the fantastic and imaginative side of travel, then by aligning himself with Mandeville, Peregrine sets a higher value on cognitive travel than on physical travel. His adamant rejection of conventional travelers follows from this point. When Doctor Hughball asks, "What think you, sir, of Drake, our famous countryman?" (1.3.29), attempting to show Mandeville's inferiority to more recent travelers and explorers, Peregrine replies, "Drake was a didapper to Mandeville. / Candish, and Hawkins, Furbisher, all our voyagers / Went short of Mandeville" (30-2). These figures would be known predominantly through texts as well;⁶⁰ however, as figures of relatively recent (English) memory, they would be distinct from Mandeville on the basis of their historical and national identity: Hughball calls them "our famous countryman," and even Peregrine calls them "our voyagers." By contrast, not only did Mandeville's *Travels* contain invalidated information, but it also lacked a verifiable author to legitimize it as a source of authority, and the partial authors then being identified, like those Sanders mentions, were not English. Peregrine's assertion that Mandeville went further than all the rest relies on a perception of distance as measured in terms of the mind, not physical space. Rather than spreading outward, this type of distance spirals inward, and mental travel of the sort Peregrine enacts does the same. The authority of Peregrine's source thus

⁶⁰ The narratives of Hawkins (William and John), Frobisher, Cavendish, and Drake were all included in Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations*; Drake's circumnavigation of the globe was also described in *The World Encompassed by Sir Francis Drake* (1628), a collection compiled from the ship's chaplain Francis Fletcher and other sources (see Klaus).

creates a textual *mise en abyme*, an image to which I will return in my discussion of the play's structure.

Peregrine's relationship with contemporary travelers is not entirely consistent. Martha reports that in lieu of a son, Peregrine "told me, faced me down and stood on't, / We had three sons, and all great travellers— / That one had shook the Great Turk by the beard" (1.2.228-30). As Parr points out in his footnote to this passage, Brome is likely alluding to the Sherley brothers. That Peregrine would claim the Sherley brothers as his offspring but disparage Drake, Cavendish, and the others at first seems curious. Although Drake's reputation had fallen substantially under James's rule, Christopher Hodgins points out, "James was less than a year in his grave when, in 1626, there appears the first of three different seventeenth-century books entitled—in this case, almost crowingly—*Sir Francis Drake Reuiued*" (447), followed by a rush of renewed popularity for the explorer in light of growing hostilities with Spain. However, if Peregrine is to represent mental and particularly *imaginative* mental travel, his association with the Sherley brothers, whose story had appeared on stage in 1607 in Day, Rowley, and Wilkins's *Travels of the Three English Brothers*, is perhaps not so unusual.⁶¹ According to Hodgkins, "Drake's influence on English literature is only felt 'gradually, obliquely, inconspicuously almost,' in the imagery of *The Tempest*, in Donne's hymn in his sickness, in Marvell's ode on the Bermudas" (Hodgkins 428, quoting Michael J.B. Allen).⁶² Not until 1659, twenty years after *The Antipodes*, was Drake's life dramatized in a recorded

⁶¹ Mandeville himself was, presumably, the subject of a now-lost 1591/2 play titled *Sir John Mandeville*: c.f. C.W.R.D. Moseley and McInnis, "Sir John Mandeville."

⁶² If not in drama, Drake was extensively commemorated in poetry; Hodgkins especially emphasizes Reverend Charles Fitzgeffrey's 1596 elegaic epic, *Sir Francis Drake, His Honorable lifes commendation, and his Tragicall Deaths lamentation* (443).

theatrical production.⁶³ Peregrine's rejection of Drake can be understood as an affirmation of antiquity over contemporaneity, but the exception of the Sherley brothers remains problematic. It could stem from the successful immersion of these semi-contemporary figures into a theatrical creation; however, the reference could also be read as a mocking attempt by Peregrine to brush off Martha's inquiries.

Another possibility is that it could reflect the ambiguities present in contemporary sentiments about travel. Miles Taylor argues, "The play's Anti-London thus instantiates an ambivalence about travel in that it is both at the most extreme distance from and a complex mirror image of London herself" (440). Taylor says, "One sees throughout the period the diminishment of travel and travel writing as inessential, escapist, dangerous to one's masculinity, and fundamentally unpatriotic, and it is just these tropes that we encounter in Brome's *The Antipodes*, even as it employs both real and fictive travel to effect its happy conclusion" (441). He sees in the play's conclusion an unavoidable contradiction in that alterity (Anti-London, in this case) is at once desirable as a cure for social ills and dangerous as a disorder that provokes a reactionary impulse (451). The travel play as a genre lends additional emphasis to the danger of travel because it uses an English stage with English actors wearing English costumes and carrying English props to create a world said to be wholly unlike England.

Because this is a play in which ambiguity and lack of closure are the ruling principles, the possible contradiction in Peregrine's relationship to contemporary

⁶³ This claim is still somewhat speculative. One known production about Drake is Sir William Davenant's 1659 operatic tableau *The History of Sir Francis Drake* (Hodgkins 450). Harbage makes the case that Cavendish and Drake both featured in a lost opera called *Ladrones or the Robbers' Iland* (1658), by Mildmay Fane. Earlier possible theatrical representations of Drake's travels include *Conquest of the West Indies* (a lost play from 1601) and *New World's Tragedy* (also lost, 1595), but these references are largely speculative: c.f. Ramsaram and McInnis.

travelers does not necessarily demand resolution. First and foremost, the credibility the play attributes to Peregrine's views of authority is called into question because he is considered mad.⁶⁴ Second, contradiction is one means of destabilizing narrative authority, and Peregrine's supposed madness is the grounds for the play's larger critique of authority. Peregrine is driven to rely on mental travel because he has been prohibited from traveling in actuality by his father. Joyless's repressive and authoritative tendencies appear throughout the play in his asides to Diana. At several moments, he orders Diana to leave the byplay, telling her "Into your chamber!" (1.3.136). In each case, he must be countermanded by Hughball or Letoy. Ira Clark calls this tension between the desires of youth and the repression of the older generation typical of plays by Caroline professionals like Brome (23). He goes on to conclude that Brome "satirize[s] dual contemporary vices, abuses of authority and abuses of ambition" and celebrates "free, extemporaneous play" (32). Although I would argue that Clark overstates the freedom of the extemporaneous play represented in *The Antipodes*, his point about the play's satirization of authority is well made. Joyless is a comic figure precisely because he is overmastered by the authority of Doctor Hughball and then Lord Letoy.

Whether or not Peregrine's obsession with cognitive travel is internally consistent, it produces disconcerting repercussions for the structure and content of the play. Miles Taylor argues, "Only by presenting a fictive world that is as contradictory and irreducible as the real world can Hughball move Peregrine from utter isolation in fantasy to spectatorship and finally to interaction and participation" (451). The same approach can be applied to the effect of *The Antipodes* on readers and viewers. Through its language of

⁶⁴ Although here I use the terminology of disease, I will return to this question of sanity and madness in my analysis of the play's conclusion.

childbearing and its unsettling of comedy through the figure of a husband who generates only dreams and illusions inherited from an outmoded text, *The Antipodes* problematizes travel that is solely cognitive and metaphorical rather than part of an ongoing tradition of tropes, images, forms, and representations based on the experiences of real travelers. At the same time, it demonstrates the barrenness of the models of authority that force narrative to become only metaphoric and self-enclosed. As an alternative, *The Antipodes* points to a model of productive travel that refuses closed systems of authority.

Unconsummated Masques and Byplay: Balancing tradition and innovation

By incorporating the structure of masques and inset plays, *The Antipodes* replicates its central conceit of infertility or failure to consummate on the level of structure. The progression toward closure implied in the masque calls attention to the lack of both progression and closure in Brome's play. In "Of Masques and Triumphs," Francis Bacon famously calls masques "but toys to come amongst such serious observations" (159); however, in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, David Bevington and Peter Holbrook call for a reassessment of masques as "important trifles" for negotiating divisions in the Stuart and early Caroline courts (4), a task writers like Jonson took quite seriously.⁶⁵ Since Brome was famously referred to in the induction to *Bartholomew Fair* as "Jonson's man," and moreover because as a professional dramatist he was well-versed in what was then an established, dominant form of playing, it is no surprise that *The Antipodes* should be thoroughly conversant in the conventions of the masque. After all, 1638 was the year not only of *The Antipodes* but also of Davenant's

⁶⁵ In Jonson's masque *Neptune's Triumph* (1624), a Poet and a Cook debate the difficulties each faces in satisfying the tastes of the time and responding to contemporary political situations like Prince Charles's failure to win a Spanish bride. Notably, *The English Traveller* alludes to this masque in its scene of revelry when the constable is compared to Neptune and his trident (see Rowland 219).

Brittania Triumphans, which Lauren Shohet identifies in *Reading Masques* as the first masque performed at court since 1635 (1). According to Barbara Lewalski, “Caroline masques were even more exotic and prodigiously expensive than Jacobean masques, sets and machinery were more elaborate, antimasques were much more numerous, and dramatic speech was more prominent” (296). As a result, masques represented political power, courtliness, wealth, and prestige. *The Antipodes* participates in a tradition of derivative masques that Shohet extends to aristocratic pieces, public theatricals, and plays with songs and inset masques (45).⁶⁶

In addition to the actual masque performed by Lord Letoy’s men at the end of the play, the play demonstrates some of the characteristics of a masque in its structure. In *The Antipodes*, Doctor Hughball’s cures cancel out conflict through inversion and doubling: antimasque, masque; London, Anti-London. In *The Jonsonian Masque*, Stephen Orgel says the restorative promise of the masque requires both parties to recognize the theatricality of what is taking place:

It attempted from the beginning to breach the barrier between spectators and actors, so that in effect the viewer became part of the spectacle. The end toward which the masque moved was to destroy any sense of theater and to include the whole court in the mimesis—in a sense, what the spectator watched he ultimately became. (6-7)

⁶⁶ Other examples are *The Tempest*, *Love’s Labours Lost*, and *The Malcontent*. *The Tempest* is an example of a very popular play with an inset masque modeled on court masques. Shohet argues that *The Tempest*’s masque presents a disjunction between the poet-king’s authoritative rhetoric and the audience’s obedience. “Prospero’s injunction [‘No tongue. All eyes. Be silent.’] notwithstanding, Ferdinand is *not* ‘all eyes.’ When Ferdinand compliments the invention, Prospero responds courteously, then instructs him, ‘Sweet now, silence’” (23). Letoy’s audience is similarly unruly, marked by the number of times he has to silence Joyless, Diana, or Martha during the inset play.

Especially in Elizabethan and Stuart court masques, the performance leads up to the “taking out,” a dance in which the masquers select members of the court to join them, and then another, faster dance, in which more audience members merge with the masquers (Barroll 127-30).⁶⁷ The motif of absorption appears in the structure of Brome’s play as well, which concludes with a masque presented by Lord Letoy’s players that accompanies the reunion of Peregrine and Martha with Joyless, Diana, Letoy, and Hughball after all have been disabused of their illusions about the inset play.

