chapter eight

The Meta-Theatrical Mediterranean: Theatrical Contrivance and Miraculous Reunion in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, *The Four Prentices of London*, and *Pericles*

JANE HWANG DEGENHARDT

This chapter discusses three plays performed on the English public stage around the turn of the seventeenth century that represent the dispersal and ultimate reunion of family members in the region of the eastern Mediterranean. To varying degrees each of these plays figures the culminating familial reunion as a miracle brought about through divine providence. Whereas the whims of fortune drive the characters along separate and unpredictable courses, the hand of providence reunites the far-flung travellers at the plays' conclusions. This sense of providential intervention is underscored by the explicit religious themes and conflicts running through these plays, which are directly informed by the richly layered religious associations of their Mediterranean settings. At the same time, these reunions are facilitated through a range of theatrical contrivances that call attention to the gaps between the plays' divinely infused settings and the artifice of the stage, including the use of dumbshow, choric narration, grossly improbable coincidences, magical props and stage mechanics, and the convention of the deus ex machina. What happens when the dramatic representation of miracle converges with theatrical devices that generate a meta-theatrical effect? While one might easily assume that meta-theatrical effects detract from the sincere representation of miracles by drawing attention to their staging and their artificiality, in the plays that I discuss the convergence of meta-theatricality and miracle is mutually enhancing.

The wondrous effect of miraculous reunion in these plays may be attributed to their particular Mediterranean settings (Jerusalem, Ephesus), yet these plays also produce wonder by transforming the Mediterranean into a self-consciously theatrical space. In doing so, they show us how the geographical setting of the Mediterranean is integrated into a larger theatrical semiotics that cultivated new forms

of audience engagement, imagination, and pleasure, and that enabled the public theatre to simulate the authority of divine providence. By drawing attention to the disjuncture between a place such as Jerusalem and its theatrical representation, these plays engaged their audience's active imaginations and fostered a particular kind of faith – which I shall call *theatrical faith* – in the stage's own interventions.

Like the other chapters in this section, this chapter explores the English stage's projection of the Mediterranean as an imagined, conceptual space, though it also focuses on how this imagined, conceptual space is specifically mediated – and transformed – by the theatre's own conventions and physical mechanics. The popularity of Mediterranean settings on the London stage reflects the increased importance this region assumed for the English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as the result of trade interests. With England's growing participation in Mediterranean commerce, English citizens became more acutely aware of the imperial and religious threats posed by the Ottoman Empire, as well as of the dangers of piracy and captivity – all of which provided rich fodder for the stage. Many plays also tapped into the layered classical and medieval histories of particular Mediterranean sites and the intense inter-religious and inter-imperial struggles associated with these histories. However, the task of depicting these foreign and faraway places – whether in the context of the past, the present, or some combination of both – prompted playwrights to indulge their imaginations and to experiment with different theatrical modes of representation. The plays that I discuss address the challenge of representing geographic distance and travel by employing meta-theatrical devices (such as choric narration) that draw attention to the stage's artifice. They also attribute the improbable reunions of families dispersed in the Mediterranean to *both* the miraculous potential associated with Ephesus and Jerusalem – often expressed through a discourse of fortune or providence – and the self-conscious interventions of the stage itself. The challenge of depicting Mediterranean settings on stage, I argue, prompted playwrights to experiment with new forms of representation, and to fuse in complex ways the forces of divine providence and theatrical intervention. In turn, the meta-theatrical staging of providential reunion offered an empowering way of confronting some of the religious and political challenges associated with early English incursions in the Mediterranean.

The Travels of the Three English Brothers: Theatrical Intervention and the Geography of the Stage

The epilogue to Day, Wilkins, and Rowley's *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (perf. 1607) stages a spectacle that both simulates and defies geographical distance through a highly self-conscious use of theatrical space. Noting that

the play's three protagonists (based on real-life English adventurers Thomas, Anthony, and Robert Sherley) are physically dispersed across vast stretches of geography, both within the play's fictionalized plot and in actual life, the Chorus requests the audience's indulgence to unite the brothers through the art of the stage. Dividing the stage into three parts (one representing England, one Spain, and one Persia), the Chorus sets up for a brief dumbshow, described in the following stage directions: "*Enter three several ways the three brothers: Robert with the state of Persia as before; Sir Anthony with the King of Spain and others, where he received the Order of Saint Iago, and other offices; Sir Thomas in England, with his father and others. Fame gives to each a prospective glass: they seem to see one another and offer to embrace, at which Fame parts them, and so exeunt all except Fame.*"[1]

Purporting to offer each Sherley access to a framed spectacle of his far-flung brothers, the prospective glasses represent the stage's ability to elide spatial distance through a negotiation of its own material and semiotic conventions. As Henry Turner has argued, these evolving stage conventions were partly informed by emerging scientific spatial arts, including early modern technology, applied mathematics, and pre-scientific thought.[2] As Turner points out, the theatre itself was a form of mechanical science (like carpentry and engineering), and its conventions for representing place ("topographesis") drew upon geometric concepts to transport viewers across vast distances.[3] The scene's spatial manipulations demonstrate Turner's claim that the early modern theatre was "a highly spatialized mode of representation" and one quite focused on cultivating the art of spatial representation.[4] The division of the stage into three distinct parts and the entrance of the brothers from three different directions imply their geographical separation, while the prospective glasses through which the brothers view one another propose a use of technology that foreshortens distance. Yet if the division of the stage, the separate entrances, and the handheld props are meant to suggest the vast distance across which the brothers see one another, the actors ultimately come to stand in relatively close physical proximity, confined as they are by the dimensions of the platform stage. Thus, in seeking to represent both distance and the foreshortening of distance, the scene highlights a common condition of early modern theatre, in that its representational conventions must work against the physical properties of the stage.

As Cyrus Mulready has demonstrated, the representational capacity of the stage was stretched in particular by attempts to represent geographical expanses – a challenge that increased as audiences demanded plays featuring multiple geographies and long-distance travel.[5] Focusing specifically on stage romance, Mulready draws attention to how theatrical attempts to represent travel offended neoclassicists like Philip Sidney because they violated classical

representational boundaries. Nevertheless, Mulready argues, "Sidney's call for dramatic unity ... ultimately proved hopeless against the mounting demand for plays that gave audiences representations of an expanded world."[6] As I go on to discuss, representations of travel across distant geographies may have been popular with English audiences not just because of early modern interests in overseas expansion, but also because of the opportunities they provided for cultivating new kinds of meta-theatrical effects, dramaturgical practices, and audience engagement. Rather than attempt to represent geographical distance mimetically, the final scene of *The Three English Brothers* calls attention to the theatrical contrivances that make such representation (im)possible. In doing so, it comments meta-theatrically on the limitations of the stage as well as its potential to operate outside the bounds of classical mimetic conventions. Because the audience views not what is seen through the prospective glasses (i.e., the characters' perspectives), but rather the spectacle of the characters viewing one another, the physical unity of their bodies is emphasized. At the same time, that unity is understood to be mediated through a technology that intensely heightens or transcends the abilities of natural vision.

The "prospective glasses" might have referred to telescopes or another kind of scientific device, but they would have also suggested magical devices, which were employed by magicians and conjurors in other plays such as Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (ca 1590). The two meanings of "prospective glass" operative in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries – "a magic glass, mirror, or crystal in which it is supposed that distant or future events can be seen" and "a telescope or pair of binoculars" – reflect how the ability to see across distance was ambiguously attributed to both supernatural and scientific explanations, as well as reflecting the overlapping cultural spheres of magic and science (or the occult and natural philosophy).[7] Barbara Fuchs's discussion of the use of a crystal ball in which an Indian sorcerer can see the whole world in Alonso de Ercilla's *La Araucana* demonstrates how such technology brings together advances in optics, expanded geographies, and problems of representation.[8] As Stuart Clark has argued, advances in optical technology created uncertainties about whether such technology afforded greater access to natural truths or was duplicitous and therefore potentially dangerous and immoral.[9] The use of the prospective glasses in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* evokes a similar ambiguity by at once proposing a technology that enhances the abilities of human vision and facilitating an impossible and highly theatrical reunion.

