



SEDERI Yearbook

ISSN: 1135-7789

sederiyearbook@yahoo.es

Spanish and Portuguese Society for English
Renaissance Studies
España

Laureano Domínguez, Lorena

Pericles' "unknown travels": the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's Pericles

SEDERI Yearbook, núm. 19, 2009, pp. 71-97

Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies

Valladolid, España

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=333527606004>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

Pericles' "unknown travels": the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's *Pericles*¹

Lorena Laureano Domínguez
University of Huelva

ABSTRACT

The present essay explores the complex notion of geography and its manifold implications in Shakespeare's first romance, *Pericles*. It will be argued that the role of geography and travelling in the play cannot be reduced to a mere formal strategy. In the play's treatment and representation of geography, psychological, moral and political aspects intertwine. Thus *Pericles* can be understood simultaneously as an individual's life journey, as a spiritual journey, and even as an exploration of different forms of government and power. Taking as a point of departure John Gillies' concept of "geographic imagination" and Freud's notion of "the uncanny," I will focus on the psychological meaning and on the poetic and dramatic effectiveness of the author's imaginative use of geography. Examination of the different locations demonstrates that, beyond their existence as specific external spaces, they are relevant as inner mental entities informing Pericles' experience and acquiring meaning within the hero's microcosm. With a special emphasis on the incest scene, it will be contended that in *Pericles* the geographical and the psychological fuse and that geographical locations work as different layers of the psyche. Geography will be analysed in relation to plot and characters, always taking into consideration its allegorical, psychological and poetic dimensions.

KEYWORDS: Shakespeare, *Pericles*, geography, space, psychoanalysis, barbarian, the uncanny.

¹ The author wishes to acknowledge the support of the Spanish Ministry of Education through a FPU scholarship (Programa de Formación de Profesorado Universitario).

In *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, John Gillies makes an exhaustive and insightful exploration of the concept of geography in the Renaissance, and its classical and medieval antecedents, in order to analyse how this notion works imaginatively, poetically, and symbolically in Shakespeare's dramatic production. For his analysis, Gillies focuses on *Titus Andronicus*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello* and *The Tempest*. But he leaves aside one of the plays in which geography and travel are more explicitly and deeply incorporated, both at the level of dramatic structure and semiotic texture: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, which is not even mentioned in his book. Although Gillies subsequently tackles specifically the question of place in some of Shakespeare's late plays, including *Pericles* (see Gillies 2005), the omission of the play from his book-length study on Shakespeare's use of geography is striking and significant.

If Gillies chose not to include *Pericles*, it is probably because geographical interest in this play is substantially different from the geographical interest displayed in the other plays. But where does the peculiarity of the geography of *Pericles* reside? An initial relationship may be established between the peculiar quality of the geographical representation in *Pericles* and the peculiarity of the play as a whole. Some preliminary considerations about the play may, then, be useful before focusing on its geography. *Pericles* is generally considered to be a "problem" play. This overall impression originates in certain indisputable facts: the textual problems the play presents, the controversy over its authorship, and the difficulty of categorizing it within the range of dramatic genres. The extent to which the first two aspects influence my approach to the treatment and significance of geography is, however, fairly limited. More relevant is the generic complexity of the play and its relation to the narrative tradition of romance.

The question of authorship has been a major subject of debate in the history of criticism of *Pericles* and, although complete agreement has not yet been achieved, one of the most widely accepted views is that *Pericles* was written in collaboration by George Wilkins and William Shakespeare. Roger Warren in his edition of the play for the Oxford Shakespeare –based on Gary Taylor and Macd. P. Jackson's previous reconstruction of the text– and Suzanne Gossett in her recent edition for the Arden Shakespeare are both proponents of this

theory. They offer good summaries of the evidence available supporting a Wilkins-Shakespeare collaboration. The editors of the play for the New Cambridge Shakespeare, Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond, on the contrary, suggest Shakespeare's single authorship and regard the authorship debate as "an interesting *but fundamentally irrelevant* aspect of the process of reading and comprehension." Hammond and DelVecchio conclude their section on authorship by stating that they "don't really care who wrote *Pericles* (though we do believe it to be the product of a single creative imagination)" (1998: 15; see Warren 2003: 60-71; Gossett 2004: 62-70; Hammond and DelVecchio 1998: 8-15).

But what are the implications of the question of authorship as regards the artistic handling of geography? If Wilkins wrote the first two acts (scenes 1-9), as is commonly assumed, and since the geographical pattern of the play is evident from the very beginning, we may conclude that Shakespeare could have been influenced by the pattern that Wilkins had established. Moreover if, as Warren proposes, George Wilkins was responsible not only for the first acts but for the outline of the play, the basic dramatic arrangement and design of the source material, so highly dependent on geography, would have been the work of Wilkins.² I consider that my approach to the geography of *Pericles* would be essentially the same whether Shakespeare alone or in collaboration with Wilkins wrote the play. However, the possibility of regarding *Pericles* as the product of a design by Wilkins may explain the "oddity" of its geographic representation as well as the notable differences between the geography of *Pericles* and that of the rest of Shakespeare's plays, even those belonging to the same group: the romances.

Geography in *Pericles* is an extremely complex notion indissolubly linked with the idea of travelling. The dramatic unities are flagrantly overlooked. Years pass by and places follow one another in quick succession in front of our eyes. Time and space are

²One of the arguments Roger Warren provides as evidence supporting this idea is that "the plot of *Pericles* follows Gower's narrative closely." He argues that "[i]t is unusual for Shakespeare to stick so closely to a single narrative source and this is one of the reasons for thinking that the outline of the play may not have originated with him but with George Wilkins" (2003: 13-14). According to him, "[i]f Wilkins did offer a 'plot' or outline of the play to the King's Men, the credit for its construction should go to him" (2003: 5).

so fragmented that Gower “must stand in th’gaps” teaching us “[t]he stages of our story” (4.4.8-9).³ The striking episodic nature of the play as well as its spatial (and temporal) discontinuities evince the importance of geographic representation in a play whose structure, plot and characters are all defined by constant movement and transition. But geographical representation goes beyond the factual description that a ‘scientific’ understanding of geography may provide. Geography becomes in *Pericles* one more element subject to the creative and imaginative power of the author(s), in whose hands geographic representation turns out to be a poetic and symbolic complex in which psychological, moral and political aspects intertwine.

A point about which the various editors of the play agree –even those advocating the hypothesis of collaboration– is the “the overall coherence of design in the play” (Hammond and DelVecchio 1998: 13). Roger Warren states that *Pericles* “despite its unevenness and its wandering narrative, holds together in performance since it is well constructed, each half building to an act of healing” (2003: 5). Suzanne Gossett contends that “the text is complete in outline and carefully structured by repetition, parallel and contrast of characters and events” (2004: 9). Apparent stylistic disparity, irregularity or incoherence (on which the theory of collaboration is primarily founded) is compatible in most editions with the acknowledgement of the structural and thematic cohesion of the play.

