



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

‘THE NAME OF FATHER HAS CEASED
TO EXIST’:
INCEST, PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP
IN THE *HISTORIA APOLLONII REGIS TYRI*,
BOOK VIII OF THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*
AND *PERICLES*

JOANNA GREENLAND

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English,
The University of Auckland, 2006

This thesis examines three texts – the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, Book VIII of Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, and Shakespeare’s *Pericles* – which tell a single story, the story of *Apollonius of Tyre*. The earliest text, the Latin *Historia*, is the major source for Gower’s version of the story, which is in turn the main source for *Pericles*.

Using the *Historia* as the basis for my initial observations, I then look at the ways in which Gower made use of and adapted the *Historia* and how Shakespeare then adapted Gower’s text. I employ a variety of methods in examining the texts, including considering the historical background behind the *Confessio Amantis* and *Pericles*, and making use of a psychoanalytical approach, considering the texts in the light of both Oedipal theory and ‘seduction theory’.

The themes which emerged as concerns for the three authors were incest, patriarchy and kingship. These themes can be found in all three works, but the importance of each theme and the way in which it is handled varies greatly amongst the three. The *Historia* places the least emphasis on these themes overall: it condemns incest and patriarchal excesses, but it does not dwell on these issues or question the institutions of its society. Gower does question the validity of the patriarchal social structure, by concentrating on the evils of father-daughter incest and by giving the women in his tale more control over decision-making. He also emphasizes the need for the rule of law, rather than tyrannical kingship. Incest is a major theme in *Pericles*, but the play is less concerned with issues around patriarchy. Instead, *Pericles* devotes more time to considering the role of kingship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my supervisor, Professor Stephanie Hollis, for all your assistance and your valuable input – and for taking me on in the first place!

Thanks also to my family and friends, especially my parents, John and Iris.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		1
Chapter One:	AN INITIAL COMPARISON OF THE <i>HISTORIA APOLLONII REGIS TYRI</i> , BOOK VIII OF THE <i>CONFESSIO</i> <i>AMANTIS</i> AND <i>PERICLES</i>	12
Chapter Two:	INCEST AND PSYCHOANALYSIS IN <i>APOLLONIUS OF TYRE</i>	36
Chapter Three:	PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP IN <i>APOLLONIUS OF TYRE</i>	57
Conclusion		93
Appendix A:	PLOT COMPARISON	99
Appendix B:	NAMES OF CHARACTERS AND LOCATIONS	110
List of Works Cited		111

INTRODUCTION

‘[T]he name of father has ceased to exist’: so says Antiochus’ daughter in the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* after she is raped by her father (113). Antiochus has committed the ultimate transgression against the norms of patriarchal society, and according to his daughter, he pays the ultimate price in losing his right to patriarchal authority, that is, losing the ‘name of father’.¹ Incest is the starting-point for the plot of *Apollonius of Tyre*, and incest was the starting-point for my investigation of the meaning of *Apollonius of Tyre*. As I thought about the text, however, it became clear that although incest is literalised in *Apollonius of Tyre*, it also retains its symbolic value. *Apollonius of Tyre* is not ‘about’ incest as much as it is ‘about’ the role of fathers in society and in the family. Father-daughter incest, as I will argue, is a powerful symbol for the ills of patriarchal society and, in these texts, for the tyranny of an absolute monarch. What Apollonius unconsciously seeks on his journeys – which are an extended recoil from the horrors of incest – is the ability to function as a father and a king within a patriarchal society. His first response is to reject his society altogether – to flee, to cease to be a king – but he must, by the end of the text, accept his place in society. All three versions of *Apollonius of Tyre* studied in this work carry a message not of revolution, but of reform: not systemic reform, but the personal reformation of one man, as Apollonius confronts the evils of his society and struggles to find a way to be a good father and a righteous king when the temptations of incest and tyranny are always close at hand.

In this study, I compare three versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story: the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, John Gower’s re-telling in Book VIII of his *Confessio*

¹ The meaning of this quotation will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

Amantis, and William Shakespeare's *Pericles*. Broadly, this work is a comparative study of the thematic material of the three works; it is not intended as a discussion of their relative or intrinsic literary merits, or issues of style, character development, linguistic features and the like.

Where I am referring to generic details common to all three versions, I will refer to the story of *Apollonius of Tyre*, otherwise I will refer to one of the three versions by name. Throughout this study, I will refer to character and place names using the names and spelling found in the *Historia*, unless I am specifically discussing the *Confessio Amantis* or *Pericles*.² Because so much of the narrative material is common to all three versions, I will generally discuss particular thematic issues with reference to the *Historia* in the first instance, and then turn to the *Confessio Amantis* and *Pericles* in order to demonstrate how these later versions differ in their presentation of the theme.

VERSIONS OF THE *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE* STORY

THE *HISTORIA APOLLONII REGIS TYRI*

All references to the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* are to Elizabeth Archibald's translation, in Archibald's *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations* (1991).

The Latin *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* is the earliest-known version of the story of *Apollonius of Tyre*, and the earliest-surviving manuscripts date from the late fifth or early sixth century A.D. (Archibald, *Apollonius* 6). However, its origins before this time are the subject of debate. It has been argued that the original text was a Latin

² The exception is Apollonius, who is actually called 'Appolinus' by Gower (VIII 375). I will refer to him as 'Apollonius' throughout, as he is invariably known by this name in the critical literature.

version of the third century A.D., later Christianized to become the *Historia* known today (Archibald, *Apollonius* 6). It has also been suggested that the original text was Greek, not Latin, but composed at around the same time, that is, in the late second or early third century A.D. (Archibald, *Apollonius* 7). Despite this disagreement, it is generally agreed that the text as we have it does not represent an original creation (Archibald, *Apollonius* 8). Because of the uncertainty around the date and authorship of the *Historia*, I have avoided the sorts of discussions about historical background of the *Historia* which I have explored with the *Confessio Amantis* and *Pericles*.

In her study *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations*, Elizabeth Archibald traces the dissemination of the *Historia* from the tenth century onwards (45-51). As well as numerous vernacular versions, over a hundred Latin texts of the *Historia* survive, mostly with only minor alterations to the text (Archibald, *Apollonius* 46). The *Historia* seems to have been particularly popular in the twelfth century, with at least twenty manuscript versions surviving from that period (Archibald, *Apollonius* 47). Thereafter, the Latin text continued to be copied, with vernacular versions becoming more common through the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries (Archibald, *Apollonius* 47-48).

BOOK VIII OF GOWER'S *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*

All references to the *Confessio Amantis* are to Richard A. Peck's edition (2000), and will include the Book and line reference in each case, in the following format: (for example) VIII 1. Any references in this format are to the *Confessio Amantis*, unless otherwise indicated.

The *Confessio Amantis*, a long narrative poem in Middle English, first appeared in 1390, with later recensions appearing in 1392. The *Confessio* takes the

form of an extended dialogue between a lover (Amans) and his confessor (Genius, priest of Venus). Genius asks Amans whether he is guilty of committing the Seven Deadly Sins, in all their permutations, with special attention to whether he has strayed from the laws of love. In order to illustrate the nature of the sins, and in an attempt to elicit a confession from Amans, Genius tells hundreds of *exempla* of varying lengths. The tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* is the longest, and the last, of these *exempla*. It is told as an *exemplum* of the sin of Lechery, following books which deal with (in this order) Pride, Envy, Wrath, Sloth, Avarice, and Gluttony. Book VII departs from the established model of confession and exploration of the Seven Deadly Sins, to present the subject of the Education of a King.

At the beginning of his re-telling of *Apollonius of Tyre*, Gower states that his source is the *Pantheon* (VIII 272), which is a twelfth-century ‘world history’ in Latin by Godfrey of Viterbo (Archibald, *Apollonius* 185).³ The *Pantheon* version of the tale is based on the *Historia*, but omits many of the incidents of that text, including, in two recensions, omitting the incest riddle (Archibald, *Apollonius* 185-86). Although the *Pantheon* text was almost certainly known to Gower, G.C. Macaulay concludes, based upon the correspondences and differences between Gower’s text and the *Pantheon* and other sources such as the Latin *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, that ‘Gower unquestionably followed mainly the Latin prose narrative which was commonly current [i.e. the *Historia*], though he thought the *Pantheon*, as a grave historical authority, more fit to be cited’ (Macaulay 537). There are also indications that Gower was familiar with the *Gesta Romanorum*. The *Gesta Romanorum* is a collection of exemplary tales in Latin dating from around 1475 (Archibald, *Apollonius* 190-91). One manuscript of the *Gesta* includes the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*, in a version

³ Godfrey of Viterbo’s version of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story unfortunately does not appear to be available in a modern English translation.

which is very close to the text of the *Historia* (Archibald, *Apollonius* 191). Archibald notes that the first of the Latin marginalia in Gower's tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* is phrased similarly to the introduction to the tale in the *Gesta* (*Apollonius* 192).

We expect the final portion of a work to be a kind of summary of the rest, or at least to be a conclusion in keeping with the spirit of the preceding material. In fact, some critics have faulted the *Confessio* on this very point. Macaulay, who edited Gower's complete works in the early twentieth century, described the topic of Book VIII as an 'unpromising subject' which presumably caused Gower 'some embarrassment'. He believed that Gower was somehow forced to fall back on the topic of incest because he had already covered the other aspects of the sin of lust 'more or less fully' elsewhere in the work (536). As Larry Scanlon has written, '[o]ne may well ask where the "embarrassment" actually lay, with Gower, or with Macaulay himself' (98). Scanlon rather scathingly attacks this 'half-hearted hypothesis' that 'Gower... somehow forgot in the course of treating the first six of the Deadly Sins that there was a seventh, and thus arrived at the final book bereft of a suitable topic' (98). One could add that Macaulay himself apparently forgot that, along with the other branches of lust, Gower had already discussed incest, in the tale of Canace and Machaire in Book III.

While acknowledging that incest had in fact already been dealt with, Terence Tiller, when he came to translate the *Confessio* into modern English, similarly accounted for the extended treatment of the tale of Apollonius by explaining that 'Gower is in difficulties here: he has already dealt with almost every aspect of Lechery' (260). He then proceeds to summarize the entire tale in five pages (to put this in context, his treatment of the very well-known tale of Dives and Lazarus, which occupies some 135 lines of verse in Middle English [VI 975-1109] to *Apollonius of*

Tyre's over 1700, is given almost four pages by Tiller [224-227]). Tiller explains his decision by saying the verse is 'mostly undistinguished', but, bearing in mind that he also summarized the other 'awful examples' of incest in the book, it may be nearer to the mark to suggest that he, too, felt some embarrassment with the topic (262).

Critics are generally now more receptive to the idea that Book VIII is a fitting and appropriate conclusion to the *Confessio*. It is now often described as a sort of catch-all tale, able, with its varied themes and episodic structure, to tie together 'tales of marriage, wandering, and homecoming as well as tales of various sins such as incest, wrath, envy, perjury, and avarice, and also tales of virtues such as chastity, constancy, pity, perseverance, and good intent' (Peck, *Kingship* 169). Whatever thematic threads one observes in the work, it would seem that they are reflected in the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*.

PERICLES

All references to *Pericles* are to F.D. Hoeniger's Arden Shakespeare edition (1963), and will include the Act, Scene, and line reference in each case, in the following format: (for example) I.i.1. Any references in this format are to *Pericles*, unless otherwise indicated.

The play has been dated to late 1607 or early 1608, although other dates from 1606 to 1608 are possible (Hoeniger lxiv-lxv). The main sources for *Pericles* are the *Confessio Amantis* and *The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures* by Lawrence Twine (Hoeniger xiv). Twine's narrative, first printed in 1594, is fairly close to the text of the *Historia*, although with a greater propensity towards moralizing and set more firmly within a Christian framework. Twine does not return to a discussion of the incest theme at the end of his text; instead he details the fortunes of the main characters after

their reunion at even greater length than does the *Historia*. Uniquely, in Twine's text, the pirates who snatched Tharsia are found and pardoned for their crimes, to the point that they are given money and made knights. Shakespeare turned to Twine particularly for his depiction of Athenagoras and the brothel scenes.

There have long been questions around the authorship of *Pericles*. The play was omitted from the First and Second Folio, although the Quarto edition attributed the play solely to Shakespeare (Hoeniger liii). In the eighteenth century, critics such as Alexander Pope believed that the play was not by Shakespeare, others such as John Dryden thought that *Pericles* was by Shakespeare, but was one of his first dramatic efforts, and yet a third group, represented by critics such as George Steevens, argued that the play was a joint effort of Shakespeare and one other author (Skeele 18-19). Most modern critics believe *Pericles* to be the product of joint authorship (Hoeniger liii), although they disagree as to the identity of Shakespeare's collaborator and the exact proportions attributable to each author, as well as arguing about whether the authors worked together, or whether Shakespeare completed an existing text. For example, Hoeniger argues that Shakespeare finished off a draft text produced by John Day and George Wilkins (author of the prose work *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*) (lxiii). Suzanne Gossett believes that 'George Wilkins... was probably Shakespeare's collaborator on the play, responsible for the first two acts and possibly some later choruses (49). Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond pronounce the evidence in favour of Wilkins as Shakespeare's collaborator to be 'undeniably persuasive' but not conclusive (13). Ultimately, they believe that the authorship debate is little short of a frivolous distraction for the average reader (DelVecchio and Hammond 15). At the other extreme, Roger Warren's edition of *Pericles* is a 'conjectural reconstruction' of the text, based upon that of Gary Taylor

and MacDonald P. Jackson (Warren v), which draws upon Wilkins' *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre* in an attempt to provide a more complete text (Warren 3).

Taylor, Jackson, and Warren were motivated to 'reconstruct' the play because of the 'grossly corrupt' nature of the Quarto text (Warren 2). This corruption also complicates the authorship debate, since it is the play's 'uneven style' upon which arguments for mixed authorship chiefly rest (Hoeniger liii). A number of explanations have been offered for how this corruption occurred: Gossett offers an inclusive account, writing that:

The chances are good that Q[uarto] has a complex history, involving two authors, one of whom may have attempted with difficulty to copy the handwriting of the other; reporting of the script by actors; dictation, possibly involving shorthand, additions and revisions to the resulting text; imprecise casting off and a resultant readiness on the part of one compositor in particular to reline his copy in order to fit lines onto the page regardless of original verse and prose distinctions (27-28).

As I have noted above, I am primarily interested in comparing how the three texts treat certain thematic issues. I will, therefore, refer to the play as 'Shakespeare's' throughout, and will not return to any issues of authorship or of textual corruption in the body of this study.

THE PLOT OF *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

The plot of *Apollonius of Tyre* is rather complicated and episodic in nature, a problem which is exacerbated by the variants between different versions, particularly the name-changes between Gower's story and Shakespeare's play. I wish, therefore, to begin with a summary of the basic plot of *Apollonius of Tyre*. This summary is based on the plot of the *Historia*, although I have attempted to include only generic details common to all three versions.

The story begins at the court of Antiochus, King of Antioch. After his wife dies, Antiochus turns his attentions upon his daughter, commencing an incestuous relationship with her. To deter suitors and retain his daughter, Antiochus sets a riddle which suitors must solve to win her hand, or else die in the attempt. This riddle is, in actuality, a coded confession of their incestuous affair. Apollonius attempts the challenge and immediately deciphers the riddle, although in order to avoid the king's wrath he does not openly solve it. Antiochus, who realises Apollonius has guessed his secret, gives him a grace period in which to 'solve' the riddle, but secretly determines to have him killed. Sensing his life is in danger, Apollonius flees Antioch.

He returns to his kingdom of Tyre, but fearing he may be pursued there by Antiochus, sets out on the seas again. He calls in at Tarsus, where the land is gripped by famine, which he is able to relieve with the stocks of grain on his ship. In gratitude, the people of Tarsus erect a statue in his honour. Here, he receives news from home that Antiochus is indeed pursuing him, and decides to leave Tarsus. Before long, he is shipwrecked and washes up at Pentapolis, where he attracts the attention of the king's daughter, whom he subsequently marries.

At Pentapolis, Apollonius receives news that Antiochus and his daughter have been struck by lightning and killed, leaving him free to return to Tyre. On the journey, however, Apollonius' pregnant wife gives birth to a daughter in the midst of a fierce storm and (seemingly) dies. The superstitious sailors persuade Apollonius to cast his dead wife overboard in a chest; otherwise (so they believe) the storm would not abate. The princess is washed ashore and discovered by one Ceremon, a mystical healer, who restores her to life. She then decides to enter the temple of Diana and live chastely.

Meanwhile, Apollonius decides to foster his daughter Tarsia out under the care of Stranguillio and Dionysias at Tarsus, while he returns to Tyre. Tarsia grows up in Tarsus until, as a young woman, she attracts the wrath of Dionysias by outshining her own daughter. Dionysias arranges to have her murdered, but at the last moment she is instead captured by pirates, who sell her into a brothel at Mytilene. There, she manages to avoid being raped with the help of divine grace and her own eloquent pleading and lamenting. Eventually she manages to persuade her panders that, as she is not bringing in any money by selling her body, she should be allowed to earn them money by demonstrating her various courtly skills to the local people.

Soon Apollonius arrives at Tarsus to fetch his daughter, only to find that she has 'died'. Apollonius falls into a deep despair, and sets out again to sea. He encounters another tempest, but rides out the storm and eventually arrives at Mytilene. The governor of the town, Athenagoras, visits the ship and learns of Apollonius' sorrow. It is suggested that the wise and eloquent Tarsia may manage to rouse Apollonius out of his depression, so she is called to the ship, where she attempts to cheer him in various ways. For her pains, she is struck by Apollonius, and reacts indignantly, telling him that he would not treat her so if he knew her noble ancestry. Strangely attracted to her, Apollonius questions her about who she is, eventually realizing that she is his daughter. He joyfully comes out of his seclusion and reassumes his kingly position. Athenagoras then asks for Tarsia's hand in marriage, which is swiftly granted by Apollonius.

Apollonius is then visited in a dream by a deity and told to go to Ephesus to make sacrifices and learn the fate of his wife. There, he tells the story of his misfortunes and is overheard by his wife, leading to a joyful reunion of the family. Tarsia and Athenagoras become the rulers of Tyre, while Apollonius becomes ruler of

Pentapolis owing to the death of his father-in-law. Stranguillio and Dionysias are punished for their betrayal of Apollonius and his daughter, either with or without the direct intervention of Apollonius. The three texts end in different ways, as will be discussed in Chapter One.

CHAPTER ONE: AN INITIAL COMPARISON OF THE *HISTORIA APOLLONII REGIS TYRI*, BOOK VIII OF THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*, AND *PERICLES*

In this chapter, I compare the three texts, looking first at the moral explicitly or implicitly attached to each text, and then at other key variations, such as changes in characterization and the name-changes which occur in Shakespeare's *Pericles*.

THE MORAL OF THE STORY

THE MORALS OF THE *HISTORIA*

The *Historia*, unlike the two other texts, does not end with an explicit moral or with a review of the story as a whole. It does, however, revisit past episodes in the tale to an extent, and it is presumably to these efforts to round off the tale that we must look in our search for meaning. After being reunited with his wife and child, Apollonius (as in the *Confessio*) first goes to Tarsus, to punish Stranguillio and Dionysias. As well as the obvious crime of attempted murder, ingratitude and perjury are also singled out for punishment in this scene. While Apollonius does not directly accuse Stranguillio and Dionysias of ingratitude, it is established as a key concern by his first question to the people of Tarsus: 'has Apollonius of Tyre shown himself ungrateful to any of you in any matter?' (175). Apollonius' charge of 'perjury' (175) is crucial to the condemnation of Stranguillio, who had nothing to do with the attempt on Tarsia's life, but who did lie to cover it up. The scene also demonstrates the quality of mercy, as Tarsia pardons her would-be killer Theophilus, who (albeit inadvertently) delayed killing her and thus saved her life. Tarsia is not motivated wholly by a sense

of mercy, however. She enters into a sort of 'plea bargain' with Theophilus, telling him, 'if you want to be excused the torture and death which you deserve, and to earn indulgence from me, say in a clear voice who ordered you to murder me' (177). Her decision may also reflect the fact that Theophilus allowed her 'time to call on the Lord' (177), thus reflecting at least a residual degree of Christian belief, or perhaps, since she grants Theophilus his freedom, she is mindful that a slave may not be wholly responsible for his own actions.

The next episode which may give a clue as to the morality of the *Historia* is Apollonius' meeting with the fisherman who helped him when he suffered shipwreck. In return for this past service, Apollonius 'gave him two hundred thousand gold sesterces, servants and maids, clothes and silver to his heart's content, and made him a count for the rest of his life' (179). Immediately afterwards, Apollonius rewards Hellenicus, 'who told Apollonius everything when Antiochus was persecuting him and would not accept anything from him' (179), in much the same way. These actions revive the theme of gratitude/ingratitude, of repaying past favours as well as settling old scores, as well as, in the case of Hellenicus, reminding us of the virtue of helping others without looking for a reward. They also seem to give a quasi-feudal character to the *Historia*, as a sense of mutual dependence and support between Apollonius and his underlings is established.

Other virtues which are lauded in the *Historia* include the virtue of chastity, as the pimp who attempted to prostitute Tarsia is burned alive, whereas the people of Tarsus erect a statue to Apollonius and to 'the most chaste Tarsia, for keeping her virginity in the face of the most demeaning misfortune' (171, 173). Tarsia's mother is also praised for remaining chaste while separated from her husband (173).

Athenagoras is praised for his compassion (153). Intelligence and knowledge are also

held in high esteem – as well as Apollonius’ wit and ability to solve riddles, he is praised for his athletic (125) and musical abilities (129). His future wife is also admired for her musical skills (129), and Apollonius speaks approvingly of her ‘love of learning’ (131). Tarsia’s education and intelligence are also remarked upon more than once (155, 161, 163), and the skill of Ceremon’s assistant in reviving Apollonius’ wife is praised and rewarded monetarily (141). Generosity is also a valued attribute, as embodied by Apollonius when he gives grain to the starving populace of Tarsus (121) and by his wife, who showers Apollonius with gifts (129), (as well as by Hellenicus and the fisherman).

Other vices singled out by the text include the vice of greed, particularly in connection with the pimp (151, 155, 171), and that of jealousy, which drove Dionysias to have Tarsia killed (145, 147). Lust is also condemned, both the lust of Tarsia’s would-be customers in the brothel (151, 153), and the ‘immoral passion’ (113) of Antiochus. However, unlike in the later versions of the tale, Antiochus’ ‘immoral passion’ is not dwelt upon in the *Historia* as a whole, nor is it recalled at the end of the text. The *Historia* does begin with a rather graphic presentation of Antiochus taking ‘his daughter’s virginity by force, in spite of her lengthy resistance’ (113). The description of how the daughter ‘tried to hide the flow of blood: but drops of blood fell onto the floor’ (113) is the most shocking of the three texts, but after this opening scene, the subject of incest largely fades from view. For example, when Antiochus is struck down, it is whilst in bed with his daughter, indicating that his death is punishment for his incestuous relationship rather than for his other crimes such as murder, but this point is not made explicitly. He is called ‘the most cruel King Antiochus’, implying that his cruelty, not his incestuous relationship, is his worst failing (137). When Apollonius recounts his life story at Ephesus, however, he does

mention both aspects of Antiochus' immorality – 'he had a relationship of the most horrible kind with the girl whose father he had been appointed by nature; flouting morality, he became her husband, and plotted to kill me' (173) – but the emphasis on the crime of incest is still not nearly as strong in the *Historia* as in the other two versions of the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*.

THE MORALS OF GOWER'S *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

It is a far easier task to assign a moral to Gower's tale than to the *Historia*. Firstly, Gower puts his story in context: it is unambiguously an *exemplum* on the subject of Lechery, the seventh in his list of Deadly Sins. He then prefaces the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* with a discussion of the origin of the laws on incest, stretching back to the dawn of creation, illustrated by several short *exempla* on the subject of incest, and with significant editorializing on Genius' part as to the culpability of incest. We are already well-prepared for a story on the subject of incest by the time Genius tells us he has a story to illustrate the consequences of illicit love within one's 'sibrede' (VIII 266).