The form of reunion afforded by the prospective glasses, as well as the spectacle of the actors viewing one another through these devices, allude meta-theatrically to the magic and technology of the early modern stage itself. As

the scene insists, the physical union of the brothers is not possible in real life and is made uniquely possible in the space of the theatre. Indeed, if the scene begins with Robert in Persia, Anthony in Spain, and Thomas in England, it concludes with their ceasing to be in these places; instead, they are relocated to a kind of no-place that can be read only as the space of the stage – the *same* stage. Thus, the technology that places them within one another's sights, and collectively within the audience's sights, locates them within an overtly theatrical – indeed, meta-theatrical – space. Relying less on the audience's suspension of disbelief than on its willingness to authorize the creative agency of the stage, the spectacle directly links the thrill and wonder of an impossible reunion to a theatrical contrivance.

In addition to offering a spectacle of wonder, the concluding spectacle also brings a kind of generic closure to the play by providing comic resolution in the form of familial reunion. In doing so, it imposes a kind of coherence onto an episodic plot of potentially arbitrary travel and dispersal. Fame, as the Chorus, proposes this intervention specifically in answer to the brothers' discontent at being separated around the globe:

> Unhappy [are] they (and hapless in our scenes)
> That in the period of so many years
> Their destinies' mutable commandress
> Hath never suffered their regreeting eyes
> To kiss each other at an interview. (Epilogue, lines 3–7)

Thus, the Chorus sets the brothers' meta-theatrically facilitated reunion against the force of fortune – described as "their destinies' mutable commandress" – that divides them in real life and throughout the scenes of the play. Fortune – or the force of chance, hap, or luck – was frequently associated with overseas travel and commerce in early modern England. As the plays I discuss here demonstrate, the term *fortune* constitutes a pervasive keyword in scenes representing the unpredictability of travel and commerce. The common risks of sea travel (shipwreck, piracy, captivity, mutiny, sickness, hunger, death), as well as the financial gains and losses associated with maritime trade, suggested that such events might be controlled by forces of chance that operated independent from, or even in competition with, divine providence. *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* attributes not only the separation of the three brothers to fortune but also such misfortunes as the mutiny aboard Thomas's ship and his capture by Turks near Kea. In also emphasizing fortune's role in depleting the Sherleys' economic fortunes and reputations, the play illustrates how an emerging economic understanding of fortune (earned, as opposed to inherited wealth) became intertwined

with the concept of cosmic chance in a culture undergoing transformation by maritime trade and exploration.[10] Because fortune resisted meaning or moral good, it threatened a kind of nihilistic chaos. However, if *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* dramatizes fortune's power to do bad in the world, it also sets out to harness and redirect the forces of fortune through its theatrical interventions.

By facilitating an unlikely reunion among the geographically dispersed Sherley brothers, the theatre operates something like the hand of providence in staging an intervention into fortune's course. In short, in order to give travel a comic resolution, the stage facilitated a reunion that aligned theatrical agency with the work of providence. As Alexandra Walsham describes it, early modern English providentialism amounted to a way of seeing the world. It constituted "a set of ideological spectacles through which individuals from all positions on the confessional spectrum were apt to view their universe, an invisible prism which helped them to focus the refractory meanings of both petty and perplexing events."[11] In providing a way of seeing that might override the work of fortune, the stage too offered such a prism. And if the stage enacted interventions and "miracles" that took liberties with the "truth" and depended upon theatrical contrivances or the work of the imagination, the theatrical effects of these interventions were no less wondrous because of their artifice. In fact, I would argue that these meta-theatrical moments had a kind of religious effect that was conveyed not just through their simulation of divine intervention and the affective responses they drew from their audiences, but through their very artifice.[12]

The Power of Seeing and Knowing

I begin with the example of an explicitly meta-theatrical reunion to offer context for the broader consideration of the trope of familial reunion that occurs in two other plays that dramatize extensive travel: Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London, with the Conquest of Jerusalem* (perf. c. 1594) and Shakespeare's *Pericles* (perf. 1608). In these two plays, family members are separated and then serendipitously reunited in cities located in the vicinity of the eastern Mediterranean. While the culminating reunions of these plays are not overtly meta-theatrical in the way of *The Three Brothers*, they suggest a degree of improbability and divine intervention that implicitly evokes theatrical contrivance. In the cases of *The Four Prentices* and *Pericles*, the specific settings for these reunions – Jerusalem and Ephesus, respectively – powerfully inform the magic of improbable reunion, which is cast in a rhetoric of providential triumph over fortune's whims. Jerusalem is located east of the far eastern point of the Mediterranean Sea, about thirty-five miles inland. Ephesus is situated more specifically on the Aegean Sea, an embayment of the Mediterranean Sea between the mainlands

of Greece and Turkey, though of course Europeans would have accessed it by crossing through the Mediterranean. As English audiences would have known, these places had multivalent religious significance as temporally layered sites of conquest and conversion involving pagan, Jewish, Muslim, and Christian cultures. Drawing upon the histories of Christian crusade in Jerusalem and St Paul's missions in Ephesus, *The Four Prentices* and *Pericles*, respectively, encourage audiences to interpret the concluding reunions as attributable, at least partly, to a triumph of Christian faith. Accordingly, these plays present reunion in a miraculous light – an outcome that underscores a sense of Christian divinity that inheres in these Mediterranean sites.

Without lessening the affective impact of miracle, these plays also attribute the source of miraculous reunion as much to theatrical contrivance and performance as to divinity. Critics such as Nova Myhill, Anthony Dawson, and Susannah Monta have discussed similar kinds of performance effects on the early modern stage.[13] In varying ways, they identify a tension between an audience's engrossment in performance and its awareness of theatrical artifice. Myhill emphasizes the audience's discernment in interpreting a performance as either "authentic" or "counterfeit";[14] Dawson describes audience engagement as a tension characterized by the "doubleness of knowing and seeing, of metatheater and theatre, suspension and belief;"[15] and Monta draws a parallel between audience engagement and religious faith, with its inevitable intermixture of "doubt" and "belief."[16] By contrast, rather than interpret "knowing" and "seeing," or "doubt and belief," as oppositional effects, I seek to identify the wondrous potential of meta-theatrical awareness. I argue for a power in the magic of the theatre that is at the same time distinct from complete or naive engrossment – wherein theatrical artifice is neither consonant with idolatry nor a force of disenchantment, but rather has the potential to be wondrous in its own way.

I bring theatricality to the fore in order to consider not just what the stage can teach us about early modern conceptions of the Mediterranean, but to consider what happens to the Mediterranean world when it is transposed onto the stage, transformed, as it were, through the lens of the prospective glass. In other words, how does the theatre not only elide the distance between London and the distant geography of the eastern Mediterranean, but also transform this particular geographical place into a theatrical space of wonder? Critics such as John Gillies and D.K. Smith have importantly examined how early modern playwrights integrated cultural knowledge from other fields such as cartography in order to represent Mediterranean geographies, and others have productively shown how a range of non-dramatic archives may be brought to bear on dramatic representations of these geographies.[17] By contrast, I consider how the plays themselves create their own cultural knowledge by transforming

these places into theatrical spaces. More specifically, I focus on how Heywood and Shakespeare self-consciously brought the Mediterranean to London audiences with an understanding of the stage as a unique vehicle for making knowledge public. One of the chief ways that the stage accomplished this was by engaging the public audience itself in a shared experience of wonder garnered through theatrical devices.