In my view this sense of unity is achieved paradoxically through geographical fragmentation and through the representation of travelling. In the idea of journey the spatial and temporal dimensions converge. Apart from movement in space, “journeying” implies temporal change, thus becoming the medium through which not only places but also moments and episodes are connected; hence its suitability to represent the flow of human life. *Pericles* is particularly concerned with journeying and, consequently, geographical movement, and instability is more important than geographic description *per se*. This simple observation may explain, at least partially, the omission of the play from Gillies’ *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Gillies himself later offers some ideas

³ All quotations from *Pericles* as well as the spelling of the names of characters and places are taken from the New Cambridge edition.

reinforcing the peculiarity of the geography of Shakespeare's late plays and of *Pericles* in particular. "Place in these plays", Gillies asserts, "is without geographic interest as conventionally understood." For him "the most interesting way in which place inhabits these plays owes little or nothing to the new cartography, or to a conventional embeddedness within cartographic space" (2005: 176). Gillies observes, moreover, that "[p]lace in the later plays should be understood primarily in relation to the embodied self and its needs rather than to some abstract mathematized order" (2005: 177).

This inner dimension of geography, noted by Gillies, suggests that the spatial transition, which characterizes the structure of the play, is a visual reflection of the constant state of personal and psychological transition of the main character. The treatment of geography not as static setting but as a meaningful dynamic component of the story, intrinsic to the character of *Pericles*, fosters a reading of the play as an allegory of the human life. The image of life as a journey has become commonplace. What is interesting in *Pericles* is that the protagonist's inner journey is materialized in a real 'geographic' journey. He is caught in an incessant and apparently bootless odyssey around a sea which becomes an image of both life and death. Geographic localities represent different stages in a man's life. All of them are in close contact with the sea, as human life is in contact with birth and death, with loss and recovery.⁴ This allegorical dimension, perfectly captured in Marina's statement "This world to me is like a lasting storm" (4.1.19), is complicated by the psychological complexities that the behaviour of the main character presents at certain points and which will be analyzed later in this essay.

In the context of this allegorical and psychological understanding of geographic representation, the application of key ideas in Gillies' *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, such as the concept of a geographic imagination or his understanding of the new geography not as a factual context in which the study of literary works can be grounded, but as poetic in itself, "as poetry [...] as a 'text' in its own right," may prove useful (1994: 38). On the one hand,

⁴ For an analysis of the significance of the journey and the sea imagery in *Pericles*, see for example, Delvecchio and Hammond's introduction (1998: 58-63).

his analysis of the “new geography” as a discipline with its own poetics and semiotics, with its own mechanisms to generate meanings and interpretations, grants geography a new status in the field of literary studies beyond being mere “context” or “data.” Geography is already charged with meaning –meaning that has accumulated from archaic, classical and medieval times– and “with poetic possibilities –with ideas, contradictions, traditions, paradoxes, figurations” (Gillies 1994: 55). His definition of a Shakespearean geographic imagination derives from this conception of geography. For him, “Shakespeare’s geographic imagination is informed by a rich geographic tradition which is already moralised, already inherently ‘poetic’ in the sense of being alive with human and dramaturgical meaning” (1994: 4). I will focus precisely on these two aspects: on the analysis of the subjective meaning, and on the poetic and dramatic effectiveness of Shakespeare’s imaginative use of geography. Two other key concepts in Gillies’ study –the figures of the “barbarian” and the “voyager”– will also be applied in my approach to *Pericles*.

The historical and literary contextualization of the play may explain, or at least shed some light on, the evident geographical awareness in *Pericles*. In the Renaissance a new era for geography begins. The 16th and 17th centuries meant a revolution as far as geographical knowledge is concerned, and Shakespeare and his contemporaries witnessed the birth of a ‘new geography,’ which is generally assumed to be based on ‘scientific’ principles in opposition to the mythical and poetic conceptions of geography of the ancient and medieval worlds. Nevertheless, in what Gillies calls “the Shakespearean moment” the new geography “would continue to be represented also in terms of the ancient poetic geography to the extent that ‘cosmography’ served as its vehicle” (1994: 35). The works of geography in this period are still far from scientific in the modern sense and reveal a strong dependence on ancient cosmography.

But, more important than the historical context or the external circumstances surrounding the writing of *Pericles* and its transmission are the inherent qualities of the play, especially as regards genre. It seems obvious that the prominence of travelling and geography in the play owes much to its source, the story of *Apollonius of Tyre* –as retold by Gower in Book VIII of his *Confessio*

Amantis and by Laurence Twine in his *Pattern of Painful Adventures* – and to the tradition of Greek romance to which it belongs.⁵ But *Pericles*' relation to romance is rather more complex. In this play, as in the rest of Shakespeare's romances, "related yet distinct historical developments of romance" converge: Greek romance, medieval chivalric romance, and the miracle and morality plays (Felperin 1972: 10-17). Among the conventional traits that define Greek romance, Howard Felperin points out that it "deals with the hardships of separated lovers, is replete with storms, shipwrecks, pirates and savage beasts, covers many countries and many years, and concludes with virtue preserved, nobility discovered, and lovers reunited in improbable recognition scenes" (1972: 11). Concerning time and place, the action of romance "sprawl[s] across continents and take[s] years to accomplish", thus "transcend[ing] considerations of time and place" (Felperin 1972: 8).

On the other hand, the adventurous quest, the force that shapes and articulates chivalric adventure, also underlies *Pericles* and is especially prominent in the first act of the play. Furthermore, there are particular episodes which are clearly reminiscent of the world of chivalry, such as the scene of the knights' tournament in Simonides' court. As regards morality plays, Felperin highlights two fundamental features: the treatment of time "arching [...] from cradle to grave" and the reformation of the hero (1972: 15). But the psychological depth in *Pericles* complicates the structure of the morality play and the figure of the morality hero. As Hurwitz contends, "the characters come forth as symbolic depictions of internal psychic processes, almost as one would imagine occurring in a psychologically complex morality play" (2002: 5).

In spite of its diversity, there is a common element intrinsic to all forms and manifestations of romance and intimately related to the idea of geographical movement: the "quest." For Northrop Frye, it is the defining feature of romance:

The essential element of plot in romance is adventure, which means that romance is naturally a sequential and processional form, hence we know it better from fiction than from drama [...] [As] a literary form, it tends to limit itself to a sequence of minor

⁵ For a thorough analysis of the relationship between Greek romance and Shakespeare's late plays, see Gesner (1970).

adventures leading up to a major or climacteric adventure, usually announced from the beginning, the completion of which rounds off the story. We may call this major adventure, the element that gives literary form to the romance, the quest. (1972: 186-187)

The formal pattern of romance, based on the quest, is inextricably related to the idea of geographical movement, and has often been interpreted from a psychological point of view. As stated by Martin Butler in his edition of *Cymbeline*, “[romance and folktale] stage collective desires and anxieties, and frequently invoke the politics of family life: the traumas of growing up, the difficult transition from childhood to adulthood and the realization of the self as an entity separate from the family” (2005: 7).