The structure of the masque varies, but it is at its most basic a dialectic form that achieves progress through the presentation of opposites, first the antimasque, characterized by strife or disorder, and then the masque, characterized by the restoration of order. In *The Antipodes*, Discord, Folly, Jealousy, Melancholy, and Madness present the antimasque, and then they are overborne by Harmony, Mercury, Cupid, Bacchus, and Apollo. The antimasque, according to Hugh Craig, is a largely Jonsonian invention that “gave opportunity for scenes of barbaric anarchy to be played out in the court with a king as chief spectator” (177). The antimasque provides a foil, to use Jonson’s language in the *Masque of Queens*, for the masque itself (qtd. in Craig 181), and it is permissible, Craig argues, because the ability to publicly present scenes of disorder proves that the court is secure in its own sense of order (187). Brome’s use of the masque, then, both reassures the audience that comedic resolution is imminent and also makes it possible by showing

⁶⁷ In one of the essays in this collection, Leeds Barroll suggests that scholars need to recognize in the masque a greater multivocality than has been previously assumed. He points to Queen Anna’s masques and says “we ought to view these spectacles not as ‘works’ of their particular playwrights but as social constructs” that are shaped equally by writer, patron, and performers (131).

Peregrine how wit overcomes folly; love, jealousy; wine, melancholy; and health, madness (5.2.349-50).⁶⁸

Because the masque is a form in which, as Shohet argues, “moments of closure often constitute the height of artifice” (243), it is curious that Brome uses this device to conclude a play in which closure is tentative at best. Goldie argues that “*The Antipodes*’ masque is ultimately more curative than *The Tempest*’s...It appears that Letoy is firmly in control” (81). I would agree that Letoy remains firmly in control; however, as I will discuss later in reference to the play’s conclusion, the curative power of the masque is doubtful. What the use of the masque does indicate is Brome’s ability to fuse older genres with new renderings. Because the plot of *The Antipodes* turns on the anxiety of generation, this tension between new and old on the level of structure is appropriate, and it goes back to Peregrine’s new understanding of travel as primarily of the mind. The point is not that travel of the mind should be self-consuming, as Peregrine’s is, but that travel of the mind should be self-stimulating, just as a poet should use his fancies to create new syntheses out of older forms rather than to hoard his creative powers.

The language of invention and inheritance is prominent in Sir Philip Sidney’s famous argument about the proper role of poetry in the *Defence of Poesie* (1595). Sidney, himself a noted traveler on the Continent, asks if, given that poetry is an early means of lifting a nation out of ignorance, readers will, “play the Hedge-hogge, that being received into the den, drave out his host? Or rather the Vipers, that with their birth kill their parents?” (B1v). The implication is that educational parentage is to be respected, and in

⁶⁸ Shohet identifies temperance as the leading virtue proposed by masques in the 1630s (54), and the play’s general emphasis is on the curative effects of excess when it leads back to temperance, as in Letoy’s claim that “So is a madman made a fool, before / Art can take hold of him to wind him up / Into his proper centre” (4.503-5).

support of this claim, Sidney constantly calls up older figures in the poetic tradition. When it comes to literary heritage, however, Sidney distinguishes between poetry and other arts that merely replicate nature. Poetry, according to Sidney, is based on invention rather than duplication.⁶⁹ It must participate readily in the long tradition of English poetry, but it should also add to that tradition.

The Antipodes responds to similar concerns about literary generation, as the play is very concerned about its relationship to older forms. I use the term “literary generation” because one of the most prominent ways the play deals with its connections to earlier literary traditions is through metaphors of procreation. Brome participates in the popular dialogue about artistic creation as a form of parentage, a dialogue that was heavily influenced by Platonic thought. Socrates’ discourse on love in Plato’s *Symposium* divides love into two categories: body and mind. Socrates claims that in both of these cases, the aim of love is reproduction, because “reproduction is the closest mortals can come to being permanently alive and immortal” (206e, p. 44). While sexual reproduction is the bodily representation of love, “wisdom and other kinds of virtue: these are brought to birth by all the poets and by those craftsmen who are said to be innovative” (290a, 46). Letoy’s concerns about his aristocratic and literary heritage take a similar form. In reference to his own birthright, Letoy is conscious of wanting to generate new traditions and customs on the foundations of an older legacy. He claims that “the Letoys are of antiquity / Ages before the fancies were begot, / And shall beget still new to the world’s end” (2.1.7-9). Likewise, the rhetoric he uses to situate his plays and his players attempts,

⁶⁹ “Only the Poet disdeining to be tied to any such subjection, lifted up with the vigor of his own invention, doth grow in effect into another nature: in making things either better then nature bringeth foorth, or quite a new, formes such as never were in nature” (B4v-C1r).

on the one hand, to make him the inheritor of a lengthy tradition, and on the other hand, to distinguish himself apart from that tradition—to both be “of antiquity” and “beget still new.”

As an author and director, Letoy calls up a long tradition of theater history. He prides himself that his actors,

...can act the emperors' lives all over,

And Shakespeare's chronicled histories, to boot.

And were that Caesar or that English earl

That loved a play and player so well now living,

I would not be outvied in my delights. (1.2.66-71)

His words place the byplay of *The Antipodes* in a tradition going back to the Earl of Leicester in English theater history and the emperor Nero in Roman.⁷⁰ Playing off of the duality in Sidney's text, Letoy both associates his players with the theatrical tradition of Shakespeare and Nero and elevates them to a position equal to or greater than that of the aforementioned figures. His rhetoric situates them within the tradition but also beyond it. His response to the older theaters is similarly ambiguous. In a line that could be interpreted as satire or tribute, he says extemporaneous play was prominent,

...in the days of Tarlton and Kemp,

Before the stage was purged from barbarism,

And brought to the perfection it now shines with.

⁷⁰ His inclusion in this literary heritage of both English and Roman theater is in keeping with forms of English nationalism that looked backward to Rome as a model for England's aspirations. In 1636, two years before *The Antipodes* was performed, Edward Dacres published a translation of Machiavelli's *Discourses*. As translated, the preface bemoans the “esteeme which is made of antiquity” while the great deeds of history “by every one have beene so much avoided, that now the very foote steps of that ancient virtue is utterly defac'd” (Br). Machiavelli proceeds to recount the history of T. Livius for the instruction of his own prince; the English translation, which was dedicated to James, Duke of Lenox and a member of Charles's Privy Council, urges English nobility to look to the Roman past for instruction.

Then fools and jesters spent their wits, because
The poets were wise enough to save their own
For profitabler uses. (2.1.102-7)

The first half of this commentary ridicules extemporaneity as an outdated mode of presentation affiliated with the clowns Richard Tarlton and Will Kemp. The accusation is ironic given Tarlton and Kemp's extreme popularity as performers.⁷¹ The second half of the commentary makes the irony explicit, because the implication of "then" is that now poets spend their wits as fools and jesters once spent theirs, so the claim turns back to mock current (non-extemporaneous) conventions of theater.

For Brome, attempting to define a new theatrical moment requires dealing with literary heritage; it is necessary to invent but not deny one's parentage, or, in Sidney's words, "play the Hedge-hogge, that being received into the den, drave out his host." If the dialectic form of the masque promises to be one vehicle for superseding the problem of literary generation and achieving progress, the inset play in *The Antipodes* shows how that model stagnates when subjected to excessive authoritative control. After the play's opening, in which Doctor Hughball promises to cure Peregrine's madness, the group moves to Lord Letoy's mansion where Letoy's private company of actors enact a complex inset play, which I will refer to as the "byplay."⁷² Like the convention of the authorial presenter or multiple plots, the byplay emphasizes the artificiality of the larger

⁷¹ In *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, Andrew Gurr writes, "Phillip Sidney was not ashamed to be godfather to the son of Richard Tarlton the clown" (84), who was renowned as a "clown of extempore" (86). Kemp was "better known for harlequinade and jigs than wit...He is rightly or wrongly thought to have been the culprit charged by Hamlet with speaking more than was set down for him" (88).

⁷² This term comes from the list of "The Persons in the Play" as published in 1640, which mentions "Followers of the Lord Letoy's, who are actors in the byplay" (Parr 220). Some editions (e.g. Haaker, Parr) use the spelling "byplay"; some older editions, like the 1873 collected works, use the hyphenated "by-play." For consistency, because other citations from the play are taken from Parr's 1995 edition, I have chosen to use the non-hyphenated form.

play and calls attention to itself as fiction. In addition, the layering of inset plays creates a self-enfolding structure, an image to which I will return shortly.

By adopting this device, Brome situates his play in a theatrical tradition with a long history. The convention of the inset play is not unique; it is present in plays that range from *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Hamlet*, to *The Taming of the Shrew* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, to *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Jovial Crew*. Robert Witt, in an analysis of the “plays-within” in Jonson’s works, argues that such devices serve three purposes: comment, action, and spectacle. Some internal plays reflect the play’s theme, providing background information or commenting on theatrical audiences and “the illusionary nature of drama” (7). Other byplays contribute to the action of the main play, initiating it, as in the masque of *Romeo and Juliet*, or ending it, as in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Still others “provide comic entertainment and spectacle not necessarily connected with the play proper” (11). Usually, Witt concludes, a play-within serves multiple functions at once. In Shakespeare’s works alone, as Robert Nelson records, seven plays make explicit use of the play-with-a-play device (11), and Witt says of Jonson, “all of [his] plays are by one means or another made plays-within...In the action, furthermore, most are puppets and some are puppeteers” (146). The skewed distribution of authority Witt identifies in this last comment is striking with respect to the byplay in *The Antipodes*.

The master puppeteer in Brome’s play is Lord Letoy, who directs the byplay and is behind the larger plot to bring the Joyless family to his home. In addition to his assertions of direct authority over Joyless (see 2.2.146 and 2.2.248), he shares many of the characteristics previously identified with traditional travel narrators. His constant

interjections during the byplay interpret and moralize what is happening on stage for the spectators, using the wide range of metaphors written into his play. During a scene that inverts the roles of beggar and lawyer, Letoy says beggars are the “Most absolute courtiers in th’ Antipodes” (3.208), and he goes one step further to tell Diana the appropriate didactic rendering of the scene, saying, “The moral is, the lawyers here prove beggars, / And beggars only thrive by going to law” (268-9). At a key moment in the play, he also retroactively constructs a narrative of what has taken place. After Peregrine and Martha leave the stage together, Letoy explains to Joyless and Diana, who have also been observing the play, what is “the doctor’s art” in curing their son and clearing the way for “the fair issue likely to ensue” (4.494-5). By narrating what has already taken place, Letoy assumes the authority to interpret it and deliver judgment on its purpose and effects.