The Four Prentices of London: Seeing Differently in Jerusalem

The Prologue to Heywood's *Four Prentices of London* (probably first performed sometime between 1592 and 1594)[18] specifically calls attention to the public role of the stage and to this specific play's interest in bringing an unfamiliar history to a broad theatrical audience. The Prologue opens with three actors entering the stage to defend the play's performance. Asked by Player #1 to justify the play's authority as a "History" for those who "will believe nothing that is not in the Chronicle," Player #2 explains, "Our authority is a Manuscript, a book writ in parchment; which not being publique, nor generall in the world, wee rather thought fit to exemplifie unto the publique censure, things concealed and obscur'd, such as are not common with every one."[19] Thus, the play is framed as a rare and unfamiliar history that is being performed with the explicit purpose of bringing this history to public attention. In setting such an agenda, the Prologue imbues the stage with a distinct role that involves not just entertaining but also educating the public, and, in particular, exposing what is "not common with every one" so that it may become "communal."

At the same time, the claim that this particular story is entirely unknown to English audiences is partly disingenuous. The historical content of the play involves the figure of Godfrey of Bouillon, the leader of the First Crusade and the first Latin ruler of Palestine after the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. As Annaliese F. Connolly has discussed, this legendary figure was likely well known to English audiences.[20] Heywood's play remakes the Godfrey story by imagining Godfrey and his brothers as London apprentices and interweaving their conquest of Jerusalem with the story of their family's fall and rise, its dispersal and unlikely reunion in Jerusalem. In a sense Heywood's play does not so much bring something new to English audiences as it reinterprets a familiar history in a new way. It may follow that part of the pleasure of seeing a play such as *The Four Prentices* lay in experiencing its familiarity, as well as in seeing what new twist this production might add to the story. In addition to its thematic adaptation, Heywood's play remakes a familiar story through its extensive and innovative

use of theatrical devices. In particular, through its self-conscious manipulation of audience engagement, the play enables spectators to experience Jerusalem as a highly theatricalized space.

One of the likely draws of *The Four Prentices* for English audiences was the setting of Jerusalem, explicitly advertised in the play's title (*The Four Prentices of London, with the Conquest of Jerusalem*) as well as its Prologue. Player #2 in the Prologue touts, "Had not yee rather, for novelties sake, see Jerusalem yee never saw, then London that yee see howerly?" (lines 31–3). The novelty of seeing Jerusalem was of course a rare opportunity for London theatregoers, the vast majority of whom would never see the real Jerusalem. In effectively eliding the distance between London and Jerusalem, the play transported audiences across the globe without their ever having to leave home. Such transportation constituted a unique property of the stage, whose sensory and physical orientations offered an experience acutely different from that of reading. But the Jerusalem to which audiences were transported was not experienced as a kind of ethnographic immersion or realism, as is characteristic of the experience of watching a film.[21] The stage was relatively bare; the only set piece consisted of "walls" around the city, which served as a backdrop for much of the action as well as a structure mounted by the actors. Such walls were common stage props used in many plays with settings located in any number of geographical places. But even aside from such material conventions (often conceived of as limitations), the early modern stage was simply not oriented to providing audiences with a realistic sensory experience of Jerusalem, replete with local texture. Rather, it conjured the attributes of Jerusalem through its representation of the kinds of things that happen there, and, by extension, through the particular logic of cosmic or divine authority that appeared to govern these events.

In that the Jerusalem of *The Four Prentices* is a place of rare and improbable good fortune, we might compare the theatre's transportation of audiences there to a view through a prospective glass in which impossible things are seen to be possible. More specifically, the Jerusalem shown through the prospective of *The Four Prentices* is a place of unlikely reunion, reversal of fortune, and homecoming. If the play transports audiences away from London, it also offers a home away from home for its London protagonists – four brothers, their sister, and their father. Its representation of Jerusalem as a site of serendipitous reunion is explicitly set against the preceding geographical dispersal of the family members across Europe and the series of chance encounters and misrecognitions that ensue.

As in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, the circumstances that take this family to sea and result in their separation from one another are explicitly cast

in a language of fortune. The patriarch of the family opens the play by explaining the family's fall from nobility as a function of fortune:

> Daughter, thou seest how Fortune turns her wheel
> We that but late were mounted up aloft
> Lulled in the skirt of that inconstant Dame
> Are now thrown head-long by her ruthless hand
> To kiss that earth whereon our feet should stand. (lines 1–5)

Described metaphorically through the turn of fortune's wheel, the old earl has lost his land to the French king after aiding William the Conqueror in the Norman Conquest of England. As a result his four sons are reduced to living in London as citizens and tradesmen, apprenticed to a mercer, a haberdasher, a grocer, and a goldsmith. In a sense, these trades offer a way of dodging the force of fortune; as Guy puts it, whereas one who is "borne a Prince" risks being "cast downe / By some sinister chance, or fortunes frowne" having a trade offers "a meanes to purchase wealth ... that still stayes with mee in the extream'st of all," even through the loss of "[e]state" and "honors" (lines 84–9). The play thus sets the economics of the London guilds against that of an inheritance system based on land that is destabilized by the Norman imperial conquest. The brothers ultimately regain their nobility by virtue of another imperial conquest – that of Jerusalem – but they must first abandon their trades and re-enter the insecure world of fortune to have the chance of rising up again. When a captain comes to London with a proclamation recruiting soldiers for the Holy Wars in Jerusalem, the brothers jump at the chance to improve their circumstances by joining the Christian forces (entering the service of Robert Duke of Normandy, son of William the Conqueror). They take their leave of London and its trades, followed by their sister and preceded by their father, who has also set off for the Holy Land on a pilgrimage. Their subsequent journey is characterized by accidents and lost ways, conflicts and misrecognitions, thus setting up Jerusalem as a destination that will eventually impose order onto this chaos of fortune.

A crucial way in which the play imparts this story of fortune turned provident – both narratively and visually – is through its representation of travel, an action represented by the stage in imperfect and unique ways. Described by the Presenter, the fateful sea journey that leads to the brothers' separation emphasizes the power of fortune in guiding travel and associates it with the dispersal of family members. And, as with Anthony and Robert Sherley's journey to Persia, the play calls upon the audience's active participation to imagine their journey and the shipwreck that throws the brothers fatefully off course:

> Thus have you seen these brothers shipped to sea
> Bound on their voyage to the Holy Land
> All bent to try their fortunes in one Bark. (lines 249–51)
> ...
> Their instant fortunes I will soon express
> And from the truth in no one point digress. (lines 259–60)
> ...
> Imagine now yee see the air made thick
> With stormy tempests that disturb the main
> And the four windes at war among themselves
> And the weak bark wherein the brothers sail
> Split on strange rocks, (lines 265–9)
> ...
> [and they] Dispersed to several corners of the world (line 271)
> ...
> from their fortune all our scene must grow (line 273)

The audience's active role in imagining the journey, tempest, and shipwreck aligns them with the very force of fortune that guides the brothers' paths, simultaneously making the audience aware of theatrical artifice through the theatre's inability to mimetically represent travel and its risks.[22] Imagination is aided by the well-known trope of shipwreck, familiarized through the genres of epic and romance. This trope automatically evokes the powerful role of fortune and the notion of a journey characterized by chance, luck, and risk. The word *fortune* (or *fortunes*) appears three different times in the Presenter's speech, encapsulating monetary fortune as well as more general luck. Directly associated with the sea and the weather, fortune separates the brothers by casting them into different geographical regions or "corners of the world," spanning France, Italy, and Ireland. It also drives the subsequent scenes and structure of the play by propelling the brothers onto separate episodic paths. Their misfortunes at sea temporarily bring them even lower than they were as apprentices in London. But the severing of the family and the individual paths of struggle, misrecognition, and conflict that unfold only emphasize the triumphant reversal of fortune that takes place in Jerusalem, where the brothers not only recoup their nobility through imperial conquest but also experience the joy of reunion. If fortune guides the brothers' paths individually and episodically through Europe, providence draws these episodic paths together in Jerusalem.

