‘Jonson’s adherence to the so-called ‘unities’ and Shakespeare’s radical breach of them is often taken to be a dry, boring observation. Actually, it accounts for the entirely different ‘feel’ of plays like The Winter’s Tale and The Alchemist. It’s the whole secret of their ‘distinction’. Is this claim exaggerated or is there anything in it?

Alexandra Pedder

The antecedents of the dramatic unities can be found in Aristotle’s Poetics which affirms that a successfully unified work of art must ‘dramatise a connected sequence of actions which lead to a single, sharply focussed conclusion.’ However, the Renaissance understanding of the unities is derived from Castelvetro’s reading of the Poetics. For Castelvetro, an action must occur ‘in a space no larger than the stage occupied by the actors, and for a duration no longer than the time for which they occupy the stage.’ The dramatic unities feed into a broader dialectic concerning the function of theatre as the creator of verisimilar illusions or self-conscious works of art. To adhere to the unities was thought to sustain theatrical illusion whereas a departure from them reminds the audience that ‘the stage is only a stage’. The platform stage of Elizabethan theatre played host to ‘a new consistency of mimesis and traditional audience awareness’, achieved through the employment of both ‘realistic and stylized modes of expression’.

The Alchemist is an exemplar of Jonson’s attitude towards the dramatic unities which, as Fass notes, was ‘an ambivalent one.’ Thus, whilst Jonson’s precise observance of the unities constitutes an important part of the play’s effect, it is an effect which is persistently undermined through a refusal to allow its audience to succumb to theatrical enchantment. Providing a stark contrast, Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale, with its ‘governing aesthetic of multiplicity’, defies all three of the dramatic unities. As a result, its spectators are prompted ‘to range […] between the extremes of a nearly alienation-effect-type self-awareness and a complete absorption in the illusion of spectacle.’ Thus, Shakespeare owns a flexible approach to illusionist dramaturgy, in fact, both dramatists employ a strain of ‘illusion-breaking remarks’, such as the asides of Face and Autolycus and the overt reference to
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costume change; Face wishes for a suit ‘To fall now like a curtain: flap’; and Camillo orchestrates the exchange of Florizel and Autolycus’ costumes. This essay will deal with the means by which each playwright deploys the utilities of action, time and place to negotiate the dialogical space between illusion and non-illusion which renaissance theatre occupied. Therefore, it will be possible to determine how *The Alchemist* and *The Winter’s Tale* construct differing experiences for an audience, culminating in distinctive responses.

Jonson’s play works to secure his characters, and audience, in the present; he pointedly establishes the play’s action in the year, and month of its performance. In addition, the Prologue equates the duration of the play in real-time and the amount of time spanned in play-time through the statement, ‘these two short hours/we wish away’ This insistence on simultaneity is also found in Subtle’s command to Ananias to return with his elders in ‘threesscore minutes’. Then, upon Ananias’ return, he states ‘O, are you come? ’Twas time. You’re threesscore minutes/Where at the last thread.’ Thus, the audience is actively encouraged to observe that real-time and play-time are synonymous and, when so closely compared with reality, the audience’s awareness of the play’s theatricality is heightened.

In *The Winter’s Tale*, Shakespeare is as willing to draw attention to his breaches of the unity of time as Jonson is to attest his strict adherence. Shakespeare’s comment on the unity of time manifests itself in the entrance of his choric Time in Act IV, scene I whose speech acts to bridge the ‘wide-gap’ of the play’s ‘untried growth’. The audience is instructed that Time both ‘makes and unfolds error’ which, as many critics have noted, represents a cyclical sense of time carried forwards into the final acts. Ewbank comments on the effect of this movement of time: ‘rather than being timeless, *The Winter’s Tale* is [...] set in a context of all time.’ This is apparent in Florizel’s speech to Perdita, he states,

```plaintext
When you speak, sweet,
I'd have you do it ever.

[...]

When you do dance, I wish you
A wave o’th’sea, that you might ever do
Nothing but that; move still, still so.
```