Letoy passes some authority to Hughball to use as he instructs Peregrine on the proper behavior of a traveler, but Hughball models the narrative authority that he teaches Peregrine on that which Letoy practices. Hughball affirms the use of retrospective construction when he reassures Peregrine that he has not failed in his duty as a traveler because he did not record his passage to the Antipodes: “We’ll write as we return, sir; and ‘tis true / You slept most part o’th’ journey hitherward, / The air was so somniferous” (2.2.12-5). He also encourages Peregrine to “speak like a traveller” (2.2.24). What that translates to is Peregrine’s speech describing what happened,

...as we passed the verge

O’th’ upper world, coming down, downhill,

The setting sun, then bidding them good night,

Came gliding easily down by us and struck,

New day before us. (2.2.25-9)

Peregrine's discourse bears all the markers of a traveler's speech: it is constructed retroactively, includes acts of translation through metaphor and personification, represents what cannot be shown due to physical limitations (the sun), and, moreover, the audience knows it to be wholly fictional. Likewise, when the doctor fills in gaps of their journey for Peregrine, he seems to surmount physical limitations of the theatre as he describes their journey, which has, he claims, taken "Eight months, and some odd days, / Which was but as so many hours and minutes" (2.2.16-7). The difference in this case is that the Salisbury Court audience knows that no physical travel has taken place. Whereas earlier travel plays, like *Pericles* and *The Three English Brothers*, required the audience to suspend their disbelief, the play-within-a-play structure invites them to acknowledge as theatrical illusion the "stage as ship" metaphor.⁷³

Although the audience is, so to speak, "in on the joke" from the beginning, some critics have tended to read Letoy's authority as more transitory than its representation in *The Antipodes* merits. In "Actors, Audiences and Authors," Audrey Birkett argues that *The Antipodes* responds to the increasing opposition Caroline playwrights like Brome faced and the competition for authority that surrounded the performance and publication of plays. Birkett traces the history of the play and associates Letoy with the figure of the embattled author. She concludes that Letoy gradually gives over authority to his players, and that this concession of authority is what permits Peregrine to be cured. She writes, "Allowing the players to act extempore means that Letoy now holds no power over what

⁷³ Although *The English Traveller* also mocks this theatrical convention through the fanciful "travels" of Reignald and Young Lionel and their drunken friends, it preserves the idea of actual travel in the figures of Old Lionel and Young Geraldine, the legitimacy of whose off-stage travels is never questioned.

is to happen next...Byplay's terming Letoy merely 'a voice out of the clouds, that doth applaud' makes him a spectator and not the controlling agent of the play" (66). Birkett claims that the play is able to restore social order by virtue of Letoy's concession and that it was similarly necessary for Caroline playwrights like Brome to give over their texts to print and performance. The problem with this interpretation is that in the scene Birkett cites, Byplay tells Peregrine that Letoy is only a "voice out of the clouds," but in fact the reason Peregrine notices Letoy in the first place is because Letoy reminds Byplay to follow his "instructions / Touching his subjects and his marriage" (4.403-4). Immediately afterward, Letoy informs Diana and Joyless that he must go down to the play, "And set out things in order" (409).

Even though Letoy purports to advocate extemporaneity, he continues to direct the action of the byplay. Even his oft-cited critique of overly controlling poets in act two is not as straightforward as it might seem. When he first tells Hughball about his plans to prepare his actors, Letoy claims, "I am none of those poetic furies / That threatens the actor's life, in a whole play / That adds a syllable or takes away" (2.1.20-2). Once the players begin their performance, however, he readily critiques minor flaws in their performance, including the failing of taking too much license with the text. He chides,

...you, sir, are incorrigible, and
Take license to yourself to add unto
Your parts your own free fancy, and sometimes
To alter or diminish what the writer
With care and skill composed. (2.1.93-7)

Later, he tells Quailpipe, “This had been well now, if you had not dreamt / Too long upon your syllables” (2.2.67-8) and scolds Byplay, “Dismiss the court; cannot you hear the prompter?” (3.481), so even his leniency with regard to textual purity is questionable, but especially when it comes to theatrical competence, he demonstrates strict authoritative control.

As the verbal reinforcements of Letoy’s authority throughout the play demonstrate, the byplay is a form that can be supportive of hierarchies within the play, and also hierarchies external to it. If the dominant model of authority in the Renaissance could be understood as a series of circles, in which divine authority made up the outermost circle and was represented in miniature by the king’s dominion over his subjects, which was in turn represented in miniature by the father’s control of his family, then the theatrical equivalent, structurally, would appear to be a play with an inset play that confirms its dominant moral precept. Brome’s play distinctly problematizes this reading. In “Alienation and Illusion,” Charlotte Spivack identifies a shift from Elizabethan and Jacobean internal plays that serve a moral or didactic function to Caroline plays in which the byplay is used for psychological effect and does not represent a microcosm of the play as a whole (198). Because Spivack interprets the byplay in *The Antipodes* as “disjunct from the whole” (206), she concludes that it challenges the traditional religious imagining of the world as a series of microcosms in which small events are representations in miniature of the larger workings of God in the world. Instead of encapsulating a larger moral message, the byplay is merely ancillary to the workings of the plot.

On a thematic level, *The Antipodes* draws on the rambling, episodic nature of the travel narrative, in which accounts, or in this case, didactic interpretations, may exist side-by-side without significant overlap. On the level of structure, however, it comes closer to the self-consuming form of a *mise en abyme*. The byplay in *The Antipodes* has multiple layers based on the participants' knowledge of events and plans. It could more properly be termed a play-within-a-play-within-a-play-within-a-play-within-a-play, as Donaldson identifies five different levels of audiences. Peregrine is "the closest and most enthralled spectator" (90). He is followed by Martha, Joyless, and Diana—"marginally more sophisticated and objective viewers" (91). Blaze and Barbara are "knowing spectators" (92), followed by, first, Letoy and the Doctor, and finally, the actual audience in Salisbury Court, who have "the pleasure of overseeing the inner play" (92). Donaldson compares the effect of the play's layering to a set of Chinese boxes, but the image of a *mise en abyme* is also appropriate.

"Mise en abyme," meaning literally "to put in the center [of an escutcheon]" comes from the heraldic custom of emblazoning in the center of the coat of arms a smaller version of the device. In theory, the image repeats itself in an infinite regression.⁷⁴ In literature, *mise en abyme* is more frequently applied to visual images in the text, particularly mirrors and works of art, but in this case it is structurally applicable to the byplay, especially given that Blaze, one of the participants, is by occupation a "herald's painter," an emblazoner of heraldic devices (1.2.2).⁷⁵ What this produces in

⁷⁴ French author André Gide brought the term *mise en abyme* into literary theory in the twentieth century by applying it to examples of interior duplication and characterizing it as a form of literary self-reflexivity. A frequent example is the inset play in *Hamlet*. Gide writes, "In a work of art I rather like to find transposed, on the scale of the characters, the very subject of that work" (1:29).

⁷⁵ A similar connection could be drawn between the form of *Pericles* as itself a play-within-a-play and the scene with the presentation of shields at the tournament in Pentapolis.

terms of structure is a play that recedes inward upon itself. Martha's comment in act two—"The play? What play? It is no children's play, / Nor no child-getting play, pray, is it?" (2.2.80-1)—is ironically appropriate. Rather than moving outward in a generative or progressive form, this play makes apparent what the other two I have examined only imply: systems of narrative in which authority is strictly self-enclosed produce a form of structural incest and impede creative generation. The implications of structuring a play in the style of *mise en abyme* are especially significant in light of the device's associations with ancestry.

The end of the play reveals one source of Letoy's anxiety over ancestry: he is seeking the daughter he (like Leontes and Pericles) gave away in infancy because he doubted his wife's fidelity (5.2.212-29). No other children are mentioned, so viewers are led to assume that Letoy does not yet have another heir; as a result, his stake in Peregrine's cure becomes implicitly higher. Not only is Letoy reconstructing his genealogy backward by having his herald trace his ancestry "*Ex origine, ab antiquo*" (1.2.6), he is also reconstructing it forward by reclaiming his daughter, presumably mending her relationship with her husband, and ending his grandson's failure to reproduce. Yet there is a glitch in the comedic resolution, and it shares a great deal in common with a problem found in *Pericles*. When Letoy asks Blaze about the genealogy, he says, "My ancestors and I have been beginners / Of all new fashions in the court of England / From before *Primo Ricardi Secundi*" (1.2.15-7). Stage directions indicate that Letoy is dressed as a servant, and Blaze cautions him, "I cannot think, my lord, / They'll follow you in this" (19-20), implying that Letoy's lineage of fashion, at least, may not be sustainable. Although this exchange is minor, it echoes later threats that arise against

Letoy's legacy. As the scene progresses, Letoy defends his independence from social strictures with language that relies increasingly on reflexive and possessive pronouns. He says, "my broadcloth / Pleases mine eye as well, my body better" (31-2), claims, "I please myself with more choice home delights / Than most men of my rank" (50-1), and concludes with, "Stage plays and masques are nightly my pastimes, / And all within myself: my own men are / My music and my actors" (56-8). The self-reflexivity of his language characterizes him as a solipsistic figure whose house is self-enclosed. As Julie Sanders writes, "There is something dangerously self-contained about his theatrical stagings. If theatre and travel are linked experiences, then Letoy is also confined to and by home" ("The Politics of Escapism" 144). Letoy characterizes his house several times as a prison (see 3.250) and completes the association when he has Joyless locked in his rooms at the beginning of act five. The physical house into which Letoy draws the Joyless family stands in for the metaphoric "house" or lineage that Letoy wants Diana and her son to rejoin, and it is a very claustrophobic place, which, as I will discuss later, has uneasy affiliations with the plague.

At the same moment that the play assuages Joyless's jealousy by naming Diana Letoy's daughter, it creates a new menace: incest. Letoy's kisses (2.2.73, 3.115), although designed to provoke Joyless, take on another nuance, as does his rhetoric of seduction in 5.2. Moreover, unaware of the relationship between them, Diana clearly expresses an attraction for Letoy, saying early in the play, "I love this plain lord better than / All the brave, gallant ones that e'er I dreamt on" (2.2.176-7). Even after Truelock confirms Letoy's assertion, Barbara mocks Letoy, saying, "Daughter! That's the true trick / Of all old whoremasters, to call their wenches / Daughters" (5.2.274-6). Neither of

the two names, “wenches” or “daughters,” is finally erased, leaving them side-by-side in problematic fashion. In this respect, *The Antipodes* shares the implied threat of incest that marks Gower’s epilogue in *Pericles*. Together, the parallels between the closed system suggested by Letoy’s relationship with his daughter and the closed system of theatre he has established in his house, one that is perpetually regressive and, one could say, incestuous, threaten to undermine the play’s comic resolution.

Barren Authority, Begotten Texts: Applying procreative language to writing

The problem of literary origins, parentage, and authority is worked out in *The Antipodes* through an obsession with the language of childbearing as it relates to travel and to writing. The play’s comic center is Peregrine’s failure to have sex with his wife Martha even after three years of marriage. His neglect is extremely problematic given that the central source of resolution in comedy is marriage or childbearing for the establishment of a family line. Because comedic resolution is confirmed through marriage and the promise of regeneration, Peregrine must be “cured” to assure the possibility of this conclusion. In this respect, he belongs to an earlier tradition of neglectful rulers like Marlowe’s *Edward II* (see 1.2.3-32, 47-55) and Shakespeare’s Prospero (see *Tmp.* 1.2.75, 88), and neglectful husbands like Bertram (see *AWW* 2.3.272-3) and Othello. In each of these cases, especially the last two, travel is either a means or a cause of this neglect. In a famous example, as mentioned in chapter one, Othello’s travel narratives both render him “other” and bind him to Desdemona and to the text. Othello and Desdemona’s marriage is an example of the conflicted relationship between sexuality and extensive travel. When Othello is called to war with the Turks, he says in support of Desdemona’s plea to go with him, “I therefor beg it not / To please the palate of my

appetite, / Nor to comply with heat...But to be free and bounteous to her mind” (2.1.264-6, 268). His vow relies on his ability to disambiguate the corporeal from the mental in order to facilitate his military campaign, but it echoes one of the notorious problems of *Othello*, the question of consummation. Although Othello and Desdemona exit before his battle against the Turks with him stating, “I have but an hour / Of love, of worldly matters and direction, / To spend with thee” (302-3), when they are reunited in Cyprus, he calls her to bed with the claim, “The purchase made, the fruits are to ensue; / That profit’s yet to come ‘tween me and you” (2.3.9-11), suggesting that the marriage has yet to be consummated. On the level of content, *The Antipodes* follows in this tradition, in that the main conflict is that excessive travel—physical in *Othello*, cognitive in *The Antipodes*—begets neglect, not children.