The fantasy of rising out of the apprentice system is enabled by religious crusade, a fantasy afforded by the play's temporal fusing of the first Crusade

with present-day London guild culture. As Jean Howard puts it, in transposing the story of Godfrey of Bouillon to London, Heywood "invites ordinary London theatergoers to feel that the brothers' crusade is their own, that even middling-sort adventurers can aspire to do chivalric deeds and win glory for their country in foreign lands."[23] At the same time, the play draws a clear division between the world of Jerusalem and that of London, figuring Jerusalem as a place that rectifies the losses wrought by fortune and that recuperates underlying nobility through its providential power. With their conquest of Jerusalem the brothers are able to shed their trades, even as they physically mark their conquest of the Holy Land with their livery. In essence, they exchange the crests of their trades for imperial crowns, recovered from the heads of the Muslim leaders and representing the brothers' new rule over Jerusalem, Sicily, and Cyprus. If middling London apprentices have become kings, it is only in Jerusalem, and more specifically in the Jerusalem of the live theatre, that this can take place.

Notably, this triumphant resolution comes not as a surprise for the audience, for the play's subtitle ("with the conquest of Jerusalem") as well as the legendary historical victory of the eldest brother's namesake, Godfrey of Bouillon, in the First Crusade make the military victory known. In addition, the excessive misrecognitions of the brothers (as they repeatedly cross paths and fight each other for romantic access to the woman they don't recognize as their sister) establish the expectation that one day they will realize they all know one another. The certainty of this outcome contains fortune's power to do bad, demonstrating how fortune is subject to a generic arc that guarantees a providential resolution. Thus, the audience's affective experience is not simply conditioned by genre but also mirrors the discourse of fortune as providential certainty. Alluding to this outcome, the Presenter reflects upon the brothers' separation:

> Thus have you seene these foure, that were but now
> All in one Fleete, a many thousand leagues
> Seuere'd from one another: Guy in France
> Godfrey in Bulloigne, Charles in Italy
> Eustace in Ireland 'mongst the Irish kernes.
> Yet Gentlemen, the self same wind and fortune
> That parted them, may bring them altogether.
> Their sister follows them with zealous feet
> Be patient, yee will wonder when they meet (lines 321–9)
> ...
> Grant them your wonted patience to proceed
> And their keen swords shall make the pagans bleed. (lines 334–5)

As the Presenter suggests, fortune will be made providential in time and with the aid of the audience's patience. From this point early on in the play, the audience is promised an experience of "wonder" at the play's conclusion. The explicit promise of this reward suggests not that wonder will emanate from the suspense of *not knowing* what will happen, but rather that it accords with the audience's theatrical expectation, that the play's self-conscious theatricality does not detract from its ability to elicit wonder. As I have been suggesting, the very familiarity of the story, and the audience's authorization of the theatrical contrivance needed to deliver a happy ending, contribute to the pleasure and delight of watching the play. If the play attributes its wondrous resolution to the magic of Jerusalem (and by extension to the magic of the theatre), it achieves this effect through a careful engagement of its audience's expectations and appreciation for theatrical devices.

The brothers' excessive misrecognitions of one another across Europe emphasize the theatrical self-consciousness with which the familial reunion takes place in Jerusalem. The main difference between Europe and Jerusalem seems to be that the protagonists don't recognize each other in Europe, whereas they do in Jerusalem. Europe is thus made strange, and Jerusalem rendered a place of familiarity – a distinction that seems to highlight the play's awareness of the fact that both places occupy the same bare stage and are differentiated primarily by how the protagonists see the world, and in particular one another, in these spaces, rather than how the space itself is seen. The farcical nature of the protagonists' misrecognitions of one another is enhanced by their individual decisions to brandish the insignia of their London guilds on their flags and shields – a device that makes them each immediately recognizable to the audience. The gross improbability of their multiple chance meetings, compounded by the fact that they never recognize one another when they meet, exemplifies Heywood's special brand of dramaturgy – inverting the confusions of Shakespeare's closely contemporary *Comedy of Errors*, in which recognition is forestalled because the protagonists never seem to run into one another. If, as Jeremy Lopez has argued, "the drama and its audience were very much aware of the limitations of the early modern stage, and that the potential for dramatic representation to be ridiculous or inefficient or incompetent was a constant and vital part of audiences' experience of the plays," Heywood seems to flaunt this potential for its own sake.[24] In doing so, he shows how the play's ridiculous improbabilities, rendered in ways that are theatrically self-aware, might also enhance its wondrous effect.

If the moment of mutual recognition and reunion in Jerusalem is *potentially* laughable, the success of the play seems to depend on its being not *merely* laughable. Overtly signposted, the moment is verbally punctuated by shouts of

"Eustace!" "Godfrey!" "Guy!" "And Charles!"; and then all together: "Brothers!" (line 2118). Though the brothers have unknowingly crossed paths multiple times, they have not recognized one another until now. Conceivably, the ridiculousness of this possibility should mitigate the miracle of their ability to finally know one another in Jerusalem. Pulling visually against the wonder of their paths repeatedly crossing as they each traverse a vast geographical distance is the relatively small physical space of the stage that inevitably places their bodies in close proximity to one another. And yet, despite the layered spatial effect of their physical movements – presentation pulling against representation – their convergence at the same time in Jerusalem yields a wonder that is manufactured partly through its theatrical contrivance. Witnessing the unlikely reunion, Robert, duke of Normandy, exclaims, "This accident breeds wonders in my thoughts" (line 2119). For the performance to succeed, the members of the play's audience must share to some degree in this sense of wonder, rather than simply mock the contrived nature of the miracle.

Recognition and reunion in Jerusalem are also inflected by a religious force manifested through the Christian conquest of Jerusalem, thus fusing theatrical contrivance with providential Christian triumph. Upon claiming Christian victory, Robert, duke of Normandy, beseeches his men to laud God "with penitentiall praises" and to "ascribe all glory to the heavenly Powers" (lines 2382–3) that aided their victory, to which Tancred adds, "We do abhorre a heart puffed up with pride / That attributes these conquests to our strength / Twas God that strengthened us and weakened them / And gave us Syon and Jerusalem" (lines 2385–8). This interpretation of Christian victory as ordained by God displaces the many errors directed by fortune on the way to Jerusalem. Indeed, whereas the word *fortune* occurs more than twenty times in the play before the brothers reach Jerusalem (a little more than halfway through the play), it is used only five times after that point. In the final speech of the play, Robert instructs the brothers to hang their "trophies" (helmets) in the temple of Jerusalem "as a remembrance of [their] fortune's past" (lines 2563–4). Christian providence in turn inflects the distribution of imperial territories among the four brothers, who regain their nobility (and more) when they literally put on the crowns of Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Sicily. Connolly draws an apt contrast between Heywood's providentialism and the ironic treatment of providential monarchs in Shakespeare's *Henry V* and Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, which "mocks the idea of a providential God."[25] In the Jerusalem of *The Four Prentices*, God's intervening hand is fully empowered and receives sincere treatment, even as it is expressed through overt theatrical contrivances.