Through the repetition of ‘ever’ and the phrase ‘move still, still so’ and the reference to the timeless metaphor of a wave, the speech describes ‘a desire to arrest time, to achieve permanence outside the flux of time.’ Thus, Shakespeare’s treatment of time, a consequence of his attitude towards the unities, also effects the very language of the play. Whilst Shakespeare’s Time endeavours to ‘make stale/The glistering of this present’ so that the play and audience might encompass all time, *The Alchemist* is keen to present a time, specifically the time in which this dramatic illusion is being played out. This has connotations for both plays’ relationship with its audience. The effect of the intrusion of the non-illusionist device, choric Time, constitutes what Ryan terms a ‘flaunting of the play’s omnipotent artifice [which] at once detaches and conscripts the audience’ since it enhances their
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awareness ‘of the play as a play’ and ‘solicits their collusion’\(^{19}\) in the play’s manipulation of time. Thus, in Shakespeare’s play, the spectator ‘is invited to choose his illusions, provided that he knows them to be illusions.’\(^{20}\) In *The Alchemist*, despite its observance of the unities, the audience is never conscripted in an illusion and, as such, ‘a true desire for illusion is itself laughable’\(^{21}\).

Continuing the playwright’s deployment of time, in Act I, scene ii of *The Alchemist*, Dapper enters and declares that, having lent his watch to someone, he ‘was robbed of my pass-time.’\(^{22}\) The lexical selection of ‘robbed’ here establishes time as a commodity in the play, and one which is precious. Working in conjunction with such verbal allusions to time’s scarcity is Jonson’s time-scheme which, as Donaldson comments, is ‘precisely calibrated’\(^{23}\). Such statements as Subtle’s, ‘Pray heaven/The master do not trouble us this quarter’\(^{24}\), contribute to the audience’s awareness of the sense of urgency which pervades the play; as Smallwood observes, ‘the whole action is taking place in borrowed time.’\(^{25}\) As a result, all action is haste; characters must think and move quickly. This is apparent in the syntactical patterning of the venture tripartite’s speech, which, through short, sharp utterances such as, ‘Who’s that!/One rings’\(^{26}\), implies that language must be used economically, since there is no time to waste. In the opening of the play the audience witnesses the behind-the-scenes quarrel of the three tricksters:

Subtle: Cheater.
Face: Bawd.
Subtle: Cowherd.
Face: Conjurer.
Subtle: Cutpurse.
Face: Witch.
Doll: O me!\(^{27}\)

Thus, language impels us forwards at such a speed that the verbal make-up of the play is infused with rapidity. The language of *The Winter’s Tale* is also symptomatic of its attitude towards the unities. Ryan lists the different styles of language employed in the play, ranging from ‘the formal and more idiomatic modes of blank verse and prose in the court scenes’ to ‘the distinctive registers and styles of the pastoral lyric, the popular ballad and the masque.’\(^{28}\) As a result, the language of *The Winter’s Tale* contributes to the multiplicity of *The Winter’s Tale* and enacts, on a syntactic level, the organisation of the play’s events.

As the play continues, any expectation of a teleological plot which adheres to Aristotle’s unity of action is rescinded. This is demonstrable in Curren-Aquino’s observation of ‘the gathering of women characters at the prison- Paulina and Emilia onstage with the offstage incarcerated Hermione, newly delivered of a daughter’\(^{29}\) at the beginning of Act II, scene ii. This image of feminine unity contrasts with that of masculinity in the previous scene where Leontes attempts to enforce his suspicions upon Antigonus and attending Lords. This
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exemplifies Faas’ suggestion that Shakespeare’s ‘audience moves not consequentially but pictorially from scene to scene’\textsuperscript{30}. In addition, Shakespeare’s use of anaphoric and cataphoric reference constitute the means by which ‘interrelation between moments […] not causally connected by the mechanics of plot may be performed.’\textsuperscript{31} In Act II, scene iii, Leontes instructs Antigonus to abandon his newly-born daughter, stating ‘thou bear it/To some remote and desert place’ and, later, Antigonus speaks of ‘Wolves and bears’\textsuperscript{32}, both of which constitute cataphoric references to the entrance of a bear in Act III, scene iii. By such means, Shakespeare overrides the teleology; the preceding scenes foretell the bear’s presence in the tale, denying a logical sequencing of events.