The focus on incest as a theme is continued within the *Apollonius of Tyre* story itself. In all three texts (as I mention elsewhere) the structure of the story, with its multiple pairings of fathers and daughters and plot incidents such as the abandonment of Tarsia at Tarsus (motivated, as I shall argue in Chapter Three, by Apollonius' fear of incest), sustains the theme of incest throughout the story, although the three texts emphasize these features to varying degrees. In Gower, for example, the theme of incest is magnified by the language he uses, which draws attention to, and condemns, the act of incest between Antiochus and his daughter. He uses such terms as 'spille' (destroy) (VIII 297, Peck's translation), 'forlih' (raped) (VIII 300, Peck's translation),

and ‘devoureth’ (VIII 309) to describe the king’s actions. The sinfulness of his behaviour is also stressed: Antiochus is said to act ‘[w]ithoute insihte of conscience’ (VIII 294), and we are told that ‘[h]im thoghte that it was no sinne’ (VIII 346), with the clear implication that it was, in fact, very much a sin. His daughter, on the other hand, is portrayed as an innocent victim; we are told that ‘sche was tendre and full of drede, / Sche couthe noght hir maidenhede / Defende’ (VIII 301-03), and that she ‘evere wissheth after deth’ as a result of the incest (VIII 333).

Gower’s tale also ends with a moral which makes it clear that, in this story, obeying or disobeying the incest taboo is the primary standard by which the characters are judged. Of Apollonius we are told:

Lo, what it is to be wel grounded:
For he hath ferst his love founded
Honesteliche as for to wedde,
Honesteliche his love he spedde
And hadde children with his wif (VIII 1993-97).

This passage also links endogamy with generation (in contrast to the death-like sterility of Antiochus’ court), which is seen as a virtue in itself, particularly for kings who thereby secure a dynasty (Jordan 36; Goddall 247). The reader is told to take example from Apollonius’ behaviour, and to avoid the example of:

on that other side,
Antiochus with al his pride,
Which sette his love unkindely,
His ende he hadde al sodeinly,
Set agein kinde upon vengeance,
And for his lust hath his penance (VIII 2003-08).

Genius then, as if his point has not already been made abundantly clear, directly advises Amans:

Lo thus, mi sone, myht thou liere
What is to love in good manere,
And what to love in other wise.
The mede arist of the servise;
Fortune, thogh sche be noght stable,

Yit at som time is favorable
To hem that ben of love trewe.
Bot certes it is for to rewe
To se love agein kind falle,
For that makth sore a man to falle (VIII 2009-18).

He tells Amans not to ‘take lust as doth a beste’ (VIII 2025), as ‘[s]uch lust is noght of loves kinde’ (VIII 2028). Amans denies that he has ever sinned in this way, but tells Genius nonetheless that his story is a ‘thing which worthi is to hier, / Of gret ensample and gret matiere’ (VIII 2031-32).

The condemnation of incest and the praise of ‘kindely’ love (VIII 1707) is clearly, then, the central concern of Gower’s version of *Apollonius of Tyre*, but he does also touch upon other morals in his tale. Russell Peck claims that in this tale, Apollonius fulfils the ‘five points of policy’ outlined by Genius in Book VII (*Kingship* 168). These are: Truth, shown by Apollonius accepting responsibilities and fulfilling promises; Liberality, demonstrated by Apollonius’ generosity towards the people of Tharse and by rewarding Cerymon; Justice, which Apollonius carries out by bringing Stranguilio and Dionise to trial; Pity, which he shows in helping the people of Tharse; and Chastity, manifested by Apollonius remaining chaste after losing his wife and by the fact that he does not make advances to his daughter during the ‘recognition scene’ (Peck, *Kingship* 168-69). Gower’s tale also praises the quality of mercy in connection to the execution of Stranguilio and Dionise, although the mercy here is that exhibited by ‘Goddes pourveance / Which doth mercy forth with justice’ (VIII 1956-57), and the beneficiary of this mercy is Thaise: ‘thurgh mercy sauf is simplese / Of hire whom mercy preserveth’ (VIII 1960-61).

The *Confessio* also condemns or praises many of the same qualities as does the *Historia*. For example, the ‘coverture and sleyhte of speche’ (VIII 1576) of ‘[t]his false man Stranguilio’ (VIII 1577) and his wife is disapprovingly mentioned, as is the

‘lecherie’ (VIII 1418) and ‘vileinie’ (VIII 1431) of Thaise’s would-be customers in the brothel. On the other hand, Gower does not trouble to reintroduce the fisherman and Hellican in order to reward them for their past services to Apollonius. They are simply forgotten, as Gower does not share the *Historia*’s thematic concern with repaying good deeds. Likewise, the pimp at Mitelene goes unpunished, not (apparently) because he allowed Thaise to go free, but simply because Gower is not interested in pursuing this thread of the story.

THE MORALS OF *PERICLES*

Pericles does not announce its intentions from the beginning, as does Gower’s work; there is no framework around the play which makes it clear that it is staged for a particular purpose or to highlight a specific issue. Thus it is more like the *Historia*, in the sense that we must read and intuit the moral of the work, rather than having it placed before us from the outset.

Because *Pericles* begins when the incestuous relationship between Antiochus and his daughter is already well-established, and is ‘with long use account’d no sin’ (I.Chorus.30), Shakespeare devotes much less space to examining the nature of incest than does Gower, and the *Confessio*’s frank presentation of the violence of the act and the daughter’s response to the incest are completely absent from *Pericles*. The full implications of Shakespeare’s treatment of the opening incest episode will be explored elsewhere. For the purposes of this discussion, one need only note that Shakespeare’s watered-down handling of this material does not immediately suggest to his readers that incest will form an important theme in the play. Although the incest is immediately characterized as ‘evil should be done by none’ (I.Chorus.28), it is not until *Pericles* solves the riddle that a strong, sustained condemnation of incest appears.

Pericles then repeatedly refers to the 'sin' of their incest (I.i.81, 93, 122, 138) and the 'foul', 'uncomely' and 'defiling' nature of their actions (I.i.127, 129, 132).

However, Pericles' condemnation of Antiochus' incest is mixed with consideration of his other sins, particularly his murderous streak which now threatens Pericles himself, as '[o]ne sin... another doth provoke; / Murder's as near to lust as flame to smoke' (I.i.138-39). It is this aspect, namely, the threat to himself, which Pericles continues to dwell upon once he returns to Tyre. He has a long soliloquy on the danger Antiochus presents to him (I.ii.1-34), and when he tells Hellicanus about the events at Antioch, he discloses the fact of Antiochus' incest in a single phrase (I.ii.76) before going on to describe the danger to himself and the fact that 'many worthy princes' bloods were shed / To keep his bed of blackness unlaid ope' (I.ii.88-89) at much greater length. This makes it unclear whether incest is being singled out as a particularly grave or unnatural sin, or whether Pericles, and Shakespeare, are equally concerned with Antiochus' sin of murder.

It is only through the development of the plot that incest emerges as a key theme in the play. In fact, in the 'recognition scene' of *Pericles*, the theme of incest emerges more strongly than in either of the two other texts (as will be further discussed in Chapter Two). The epilogue also returns to the subject of incest, proclaiming that '[i]n Antiochus and his daughter you have heard / Of monstrous lust the due and just reward' (Epilogue.1-2), although it does not dwell upon this moral as strongly as does Gower. Rather, it mixes this anti-incest moral in with several others:

In Pericles, his queen and daughter, [you have] seen,
Although assail'd with fortune fierce and keen,
Virtue preserv'd from fell destruction's blast,
Led on by heaven, and crown'd with joy at last.
In Helicanus may you well descry
A figure of truth, of faith, of loyalty.
In revered Cerimon there well appears
The worth that learned charity aye wears.

For wicked Cleon and his wife, when fame
Had spread his cursed deed to th'honour'd name
Of Pericles, to rage the city turn,
That him and his they in his palace burn:
The gods for murder seemed so content
To punish; although not done, but meant (Epilogue.3-16).

Again, this ending seems closer in spirit to the *Historia* in that (while it does not show the same interest in rewarding benefactors or the desire to finish off all the plot lines of the tale) it shows equal interest in several different morals as exemplified by different characters in the story. Nonetheless, taken as a whole *Pericles* does show a strong moral and thematic concern with incest because of the parallelism of the plot and the use of language which insistently and repeatedly looks back to the opening scene of incest, only achieving final closure in the 'recognition scene'. Shakespeare's handling of the 'recognition scene', particularly as regards the theme of incest, will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

OTHER VARIATIONS

THE RIDDLE

Riddles are, of course, one type of text where choice of words is of paramount importance. For that reason, I will give the text of the riddle in full for each of the three versions, for the reader's reference.

THE RIDDLE IN THE *HISTORIA*

In the *Historia*, the riddle is read by King Antiochus:

Scelere vehor, maternam carnem vescor, quaero fratrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filium: non invenio (114).
I am borne on crime; I eat my mother's flesh; I seek my brother, my mother's husband, my wife's son; I do not find him (115).

THE RIDDLE IN THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*

In the *Confessio Amantis*, the riddle is also read by King Antiochus:

With felonie I am upbore,
I ete and have it noght forbore
Mi modres fleissh, whos housebonde
Mi fader for to seche I fonde,
Which is the sone ek of my wif.
Hierof I am inquisitif;
And who that can mi tale save,
Al quyt he schal my doghter have;
Of his ansuere and if he faile,
He schal be ded withoute faile (VIII 405-09).

THE RIDDLE IN *PERICLES*

In *Pericles*, Antiochus gives Pericles a written copy of the riddle, which Pericles reads:

I am no viper, yet I feed
On mother's flesh which did me breed.
I sought a husband, in which labour
I found that kindness in a father.
He's father, son, and husband mild;
I mother, wife, and yet his child:
How they may be, and yet in two,
As you will live, resolve it you (I.i.65-72).

As Larry Scanlon points out, the exact meaning of the riddle is irresolvable: whilst riddles traditionally have one single resolution which unites all their disparate strands, '[i]n this riddle... instability is all' (124). It is obscure because the institution of the family has been hopelessly confused by the multiplication of roles brought about by incest (Scanlon 125). This multiplication of roles – the fact that father and daughter also stand in relationship to each other as lovers 'and yet in two' – is further complicated by the fact that (particularly in Gower's text) the father and daughter almost seem to merge into one as the speaking voice of the riddle, thanks to the shifting viewpoint, which at one moment can speak of 'mi fader', and the next of 'my doghter'. The riddle does, however, seem to get progressively more transparent in

each successive version, from the compact and enigmatic text of the *Historia* to the riddle of *Pericles*, which removes many of the difficulties of the earlier versions by sustaining a single viewpoint, that of the daughter.

NAME-CHANGES IN *PERICLES*

While the names of characters undergo minor alterations between the *Historia* and the *Confessio Amantis* – Tarsia becoming Thaise, for example – in *Pericles*, many characters are given completely new names, and in other cases, names are transferred from one character to another.

Of course, the most prominent change is in the name of the eponymous hero, from Apollonius to Pericles. It is unclear at what point Pericles was first used for the hero of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story (Davis 374). George Wilkins used the name in his *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, but it is not certain whether this work pre- or post-dates *Pericles* (Davis 375). The reasons for the change to the name Pericles are equally unclear. It has been suggested that the motivation for change could be as simple as the inherent unsuitability of the five-syllable name Apollonius for blank verse: Elizabeth Archibald points out that the name Coriolanus is rarely used in that play (*Apollonius* 215). As for the meaning of the name, many theories have been broached. Hoeniger suggests that perhaps ‘the association of the hero’s name with “peril” or Latin “periculum” was in Shakespeare’s mind’ (3). Others have pointed to the similarity to the character of Pyrocles in Sidney’s *Arcadia*, who likewise suffers shipwreck (Gossett 72; Hoeniger 3). Another possibility is that the name was taken from the historical Athenian statesman, who figures in Plutarch’s *Lives*, an oft-used source of Shakespeare’s. Supporters for this theory point out that Plutarch and Shakespeare both stress the patience of their Pericles (Gossett 73;

Hoeniger 3), although J. Madison Davis and A. Daniel Frankforter dismiss the idea as ‘less persuasive’ than other mooted derivations (375).

Pericles’ wife and daughter also undergo name-changes. The name of Pericles’ daughter, Marina, is apparently original to Shakespeare, and is self-explanatory: as she puts it, she is ‘[c]alled Marina / For I was born at sea’ (V.i.155-6). This significant name bears obvious resemblance to the other ‘romance’ heroines, such as Perdita, ‘that which is lost’ in *The Winter’s Tale* (III.ii.135) and Miranda, who is addressed by Ferdinand as ‘you wonder’ in *The Tempest* (I.ii.429). It has also been remarked upon that there is more than one Saint Marina, including ‘a virgin martyr at Antioch, also called St Pelagia, St Margaret, and “Pearl of the sea”’, although Hoeniger notes that ‘it seems improbable that Shakespeare had heard of her’ (4). Marina’s name is also a riddle of sorts. As Mark Taylor explains, traditionally riddles were of the ‘What am I?’ type, ambiguous descriptions of a thing which expect to be resolved by naming the object concerned (70-71) (this, of course, is the type of riddle found in the ‘recognition scene’ of the *Historia*). The name ‘Marina’ resolves the riddle encoded in Pericles’ and Marina’s dialogue:

PER. What countrywoman?
 Here of these shores?
MAR. No, nor of any shores;
 Yet I was mortally brought forth (V.i.102-104).⁴

and also resolves the broader riddle of the identities of the interlocutors.

In the *Historia* and in the *Confessio Amantis*, Apollonius’ daughter is called Tarsia or Thaise (respectively). In *Pericles*, this name (altered slightly to Thaisa) is used for Pericles’ wife. Perhaps this change was a simple matter of expediency: in the *Historia* and in Gower, Apollonius’ wife is nameless, and Shakespeare, after deciding

⁴ ‘[M]ortally brought forth’ is in itself a kind of riddle: Marina means that, despite the fact she is not ‘of any shores’ she is a mortal, a human being, but the secondary meaning of her words is that her birth was ‘mortal’ for her mother, causing her death.

upon the resonant name of Marina for his heroine, had a name to spare, as it were. Whilst this particular name change seems to go largely unremarked upon by editors and critics,⁵ surely, in a play where so many names are changed for little apparent reason, the retention of this name is significant. I would like to suggest that this is an (admittedly subtle) technique intended to identify mother and daughter closely with each other. This is a play where family roles and the names for family members are crucial; we must not forget the riddle ‘[h]e’s father, son and husband mild; / I mother, wife, and yet his child’ (I.i.69-70). Appropriating the daughter’s name to the mother, or, rather, to the *wife*, stresses the dangerous interchangeability of these roles in a play haunted by father-daughter incest.

It is worth mentioning here, although it is a detail common to the *Historia*, to Gower and to Shakespeare, that Antiochus’ daughter is given no name at all. While the third edition of the Folio text of Shakespeare’s plays, the first to include a list of the *dramatis personae*, gives the daughter the name of ‘Hesperides’ (Hoeniger 2), this is clearly a misreading of Antiochus’ lines: ‘[b]efore thee stands this fair Hesperides, / With golden fruit’ (I.i.28). As Richard McCabe writes, this lack of a given name for Antiochus’ daughter (and wife) ‘forc[es] us to refer to them through the very relationships the crime violates’ (182). He further notes that ‘[i]f the princess has a name that name is incest – the word that “resolves” the riddle, traditionally “unspeakable” and appropriately left unspoken’ (McCabe 184).

The other name changes are of minor significance, but may be found in a table in Appendix B.

⁵ For example, the following critics, while they discuss the meaning of the names ‘Marina’ and ‘Thaisa’ do *not* apprehend the importance of the transference of the daughter’s name in the source texts to the mother in *Pericles*: Gossett (168-69), Hoeniger (3-4), DelVecchio and Hammond (84), Davis and Frankforter (304), Warren (128, 166), and Levith (105).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE *HISTORIA* AND THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*

Stylistically, the *Historia* and Gower's tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* are quite obviously different: the *Historia* is a prose tale, Gower's is in verse; the text of the *Historia* tends towards the sparse and compact (although it is prone to repetition), Gower is expansive and descriptive, and given to editorializing. However, there are also similarities: neither text is particularly concerned with character development, for example. There are dozens of differences between the two works; the most significant are discussed below.

Some of these changes are possibly made simply in order to give Gower's tale a more contemporary feel. For example, the Greek 'gymnasium' scene in the *Historia* is replaced in Gower with a sort of festival of games, possibly a tournament of some kind (VIII 675-695). In the *Historia*, Apollonius impresses King Archistrates with his skill in a ballgame and then 'boldly approached the king. Then he rubbed [the king] with wax ointment so expertly and gently that the old man was rejuvenated,' and '[a]gain in the bath... massaged him very agreeably' (125) As Macaulay writes, 'Gower did not understand the Greek customs', and so altered the situation (539). I do not pretend to understand the Greek customs either, but there is certainly, in the Latin text, if not *homosexual* overtones in the scene, then at least *homosocial* resonances. As will be further explained in Chapter Three, homosociality is essentially male bonding, but male bonding in which women play a major role, though as the 'conduit of a relationship rather than a partner to it' (Rubin 174), as they are given from father to future husband in order to strengthen the bonds of the men involved in the exchange (Sedgwick 25-26). Whether Gower was actively uncomfortable with these political implications, or whether he considered the gymnasium scene outmoded or merely too risqué (the participants in his games are also naked, but he makes sure to inform the

reader that this was then the ‘custume and us’ and ‘[a]monges hem was no refus’ [VIII 685, 686]), is another matter.

Gower also makes changes to his source material in order to clarify events or to remove certain awkward or illogical incidents in the *Historia*. For example, the *Historia* makes it clear that the penalty for even attempting Antiochus’ riddle was death, regardless of whether or not the suitor solved it correctly: ‘if anyone happened to find the solution to the riddle through intelligence and learning, he was beheaded as if he had not answered at all’ (115). This statement creates an obvious problem for the plot, as it renders obscure Antiochus’ decision to allow Apollonius a grace period to ‘solve’ the riddle. This ‘grace period’ becomes far more plausible in the *Confessio*, where Gower states that the suitors were beheaded ‘[f]or lacke of ansuere in the wise’ (VIII 371).

Likewise, in the *Historia* the behaviour of Athenagoras is distinctly odd: when he fetches Tarsia to console Apollonius he is aware that the name of both her father and the name of the sorrowful man on the ship is Apollonius, but he does not tell her this (159, 161), leaving his actions explicable only in terms of the demands of the plot and for narrative suspense. Further problems are created by Athenagoras’ repeated offers of money to Tarsia for attempting to console Apollonius. Oddly, Athenagoras offers to ‘redeem you from the pimp for thirty days’ should she succeed in alleviating Apollonius’ grief (161). This seems to beg the question of why, if it is easily done, Athenagoras, who ‘watched over’ Thaise as if she was his ‘daughter’ (155), had not attempted to buy her freedom before, or why he should put conditions upon this offer. These difficulties are removed by Gower, as in the *Confessio*, Athenagoras does not know Thaise and it is at the suggestion of ‘hem that weren wise’ that she is brought to cheer up Apollonius (VIII 1650).

Doubtless Gower's changes to the role of Athenagoras were motivated not solely by the desire to tidy up weaknesses in the plot of the *Historia*. He surely must have also felt uneasy with the idea of marrying his heroine off to such a reprobate as Athenagoras appears to be in the *Historia*. In the earlier text, when Tarsia is put up for sale by the pirates, a bidding war ensues between a pimp and 'the prince of the city, Athenagoras' (151). Athenagoras eventually relents and allows the pimp to buy her, reasoning that 'when he puts her in the brothel I will be her first client, and will deflower her for a low price, and I shall feel just as if I had bought her' (151). When Athenagoras visits the brothel, however, he is persuaded by Tarsia's tears and the thought that 'I too have a daughter who is a virgin' and gives her money without raping her (151, 153). Added to this slightly unsettling comparison of Tarsia, his future wife, with his own daughter, is the later remark that Athenagoras 'watched over her as if she were his own only daughter' (155). Gower's Athenagoras is far more suitable as a husband for Thaise: he is noble, he has no connection to the brothel, no awkward quasi-paternal feelings for Thaise, and, as Gower makes certain to tell us, '[w]ifles he was into that day, / As he that yit was of yong age' (VIII 1760-61). As readers, we can be far more content with Thaise's future husband in the *Confessio* than with his counterpart in either the *Historia* or in *Pericles*.

Gower also makes significant changes to the characterization of Apollonius. In the *Historia*, there are several incidents which place Apollonius in a rather unflattering light. Firstly, when Antiochus sends his henchman Taliarchus in pursuit of Apollonius in the *Historia*, he tells him, 'when you come to Tyre, his home, seek out some enemy of his, who would kill him with a sword or with poison' (117). Although, of course, Antiochus' perception of Apollonius is likely to be inaccurate, this does raise the possibility that Apollonius is not as universally admired as it might seem.

This impression is later reinforced by the effect of Antiochus' bounty on Apollonius' head: 'not only Apollonius' enemies but also his friends were influenced by greed and hurried to track him down' (119). Antiochus' proclamation also does not appear in Gower. There, the king rather weakly decides to 'stint his wraththe and let him be' (VIII 536), thus rendering Apollonius' continued flight unnecessary (although Apollonius, of course, does not realise this).

Shortly afterwards, we witness in the *Historia* some unbecoming behaviour on Apollonius' part. When, in the *Historia*, Apollonius meets 'Hellenicus, a fellow-citizen' at Tarsus, he scorns his greeting 'as great men are inclined to do' (119). However, when Hellenicus informs him that Antiochus has put a price on his head, Apollonius seeks to reward him for his loyalty in warning him rather than seeking the reward from Antiochus. Hellenicus replies, in what seems an implicit rebuke, '[f]ar be it from me, lord, to accept a reward for this affair. Among good men, friendship is not acquired for a price' (121). Apollonius is similarly warned in Gower, but he neither ungraciously ignores Hellican nor rewards him for his warning (VIII 571-583).

A little later on, the *Historia* again presents Apollonius as a rather ungracious figure. When Arcestrates' daughter plays the lyre (for the express purpose of cheering Apollonius), she is praised excessively by the whole company except Apollonius, who eventually ventures the opinion that she 'has stumbled on the art of music, but she has not learned it'. He then asks to demonstrate his own skill at playing so that the company 'will find out at once what [they] did not know before' (129). In Gower, Apollonius courteously acknowledges that she plays very well, although he ventures that it would be nice if she also played 'the mesure', which he can teach her (VIII 767-770). Nevertheless, Apollonius' accomplishments seem to have a greater effect upon the princess in the *Historia*, who 'when [she] saw that the young man was

full of every kind of talent and learning, ... was wounded by a fiercely burning passion, and fell very deeply in love' (129). In Gower, his accomplishments are rather proof of a supposed noble birth than, it would appear, an overwhelming attraction of their own accord (VIII 790-794).

These three incidents, although small in themselves, do affect our view of Apollonius. Overall, Gower's Apollonius is far more courteous and refined, able to interact graciously with both those below him on the social scale and with his equals. In the *Historia*, on the contrary, we may be tempted to think that Antiochus has good reason to believe that Taliarchus may be able to find 'some enemy' of Apollonius' willing to kill him.

There is even one further episode in the *Historia* which could possibly contribute to a negative view of Apollonius: his behaviour on his first visit to Tarsus. Apollonius dispenses grain to the citizens of Tarsus in both texts, but whereas in Gower we are told simply that '[h]e gaf, and tok of hem riht nocht' (VIII 558), the action in the *Historia* is more complex. There, Apollonius first offers the grain 'at the same price that I paid for it in my own land', an offer which greatly pleases the Tarsians, who have been paying inflated prices. Immediately afterwards, however, Apollonius decides 'in order not to appear to have abandoned his royal dignity and to have taken on the role of a merchant rather than a benefactor' to return the money to the people (121). As David Skeelee observes (drawing on the work of Steven Mullaney, and writing of the same action in Twine's *The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures*), 'this only serves to redouble the populace's debt to him', describing the whole transaction as a 'display of mercantile greed and cunning' (131). While this reading seems a little harsh, Gower evidently thought it more straightforward at least,

or perhaps more honest and dignified on the part of his hero, to simply present the grain as a gift.