Geographical interest is by no means exclusive to *Pericles*. The role of geography in Shakespeare’s other romances, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Tempest*, also deserves attention. Their generic affinities lead Roger Warren to emphasize the features that *Pericles* shares with these plays. He detects a similar treatment of time and space and contends that in *Pericles* but also in the other romances “the external journeys mirror the psychological journeys of the central characters” (2003: 8). However, travelling in these plays does not have the relevance it has in *Pericles*. In *The Winter’s Tale* the action takes place essentially in two locations: the private space of the Sicilian court and the pastoral atmosphere of the Bohemian countryside. These two spaces correspond broadly to the two temporal segments in which the action is divided, with the sixteen-year gap announced by Time in the middle. At the end there is a return to Sicilia where Leontes, his daughter, Perdita, and his wife, Hermione, are finally reunited. The action of *The Winter’s Tale* features two journeys. In the first, Antigonus leaves newborn Perdita in the Bohemian seacoast. In the second, young Perdita runs away with Florizel and both arrive, following Camillo’s directions, in Sicilia. But Leontes remains in Sicilia from the first scene to the last as well as does Hermione: it is only Perdita who travels from Sicilia to Bohemia and back to Sicilia.⁶ Leontes is tied to a single setting, his

⁶ I am referring here to the journeys in which the central characters are involved. However, the action includes other journeys: the journeys of Polixenes and Camillo, who escape from Leontes’ court to Bohemia and return to Sicilia at the end of the play, and the journey to Delphos of two Sicilian lords, Cleomenes and Dion.

court in Sicilia, whereas Pericles is in a constant state of transition. And, although Leontes, goes through a long process of penitence and repentance, his “spiritual journey” –to use Warren’s expression– is not dramatized as an “external journey.”

In *Cymbeline*, the sense of geography (and also time) is more disjointed. The action moves from Rome to Britain (ancient and contemporary). The various geographical locales correspond to the several actions that comprise the plot. The political pseudo-historical plot of the war between Rome and Britain develops in the ancient settings. The alternation between Renaissance England and Italy is the basic frame of the wager plot of Iachimo, Posthumus and Innogen. Finally, the peculiar rustic atmosphere of Wales is the setting of the plot concerning the king’s lost sons, Arviragus and Guiderius. There is no figure, like Pericles, to unite the play’s geographic and temporal fragmentation. Finally, *The Tempest* is one of the plays in which Shakespeare scrupulously observes the dramatic unities of time and place. The action develops in the confined space of the island. The shipwreck dramatized in the play concerns the antagonists, and it is only by means of Prospero’s narration that the spectator learns that a previous journey and shipwreck had taken place twelve years before. The island seems to represent a significant and necessary parenthesis in the lives of the characters, in which the conflict is resolved. As regards geographic and temporal scope, *The Tempest* and *Pericles* are almost opposites: the action of *The Tempest* develops in three hours whereas the action of *Pericles* takes place over more than fourteen years; the only setting of *The Tempest* is the island, whereas in *Pericles* the action develops in six different locations. The number and variety of locations we find in *Pericles* does not have a parallel in any of the other romances.⁷

⁷ Roger Warren emphasizes the similarities among the romances but does not refer to the peculiarity of *Pericles* within the group: “The narrative of these plays is far-flung in both space and time: *Cymbeline* moves between ancient Britain, classical Rome, medieval Italy, and Renaissance England (and Wales), *The Winter’s Tale* between Sicilia and Bohemia, with a gap of sixteen years in the middle of the play. The action of *The Tempest* is restricted to one place, Prospero’s island in the Mediterranean and to the time it takes to perform; but by having Prospero recall and in the process re-experience the events in Naples twelve years before, the play, as it were, brings the outside world to the island itself; and by looking into the ‘dark backward and abyss of time’ through Prospero’s eyes, it emphasizes that it is essentially about his spiritual journey. In the two other plays, too, the external journeys mirror the psychological journeys of the central characters, Innogen and Posthumus in *Cymbeline* and Leontes

Geographically, Pericles' voyages cover the area of the Eastern Mediterranean and it is evident that geographical movement around this area determines the formal pattern of the play. Yet the role of geography and travelling cannot be reduced to a mere formal strategy. Geography becomes significant in relation to plot and characters and makes possible the inquiry into moral and psychological issues both in the private and public spheres. The plot unfolds in six different kingdoms –Antioch, Tyre, Tarsus, Pentapolis, Miteline and Ephesus– and Gower, conscious of the variety of places, asks spectators to use their imagination. His interventions show the difficulties of translating the narrative source material to the medium of drama.

Thus time we waste and longest leagues make short;
Sail seas in cockles, have and wish but for't,
Making to take your imagination
From bourn to bourn, region to region.
By you being pardoned we commit no crime
To use one language in each several clime
Where our scenes seem to live. (4.4.1-7)

Some critics have interpreted this superabundance of geographical locations as evidence to support the claim that *Pericles* is a burlesque of the romance form. Michael Saenger, for instance, argues that "the most obvious exaggeration [...] is the six episodic locales, a dizzying number even for a Renaissance romance play" (2000: 197). Add the shipwrecks and the various tempests and it seems excessive, especially if compared with the subsequent romances. This fact has been regarded as evidence of an evolution towards a more mature treatment of the romance mode. According to Saenger, once Pericles leaves Antioch, Antiochus and Antiochus' daughter "are barely heard from again", so, for him, "the five succeeding settings compound the absurdity" (2000: 197). For David Hoeniger, however, Shakespeare "consciously" decided to maintain the episodic nature of the source narrative, "the pattern of numerous short episodes [...] with frequent changes in locale" (1982: 465). This method of dramatization has a dramatic and symbolic significance. The geographical representation of the six cities on the Mediterranean coast and their indissoluble union with the sea

in *The Winter's Tale*, which are at the heart of each play and help to hold each together" (2003: 9-10).

represent an important poetic construction. The pattern is dramatically effective and highly symbolic: a powerful way of presenting the flux of human life.

The dramatic handling of geography and travelling in *Pericles* allows for a rich variety of interpretations and approaches to the role of space. From a psychological perspective, the play can be analyzed as the enactment of an inward life journey, that is, as the sum of the fears, desires, lived moments, experiences and memories constituting Pericles' self. But geography also acquires a political dimension if the play is considered as an exploration of different forms of government and power. These potential readings have been reflected in the various critical appraisals of the topic. Linda McJannet, for instance, though acknowledging the symbolic and poetic function of geography, devotes the greater part of her study to demonstrating the geographical and historical accuracy of the depiction of the Hellenistic world. Lisa Hopkins, on the contrary, minimizes the relevance of geographical accuracy and insists that "what we find in *Pericles* is not so much a Greece of the atlas but a Greece of the mind" (2000: 228).