Smallwood’s observance, in relation to \textit{The Alchemist}, that ‘the directness and singularity of attention of the action is unwavering’\textsuperscript{33}, distinguishes it from Shakespeare’s structuring of events. The play’s single departure from the unity of action is that it begins in medias res but from that point onwards it layers the receptions of each gull until Lovewit’s return. Thus, the play achieves, as Sanders terms it, ‘a remarkable sense of inevitability’\textsuperscript{34} in which actions move in parallel. It is this sense of an unavoidable ending which leads Creaser to say of Jonson’s plays, ‘the modes of confusion which his comedies generate are, however inventive, limited in range’\textsuperscript{35}. This assertion ignores the anxiety generated in an audience made painstakingly aware that the seven plots, which must be kept separate, will inevitably conflate. It is these desperate, and improvised, attempts to keep the various gulls apart which leads to much of the comedy; in Act III, scene v, Mammon arrives whilst Face, Doll and Subtle are entertaining Dapper and they must dispose of him quickly:

\begin{quote}
  Subtle: He must not be sent back.
  Face: O, by no means.
  What shall we do with this same puffin here,
  Now he’s o’ the spit?
  Subtle: Why, lay him back a while,
  With some device.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

Such manoeuvres necessitate the use of both doors either side of the \textit{frons}\textsuperscript{37} to conduct gulls via ‘the back way’\textsuperscript{38}, or into the privy in this case. Thus, the play is able to ‘exploit the sheer size of the Renaissance stage’\textsuperscript{39} to great effect. In making the audience aware that these separate plots will eventually meet, the times at which the dupes almost cross each others’ paths carry more dramatic impact and relief is denied the audience since the avoidance of their meeting is simply a delay of the inevitable. Thus, as has been suggested by the frustration of a teleological narrative in \textit{The Winter’s Tale}, for an audience of Shakespeare the question of the narrative is whether a certain event will occur; Jonson’s audience is asking not if, but when. This divests the plays with two very different ‘feelings’, a fact which is due primarily to their relationship with the dramatic unities.
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Jonson and Shakespeare’s differing attitudes towards the unities of action and time stipulate the genre and characterisation of their plays, both of which contribute to the effect the plays exact upon their audience. Womack identifies the connection between character and the unities, suggesting the unities to constitute ‘the matrix in which it was formed’.\(^\text{40}\) He explains how an adherence to the unities ‘exclude those potentialities of language and theatre which would introduce difference into the dramatis personae’.\(^\text{41}\) Thus, *The Winter’s Tale’s* vastness admits the passage of time, creating a space in which ‘human identity becomes malleable and subject to change’\(^\text{42}\). In tragi-comedy ‘the proverbial wheel of fortune is allowed […] to enter into a new, upward phase’\(^\text{43}\) and Leontes is permitted a second chance. However, this transformation is denied the characters which populate Jonson’s comedies, even the conspirators, as Mebane argues, ‘assuming theatrical costumes and adopting an inflated jargon’ have only ‘undergone illusory transformations’\(^\text{44}\). It is *The Alchemist’s* strict adherence to the unities which accounts for the denial of transformation as it creates a world which is ‘static and confined, hardly subject even to change, much less amendment.’