Perhaps surprisingly, given its post-Reformation context, the play comes close to staging God's presence in a way reminiscent of the medieval mystery plays.

Godfrey, the eldest brother, relinquishes the crown of Jerusalem to the next eldest and chooses instead to wear a crown of thorns in imitation of Christ's suffering. The casting of a London apprentice in this role may resonate with the performance of the mystery plays by local craft guilds. The play also cites the historical Godfrey of Bouillon, who according to legend refused the title and vestments of royalty, declaring he would never wear a crown of gold in the city where Christ wore a crown of thorns. As Elizabeth Williamson has discussed, religious stage props evocative of Catholicism or the medieval mystery tradition operated as "affective technologies" that translated an emotional charge from the religious sphere to the secular theatre, though not necessarily in any straightforward way.[26] In this case, the spectacle of an actor donning a crown of thorns – and leading a procession to "CHRISTS Tombe" (line 2571) – dangerously invokes the embodied staging of Christ while at the same time achieving dramatic distance through its self-conscious citational effect. In this way, it projects a complex fusing of religious and self-consciously theatrical power.

In addition, Godfrey's donning of the crown of thorns underscores how the brothers' restored noble status is ordained through an imperial conquest driven by religion rather than by economics. While Fanella Macfarlane has argued that the victory of Heywood's prentices poses an economic challenge to the large company monopolists who controlled England's overseas business and with whom London's domestic tradesmen were in direct conflict, the play seems insistently to divorce imperial conquest from global commerce, associating it instead with religious crusade.[27] It represents Jerusalem not as a place of trade or economic interest but as a site of holy wonder. This Jerusalem seems not to critique London and its mercantile practices but to be its antithesis – a place divorced from early modern economics. Having shed the livery of their London apprenticeships, the brothers, along with the other Christians, exit the stage in a procession towards the Holy Sepulchre (located somewhere offstage), fulfilling the earl's intention at the start of the play to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. As I have argued elsewhere, the threat of Islam and its contemporary association with the Ottoman Empire helps to justify the stage's empowerment of otherwise reviled Catholic rituals, practices, and objects.[28] Positively portrayed in this play are the trappings of Catholic crusade and pilgrimage, the performance of a holy procession, and the use of a crown of thorns as a stage prop. At the same time that the temporally and geographically distant setting of Jerusalem mitigates the controversial effect of these representations, it also heightens their religious meaning. Similarly, the setting of Jerusalem in this play lends credence to the staging of a miracle, aligning comic resolution with a miraculous conquest, and theatrical contrivance with divine intervention.

And yet the fact that Jerusalem is conquered by London apprentices who prominently display their trades by hanging their shields on the very walls of Jerusalem juxtaposes London economics with Christian providence in a way that calls attention to theatrical fantasy. Describing *The Four Prentices* as a particularly "experimental" play within Heywood's corpus, Jean Howard emphasizes how it "rewrites the chivalric romance to accommodate the interests of London guild culture."[29] The lampooning of a grocer-turned-knight in Francis Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607) responds to the ridiculousness of this fantasy. But as I have argued, and as the apparent success of *The Four Prentices* may demonstrate, it is a fantasy no less wondrous because of its theatrical contrivance. If Heywood's thematic adaptation of the Godfrey story represents a new experiment, it also works hand-in-hand with his extensive and innovative exploitation of theatrical devices. The combined mechanisms of Christian miracle and theatrical intervention transform Jerusalem into a place where one's recognition of one's own brother can be as wondrous as the conquest of Jerusalem by London apprentices.

Pericles Divine/Theatrical Intervention and Miraculous Reunion in Ephesus

Shakespeare's *Pericles* (1608), performed within a year following *The Travels of the Three Brothers* and sharing a co-author in George Wilkins, also produces wonder through self-consciously theatrical effects. Like *The Four Prentices*, it locates these effects in an eastern Mediterranean city, where three family members reunite after fourteen years and where the fortunes guiding their movements turn out to be providential. Set in the ancient Greek Mediterranean, the world of *Pericles* is ruled ostensibly by pagan gods and the cosmic force of fortune, yet the distinction between pagan and Christian divinity eventually breaks down, as the pagan divine forces are implicitly assimilated with a Christian providentialism. The significance of Ephesus as not only the site of Diana's temple, but also of Christian conversion and miracles, prominent in St Paul's journeys, reinforces the play's fusing of pagan and Christian divinity. As Elizabeth Hart and Randall Martin have shown, Diana's Graeco-Roman associations with chastity diverged from Artemis's Hellenistic associations with fertility and childbirth, creating a productive tension between the two cultural influences.[30] What I suggest is not simply that the Christian supplants the pagan, but that the two merge to effect a single providential resolution to the play that veers from the confusions of fortune. At the same time, the providential interventions that bring about Pericles's miraculous reunions with Marina and Thaisa draw attention to the use of stagecraft, either by foregrounding the

stage's mechanical special effects or by eliciting the audience's imagination to compensate for the inadequacies of the stage. If fortune is eventually revealed to be provident in this play – coming into focus as though viewed through a prospective glass – this revelation is shown to be a function of both divine providence and theatrical artifice.

The divine intervention that directly facilitates the familial reunion in Ephesus conjoins miracle with theatricality in ways that likely drew attention to the mechanics of the stage. In the final act, the goddess Diana appears and directs Pericles to travel to Ephesus, where he and Marina will be reunited with Thaisa, long presumed to be dead. I agree with Suzanne Gossett (as well as a number of other editors and critics of the play), who argues for the likelihood of Diana's descent onto the stage, linking the play "to the increasingly elaborate Jacobean court masques" as well as to a broader tradition of godly descents on the public stage.[31] I draw attention to the great dramaturgical power of such a spectacle and to how it self-consciously evokes an awareness of the theatrical contrivance of the deus ex machina as well as of the literal physical mechanics of lowering an actor onto the stage from above. To the accompaniment of music, the goddess would descend, offer Pericles a set of explicit directions, and then ascend from the stage:

> *Diana* [*descends*]
> My temple stands in Ephesus. Hie thee thither
> And do upon mine altar sacrifice.
> There, when my maiden priests are met together,
> Before the people all,
> Reveal how thou at sea didst lose thy wife.
> To mourn thy crosses, with thy daughter's, call,
> And give them repetition to the life.
> Or perform my bidding, or thou livest in woe;
> Do't, and happy, by my silver bow.
> Awake, and tell thy dream. [*She ascends.*][32]

Quite possibly, the actor descended and ascended by being lowered from an upper platform via a pulley system. In this case, his entrance would have relied upon the relatively crude mechanics of the early modern stage. The number of similar instances in which actors descended from above, including Jupiter in *Cymbeline*, Cupid in *Love's Mistress*, and Fortune in *The Valiant Welshman*, suggests that this was a familiar device for early modern playgoers. Alan Dessen and Leslie Thompson's *Dictionary of Stage Directions* identifies *descend* as a stage direction "roughly ninety times in sixty plays" and certainly a number of other

plays featured descents from above, despite the omission of explicit stage directions in their early quartos.[33] In evoking the machines used in Greek tragedy to lower gods onto the stage, Diana's descent would have also drawn attention to the plot device of the deus ex machina, which offers an easy way of solving a problem in a play without necessitating further explanation. Horace and Aristotle disparaged playwrights' use of the device because of its crude theatrical contrivance and its introduction of improbability into a plot. Such potential criticism clearly applies to Diana's role in *Pericles*, where the need to resolve the plot by reuniting Pericles and Marina with Thaisa is perhaps too conveniently answered by a divine intervention. Early modern audiences would have recognized the contrived and convenient resolution afforded by Diana, as well as of the stage mechanics that likely brought her onto the stage. And yet, both the moment of Diana's appearance and that of the familial reunion that follows must have engendered wonder for early modern audiences in order for the play to be so successful. As I have been suggesting, this sense of wonder fully assimilated – even celebrated – an awareness of theatrical contrivance, rather than ignoring it.