According to McJannet, "the path of [Pericles'] voyages is geographically consistent with the navigational practices of ancient times" and thus is "far from purely fanciful" (1998: 96); whereas for Hopkins, "the true borders and the true journeys are of the mind" (2000: 228). Like Hopkins, Gillies argues that "[t]he various settings of the late plays tend, like the Near-Eastern cities of *Pericles* [...] to be qualitatively 'thin' and virtually interchangeable [...]. Instead of being boxed into 'settings,' I prefer to think of the placial imagination as informing the whole narrative, symbolic and dramatic life of the plays" (2005: 177). These various interpretations move from the play's actual geographical location(s) to its symbolism (see McJannet 1998; Hopkins 2000; Gillies 2005). In my view the consistency of the locations in the play with real geographic and historic locations is a secondary aspect with no real import in the understanding of the play.

Constance C. Relihan, for her part, offers a political reading of the play, highlighting the ambiguity and liminality of its Greek setting and tracing some correspondences between the political conflicts of the play and the contemporary politics of James I's court (Relihan 1992). Relihan has pointed out the ambivalent attitude in

the English Renaissance towards the Greek cultures presented in the play, an attitude oscillating between the “desire to claim the ancient world as European and Western” and the connection perceived at the time between “Greece and the infidel Turks” (1992: 282-283). In any case, by taking the reader to what traditionally has been considered, as DelVecchio and Hammond put it, the “cradle of civilisation” (1998: 59), Shakespeare is not only intending a geographical displacement but also a displacement in time (though not always consistent) to the Hellenic world.⁸ In addition, this setting is highly symbolic since it constitutes the meeting-point of the three ancient continents (Europe, Asia and Africa). Shakespeare is closer, in this respect, to the “geography of antiquity” (DelVecchio and Hammond 1998: 59) than to the ‘new geography’ of his time. This same argument is supported by Hopkins, for whom Shakespeare deliberately displays in *Pericles* “archaizing strategies,” revealing that “the author is [...] patently uninterested in more contemporary geographical perspectives and information” (2000: 233).⁹

In order to understand fully the relevance of geography in *Pericles* we need to stop thinking of geography as mere background, as the frame in which the plot develops and characters act –as Gillies points out, “the predominant structural modality of place here is not that of ‘setting’” (2005: 177)– but, rather, as an element charged with meaning and symbolism, and inherent to plot and character. David Skeeel’s study of the critical reception of *Pericles* (1998; see also Skeeel 2000) reveal that, apart from being a play that has “swung so

⁸ Linda McJannet has located the play very specifically in the historical period corresponding to the Seleucid times. According to her, “the urban locales; the geography of *Pericles*’ voyages; the political nomenclature; and the treatment of religion, language, and education are largely consistent with the East in Seleucid times” (1998: 95).

⁹ Gillies’ view as regards the ‘archaic’ or ‘modern’ character of Shakespeare’s use of geography is, in my opinion, particularly useful: “The paradox posed by the simultaneously ‘new’ and ancient character of Shakespeare’s geographic imagination should thus be seen in the context of the co-existence of ancient and modern values in the new geography. Eventually the new geography would break from its ancient legacies –both ‘cosmographic’ and ‘poetic geographic’– but not until after the passing of ‘the Shakespearean moment’. Perhaps the most compelling reason for the persistence of ancient poetic geographic values within the new geography was the imaginative insecurity of the new discourse. For all its self-consciousness, the new geography had yet to achieve a hermeneutic identity. It required the hermeneutic energy of the ancient geography, as well as the active complicity of Renaissance poets in order to fashion its own poesis” (1994: 35).

erratically, so violently between the poles of opprobrium and adoration" (Skeele 2000: 1), in its critical history two aspects have emerged as notable 'flaws': the fragmentation of the plot, some "streams" of which "appeared to dribble off into nowhere and evaporate" (Skeele 1998: 18), and its shallow, poor or simplistic characterization. In my view, *Pericles* displays a peculiar configuration of plot and character that cannot be adequately understood unless we analyse it from the perspective of geography and geographical movement. Both plot and character in *Pericles* are conceived *geographically*. The action advances as long as there is geographical movement, as long as the characters travel. The periods of spatial stasis correspond to moments in which the action is frozen. On the other hand, characters evolve as they travel. We come to know them as they are placed successively in different locations.¹⁰

From the opening scene in the play, we see a displaced Pericles. He is not in his court at Tyre, but in Antioch. The city is barely introduced by Gower as Antiochus' "chiefest seat" and as the "fairest in all Syria" (Prologue 18-19). The scene shows the court of "Antiochus the Great" whose most significant feature is the impaled heads of the previous unsuccessful suitors of Antiochus' daughter. For the spectator, the image of the "fairest" city is reduced to the appalling spectacle of the "grim looks" (Prologue 40), the "speechless tongues", the "semblance pale" (1.1.37) and the "dead cheeks" (1.1.40) of the suitors' impaled heads. Pericles is depicted in this first scene as the romance hero *par excellence*. He presents himself as "ready for the way of life or death" (I.i.97). He compares himself to a "bold champion" whose actions are dictated by no "other thought / But faithfulness and courage" (I.i.62-64). However, this opening scene also shows the first evidence of the psychological problematization of the archetype of the hero. As Suzanne Gossett rightly observes, in *Pericles* there is an "alternation between an archetypal structure and adumbrations of a psychological view of the hero" (2004: 107).

The only action that takes place in Antioch is Pericles' deciphering of the riddle and his subsequent awareness of an

¹⁰ This idea is especially relevant in the case of Pericles, which will be the focus of my analysis. He is the most complex character, in opposition to other characters such as Antiochus, or even Thaisa, who are almost flat, in part because they are physically static and remain fixed in a single location.

inescapable death, either by revealing or hiding what he knows. Once incest is discovered the role of Antioch is exhausted and the city as geographical location does not reappear. At this point, Pericles decides to sail away to Tyre. His motivation for travelling seems to be sheer fear, as he himself states: "Then lest my life be cropped, to keep you clear / By flight I'll shun the danger which I fear" (1.1.143-144).¹¹ Pericles does not denounce the corruption that he has discovered at the core of Antiochus' court, a corruption that threatens the moral order and the foundations of family and state. His voyages reflect his inability to cope with his awareness of incest. As Relihan puts it, he just "runs from his knowledge of the crime" (1992: 287).