Thus we can observe in Gower a general trend towards simplifying and clarifying the material he finds in his source. He is concerned to make his heroes more unambiguously heroic, without the sort of flaws that Apollonius and Athenagoras have in the *Historia*. He clearly has considered the weaknesses of plot development and logic which appear in the *Historia*, and worked to correct them in his own text. Whilst his work remains archaic in some ways, particularly of course in its use of pagan gods, he seeks to make it fairly contemporary for the most part.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS* AND *PERICLES*

While *Pericles* is clearly indebted to Gower's version of *Apollonius of Tyre* (and makes this debt clear by its use of Gower as its choric narrator), obviously Shakespeare had to make many changes to his source material to suit the requirements of drama. Whilst *Pericles* is perhaps not the most dramatic of Shakespeare's plays (a significant portion of the action takes place off-stage or in dumb show) the material had to be altered and, above all, compressed, to suit the play format. These cuts are, in general, not to the incidents of the plot, but to unnecessary verbiage. Gower has a tendency to enlarge upon every concept and sentence, using many words to express an idea which could easily be summed up in a few. For example, Shakespeare tells us of Lysimachus' intent to visit Pericles in his ship thus:

Lysimachus our Tyrian ship espies,
His banners, sable, trimm'd with rich expense;
And to him in his barge with fervour hies (V.Chorus.18-20).

Gower, on the other hand, takes some ten lines to recount the same event:

The lord which of the cité was,
Whos name is Athenagoras,

Was there, and seide he wolde se
What schip it is, and who thei be
That ben therinne: and after sone,
Whan that he sih it was to done,
His barge was for him arraied,
And he goth forth and hath assaied.
He fond the schip of gret array (VIII 1621-29).

This is not to say there are no examples of banal exposition in *Pericles*, such as Thaliard's speech, '[s]o this is Tyre, and this the court. Here must I kill King Pericles; and if I do it not, I am sure to be hang'd at home: 'tis dangerous' (I.iii.1-3).

The only major examples of Shakespeare making significant cuts to the story itself are at the very beginning and the very end. In *Pericles*, we are given a brief vision of the fate of the protagonists after the play's end (essentially, that Marina and Lysimachus will marry and rule in Tyre, while Pericles and Thaisa will reign in Pentapolis [V.iii.70-83]) before a short moralizing Epilogue. He certainly does not show the concern demonstrated (in different ways) by Gower and the *Historia* to go back and resolve all the loose ends in the narrative. His decision to begin the play after the opening incest episode found in Gower and in the *Historia* will be further discussed in Chapter Two.

Shakespeare also occasionally enlarges upon the material he found in his source material. Examples of this include the fisherman scene and the scenes set in Tyre during Pericles' absence (discussed in Chapter Three) and the tournament scene at Pentapolis. In this scene, Shakespeare fashions a chivalric 'triumph' (II.ii.1) (in which the knights present themselves and their shields before Simonides and Thaisa) in place of the vague and briefly described 'gamen' (VIII 680) of Gower. There seems little point in this scene in terms of plot development; it is more a spectacle than an integrated part of the drama (Hoeniger lxxvii). Anonymous knights parade past Simonides and Thaisa, who describe and explain the devices and mottoes on their

shields, followed at length by Pericles, who cuts a sorry figure in his rusty armour. Hoener suggests that the scene may have been derived from the popular practice of holding tournaments before the royals in the reigns of James I and Elizabeth I, which generally began with such a presentation (52). Despite the fact that the scene is not directly derived from Gower, it also fits the play's efforts to give a sense of antiquity to the tale (for example, by having 'Gower' narrate in verse, using such archaic verb forms as 'y-slacked' [III.Ch.1] and 'perishen' [II.Ch.35]).

Shakespeare's brothel scenes are also greatly expanded from the material he found in Gower. They are much closer to the spirit of the *Historia*, although the changes were actually based on Shakespeare's other source text, Lawrence Twine's *The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures*. The time Marina spends in the brothel is analogous to her father's trials in losing status, possessions, and his loved ones through the play. It is her time of trial, and she acquits herself with flying colours. She bears up under her misfortunes, in fact, far better than does her father, demonstrating courage, wit, strength and piety. Her experience is also important as a way to conquer 'the shadow of oedipal sexuality' (Coppélia Kahn, qtd. in Skeele 80). As she encounters and rejects the advances of men old enough to be her father, we may be confident that she will not become a victim of incest by the end of the play. However, if one accepts (as I will argue in Chapter Two) the reality of 'seduction theory', with the older male as aggressor, over 'Oedipal theory', in which the child feels sexual passion for the parent, the greater danger – that Pericles will himself make advances to his unrecognised child – still remains despite Marina's testing.

Shakespeare's treatment of these scenes, however, goes beyond anything called for by the plot or for the purposes of thematic development. The brothel scenes are an indulgence, a chance to play with puns and *double entendres*, to show the

lowest of the low in their natural habitat, to show, in Bagehot's neat turn of phrase, that he is 'sympathizingly cognizant with the talk of the illogical classes' (qtd. in Hoeniger 108). He departs notably from Gower, in order to follow Twine's version of events. As noted above, in Gower the governor of Mitilene does not visit Marina in the brothel. In Twine, not only does he do so, but (as in the *Historia*) he also bids for outright ownership of her in the marketplace. This latter event does not occur in Shakespeare, but Shakespeare's Lysimachus is clearly a reprobate, striding into the brothel and greeting the bawd with '[h]ow now! How a dozen of virginities?' (IV.vi.19). Hoeniger squeamishly writes that, while George Wilkins, in his work *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, has his Lysimachus 'visit the brothel with wicked intent' (129), this was 'surely not Shakespeare's intention in the play, though Lysimachus throws off his mask only at l. 101' (130). This smacks of the views of Victorian commentators such as Frederick Gard Fleay, who sought to deny that Shakespeare wrote the brothel scenes at all, based entirely on his suppositions about Shakespeare's moral character (Skeele 26-27), and is thoroughly unconvincing. His easy banter with the brothel-keepers, his description of himself as one of the 'resorters' (IV.vi.22) of the brothel, the fact that he is recognised by the bawd even when disguised (IV.vi.15-16) and his initial conversation with Marina ('[w]ere you a gamester at five or at seven?' [IV.vi.73-74]) all proclaim that Lysimachus came to the brothel as a *bona fide* customer. Hoeniger's argument also begs the question of why Lysimachus, who in his conversation with Marina certainly appears to be ignorant of all information concerning her, should have come to the brothel at all were it not 'with wicked intent'. His later protestations that 'I came with no ill intent; for to me / The very doors and windows savour vilely' (IV.vi.109-10) do not ring true. While this renders his transformation from hardened degenerate to chivalrous champion

somewhat unconvincing in its speed, it is ultimately proof of Marina's great powers of persuasion and general piety that she should accomplish such a deed.⁶

That Marina should be ultimately married off to such a man may be a disappointment to the reader, but it helps to reinforce the sense that, at the end of the play, Marina must be disposed of as quickly as possible to negate any lingering possibility that the incest with which the play opened could possibly be repeated. It also feeds into the impression that this play is less concerned with gender equality than Gower's tale. As well as the more positive presentation of Athenagoras in Gower, we are told that he makes his addresses – in this order – 'to this maide' (VIII 1770) '[a]nd to hir fader ek also' (VIII 1771), and that 'be thei alle of on acord' (VIII 1776)'. In *Pericles*, by contrary, Marina seems to have no say in her marriage partner. When Lysimachus tells Pericles that he has something to ask him, Pericles replies '[y]ou shall prevail, / Were it to woo my daughter' (V.i.259-60). At this point of the play, 'the previously eloquent Marina' has not spoken for nearly 50 lines, and will speak only a single sentence more before the end of the play (Quilligan 226). One gets the sense that, once she is back under patriarchal control, she is her father's to dispose of as he pleases.

Shakespeare's emphases in the 'reunion' scene between Pericles and Marina also seem somewhat different from his sources. While the prelude to the eventual recognition of Marina by Pericles is certainly drawn out (presumably to increase the dramatic tension of the scene), Shakespeare seems less concerned with the 'business' of recognition than do his sources, and more concerned with the emotional resonances of the scene.

⁶ Roger Warren argues that there is a substantial amount of text missing from this scene, wherein Marina's powers of persuasion are demonstrated and she convincingly converts Lysimachus (49-52).

In *Pericles*, it takes some 100 lines from the initial encounter between Marina and Pericles to the moment of full recognition (V.i.79-180), and then an additional 57 lines until the end of the scene. In Gower, approximately 58 lines are given from Thaise's entrance to the recognition (VIII 1659-1717), thereafter there are around 26 lines (VIII 1718-1744), but only three of these lines really deal with the emotions of the protagonists: 'such a joie as he tho made / Was nevere sen; thus be thei glade, / That sory hadden be tofor' (VIII 1733-35) – the remaining lines are taken up by further explanations by Thaise of what had befallen her, a short piece on the mutability of fortune, and the physical ascent of Apollonius from 'his derke place' into the 'liht' (VIII 1740, 1741).

By contrast, in Shakespeare it is almost all emotion. Pericles almost raves in his joy:

O Helicanus, strike me, honour'd sir!
Give me a gash, put me to present pain,
Lest this great sea of joys rushing upon me
O'erbear the shores of my mortality,
And drown me with their sweetness. O, come hither,
Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget (V.i.190-95).

The scene culminates with Pericles hearing the music of the spheres in his bliss, a sign that the reunion of father and daughter is attended with supernatural blessings as opposed to the divine wrath generated by the unnatural union of Antiochus and his daughter. Here, there is harmony in place of the discord generated by incest, recalling Pericles' comparison of Antiochus' daughter with a musical instrument, which 'being played upon before... time' has the result that 'Hell only danceth at so harsh a chime' (I.i.85, 86). The line '[t]hou that beget'st him that did thee beget' beautifully both recalls and dispels the threat of incest: as Gower would put it, replacing 'unkinde fare' (VIII 312) with 'kindely' love (VIII 1707).

CHAPTER TWO: INCEST AND PSYCHOANALYSIS IN *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

In this chapter, I will examine the thematic importance of incest in the three versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story. After explaining why I believe that incest is such an important element in *Apollonius of Tyre*, I will look at the relationship of *Apollonius of Tyre* to the Greek drama *Oedipus the King* (*Oedipus Rex*) by Sophocles. After discussing of the text in relation to theories of the Oedipus Complex, I will make a case for reading *Apollonius of Tyre* according to Freud's earlier Seduction Theory.

THE THEME OF INCEST

It has not always been recognised that incest is a key theme in the *Apollonius of Tyre* story. Elizabeth Archibald cites Rohde's argument that the opening incest episode was not an original part of the story, but was added in order to prompt Apollonius' flight from Tyre (*Apollonius* 15), and the stage history of *Pericles* is full of productions which omitted the incest scenes altogether.⁷ So, what reasons do I have for seeing the theme of incest as so vital to an understanding of the story? Firstly, as Archibald also points out, the incest at Antioch appears in every extended narrative version of the tale, indicating that its adapters certainly did not see it as essentially alien to the rest of the story (*Apollonius* 98). Then there is the fact that Gower explicitly used the story of *Apollonius of Tyre* as an *exemplum* on incest.

⁷ For example, 'the one major *Pericles* of the nineteenth century', Samuel Phelps' 1854 production (Skeele 38) cut 'any reference that might suggest incest to his audience' (Skeele 41). John Coleman's 1900 production was so heavily expurgated that Frank Benson, the manager of the Memorial Theatre in Stratford-upon-Avon where it was staged (Skeele 52-53), was able to declare 'there is *nothing objectionable* in Coleman's version. I should not mind my little girl of 10 coming to see it' (qtd. in Skeele 53). As late as 1947, Nugent Monck revived his 1929 production of *Pericles* (Skeele 102-03), minus the 'pointless story of incest with which the plot begins' (Franklin J. Hildy, paraphrasing Monck, qtd. in Skeele 102).

The most compelling evidence, however, comes from the internal mechanics of the tale. As I wrote in Chapter One, the story is structured around pairs of fathers and daughters who mirror each other and reflect back to the first father and daughter of the tale, Antiochus and his daughter. This has the effect of constantly keeping the theme of incest in the reader's mind, as we read each successive father-daughter relationship through the prism of Antiochus' incest. This effect is particularly strong in the 'recognition scene' between Apollonius and Tarsia.

Many readers will surely approach this 'recognition scene' with an expectation that some sort of incestuous outcome will arise (whether this be consensual sex, rape, or merely some sort of sexual advance by Apollonius). As Mark Taylor has written, 'we may ask ourselves what we, as readers, *expect* to happen in a play that begins with a scene of father-daughter incest, goes on to make another man father to another daughter, has him abandon her for fourteen years, and then brings them together, their identities unknown to each other, outside a brothel' (72).⁸ There are also hints in some texts that the author is deliberately trying to create an atmosphere of unease, as in *Pericles* where, before Marina attempts to console Pericles, she says:

I will use
My utmost skill in his [Pericles'] recovery, provided
That none but I and my companion maid
Be suffer'd to come near him (V.i.75-78).

No reason is given for Marina's wish to be left essentially alone with Pericles; the only reason which springs to mind is Shakespeare's wish to create dramatic tension around the possibility of incest.

This dramatic tension is steadily increased through the three texts. As I have indicated in Chapter One, of the three, the *Historia* shows the least concern with incest thematically, particularly in its 'recognition scene'. While the 'recognition

⁸ Pericles and Marina are, of course, on board Pericles' ship rather than outside a brothel, but Taylor's point is valid nonetheless.

scene' in the *Historia* is far longer than the equivalent in the *Confessio Amantis*, most of the space is taken up by the 'business' of recognition: the songs, riddles, and the recounting of Tarsia's life story. Unlike in Gower or in Shakespeare, in the *Historia*, Tarsia's riddles are given in full. This attention to riddling does remind the reader of the central riddle of the tale: the riddle of incest, but the *Historia* lacks the sexual tension of the corresponding scenes in Gower and in *Pericles*. In the *Historia*, Tarsia announces from the first that she is 'no fallen woman who has come to console you, but an innocent girl, who keeps her virginity intact in the midst of moral shipwreck' (161), so it seems less likely that Apollonius will attempt to seduce her. In the *Historia*, Apollonius also recognises his daughter immediately after he strikes her, as she clearly recounts her life story. In the two other texts, Tarsia does not proclaim her chastity at the beginning of the scene, leaving much more room for ambiguity in Apollonius' eyes.

Gower and Shakespeare also delay the moment of recognition until a kind of affection or affinity has grown up between the pair. In the *Confessio*, Gower tells us before the final recognition that:

of hem tuo a man mai liere
 What is to be so sibb of blod.
 Non wiste of other hou it stod,
 And yit the fader ate laste
 His herte upon this maide caste,
 That he hire loveth kindely,
 And yit he wiste nevere why (VIII 1702-08).

Even more ominously, Pericles eulogizes Marina's beauty, comparing her to his wife, before the moment of recognition:

My dearest wife
 Was like this maid, and such a one
 My daughter might have been: my queen's square brows,
 Her stature to an inch; as wand-like straight;
 As silver-voic'd; her eyes as jewel-like
 And cas'd as richly; in pace another Juno;

Who starves the ears she feeds, and makes them hungry
The more she gives them speech (V.i.106-13).

Pericles' speech recalls not only the beauty of his wife, but also that of Antiochus' daughter, who is described as fit '[f]or the embracements even of Jove himself' (I.i.8). (Jove, of course, being the husband of Juno.)

Apollonius' reasons for striking Tarsia are also ambiguous. Thaise in the *Confessio* and Marina in *Pericles* respond to this act in similar ways:

(Thaise): Avoi, mi lord, I am a maide;
And if ye wiste what I am,
And out of what lignage I cam,
Ye wolde nocht be so salvage (VIII 1696-99).

(Marina): I am a maid,
My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes,
But have been gaz'd on like a comet; she speaks,
My lord, that, may be, hath endur'd a grief
Might equal yours, if both were justly weigh'd.
.....
My derivation was from ancestors
Who stood equivalent with mighty kings (V.i.84-91).

The fact that, unlike in the *Historia*, the first instinct of both Thaise and Marina is to emphasize their chastity indicates that they, at least, understand Apollonius' action to have some sort of a sexual element. Pericles' motivation for striking Marina is obscure; Apollonius' for striking Thaise is presumably because she has laid hands on him first, an action which is described in the *Confessio* in somewhat loaded terms: 'in the derke forth sche goth, / Til sche him toucheth, and he wroth' (VIII 1691-92). What seems to have happened here is that Apollonius has mistaken Thaise's action for a sexual advance, and, presuming her to be a prostitute, angrily rejects her. Thaise (and Marina) understand the false presumption which has motivated Apollonius and swiftly act to declare their social position and sexual purity. This interpretation means that there was no real chance, in the final analysis, of incest taking place between the pair, but, of course, the sexually fraught atmosphere of the scene is unchanged. In the

Historia, when Apollonius strikes Tarsia, we may be reminded of the ‘flow of blood’ (*Historia* 113) suffered by Antiochus’ daughter when raped, and be tempted to read this incident as a symbolic deflowering, but the fact that Tarsia has already made her chastity clear, and does not repeat this information at this stage leads me to reject that interpretation.

In the end, although it has been in the interest of dramatic tension to offer the suggestion that incest (consummated or averted) could have resulted from the encounter of Apollonius and Tarsia, the scene’s purpose is not to replay the opening scene but to recall it in order to present a new scene of incest overcome. Throughout the play, Apollonius has been in flight from incest, both in a literal sense (through his flight from Antioch’s court) and more metaphorically (through his abandonment of Tarsia). The entire tale builds up towards this reunion scene, when Apollonius can finally come to terms with what he witnessed at Antioch and stop running. The scene’s purpose in healing psychic wounds is shown in the way it picks up terms and motifs which have been previously associated with incest and refashions their meanings. Thus Gower writes that Apollonius loves Thaise ‘kindely’ (glossed by Peck as ‘warmly’ or ‘naturally’) (VIII 1707), a word that has previously appeared in the text in a negative form and been associated with incest (for example, Antiochus’ rape of his daughter is described as ‘unkinde fare’ [VIII 312]). *Pericles* features the wonderfully expressive description of Marina as ‘[t]hou that beget’st him that did thee beget’ (V.i.195), a line which recalls Antiochus’ daughter who is ‘mother, wife, and yet his child’ (I.i.70), but transforms the awful literalness of Antioch into a powerful statement of the emotional life a child may awaken in its parents.

APOLLONIUS OF TYRE AND OEDIPUS THE KING

Most modern readers will be struck, upon first reading the story of *Apollonius of Tyre*, by its resemblance to the Greek tragedy of *Oedipus the King*. It has even been suggested that the story of *Apollonius of Tyre* developed out of the Oedipus legend (Scanlon 114). Most noticeably, both tales feature riddles and, of course, both are concerned with incest. It is the use to which *Oedipus the King* has been put in modern psychoanalysis (originally by Freud) which renders this story so familiar to us. The idea of the so-called Oedipus Complex is ingrained in our culture to such an extent that it is difficult to examine a literary work on incest without pondering its possible connections to *Oedipus the King*.

However, the differences between *Oedipus the King* and *Apollonius of Tyre* are just as glaring as their surface similarities. While both feature inter-generational incest, in *Apollonius of Tyre* the incest is between a father and his daughter, whilst *Oedipus the King* involves mother-son incest. In each story the same-sex parent is absent, but in *Apollonius of Tyre* the (natural) death of the mother may be said to have precipitated the incest, whilst in *Oedipus the King*, Oedipus himself (unwittingly) murders his father. The greatest difference is that the incest in *Oedipus the King* is unintentional, between a mother and son who do not know their true relationship, and consensual. The incest in *Apollonius of Tyre* is neither of these things.

Before considering how the story of *Oedipus the King* has been used in the twentieth century and beyond – that is to say, before looking at the Oedipus Complex in any detail - I would like to briefly examine other ways in which the story of Oedipus connects to and possibly illuminates the story of Apollonius.

THE RIDDLE

Firstly, there is the riddle. The riddle in itself is not important: it is only mentioned in passing in *Oedipus the King*, and its text is not revealed. What is important, for *Oedipus the King* and for our comparison with *Apollonius of Tyre*, are the consequences of solving the Sphinx's riddle. One consequence is that Oedipus gains a reputation for wit and intelligence. As he says, 'I came, I, Oedipus the ignorant, and made her [the Sphinx] mute, when I had seized the answer by my wit, untaught...' (Sophocles 181). Skill with riddles, of course, also distinguishes Apollonius and his daughter Tarsia. Elizabeth Archibald claims that riddles are traditionally associated with royalty (*Apollonius* 24-5). This seems to be confirmed by the *Historia*, where Apollonius' ability to decipher Tarsia's riddles is seen as proof 'that he really was a king' (163). Riddles also seem to have a special affinity with incest, perhaps because of the inexpressibility of incest. As Oedipus says, 'tis unmeet to name what 'tis unmeet to do' (Sophocles 207), but in a Freudian interpretation, what is inadequately repressed must come to light – in the form of a riddle.

The other consequence of Oedipus' solving of the riddle is that it brings him one step closer to becoming king of Thebes and marrying his mother. In *Oedipus the King* the riddle is ostensibly unconnected with the actual incest. The riddle is not a test for suitors who, solving it, win hand of a princess. However, the *result* of solving the riddle is nevertheless that Oedipus is able to marry the queen, Jocasta. In *Apollonius of Tyre*, almost the exact opposite is true: solving the riddle ostensibly *does* permit one to marry the princess, but in reality the riddle is a literal dead end for those who venture it. This motif of solving a riddle to win someone's hand in marriage may have its origins in actual folk traditions.⁹ The ironic uses to which this custom is put – the 'riddle' that winning a riddle contest and a wife (in actuality in

⁹ For example, in 1783 Christfrid Ganander recorded a Finnish folk tradition wherein 'when a suitor or a young man came to ask for a girl, three or more riddles were posed to him, to test his mind with them, and if he could answer and interpret them, he received the girl, otherwise not' (qtd. in Maranda 127).

Oedipus the King, but only in theory in *Apollonius of Tyre*) can actually lead to death and destruction – is neatly expressed in *Oedipus the King*:

OEDIPUS. What riddles, what dark words thou always speakest!

TEIRESIAS. Nay, art not thou most skilled to unravel dark speech?

OEDIPUS. Make that my reproach in which thou shalt find me great.

TEIRESIAS. Yet 'twas just that fortune that undid thee (Sophocles 182).

Another important similarity is that much time is devoted both in *Oedipus the King* and in *Apollonius of Tyre* to questions of identity, questions which often seem to take a riddling turn. Again, however, while the thematic search for identity is common to the two texts, the consequences in each are radically different. In *Oedipus the King*, the discovery of his identity leads to tragedy for Oedipus and his mother. In *Apollonius of Tyre*, by contrary, the mutual discovery of each other's identities by Tarsia and Apollonius leads to healing and restoration.

FORTUNE

Also of great importance in the two tales is a conception of 'fate' or 'fortune'. Leaving aside Freudian interpretations, in the original text, *Oedipus the King* is more about Fate and the gods than it is about incest. The true tragedy of *Oedipus the King* is that the characters bring about their own downfalls by the very stratagems with which they seek to elude their fates. Jocasta and Laius expose their child, Oedipus, after learning of a prophesy that he will grow up to marry the former and murder the latter (Sophocles 189). Oedipus, when he learns he is fated to murder his father and marry his mother, flees from his (adoptive) parents, and thus arrives at Thebes to fulfil his destiny (Sophocles 191). The characters frequently make foolish pronouncements on the efficacy of prophecy, such as Jocasta's claim that 'nought of mortal birth is a sharer in the science of the seer' (Sophocles 189). The play exists, in large part, to

prove these pronouncements wrong, to assert that we cannot escape our fates, and, in fact, that by fleeing our destiny we may actually be taking steps to fulfil it instead.