The efficacy of Diana's intervention, in which theatricality merges with miracle, is demonstrated through the familial reunion that immediately follows upon Pericles's heeding of Diana's directives. Quite unabashedly, Pericles refers to the reunion with Thaisa as a "great miracle" (5.3.59). Such a reading of Diana's intervention and the resolution that follows suggests that they were portrayed with absolute sincerity. Perhaps because of its Catholic associations, the word *miracle* is relatively rare in Shakespeare's plays, appearing only thirty-one times in his entire dramatic canon, and most often in humorous or ironic contexts (*fortune*, by contrast, appears 509 times). In *Pericles*, the word is spoken earnestly and with reverence, as Pericles wonders "who to thank, / Besides the gods, for this great miracle" (5.3.58–9). He refers here not just to his reunion with Thaisa, but also to her restoration from apparent death, which he learns to have been facilitated by Cerimon, as well as by the fortune that cast her ashore in Ephesus. This moment, too, is linked to Diana, as Thaisa first calls out her name upon being revived: "Oh dear Diana, / Where am I?" (3.3.102). Thaisa will later describe Cerimon as a man "through whom the gods have shown their power," suggesting that he is a vehicle for (pagan) divinity (5.3.61). In addition to its authorization of pagan divine power, Thaisa's revival evokes the Christian miracle of resurrection. And, at the same time, it produces a wondrous theatrical spectacle, enhanced by the audience's awareness that, in seventeenth-century London, revival from death is something that happens exclusively (and often) on the stage. Myhill's discussion of the simultaneity of miracle and theatrical artifice seems apt here, and once again I draw attention to how these

two forces might work hand-in-hand, rather than against one another, to create a wondrous effect.

If the "miracle" of Pericles's reunion with his family is informed by the theatrical artifice of Diana's intervention, this miracle is also authorized by the particular setting of Ephesus, which held rich associations with pagan as well as Christian divinity. As Randall Martin has discussed, ancient Ephesus was "a place of competing loyalties to a long-standing female-centered religion versus a transplanted patriarchal one."[34] Though also known for its major commercial seaport – both in ancient times and in Shakespeare's time – the Ephesus of *Pericles* is distinguished most by the temple of Artemis, one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. In that the temple serves as a sanctuary for Thaisa to live as a chaste widow, it draws more on Diana's identity as the Graeco-Roman patron of chastity than on that of her Hellenistic identity, Artemis, the deity of fertility and childbirth. Martin describes how both the European tradition of Diana and the Asian and Hellenistic worship of Artemis were assimilated by Christianity, when Mary, "their avatar," became known as the virgin mother of god."[35] At the same time, local worship of Artemis persisted until the fourth century, and the temple itself was a site of fierce resistance to Christian conversion and Paul's evangelizing missions. *Pericles* translates this history of violent conflict and transition into a seamless fusing of paganism and Christianity, figured on some level as a merging of fortune with providence. Though outwardly pagan, Shakespeare and Wilkins's Ephesus is a site of "miracle" and provident resolution. The triumph of providence over fortune is expressed by Gower's final epilogue, which sums up the fate of all the characters in the play: "In Pericles, his queen, and daughter seen, / Although assailed with Fortune fierce and keen, / Virtue preserved from fell destruction's blast, / Led on by heaven and crowned with joy at last" (Epilogue, 3–6). If pagan and Christian merge in the play's provident resolution to fortune's whims, they accomplish their victory through an unexpected miraculous intervention, which is authorized by both the theatrical stage and the divinely enchanted setting of Ephesus.

Crucial to this miracle (and to rendering fortune provident) is Pericles's obedience to forces that may look like whims of fortune but are later revealed to be providential. Often disparaged as a passive or one-dimensional character, Pericles may alternatively be seen to model a lesson of Christian patience. In response to Diana's directions, Pericles unquestioningly vows obedience, answering, "Celestial Dian, Goddess argentine, / I will obey thee" (5.1.237–8). After heeding rather than questioning this directive, no matter how seemingly arbitrary or nonsensical the message, Pericles is ultimately rewarded through reconciliation with his wife. His reunion with his daughter is similarly facilitated

through a kind of obedience to forces greater than himself. Caught in a tempest, Pericles is "driven before the winds" to the coast of Mytilene (5.0.14). Though facilitated by forces of nature, this reunion parallels Pericles's reunion with Thaisa in that his complete surrender to a power greater than himself leads to unanticipated reward. Exhibiting a logic of Christian providence, the play's resolution suggests that Pericles's triumph is neither arbitrary nor brought about through his own direct agency, but rather the result of a patient obedience that propels him to travel passively.

Though the final reunion in Ephesus overshadows the significance of Pericles and Marina's reunion in Mytilene, it seems important to recognize the importance of this earlier reunion and how it, too, is facilitated by an intervention that draws attention to the mechanics of the stage. In this case, it is not an embodied goddess who brings about reunion, but a storm-ridden journey that randomly lands Pericles on the coast of Mytilene, the same city where his daughter was sold by pirates into a brothel. Narrated by Gower in two non-consecutive scenes, rather than physically enacted on the stage, the storm constitutes a form of intervention that differs in interesting ways from the intervention made by Diana. Following Dionyza's attempted murder of Marina and a dumbshow in which Pericles is confronted with Marina's coffin, Gower describes how Pericles sets sail from Tarsus for Tyre when

> . . . He bears
> A tempest which his mortal vessel tears,
> And yet he rides it out. (4.4.29–31)
> ...
> Let Pericles believe his daughter's dead
> And bear his course to be ordered
> By Lady Fortune, while our scene must play
> His daughter's woe and heavy well-a-day
> In her unholy service. Patience then,
> And think you now are in Mytilene. (4.4.46–51)

As in *The Three English Brothers* and *The Four Prentices of London*, the Chorus steps in to narrate an instance of travel that the stage cannot easily represent. In addition, Gower asks the audience's leave for Pericles "to believe" that Marina is dead, to let him "bear his course" that is "ordered by Lady Fortune," and to have "patience" while the scene transitions to Mytilene before returning to Pericles's travels. In a sense, it lays bare the clunky mechanics of scene transition and the difficulties of representing simultaneous events in different settings. Quite antithetical to the scene of Diana's intervention that soon follows, this scene lays the burden of Pericles's redirected course on the audience. In effect, the audience is asked to conjure the journey and the storm in their imaginations, and to patiently indulge Pericles's perspective on the events that befall him, while knowing that Marina is alive and living in Mytilene. This solicitation of audience participation aligns the spectators' imagination and consent with the force of fortune ("Lady Fortune") that drives Pericles's course. In doing so, it draws attention to the theatrical nature of Pericles's travels and associates both the theatre and travel with the unpredictable force of fortune.