Lisa Hopkins has noted that one of the most interesting aspects as regards Antioch is the association place/person. She argues that, in Gower's presentation of Antioch, the city is depicted as "virtually an extension of Antiochus's identity" (2000: 229). Going a step further in the identification place/person, we may notice that Antiochus embodies, in some respects, the features ascribed to the barbarian; and the barbarian, as John Gillies notes, is indissolubly related to the idea of geography and to the mental organization of space. This figure was located within the "dialectic of centre and border" or *oikumene* ("home world") and *eschatia* ("end zones") (1994: 7-8). For the Greeks, "the peoples of these regions will represent an extreme (savage, demonic or carnivalesque) inversion of Greek society" (Gillies 1994: 8-9). The barbarian, therefore, is physically located in the limits or outside the *oikumene*. Behind the construction of geographical spaces and of the figures attached to them, there seems to be an underlying psychological motivation. Figures like the "barbarian" or the "outsider" become mere receptacles of forbidden desires, fears or aspects of human nature that social and moral conventions make us bluntly reject.

Thus, as myth and cultural construct, the "barbarian" is depicted as promiscuous, as "transgressor of bounds" and "violation

¹¹ An opposing view is held by Linda McJannet who, on the historical basis of the Hellenistic political organization, considers that "Pericles' flight from Tyre need not be ascribed to immaturity or an errant desire for travel." According to her, Pericles' "fear of Antiochus's revenge", far from being irrational, "is understandable in light of the latter's far greater power and status. Antiochus's empire included Tyre and all the other locales of the play, except (perhaps) Pentapolis" (1998: 96-97).

of prohibitions" –above all "the prohibition of incest upon which rests the institution of the family and ultimately that of the state" (Gillies 1994: 14). The barbarian, therefore, proves to be extremely "destructive" for the family, "the symbolic economy within which the roles of husband, wife, parent, child, brother and sister have meaning." According to Gillies, "[t]he antithesis of barbarian and family is perhaps even more fundamental than the link between barbarians and incest" (1994: 18). Before this incestuous couple, which represents the moral annihilation of the family, stands the isolated figure of Pericles, an individual placed outside a family context. In fact, except for the scant references to his dead father, no mother, brothers or sisters of the main character are mentioned.¹² In a sense, what we find are two initial negations of the family. We are unable to ascribe a family role to Antiochus and his daughter because they have confounded these roles, but we cannot ascribe a family role to Pericles either because he is presented to us outside this economy: he is neither son, brother, husband nor father.¹³ Thus, confusion and absence of family roles open a play which ends with the apparently happy and satisfactory reunion of Pericles, his daughter and wife, which can be regarded as a celebration of family.¹⁴

As has already been pointed out, Antiochus, the incestuous king, displays the characteristic behaviour and features of the

¹² Pericles refers to his father on two occasions: in 2.1, when he recovers the armour he had inherited from his father and that he thought lost after the shipwreck (2.1.109-2.1.122); and in 2.3, when the image of Simonides reminds him of his father: "Yon King's to me like my father's picture" (2.3.36).

¹³ This fact has not been overlooked in criticism. Hurwitz, for instance, points out: "Pericles seems to be without either parent; indeed his mother is never mentioned in the text and his father only referred to a few times. This is another odd dramatic element in the text, given that Pericles is still an unmarried prince and presumably young enough to have both parents living. Drawing from archetypal heritage in presenting this situation, the play uses it for dramatic benefit, emphasizing Pericles' isolation" (2002: 41).

¹⁴ In her article "Riddled Romance: Kingship and Kinship in *Pericles*," Jeanie G. Moore argues that the incest scene problematizes the romance closure and that this scene does not stand morally in opposition but "underlies" all that comes after: "the events that have transpired between the time of Pericles' strange encounter in Antioch at the play's beginning and the happy reunions of the ending do not work on all levels toward a tidy romance closure; the emotion of father, daughter, and mother reunited –a strategy to effect that closure– does not eradicate the contradictions within the text which seem to resist romance" (2003: 33).

“barbarian.” What is interesting in *Pericles* is that the primal association of barbarian and foreignness, which is the basis of this cultural myth, dissolves. The city of Antioch is not located at the farthest ends of the known world; on the contrary, it seems to be at the centre of the Greek world of the play –midway between the protagonist’s native Tyre and Tarsus. Consequently, Antiochus is not an outsider, he is within the *oikumene*. And although the Renaissance audience may associate him with the other, within the dynamics of the play Pericles cannot possibly conceive of him as an outsider. Antiochus is a neighbouring monarch, and it is in his geographical closeness that Pericles sees the danger (literal and symbolic): the danger of being murdered, the danger of being morally polluted by the tyrant. Not only does Antiochus belong to the *oikumene*, but he is at the top of its cultural, social and political organization, what makes him a much more dangerous kind of barbarian.

In this first scene we encounter a highly paradoxical situation. The “barbarian,” the “outsider,” the “other” (figures constructed as the embodiment of characteristics that do not belong to “us” or that we are reluctant to acknowledge to be our own) is inside. Prospero’s words, “This thing of darkness / I acknowledge mine” (*The Tempest*, 5.1.274-275) are especially revealing in this context. Antioch is a different city but is still part of the same world to which the neighbouring Tyre, Tarsus or Pentapolis belong. Hence Pericles’ discovery of incest is doubly shocking. It is shocking, firstly, because of the meaning and implications of incest itself and, secondly, because incest is located at the core of his world and, by virtue of the psychological dimension of geography in the play, at the core of himself. The strange and the familiar cannot share the same space. These concepts are distinguished precisely because they occupy different spaces, because they belong to different spheres. What Pericles experiences in the first scene of the play is that incest, repulsive and morally reprehensible, is, for him, simultaneously foreign and familiar.

The feeling resulting from the blurring of the boundaries between the foreign and the familiar, between what is alien and what is one’s own, leads us to the Freudian concept of “the uncanny.” Freud’s discussion starts from the usual meaning of the word –“what is frightening”, “what arouses dread and horror”– but

he detects that the word “is not always used in a clearly definable sense” (1919: 930). If everything that is uncanny is frightening but not everything that is frightening is uncanny, there must be some nuance, some particularity in the experiences, feelings or actions described as “uncanny.” As Freud puts it, “we may expect that a special core of feeling is present which justifies the use of a special conceptual term” (1919: 930). In order to discover where the peculiarity of the uncanny rests, Freud adopts an etymological approach to the term. The German *unheimlich* (unhomely) is the opposite of *heimlich*, and both adjectives derive from the noun ‘Heim’ (home). The “uncanny” is defined, thus, in relation to a space (real and symbolic): the intimate, known space of the family home, and Freud’s initial discussion of the meaning of the “uncanny” revolves around ideas of home, family, familiarity, domesticity and their opposites.