The play is rife with the language of begetting, fullness, bearing, and generation. In the first thirty lines of the opening act, Blaze compares Joyless’s long absence from the city to the “forced abstinence from the sight of friends, / The sweetlier filled with joy” (1.1.8-9). Their coming ends a period of barrenness by impregnating the Londoners with joy. He also describes Doctor Hughball’s skills as a physician as “medicine of the mind, which he infuses / So skillfully, yet by familiar ways, / That it begets both wonder and delight” (24-6). These lines establish the play’s underlying moral: to be socially and mentally healthy is to be full in the sense of pregnancy; to be unhealthy is to be barren.⁷⁶ Because the play establishes this principle before introducing Peregrine and Martha and their failure to produce children, the implication is that the couple is representative in

⁷⁶ Here, too, the play adheres to Platonic ideals of love. Eryximachus, a doctor, says in *The Symposium*, “Medicine, in essence, is knowledge of the forms of bodily love as regards filling and emptying...The good practitioner can bring about changes, so that the body acquires one type of love instead of the other” (186c-d, 19).

miniature of a larger social or theatrical illness. By tracing the images of pregnancy in the language of the play, I will argue that childbearing becomes a metaphor for the same issues of stifled creativity and inheritance I have identified in the play's structure, problems closely linked to the use of travel as a model for narrative authority. By moving the effects of travel into the bodies of subjects, this play is comments on the transposition of travel narratives from explications on that which is foreign to England to metaphors used to explain and navigate domestic spaces, as seen in *The English Traveller*.

The language of pregnancy is consistent with contemporary medical discourse about the imagination and the importance of purgation. According to David Hoeniger in *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*, a Galenic understanding of the brain located the power of imagination in the inner of two membranes between the skull and the brain, the *pia mater*. The *pia mater* was represented in discourse as “a womb that nourishes poetic invention” (151). However, this physical understanding of the imagination meant that, “Not only could the phantasy or imagination run wild, but images could also become stuck in it under the influence of some strong desire or passion” (159). Both Peregrine and Young Geraldine suffer from a mental blockage that prevents them from fulfilling their proper roles. One of *The Antipodes*'s clearest demonstrations of the connection between pregnancy and the imagination is in the play's punning on the similarity between the words “travel” and “travail,” with the association of labor.⁷⁷ In act

⁷⁷ A similar ambiguity is at play in Bacon's essay “Of Travel.” Bacon writes, “He that *travaileth* into a Country, before he hath some Entrance into the Language, goeth to *Schoole*, and not to *Travaile*. That Young Men *travaile* under some Tutor, or grave Servant, I allow well; So that he be such a one, that hath the Language” (reprinted in Hadfield 33). Bacon's commentary draws on the overlap between the words “travel”—“to journey”—and “travail”—French for “to work,” which was used in English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to mean “put to work” but also to refer to a woman's labor in childbearing (see “Travel, n.” and “Travail, n.1.”). Thus, “he that *travaileth*” (journeys) into a Country “goeth to *Schoole*, and not to *Travaile*” (labor). The interplay of the words draw attention to the work of translation a traveler must undertake before he can pass on, or give birth to, his newly acquired knowledge.

one, Barbara brings news that Peregrine is “in travail” (1.1.175), pronounced “travel,” implying that he is in labor and unable to give birth. Elsewhere, the doctor applies the same terminology to Joyless and Diana, saying, “I know the grief / You both do labour with, and how to cure it” (1.3.51-2). Because the use of pregnant language is applied to Peregrine and Joyless as well as Diana and Martha, the play transfers the literal problem of childbearing to a problem of barrenness on the level of textual or narrative production.⁷⁸ In his obsession with travel, Peregrine consumes, takes inside of himself, the contents of Mandeville. As Matthew Goldie points out in *The Idea of the Antipodes*, describing the changing uses of this metaphorical space, “It is not so much that the ill man, the doctor, and the other characters hold the *Book* or know Mandeville. Rather, antipodean creatures and features possess and inhabit the sick man” (71). This image creates a parallel between Peregrine and Young Geraldine, whose reluctance to narrate leads Wincott to describe him as, “Most pregnant in his answer” (*English Traveller* 1.1.147), implying a non-productive act of withholding that keeps Geraldine from usefully contributing to London society out of the knowledge he gained abroad.

The language of procreation also aligns with contemporary philosophical discourses of poetic invention. Charles Carlton, in his biography of Charles I, claims that both Henrietta Maria and Charles espoused a platonic view of love and made it the basis of their courtly interactions (130). As a result, in early modern writings, the attribution of a metaphorical womb to the father, as Suzanne Penuel claims in “Male Mothering and *The Tempest*,” is most often associated with the poet as a symbol for the imagination

⁷⁸ Notably, male pregnancy is also a characteristic of Anti-London. In 1.3, Diana says, “Why then, the women / Do get the men with child, and put the poor fools / To grievous pain, I warrant you, in bearing” (1.3.133-5).

(126).⁷⁹ The Platonic ideal underlying this metaphor is that, “All human beings are pregnant in body and mind” (*Symposium* 206c, 43), but that for men, the higher form of love is a pregnancy of the mind, which gives birth to “many beautiful and magnificent discourses and ideas” (210d, 48). Peregrine’s failure as a husband and son is a failure to author or beget a child, but his failure is also demonstrated in his reluctance or inability to beget text.

When Peregrine awakes from his drugged sleep and the doctor informs him that they have reached the antipodes, Peregrine expresses anxiety about his failure to record his journey, demonstrating his familiarity with Francis Bacon’s “Of Travel,” which instructs, “in *Land-Travile*, wherein so much is to be observed, for the most part, they omit it; As if Chance, were fitter to be registred, then Observation. Let Diaries therefore be brought in use” (Hadfield, *Amazons* 34). If this is one of the primary duties of the traveler, Peregrine is aware that he has failed to fulfill it. He says,

What worlds of lands and seas have I passed over,
Neglecting to set down my observations!
A thousand things remarkable
Have slipped my memory, as if all had been
Mere shadowy phantasms, or fantastic dreams. (2.2.7-11)

Although Peregrine has barely begun his “journey,” the first evidence of his cure is already apparent. In act one, Martha laments that Peregrine “put dreams into me, but / He ne’er put child, nor anything towards it yet / To me to making” (1.2.238-40). The shared language of dreams equates Peregrine’s neglected traveler’s diary with the child he has

⁷⁹ See Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater* (University of Chicago, 1995).

failed to beget, and it demonstrates his growing recognition of his own responsibility to generate a lineage, be it human or textual.⁸⁰ He reads Mandeville, but does not himself travel. As a result, neither he nor his wife can beget anything other than dreams and fancies, which are ephemeral and non-regenerative.

The fantastic progeny begotten by mental travelers is repeatedly described in the language of dreaming. Martha calls Peregrine's assertion that she has three sons a "dream" if "the poor mother never know nor feel" the birth (1.2.234). Both Barbara and Martha repeat the language of impregnation, suggesting that all Peregrine has put into Martha is a dream rather than the progeny it is his duty—as a husband in a comedy—to produce. Peregrine's early dreams are described as poor substitutes for children. In this respect, they draw from the classical tradition of predictive, rather than monitory dreaming. This tradition includes riddles, oracles, and other predictions of the future that are dangerous because of the ambiguity of their promises (Garber 1-2). The language of dreaming associated with his cure, by contrast, comes from another understanding of dreams in which, according to Marjorie Garber's *Dream in Shakespeare*, "the dreamer, reversing the pattern of the monitory apparition, has come to the dream figures, and enters for a moment the transforming world of the dream, from which he will return greatly changed" (4). The scenes of Anti-London that Hughball and Letoy place before Peregrine are physical manifestations of the dreams with which Mandeville has impregnated him, as he acknowledges in act four when he exclaims, "Sure these are dreams, / Nothing but dreams" (4.158-9). This latter type of dream is associated with metamorphosis. The play's resolution carries through this language, as Barbara relates that Martha and

⁸⁰ That this realization comes in response to textual duties shows, apparently, that he takes his responsibility as a traveler more seriously than he takes his husbandly duty.

Peregrine have been cured, “And all their melancholy and his travels passed, / And but supposed their dreams” (5.268-9).

Part of the problem is, as Sanders argues in “The Politics of Escapism,” that “oppressive patriarchal control” by Joyless has kept Peregrine from fulfilling his desire to travel (145). Part, however, is his own infertility as an author, which is in turn traceable to his reliance on Mandeville. In an early part of the play, when the doctor interrupts Peregrine’s lengthy description of Mandeville’s discoveries of “monsters more, as numerous as nameless,” Peregrine’s reliance on Mandeville’s textual authority is a constant refrain in the subsequent exchange:

Doctor Stay there—

Peregrine Read here else. Can you read?

Is it not true?

Doctor No truer than I ha’ seen’t. (1.3.40-2)

A few lines later, Peregrine inserts, “Read here again then: it is written here” (1.3.45). To Hughball’s invocation of eyewitness testimony, Peregrine consistently returns to weigh it against his authoritative text. Only when the doctor begins to speak the language of Mandeville (1.3.59) does Peregrine consent to his narration (1.3.62). Fixation on Mandeville has prevented Peregrine from fathering a child, both literally and figuratively in terms of text. The motif of impotence due to reliance on an outmoded and fantastical text also applies to the challenge of balancing theatrical invention and convention.

The cure on both fronts, as Barbara describes it, is for Doctor Hughball to,

...play the man-midwife and deliver [Peregrine]

Of his huge tympany of news—of monsters,

Pygmies and giants, apes and elephants,
Griffins and crocodiles, men upon women,
And women upon men. (1.1.177-81)

Hughball's cure is in effect to stimulate Peregrine's imaginative powers by giving him a theatrical space to populate. In "'Smock Secrets': Birth and Women's Mysteries on the Early Modern Stage", Janelle Jenstad compares theatrical creation to childbirth, using Jonson's *The Magnetic Lady* as an example. She writes, "The secrets of laboring women are comparable to the secrets of playmaking. The tiring house is the space where the off-stage birth is imagined to take place, but it is also the womb where new characters are born, a protean imaginative space" (97). If Peregrine has been impregnated with Mandeville's writings, the doctor's cure is to purge him of those writings by symbolically "delivering" them and placing them before Peregrine in the form of a play, an alternative form of text. Hughball creates a series of scenes so contrary to Peregrine's notions of normality and propriety that he is forced to intervene. When Peregrine does act to restore order, he begins to generate his own narrative and is subsequently able to consummate his marriage as well. What is particularly intriguing about the doctor's cure is that the blank space Peregrine is given is not a book but the stage. If Mandeville's text produces a kind of constipation or impotence, the implication is that performance has a liberating effect.

Initially, Peregrine enters Anti-London as a passive observer. He has never before seen a play (2.1.112-3), so he must rely Hughball's guidance as the sort of instructor recommended by Bacon, who wrote in "Of Travel," "That Young Men travaile under some Tutor, or grave Servant, I allow well; So that he be such a one, that hath the

Language, and hath been in the Country before, whereby he may be able to tell them, what Things are worthy to be seene” (Hadfield, *Amazons* 33). Hughball must direct Peregrine’s gaze to “see one of the natives of this country. / Note his attire, his language, and behaviour” (2.2.47-8). Peregrine is largely silent throughout the first act of the byplay, with the exception of a few questions (2.2.163, 201, 205). Only at the end of the scene does he express a desire to alter the proceedings, and when he does so it is in the form of a request: “Yet give me, as a stranger, leave to beg / [The scholars’] liberty this day” (2.2.217-8). His interventions are encouraged by the character Byplay, who says, “’Tis our custom / To deny strangers nothing” (2.2.253-4). In act three, Peregrine and Hughball do not even enter until three hundred and fifty lines in, and when Peregrine speaks, it is to affirm the proceedings passively (3.378, 485). In order to engage him in the events of the byplay, Byplay must invite him to take control of the action: “Accept one of our hall feasts, and a freedom, / And freely use our purse for what great sums / Your majesty will please” (3.502-4). After this point, Peregrine begins to assert the authority he has been given and to interject more frequently as he shapes the events of the byplay to his own invention. His interjections disrupt the scripted text and create his own, requiring the players to turn to extemporaneity. In act four, one of the players complains to Hughball, “He puts me out; my part is now / To bribe the constable” (4.106-7), and later in the act, Letoy exclaims, “We now / Give over the play, and do all by extempore” (4.399-400). Peregrine’s assumption of narrative authority leads to his reunion and consummation with Martha.