Lady Fortune's role in directing Pericles's course is not unique to this particular journey or episode in the play, suggesting that the providential nature of the storm can be perceived only after the fact. Prior to this trip, Pericles has undertaken a number of journeys through the Mediterranean Sea and encountered two previous storms of significant consequence – one that leads to his marriage to Thaisa and one during which his daughter is born and his wife is presumed to die. In these previous episodes, fortune plays a similar, crucial role: "Fortune ... threw him ashore" in Pentapolis (2.0.37–8); Pericles and Thaisa are thrown off course by "Fortune's mood" when departing Pentapolis for Tyre (3.0.46); when Thaisa's coffin washes ashore on Ephesus, Cerimon comments, "'Tis a good constraint of fortune / it belches upon us" (3.2.55–6); and Marina attributes her landing in a brothel to "most ungentle Fortune" (4.5.100) and her devaluation in social status to "wayward Fortune" (5.1.80) These repeated references to "fortune" (the word appears twenty-one times in all throughout the play) suggest that, unlike Diana's intervention, the storm that takes Pericles to Mytilene represents just one more episode of fortune in a play that abounds with such episodes. And yet, *this* storm leads to an improbable reunion between Pericles and Marina that serves as a partial comic resolution to the plot, soon followed by the reunion of the whole family in Ephesus. If this storm is revealed ultimately to be providential through its wondrous consequences, it relies on the audience to perceive it as such by retrospectively understanding this instance of fortune to be different from and more meaningful than the previous ones.

When Gower re-enters the stage after two intervening scenes set in Mytilene to complete his narration of Pericles's journey, he similarly elicits the active participation of the audience to bring about the providential reunion between father and daughter:

> And to [Marina's] father turn our thoughts again,
> Where we left him, on the sea. Where there him lost,
> Whence, driven before the winds, he is arrived
> Here where his daughter dwells, and on this coast

Suppose him now at anchor. (5.0.12–16)
...
In your supposing once more put your sight:
Of heavy Pericles, think this his bark,
Where what is done in action, more if might,
Shall be discovered, please you sit and hark. (5.0.21–4)

In beseeching the audience to "turn their thoughts" to Pericles at sea, to "suppose" that he is "now at anchor," and to "think" that the stage is his "bark," Gower emphasizes how much he relies upon the intervention of the audience (and not that of the storm) to carry out the redirection of Pericles's course. By offering an extreme instance in which the stage fails at mimetic representation, Gower's speech also calls attention the difficulty of theatrical faith. Describing how a similar moment of choric narration in *The Winter's Tale* elicits audience belief, Monta explains, "There is something 'willing here,' but it is not exactly or simply a suspension of disbelief – the audience is asked to engage imaginatively despite and because of [the Chorus's] insistence on the shortcomings of dramatic fiction."[36] Through its implicit acknowledgment of theatrical inadequacy, Gower's narration reminds us of how belief in the theatre is always beholden to an audience, and of how all theatrical representation relies on the imagination and faith of spectators.

Pericles's structural excesses and the difficulty of staging its extensive traversals of time and space contribute to its lesson of fortune made provident, as well as to the audience's pleasure in observing the work of the stage. The play's episodic structure reinforces this message by presenting an unrelated series of journeys to multiple, seemingly random destinations that turn out to have providential significance. Unlike in *The Four Prentices*, the audience experiences the recognition that fortune is in fact providential almost simultaneously with Pericles, at the end of the play. In addition, the episodic structure divorces travel from an explicit goal or ambition, depicting the traveller not as a subject but as an object tossed from place to place. Gower as choric narrator serves a key function in helping to knit together the disjointed episodic structure, as well as exposing its gaps and breeches. When Gower says to the audience, "I do beseech you / To learn of me, who stand [in the] gaps to teach you / The stages of our story," he draws attention to his role in shaping both what is seen and not seen: the "gaps" occupy the stage as surely as the "stages," or episodes, themselves (4.4.7–9). Often Gower's narration seeks to fill the gaps for what the stage cannot show. For example, in the fifth scene of the play, Gower describes Pericles's journey from Tarsus to Pentapolis:

For now the wind begins to blow;
Thunder above and deeps below
Make such unquiet, that the ship
Should house him safe is wreck'd and split,
And he, good prince, having all lost,
By waves from coast to coast is tossed.
All perishen of man, of pelf,
Ne aught escapend but himself;
Till Fortune, tired with doing bad,
Threw him ashore to give him glad. (2.0.29–38)

Here, Gower functions as a meta-theatrical device that compensates for the difficulty of staging sea travel. However, in narrating what cannot be shown, Gower also exploits the aspects of theatrical experience that are auditory, rather than visual, and that call upon the audience's imagination to envision the spectacle in their mind's eye. The anachronisms in Gower's language help to shape the imagined experience by invoking a world and a literary tradition from the past, and by thus rendering the narration less immediately transparent for early seventeenth-century audiences. If Pericles's toil is characterized by "letting go and letting God," the audience performs an opposite form of labour in actively transporting Pericles through the work of the imagination.[37]

Such transportation across vast expenses of geographic space and fourteen years of time requires compressions that make the play suitable for live theatrical performance. Rather than obscure these compressions, the play draws the audience's attention to them, and in doing so flaunts its awareness of the packaging of material for commercial consumption. For example, at the beginning of act 4 (scene 15),[38] Gower reflects on the process of compression as he tells of Dionyza's growing jealousy of Marina and her intention to have her murdered:

... The unborn event
I do command to your content,
Only I carry winged time
Post on the lame feet of my rhyme,
Which never could I so convey
Unless your thoughts went on my way. (4.0.45–50)

Here Gower draws attention to his poetic "rhyme," which compresses and in effect stands in for events that the stage does not show. More efficient than theatrical enactment, Gower's poetic narration repackages a story that is too long for the stage so that it might be suitable for theatrical performance, but

as Gower makes clear, such repackaging would not be possible without the "thoughts" of the audience. The absence of spectacle and mimetic representation on the stage solicit a distinct kind of audience interaction – an effect highlighted against the contemporary trend of staging elaborate spectacles in court masques.

I suggest that *Pericles*'s excesses – its expanses of time and space, and its loose, episodic structure – as well as its gaps, added something positive to the play in the form of theatrical pleasure and entertainment. Cyrus Mulready persuasively argues that early modern audiences' expanding geographic and cultural imaginings, satisfied by romance's depiction of faraway places, prompted playwrights to defy neoclassical standards for dramatic unity, despite the costs of doing so.[39] But could it also be that *Pericles*'s popularity with early modern audiences encourages a different understanding of how audiences interacted with and appreciated the theatre on a meta-theatrical level, taking pleasure in witnessing the gaps and limitations of the stage, and the exposure of its mechanics? In transporting audiences to the eastern Mediterranean, plays such as *The Four Prentices* and *Pericles* simultaneously made spectators aware of the disjuncture between verisimilitude and theatricality, the arbitrary chaos of fortune and the framed prospective of providence.

The three plays I have discussed are among many English plays of the same period that depict travel in the spaces of the eastern Mediterranean.[40] This geographical region was of heightened importance to the English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, largely because of English interests in Mediterranean commerce, as well as because of the looming religious and imperial threat posed by the Ottoman Empire. Places such as Jerusalem and Ephesus were also sites of past Christian struggle that assumed new topical relevance as the English contemplated Christian vulnerabilities in these now Ottoman-controlled territories. And yet, as this chapter has attempted to demonstrate, eastern Mediterranean settings also provided a unique opportunity for the theatre to experiment with new forms of representation because of the very difficulty of depicting travel and geographical distance on the stage. While at times the stage construed its inability to represent travel mimetically as an inadequacy, it also used these moments to produce meta-theatrical effects that cultivated new and sophisticated forms of audience engagement and pleasure. In addition, the plays I have discussed drew upon Christian histories of conflict and triumph in Jerusalem and Ephesus to stage miracles of familial reunion, but they also effected these miracles in overtly theatrical ways that drew attention to the theatre's own evolving semiotic conventions, physical mechanics, and dramaturgical practices. In doing so, these plays mobilized theatrical

artifice to create a sense of wonder that was entirely distinct from, but not necessarily less powerful than, miracles of a divine nature. In transforming the Mediterranean into an overtly theatrical space, the early modern English theatre operated something like the hand of providence and cultivated among audiences a faith in the theatre's own unique contrivances.