In the *Historia*, there is no strong thematic concern with fortune, although there are sporadic references, such as that Apollonius' decision to leave Tarsus was made 'at the encouragement of Stranguillio and Dionysias his wife, and urged on by Fortune' (123). However, fortune is a key concern in Gower's version of the tale. The first reference to fortune comes within the first ten lines of the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* – 'such fortune cam to honde, / That deth, which no king mai withstonde / ... / This worthi queene tok aweie' (VIII 279-82). Death and fortune seem to be the only things that cannot be challenged by the will of a king. A king can, and in this story, does, break the fundamental human law against incest, but the mightiest of tyrants cannot escape death (particularly when it takes the form of the kind of divine retribution which eventually strikes Antiochus down).

But while Antiochus does his best to challenge his fate, Apollonius is literally washed along on a tide of his own fortune. His wanderings sometimes seem aimless, both in terms of Apollonius' personal narrative and in terms of the narrative of *Apollonius of Tyre*: that is, his various sea-journeys and shipwrecks seem to exist for no other purpose than to further the plot. Only if we understand that Apollonius is a victim of fortune – and of his own passivity in the face of fortune – can we ascribe any meaning to his wanderings. For it is the intersection between the traditionally changeable nature of fortune and Apollonius' own personality which informs the movement of the plot. Gower's conception of fortune allows for the traditional image of man as the plaything of the gods:

Fortune hath evere be muable
And mai no while stonde stable,
For now it hiheth, now it loweth,
Now stant upriht, now overthroweth,

Now full of blisse and now of bale (VIII 585-89).

But he also gives man a part in shaping his own destiny:

For after that we falle and rise,
The world arist and falth withal,
So that the man is overall
His oghne cause of wel and wo.
What we fortune clepe so
Out of the man himself it groweth (Prologue 544-49).

Thus, in the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*, we can perhaps attribute Apollonius' shipwrecks to the hand of fortune, but we can also acknowledge that the way in which Apollonius responds to events is significant. Perhaps Gower's dual conception of Fortune is why, despite the shape of the plot (which seems to argue for fortune as a driving force of the action) and despite the references to fortune in the text, there is not really a strongly fatalistic feel to the story, as there is in *Oedipus the King*. This may also be because *Apollonius of Tyre* is a comedy, and often the feeling of inescapable destiny is linked with the impending doom of tragedy. We need not trouble ourselves so much over the vagaries of fortune when we anticipate a happy ending:

Lo, thus fortune his hap hath lad;
In sondri wise he was travailed,
Bot hou so evere he be assailed,
His latere ende schal be good (VIII 1320-24).

With this assurance, we can view ironically Apollonius' railings against fortune (VIII 1584-88), secure in the knowledge that all will turn out for the best, since '[s]o goth the world, now wo, now wel' (VIII 1738).

The question of the role of fortune in *Pericles* is more vexed. There is much in the plot which depends upon the machinations of fortune, whether one believes these events to be divinely inspired or sees them simply as chance happenings. Critics such as F.D. Hoeniger detect in *Pericles* a thematic concern with 'man as the plaything of

Fortune or of the gods' (lxxiii). Hoeniger writes that 'the course of Pericles' life is shaped mainly by Providence and only secondarily by his human contacts and his own actions', stressing Pericles' passivity in response to events (lxxx). However, as I have indicated above, passivity in the face of fortune is in itself a choice and a way of shaping one's own destiny. To ascribe the action of the plot as primarily driven by fortune in the way Hoeniger claims is to ignore a character such as Marina, who, unlike Pericles or Antiochus' daughter, does not patiently endure the worst fortune has to throw at her, but moves to shape her own destiny and thus sets in motion a series of events which ultimately leads to her reunion with her father. This contradiction is reconcilable by taking a dual view of fortune similar to Gower's.

There are other hints that the concept of fortune is perhaps not taken as seriously by Shakespeare as it is by Gower. In *Pericles*, 'fortune' sometimes appears more as a clichéd shorthand for the inherent inexplicability of events than a signifier of any deeply-held belief in predestination. Rather than a mighty force, Fortune seems at times, at best, a petulant child, as in the description of Pericles' shipwreck: 'fortune, tir'd with doing bad, / Threw him ashore, to give him glad' (II.Chorus.37-38). The concept of fortune also comes in for some ironic handling. The image of the Fates is invoked in Helicanus' advice to Pericles: 'go travel for a while, / Till that [Antiochus'] rage and anger be forgot, / Or till the Destinies do cut his thread of life' (I.ii.106-08). This seems a mere figure of speech, but it comes true in a much more literal way than Helicanus presumably anticipated, when Antiochus is struck down by 'the most high gods' due to his incest (II.iv.3). Conversely, Dionyza (after ordering the death of Marina) flippantly observes that '[n]urses are not the fates, / To foster [life], not ever to preserve' (IV.iii.14-15), ignoring the fact that she (as she thinks) has acted as one of the fates in ending Marina's life.

At other moments in the play, however, Shakespeare does seem to take fortune seriously. For example, the dialogue (original to Shakespeare) between Cleon and Dionyza comparing the dire situation at Tharsus to its former prosperity seems to bear comparison to Pericles' own vicissitudes and contains a warning on the mutability of fortunes:

O, let those cities that of plenty's cup
And her prosperities so largely taste,
With their superfluous riots, hear these tears!
The misery of Tharsus may be theirs (I.iv.52-55).

There is also a sense that Pericles means it when he says, upon recovering his armour after suffering shipwreck, '[t]hanks, Fortune, yet, that after all thy crosses / Thou giv'st me somewhat to repair myself; / ... though it was mine own, part of mine heritage' (II.i.120-23).

POLLUTION

The final comparison I wish to make between *Oedipus the King* and *Apollonius of Tyre* involves the concepts of guilt and 'pollution'. Critics such as Diane Watt and Larry Scanlon (126) have argued that Apollonius is somehow 'implicated in Antiochus' sin' (Watt 139) by the very act of attempting to solve the riddle and win the hand of Antiochus' daughter. According to Scanlon:

In pitting his lore against that of Antiochus, Apollonius literally expresses a desire to displace him, a desire necessarily tainted by the guilty power which is its object. Apollonius seeks to acquire the patriarchal authority over the daughter which Antiochus holds; that authority assumes the possibility of abuse which Antiochus has made actual (126).

While she does not appear to view Apollonius as guilty, María Bullón-Fernández does suggest that he has been 'stigmatized' by his encounter with incest, and must spend the rest of the tale being 'educat[ed]' (50).

Reading *Apollonius of Tyre* in the light of *Oedipus the King*, one might suggest that Apollonius has not been ‘implicated’ in sin so much as ‘polluted’ by it. Oedipus and Jocasta may be guilty of trying to thwart destiny, but they have not really sinned (if the concept of sin may be applied to a pre-Christian text), as they erred unwittingly. What occurs, in Richard McCabe’s words, is ‘not conscious sin, but necessary pollution’ (71). The unnaturalness of parricide and incest manifests itself physically, in blight, barrenness, and plague (Sophocles 172). As Page duBois writes, ‘[t]he city itself is a body polluted by an unknown presence; it is diseased and suffering and it needs *relief*. And it is Oedipus himself of whom the city must be cleansed’ (21). Imagery of pollution, staining, and defilement recur through the play. The oracle speaks of a ‘defiling thing... harbored in this land’ (Sophocles 173), Jocasta seeks ‘riddance from uncleanness’ (Sophocles 194), the messenger asks whether Oedipus ‘dread[s] to be stained with guilt through [his] parents’ (Sophocles 196), and Oedipus cries out ‘I pollute the bed of the slain man with the hands by which he perished. Say, am I vile? Oh, am I not utterly unclean?’ (Sophocles 192). While Oedipus’ tragic fate is of course brought on by his direct involvement in parricide and incest, the land as a whole suffers. In the context of *Apollonius of Tyre* we may consider that perhaps while Antiochus dies for his sin, Apollonius, like the people of Thebes, merely suffers pollution through his encounter with sin, but need not die, because he is not as guilty as Watt and Scanlon would have us believe.

Of the three texts, the sense of physical pollution is strongest in *Pericles*. The opening scene is full of references to touch, usually coupled with imagery of danger, pollution, and ‘defiling’ (I.i.132). Antiochus’ daughter is described as ‘fair... / ... but dangerous to be touch’d; / For death-like dragons here affright thee hard’ (I.i.28-30), and in a mirror-image, after learning the secret of incest, Pericles remarks: ‘now my

thoughts revolt; / For he's no man on whom perfections wait / That, knowing sin within, will touch the gate' (I.i.79-81). Despite Pericles' apparent revulsion, Antiochus still finds it necessary to again warn him, 'touch not, upon thy life' (I.i.88). This imagery of pollution and rottenness is literalized in Antiochus and his daughter's death, when '[a] fire from heaven came and shrivell'd up / Their bodies, even to loathing; for they... stunk' (II.iv.9-10). While Pericles' response to his discovery of the incest may seem to indicate that he has not 'touch[ed] the gate' and is therefore unpolluted by the incest, it is clear that he has been deeply affected by the experience, to the point that '[t]he sad companion, dull-ey'd melancholy' haunts him (I.ii.3).

Pericles himself describes the experience as 'mine if I may call offence' (I.ii.92), which is a useful frame of reference for thinking about the encounter. McCabe suggests that Pericles' 'desire has polluted him', inasmuch as 'he has loved something horrible and "could still" but for the knowledge of such horror' (184-85). While I can see how such an encounter would affect Pericles psychologically, in terms of his ability to trust others and to trust himself, I do not believe his offence is the offence of innocent desire. Pericles, if he has offended, has offended in the way the people of Thebes have offended, in 'harbour[ing]' a 'defiling thing' (Sophocles 173): that is, by encountering incest and allowing it to persist. Perhaps Pericles could have challenged the incest no more than the Thebans could have driven out the unknown pollutant in their midst: the point is that the contact with sin has occurred and Pericles must spend the rest of the play shaking off the threat of incest.

THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX AND *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

Before examining *Apollonius of Tyre* and the psychological interpretations various critics have made of it, I wish to briefly give an account of the Oedipus

Complex. Essentially, Freud developed his theory of the Oedipus Complex from about 1900 on, when he published his *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Young 19). This theory holds that all children naturally focus their sexual desires, initially, upon their opposite-sex parent. This leads to a corresponding resentment of the same-sex parent for monopolizing the attentions and affections of the desired opposite-sex parent (Young 3-4). In order for the child to function effectively in society, these feelings must be repressed, but they cannot be eliminated, resulting in a constant conflict between the repressed desire and the social prohibition of this desire (Freud, *Totem* 29). In times of stress, these repressed feelings may resurface, ‘usually as the result of the death of a parent or a similar traumatic experience’ (de Berg 80).

If we were to apply the Oedipus Complex to *Apollonius of Tyre*, then, we may say that the adult daughter of Antiochus is, at the opening of the tale, undergoing an Oedipal crisis brought on by the death of her mother. She unconsciously desires her father, and the removal of her mother has paved the way for the fulfilment of her desires. In terms of this interpretation, Gower’s remark in the *Confessio Amantis* that Antiochus’ daughter is struck down by thunder and lightning along with her father ‘[s]o be thei bothe in o balance’ (VIII 1002), reflects the daughter’s desire for her father, and indicates that perhaps she assented to her ‘seduction’ after the fact. There is no equivalent line in the *Historia*: there, the messenger reports that ‘the most cruel King Antiochus has been struck by God’s thunderbolt as he was lying in bed with his own daughter’ (137). It almost seems as if, by this report, the God of the *Historia* has chosen to punish Antiochus by targeting him *in flagrante delicto*, leaving the daughter to die along with him as ‘collateral damage’. The daughter’s guilt is made more transparent in Shakespeare’s *Pericles*. While Shakespeare acknowledges that the father ‘did provoke’ (I.Chorus.26) his daughter to incest, he makes it clear that the

daughter came to accept the incestuous relationship: it '[w]as with long use account'd no sin' (1.Chorus.30). Shakespeare also stresses that Antiochus' daughter is blameworthy for allowing the incest to occur: she is called a 'sinful dame' (1.Chorus.31), a 'glorious casket stor'd with ill' (I.i.78), and she and Antiochus are labelled as '[b]ad child, worse father' (1.Chorus.27). By contrast, the story of Apollonius and his daughter Tarsia represents the Oedipus Complex overcome. While their reunion is fraught with sexual tension, each find how to love the other 'kindely' (VIII 1708), in direct contrast to the 'unkindely' (VIII 2005) love of Antiochus.

Such, at least, is the interpretation forced upon the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* by many critics. Otto Rank sees textual attempts to apportion a greater share of blame to the father for the incest (as in Gower's text or in the *Historia*) as 'repression... assert[ing] itself, just as in real life, in that only one partner (usually the father) appears to be seized by the forbidden passion, while the other partner (usually the daughter) rejects the approach with revulsion or attempts to escape it by fleeing' (301). Rank admits that tales of father-daughter incest are usually presented from the father's point of view (unlike their counterparts which deal with mother-son incest), in order to 'gratify and justify male sexual fantasies' (300), but he believes nonetheless that in cases of father-daughter incest 'this attraction is by no means one-sided' (301).

Georgiana Donavin interprets the riddle as revealing 'an Oedipal desire for the mother which is finally satiated in the daughter' (104). As the daughter is also, as his mother's grand-daughter, the flesh and blood of his mother, Antiochus' incest with his daughter is symbolically incest with his own mother. Donavin further explains Antiochus' tyrannous behaviour as an effort to replicate his own father's tyrannous 'possession' of the mother, writing 'Antiochus becomes a tyrant himself... in an attempt to imitate the father and thus attract the mother' (104).

Diane Watt similarly lays out a complex schema in order to reconcile the facts of the text – that a father rapes his daughter – with the orthodox theories of the Oedipus Complex. According to Watt, Antiochus’ riddle reveals his Oedipal preoccupations (135). She claims that the father’s stated desire to devour his mother’s flesh is explicable in Freudian terms as his repressed sexual longing for his own mother.¹⁰ Since the mother is inaccessible, these desires are projected onto the daughter (Watt 131). The other side of the Oedipus Complex – aggression towards the father – is also, according to Watt, present in the riddle. Curiously, however, Watt recasts Freud’s concept of a murderous hatred towards one’s father as a ‘longing’ for the father parallel to the longing for the mother: ‘[j]ust as the infantile desire for the mother is displaced onto the daughter, so the fixation on the father reemerges in a search for the son. Antiochus redirects his longing from his father onto, not his actual son (since he has none), but his son-in-law presumptive, Apollonius’ (Watt 135). For Watt, the grace period Antiochus allots Apollonius reflects his ambivalence towards him: he simultaneously wishes to destroy him (as a rival to his daughter’s affections) and to let him live, possibly because he identifies with him (136).

As mentioned in Chapter One, in the *Historia* this grace period does defy straightforward explanations, as it would appear that Antiochus has executed suitors in the past, even though they, like Apollonius, have correctly solved the riddle. In Gower and in Shakespeare, where, as far as one can tell from the text, all previous suitors have failed to guess the meaning of the riddle, Antiochus’ behaviour is far more explicable. As Roger Warren writes, the riddle in *Pericles* seems relatively easy to solve. The difficulty lies in indicating to Antiochus that one has solved the riddle, without saying so in as many words (36). When Apollonius manages this feat,

¹⁰ It is more usually assumed that the line of the riddle (in all three versions) referring to the eating of mother’s flesh is spoken by or refers to the daughter.

Antiochus is left in a difficult situation: he does not want to let Apollonius go, as he is aware that Apollonius has guessed his secret, but if he openly condemns him to death, Apollonius will have nothing left to lose and is likely to publicly expose Antiochus' guilt. Thus there is an entirely plausible explanation for Antiochus' behaviour, at least in the two latter texts.

Watt bases some of her arguments on Larry Scanlon's analysis of *Apollonius of Tyre*. Scanlon claims, in line with Oedipal theory, that what Antiochus desires is to displace his own father:

[b]y effectively becoming his daughter's husband, he also becomes his own father, because the law which separated him from his father has lost its force. Likewise, his father might as well become the son of his own daughter, since she has now become his wife. The distinctions among all these categories depend upon the father acting like a father, upon his restraint of his own power, his categorical refusal to take advantage of the violent possibilities which paternal authority must necessarily open up to him (125).

For Scanlon, father-daughter incest is defined primarily not by sexual desire, but 'as a pure expression of power' (119). It is the ultimate expression of patriarchal control over one's own family. While, as Scanlon writes, '[t]he law of exogamy requires the father to assume power over the daughter for her protection', this power can easily 'give way to a desire for dominance ultimately indistinguishable from the illicit sexual desires the father's protection is meant to prevent' (118).

Scanlon sees the incestuous father as engaged in a search for 'the Name of the Father' (125). The 'Name-of-the-Father' is Jacques Lacan's term for 'the symbol of an authority', that is, the authority generally associated with the role of father (Bowie 108). However, the *Historia* suggests that in violating the norms of the father-daughter relationship, in tyrannously abusing his power, the father in fact loses the Name-of-the-Father which he seeks. In the *Historia*, when the nurse asks Antiochus' daughter why she does not tell her father what has happened, she replies, '[a]nd where

is my father? Dear nurse... if you understand what has happened: for me *the name of father has ceased to exist*' (113, emphasis added).

These sorts of ideas, locating the responsibility for the incest with the patriarchal father, seemingly ignored by Watt, tend to point away from an Oedipal interpretation of the tale (that is, an interpretation in which the daughter is complicit in her own seduction) to a return to an older conception in psychoanalysis, namely, Freud's abandoned 'seduction theory' (Scanlon 94).

SEDUCTION THEORY AND *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

The history of how Freud developed, and then rejected, 'seduction theory' is given by Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson in his book *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. In an appendix to his book, Masson gives the full text of a speech given by Freud in 1896, entitled 'The Aetiology of Hysteria'. In this speech, Freud outlines a theory he was later to abandon in favour of the Oedipus Complex: essentially, that 'at the bottom of every case of hysteria there are *one or more occurrences of premature sexual experience*' (that is, of sexual abuse) ('Aetiology' 271). Freud also made it clear in this speech that 'unhappily all too often', the abuser was 'a close relative' ('Aetiology' 276). While Freud went on in this speech to refute the objections he anticipated from his colleagues, including the putative objection that his patients may simply be inventing their claims of abuse ('Aetiology' 272 ff.), and proclaimed himself prepared 'to meet with contradiction and disbelief' ('Aetiology' 289) he was in future years to almost totally abandon his 'seduction theory', following the 'contradiction and disbelief' he had foreseen.

Eventually, Freud was to write, in 1916, 'if in the case of girls who produce such an event [i.e., claim to have been sexually abused] in the story of their childhood

their father figures fairly regularly as the seducer, there can be no doubt... of the imaginary nature of the accusation' (qtd. in Masson 132-33). In place of the reality of sexual abuse, Freud now believed that in all, or nearly all, cases, 'seduction' was an Oedipal fantasy rather than an actual event.

Rather than interpreting *Apollonius of Tyre* as an Oedipal tale, as some critics have tried to do, it would make more sense to see it as an archetype of this abandoned 'seduction theory'. It is emphatically clear in the *Historia* that Antiochus' daughter was raped: '[s]purred on by the frenzy of his lust, [Antiochus] took his daughter's virginity by force' (113). Gower also presents a forceful depiction of an act of rape at the beginning of his tale:

This king hath leisir at his wille
 With strengthe, and whanne he time sih,
 This yonge maiden he forlih.
 And sche was tendre and full of drede,
 Sche couthe noght hir maidenhead
 Defende.....

 It helpeth noght although sche wepe (VIII 298-305).

Rather than an Oedipal crisis in the daughter, the mother's death would seem to have provoked incestuous desires in the bereaved father. Similar situations are presented in some medieval folktales, where the father fixates upon his daughter because of his resemblance to his lost wife, or because he can find no-one more beautiful than his dead wife was and his daughter is (Herman 2). Whilst, in the *Historia* and the *Confessio*, the daughter at first 'ever wissheth after deth' (VIII 333), she eventually accepts that '[w]han thing is do, there is no bote, / So suffren thei that suffre mote' (VIII 339-40). This silent acquiescence by the daughter has been identified by some as the determinative factor in her death (Donavin 107). The contrast between the silence of Antiochus' daughter and Tarsia's use of words to avoid rape in the brothel has also been remarked upon (Goddall 246). As María Bullón-Fernández writes,

drawing on the theories of Rousseau and Derrida, '[l]anguage displaces incest; silence acquiesces with it' (57). These theories still place some of the responsibility for the incestuous relationship (as opposed to the initial rape) upon the daughter, but are not incompatible with a reading of *Apollonius of Tyre* according to 'seduction theory' rather than the Oedipus Complex.

The decline in popularity of versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story such as the *Confessio Amantis* and *Pericles* after the Renaissance can be partly explained by a desire by society to repress treatments of incest as a reality. As Scanlon writes, 'on the specific question of father-daughter incest medieval culture was in some ways less repressed than late modernity' (96). The history of psychoanalysis and of literary studies may have been very different if modern society had not sought to ignore the reality of incest, particularly father-daughter incest, if Freud had not abandoned his 'seduction theory', if *Apollonius of Tyre* had been taken as a key text in psychology, in place of or alongside *Oedipus the King*.

CHAPTER THREE: PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP IN *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

It is frequently claimed by critics that *Apollonius of Tyre* is intended as a sort of exposé of patriarchy, with Antiochus representing its worst excesses, and Apollonius regarded variously as the saviour of patriarchy or as complicit in its evils. These arguments are frequently linked to the idea that *Apollonius of Tyre* seeks to examine the institution of kingship (via the concept of the family as a microcosm of the state). All three versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story examined in this thesis, having the same basic plot, share the same thematic concerns to some extent. However, in the *Historia*, the questioning of patriarchy does not seem as strong as in Gower, and the questioning of the role of kings does not seem as strong in Gower as in Shakespeare. In this chapter, I will, after dealing with the relationship of incest with patriarchy and with kingship, examine how each text tackles these issues, using the *Historia* as a base text for my arguments, then exploring how Gower's and Shakespeare's work departs from the *Historia*'s treatment of the subject.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF INCEST AND PATRIARCHY

It is generally recognised in modern studies that incest between an older male perpetrator and a younger female victim is the most common form of the crime (Herman and Hirschman 3). Furthermore, the single type of incest which is most frequently reported is father-daughter incest, the type of incest found in *Apollonius of Tyre* (Herman and Hirschman 4). Based on these facts, it has been argued that this abuse stems from the inequality inherent in the father-daughter relationship. As Judith Lewis Herman and Lisa Hirschman write, '[i]t is no accident that incest occurs most often precisely in the relationship where the male is most powerful' (4). They explain

that, within modern societies, families within which father-daughter incest occur are unusually traditional and patriarchal, with the women of the household occupying clearly inferior positions (Herman and Hirschman 71-72).

Within medieval literature, father-daughter incest was also the most common type represented (Archibald, *Incest* 190). These stories also tend to portray father-daughter incest as a deliberate act perpetrated by an aggressive father upon his unwilling daughter (although the daughter may be said to have become habituated to the incest with time) (Archibald, *Incest* 146).

Father-daughter incest can be seen both as a crime against patriarchy, and a crime generated by patriarchy. Otto Rank has suggested that generally, in literature, mother-son incest was seen as a more serious offence than father-daughter incest (301). (Presumably, Rank is thinking of the importance ascribed to the tale of Oedipus.) María Bullón-Fernández explains that this perspective may have been derived from Thomas Aquinas' view that father-daughter incest was less unnatural than mother-son incest because father-daughter incest replicates the distribution of power in traditional heterosexual relationships, with the male partner dominant over the female (18). It has also been pointed out that, in patriarchal societies, the daughter is the only family figure who doesn't 'belong' to a man other than her father: while abuse of other females within the family – nieces, granddaughters, and so on – can and undoubtedly does occur, such abuse is rendered more difficult by the fact that these women are under the aegis of another male (Boose 64; Herman and Hirschman 60). This, Herman and Hirschman argue, is the reason that the Biblical injunctions against incest, which cover nearly every other possible form of incest, do not mention father-daughter incest (60). What is being forbidden, they write, is not incest as a crime against 'the women taken for sexual use but against the men in whom the rights

of ownership, use, and exchange are vested'. Therefore, according to Herman and Hirschman, what is actually being forbidden is not incest *per se* but 'the sexual use of those women who, in one manner or another, already belong to other relatives' (61).