The erosion of the scripted play has been interpreted by some as the breakdown of Letoy’s autarchical authority. Hsiao-chen Chiang, in “Metadramatic Inner Play,” claims

that the byplay is ultimately destroyed by metadramatic intrusions from Peregrine, Joyless, and others. He writes, “Peregrine’s constant intrusion in the inner play forces Letoy to direct an impromptu show instead of a planned play...eventually forcing Letoy to give up his ‘fair play’” (66-7). Although Peregrine’s interjections turn away from the original script of the play as written by Letoy, Chiang’s argument fails to acknowledge, first, that Letoy continues to direct the play, and in fact does so more actively after Peregrine intrudes, and second, that Peregrine’s intrusions still fall under Doctor Hughball’s overarching plan for his cure (see 2.1.27-ff. and 4.108). When Byplay brings the news that Peregrine has ransacked the actors’ properties and proclaimed himself King of the Antipodes, Letoy responds, “Let him enjoy his fancy,” (3.318) and Byplay adds, “Doctor Hughball / Hath soothed him in’t, so that nothing can / Be said against it” (318-20). Letoy affirms that this turn of events falls under the authority of the doctor’s cure, saying, “I see th’event already, by the aim / The doctor takes” (325-6). His words emphasize the doctor’s control over the situation and re-subsume Peregrine’s insurrection into the trajectory of the cure. Furthermore, the “extemporaneity” that Peregrine initiates is in fact still contained within the script of a play—Brome’s play—so if the move toward extemporaneous acting seems to promote free play over authoritative control, it can do so finally only in an ironic way.

Creative Consummation: Demystifying theatrical authority

Understanding the play of authority in *The Antipodes*’s conclusion requires going beyond the paradigm of disease and cure on which most critics have centered their readings of the play. Donaldson’s early work on the play highlights the widening “circles of madness and eccentricity” (89) in the play that extend from Peregrine to Martha,

Joyless, Diana, and Letoy. Charlotte Spivack focuses on the psychological dimensions of disease by emphasizing the dialogue between *The Antipodes* and contemporary texts like Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), which delineates six types and causes of melancholy and which is a probable source for elements in Brome's play (Spivack 200-3). One of the most prominent disease models is based on historical associations with the plague. Matthew Steggle explains the play's obsession with disease and the language of cure by pointing out the impact of the plague on London theatre-goers (114-5). In *Plague Writing*, Ernest Gilman examines textual representations of the plague, especially the outbreaks in 1603 and 1625. In the face of the plague outbreak that had closed London theatres in 1636, about the time Brome was writing *The Antipodes*, disease metaphors were particularly relevant for audiences who had only recently returned to the city. Gilman argues that narratives like More's *Utopia* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* respond to the plague by proposing new beginnings, free of infection. *The Antipodes*, by withdrawing out of the city to Letoy's house and emphasizing not London, but Anti-London, seems to belong to this tradition.

Because domestic quarantine was "one of the few weapons available to public health authorities" (Gilman 36), the insularity of Letoy's mansion has an ominous quality, particularly in Joyless's classification of the house as a prison at the end of act four, when he asks Letoy, "Sure your lordship / Means not to make your house our prison?" (4.537-8).⁸¹ In the context of plague writing, interiority carries the additional threat of disease and contamination. Theaters were a prominent scapegoat both as a result of how quickly their packed conditions spread airborne infection and because of the moral censure they

⁸¹ As discussed in chapter two, the disease association also applies to *The English Traveller*, which was performed shortly after the 1625 outbreak of the plague, when Reignald urges the rioters into the house and promises to "make / That prison of your fears your sanctuary" (2.2.66-7).

received from individuals like William Prynne, who, in the dedicatory epistle of *Histriomastix* (1633) called actors, “no other, as the *Fathers* phrase them, but *the very plagues and poysons of mens mindes and soules*” (3v). *The Antipodes* counters the traditional association of theaters with disease by using theatricality to cure Peregrine’s mental infection. Furthermore, Hughball says Peregrine has avoided “the calenture” by not remaining awake to write. Parr’s footnote identifies calenture as a “‘pestilent ague’ experienced by sailors in the tropics.” Thus, cognitive travel (the reality behind Peregrine’s escape of disease) eliminates the physical dangers intrinsic to travel. In the upside-down world of *The Antipodes*, metaphorical travel is the cure rather than the cause of physical illness.

However, contrary to the neat and straightforward interpretation posited by circular models of disease and cure, the play actively refuses to participate in total restoration, as its final scenes show. In order for an inset play to demonstrate the restorative effects of theater, it must have closure, and the byplay in *The Antipodes* is never finally consummated in this manner. The final scenes of the play blur the boundaries between the byplay and the play proper, and because it bleeds into the larger play, the byplay cannot be said to “end” in a definitive manner. Furthermore, the layers of the play turn the same challenge of distinguishing play from reality back upon the viewer or reader. When Martha and Peregrine leave the stage in act four to consummate their marriage, the stage direction reads, “*Exeunt in state as LETOY directs. LETOY remains on-stage, gesticulating*” (Parr 304). Diana remarks from above, “See, my lord now is acting by himself” (4.476), and Letoy then proceeds to call Joyless and Diana down from their position of observation so that he can instruct them in what they have just seen. He

proceeds smoothly from directing the actors in the byplay to directing Diana and Joyless, thus blurring the distinction between byplay and action. What is more, Peregrine and Martha's sojourn in the antipodes is not formally closed at this point. Letoy tells Diana and Joyless, "the youth / Will give her royal satisfaction, / Now, in this kingly humour" (4.528-30). However, the subsequent scene at the opening of act five abandons the incomplete byplay and moves directly into the subplot with Diana and Joyless, which Letoy manipulates and directs in another informal byplay.

Letoy's scheming makes it difficult for all involved to separate illusion from reality, as seen in the staged scene between Diana and Letoy, which initially convinces Joyless of Diana's chastity. Joyless thanks Letoy, saying,

My lord, you have cured my jealousy, I thank you;

And more, your man for the discovery;

But most the constant means, my virtuous wife,

Your medicine, my sweet lord. (5.2.133-6)

Although he uses the language of cure, the resolution is not complete or final: a few lines later, having learned that the encounter between Diana and Letoy was staged for his benefit, Joyless doubts its veracity, recognizing the ability for performance to mislead. His recognition is aided by the fact that he has just seen a similar technique employed by Letoy and Hughball in the main byplay. He exclaims, "Why may not this be then a counterfeit action, / Or a false mist to blind me with more error? / The ill I feared may have been done before" (5.2.146-8). Because Joyless has been in the audience of one staged performance, he no longer trusts that what he is seeing now is genuine.⁸² This

⁸² *Pericles* also treats performance with suspicion through Gower's claim that the dumb show of Cleon and Dionyza's grief is "borrowed passion" that "stands in for true-owed woe" (18.23-24).

effect renders theatrical reparation problematic, because in order for the cure to be completed, the physician must lift the illusion by which it was accomplished, and when that happens, it is possible that the patient will see not just the cure but the curer as deceitful and will “fall back again,” as Diana says of Joyless and the doctor echoes with respect to Peregrine (5.2.320).

The same doubt about where theatrical illusion ends is transferred to the audience in the latter part of this scene. A few lines after Joyless’s regression, Letoy exonerates himself with the revelation that he is in fact Diana’s father; but as mentioned earlier, when Barbara re-enters, she calls into question Letoy’s honesty by reiterating Blaze’s earlier insinuation that Letoy has already cuckolded him (see 1.1.83). Barbara repeats her charge during the masque when she compares her husband to Jealousy, “with one horn and ass ear upon his head” (5.2.333), signifying a threat of cuckoldry, and Letoy silences her. Instead of providing further proof that he is telling the truth and that the imaginative work is finished, the play shifts to a masque, adding another layer of illusion and attempting, through an older form of drama, to give closure to a play that stubbornly refuses it.

Ultimately, the play rejects the finality of a cyclical model of restoration and proposes instead a progressive model based on the invention and re-creation Sidney advocated in his *Defence*. In order for Peregrine to consummate his marriage with Martha, it is not enough for him to play out his reservations in Anti-London and then “return” to the real London to meet his bride; Martha must enter the world of Anti-London and be remade and presented to him as a queen. When Peregrine protests, “I have a wife already” (4.446), the doctor reassures him, “No, you had, sir; / But she’s deceased” (446-7).

Peregrine accepts the doctor's assurances and proceeds to kiss Martha. Rather than the illusion being instrumental in restoring the relationship between the original husband and wife, the original wife "dies" in order to animate the illusion, thus allowing the illusion to proceed unbroken while the original coupling dissolves. Likewise, Peregrine must be remade. When she meets Peregrine, Martha misrecognizes him and initially rejects him on the grounds that he is "so like my husband, if you note him, / That I shall lose time and wishes by him. / No, no, I'll none of him" (451-2). As she vacillates whether or not to accept Peregrine, she does so under the impression that the man she faces is not the one she married. Again, the illusion outlasts the reality. The implication of the play's rhetoric is that resolution does not come from closure and restoration (the cyclical model), but rather from extemporaneity and remaking (the dialectic model).

By contrast, the structure of the play affirms traditional models of authority and closure. When Peregrine returns after having been fully informed about the doctor's cure, his subsequent speech, like earlier theatrical epilogues, reserves final interpretation and judgment for his audience, who must decide what exactly they have witnessed:

I am what you are pleased to make me; but
Withal so ignorant of mine own condition—
Whether I sleep, or wake, or talk, or dream;
Whether I be, or be not; or if I am,
Whether I do, or do not anything.
For I have had (if now I wake) such dreams,
And been so far transported in a long
And tedious voyage of sleep, that I may fear

My manners can acquire no welcome where

Men understand themselves. (5.2.307-16)

With its anaphoric presentation of contraries, Peregrine's speech avoids closure, and his statement, "I am what you are pleased to make me," identifies his "cure" not as restoration but as re-creation in as-yet unscripted form. However, in terms of theatrical convention, this speech of the play makes closure possible. Goldie compares Peregrine's words to Prospero's epilogue in *The Tempest* (80), but the echo is closer to Puck's in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: "Think but this, and all is mended, / That you have but slumbered here / While these visions did appear" (5.1.419-21). To return to Weimann's explanation of theatrical epilogues as particularly liminal moments (see chapter one), it is necessary for the sleeper to wake and the narrator's authority to pass to the audience in order to fulfill the "contractual relationship between playhouse and spectators" (*Author's Pen* 217). In *The Antipodes*, because the byplay creates a doubling effect and produces a secondary audience, this is a two-step process. First, Peregrine's speech hands authority of interpretation to the audience of the inset play, especially Letoy and Hughball. Second, the epilogue of *The Antipodes* completes the traditional passing on of authority when Hughball cedes to the audience the authority to determine Peregrine's fate:

Whether my cure be perfect yet or no

It lies not in my doctorship to know.