NOTES

1 *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), Epilogue, stage direction following line 13. Subsequent quotations from the play will be cited parenthetically by scene and line number.
2 Henry Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580–1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
3 Ibid., 30.
4 Ibid., 2.
5 Cyrus Mulready, "'Asia of the one side, Affric of the other': Sidney's Unities and the Staging of Romance," in *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*, ed. Valerie Wayne and Mary Ellen Lamb, 47–71 (London: Routledge, 2008). See also, Mulready, *Romance on the Early Modern Stage: English Expansion before and after Shakespeare* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
6 Mulready, "'Asia of the one side,'" 49.
7 "prospective glass," OED online.
8 Barbara Fuchs, *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 40.
9 Stuart Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); see especially "Prestiges," 78–122.
10 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, *fortune* assumed the meaning of a "position determined by wealth" or an "amount of wealth" in the late sixteenth century; the earliest example of this usage cited in the *OED* is from 1596. See *fortune*, *OED* online.
11 Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 3.
12 For a discussion that gestures in a similar direction, see Erika T. Lin, *Shakespeare and the Materiality of Performance* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), esp. on "religious ecstasy" in chap. 3.
13 Nova Myhill, "Making Death a Miracle: Audience and the Genres of Martyrdom in Dekker and Massinger's *The Virgin Martyr*," *Early Theatre* 7, no. 2 (2004): 9–31; Anthony Dawson, with Paul Yachnin, *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and Susannah Brietz Monta, "'It

is requir'd you do awake your faith': Belief in Shakespeare's Theater," in *Religion and Drama in Early Modern England*, ed. Jane Hwang Degenhardt and Elizabeth Williamson, 115–37 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

14 Myhill, "Making Death a Miracle," 9.

15 Dawson, with Yachnin, *Culture of Playgoing*, 107.

16 Monta, "'It is requir'd,'" 124.

17 John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). D.K. Smith, *The Cartographic Imagination in Early Modern England: Rewriting the World in Marlowe, Spenser, Raleigh, and Marvell* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008). Many critics have relied on other archives such as pamphlet literature and travel narratives to illuminate dramatic representations of the Mediterranean. See, for example, Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1558–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570–1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

18 For an overview of critical speculation regarding the dating of the play, see Mary Ann Weber Gasior, ed., *The Four Prentices of London* (New York: Garland, 1980), vii–xv.

19 *The Four Prentices of London*, ed. Mary Ann Weber Gasior (New York: Garland, 1980), Prologue, lines 25–30. Subsequent quotations from the play will be cited parenthetically by line number. This edition follows the 1615 quarto, which does not contain headings for act or scene divisions, other than for the Prologue and a single heading for "Actus primus, Scoena prima."

20 Annaliese F. Connolly, "Guy of Warwick, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Elizabethan Repertory," in *Early Modern England and Islamic Worlds*, ed. Bernadette Andrea and Linda McJannet (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 150. Godfrey's story was disseminated in contemporary publications such as Richard Carew's 1594 translation of the first five cantos of Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*. It may have also inspired two other plays referenced in Henslowe's *Diary*, namely *Jerusalem*, performed in 1592 at the Rose by Lord Strange's Men, and *Godfrey of Bullen*, performed in 1594–5 by the Admiral's Men.

21 For a related discussion of the relationship between early film and the viewer, see Tom Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction: Early Film, Its Spectator, and the Avant-Garde," in *Film and Theory: An Anthology*, ed. Robert Stam and Toby Miller, 229–35 (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000). Gunning argues that film prior to 1906 established a particular relationship with its viewing audience by presenting a visual travelogue of exotic places and drawing on the illusory power of these views.

22 Indeed, as Erika T. Lin has argued, what we now understand as mimetic representation (something akin to realism) differs from early modern mimesis, which worked in conjunction with an allegorical mode of understanding; see Lin, *Shakespeare and the Materiality of Performance*, chap. 3.

23 Jean Howard, "Thomas Heywood: Dramatist of London and Playwright of the Passions," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, ed. Ton Hoenselaars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 121–2.

24 Jeremy Lopez, *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 2.

25 Connolly, "Guy of Warwick," 148.

26 Elizabeth Williamson, *The Materiality of Religion in Early Modern English Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 27.

27 Fenella Macfarlane, "To 'try what London apprentices can do': Merchant Chivalry as Representational Strategy in Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 13 (2000): 141.

28 Jane Hwang Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

29 Howard, "Thomas Heywood," 121.

30 Elizabeth Hart, "'Great is Diana' of Shakespeare's Ephesus," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 43, no. 2 (2003): 347–74; and Randall Martin, "Rediscovering Artemis in *The Comedy of Errors*," *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean: Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Valencia, 2001*, ed. Tom Clayton, Susan Brock, and Vicente Forés, 363–79 (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2004).

31 Suzanne Gossett, ed., *Pericles*, Arden edition, 3rd ser. (London: Thomson Learning, 2004), Introduction, 81.

32 Ibid., 5.1.227–36. Subsequent quotations from the play will be cited parenthetically by act, scene, and line number.

33 A portion of this number refers to descents through a trapdoor located in the stage and to descents "from a state." Alan Dessen and Leslie Thompson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 67–68.

34 Martin, "Rediscovering Artemis," 369.

35 Ibid., 364.

36 Monta, "'It is requir'd,'" 116.

37 For a discussion of how *Pericles* effaces the labour of early modern travel, see Daniel Vitkus, "Labor and Travel on the Early Modern Stage: Representing the Travail of Travel in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* and Shakespeare's *Pericles*," in *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Michelle Dowd and Natasha Korda, 225–42 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

38 The 1609 quarto was divided into scenes and not acts, consistent with the episodic structure of the play. Many modern editions, including the one cited in this chapter, impose act divisions, a practice that began with the third folio.

39 Mulready, "'Asia of the one side.'"

40 For discussions of some of these plays, see, for example, Tom Clayton, Susan Brock, and Vicente Forés, eds., *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2004); and Goran Stanivukovic, ed., *Re-Mapping the Mediterranean World in Early Modern English Writings* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

chapter nine

Copying "the Anti-Spaniard": Post-Armada Hispanophobia and English Renaissance Drama

ERIC GRIFFIN

> In breefe, such is this comparison that if some Rhetoritian would employ his eloquence in framing of a long and lively Antithesis, he could not in the world find a subject more sortable to his purpose then the comparing of our conditions with those of this mongrell generation.
>
> *A Comparison of the English and Spanish Nation* (1589)[1]

In England, the period following the Armada crisis of 1588 saw a marked increase in the publishing of anti-Spanish propaganda. Contrary to the lessons of Whig historiography, contemporaries realized that the defeat of Philip II's Enterprise of England had settled nothing. Seeking to capitalize on the fear and fervour generated by a crisis that had not yet reached the mythic status accorded it by later generations,[2] the Elizabethan regime mobilized a network of printers, propagandists, translators, and hack writers coordinated by William Cecil.[3] Their publications elevated an inflammatory rhetoric of ethnicity to a volume not previously heard in England. This discourse – which to this point had been more characteristic of the Dutch nationalists, French anti-Leaguers, and Huguenots who had been demonizing Spain for more than a generation – extended the dichotomizing discourse characteristic of Reformation polemic in order to subvert virtually every "kind and quality" that could be associated with Spanish nationality.[4] Yet more deleterious was the way this discourse erased evidence of cultural complementarity, overwriting the field of Anglo-Hispanic relations with English national significance.[5]

Later decades confirm that the English propaganda effort of the 1590s may have been one of the most devastating ever launched. Certainly audiences were moved while reading of the legendary cruelty ascribed to his countrymen by