These assertions can be traced back to medieval pronouncements on the subject. In the *Confessio Amantis*, Gower explains that, amongst the direct offspring of Adam and Eve, 'nede hath no lawe' (VIII 75): because there were no other options, brothers and sisters had to commit incest in order to procreate, and '[f]orthi that time it was no sinne / ... / Whan that ther was of chois non other' (VIII 68-70). It was only when 'ther was poeple ynouh in londe' (VIII 101) that the laws of exogamy began to come into force. The rules were eventually codified by the Church (VIII 145-147). These explanations are based on the pronouncements of theologians, such as St. Augustine's arguments in his *The City of God Against the Pagans*. Augustine writes that sibling marriage at the dawn of creation 'was acceptable, because done under the compulsion of necessity; now, however, it is damnable because forbidden by religion' (665). What is important about these arguments is that they acknowledge that the taboo against incest is not necessarily based upon natural human instinct, but rather is a human construct (Donavin 96; Archibald, *Incest* 27), a matter of 'custom' in Augustine's words (666). This is further acknowledged by Gower's lines,

Bot thogh that holy cherche it bidde,
So to restreigne mariage,
Ther ben yit upon loves rage
Full manye of suche nou aday
That taken wher thei take may (VIII 148-52).

Behind this ban on endogamy is, of course, an insistence upon exogamy. Augustine explains that this desire for exogamy is the desire 'to unite a greater number in the closeness of affection' (666). In words which perhaps lie behind the riddle in the *Apollonius of Tyre* story, he recounts how 'the marriage of brothers with

sisters would then have made one man the father, father-in-law and uncle of his own children. By the same token, his wife would be the mother, aunt and mother-in-law of their shared children' (666). If, on the other hand, 'each of these relationships were assigned to a different individual' – that is to say, if the rule of exogamy had been observed – then 'the social bond would extend not merely to a small group, but ever more widely, to connect a large number more closely together' (666).

Almost identical concepts have been articulated in modern times by such writers as Claude Lévi-Strauss. Lévi-Strauss writes, '[t]he prohibition of incest is less a rule prohibiting marriage with the mother, sister, or daughter, than a rule obliging the mother, sister, or daughter to be given to others. It is the supreme rule of the gift' (qtd. in Herman 51). Larry Scanlon (drawing on the work of David Herlihy) calls the incest taboo a way to 'combat... "resource polygyny"' whereby women were 'accumulate[d]' in a handful of households, thus preventing both fresh kin alliances and the distribution of property (103). Of course, for women to be 'given' from one man to another or 'circulat[ed] across kindreds' (Scanlon 103) a more-or-less patriarchal social structure must exist. Committing incest involves turning one's back on society, ignoring the obligation to form bonds amongst men through the exchange of women, and it is for this reason that father-daughter incest, a crime springing from the abuse of patriarchal power, can also be described as 'the worst sin against the foundations of patriarchal society' (Bullón-Fernández 18).

All of these arguments suggest that the most compelling argument against incest is that it precludes the formation of homosocial ties. Homosociality, as critics such as Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick argue, is the sort of male bonding which is continued and sustained primarily through the exchange of women from their fathers to their future husbands. 'Patriarchal heterosexuality', she writes, uses women 'as

exchangeable, perhaps symbolic, property for the primary purpose of cementing the bonds of men' (25-26). The failure of homosociality is a grave event: as David Townsend points out (writing of Apollonius' failed wooing of Antiochus' daughter in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*), 'Apollonius's heterosexual failure may disappoint him; but it's the failure of the homosocial compact that threatens to kill him' (176).

INCEST AND KINGSHIP

It is but a small leap from identifying incest as intimately connected with the workings of patriarchy to identifying incest as intimately connected with the workings of kingship. After all, what is a king but the patriarch of patriarchs? Of course, in the *Apollonius of Tyre* story, the possible links between incest and kingship are made transparent by having the perpetrator of incest literally be a king.

This assessment is reinforced by pervasive imagery which explicitly views the state as a family, with the king as the benevolent or tyrannical 'head of the household'. For example, James I of England in his *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (written when he was King of Scotland alone), described the king's role as 'naturall Father to all his Lieges at his Coronation: And as the Father of his fatherly duty is bound to care for the nourishing, education, and vertuous gouernment of his children; euen so is the king bound to care for all his subiects' (qtd. in Jordan 16). This imagery could be turned on its head to link the tyrannical king with the incestuous father. Elizabeth Archibald notes that it was a common strategy to accuse an unpopular ruler of incest, due to the theory that a corrupt ruler in the political sense may be corrupt in his personal life also, and as a symbolic reminder that a tyrant considers himself above the law, free to do as he wishes (*Incest* 145-46).

In a general sense, incest represents the breaking of boundaries. In *Apollonius of Tyre*, Antiochus goes beyond the limits of his authority over his daughter in the same way that a tyrant abuses his power if he infringes upon the private rights of his subjects (Bullón-Fernández 2). Antiochus also flouts his position as law-giver by creating an unjust law whereby those who attempt to woo his daughter are condemned to death (Peck, *Kingship* 166). Furthermore, '[t]he absolutist king who concentrates his power in the court and does not interact with the outside' can also be compared with the incestuous father who refuses to engage with society at large (Bullón-Fernández 22).

THE *HISTORIA* AND THE EXAMINATION OF PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP

The most obvious fact is that the main protagonists in all versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story are royals. It is, of course, impossible to know if this was a deliberate choice made to highlight issues around kingship and good rule. What we can ascertain is what use the various authors make of this fact, that is, whether or not the characters' roles as royalty are emphasized, and whether their good or bad qualities are linked to their royal status.

ANTIOCHUS

Let us begin with Antiochus, the first of the *Historia's* patriarchs. In the *Historia*, we are told that he is led to consider his daughter as a potential sexual partner through 'considering to whom best to give [her] in marriage' (113). That is, it is through his role as father – as patriarch – that he is led into incest. This detail makes transparent the father's 'proper' role in giving his daughter to another man, building networks of affection (as Augustus would have it), or forging homosocial bonds (as

Sedgwick might say). It also makes clear that Antiochus is not only abusing his daughter, he is also betraying his role as patriarch, and betraying other men who might reasonably have hoped to wed the princess.

Although Antiochus' crime seems to stem from his patriarchal power rather than his kingly power, his authority does not count for nothing. Firstly, in her role as princess, Antiochus' daughter is understood to be afforded a special kind of inviolability. The first reaction of her nurse on learning her charge had been raped is to ask, '[w]ho was so bold as to violate the bed of the virgin princess, and did not fear the king?' (*Historia* 113).¹¹ Ironically, she is molested by the only man who could do so with impunity. Secondly, Antiochus' power is instrumental in covering up his crime. As has been noted above, he abuses his judicial authorities by condemning the princess's suitors to death, and he uses his influence and resources to attempt to track down and kill Apollonius. However, Antiochus' power is not limitless, as his attempt to pursue Apollonius is thwarted by the 'dilatatory' preparations of his subjects (*Historia* 119), and his efforts to 'present... himself deceitfully to his citizens as a devoted parent' (*Historia* 115) suggest that he perhaps feared the reaction of his subjects if they knew the true state of affairs. It seems, therefore, that the author of the *Historia* is not endeavouring to make any strong connection between the act of incest and Antiochus' role as king, although the power a king possesses, and the potential for the abuse of that power, is unquestionable.

APOLLONIUS

The second monarch-patriarch of the text is Apollonius. Apollonius is powerful, but not as powerful as Antiochus. He is victimized by Antiochus just as

¹¹ The phrase 'and did not fear the king' does not appear in the 'RA' text of the *Historia*, on which Archibald bases her translation. It appears in a variant ('RB') text and is given by Archibald in a footnote to her translation.

Antiochus' daughter is: in an echo of the nurse's words, Apollonius asks 'who had the power to proscribe me, the ruler of my country?' (*Historia* 119). Once again, the answer is Antiochus.

The first impressions of Apollonius are rather mixed. He is foolhardy in wooing Antiochus' daughter despite the risk of death, yet wise in his ability to decipher Antiochus' riddle. He is beloved by his people, yet he puts them in danger by arousing Antiochus' wrath and pains them by fleeing Tyre: '[the people of Tyre] were alarmed, and the sound of great lamentation was heard throughout the entire city. So great was his [Apollonius'] people's love for him that for a long time the barbers were deprived of clients, the shows were cancelled and the baths were closed' (*Historia* 117). There is nothing in the text of the *Historia* to suggest that his flight from Tyre is motivated by concern for his people's welfare rather than for his own. Even when the threat posed by Antiochus is removed, in the *Historia*, Apollonius does not return to his kingdom because of his grief (143). In the only extended dialogue between Apollonius and one of his Tyrian citizens, he scorns 'the lowborn man' and confuses his natural loyalty to his prince with greed (*Historia* 119).

Is Apollonius, therefore, a bad king? He is no tyrant, as Antiochus is, but he is negligent. This negligence is not isolated to his governance; it is a general character flaw. Apollonius neglects not only his kingdom, but also himself. This characterization of Apollonius feeds into the sense that the success of a monarchical system depends to a large extent upon the personal qualities of the monarch occupying the throne, rather than to any systemic attributes of monarchical rule. Thus, Apollonius has his failings as a person, but when he does manage to devote himself to ruling his kingdom, he appears to do a good job.

Significantly for our judgement of him, the text ends with Apollonius making wrongs right. He is instrumental in overthrowing the rule of Dionysias and Stranguillio in Tarsus for the crime of attempting to murder his daughter Tarsia (*Historia* 175). The citizens of Tarsus rise up against Stranguillio and Dionysias as they consider Apollonius as ‘our king and the father of our country’ (*Historia* 175) (although it is unclear whether this is meant literally, as in the *Historia*, Tarsus is not mentioned at the end of the text as part of Apollonius’ kingdom [179]). While the overthrow of Dionysias and Stranguillio rights a manifest wrong (and is preceded by a trial of sorts), the text still condones a kind of mob rule and regicide: ‘the citizens rushed together, seized Stranguillio and Dionysias, took them outside the city, stoned them to death, and threw their bodies on the ground for the beasts of the earth and birds of the air, so as also to deny their corpses burial in the earth’ (*Historia* 177).¹² This action, however, is implicitly sanctioned by Apollonius and Tarsia, since Tarsia intervenes to stop the murder of Dionysias’ henchman Theophilus, pardoning him and even rewarding him for indirectly saving her life (*Historia* 177). At the end of the text, Apollonius also makes up for his ill-mannered behaviour towards his subject Hellenicus by ennobling him and giving him wealth (*Historia* 179), as he also does for the poor fisherman who helped him after his shipwreck at Pentapolis (177).

So while the final impression of Apollonius as a king is a positive one, perhaps the ‘moral’ of the *Historia*, as far as kingship is concerned, is that monarchs are individuals and human beings, with human failings and weaknesses. Problems arise when these failings impact upon the state or its people, due to the power held by the

¹² The *Historia* does not make the exact status of Stranguillio and Dionysias clear: Stranguillio is described simply as a ‘man’, not as the king or ruler of Tarsus (*Historia* 121). However, I have chosen to consider Stranguillio and Dionysias as the rulers of Tarsus because their counterparts in the *Confessio* and in *Pericles* hold that position; because there is no mention in the *Historia* of any other rulers of Tarsus; because Apollonius evidently considers them of sufficient status to take care of Tarsia; and because they appear to take a prominent role in decision-making for the city, such as when Stranguillio promises protection to Apollonius in return for his gift of grain (121), or when Dionysias ‘summon[s]’ the citizens to break the news of Tarsia’s death (149).

king. The *Historia* does not suggest that any alternative system of governance would be preferable to monarchy, but it does allow that a people may rise up against their rulers should their behaviour warrant it.

As well as Apollonius' standing as a king, there is also his position as a patriarch to be considered. There may seem to be little evidence on which to judge Apollonius' performance as a patriarch: after all, his interactions with his daughter are extremely limited. However, this in itself is very telling. What are we to make of the fact that Apollonius gives his daughter away as soon as she is born, then abandons her for fourteen years with (as it happens) a negligent and cruel foster-father and foster-mother (respectively)? Archibald summarizes a number of different critical perspectives on this 'problem'. Generally, the arguments propose that it was a plot-driven decision, enabling Tarsia's independent adventures to take place (*Apollonius* 68). Archibald herself suggests that '[t]o a medieval audience it would have seemed quite natural for a father to take little interest in a daughter until she was of marriageable age', adding that it was not unusual for a noble child to be brought up in a foreign court (*Apollonius* 68). Writing of the same action in *Pericles*, Constance Jordan suggests that Pericles perhaps leaves Marina at Tarsus due to the internal strife at Tyre (62). Also writing of *Pericles*, Mark Taylor suggests that Pericles may be reluctant, having so recently lost his wife at sea, to submit his infant daughter to a sea-voyage (55). He goes on to account for Pericles' long absence as due to the exigencies of the plot, adding that 'Shakespeare simply did not trouble... to make the reason for it particularly credible' (56).

While the fostering of Tarsia is certainly useful in plot terms, it is not essential; she could have easily been snatched by pirates and be presumed dead had she lived in Tyre with her father. Taylor's other theory is also unconvincing, as it ignores the fact

that Pericles' wife died in childbirth, not from any cause directly related to the sea. Jordan's theory is plausible so far as *Pericles* is concerned, but makes no sense applied to the *Historia* or the *Confessio Amantis*, where there is no suggestion of turmoil in Tyre. Archibald's suggestion is useful in terms of illuminating audience-response to Apollonius' actions, but still does not really explain *why* he behaved as he did.

Far more convincing than any of the previous ideas is a psychoanalytical explanation for Apollonius' behaviour. I have already mentioned, and many critics have noticed, the neat structural parallels which inform the plot of *Apollonius of Tyre*, and the ways in which one father-daughter pair reflects upon another.¹³ It seems entirely reasonable to suppose that, consciously or unconsciously, Apollonius would also have recognised the parallels between his situation – alone with a motherless daughter – and that which he encountered at Antiochus' court. As Bullón-Fernández points out, his behaviour on the death of his wife is actually the exact opposite of that of Antiochus: while Antiochus seeks total, obsessive control over his daughter, Apollonius relinquishes all immediate authority over his (52). Critics such as Scanlon (121) and Watt (139) contend that Apollonius' separation from and ultimate loss of Tarsia represents some sort of providential working-out of his guilt over Antiochus' incest: guilt he shares as a fellow-patriarch or because he desired Antiochus' daughter and hence in some way desired incest itself. As I have written in Chapter Two, I do not accept that Apollonius feels, or ought to feel, guilt over his encounter with incest. What he is guilty of here is an over-reaction. It is a natural over-reaction, given his recently-acquired knowledge of incest, but an over-reaction nonetheless. It is *possible* that Apollonius senses some inner weakness, some liability towards incest, but it is

¹³ For example, see Bullón-Fernández 42; Archibald, *Apollonius* 15; McCabe 185; Goddall 243; Scanlon 117.

equally possible that his fears over incest are all externally generated, lingering resonances of the secret of Antiochus, with no answering impulse within his own soul. What the text needs to teach Apollonius – and its audience – is that there is a way for fathers and daughters to co-exist without the spectre of incest hanging over their relationship.

But does the *Historia* ever really succeed in this aim? While Tarsia and Apollonius are reunited, and, to all indications, happily so, no real relationship is established between them. Almost as soon as father and daughter have recognised each other, Athenagoras begs Apollonius to marry Tarsia to him. He makes a reasonable case for his merits as a suitor, as he is qualified by virtue of his rank and his service to Tarsia. As he puts it, ‘I am the prince of this city, and through my help she has remained a virgin’ (169). Apollonius, of course, does not know the converse aspect of this ‘service’ to Tarsia, the fact that Athenagoras came across Tarsia in his quest to purchase a mistress – but then he couldn’t know, as he doesn’t trouble to ask Tarsia about the man. Again, this is an ambiguous event. To modern audiences, doubtless it seems a betrayal of the agency Tarsia has established for herself in the brothel and in the recognition scene. Diane Watt, for example, sees it as part of a process of ‘[t]he recontainment of female sexuality’ undertaken by the text (147). This is certainly a valid perspective, but one may presume that this incident would have been viewed in a more positive light by a contemporary audience. If Antiochus was committing ‘the worst sin against the foundations of patriarchal society’ (Bullón-Fernández 18) by abusing his daughter, Apollonius must therefore be upholding the edicts of patriarchal society, following the ‘rule of the gift’ (Lévi-Strauss, qtd. in Harman 51). Just as he did by separating himself from Tarsia for so many years, Apollonius is avoiding any possibility (however faint) of incest by allowing her

marriage. We may not approve of the structure of patriarchal society, but we can acknowledge that Apollonius has journeyed far from the norms of Antioch.

However, one aspect of Apollonius' 'gift' of Tarsia to Athenagoras bears closer examination: his stated reason for agreeing to the marriage. In the *Historia*, Apollonius' reply to Athenagoras' request for Tarsia's hand in marriage runs thus: '[h]ow can I be hostile to such goodness and compassion? Indeed I am willing, because I made a vow not to give up my mourning until I had given my daughter in marriage' (169). Apart from the fact that this choice of words makes it seem almost as if Apollonius is willing to marry Tarsia off to just about anyone so that he can end his mourning, this speech reminds us of the unusual vow Apollonius made upon his daughter's birth. We are told that when Apollonius left Tarsia at Tarsus he 'swore a great oath not to cut his beard or hair or nails until he had given away his daughter in marriage' (*Historia* 143). This vow seems to be of some importance: Stranguillio and Dionysias are 'amazed that he had sworn such a solemn oath' (143), the oath forms part of Lycoris the nurse's story when she reveals Tarsia's true parentage to her (145), and Apollonius' unkempt appearance is noted several times (155, 159), including when his hair is cut after the recognition scene (171). The vow is also retained in both Gower's and Shakespeare's versions of the story.

So what does Apollonius' vow mean? Firstly, it is attributed within the *Historia* as a gesture of mourning. Apollonius himself refers to the vow as 'a vow not to give up my mourning' (169), and earlier, the people of Tyre showed their mourning over Apollonius' absence by (among other things) refusing to go to the barbers (117). There are a number of theories as to why growing or cutting hair may be associated with mourning, or may be significant in other ways. E.R. Leach summarizes the arguments of Dr. Charles Berg, that hair-cutting and allowing one's hair and beard to

grow without check can be interpreted as 'symbolic castration' and 'ascetic repudiation of the very existence of sex' (respectively) (149). Leach himself suggests that '[i]n ritual situations: long hair = unrestrained sexuality; short hair or partially shaved head or tightly bound hair = restricted sexuality; close shaven head = celibacy' (154). He also points out that hair has often been equated with the soul (160), and that the cutting of hair is often a rite of passage 'in which the individual publicly moves from one social position to another' (162). C.R. Hallpike attacks Leach's thesis (which he rather reductively states as being that hair-cutting equals castration). Hallpike points out that women also cut or shave their hair for mourning in some cultures, and that rituals focused on the beard rather than hair would make more sense as symbols of male sexuality (259). He suggests instead that 'long hair is associated with being outside society and... the cutting of hair symbolises re-entering society' (Hallpike 260).

Berg's theory makes little sense. In fact, the entire dichotomy seems somewhat absurd: self-castration and the repudiation of sex are not opposites, so how can the opposing rituals of cutting the hair or letting it grow be symbolic representations of these acts? In terms of *Apollonius of Tyre*, while the period in which Apollonius allows his hair and beard to grow does coincide with a repudiation of sexuality, brought on by the death of his wife and continued in his rejection of the possibility of incest with his child, the idea that the cutting of his hair represents castration does not fit the story. The presumed need to symbolically castrate himself would surely end with his daughter's marriage. It would be nonsensical for a man with good reason to fear the possibility of incest to choose symbolic castration only when his daughter was safely out of his reach. As for Leach's equation of long hair with rampant sexuality, there is no hint that Apollonius is experiencing, or wishes to portray himself

as experiencing, a period of unbridled sexuality during his mourning. Leach's idea of hair-cutting as a rite of passage, however, and in particular Hallpike's similar suggestion that the cutting of hair represents a return to society make more sense in terms of *Apollonius of Tyre*. Apollonius certainly excludes himself from society, and in all three versions, the cutting of hair and changing of clothes point to a resumption of his royal status. In the *Historia*, Apollonius' exclusion from society is more marked than in the other versions, as he completely cuts himself off from his home and his kingly position for the duration of his mourning. He even undergoes a striking alteration in status or class in the *Historia*, as he becomes a merchant for the period of his mourning (*Historia* 143). In Gower and Shakespeare, his isolation does not really begin until he believes Tarsia to be dead, when he breaks down utterly.

What is still unexplained by this analysis is why Apollonius makes this vow of mourning. At first, the explanation seems obvious: Apollonius goes into mourning because his wife has died. However, he chooses to tie the end of his mourning to the marriage of his daughter. Why does he do so? Is it that he has Antiochus' daughter in mind and is mourning the perilous existence of an unmarried female? Or is he in mourning for himself, burdened with the incestuous temptations he fears a daughter may represent? Mark Taylor, writing of *Pericles*, describes Pericles' oath as 'vows to the goddess of chastity' (56). While Pericles does not explicitly make any vow of chastity, Taylor's observation draws attention to the fact that, in *Pericles* (although not in the *Historia* or in Gower), he dedicates his oath to 'bright Diana, whom we honour' (III.iii.28). This strengthens the argument that the vow is to be understood as the relinquishment of sexuality until his daughter passes permanently from his control into the control of another man. Until that time, Apollonius feels the need to isolate

himself physically from his daughter and isolate himself symbolically from society by refusing to follow the norms of physical appearance.

ARCHISTRATES

Archistrates is the third important king-patriarch in the story (if we disregard Stranguillio, briefly discussed above). Archistrates is widely regarded as the representative of ideal kingship in the text, and a role model for Apollonius.¹⁴ Unlike in Shakespeare, in the *Historia* the fisherman whom Apollonius meets at Pentapolis (that is, the representative of the common people of the kingdom) does not have anything to say about the calibre of his ruler. However, the reader is still given a positive impression of Archistrates. He rewards Apollonius' merit and service at the baths by inviting him to dine with him, and is generous in doing so despite Apollonius' impoverished condition (*Historia* 125, 127), and he is pleasant and courteous towards his 'sweet and clever daughter' (*Historia* 127), to the point that he defends her when Apollonius fails to praise her musical ability, saying 'Apollonius, your behaviour is disgraceful' (*Historia* 129).

Most importantly of all, he seems to be the perfect patriarch, to modern eyes as much as to medieval. He gladly obeys the incest taboo (or, if you prefer, the rule of exogamy) in his willingness to allow his daughter to marry. Furthermore, he specifies that his daughter 'may choose for herself whom she wants as a husband' (*Historia* 133), even allowing her to marry a penniless man of unknown provenance, 'for I too became a father as a result of being in love' (*Historia* 135). As Georgiana Donavin has noted, his daughter 'obey[s] the incest taboo with assertiveness' (107), even to the point of vowing (in Gower and in Shakespeare, though not in the *Historia*) 'if I of him

¹⁴ For example, see Watt 133; Bullón-Fernández 47; Archibald, *Apollonius* 17; Goddall 244; Peck, *Kingship* 169.

faile, / ... / Ye schull for me be dowhterles' (VIII 901-03). This, judging from Shakespeare's interpretation – '[s]he tells me here, she'll wed the stranger knight, / Or never more to view nor day nor light' (II.v.16-17) – is a threat of suicide rather than of an intention to cut herself off from her father if he opposes the marriage. Luckily, his daughter chooses 'the very man... [Archestrates] wanted [her] to marry from the moment [he] saw him' (*Historia* 135), but as he was obviously willing to let his daughter marry any of her three original suitors, we may assume he would have followed his daughter's wishes even if she wished to marry a man he did not like so much. These events are handled slightly differently in the *Confessio Amantis* and in *Pericles*, and will be further discussed below.