Your approbation may more raise the man

Than all the College of Physicians can (5.2.379-82)

Although the doctor's words admit to incomplete knowledge and thus a need for ongoing remaking, his cession of authority to the audience ends the play. This is part of the play's

ultimate irony: although Hughball and Letoy claim that artistic extemporaneity and openness is the key to Peregrine's restoration, the structure of the play belies their rhetoric because its regressive structure (the play-within-a-play-within-a-play, etc.) and reliance on older forms prevents the kind of progression and invention its language promotes.

This paradox is related to the distinctions I have been making throughout this project between prose travel narratives, which claim to show only the *product* of competitions for authority, and theatrical performances, which show the *process* of acquiring and maintaining authority. Brome's play demonstrates the final deception of the theater's promise to offer privileged access to this kind of information. Although *The Antipodes* pretends to show the process of preparing a play and the disintegration of a scripted play into extemporaneity, what the audience actually sees performed is a product, not a process. The extemporaneity in *The Antipodes* may not be in Letoy's text, but it is in Brome's, and while one of the allures of a play like *The Antipodes* is that it purports to show what happens "backstage" in the theater company's preparations, the preeminent example of this audience intrusion, the description of Peregrine's revels in the tiring-house (3.288-317), is not shown, but rather narrated by Byplay. Although the catalogue of stage properties creates an illusion of access, the audience is never allowed into this restricted space. Likewise, when Blaze and Barbara reunite after the inset play is over, he calls her to "Come in and help me on with't in our tiring-house...And thou shalt then see all our things, and all / Our properties, and practice to the music" (5.2.123, 125-6). They exit, and the distinctly sexual overtones of his offer reinforce the idea that this is a private

space.⁸³ Although a “tiring-house” literally refers to the room at the back of the platform where actors changed costumes (Gurr, *Shakespearean* 1), the tiring-house is also linked metaphorically to other liminal or inaccessible spaces.⁸⁴ A 1630 poem by Francis Quarles says “Those secret Rooms / Wherein we tire us, are our mothers’ wombs” (qtd. in Gurr, *Playgoing* 285). In 1678, R. Cudworth writes in *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*, “Dying, to the Rational or Humane Soul, is nothing but a withdrawing into the Tiring-house, and putting off the Clothing of this Terrestrial Body” (“tiring-house, n.”). In the trope of the *theatrum mundi*, the tiring house represents the liminal space of birth as well as death. The tiring-house is a space of transition: for the actor, between roles; for the human, between birth and life and life and death. For this reason, like travel in the earlier plays, it cannot be represented except in allusion or metaphor. Just as Letoy’s byplay offers Peregrine access to the unknowable and inaccessible—the world of travel—Brome’s play offers its audience access to the process of making plays. In both cases, however, representations of the “unknowable” turn out to be nothing more than theatrical illusions.

⁸³ Ironically, the permeability of this private space was a source of controversy in the Restoration when audience members gained access to not only actresses’ dressing rooms, but also their bodies (see Katharine Eisaman Maus, “‘Playhouse Flesh and Blood’: Sexual Ideology and the Restoration Actress,” *ELH* 46.4 (1979): 595-617).

⁸⁴ The element of mystery associated with the room may have been enhanced by the sixteenth-century practice of having musicians play “within” the tiring-house (Gurr, *Shakespearean* 148); however, in seventeenth-century private theatres, musicians generally played in the gallery or on stage between acts.

CONCLUSION

Least Travellers may be greatest writers—Even I, which have written so much of travellers and travels, never travelled 200 miles from Thaxted in Essex where I was borne.

It is not the fable or falsehood which wee seeke in fabulous Antiquities, but that truth which lieth buried under poetically rubbish. For nothing but nothing can rise of nothing. Some truth therefore gave occasion to those fables.

--Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimes*

Earlier, in reference to Foucault's definition of heterotopias in "Different Spaces," I said that theater has the potential to be both satirical and escapist: a tool for social critique or a pacifier in the face of oppressive authority. Any study of the role of travel in creating and challenging narrative authority on stage must refer back to this larger question about theater's effectiveness as an instrument of critique. To answer that question in full would be a mammoth task; however, in the specific context of the plays and narratives I have analyzed, I want to propose a tentative response. As I have argued with respect to *Pericles*, *The English Traveller*, and *The Antipodes*, representations of travel on stage in the first half of the seventeenth century shift from the presentation of travel as morally instructive fact (*Pericles*) to a blend of factual and metaphorical travel that mocks the traveler but affirms the status he gains (*The English Traveller*) to metaphorical travel that is shown to be illusion and a problematic source of narrative authority (*The Antipodes*). The progression visible in these three plays also appears in modified form in prose travel narratives of the seventeenth century, and it is to these that I want to return as a gateway to the larger issues with which this project engages.

Although they share a common name, the 1625 collection *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes* differs greatly in tone from Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations*. Hakluyt pledges in the preface to the first edition of *Navigations* to record word-for-word "whatsoever testimonie I have found in any authour of authoritie appertaining to my argument" (1:6), while Samuel Purchas openly calls his text a product of his own invention, "having out of a Chaos of confused intelligences framed this Historicall World" (Epistle Dedicatorie, 1:xxxvii). In the prefatory remarks "To the Reader," he describes his project as compiled "not by one professing Methodically to deliver the Historie of Nature according to the rules of Art, nor Philosophically to discuss and dispute; but as in way of Discourse, by each Traveller relating what in that kind he hath seene" (1:xl). Not only has the text been "framed" by Purchas's editorial intervention, but each of the accounts it contains is shaped by the individual travelers' viewpoints. Purchas's text is a compendium of disparate narratives shaped into a whole greater than the sum of its parts.

Hakluyt, by contrast, speaks in the language of reconstituting what was once a unified whole. In the preface to the second edition of his tome, he promises to "incorporate into one body the torne and scattered limes of our ancient and late Navigations by Sea, our voyages by land, and traffiques of merchandise by both" (1:19). His description of the text as a broken body assumes that the body was once whole and that he is merely rebuilding it. In addition, when Hakluyt speaks of his labor "in bringing these rawe fruits unto this ripeness" (1:12), he casts himself as a caretaker over a natural rather than an artificial process, whereas Purchas acknowledges his role to be that of a creator, not just a guardian: "I was therein a Labourer also, both to get them (not without hard conditions) and to forme and frame those Materials to their due place and order in

this Ædifice, the whole Artifice (such as it is) being mine owne” (1:xli). His choice of the word “artifice,” reinforced by the parenthetical remark “such as it is,” exemplifies what sets his collection apart: in the developing double sense of the word, he acknowledges his text to be both a product of human skill and a deceptive trick when it claims to provide knowledge about the world (“Artifice, n.”). Thus, the span of more than thirty years that separates the first edition of Hakluyt’s collection (1589) from the first edition of Purchas’s (1625) sees a shift in textual representations of travel from a series of factual accounts that form a unified whole, in which Hakluyt “refer[s] every voyage to his Author, which both in person hath performed and in writing hath left the same” (1:6), to a hybrid narrative that blends Bacchus, Osiris, Aeneas, Alexander, and Saint Paul with Edward Terry and Thomas Roe and draws no clear distinction in value between the factual and the fictional. Instead, as quoted above, Purchas claims that fabulous antiquities, even—or perhaps especially—those that admit to being fictitious, are equally capable of containing truth.

The difference between Hakluyt’s and Purchas’s ways of (re)presenting the world resembles, on the level of metaphoric language, the difference between a prose travel narrative and a travel play. A prose narrative may claim to represent a pre-existing body of information about travel encounters and experiences because its acts of mediation are muted and concealed in language. A travel narrative can make a claim about Virginia that is read by someone in England by virtue of the fact that it was written while the traveler was in the Americas. A text can compare “England” and “the Indies” without seeming to disrupt a stable reality because it merely names, it does not exhibit those locations. By contrast, in a travel play, an actor who is physically present before the audience fills the

gaps between the traveler, his encounters, the text he writes about his encounters, and his persona within that text; moreover, especially before the age of prospective scenery, Pentapolis, London, and Anti-London are all staged in the same physical space.

The effect is to reveal what the text conceals: that the traveler's image of his travels, and his authority, is equal parts construction and illusion. One of the potential implications of this research is that scholars might examine travel narratives not just to discover the theater's source material, which presupposes that drama and narrative are linked only thematically, but also to discover what travel plays reveal that the increasingly metaphoric language in travel narratives obscures. As the movement of travel toward metaphor in later plays like *The Antipodes* suggests, when travel becomes more deeply embedded in metaphor, as both the vehicle and the tenor, the authority structures that travel upholds also become more ingrained in language and thus harder to identify or contest. Because theatrical texts sever the layers of authority that prose narratives conflate, they reveal the artificiality of the traveler's claim that he has the authority to narrate the lives of those he encounters.

This statement seems to imply that when it comes to early modern travel writing, theater and prose are irrevocably divergent, but on a fundamental level, the function that obscures illusion in prose narratives is the same function that reveals it in theatrical texts. Although travel accounts pretend to be exceptional based on the singularity of each traveler, their layered metaphors reveal instead the system of translations, interpretations, and expectations that have accrued from earlier texts. With a prose text, the traces are easier to ignore, because reading is a solitary activity and each copy of a text is physically self-contained. Theatrical performances are likewise imbued with traces, but they are

marked physically. In place of a traveler's claim to univocal authority, theatergoers face the plurality that comes from seeing in the same playing space within a single year *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, and *Pericles*, or watching "Tamburlaine" play Barabbas and "Lear" in the role of Othello.⁸⁵ This process of accretion leaves a mark on all subsequent performances as well as on the actor himself, as Richard Corbet's 1618 poem "Iter Boreale" demonstrates. The subject of the poem "mistook a player for a King. / For when he would have sayd, King Richard dyed, / And call'd – A horse! a horse! – he, Burbidge cry'de" (qtd. in Gurr, *Playgoing* 278). The slippage Corbet identifies between Burbage and King Richard is an example of the traces that performance leaves on the performer and in the memory of the public viewing it. Such traces prevent a play from claiming to be a self-contained (authoritative) whole.

As I have noted in each chapter, but especially with respect to the chorus and the epilogue, in order for the liminality of the playhouse to function, for imagination to transport the audience to distant and fantastic places, theater relies on the cooperation and participation of the audience. For this reason, when a play calls attention to the illusory nature of narrative authority, it creates, however temporarily, a climate of extreme volatility. Looking back in 1654 on an earlier theatrical moment, Edmund Gayton, Esq. writes in his *Pleasant notes upon Don Quixot*,

I have known upon one of these *Festivals*, but especially at *Shrove-tide*, where the Players have been appointed, notwithstanding their bills to the contrary, to act what the major part of the company had a mind to; sometimes *Tamerlane*, sometimes *Iugurth*, sometimes the Jew of *Malta*, and sometimes parts of all these,

⁸⁵ Alleyne and Burbage respectively.

and at last, none of the three taking, they were forc'd to undresse and put off their Tragick habits, and conclude the day with the merry milk-maides....*Fowler*, nor *Andrew Cane* could pacifie;⁸⁶ Prologues nor Epilogues would prevaile; (271)

Collectively, the audience can refuse to grant the play authority to close by choosing to see the events on stage not in terms of a prescribed unity, but in terms of a fundamental multiplicity. The playgoers' access to the possibility of other performances undermines the authority of the theatrical illusion. Their seizure of authority in this scene is both like and unlike Peregrine's in *The Antipodes*. Peregrine's revolt is managed by Letoy's (and Brome's) authorial control, and it reinforces the value of theatrical illusion, whereas this incident shows the fragility of the theater's claim to stability.