Unheimlich implies a negation of what is known and familiar (apparently positive concepts) and this is the source of fear and fright associated with “uncanny” experiences. In Freud’s words “we are tempted to conclude that what is “uncanny” is frightening precisely because it is *not* known and familiar” (1919: 931). The “uncanny” comes to be associated with strangeness, foreignness, with what is unknown. However, Freud highlights another meaning of *heimlich*: “Concealed, kept from sight, so that others do not get to know of or about it, withheld from others” (1919: 933). In this second sense, *heimlich* is somehow associated with what is unknown and comes closer to the meaning of its opposite. Freud also refers to Schelling, for whom the *unheimlich* is everything “that ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light” (1919: 934).¹⁵

¹⁵ It is worth analyzing in some detail the vocabulary of the first scene of *Pericles*. Essential ideas in the definition of the “uncanny”, such as “knowing,” “seeing,” “revealing” and their opposites, “hiding” and “blinding” abound in this scene. Once Pericles discovers incest, he resolves that “[w]ho has a book of all that monarchs do, / He’s more secure to keep it shut, than shown; / For vice repeated is like the wandering wind, / Blows dust in other’s eyes to spread itself, / And yet the end of all is bought that dear, / The breath is gone, and the sore eyes see clear (1.1.94-100). Immediately after, Antiochus reveals his fear that Pericles may “trumpet forth [his] infamy” (1.1.146). In 1.2 Pericles states that Antiochus “Will think me speaking though I swear to silence” and that “what may make him blush in being known, He’ll stop the course by which it may be known” (1.2.19.23; emphasis added).

My interest is in the relationship between uncanniness and space. The conflation, fusion or confusion of notions which are spatial, at least in origin, like closeness and remoteness, inside and outside, foreignness and familiarity may awaken a particular feeling of “uncanniness”. The handling of space and geography can be, therefore, a very effective means to transmit the “uncanny.” Pericles’ feeling of “uncanniness” when confronted face to face with incest is dramatically represented by placing him in a foreign court, patently barbarous yet belonging to his world and close enough to prevent the protagonist from witnessing the events at Antioch with a feeling of detachment: he becomes strangely –almost mysteriously– and intimately involved in the incest.

The arrival in Tyre does not ameliorate Pericles’ uneasiness of mind and agitation. “Dull-eyed melancholy” has become Pericles’ companion, although he himself acknowledges that “danger which, I feared, is at Antioch / Whose arm seems far too short to hit me here” (1.2.7-8). Therefore, objective geographical distance is not enough to lessen Pericles’ anxiety, for, as Hopkins argues, he has “internalized his own Antiochus” (2000: 230), his own Antioch and what they represent: the violation of natural and familial bonds (incest) and its reflection and aftermath in the political sphere (tyranny). Antioch is no longer an external geographical location; it has become part of Pericles, who will be carrying in all his travelling “the emotional burden that he has acquired at Antioch” (Moore 2003: 38). Thus, this city represents a fundamental stage in the psychological characterization of Pericles, in the creation of the character’s identity. The way in which he confronts and reacts to the knowledge of incest reveals the deep impact this episode has on Pericles. Moore points out that the literal riddle represents, for Pericles, an “internal conflict” and that the riddle “on this metaphorical, psychological level [...] remains unsolved” (2003: 35).

In his account of the events in Antioch, Pericles relates to Helicanus the consequences: “Drew sleep out of mine eyes, blood from my cheeks, / Musings into my mind, with thousand doubts / How I might stop this tempest ere it came” (1.2.95-97). The quotation refers to the symbolic tempest which will accompany Pericles throughout his life and which will be mirrored by the several ‘real’ tempests that take place in the play. Pericles’ apparent motivation to set out on his travels is fear of Antiochus’ anger. He fears for his life

and Hellicanus understands his motivation: "Antiochus you fear / And justly too I think you fear the tyrant / who [...] will take away your life" (1.2.101-104); he advises the prince to "go travel for a while" (1.2.105). The reader/spectator may notice the paradoxical nature both of Hellicanus' advice and of Pericles' decision: he wants to escape death by exposing himself to a more than probable death. Voyaging, especially navigation was a "dangerous" and "inherently 'terminal'" activity (Gillies 1994: 19). In Hellicanus' words, Pericles "puts himself unto the shipman's toil / With whom each minute threatens life or death" (1.3.22-23).

Tarsus is the next location. In the same way that Antioch is identified with incest, Tarsus is identified with famine and starvation. Again, there are no specific details or particularities about the place. There is very little information that can be extracted from the lamentation speeches of Cleon and Dioniza. In fact, Cleon's description of the city is pervaded with conventional and commonplace terms in such a way that Tarsus could have been any city (see Hopkins 2000: 231-232). As Cleon laments:

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 Tarsus may be theirs. (1.4.56)

Pericles shows in Tarsus his magnanimity and princely behaviour: he brings grain to mitigate the starvation of its people. Nevertheless, we never see the Prince of Tyre –no matter what the complete title of the play may suggest– acting as "a true prince" for the people. On the contrary, he neglects his duties as ruler and leaves the government of his kingdom in the hands of Hellicanus, his faithful counsellor, to embark on a series of voyages whose initial justification –Antiochus' threat– progressively blurs as the plot moves forward. Why does Pericles, then, continue with his travelling? Moore has linked, in a sort of cause-and-effect relationship, Pericles' disregard of his political –and also familial– obligations and his voyages by arguing that throughout the play Pericles is escaping "first from Antiochus, and later, unconsciously from the responsibilities of kingship and parenthood" (2003: 38).

The seeming purposelessness of Pericles' voyages –the lack of a logical cause-and-effect relationship that may explain or justify the prince's behaviour, the movement from one locale to another, or the

events taking place in each of them— make us wonder what kind of regions are portrayed in the play. Are the different locations different layers in the psyche: from the most unconscious of desires in Antioch to the final compliance with social rules and moral standards in Ephesus? The possibility of reading geographical spaces in a psychoanalytical key may shed some light on the handling of geography as well as contribute, at least partially, to clarify the meaning of the play and to explain its apparent inconsistencies. The consideration of the world we are entering in *Pericles*, with its multiple locales as a dramatic representation of the human psyche, opens up the possibility that places and events are linked to one another by the irrational forces of desire and fear.¹⁶

The presentation of different locations, separate, yet all of them connected by the sea, all of them related by similarities, repetitions and associations, is an effective way of portraying the working of the psyche. Antioch would represent in this sense the unconscious. Pericles' repressed incestuous desire, his oedipal complex, would be mirrored in the incestuous relation of Antiochus and his daughter.¹⁷ The repressed desire is confronted by the consummated deed. In his discussion of incest in relation to the Freudian notion of the

¹⁶ This psychoanalytical interpretation is greatly indebted to Gregg Andrew Hurwitz. He argues that "the pattern underlying the surface of the text and the mechanism driving its action are primarily psychological, that the play itself attempts to represent and resolve certain fundamental processes of the psyche" (2002: 4). Hurwitz views *Pericles* as a play "seeking to represent the psyche itself" (2002: 7), and contends that "the protagonist traverses a psychological landscape of sorts, facing and coming to terms with dramatic representations of elements of the unconscious" (2002: 5). Gillies also notices a psychological motivation in the action of *Pericles* and the rest of the romances. He observes that behind "what may sometimes strike us as unmotivated wanderings in these plays [Shakespeare's romances]" there is a "willed and abjectional element," "a sense of illegitimacy," originating in "sexual pollutiveness" (2005: 178).