Archestrates also looms large as a patriarch in Apollonius' consciousness. In the *Historia*, Apollonius' grief over his wife's death (or at least, the part which he verbalizes) seems to be centred upon the putative reaction of her father: 'He began to cry most bitterly, and said: 'Dear wife, beloved only daughter of a king, what has happened to you? How shall I answer for you to your father? What shall I say about you to the man who took me in, poor and needy, when I was shipwrecked?' (*Historia*, 139). Apollonius' grief in the *Confessio Amantis* is far more poetic and touching – 'he seide, "Ha, wif,/Mi lust, mi joie, my desir,/Mi welthe and my recoverir,/Why schal I live, and thou schalt die?" (VIII, 1062-65). This seems in keeping with the sense in the *Historia* of marriage as essentially a homosocial contract between men, as opposed to Gower's pains to present a more equal male-female relationship.

GOWER'S *CONFESSIO AMANTIS* AND THE EXAMINATION OF PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP

In the case of Gower, it is helpful to put the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* (along with the rest of Book VIII) in the context of the rest of the *Confessio Amantis*. As I have argued in the Introduction, Book VIII acts as a fitting summary for many of the themes raised in the rest of the *Confessio*: I will now examine a few of the connections between Book VIII and the rest of the work.

GOWER'S PROLOGUE

If Gower is interested in examining the king-as-patriarch, then the patriarch under the microscope must be Richard II. Gower's original prologue to the *Confessio* described his work as '[a] book for King Richardes sake / To whom bilangeth my ligeance' (Prologue *24-25).¹⁵ Gower, in fact, claims that his work was written at the behest of Richard himself:

In Temse whan it was flowende
 As I by bote cam rowende,
 So as Fortune hir tyme sette,
 My liege lord par chaunce I mette;

 And whan I was with him at large,
 Amonges othre thinges seyde
 He hath this charge upon me leyde,
 And bad me doo my busynesse
 That to his hihe worthinesse
 Som newe thing I scholde booke,
 That he himself it mighte looke
 After the forme of my writyng.
 And thus upon his comaundyng
 Myn hert is wel the more glad
 To write so as he me bad (Prologue *39-42, 46-56).

However, when Gower completed a revised version of the poem, in 1392, this passage was completely rewritten. Instead of '[a] book for King Richardes sake' (Prologue *24), the *Confessio* is now described as '[a] bok for Engelondes sake' (Prologue 24). Instead of the charming description of meeting Richard upon the

¹⁵ The asterisk is Peck's indication that these lines are from the first recension. Line references without the asterisk refer to the text of the third recension.

Thames, Gower speaks wearily of the uncertainty of the times ('[w]hat schal befaller hierafterward / God wot' [Prologue 26-7]), when writing and authors seem less prized than formerly (Prologue 36-51). He ends the revised passage with a dedication to Henry of Lancaster (the future King Henry IV):

This bok, upon amendement
To stonde at his commandement,
With whom myn herte is of accord,
I sende unto myn oghne lord,
Which of Lancastre is Henri named.
The hye God him hath proclamed
Ful of knythode and alle grace (Prologue 83-89).

In order to grasp the political significance of Gower's work, and the meaning of his re-dedication of the revised version, it is worth considering the historical context of the times. Richard II's reign was a turbulent time for England. He ascended the throne at just ten years old, in 1367. As Richard Jones writes, this was 'the first time since the Conquest [that] a hereditary minor had succeeded to an uncontested throne', and many lamented the uncertainty engendered by this power vacuum (5). William Langland's *Piers Plowman* probably reflects these anxieties in quoting the Biblical verse '*Ve terre ubi puer est rex!*' ('Woe to the land where the king is a child') (Prologue, l. 196, p. 11, Schmidt's translation). Unfortunately, the situation in England did not improve markedly as Richard grew up. Gower wrote the *Confessio Amantis* from about 1386 to 1390 (Peck, *Confessio* 61), which was a period of particular upheaval.

The crisis began in 1386 when a group of magnates (usually known as the Lords Appellant) sought the removal of the chancellor and treasurer from their offices. Their aim was to increase their power at the expense of Richard's favourites and to humiliate the court inner circle into the bargain (Jones 28-29). When Richard refused to comply with their wishes, the crisis eventually escalated to the point that,

according to some accounts, Richard was actually deposed for three days and only reinstated as king when the Lords couldn't agree on his successor (Saul 189). Nonetheless, the Lords took effective control of the country by establishing a commission 'to which was entrusted final authority to supervise the offices of state, the household, and the courts of law, as well as to hear and amend all grievances which might be presented' (Jones 33). In the 'Merciless Parliament' of 1388, several of the king's supporters were put on trial: Nigel Saul writes of these trials, '[i]f there was a theme running through the counts [i.e. charges], it was the familiar one of medieval oppositions, that the accused had taken advantage of the favour shown to them "to accroach the royal power" that is, to gain such a hold over the king as to allow them to make illegitimate use of his authority' (191). These trials succeeded in destroying the 'inner circle' of the king's supporters (Saul 195), but thereafter the Appellants lost favour with the commons through a lack of military victories against the French and because of the financial burdens the war imposed (Saul 199).

This left Richard in a position to assume control once more. In 1389, he declared that his minority was over and he would assume personal control over the government of the kingdom. He claimed at this point that he had formerly had little choice over his advisors, with the result that the realm had been mismanaged in many ways, especially through harsh taxation (Jones 64). He quickly made a truce with the French, a move which would likely have met with Gower's approval: Saul points out Gower's attack on war in the *Vox Clamantis* (Saul 206). From 1390 on, Richard was relatively popular with the nobility and the people; the land was prosperous and at peace and there were no major political crises apart from a 1392 quarrel between Richard and the city of London over an enforced loan (Jones 68-69; Saul 235, 259).

Of course, the period of Richard's 'tyranny' and his final downfall lay ahead, but when the third recension of the *Confessio Amantis* appeared in 1392, Richard was arguably stronger and more popular than at any other time during his reign. So why did Gower at this point change the dedication of the *Confessio Amantis* from one honouring King Richard II to one honouring Henry of Lancaster, the man who would, seven years later, usurp Richard's throne? One possibility is that it was the 1392 dispute between Richard and the city of London which turned Gower against the king (Peck, *Confessio* 27). However, Russell Peck believes that 'there is no sound evidence that Gower was hostile toward the king early in the decade' (*Confessio* 27). Peck gives the impression that the dedication to Henry was more of an alternative to the dedication to Richard, rather than a replacement version suggesting a critique of Richard (27). What, then, are the possible reasons *for* the dedication to Henry (as opposed to the reasons for the removal of the dedication to Richard)?

Henry had ties to the Lords Appellant, and fought on their side against Richard's supporter Robert de Vere at Radcot Bridge in 1387 (Kirby 25). Henry was one of the claimants for Richard's throne at this stage, although he did not play a leading role in events (Kirby 26). When John of Gaunt, Henry's father, returned to England in 1389, Henry's role in political life lessened (Kirby 27). He spent the next few years abroad, for the most part, travelling, crusading, and undertaking diplomatic missions (Kirby 28-40).

On the surface of things, then, there is no immediately compelling reason for Gower to dedicate his poem to Henry. However, Lynn Staley argues that Henry remained a key player in the English political scene during this period, not in his own person, but through his father John of Gaunt. She claims that by the early 1390s, Richard was no longer open to the sort of advice the *Confessio Amantis* offered to him

in the first recension of the poem (79). Meanwhile, however, John of Gaunt was involved in ‘the careful promotion of Henry’s exploits’, distinguishing Henry as ‘a potential hero, as a man who fights real battles and not merely tournaments, a defender of the faith against the pagans, a commander of men’, in other words, everything Richard was not, or was not seen to be (Staley 85). In Staley’s analysis, Gower’s re-dedication of the poem emerges as not (or not only) a sign of discomfort with Richard’s governance, but as a sign his loyalties had begun to gravitate towards John of Gaunt’s pseudo-court (96).

All this, however, was in the future when Gower first began work on the *Confessio Amantis*, and we can presume that part of his original intention in creating a work to be ‘wisdom to the wise / And pley to hem that lust to pleye’ (Prologue *84-85) was to offer advice to the young King Richard. Indeed, immediately after his opening section which includes his reasons for writing and his dedication, Gower begins to anatomize the state of contemporary society. He attacks the Church at length for its simony, greed, and worldliness (Prologue 193-498), and the Commons, who are led into rebellion because ‘[w]her lawe lacketh, errour groweth’ (Prologue 511). While the implicit suggestion may be that the responsibility for a kingdom where ‘justice out of the weie / With ryhtwisnesse is gone aweie’ (Prologue 131-32) lies with the king, Gower shies away from pointing the finger at Richard himself. He seems to suggest that the troubles of the kingdom may be due to bad advisors surrounding the king, as he writes that trouble will follow ‘bot the pouer / Of hem that ben the worldes guides - / With good consail on alle sides’ (Prologue 144-146).¹⁶ This is, of course, a fairly commonplace political sentiment in non-democratic regimes, but it is also noticeably close to the sentiments expressed by the Lords Appellant in the trials of the

¹⁶ This is translated by Terence Tiller as ‘if the power borne/By those who are the nations’ guides/Have not good counsel from all sides’ (19).

Merciless Parliament. Gower, however, makes it clear that ‘unto him which the heved is / The members buxom scholden bowe, / And he scholde ek her trowthe allowe’ (Prologue, 152-154). As Diane Watt writes, ‘[w]hatever his views of Richard II’s government, he certainly does not, at this stage, seem to be advocating the overthrow of the king’ (147-48), but it is clear that Gower understood and intended that his work should have political significance.

BOOK VII

Book VII breaks the rules of the *Confessio Amantis*. Before Book VII, each of the books has been devoted to a discussion of one of the Seven Deadly Sins in all their variations, complete with illustrative stories. Book VII breaks this mould in concentrating not on sin, but on advice, and it is advice to a king. This book outlines the kind of education Gower believes vital for a king. It covers both education in a more literal sense – the need to learn such topics as astronomy, for example – and moral education.

Hence, rulers must learn to beware of such things as ‘covoitouse flaterie, / Which many a worthi king deceiveth’ (VII 2168-69) (this possibly hearkens back to the concerns he may have held about the king’s advisors, since ‘betre it is that thei be wise / Be whom that the conseil schal gon, / For thei be manye and he [the king] is on’ [VII 4158-60]). A king must administer justice and not abuse his extra-legal powers: ‘[h]is pouer stant above the lawe, / ... / Bot thinges whiche are excessif / Agein the lawe, he schal nocht do’ (VII 2719, 2722-23). This is a point with special significance for Antiochus in the following tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*. Also applicable to the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre* is the exhortation to kings not to abuse their powers in

order to satiate their lusts, illustrated by the tales of Tarquin and Lucrece and that of Appius and Virginia.

This interruption in the established flow of the work surely gives greater significance to the last book of the *Confessio*. Gower has firmly established his intense interest in the subject of kingship and proper rule, and we may expect that Book VIII will tie together all the themes of the work, including the theme of advice to and the proper education of a king.

BOOK VIII OF THE *CONFESSIO AMANTIS* AND THE EXAMINATION OF PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP

Much of the material in Book VIII of the *Confessio Amantis* is so close to that of the *Historia* that it does not bear further examination. I will, therefore, discuss only those instances where the *Confessio* differs from the *Historia* in a significant way (vis-à-vis the theme of patriarchy and kingship).

THE SHORT *EXEMPLA* IN BOOK VIII

Book VIII contains several short *exempla* on the subject of incest, alongside the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*, which help illuminate Gower's thinking on the relationship between incest and patriarchy and kingship. Two of the *exempla* feature royals. Firstly, there is Caligula, who rapes his sisters and, like Antiochus, suffers divine punishment: 'afterward withinne a while / God hath beraft him in his ire / His lif and ek his large empire' (VIII 208-10). Secondly, he recounts the Biblical tale of Amon (Amnon), son of King David (2 Samuel 13) who raped his sister Tamar (Tamar). The dangers of appropriating to oneself a woman who is under the protection of another man is illustrated by this tale, as Amnon is subsequently killed by his (and

Tamar's) brother Absalom. As Gower says, 'thus th'unkinde unkinde fond' (VIII 222).

The most significant *exemplum*, in terms of shedding light on Gower's thinking around incest, is the tale of Lot. Although Lot is not a royal, he is certainly a patriarch who believes in the laws of homosociality. Faced with the demands of the men of Sodom to be permitted to have sex with his guests (actually disguised angels), in the Biblical text Lot replies:

"No, my friends. Don't do this wicked thing. Look, I have two daughters who have never slept with a man. Let me bring them out to you, and you can do what you like with them. But don't do anything to these men, for they have come under the protection of my roof" (Genesis 19:8).

After fleeing the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (and after Lot's wife has been transformed into a pillar of salt), Lot's daughters, seeking to preserve their family line, intoxicate Lot and sleep with him without Lot realizing what has happened (Genesis 19:30-38). Gower's version of the story begins after the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and varies significantly from the Biblical text:

Whan Lothes wif was overgon
And schape into the salte ston,
As it is spoke into this day,
Be bothe hise dowhtres thanne he lay,
With childe and made hem bothe grete (VIII 227-231).

A reader unfamiliar with the Biblical tale might be forgiven for concluding that Lot was the aggressor in this situation. Gower also seems to link the father-daughter incest with the loss of Lot's wife, in a parallel to Antiochus' situation at the beginning of the tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*. This seems to indicate that Gower possibly connects the trope of incest with royalty, and certainly that he is inclined to assign blame for (inter-generational) incest to the male, patriarchal figures in his tales.

APOLLONIUS OF TYRE

One of the key differences between Gower's version of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story and that of the *Historia* is Gower's greater concern for issues of justice and legality. For example, in the *Historia* Antiochus beheads his daughter's suitors for failing to answer his riddle, but apparently without the benefit of any law to that effect. It is Gower who introduces the notion that Antiochus is not just acting tyrannically and arbitrarily, but is actually perverting the entire judicial system of his country by twisting it to his own ends: 'such a statut thanne he sette, / And in this wise his lawe he taxeth...' (VIII 360-361).¹⁷

Part of the grief of the people of Tyre upon Apollonius' departure from them is generated not merely by the fact of his absence, but because he left '[w]ithoute the comun assent' (VIII 493). This indicates Gower's disapproval of princes who act upon their own wishes without taking into account the best interests of their people, but also suggests that the people of Tyre are used to a more inclusive style of governance. This occasion of arbitrary behaviour stands out for them because they are used to a different style of leadership from Apollonius. Furthermore, in the *Historia*, the succession seems entirely a matter for kings to decide; for example, we are told that Archistrates dies 'leaving half the kingdom to Apollonius and half to his own daughter' (*Historia* 177). By contrast, in the *Confessio Amantis* we are told that:

A parlement [Apollonius] hath sommoned,
Wher he his doghter hath coroned
Forth with the lord of Mitelene,
That on is king, that other queene.
And thus the fadres ordinance
This lond hath set in governance,
And seide thanne he wolde wende
To Tharse (VIII 1915-22).

¹⁷ Peck glosses 'taxeth' as 'imposes', (*Confessio* 204), while the *Middle English Dictionary* (quoting this line) gives a meaning of 'to prescribe' for the verb 'taxen'. This, presumably, means the line translates into modern English as something close to '[a]nd he imposes/prescribes his law in this way...'. Otherwise, it would be tempting to interpret the line as an explicit judgement on the illegality of Antiochus' actions – with a translation such as 'in this way he taxes his law ...'.

Thus Apollonius settles the affairs of state with the assent of his people, and this time he makes sure he has his kingdom in order *before* he leaves Tyre. Even more strikingly, the ascendance of Apollonius and his wife to the throne of Artestrathes is conceived of in Gower as entirely a movement of the people. The ‘commune / Forth with the grete lordes alle’ (VIII 1976-77) beg Apollonius to come to Pentapolis upon the death of Artestrathes. At Pentapolis, Apollonius ‘tok his conseil to him tho, / And sette a time of Parlement, / Wher al the lond of on assent / Forth with his wif hath [Apollonius] corouned’ (VIII 1988-91).

The execution of Strangulio and Dionise is also put on a firmer legal footing in Gower than in the *Historia*. As noted above, the act in the *Historia* appears as a sort of mob rule with a gloss of propriety added by the apparent assent of Apollonius and Tarsia. In the *Confessio*, Apollonius makes his case to the people of Tharse, and their rulers are accordingly ‘[a]tteint... be the lawe’ (VIII 1947), an outcome which Gower describes as ‘mercy... with justice’ (VIII 1957) – the mercy apparently being Thaise’s due, the justice being meted out to Strangulio and Dionise.

While it seems that Gower perhaps does not think of these lands as fully hereditary monarchies, it seems clear that he believes that any monarch must govern with the assent of his people, and bear his peoples’ wishes and best interests in mind when making decisions. Gower’s ideal monarch, it would seem, consults with advisors (his ‘conseil’ [VIII 1988]) and with his people, either directly or through a ‘Parlement’ (VIII 1989). He is not above the law, and may (as in the case of the rulers of Tharse) be brought to account before the law in cases of gross tyranny. If Gower is offering friendly advice to Richard II, it is advice to watch his step.

One small but significant difference between Gower’s version of *Apollonius of Tyre* and that of the *Historia* and *Pericles* is that in the *Confessio*, Artestrathes has a

wife. He consults with his wife on the matter of his daughter's marriage to Apollonius, '[f]or he wol have hire good assent' (VIII 931). This detail enhances the picture of Aretestrathes as a benevolent patriarch, who consults with his daughter and wife as to their wishes, and acts accordingly. However, it somewhat spoils the pattern of fathers and motherless daughters which otherwise recurs through the tale, leaving open the possibility that he and his daughter enjoy such a healthy relationship only because there is still a wife and mother in the picture to act as a buffer between the two. Thematically, the situations in the *Historia* and in *Pericles* probably are more effective as they offer at least one father-daughter relationship where the question of incest does not appear to raise itself, even though the daughter is without a female guardian and the father is without a sexual partner.

***PERICLES* AND THE EXAMINATION OF PATRIARCHY AND KINGSHIP**

THE LEGACY OF HENRY VIII

In Shakespeare's day, the issue of incest must have been associated, to a large extent, with royalty. Whilst Henry VIII had been dead for nearly twenty years by the time Shakespeare was born, his daughter Elizabeth was on the throne for the greater part of Shakespeare's life, and her life and claim to the throne were strongly affected by the issues of incest raised by her father. For the most part, of course, nuclear family incest of the type shown in *Pericles* was not at issue, but the mere fact of any sort of incest playing such a significant role in affairs at the highest level must have had a profound effect on the public profile of incest.

The centrality of incest in Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon is so well-known as not to warrant discussion here. What is perhaps less well-known (and of more significance to this discussion) is the role of incest in Henry's marriage to

Anne Boleyn, the mother of Elizabeth I. In the eyes of the Catholic Church, Henry's marriage to Anne was illegitimate all along, as Henry was still married to Catherine. But Henry and Anne's marriage was also illegitimate in a second way, because Anne's older sister had been Henry's mistress, and Henry was therefore committing with Anne almost exactly the type of incest that he had decided Catherine was committing with himself. Henry went so far as to seek a papal dispensation for his marriage with Anne, which was granted, but which was of little value as the Church did not recognise the marriage in any case (Quilligan 33). Henry later used the supposedly incestuous nature of their union as a reason to divorce Anne, before ultimately executing her for (among other things) committing incest with her brother George (Quilligan 34).

Elizabeth's mother *and* father, then, were seen as incestuous, a fact which anti-Elizabethan propaganda frequently mentioned (Boehrer 47-48). Maureen Quilligan argues that the taint of incest and illegitimacy which hung over Elizabeth made her a less desirable marriage partner (before she became queen), and led to Henry taking little care to find a husband for her (34). This meant that Elizabeth was able to ascend the throne as an unmarried woman and choose her own partner (or lack thereof). In essence, Elizabeth was, as Quilligan writes, 'her own patriarch' (36). Bruce Boehrer agrees that in large part Elizabeth's (and her sister Mary's) marital choices were shaped by their father's actions and their subsequent uncertain status. Boehrer points out that Elizabeth defends her decision not to marry in vaguely incestuous terms, 'on the ground that she is effectively precontracted to the subjects who are, in her various formulations, at once her children and her spouse' (45).

One feature of endogamy, as has been noted, is its desire to secure wealth within a family, rather than trading it away through marriage. Likewise, in her desire

not to dilute her power in any way through marriage, Boehrer notes, Elizabeth dooms the Tudor line to extinction as she becomes ‘an emblem of royal endogamy taken to its logical extreme’ (46). Perhaps the extreme abruptness with which Marina is married off at the end of *Pericles*, which results in the absolute silence of Marina and the seeming loss of the agency she has acquired throughout the play (Quilligan 223, 226), is a kind of acknowledgement on Shakespeare’s part that, in a patriarchal society, exogamy can erode women’s rights almost as much as can incest, but it is the price women must pay to avoid the sterility that haunted both Antiochus’ court and Elizabeth’s.

KINGSHIP IN *PERICLES*

Of all three texts, *Pericles* is the most concerned with issues of kingship, which is demonstrated throughout the text. For example, while in the *Historia* and in the *Confessio Amantis*, Apollonius certainly recognises that it would be dangerous to reveal Antiochus’ secret directly, in *Pericles* this fact is the impetus for a discussion on the interactions between kings and their courtiers:

Who has a book of all that monarchs do,
He’s more secure to keep it shut than shown;
.....
Kings are earth’s gods; in vice their law’s their will;
And if Jove stray, who dares say Jove doth ill? (I.i.95-96; 104-05).

Pericles’ assertion that ‘[k]ings are earth’s gods’ may reflect the debate in England under James I over absolutism and divine right. James saw the ‘monarch’s “free and absolute” authority and power over the property and persons of his subjects as total and godlike’ (Jordan 19), a view which clashed with that of many of his subjects, who pointed to legal and traditional constraints upon a king’s power (Jordan 6). Of course, James never claimed to *be* a god, but the idea of ‘divine right’ held that the king was

the representative of God (Jordan 15), answerable to no-one except God (Jordan 17), and that the *office* of king encompassed a certain kind of divinity (Jordan 21).

Pericles' answer also touches upon the issue of giving advice to kings, that is, the difficulty in monarchs obtaining objective advice rather than flattery, given the real danger involved in speaking bluntly to a tyrant, a theme which will be explored in more detail later in the play.

The sense that it can be dangerous to be in a king's confidence is taken up later by Thaliard, whom Antiochus despatches to kill Pericles. Thaliard is placed in the awkward position of having either to kill Pericles or be killed himself, 'for if a king bid a man be a villain, he's bound by the indenture of his oath to be one' (I.iii.7-8). This being so, Thaliard says, 'he was a wise fellow and had good discretion that, being bid to ask what he would of the king, desir'd he might know none of his secrets' (I.iii.3-6). Thaliard's words recall the earlier scene at Tyre where Helicanus has dared to speak plainly to Pericles, since he believes that:

They do abuse the king that flatter him,
For flattery is the bellows blows up sin;
.....
Whereas reproof, obedient and in order,
Fits kings, as they are men, for they may err (I.ii.39-40; 43-44).

Pericles reminds Helicanus that 'I have power / To take thy life from thee' (I.ii.57-58), before he admits that Helicanus is right to advise him honestly, as, he says, 'heaven forbid / That kings should let their ears hear their faults hid!' (I.ii.61-62). Shakespeare, obviously, is making the point that kings should be open to honest advice, and their counsellors should be brave and noble enough to give it to them. However, compared with Pericles' own response to Antiochus and with Thaliard's words, it emerges that the exchange of advice depends very much upon the character of the monarch. While

Pericles' threats to Helicanus are but a feint, there is no doubt that Antiochus would execute anyone who dared to openly defy him.