One final example highlights why this characteristic of the theater is both advantageous and problematic in terms of its potential to challenge authority. In "To Mr. Alexander Goughe" from *The Queene* (1653), R.C. questions the ban on theatrical performances during the Interregnum. He asks, "Is it unlawfull since the stage is down / To make the press act: where no ladies swoone...the guiltless presse / Weares its own innocent garments: its owne dresse" (qtd. in Randall 1). The press, which does not require a face-to-face encounter between subject and audience, escapes the stigmata of licentiousness and disorder applied to theaters. As I have suggested, print narratives are not free of traces challenging their unity and underlying claims to authority. However, in this instance, print narratives' "innocent garments" permit them to retain authorization despite censorship,⁸⁷ while the theaters are ordered, ironically enough, to close.

⁸⁶ Gurr identifies Richard Fowler as a tragedian known for his role as Tamburlaine and other "conquering parts" (*Playgoing* 216-7). Andrew Cane was a quick-witted clown at the Fortune (*Shakespearean* 94).

⁸⁷ See Randall p. 42.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Thomas. *Fiue Sermons Preached Vpon Sundry Especiall Occasions*. London, 1626. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 3 April 2011.
- Alexander, Catherine M.S., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Last Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2009. Print.
- "Aloe, n." Def. 1. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 5 May 2011.
- "Amber, n.1." Def. II.3a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 5 May 2011.
- Andrews, Clarence Edward. *Richard Brome: A Study of His Life and Works*. (1913). Hamden: Archon Books, 1972. Print.
- Anon. *A Pleasant Comedie, Called Wily Begvilde*. London, 1606. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 3 April 2011.
- Archer, John. *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern English Writing*. Stanford: Stanford, 2001. Print.
- "Artifice, n." Defs. 5a, 6b. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 5 May 2011.
- Bacon, Francis. *Essays and New Atlantis*. 3rd ed. London, 1625. Ed. Gordon S. Haight. New York: Walter J. Black, 1942. Print.
- Bakhtin, M[ikhail] M[ikhailovitch]. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U. of Texas, 1981. 259-422. Print.
- Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. New

- York: Cambridge, 2003. Print.
- Barroll, Leeds. "Inventing the Stuart Masque." Bevington and Holbrook 121-43. Print.
- Barton, Anne. "Leontes and the Spider: Language and Speaker in Shakespeare's Last Plays." Ryan 22-42. Print.
- Bevington, David M., ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 6th ed. New York: Pearson, 2009. Print.
- Bevington, David M. and Stuart Holbrook, eds. *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1998. Print.
- Birkett, Audrey. "Actors, Audiences, and Authors: The Competition for Control in Brome's *The Antipodes*." *Divining Thoughts; Future Directions in Shakespeare Studies*. Ed. Peter Orford. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 53-68. Print.
- Bristol, Michael D. *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. New York: Methuen, 1985. Print.
- Brome, Richard. *The Antipodes*. Parr 217-326. Print.
- . *The Antipodes*. Ed. Ann Haaker. *Regents Renaissance Drama Series*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966. Print.
- . *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome Containing Fifteen Comedies Now First Collected in Three Volumes*. 3 vols. London, 1873. Print.
- Bullón-Fernández, María. *Fathers and Daughters in Gower's Confessio Amantis: Authority, Family, State, and Writing*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000. Print.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Ophelia's 'False Steward' Contextualized." *The Review of English Studies* 46.181 (1995): 48-56. Web. 4 April 2011.
- Carlton, Charles. *Charles I: The Personal Monarch*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Print.

“Cassia, n.1.” Def. 1a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 7 April 2011.

Charles I. “By the King, a Declaration of Orders Made by the Governour and Company of Merchants of London, Trading to the East Indies Concerning Priuate trade, to, in, or from the Said Indies, Ratified and Allowed by the King, and by His Maiesties Consent May Bee Printed for the Better Publication Thereof.” London, 1627. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 10 November 2010.

---. “A Declaration of the True Causes Which Moued His Maiestie to Assemble, and After Inforced Him to Dissolue the Two Last Meetings in Parliament.” London, 1626. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 15 November 2010.

---. “By the King. A Proclamation for Calling Home Such of His Majesties Subjects as Are Now Employed Either by Sea, or Land in the Services of the Emperor, the King of Spaine, or the Archduchies.” Oxford, 1625. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 15 November 2010.

Chiang, Hsiao-chen. “The Metadramatic Inner Play in Richard Brome’s *The Antipodes*.” *Zhongshan Wen Ren Xue Bao* 19 (2004): 57-69. Web. 15 March 2011.

---. “The Trope of an Upside-Down World: Carnival and Menippean Satire in Richard Brome’s *The Antipodes*.” *Concentric* 32.2 (2004): 55-72. Web. 15 March 2011.

Clark, Ira. *Professional Playwrights: Massinger, Ford, Shirley, & Brome*. Lexington: Kentucky, 1992. Print.

Cooper, Helen. ““This Worthy Olde Writer”: *Pericles* and Other Gowers, 1592-1640.” *A Companion to Gower*. Ed. Siân Echard. Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2004. 99-113.

Print.

Coryate, Thomas. *The Odcombian Banquet: Dished Foorth by Thomas the Coriat, and Serued in by a Number of Noble Wits in Prayse of His Crudities and Crambe Too*. London, 1611. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 10 October 2010.

Craig, Hugh. "Jonson, the Antimasque and the 'Rules of Flattery.'" Bevington and Holbrook 176-96. Print.

Day, John, William Rowley, and George Wilkins. *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*. Parr 55-134. Print.

De Certeau, Michel. *Culture in the Plural*. Ed. Luce Giard. Trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota, 1997. Print.

Dessen, Alan C. *Shakespeare and the Late Moral Plays*. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska, 1986. Print.

Donaldson, Ian. *The World Upside-Down: Comedy from Jonson to Fielding*. London: Oxford, 1970. Print.

Dymkowski, Christine. "'Ancient [and Modern] Gower': Presenting Shakespeare's *Pericles*." *The Narrator, the Expositor, and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007. 235-264. Web. 3 March 2011.

Eggers, Walter F., Jr. "Shakespeare's Gower and the Role of the Authorial Presenter." *Philological Quarterly* 54 (1975): 434-43. Web. 2 February 2011.

Fletcher, John. *The Island Princess*. Royal Shakespeare Company. London: Nick Hern, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Ed. James D. Faubion. Trans. Robert Hurley. *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. 3 vols. New York: New

- Press, 1998. Print.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Dream in Shakespeare: From Metaphor to Metamorphosis*. New Haven: Yale, 1974. Print.
- Gardiner, Cynthia P. *The Sophoclean Chorus: A Study of Character and Function*. Iowa City: U. of Iowa, 1987. Print.
- Gayton, Edmund. *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*. London, 1654. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 6 April 2011.
- Gibbons, Brian. *Jacobean City Comedy*. 2nd ed. New York: Methuen, 1980. Print.
- Gibbons, Daniel R. "Thomas Heywood in the House of the Wise-Woman." *Studies in English Literature* 49.2 (2009): 391-416. Web. 8 February 2011.
- Giddens, Eugene. "Pericles: The Afterlife." Alexander 173-84. Print.
- Gide, André. *The Journals of André Gide*. 4 vols. Tran. Justin O'Brien. New York: Knopf, 1948. Print.
- Gilman, Ernest B. *Plague Writing in Early Modern England*. Chicago: U. Chicago, 2009. Print.
- Goldie, Matthew Boyd. *The Idea of the Antipodes: Place, People and Voices*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2004. Print.
- . *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1992. Print.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Amazons, Savages and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in*

- English, 1550-1630, an Anthology*. New York: Oxford, 2001. Print.
- . *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625*. New York: Clarendon, 1998. Print.
- Hainsworth, D.R. *Stewards, Lords, and People: The Estate Steward and His World in Later Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1992. Print.
- Hakluyt, Richard. *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America*. London, 1582. *March of America Facsimile Series*. Ann Arbor: U. Microfilms, 1966. Print.
- . *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea or Ouerland, to the Remote & Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth, at Any Time within the Compasse of These 1600 Yeares*. London, 1589. Ed. Ernest Rhys. 6 vols. London: J.M. Dent, 1907. Print.
- Harbage, Alfred. "Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Play Manuscripts." *PMLA* 50.3 (1935): 687-99. Web. 19 March 2011.
- "Harbour, n.1." Defs. 1, 3a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 5 May 2011.
- Heywood, Thomas. *The Brazen Age*. *Dramatic Works* 3:165-256. Print.
- . *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood Now First Collected With Illustrative Notes and A Memoir of the Author in Six Volumes*. 6 vols. London, 1874. Print.
- . *The English Traveller*. London, 1633. *English Drama*. Web. 18 October 2010.
- . *The Golden Age*. *Dramatic Works* 3:1-79. Print.
- . *The Iron Age, parts 1 and 2*. *Dramatic Works* 3:257-431. Print.
- . *The Silver Age*. *Dramatic Works* 3: 81-164. Print.

- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan, Or The Matter, Forme, & Power, of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*. London, 1651. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1904. *Open Library*. Web. 1 April 2011.
- Hodgkins, Christopher. "Stooping to Conquer: Heathen Idolatry and Protestant Humility in the Imperial Legend of Sir Francis Drake." *Studies in Philology* 94.4 (1997): 428-64. Web. 20 March 2011.
- Hoeniger, F. David. "Gower and Shakespeare in Pericles." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33.4 (1982): 461-79. Web. 18 February 2011.
- . *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*. Newark: U. Delaware, 1992. Print.
- Holland, Peter. "'Travelling Hopefully': The Dramatic Form of Journeys in English Renaissance Drama." Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michele Willems, eds. *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1996. 160-78. Print.
- Howard, Clare MacLellen. *English Travellers of the Renaissance*. New York: B. Franklin, 1968. Print.
- Howard, Jean E. *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. Print.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case*. Oxford: Oxford, 2003. Print.
- James I. *Basilikon Doron. Or His Maiesties Instructions to His Dearest Sonne, Henrie the Prince*. London, 1603. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 28 March 2011.
- Jenstad, Janelle. "'Smock-Secrets': Birth and Women's Mysteries on the Early Modern Stage." *Moncrief and McPherson* 87-99. Print.