¹⁷ Coppélia Kahn argues that "Pericles' episodic voyages from place to place, and his successive experiences of loss, are symbolic confrontations with oedipal desire and oedipal fear." According to her, Pericles "breaks out of time conceived as repetition of oedipal patterns and breaks into the future through his daughter and his own new family" (1980: 231). Similarly, Ruth Nevo claims that "Pericles travels out and away and back. He cannot escape, cannot cut the umbilical cord, and cannot resolve the later oedipal guilt" (1993: 169). Much in the same line, Hurwitz contends that "[f]rom a Freudian perspective, *Pericles* is a play about confronting and resolving the Oedipal complex" (2003: 18-19).

uncanny, Zenón Luis Martínez contends that “[t]he return of the repressed makes it clear that incestuous desire inscribes itself in the familial space as the homeliest, but also the most abhorrent, form of desire” (2002: 58). Therefore, Pericles must accept incest as part of himself, and the ambivalent geographical location of Antioch and his king as foreign and at the same time neighbouring, as strange and dangerously familiar, reinforces this idea. This interpretation would account for Pericles’ subsequent behaviour. Pericles does not denounce but remains silent about Antiochus’ incest. He keeps it as if it were a secret of his own. If we regard what happens in Antioch as something external to Pericles, there is no reason why he should remain silent even after the death of Antiochus and his daughter. Hurwitz points out:

Instinctually realizing his own implication in the riddle’s design, Pericles flees Antioch, representing the repression of his wishes [...]. Indeed, he will not even speak the monarch’s wrongs aloud before the very court in which they occur; having repressed his own desires, Pericles carefully avoids giving voice to any situation involving incest. (2002: 24)

With the burden of incest, Pericles travels from Antioch to Tyre and from Tyre to Tarsus, where the arrival of a messenger compels him to go on with his voyages. Here, the spectator witnesses the first tempest and subsequent shipwreck in the play, which is visually described by Gower: “And he, good prince, having all lost / By waves from coast to coast is tossed” (2.0.33-34). The sentence anticipates Pericles’ fate and future sufferings. Pericles saves his own life by reaching the coast of Pentapolis, a city that can be considered, in many respects, the opposite of Antioch. Warren argues:

As in the other late plays, the discoveries he makes upon his journey are both private and public and dramatized in contrasting extremes: he moves from a court at Antioch which is characterized by incest and murderous tyranny to another at Pentapolis which is its polar opposite, a world of love and benevolent absolutism. (1990: 211)

In light of these ideas, we could assert that in *Pericles*, geographical identity is constructed in pairs of opposites: the identity of Pentapolis is configured in opposition to that of Antioch. The same idea could be applied to Miteline and Ephesus: the moral baseness and licentiousness of the brothel in Miteline is opposed to the mysticism and sacred character of the temple of Diana in

Ephesus. However, the distinction between Antioch and Pentapolis is not so clear-cut. Certain resemblances between the two settings arise. In both kingdoms we encounter a father/daughter relationship and the absence of a queen-mother. Thus Pericles, at his arrival at the court of Pentapolis, confronts a similar situation to that of his arrival at Antioch. In both cases, moreover, we find the prince engaged in the search for a wife. Pentapolis somehow repeats Antioch.¹⁸ Recurrence, apart from being fundamental to the notion of the uncanny, connects the play with an atmosphere of nightmare or dream. The nightmare quality of the world of the play has been suggested by Jeanie Grant Moore. Derek Traversi also refers to the play as “a kind of dream” (1954: 35), and Ruth Nevo highlights “the oneiric dimension of its symbolism and the dream-like aspects of its representations” (1993: 151). It is in Hurwitz’s article that we find the idea developed in depth. According to Hurwitz, the play displays a “psycho-organic structure” where “events progress associatively rather than linearly.” He links this idea to the “non-temporal mode of expression” proper to “dreams and myths” (2002: 21).

Miteline is characterized by licentiousness and depravation embodied by the morally dubious governor of the city, Lysimachus, in contrast to the spirituality of Ephesus. This is the setting in which Thaisa, apparently dead, comes back to life. The reanimation of an inert body is also a source of the “uncanny.” According to Freud, “an uncanny experience occurs either when infantile complexes which have been repressed are once more revived by some impression, or when primitive beliefs which have been surmounted seem once more to be confirmed” (1919: 950). The first source of the uncanny has been illustrated in Pericles’ experience of incest in Antioch. In Ephesus, it is the primitive belief in the “return of dead”. However, as Freud also notes, the theme of the “re-animation of the dead” is

¹⁸ Kiefer points out that “when Pericles arrives in Pentapolis, he finds himself in a world resembling Antioch. Again a widowed king presides over a court. Again a nubile daughter attends the King. Again Pericles beholds the woman on a ceremonial occasion” (1991: 212). Hurwitz argues in this respect that “the similarities between the courts at Antioch and Pentapolis represent the repetition compulsion often displayed when people seek to solve a psychological problem”, and that “Pericles represents this repetition by two courts, which are indeed uncannily similar, yet opposite in many respects. By reliving his earlier trauma in more healthy fashion, Pericles alleviates much of his psychological problem” (2002: 28).

very common in “fairy stories” (1919: 948). Here the romance atmosphere dissipates the uncanniness of the scene:

O dear Diana, where am I? where’s my lord?

What world is this? (3.2.101-102)

Ephesus is portrayed, in fact, as a different world, one characterized by its supernatural and timeless atmosphere. As Relihan has remarked, Ephesus is the “land of lethargy and resignation” (2003: 289). But, for Thaisa, it is, above all, the land of oblivion. She forgets about her duties as wife under the groundless assumption that Pericles is dead, and as ruler since she is Simonides’ “only daughter and heir to the kingdom of Pentapolis” (Relihan 1992: 290). Most striking of all is her neglect of her role as mother. In her first speech after her miraculous resurrection, she does not even mention her daughter. In Ephesus, Thaisa absurdly resigns herself to the loss of her husband and daughter, renounces her past and partly forgets her identity. For Pericles, Ephesus means the completion of the long-life voyage that he began in Antioch. Trevor Nunn has pointed out that “Pericles is on a journey from the bestiality of Antiochus’ court to the temple of Diana. It is a metaphysical journey; rest only comes with self-knowledge” (Quoted in Warren 1990: 7). Nunn’s observation of Pericles’ “metaphysical journey” can be complemented with the idea of a psychological journey. Hurwitz views Pericles “as ego-hero passively undergo[ing] his misfortunes in order to increase the very quality of consciousness he represents.” His travels symbolize “the painful battle for consciousness and meaning” (2002: 9-10).