The next major issue of kingship the play explores is the mutual responsibilities of ruler and subjects. It asks what Pericles' duties are to his people, and whether his people have the right to rebel if he neglects these responsibilities. Pericles, by his expedition to Antioch, has brought the threat of war down upon his people, now, he says, 'all, for mine if I may call offence, / Must feel war's blow, who spares not innocence' (I.ii.92-93). Pericles, of course, hardly deserves to be pursued by Antiochus, but the event serves as a reminder that the private actions of monarchs have the potential to directly affect the lives of their subjects. Pericles claims to have only 'care of them [his subjects], not pity of myself' (I.ii.30) in mind when he decides to flee Tyre, but the fact remains that he takes this course in the knowledge that Antiochus may attack in his absence. He even refers to this possibility by a euphemism which reflects his own concerns rather than his subjects', speaking of war as Antiochus 'wrong[ing] my liberties in my absence' (I.ii.112). As Constance Jordan points out, Pericles also suffers from a notable lack of confidence in his people (47). He has no doubt that, should war eventuate, his 'men [shall] be vanquish'd ere they do resist' (I.ii.28). This contrasts strongly with Helicanus' belief that he and the people of Tyre will 'mingle our bloods together in the earth' in defence of Tyre (I.ii.113).

Whether or not Pericles' action in leaving Tyre was justified – as it happened, Antiochus was aiming only at the life of Pericles and had no intention of attacking Tyre, whether or not Pericles had remained there – his absence certainly has an effect on the people of Tyre. In all three texts, the people of Tyre are distressed by the absence of their ruler, but this leads to active dissent only in *Pericles*. The Lords of Tyre explain that 'kingdom[s] ... without a head – / Like goodly buildings left without

a roof / Soon fall to ruin –’ (II.iv.35-37), and beg Helicanus to ascend the throne. It is clear that they are motivated not by any dissatisfaction with Pericles personally, or with his rule: it is the uncertainty of being left without a permanent ruler, unsure of whether their king is alive or dead, which prompts their behaviour. Helicanus manages to avert the crisis by persuading the peers to agree to wait a year for news of Pericles before electing him as their monarch. Pericles seems to tacitly allow that the dictates of his subjects can direct his behaviour, as he ‘hastes t’appease’ the ‘mutiny’ at Tyre as soon as he hears of it (III.Chorus.29).¹⁸ Again, this scene makes clear the effect of monarchs’ actions on their subjects, but it also allows that kings must sometimes bow to the wishes of their subjects or face rebellion. Unlike in the *Historia*, Pericles returns to Tyre after leaving Marina at Tharsus, where he is [w]elcom’d and settled to his own desire’ (IV.Chorus.2). Apparently, there are no hard feelings on either side: Pericles seems to have accepted the right of his people to express their discontent, and his people seem happy to have him back with him, since he has complied with their directives.

One final reflection upon kingship remains to be explored. As noted before, the Archistrates/Simonides role is generally taken as the figure of the ‘good’ king and patriarch. Again, Shakespeare is at pains to examine Simonides’ rule more closely than do his sources. Characteristically, much of this examination is accomplished through the dialogue of the ordinary people of Pentapolis. The fishermen characterize the nature of power thus:

3. FISH. Master, I marvel how the fishes live in the sea.
 1. FISH. Why, as men do a-land: the great ones eat up the
 little ones. I can compare our rich misers to nothing

¹⁸ Mark Taylor’s assertion that Pericles spends a year in Tharsus with Marina is surely incorrect (55). Presumably Taylor has misinterpreted Pericles’ speech to Cleon: ‘I must needs be gone; / My twelve months are expir’d, and Tyrus stands / In a litigious peace’ (III.iii.1-3). Pericles’ meaning is, surely, that he has been absent from Tyre for all of the twelve-month grace period won for him by Helicanus – a period which has included the full term of Thaisa’s pregnancy – not that he has remained at Tharsus for twelve months, otherwise he would have greatly exceeded the term allowed him by the Lords.

so fitly as to a whale: a' plays and tumbles,
driving the poor fry before him, and at last devours them all
at a mouthful (II.i.26-32).

They also reflect upon the plight of the common working man, in a manner which would not be out of place on talkback radio or in a letter to the editor today:

1. FISH. ... cannot you beg? here's them in our
country of Greece gets more with begging than we
can do with working.
2. FISH. Canst thou catch any fishes then?
PER. I never practis'd it.
2. FISH. Nay, then thou wilt starve, sure; for here's no-
thing to be got now-a-days, unless thou canst fish
for't (II.i.63-70).

While they call their king 'the good Simonides' (II.i.98), they also criticize him for failing to 'purge the land of these drones, that rob the bee of her honey' (II.i.46-47), that is, failing to check the 'rich misers' who live off the work of the poor. The final judgement of the fishermen, however, is that Simonides deserves the name of 'good' 'for his peacable reign and good government' (II.i.100-01). Pericles is hopefully learning from Simonides' example when he pronounces him 'a happy king, since he gains from his subjects the name of good by his government' (II.i.102-03). Constance Jordan points out, however, that despite the fact that the final impression we are given of his subjects' response to Simonides' rule is a good one, the praise of Simonides has been offered largely by one fisherman, the complaints by another (51) and the time may come when 'the voice of Patchbreech [the complaining fisherman] may rise above the conciliatory words of the first fisherman and expose the dark side of a government that... swallow[s] the resources of whole parishes' (52). Jordan's case is probably somewhat overstated, however, as she ignores the fact that the third fisherman, Patchbreech, also refers to his monarch as 'the good King Simonides' (II.i.43), and is thus not implacably opposed to his government.

PATRIARCHY IN *PERICLES*

The question of Shakespeare's view of the incest between Antiochus and his daughter has been explored in Chapter Two. This, and the similarity of much of the material to the points discussed above in reference to the *Historia* and to Gower, leaves only one key point to be discussed here. That is the behaviour of Simonides on the occasion of Thaisa's courtship with Pericles.

Shakespeare departs from Gower by having Simonides 'comically enact... the "blocking" father's usual reluctance to grant his daughter to another man' (Quilligan 222). Richard McCabe has termed this 'blocking' role as the 'Egeus complex' (182), after, of course, Hermia's irascible father in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, who says of his daughter '[a]s she is mine, I may dispose of her' (I.i.42).¹⁹ Even the language Simonides uses in his role as angry patriarch resembles Egeus' at points. For example, both accuse their daughters' lovers of having 'bewitched' them (*Pericles* II.v.49; *MND* I.i.27).

For the audience, Simonides' pretended objections to the match are, as Quilligan says, comic, as he has informed us already that Thaisa's 'choice agrees with mine' (II.v.18), and he informs the audience of his true thoughts in several asides throughout the scene. For Pericles, on the other hand, the interaction must have been anything but comic. He believes that Simonides' actions are 'the king's subtlety to have my life' (II.v.44). Simonides' behaviour must presumably appear as threatening to his daughter also: he says to her, '[y]ea, mistress, are you so peremptory? / ... / I'll tame you, I'll bring you in subjection' (II.v.72-73). In short, he perfectly acts the part of a patriarch who views his daughter as property which is his alone to bestow, a

¹⁹ McCabe uses the term to characterize Antiochus' relationship with his daughter (as an 'extreme embodiment of the "Egeus complex"' [182]), but the term is perhaps even more applicable to Simonides' role here, since Egeus is, after all, not opposed to exogamy itself, but rather to his daughter marrying a man of whom he does not approve.

patriarch who is willing to extend as far as bloodshed to defend his own parental rights in his daughter. This behaviour surely cannot fail but to remind Pericles (and the audience) of the events at Antioch. When Pericles defends himself to Simonides by saying ‘[n]ever did thought of mine levy offence’ (II.v.51), he may be revealing that he has been so deeply affected by the perils of Antioch that he cannot now bring himself to so much as *think* of courting another king’s daughter.

While Shakespeare – and Simonides – are only playing in this scene, their play has serious undertones: Shakespeare could not play with the trope of the ‘blocking’ father if such a role was not already firmly established in literature (including in his own canon), and Simonides’ play is genuinely threatening in Pericles’ eyes. Like the contrast between Pericles’ and Antiochus’ response to plain speech by their subjects, it is a reminder that the *system* of absolutism or of patriarchy enables kings and patriarchs to become tyrants: if a monarch or patriarch is not tyrannical, it is mere fortuity that the role has fallen to a just man.

CONCLUSION

The story of *Apollonius of Tyre* could be said to have survived and flourished almost against the odds, suffering criticism as it has from such literary giants as Geoffrey Chaucer, whose Man of Law approvingly noted in the prologue to his tale that Chaucer did not tell ‘swiche cursed stories’ as that of ‘Tyro Appollonius’ (*The Canterbury Tales* l. 80-81), and Ben Jonson, who famously described *Pericles* as ‘some mouldy tale’ in his ‘Ode to Himself upon the Censure of his “New Inn”’ (l. 21).²⁰ Although the texts I have focused on in this study are beginning to receive more critical attention, the *Historia* continues to be overshadowed by *Oedipus the King*, Gower remains in the shadow of Chaucer, and *Pericles* is still a relatively neglected member of the Shakespearian canon. While I have not examined the literary merits of the three texts, I hope I have shown that, thematically speaking, they certainly reward critical attention. Most existing critical studies of these texts have tended to focus on a single text, or have compared the *Confessio* and *Pericles* only insofar as Gower’s text is a source for the later play. Thus I hope that this thesis, as a detailed comparative study of the themes of three major versions of the *Apollonius of Tyre* story, has made a useful contribution to the scholarship in this field.

This thesis has essentially addressed the choices the authors of these three texts have made. While theories about authorial intent can be read into any text, the intention of the author is particularly transparent when, as in the case of Gower and Shakespeare, they are adapting an existing tale. Neither Gower nor Shakespeare slavishly took over the story just as they found it: they interrogated and shaped the

²⁰ The Man of Law focuses on the incest episode when he makes these criticisms: ‘the cursed king Antiochus / Birafte his doghter of hir maydenhede, / / Whan he hir threw upon the pavement’ (l. 82-85).

text, and their choices tell us how they viewed the story, what they found to be important in it and what they felt they could discard.

Gower, for example, took a text which did not strongly emphasize the theme of incest and made from it an *exemplum* which repeatedly and insistently speaks on the subject of incest. Shakespeare then took up the tale and retained the theme of incest whilst dispensing with the physical presentation of incest altogether. Gower chose to reform the rakish Athenagoras of the *Historia*; Shakespeare chose to return to the earlier conception of the man's character. The *Historia* presented a patriarchal world-view, wherein Apollonius conceives of the loss of his wife as the loss of his father-in-law's daughter. Gower, on the other hand, went out of his way in order to come much closer to a vision of equality between husband and wife, even disrupting the neat pattern of fathers and daughters by giving Arthestrates a wife to consult with over his daughter's marriage. Shakespeare, again, goes back to the spirit of the original text by eliminating this wife and by showing far less concern for the points of view of the daughters of the story.

Thus there are three authors and three texts which, for all their similarities, ultimately put forward three different interpretations of the moral significance of the story. Perhaps, as the surviving 'source' text, the *Historia* merely appears to be less dynamic than the later texts, but one does feel that the *Historia* is written in less of a spirit of interrogation than the *Confessio* or *Pericles*. The *Historia* seems to take many of the norms of its society for granted; it accepts patriarchal power and absolute rule as long as these things are not taken to the extreme, as in the case of Antiochus or Stranguillio and Dionysias. Its moral message aims at cohesion, not upheaval: men should work together for the good of society, whether this be by endorsing exogamy or by rewarding loyal retainers. The *Historia* clearly takes the view that incest is

wrong, and it presents this wrong graphically, but it doesn't drive the point home because it doesn't return to the subject of incest in the way that Gower and Shakespeare do.

Gower's text is more radical. 'Radical' is perhaps a term which does not seem to sit easily with the by now well-worn epithet of 'moral Gower' (Chaucer, *Troilus* l. 1856), but Gower's text undoubtedly seems the most progressive of the three in terms of its view of gender relations. Like the *Historia*, Gower presents the opening act of incest as a violent rape. Like Shakespeare, Gower returns to the subject of incest again and again throughout his tale. Unlike either of his fellow authors, Gower repeatedly strives to give agency to the women of the story. As mentioned above, he creates a wife for Arthestrates for the sole purpose of allowing Arthestrates to consult with her over an important decision. Arthestrates' wife does not appear 'in person' in the text; she does not play any part in the story except to allow Gower to make the point that a patriarch should not tyrannically decide significant issues on his own if he can seek advice from a wife. This point is made again when, in contrast to the *Historia* and *Pericles*, Apollonius' daughter Thaise is not given away in marriage as though she were her father's property. Gower is not radical in that he does not look for revolutionary change, but he is radical in that his entire tale argues for women to have a say in shaping their own destinies.

Gower's perspective on incest and his interest in condemning patriarchal excesses are also apparent in his other tale of incest, the story of Canace and Machaire in Book III of the *Confessio*. Presumably because this occurrence of incest is consensual and not inter-generational (in contrast to the incest in *Apollonius of Tyre*), Gower does not condemn the brother-sister pair. He sees the incest as ill-advised, certainly, but he repeatedly suggests that the incest is natural, even using that

significant word 'kinde' in reference to their love (III 154).²¹ Rather than a condemnation of incest, then, their story is an *exemplum* of Wrath, the wrath of the patriarchal father who causes the death of Canace and her child through his 'horrible cruauté' (III 235).

Read alongside Gower, *Pericles* seems anti-climactic in its views on society. Shakespeare's changes to the story seem backward steps as far as the role of women is concerned. Shakespeare makes his debt to Gower clear by the unusual device of having the character of 'Gower' appear as his choric narrator. Despite this, Shakespeare undoes much of the work that Gower has done: he eliminates Archistrates' wife, he has his Lysimachus visit the brothel and then has Pericles summarily marry the silent Marina to him. Shakespeare's text is yet more patriarchal, in fact, than the *Historia*. While Antiochus' incest is unequivocally rape in the earlier texts, *Pericles* begins with an established incestuous relationship, the origins of which are murky, and in which both father and daughter seem willing participants. Thus Shakespeare offers no strident protest against the abuse of patriarchal power which the rape in the *Historia* and in Gower manifestly comprises. Shakespeare's energies are directed elsewhere, towards a much fuller consideration of the subject of kingship. The only significant plot development which Shakespeare adds to the *Apollonius of Tyre* story is his invention of civil unrest in Tyre during Pericles' absence. The abuse of kingly power concerns Shakespeare far more than the abuse of patriarchal authority. Shakespeare's powerful 'recognition scene' shows that he is interested in the transformative powers of the father-daughter relationship, but the focus is always on the father's experience of healing and reconciliation, not the daughter's.

²¹ '[K]inde assaileth the corage / With love' (Nature attacks the heart with love) (III 154-55, Peck's translation).

Although I have avoided the authorship debate throughout this thesis, perhaps this is the moment to acknowledge the possibility that the values ostensibly put forward in *Pericles* seem somewhat ‘un-Shakespearean’ because of the influence of Shakespeare’s unknown collaborator. While a focus on the dynamics of kingship is apparent in many of Shakespeare’s plays, the attitude towards the female characters in *Pericles* does not seem typical of Shakespeare’s work. The play which bears most resemblance to *Pericles*, in that it also features shipwreck, an abandoned child, a seemingly-dead wife, a ‘recognition scene’ and even the threat of incest, and which also belongs to the same time-period and genre, is *The Winter’s Tale*. The salient difference between the two (for the purposes of this study) is that *The Winter’s Tale* consistently gives women agency whereas *Pericles* does not. Notably, the character of Paulina stage-manages the climactic reunion between Leontes and his wife Hermione, who has long been thought dead by both Leontes and the audience. Furthermore, Paulina has been steadfast in criticizing the king throughout the play, whilst male characters such as Antigonus failed to openly oppose the king. Leontes’ daughter Perdita, although silent for most of the final act of the play, is also shown as an eloquent, virtuous and self-assured young woman, who chooses her own husband despite parental opposition (albeit from her future husband’s father, not from her own). Of course, it is useless to speculate whether a *Pericles* solely authored by Shakespeare and free from textual corruption may have enlarged upon the opening incest scene, or given Marina more of a voice following her reunion with her father, but it should be acknowledged that the authorial intent I have reconstructed from the changes *Pericles* makes to Gower’s story is not necessarily *Shakespeare’s* intent.

Finally, I would like to make a case for the cultural significance of *Apollonius of Tyre*. It is my belief that the frank presentation of incest (particularly in the *Historia*

and in Gower) has contributed to the long eclipse of these texts in the popular and even in the critical consciousness. However, it is precisely this frank presentation of what is the most common form of incest that should give these texts a place alongside *Oedipus the King* in the canon. The acknowledgement of the realities of incest and the condemnation of patriarchal excesses (notably in Gower) parallel Freud's abandoned 'seduction theory' and are a refreshing antidote to the anti-feminist implications of the orthodox Oedipal theory. It is above all for this reason that I believe these texts deserve to be more widely read and studied in the future.

APPENDIX A: PLOT COMPARISON

Attribute	<i>Historia</i>	Gower - <i>Confessio</i>	Shakespeare - <i>Pericles</i>
Source cited:	None.	<i>Pantheon</i> VIII 272.	Gower as Chorus, 'mine authors' I.Ch.20.
Who is blamed for the incest?	Antiochus: 'He struggled with madness, he fought against passion, but he was defeated by love' 113.	Antiochus: 'fleissh is frele and falleth ofte' VIII 289, 'with lustes blente' VIII 295, '[h]im thoghte that it was no sinne' VIII 346.	Both Antiochus and his daughter: 'Bad child, worse father' I.Ch.27 'But custom what they did begin / Was with long use account'd no sin' I.Ch.29-30 'sinful dame' I.Ch.31.
Daughter's reaction:	"I prefer the solution of death" 115.	She 'evere wissheth after deth' VIII 333, but concludes '[s]o suffren thei that suffre mote' VIII 340.	Not stated.
Are those who solve the riddle put to death?	Yes: 'if anyone happened to find the solution to the riddle... he was beheaded as if he had not answered at all' 115.	No: 'Bot if he couthe his question / Assoile upon suggestion / ... / He scholde in certein lese his hed / ... / For lacke of ansuere in the wise' VIII 363-371.	No: 'That whoso ask'd her for his wife, / His riddle told not, lost his life' I.Ch.37-38.
The riddle is:	Spoken by the father: 'I am borne on crime; I eat my mother's flesh; I seek my brother, my mother's husband, my wife's son; I do not find him.' 115.	Spoken by the father: 'With felonie I am upbore, / I ete and have it noght forbore / Mi modres fleissh, whos housebonde / Mi fader for to seche I fonde, / Which is the sone ek of my wif' VIII 405-409.	Read by Pericles: 'I am no viper, yet I feed / On mother's flesh which did me breed. / I sought a husband, in which labour / I found that kindness in a father. / He's father, son, and husband mild; / I mother, wife, and yet his child: / How they may be, and yet in two, / As you will live, resolve it you' I.i.65-72.
Apollonius' response:	'When you said "I am borne on crime", you did not lie: look at yourself. Nor did you	'It toucheth al the priveté / Betwen thin oghne child and thee, / And stant al	'Few love to hear the sins they love to act; / 'Twould braid yourself too near for me to tell

	lie when you said "I eat my mother's flesh": look at your daughter' 115.	hol upon you tuo' VIII 425-428.	it' I.i.93-94.
Antiochus' reply:	'you have thirty days' grace' 115.	'of my grace / Of thretty days fulle a space / I grante thee' VIII 437-439.	'Forty days longer we do respite you' I.i.117.
Why does Apollonius leave Tarsus?	'at the encouragement of Stranguillio and Dionysias his wife, and urged on by Fortune' 123. He has previously been warned by Hellenicus that Antiochus is looking for him. 119.	Unclear: because he has been warned by Hellican that Antiochus is looking for him VIII 578-579? He 'thoghte he wolde his place change / And seche a contré more strange' VIII 595-6.	Helicane sends word to him that Thaliard came to Tyre to kill him, '[a]nd that in Tharsus was not best / Longer for him to make his rest' II.Ch.22-26.
He is shipwrecked at:	Pentapolis 123.	Pentapolim VIII 658.	Pentapolis II.i.97.
Apollonius is clothed by/with:	Half of a fisherman's cloak 125.	'a fisshere... / ... / Of suche clothes as he hadde / With gret pité this lord he cladde' VIII 646-652.	His own armour dragged up in a fisherman's net II.i.115 ff. and a fisherman's 'best gown' II.i.161-2.
Princess & Apollonius:	Harp & sing. Apollonius acts 'a mime show' and in 'tragic costume' 129.	Harp & sing VIII 760-783.	Dance together II.iii.103 ff.
Princess's letter to her father reads:	'Good king and best of fathers, since you graciously and indulgently give me permission, I will speak out: I want to marry the man who was cheated of his inheritance through shipwreck. And if you are surprised, father, that such a modest girl has written so immodestly, I have sent my message by wax, which has no sense of shame' 133.	'Bot if I have Appolinus, / Of al this world, what so betyde, / I wol non other man abide. / And certes if I of him faile, / I wol riht wel withoute faile / Ye schull for me be dowhterles' VIII 898-904.	Simonides says to the court: 'One twelve moons she'll wear Diana's livery; / This by the eye of Cynthia hath she vow'd / And on her virgin honour will not break it' II.v.10-12 And to himself: 'She tells me here, she'll wed the stranger knight, / Or never more to view nor day nor light' II.v.16-17.
Archestrates'	He questions the	'With good herte and	'your choice agrees

response:	suitors to find out which has been shipwrecked 133. When he understands his daughter's meaning, he says, 'What my daughter wants is my wish too. For in a matter of this kind, nothing can be done without God' 135.	with good corage / Of full love and full mariage / The king and [Apollonius] ben hol acorded' VIII 923-925.	with mine; / I like that well' II.v.18-19 'I must dissemble it' II.v.22 Pretends to be angry: 'Will you, not having my consent, / Bestow your love and affections / Upon a stranger?' II.v.75-78 He then blesses the marriage II.v.81 ff.
Princess's mother	Doesn't exist in this text.	Agrees to the marriage VIII 935-937.	Doesn't exist in the play.
Princess becomes pregnant:	'it was already the sixth month and the girl's stomach was swelling' 137.	'For as thei pleiden hem betwene, / Thei gete a child between hem tuo' VIII 972-973.	'by loss of maidenhead / A babe is moulded' III.Ch.9-10.
Report of the death of Antiochus and his daughter:	'the most cruel King Antiochus has been struck by God's thunderbolt as he was lying in bed with his own daughter' 137.	'That for vengance, as God it wolde, / Antiochus, as men mai wite, / With thondre and lythnyge is forsmite; / His doghte hath the same chaunce, / So be thei bothe in o balance' VIII 998-1002.	'Antiochus from incest liv'd not free; / For which, the most high gods not minding longer / To withhold the vengance that they had in store, / Due to this heinous capital offence, / Even in the height and pride of all his glory, / When he was seated in a chariot / Of an inestimable value, and his daughter with him, / A fire from heaven came and shrivell'd up / Their bodies, even to loathing; for they so stunk, / That all those eyes ador'd them ere their fall / Scorn now their hand should give them burial' II.iv.2-12.
The people of Tyre:	Are not mentioned at this point.	'live in longinge and desir / Til ye be come agein to Tyr' VIII 1009-10.	Are discontented by Pericles' absence 'on the head / Of Helicanus would set on / The crown of