- Jonson, Ben. *Every Man in His Humour*. London, 1598. *Elizabethan Plays*. Ed. Hazelton Spencer. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933. Print.
- . "Ode (to Himself)." *The Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse*. H. J. C. Grierson and G. Bullough, eds. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934. 179-180. Print.
- Jowitt, Claire. *Voyage Drama and Gender Politics 1589-1642*. Manchester: Manchester, 2003. Print.
- Kamps, Ivo. *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1996. Print.
- Kamps, Ivo and Jyotsna G. Singh. *Travel Knowledge: European "Discoveries" in the Early Modern Period*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. Print.
- Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare After Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U. Pennsylvania, 2002. Print.
- Korte, Barbara. *English Travel Writing from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Explorations*. Tran. Catherine Matthias. New York: St. Martin's, 2000. Print.
- Krueger, Roberta L., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2000. Print.
- Levin, Richard. *The Multiple Plot in English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago: U. Chicago, 1971. Print.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Milton's *Comus* and the Politics of Masquing." Bevington and Holbrook 296-320. Print.
- Loomba, Ania. *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. New York: Oxford, 2002. Print.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Machiavels Discourses. Upon the First Decade of T. Livius*

- Translated out of the Italian; VWith Some Marginall Animadversions Noting and Taxing His Errours.* Trans. Edward Dacres. London, 1636. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 18 March 2011.
- Maguire, Nancy Klein, ed. *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*. New York: AMS, 1987. Print.
- Mandeville, Sir John. *The Voyages and Trauailes of Sir Iohn Mandeuile Knight Wherein Is Set Downe the Way to the Holy Land, and to Hierusalem: as Also to the Lands of the Great Caane, and of Praester Iohn, Inde, and Diuers Other Countries: Together with the Many and Strange Meruailes Therein*. London, 1625. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 8 March 2011.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine, Part I*. Spencer 3-36. Print.
- . *The Troublesome Reign and Lamentable Death of Edward the Second*. Spencer 101-42. Print.
- Maquerlot, Jean-Pierre and Michele Willems. *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*. New York: Cambridge, 1996. Print.
- Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1997. Print.
- McBride, Kari Boyd. *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England: A Cultural Study of Landscape and Legitimacy*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2001. Print.
- McDonald, Russ. *Shakespeare's Late Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2006. Print.
- McInnis, David, ed. "The Conquest of the West Indies." *Lost Plays Database*. U. Melbourne, 2009. Web. 20 March 2011.
- . "Ladrones or the Robbers' Iland." *Lost Plays Database*. U. Melbourne, 2009. Web.

- 20 March 2011.
- . "The New World's Tragedy." *Lost Plays Database*. U. Melbourne, 2009. Web. 20 March 2011.
- . "Sir John Mandeville." *Lost Plays Database*. U. Melbourne, 2009. Web. 20 March 2011.
- McMullan, Gordon. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2010. Print.
- Moncrief, Kathryn M. and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds. *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2007. Print.
- Moseley, Charles. "The Literary and Dramatic Contexts of the Last Plays." Alexander 71-90. Print.
- Moseley, C. W. R. D. "The Lost Play of Mandeville." *The Library* 25 (1970): 46-9. Web. 20 March 2011.
- Mowat, Barbara A. "Shakespearean Tragicomedy." Maguire 80-96. Print.
- Mullaney, Steven. "'All That Monarchs Do': The Obscured Stages of Authority in *Pericles*." Ryan 88-106. Print.
- "Musk, n." Def. 1a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 5 May 2011.
- Nelson, Robert J. *Play within a Play: The Dramatist's Conception of His Art: Shakespeare to Anouilh*. New Haven: Yale, 1958. Print.
- Nevo, Ruth. "The Perils of *Pericles*." Ryan 61-87. Print.
- Orgel, Stephen. *The Jonsonian Masque*. New York: Columbia, 1981. Print.
- Parr, Anthony, ed. *Three Renaissance Travel Plays: The Travels of the Three English Brothers, The Sea Voyage, The Antipodes*. Manchester: Manchester, 1995. Print.

- Penuel, Suzanne. "Male Mothering and *The Tempest*." Moncrief and McPherson 115-27. Print.
- Plato. *The Symposium*. Trans. Christopher Gill. New York: Penguin, 1999. Print.
- Pollard, A.W., ed. *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville with Three Narratives in Illustration of It: The Voyage of Johannes de Plano Carpini, The Journal of Friar William de Rubruquis, and The Journal of Friar Odoric*. New York: Dover, 1964. Print.
- Purchas, Samuel. *Purchas His Pilgrimes In Fiue Bookes*. London, 1625. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 3 January 2011.
- . *Hakluytus Postumus; or Purchas His Pilgrimes: Contayning a History of the World in Sea Voyages and Lande Travells by Englishmen and Others*. 20 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1905. *Open Library*. Web. 10 March 2011.
- Prynne, William. *Histrion-Mastix the Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragaedie, Divided into Two Parts*. London, 1633. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 28 March 2011.
- Randall, Dale B. J. *Winter Fruit: English Drama, 1642-1660*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1995. *Google Books Search*. Web. 5 April 2011.
- Ramsaram, J. A. "Sir Francis Drake in Contemporary Verse." *Notes & Queries* 202 (1957): 99-101. Web. 5 April 2011.
- Rowland, Richard. *Thomas Heywood's Theatre, 1599-1639: Locations, Translations, and Conflict*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2010. Print.
- . "'Thou Teachest Me Humanitie'; Thomas Heywood's The English Traveller." *English Comedy* (1994): 137-57. Web. 9 October 2010.
- Ryan, Kiernan, ed. *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*. New York: Longman, 1999. Print.

- Rych, Barnabe. *The Excellency of Good Women the Honour and Estimation That Belongeth Vnto Them. The Infallible Markes Whereby to Know Them*. London, 1613. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 2 April 2011.
- Said, Edward. *On Late Style: Music and Literature Against the Grain*. New York: Pantheon, 2006. Print.
- “Sanctuary, n.1.” Def. II.5.a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 7 April 2011.
- Sanders, Julie. *Caroline Drama: The Plays of Massinger, Ford, Shirley and Brome*. Plymouth, UK: Northcote House, 1999. Print.
- . “The Politics of Escapism: Fantasies of Travel and Power in Richard Brome’s *The Antipodes* and Ben Jonson’s *The Alchemist*.” *Writing and Fantasy*. Ed. Ceri Sullivan and Barbara White. New York: Longman, 1999. 137-50. Print.
- Segall, Kreg. “Gower and the Incestuous Father; The Intimate Author in *Pericles*.” *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 34.2 (2008): 248-68. Web. 2 March 2011.
- Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus*. Bevington, *Complete* 1384-436. Print.
- . *Hamlet*. Bevington, *Complete* 1091-149. Print.
- . *Henry V*. Bevington, *Complete* 873-918. Print.
- . *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Bevington, *Complete* 152-79. Print.
- . *Othello*. Ed. Edward Pechter. *Norton Critical Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004. Print.
- . *Twelfth Night*. Bevington, *Complete* 333-69. Print.
- . *The Winter’s Tale*. Bevington, *Complete* 1527-69. Print.
- Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins. *Pericles*. *The Oxford Shakespeare*. Ed. Roger

- Warren. Oxford: Oxford, 2003. Print.
- . *Pericles*. Bevington, *Complete* 1438-74. Print.
- Shawcross, John T. "Tragicomedy as Genre, Past and Present." Maguire 13-32. Print.
- Shohet, Lauren. *Reading Masques: The English Masque and Public Culture in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford, 2010. Print.
- Sidney, Philip. *Defence of Poesie*. London, 1595. Ed. Richard Bear. Charlottesville: U. Virginia, 1995. *Electronic Text Center*. Web. 22 March 2011.
- Sokolova, Boika. *Shakespeare's Romances as Interrogative Texts: Their Alienation Strategies and Ideologies*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992. Print.
- Spencer, Hazelton, ed. *Elizabethan Plays*. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933. Print.
- Spivack, Charlotte. "Alienation and Illusion: The Play-within-a-Play on the Caroline Stage." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 4 (1989): 195-210. Web. 14 March 2011.
- Steggle, Matthew. *Richard Brome: Place and Politics on the Caroline Stage*. Manchester: Manchester, 2004. Print.
- Taylor, Miles. "The Permeable World: Travel and Carnival in *The Antipodes*." *Exemplaria* 19.3 (2007): 438-54. Web. 18 February 2011.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Family Rites: Patriarchal Strategies in Shakespearean Romance." Ryan 43-60. Print.
- "Tiring-house, n." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 7 April 2011.
- Tranquillus, C. Suetonius. "Life of Nero." *The Lives of Twelve Caesars*. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library, 1914. Ed. Bill Thayer. *LacusCurtius*. Web. 21 March 2011.

- “Travail, n.1.” Def. I.4. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 7 April 2011.
- “Travel, n.” Def. 1-2. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2nd ed., 1989. Web. 7 April 2011.
- Turner, Victor. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1967. Print.
- Velte, Mowbray. *The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood*. New York: Haskell House, 1966. Print.
- Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2002. Print.
- Weimann, Robert. *Author’s Pen and Actor’s Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare’s Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2000. Print.
- . *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse*. Ed. David Hillman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996. Print.
- Wiggins, Martin, ed. *A Woman Killed With Kindness and Other Domestic Plays*. Oxford: Oxford, 2008. Print.
- Wiles, David. *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2000. Print.
- Wilkins, George. *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Liverpool, UK: UP Liverpool, 1953. Print.
- Witt, Robert W. *Mirror Within a Mirror: Ben Jonson and the Play-Within*. Ed. James Hogg. Salzburg: Institutut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1975. Print.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jennifer L. Greenholt

EDUCATION

- May 2011 MA, English
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
- May 2008 BA, English, *summa cum laude*
Bridgewater College
Bridgewater, Virginia

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

- Summer 2010
“Passages of Shakespeare: Reading and Representation in New Zealand, 1840-1950.”
Supported by the Paul K. Richter Memorial Fund and the Evalyn E. Cook Richter
Memorial Fund. Advised by Dr. Olga Valbuena.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- Fall 2010 Teaching Intern
ENG 165, Dr. Omaar Hena
Wake Forest University
- 2009-2011 Writing Tutor
Wake Forest University Writing Center
- 2005-2008 Writing Tutor
Bridgewater College Writing Center

PUBLICATIONS

- Words Aptly Spoken: American Documents*. 2nd ed. Seven Lakes, NC: Classical
Conversations Multi-Media, 2011.
- Words Aptly Spoken: American Literature*. 2nd ed. Seven Lakes, NC: Classical
Conversations Multi-Media, 2011.
- Words Aptly Spoken: British Literature*. 2nd ed. Seven Lakes, NC: Classical
Conversations Multi-Media, 2011.

Words Aptly Spoken: Children's Literature. 2nd ed. Seven Lakes, NC: Classical Conversations Multi-Media, 2011.

Words Aptly Spoken: Short Stories. 2nd ed. Seven Lakes, NC: Classical Conversations Multi-Media, 2011.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

“Nothing But the Cigars’: Tobacco, Narrative, and Character in *Lady Audley's Secret*.” *Reading Material: Textual and Cultural Objects.* University of Wisconsin-Madison, March 2010.

“Kallipolis to Christminster: Social Stratification and the Man in *Jude the Obscure*.” *That Which Moves: The Kinetic Nature of Language and Literature.* University of North Carolina-Charlotte, January 2010.

“Trumpet to a Red-Look'd Anger: Paulina's Courtly Speech in *The Winter's Tale*.” *Twenty-Ninth Annual Medieval and Renaissance Forum.* Plymouth State University, April 2008.

“Recreating the Restoration Woman: Tate's *A History of King Lear*.” *Mid-America Theatre Conference.* Kansas City, March 2008.

“Recreating the Restoration Woman: Tate's *A History of King Lear*.” *Undergraduate Research Shakespeare Conference.* Virginia Military Institute, November 2007.

“Awakening from a Dream: Activity and Passivity in *The Dream of the Rood*.” *Second Annual Undergraduate Conference on Literature and Creative Writing.* Tusculum College, March 2006.

AWARDS & MEMBERSHIPS

2008	Lambda Pi Eta, National Communications Honor Society
2008	Outstanding Senior Award, Bridgewater College English Dept.
2007-2008	Chapter president of Alpha Chi, National Academic Honor Society
2006-2008	Omicron Delta Kappa, National Leadership Honor Society
2005-2008	Philomathes Society, Bridgewater College Honor Society
2004-2008	Flory Fellows Honors Program, Bridgewater College