That the Jonsonian world is static and that of Shakespeare is flux is made apparent in *The Winter’s Tale* departure from, and *The Alchemist*’s adherence to, the unity of place. In the latter, action is localised through reference to Blackfriars. From the opening such comments as ‘This nook, here, of the Friars’\(^\text{45}\), in conjunction with the profusion of local place-names, ‘Pie Corner’ and ‘Artillery Yard’, act to confirm that the play’s location and the theatre’s are synonymous. This is made especially evident in Act V when the neighbours, having watched the comings and goings of the play’s characters, come forward. Smallwood suggests these neighbours may have materialised from among the stage-sitters. Indeed, the stage of the Blackfriars theatre ‘allowed up to fifteen gallants to collect stools from the tiring house and use them to sit on the stage itself,’\(^\text{46}\) making this staging conceivable and obscuring the distinction between the audience of the play and the audience in the play further. Thus Jonson, paradoxically, employs the unity of place to emphasise the play’s theatricality and fracture illusion.

Since the play cites its location as Blackfriars, it is worth examining its theatre and the nature of its space. Blackfriars theatre was located in the city liberties and its stage space was limited, consisting of only one-third of those of the open-air-theatres; ‘in every way it was a smaller, more intimate […] place’\(^\text{47}\). The indoor theatres tended to embrace ‘a greater sense of theatrical illusion’\(^\text{48}\) and Jonson’s play appears to harness this fact to make his ‘illusion-breaking’ devices all the more jarring. There is some debate as to where *The Winter’s Tale* was played since, whilst the Globe had previously been host to The King’s Men, in 1608 the company adopted the Blackfriars theatre as a second site of performance. According to Bradbrook, the last three Shakespeare plays, through ‘the delicacy of the verse, complexity and sophistication of the plots’, may have been ‘designed for a select audience and indoor staging.’\(^\text{49}\) However, as Braunmuller confirms, it is the popular form of drama that ‘ranges far in space as well as time’\(^\text{50}\) and therefore *The Winter’s Tale* would not have been
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incompatible with the audience of the Globe. If it were staged at the Globe, the audience would be an extremely 'self-conscious grouping [...], part of what Hamlet called 'the distracted globe'.

It was this sense of distraction which made Shakespeare doubt 'the possibility of bridging the gap between life and art' since it would have been virtually impossible to sustain verisimilar belief. Perhaps it is this doubt, this acceptance of the stage as a stage which fostered Shakespeare’s neglect of the unities. His play does not occupy a single location in pursuit of realism, but travels abroad with its characters. Throughout the course of the play we move between the places of Sicilia, Bohemia and Delphos. Shakespeare 'created atmosphere and locale' through the employment of “word scenery”. Thus, despite the fact that the play does not follow Cleomenes and Dion to Delphos, it is described so that we may imagine that place:

Cleomenes: The climate’s delicate, the air most sweet,  
Fertile the isle, the temple much surpassing  
The common praise it bears.

This technique is the means by which Shakespeare is able to ‘condense vast geographical spaces into the small imaginary space of the stage’. Jonson parodies this style of dramaturgy in The Alchemist through the heavily satirised character of Mammon. Mammon’s fantasies project his imagination beyond the parameters of the play, he speaks of ‘Peru’ and the ‘Indies’, appearing ludicrous and discordant with the spectator’s heightened awareness that he is firmly rooted in Blackfriars. However, Shakespeare’s use of the two realms of Sicilia and Bohemia allows him to draw contrasts, in-keeping with the pastoral tradition, which enable a sense of perspective that the monocentric world of The Alchemist denies.

According to Foucault, space has been ‘treated as the dead, the immobile’. This is certainly not the case in The Winter’s Tale. Its stage is flexible and ever in flux; it becomes two different courts, Hermione’s apartment, a prison, a boat, a shore, a pathway, a Shepherd’s dwelling and Paulina’s ‘removed house’. Shepherd and Womack discuss the difference between this sense of space, as ‘fluid’, and ‘fixed’ space. The Alchemist fixes space, establishing a concentrated feel of place which is immobile in many respects. The repetition of ‘master’s house’ in the first scene constructs an immutable setting;

Face: [...]lent you beside 
A house to practice in –  
Subtle: Your master’s house! 
Face: Where you have studied the more thriving skill  
Of bawdry since. 
Subtle: Yes, in your master’s house.