			Tyre' III.Ch.27-28.
The people of Pentapolis:	Are happy with Apollonius: 'There was great rejoicing throughout the city' 137.	Are happy with Apollonius: 'A worthi king schal ben oure lord' VIII 1016.	Are happy with Pericles: "Our heir-apparent is a king!" III.Ch.37.
The princess gives birth and 'dies':	139	VIII 1050-58	III.i.17-21
She is then:	Thrown overboard in a coffin 139.	Thrown overboard in a chest VIII 1094 ff.	Thrown overboard in a chest III.i.47 ff.
Apollonius' letter reads:	'Whoever finds this coffin, which contains twenty thousand gold sesterces, I beg him to keep ten thousand, but to spend ten thousand on a funeral. For this corpse has left behind many tears and most bitter grief. But if he does not act according to this grief-stricken request, may he die as the last of his line, and may there be no one to give him burial' 139.	"I, king of Tyr Appollinus, / Do alle maner men to wite, / That hie and se this lettre write, / That helpeles withoute red / Hier lith a kinges doghter ded: / And who that happeth hir to finde, / For charité tak in his mynde, / And do so that sche be begrave / With this tresor, which he schal have' VIII 1122-30.	'Here I give to understand, / If e'er this coffin drives a-land, / I, King Pericles, have lost / This queen, worth all our mundane cost. / Who finds her, give her burying; / She was the daughter of a king; / Besides this treasure for a fee, / The gods requite his charity!' III.ii.70-77.
The princess is rescued by:	Ceremon's pupil 141.	Master Cerymon VIII 1166.	Lord Cerimon III.ii.1 SD.
By means of :	Rubbing her with ointment: 'Her blood, which had congealed because of the extreme cold, liquefied when it was warmed' 141.	'oile and balsme', 'a liquour in hire mouth' VIII 1198-99.	'fire and cloths. / The still and woeful music' III.ii.89-90.
She was:	Alive: 'He felt the delicate breath of life on the point of struggling with false death' p. 141.	Alive: 'he soghte and fond a signe of lif' VIII 1189.	Possibly dead: 'Death may usurp on nature many hours / And yet the fire of life kindle again' III.ii.84-5.
The princess decides:	To go into Diana's temple, at Ceremon's suggestion 143.	'That in som temple of the cité / To kepe and holde hir chasteté, / Sche mihte among the wommen	'a vestal livery will I take me to' III.iv.9 in Diana's temple.

		duelle' VIII 1243-45. She then goes into Diana's temple.	
Why is Tarsia left at Tarsus?	Unclear: 'Because of my wife's death, I do not want to accept the kingdom being held for me, not to return to my father-in-law; ... instead I shall become a merchant. So... I entrust my daughter to you' p. 143	Unclear: 'The prince hath changed his entente, / And seith he wol noght come at Tyr / As thanne, bot al his desir / Is ferst to seilen unto Tharse' VIII 1142-45 'My doghter Thaise be youre leve / I thenke schal with you beleve' VIII 1295-96	'the babe / Cannot hold out to Tyrus; there I'll leave it / At careful nursing' III.i.78-80
Apollonius vows:	'a great oath not to cut his beard or hair or nails until he had given away his daughter in marriage' 143.	'That I schal nevere for [Thaise's] sake / Mi berd for no likinge schave, / Til it befalle that I have / In convenable time of age / Beset hire unto mariage' VIII 1302- 06.	'Til [Marina] be married, madam, / By bright Diana, whom we honour, all / Unscissor'd shall this hair of mine remain, / Though I show ill in it'. III.iii.27-30.
The plot to kill Tarsia:	Stranguillio and Dionysias' daughter is unfavourably compared with Tarsia. Dionysias 'became furiously angry' and asks her overseer Theophilus to kill her p. 145.	Strangulio & Dionise's daughter is unfavourably compared with Thaise. 'Who wroth but Dionise thanne?' VIII 1345 Dionise asks her servant Theophilus to kill her VIII 1358 ff.	Cleon and Dionyza's daughter is unfavourably compared with Marina. 'Cleon's wife with envy rare / A present murderer does prepare / For good Marina, that her daughter / Might stand peerless by this slaughter' IV.Ch.37-40 Dionzya asks the murderous Leonine to kill her IV.Ch.52 ff.
Tarsia is seized by pirates:	147	VIII 1390 ff.	IV.i.91 ff.
Tarsia's 'murderer':	(Apparently) allows Dionysias to assume he has killed Tarsia 147.	Tells Dionise he has killed Thaise VIII 1505-09.	Tells Dionyza he has killed Thaise and is poisoned by her (offstage) IV.iii.10.
Stranguillio:	Mourns 'for myself, whose lot it is to have such a wicked wife' 149.	Mourns for Thaise VIII 1521-22 – it is unclear whether he knows how she died, but he is later called	Learns his wife had Marina killed and is appalled IV.iii.2 ff.

		‘false man Strangulio’ VIII 1577.	
Epitaph to Tarsia reads:	‘TO THE SPIRITS OF THE DEAD: THE CITIZENS OF TARSUS ERECTED THIS MONUMENT BY SUBSCRIPTION TO THE MAIDEN TARSIA BECAUSE OF THE BENEFUNCTIONS OF APOLLONIUS OF TYRE’ 149.	‘O yee that this beholde, / Lo, hier lith sche, the which was holde / The faireste and the flour of alle, / Whos name Thaisis men calle. The king of Tyr Appolinus / Hire fader was: now lith sche thus. / Fourtiene yer sche was of age, / Whan deth hir tok to his viage’ VIII 1533-40.	‘The fairest, sweet’st and best, lies here, / Who wither’d in her spring of year. / She was of Tyrus the king’s daughter, / On whom foul death hath made this slaughter. / Marina was she call’d; and at her birth, / Thetis, being proud, swallow’d some part o’ th’ earth. / Therefore the earth, fearing to be o’erflow’d, / Hath Thetis’ birth-child on the heavens bestow’d; / Wherefore she does, and swears she’ll never stint, / Make raging battery upon shores of flint’ IV.iv.34-43.
Tarsia is sold to:	A pimp, following a bidding war with Athenagoras 151.	Leonin the brothel-keeper VIII 1410-11.	Pandar the brothel-keeper & Boulth his servant IV.ii.1 ff.
She manages to escape being raped:	By begging Athenagoras not to harm her and recounting her misfortunes 151.	‘Bot such a grace God hire sente, / That for the sorwe which sche made / Was non of hem which pouer hade / To don her eny vileinie’ VIII 1428-31.	With the help of Diana IV.ii.145-147 & through her own resources IV.V.1 ff.
She is visited in the brothel by:	Athenagoras 151.	Anonymous men VIII 1426-27.	Lord Lysimachus IV.vi.15, who is upbraided by Marina IV.vi.78-80, but claims ‘I came here with no ill intent’ IV.vi.109.
She persuades the brothel-keeper to let her go:	To give talks and play music in ‘some crowded place’ 155.	And teach the women of the local gentry VIII 1450-66.	And teach women IV.vi.181-193.
She teaches and entertains:	So that she earns the love of the people and a lot of money	With ‘the wisdom of a clerk’ VIII 1483; ‘every lusti werk /	She teaches women to ‘sing, weave, sew, and dance, / With other

	155.	Which to a gentil womman longeth' VIII 1484-85; '[t]o the citole and to the harpe, / .../ Proverbes and demandes slyhe' VIII 1487-89.	virtues' IV.vi.182-183 'deep clerks she dumbs' V.Ch.5.
When Apollonius learns of his daughter's 'death', he:	'stood stunned. He was surprised that he was unable to cry' 157.	'curseth and seith al the worste / Unto Fortune' VIII 1584-85. Then he 'hath benethe his place nome, / Wher he wepende al one lay, / Ther as he sih no lyht of day' VIII 1604-06.	'swears / Never to wash his face, nor cut his hairs. / He puts on sackcloth, and to sea' IV.iv.27-29.
When Apollonius arrives in Mytilene:	Athenagoras visits the ship and speaks with him 159.	Athenagoras goes to see whose ship it is and learns of his sorrow VIII 1623-48.	Lysimachus visits the ship and is told that Pericles grieves for his lost wife & daughter V.i.1-40.
Tarsia is called for to comfort Apollonius:	By Athenagoras 161.	On the advice of the wise men of the town: 'The wisdom of the toun this caste, / That young Taise were asent' VIII 1652-53.	At the suggestion of a lord and the order of Lysimachus: <i>I. Lord</i> 'Sir, / We have a maid in Mytilene, I durst wager, / Would win some words of him. <i>Lys.</i> 'Tis well bethought' V.i.41-43.
Because:	Athenagoras realizes the man on the ship has the same name as Tarsia's father and thinks she may be able to cheer him 159, 161.	'Sche can so moche of every thing, / That sche schal gladen him anon' VIII 1656-57.	'She, questionless, with her sweet harmony / And other chosen attractions, would allure' V.i.44-45.
When Tarsia arrives, she:	Tells him she is 'no fallen woman... but an innocent girl' 161. She then sings and tells a number of riddles 161-67.	Plays the harp and sings VIII 1670-71; tells stories, and asks riddles VIII 1675-83.	Says she will try to heal him 'provided / That none but I and my companion maid / Be suffr'd to come near him' V.i.76-78. She sings V.i.80.
Apollonius:	Pushes her so she falls to the floor 167.	Strikes her: 'after hire with his hond / He smot' VIII 1693-94.	Pushes her V.i.83 Stage Direction.
Tarsia informs him:	Of her life story in a long lament over his	She is a virgin and of noble birth and he	She is a virgin and has kings for ancestors

	treatment of her 167.	shouldn't treat her so VIII 1696-1699.	and he wouldn't hit her if he knew who her parents were V.i.84-100.
Apollonius warms towards her:	Because he recognizes her at this point 169.	'he hire loveth kindly, / And yet he wiste nevere why' VIII 1707-08.	Because she resembles his lost wife V.i.102 ff.
Apollonius:	N/A	Asks her name VIII 1713.	Questions Marina as to where she was born and bred V.i.103,114,115 And eventually asks her name V.i.140.
Eventually he realizes she's his daughter:	N/A	VIII 1725-43	After many more questions V.i.178 ff.
Joyfully, he:	Calls his servants to him and tells them he has found his daughter 169.	Comes out of his cabin and dresses himself VIII 1740-48.	Changes his clothes V.i.213, hears the music of the spheres V.i.228.
Athenagoras:	Asks Apollonius to marry Tarsia to him 169.	Falls in love with Thaise: '[s]o fell ther into his corage / The lusti wo, the glade peine / Of love' VIII 1762-64.	Tells Pericles 'I have another suit' V.i.258, having previously said, 'were I well assur'd / [Marina] Came of gentle kind and noble stock, I'd wish no better choice, and think me rarely wed' V.i.67-69.
Apollonius agrees readily to the marriage:	'Indeed I am willing, because I made a vow not to give up my mourning until I had given my daughter in marriage' 169.	'be thei alle of on acord' VIII 1776.	'You shall prevail, / Were it to woo my daughter; for it seems / You have been noble towards her' V.i.259-261.
The pimp:	Is burnt alive by the people of Mitylene after Apollonius threatens to destroy the city 169, 171.	Is not mentioned.	Is not mentioned.
Apollonius then:	Is visited in a dream by 'someone who looked like an angel' and told to go to Ephesus and recount his misfortunes 173.	Is visited by God in a dream and told to go to Ephesus to make sacrifices, and there he shall learn his fortune as respects his daughter and wife VIII 1789-1800.	Is visited by Diana in a vision and told to go to Ephesus to make sacrifices and tell the story of how he lost his wife V.i.238-246.

At Ephesus, he tells his story and is overheard by his wife:	173, 175.	VIII 1844-53.	V.iii.1 ff.
Apollonius:	Recognizes her 175.	Recognizes her at once VIII 162.	Is informed by Cerymon that this is his wife V.iii.18.
Mother and daughter:	Are reunited; no other details are given 175.	Are said to be happy together, no recognition scene given VIII 1897.	Have an emotional reconciliation scene V.iii.44 ff.
Apollonius then:	Doesn't make any vows.	Doesn't make any vows.	Promises to cut his hair 'what this fourteen years no razor touch'd' V.iii.75.
The family:	Go to Tarsus to avenge Tarsia 175.	Return to Tyre and are heartily welcomed VIII 1887 ff.	Go (presumably) to Pentapolis for the marriage of Marina & Lysimachus V.iii.72.
Stranguillio and Dionysias die because:	Apollonius brings Tarsia before the people to prove she's not dead; they rise up and stone them to death 177.	Apollonius tells the townspeople of their actions; they try the pair and condemn them to death VIII 1921-59.	The people of Tharsus learn of their ill deeds, rise up against them and burn them in their palace Epilogue, 11-14.
Apollonius then:	Goes to Pentapolis to live with Archistrates until Archistrates' death 177.	Learns of Artestrates' death and goes to rule Pentapolis VIII 1965. ff.	N/A
Apollonius then:	Rewards the fisherman and Hellenicus for past services 177, 179.	N/A	Will live out his days with Thaisa in Pentapolis after learning Thaisa's father is dead V.iii.82.
The kingdoms are redistributed:	The exact redistribution is unclear. We are told that Apollonius 'established his son-in-law Athenagoras as king in his place' 175. Archistrates leaves half his kingdom to Apollonius and half to his daughter 177. We are then told that Apollonius' son becomes king of	Thaisa and Athenagoras are made king and queen of Tyre VIII 1915-20.	Marina and Lysimachus are to rule Tyre V.iii.82.

	<p>Pentapolis in his place 179. Finally, we are told that Apollonius ‘ruled Antioch and Tyre and Cyrene as his kingdom’ 179.</p>		
<p>Conclusion / moral of the story:</p>	<p>No explicit moral. We are told that Apollonius lived happily for 74 years with his wife, then they ‘died in peace and virtuous old age’ 179.</p>	<p>‘Honesteliche his love he [Appolonius] spedde / And hadde children with his wif, / And as him liste he ladde his lif; / And in ensample as it is write, / That alle lovers myhten wite / How ate laste it schal be sene / Of love what thei wolden mene. / For se now on that other side, / Antiochus with al his pride, / Which sette his love unkindely, / His ende he hadde al sodeinly, / Set agein kinde upon vengance, / And for his lust hath his penance.’ VIII 1996-2008 <i>Confessor</i>: ‘Lo thus, mi sone, myht thou liere / What is to love in good manere, / And what to love in other wise. / ... / Fortune, though sche be nought stable, / Yit at som time is favorable / To hem that ben of love trewe. / Bot certes it is for to rewe / To se love agein kinde falle, / For that makth sore a man to falle, / As thou myht of tofore rede. / Forthi, my sone, I wolde rede / To lete al other</p>	<p>‘In Antiochus and his daughter you have heard / Of monstrous love the due and just reward. / In Pericles, his queen and daughter, seen, / Although assail’d with fortune fierce and keen, / Virtue preserv’d from fell destruction’s blast, / Led on by heaven, and crown’d with joy at last. / In Helicanus may you well descry / A figure of truth, of faith, of loyalty. In reverend Cerimon there well appears / The worth that learned charity aye wears. / For wicked Cleon and his wife, when fame / Had spread his cursed deed to th’honour’d name / Of Pericles, to rage the city turn, / That him and his they in his palace burn: / The gods for murder seemed so content / To punish; although not done, but meant.’ Epilogue.1-16.</p>

		love aweie, / Bot if it be thurgh such a weie / As love and reson wolde acorde. / For elles, if that thou descorde, / And take lust as doth a beste, / Thi love mai nocht ben honeste; / For be no skile that I finde / Such lust is nocht of loves kinde.' VIII 2009-2028.	
--	--	---	--

APPENDIX B: NAMES OF CHARACTERS AND LOCATIONS

<i>Historia</i>	<i>Gower – Confessio</i>	<i>Shakespeare - Pericles</i>
Antiochus 113	Antiochus VIII 274	Antiochus I.Chorus.17
Antiochus' daughter (not named)	Not named	Not named
Antioch 113	Antioche VIII 275	Antioch I.Chorus.17
Apollonius 115	Appolinus the Prince of Tyr VIII 375	Prince Pericles I.i.1 Stage Direction
Taliarchus 117	Taliart VIII 505	Thaliard I.Ib.151
Tarsus 119	Tharse VIII 542	Tharsus I.iv.21
Hellenicus 119	Hellican VIII 575	Helicanus I.ii.51
Stranguillio 121 and Dionysias 123	Strangulio VIII 545 and Dionise VIII 546	Cleon and Dionyza I.iv.1 Stage Direction
Pentapolis 123	Pentapolim VIII 658	Pentapolis II.i.97
Archistrates 125	Artestrathes VIII 691	Simonides II.i.43
Archistrates' daughter (not named)	Not named	Thaisa II.iii.1 Stage Direction
Lycoris 137	Lichorida VIII 1033	Lychorida III.Chorus.43
Ceremon 139	Cerymon VIII 1166	Cerimon III.ii.1 Stage Direction
Tarsia 143	Thaise VIII 1295	Marina III.iii.13
Theophilus 145	Theophilus VIII 1359	Leonine IV.i.1 Stage Direction
Mitylene 149	Mitelene VIII 1405	Mytilene IV.ii.1 Stage Direction
The pimp (not named)	Leonin VIII 1410	Pandar and bawd (not named). Their servant, Boulton IV.ii.1
Athenagoras 151	Athenagoras VIII 1622	Lysimachus IV.iv.15

WORKS CITED

- Archibald, Elizabeth. *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations*. Cambridge: DS Brewer, 1991.
- *Incest and the Medieval Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Augustine. *The City of God Against the Pagans*. Trans. and ed. R.W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Culture, Kinship, and Kingship*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Boose, Linda E. 'The Father's House and the Daughter in It: The Structures of Western Culture's Daughter-Father Relationship'. *Daughters and Fathers*. Eds. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Bowie, Malcolm. *Lacan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Bullón-Fernández, María. *Fathers and Daughters in Gower's Confessio Amantis: Authority, Family, State, and Writing*. Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2000.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales. The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed. Larry D. Benson. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. 23-328.
- *Troilus and Criseyde. The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed. Benson. 473-585.
- Davis, J. Madison, and A. Daniel Frankforter. *The Shakespeare Name Dictionary*. New York: Garland, 1995.
- de Berg, Henk. *Freud's Theory and Its Use in Literary and Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. Rochester, NY: Camden, 2003.
- DelVecchio, Doreen, and Antony Hammond. Introduction. *Pericles*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. DelVecchio and Hammond. Cambridge: The New Cambridge

- Shakespeare-Cambridge University Press, 1998. 1-78.
- duBois, Page. 'Ancient Tragedy and the Metaphor of Katharsis'. 19-24. *Theatre Journal*. 54.1 (2002). *Project Muse*. 23 February 2006. <http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/journals/theatre_journal/v054/54.1dubois.html>.
- Donavin, Georgiana. 'Taboo and Transgression in Gower's "Apollonius of Tyre"'. *Domestic Violence in Medieval Texts*. Eds. Eve Salisbury, Georgiana Donavin, and Merrall Llewelyn Price. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2002. 94-121.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Trans. James Strachey. London: Routledge, 1950.
- 'The Aetiology of Hysteria'. 1896. Trans. James Strachey. *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. Masson.
- Goddall, Peter. 'John Gower's *Apollonius of Tyre: Confessio Amantis*, Book VIII'. *Southern Review* 15.3 (1982): 243-53.
- Gossett, Suzanne. Introduction. *Pericles*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Gossett. London: Arden-Thomson Learning, 2004. 1-163.
- Gower, John. *Confessio Amantis*. Ed. Russell A. Peck. 3 vols. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000-2004.
- Hallpike, C.R. 'Social Hair'. *Man*. 4.2 (June 1969). 256-64. *JSTOR*. 4 December 2005.
- <<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0025-1496%28196906%292%3A4%3A2%3C256%3ASH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>>.
- Herman, Judith Lewis, with Lisa Hirschman. *Father-daughter Incest*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. Ed. and trans. Elizabeth Archibald. *Apollonius*. 112-79.

Hoeniger, F.D. Introduction. *Pericles*. 1963. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Hoeniger. xiii-xci.

The Holy Bible: New International Version. Children's ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1980.

Jones, Richard H. *The Royal Policy of Richard II: Absolutism in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.

Jonson, Ben. 'Ode to Himself upon the Censure of his "New Inn"'. 1621. Ed. N.J. Endicott. *Representative Poetry Online*. April 2002. University of Toronto Libraries. 28 March 2006. <<http://rpo.library.utoronto.ca/poem/1113.html>>.

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

Kirby, John L. *Henry IV of England*. London: Constable, 1970.

Langland, William. *Piers Plowman*. Ed. A.V.C. Schmidt. 2nd ed. London: Everyman, 1995.

Leach, E.R. 'Magical Hair'. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. 88.2 (July 1958). 147-164. *JSTOR*. 6 March 2006. <<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0307-3114%28195807%2F12%2988%3A2%3C147%3AMH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>>.

Levith, Murray J. *What's in Shakespeare's Names*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.

Macaulay, G.C., ed. *The English Works of John Gower*. By John Gower. Vol. 2. London: Kegan Paul, 1901.

Maranda, Elli Köngäs. 'Riddles and Riddling: An Introduction'. *The Journal of American Folklore*. 89.352 (1976). 127-137. *JSTOR*. 20 February 2006. <<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00218715%28197604>>

%2F06%2989%3A352%3C127%3ARARAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1>.

Masson, Jeffrey Moussaief. *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. New York: Penguin, 1985.

McCabe, Richard A. *Incest, Drama, and Nature's Law 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Middle English Dictionary (electronic version). 2001. University of Michigan. 18 March 2006. <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/med/>>.

Peck, Russell A. Introduction. *Confessio Amantis*. By John Gower. Ed. Peck. Vol. 1. 1-62.

--- *Kingship and Common Profit in Gower's Confessio Amantis*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.

Quilligan, Maureen. *Incest and Agency in Elizabeth's England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Rank, Otto. *The Incest Theme in Literature and Legend: Fundamentals of a Psychology of Literary Creation*. 1912. Trans. Gregory C. Richter. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Rubin, Gayle. 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex'. *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. Ed. Rayna R. Reiter. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.

Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Scanlon, Larry. 'The Riddle of Incest: John Gower and the Problem of Medieval Sexuality'. *Re-visioning Gower*. Ed. R. F. Yeager. Asheville, North Carolina: Pegasus, 1998. 93-127.

- Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. c. 1595-96. Ed. Peter Holland. 1994. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics-Oxford University Press, 1998.
- *Pericles*. c.1607-08. Ed. F.D. Hoeniger. 1963. London: Arden-Methuen, 1969.
- *The Tempest*. c. 1623. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Arden-Methuen, 1964.
- *The Winter's Tale*. c. 1611. Ed. J.H.P. Pafford. London: Arden-Methuen, 1963.
- Skeele, David. *Thwarting the Wayward Seas: A Critical and Theatrical History of Shakespeare's Pericles in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus the King*. Trans. Sir Richard Claverhouse Jebb. 1916. *Violation of Taboo: Incest in the Great Literature of the Past and Present*. Ed. Donald Webster Cory and R.E.L. Masters. New York: Julian Press, 1963. 170-210.
- Staley, Lynn. 'Gower, Richard II, Henry of Derby, and the Business of Making Culture'. *Speculum* 75.1 (2000): 68-96. *JSTOR*. 15 March 2006. <<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%28200001%2975%3A1%3C68%3AGRIHOD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V>>.
- Taylor, Mark. *Shakespeare's Darker Purpose: A Question of Incest*. New York: AMS, 1982.
- Tiller, Terence, trans. *Confessio Amantis*. By John Gower. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
- Townsend, David. 'The Naked Truth of the King's Affection in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*'. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*. 34.1 (2004). 173-195. *Project Muse*. 26 February 2006. <http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/journals/journal_of_medieval_and_early_modern_studies/v034/34.1townsend.html>.

Twine, Laurence. *The patterne of painefull aduentures: Containing the most excellent,*

pleasant and variable historie of the strange accidents that befell vnto Prince Apollonius, the Lady Lucina his wife, and Tharsia his daughter. Wherein the vncertaintie of this world, and the fickle state of mans life are liuely described.

1594. *Early English Books Online*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI, 1999-.

2 February 2006. <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/>

[search/full_rec?ACTION=ByID&SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ID=V13020](http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/search/full_rec?ACTION=ByID&SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ID=V13020)>. N.

pag.

Warren, Roger. Introduction. *Pericles*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Warren. Oxford: The Oxford Shakespeare-Oxford University Press, 2003. 1-85.

Watt, Diane. *Amoral Gower: Language, Sex and Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Young, Robert M. *Oedipus Complex*. Cambridge: Icon, 2001.