In *Pericles*, places are not just places; they become part of the identity of the characters. Examination of the different locations shows that, beyond their existence as external concrete spaces, they are relevant as inner, mental entities informing Pericles’ life experience, and also as reflections or materializations of his desires and fears. Pericles is the epitome of the wandering hero and probably the Shakespearean character who best embodies what Gillies calls “the voyager,” a “moral-geographic myth” (1994: 60) which he defines as “a Shakespearean figure [...] often related to the other,” as “a creature of extremity, a creature of horizons, an explorer of *terra incognita*” (1994: 3). The voyager is an extremely complex construction because it acquires different forms in the Renaissance and in Antiquity. The Renaissance attitude was that of

“glorifying the voyager as discoverer;” the ancient, that of “abominating him as transgressor” (Gillies 1994: 135). The violation of boundaries and the idea of conquest seem to be inherent in the voyager. To what extent, then, can this idea be applied to Pericles? What kind of voyager is he? The idea of geographical conquest is not present in the play. Pericles’ voyages are not motivated by a desire to transgress or to discover; or perhaps they are, but not in a literal sense. In *Pericles* geographic exploration cannot be exclusively understood literally, but in a more symbolic dimension as self-exploration or as exploration of the human psyche. Travel becomes inherent in him: Pericles is a character in a perpetual state of transition, in a state of flux. Thus, the bond between Pericles and Tyre is extremely weak. He is, for the most part an absent king, and at the end he becomes the King of Pentapolis, leaving the government of Tyre to Lysimachus.¹⁹

As a “creature of extremity” Pericles belongs nowhere. Hurwitz has analysed Pericles’ quality as voyager in terms of the “archetypal hero’s quest” (2003: 35):

A number of the elements of Pericles’ character have similarities to those of the archetypal hero, which can explain certain odd dramatic features of *Pericles*. The notion of hero as wanderer can perhaps explain the changing locale, which deliberately takes liberties with the third dramatic unity. (2002: 40)

The voyager as moral-geographic construction and the wandering hero as archetypal-psychological construction are not far apart in a play in which the geographical and the psychological fuse.

Shakespeare’s use of geography in *Pericles* is not restricted to “facts”; it is characterized by a richness of symbolic and poetic implication. Places are related and subservient to plot: once plot is exhausted, places disappear physically. But geographical locations make up, as well, the mental geography of the characters, in which none of the locations ceases to exist. Pericles has trespassed: he has encountered tyranny, murder and incest, human depravation and the sacred. And, although all these aspects could be concentrated in

19 Gillies argues that “Shakespeare’s voyagers are dangerous representatives of the commonwealth. Unlike the ruler, who characteristically controls the centre, the voyager controls the boundaries” (1994: 101). There seems to be an implicit opposition or incompatibility between the ruler and the voyager, which is well illustrated in the character of Pericles.

one single place, the author chooses to be faithful to the sources and to represent them in different spaces, all of them eventually converging in the character of Pericles. Shakespeare's focus, therefore, is not on objective geographical details but on a mental geography or, borrowing Lisa Hopkins' expression, on a "Greece of the mind," which contributes to the effective representation of the experiences and psychological conflicts of the main character. Pericles' uncanny experience of incest in Antioch underlies the whole play and transforms the hero's quest proper to romance, into an individual's complex passage through life. The reach of geographical exploration and travelling in this play cannot be fully grasped without considering its dramatic, allegorical and psychological implications.

References

- Felperin, Howard 1972. *Shakespearean Romance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Freud, Sigmund 2001 (1919). "The Uncanny." Ed. Vincent B. Leith. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton & Company: 929-952.
- Frye, Northrop 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gesner, Carol 1970. *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A study of Origins*. Lexington: Kentucky University Press.
- Gillies, John 1994. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillies, John 2005. "Place and Space in Three Late Plays." Ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works (Vol.IV): The Poems, Problem Comedies, Late Plays*. London: Blackwell: 175-193.
- Hoeniger, David F. 1982. "Gower and Shakespeare in *Pericles*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33/4: 461-479.
- Hopkins, Lisa 2000. "The Shores of my Mortality": Pericles' Greece of the Mind." Ed. David Skeeel. *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York: Garland: 228-237.
- Hurwitz, Gregg Andrew 2002. "A Tempest, a Birth and Death: Freud, Jung and Shakespeare's *Pericles*." *Sexuality and Culture* 6/3: 3-73.
- Kahn, Coppélia 1980. "The Providential Tempest and the Shakespearean Family." Eds. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. *Representing*

- Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press: 217-243.
- Kiefer, Frederick 1991. "Art, Nature, and Language in *Pericles*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 61/2: 207-225.
- Luis Martínez, Zenón 2002. *In Words and Deeds: The Spectacle of Incest in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- McJannet, Linda 1998. "Genre and Geography: The Eastern Mediterranean in *Pericles* and *The Comedy of Errors*." Eds. John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*. Madison and London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press: 86-106.
- Moore, Jeanie Grant 2003. "Riddled Romance: Kingship and Kinship in *Pericles*." *Rocky Mountain Review* 57/1: 33-48.
- Nevo, Ruth 1993. "The Perils of *Pericles*." Ed. B.J. Sokol. *The Undiscover'd Country: New Essays on Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare*. London: Free Association Books: 150-178.
- Relihan, Constance C. 1992. "Liminal Geography: *Pericles* and the Politics of Place." *Philological Quarterly* 71/3: 281-299.
- Saenger, Michel Baird 2000. "*Pericles* and the Burlesque of Romance." Ed. David Skeeel. *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York: Garland: 192-204.
- Shakespeare, William 1998 (1609). *Pericles*. Eds. Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins 2003 (1609). *Pericles*. Ed. Roger Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, William and George Wilkins 2004 (1609). *Pericles*. Ed. Suzanne Gossett. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- Shakespeare, William 1996 (1623). *The Winter's Tale*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. *The Oxford Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, William 2005 (1623). *Cymbeline*. Ed. Martin Butler. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William 2002 (1623). *The Tempest*. Ed. David Lindley. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skeeel, David 1998. *Thwarting the Wayward Seas: A Critical and Theatrical History of Shakespeare's Pericles in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Skeeel, David 2000. "*Pericles* in Criticism and Production: A Brief History." Ed. D. Skeeel *Pericles: Critical Essays*. New York and London: Garland: 1-33.

- Tillyard, E.M.W. 1972 (1943). *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Penguin Books.
- Traversi, Derek 1979 (1954). *Shakespeare: The Last Phase*. London: Hollis & Carter.
- Warren, Roger 1990. *Staging Shakespeare's Late Plays*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

How to cite this article:

Laureano Domínguez, Lorena. "Pericles' 'unknown travels': the dimensions of geography in Shakespeare's *Pericles*." *SEDERI* 19 (2009): 71-97.

Author's contact: lorena.laureano@dfing.uhu.es

Submission: 31/10/2008

Acceptance: 20/01/2009