In this scene, the advantages of having an indoor setting not only contribute to a sense of enclosure but also heighten its comedy through an inventive use of sound. Lefebvre attests,
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physical space has no ‘reality’ without the energy that is deployed in it\textsuperscript{60} and in this opening scene it is sound which invests the space with energy. During the scene there is much fluctuation in sound-levels; Face repeatedly asks Subtle to “Speak lower rogue”\textsuperscript{61}, to which Subtle declares he ‘carries tempest in his hand and voice’\textsuperscript{62}. This vacillation in sound levels acts to test the acoustics of the space, reaffirming a sense of confinement and the audience’s proximity to the action. Thus, when Face reminds Subtle of his former destitution and he states ‘I do not hear well […] I wish you could advance your voice a little’\textsuperscript{63}, this is comic largely due to the enclosed theatre and the concentrated sense of space.

This strict adherence to the unity of place also contributes towards Jonson’s ‘comic technique of the “magnetic-centre”’\textsuperscript{64}. The location of the play, Lovewit’s house, is the centre which remains static, whilst the characters move in and out. The play makes much allusion to the notion of attracting through coercion, seen in the repetition of ‘draw’ which reinforces the magnetic-centre verbally; the audience is told ‘much company do they [the cozeners] draw’\textsuperscript{65} and in Act V, Lovewit wonders by what means they ‘draw this company’\textsuperscript{66}. This magnetic-centre, made possible by the claustrophobic sense of place, conflates with the anxiety over time to suggest the encroachment of the exterior. Hiscock argues that the ‘potential of the world beyond the four walls’ compel the cozeners into action\textsuperscript{67}. Thus, in Act II, scene iv, when Ananias knocks on the door, Subtle delivers rapid instructions: ‘Doll, scout, scout [Doll looks out of window]; stay Face, you must go to the door’\textsuperscript{68}. The confined space and strain exerted upon it by exterior forces, culminating in threats to break down the door, create such a level of pressure that the false explosion of the laboratory is re-enacted spatially; ‘we and the play are thrust out into the cold of the Blackfriars street.’\textsuperscript{69} The effect of this sudden rupture is to alter the audience’s relationship with the characters, placing them firmly with the neighbours and gulls and, as a result, exposing the similarities between theatre-going and being cozened.

Thus, Face’s sprawling descriptions of the laboratory including brilliant colours; ‘the pale citron, the green lion’\textsuperscript{70}; and his verse, cluttered with various glasses/raw materials designed to dupe the gulls, has the same effect on the audience. Such vivid descriptions coerce the audience into supplying mental images of a laboratory which is just out of sight, in a theatrical tradition of ‘imaginative projection and amplification’\textsuperscript{71}. Thus, when Lovewit returns and describes what he finds inside his house to be ‘empty walls, worse that I left’em’\textsuperscript{72} we realise that the laboratory ‘has been a product of our personal suspension of disbelief’\textsuperscript{73} against which the play’s multiple allusions to reality have been working.

Jonson’s identification of the play’s and the audience’s temporal and locative parameters combines with this refusal to allow the suspension of disbelief, producing a distinctive feel. His motivation in carrying the application of the unities to such an extreme, ‘where they […] subvert the ideal of naturalness from within’, enables him to deconstruct the notion of dramatic unity\textsuperscript{74} and expose the mechanics of dramaturgy as comparable to
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alchemy. In comparison, Shakespeare is willing to allow his spectators to ‘lose themselves in the spectacle’ occasionally, but employs his fluid sense of space, vast time-scheme and frustration of teleological plot as a means of disrupting that theatrical illusion. His exposure of \textit{The Winter’s Tale}’s artifice enacts, dramatically, Paulina’s line, ‘No longer shall you gaze on’t less your fancy/May think anon it moves’\textsuperscript{76}. As such, the unities do provide the secret of the play’s distinction; one applies the unities to reject verisimilitude and invoke self-awareness, the other neglects the unities to move, intermittently, between them.
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